

groundwater monitoring provision under Part 40 CFR 265, Subpart F within 12 months of the promulgation of the new hazardous listing or characteristic.

RCRA section 3005 (j)(11) allows the placement of untreated hazardous waste (*i.e.* hazardous waste otherwise prohibited from land disposal which has not been treated to meet EPA-established treatment standards before land disposal) in surface impoundments under limited circumstances. Such hazardous wastes may be placed in impoundments for purposes of treatment provided the impoundments meet the minimum technology requirements and provided that any treatment residues which either do not meet the treatment standards or which remain classified as hazardous wastes are removed from the impoundment annually. *See* the implementing rules in 40 CFR section 268.4. EPA has interpreted this provision so as not to nullify the provisions of section 3005(j)(6), the upshot being that impoundments receiving newly identified or listed wastes would have four years to close or retrofit under all circumstances. *See* 56 FR 37194. If the surface impoundment continues to treat hazardous wastes after the four year period, it must then be in compliance with 40 CFR 268.4 (Treatment Surface Impoundment Exemption).

Section 3005(j) of RCRA generally requires that existing surface impoundments cannot obtain interim status and continue to receive or store newly regulated hazardous waste for more than four years after the promulgation of the listing—unless the facility owner retrofits the unit by installing a liner that meets the requirements of section 3004(o)(1)(A), or meets the conditions specified in section 3005(j)(2). Under section 3005(j)(2), a surface impoundment may obtain interim status and continue to receive or store hazardous waste after the four-year deadline if (1) The unit has at least one liner, and there is no evidence it is leaking, (2) is located more than one-quarter mile from an underground source of drinking water; and (3) complies with the groundwater monitoring requirements applicable to permitted facilities. In this case, under section 3005(j)(9), the facility owner, at the closure of the unit, would have to remove or decontaminate all waste residues, all contaminated liner material, and contaminated soil to the extent practicable.

As part of the requirement to assure that surface impoundments will be safely phased out, EPA also proposes to regulate surface impoundments that

have not completed closure prior to the effective date of the rule. Under that scenario, these units would be subject to the interim status closure requirements of 40 CFR 265.111 and 265.228(a)(2).

For surface impoundments that have not met the interim status requirements by the effective date of the rule, they would be subject to the full RCRA subtitle C closure requirements (*e.g.*, obtain a Part A permit and comply with the interim status regulations).

EPA recognizes that for regulatory purposes, it has historically not required disposal units that cease receiving new listed or characteristic wastes before the effective date of RCRA subtitle C to comply with the requirements. However, EPA believes that a revised approach is necessary to protect human health and the environment, in this particular case, given the size of the CCR surface impoundments in question; the enormous volumes of CCRs they typically contain (which typically represent overwhelming mass of the material in place); the fact that the CCRs are typically destined for permanent entombment when the unit is eventually closed (typically with limited removal); the presence of very large hydraulic head leading to continued release—even where the impoundment has been drained—that is, improperly closed CCR impoundments remain open to precipitation and infiltration; and the continuing threat to human health and the environment through catastrophic failure, if the impoundments are not properly closed.

EPA's authority under subtitle C of RCRA extends to wastes that are treated, stored, or disposed of; the statutory definition of disposal has been broadly interpreted to include passive leaking. But historically, EPA has construed the definition of disposal for regulatory purposes to be narrower than the statutory definition of disposal. Although in some situations, post-placement management has been considered disposal, triggering RCRA subtitle C regulatory requirements *e.g.*, multiple dredging of impoundments or management of leachate, EPA has generally interpreted the statute to require a permit only if a facility treats, stores, or disposes of the waste, after the effective date of its designation as a hazardous waste. *See, e.g.*, 43 FR 58984 (Dec. 18, 1978; 45 FR 33074 (May 1980)).

The consequence of this interpretation is that, for example, no permit would be required if, after the rule's effective date, a facility neither continued to accept the listed wastes for disposal, nor continued to "manage the wastes" in the existing unit. In other words, under this interpretation, facility

owners could abandon the unit before the effective date of the rule without incurring any regulatory obligations under RCRA subtitle C (presuming no other regulated unit is present on-site).

Given the particularly significant risk associated with CCR impoundments described above, as well as the fact that these risks are primarily driven by the existing disposal units, EPA believes a broader interpretation of disposal is appropriate in this case. This is reinforced by the fact that the continued release of constituents to surrounding soil and groundwater through the continued infiltration of precipitation through inappropriately closed CCR impoundments (or failure to remove the impoundment waters, which provides a hydraulic head) properly constitute regulatory disposal in this specific situation.

As a practical matter, EPA believes that owners of facilities where CCRs are managed in existing surface impoundments being brought under RCRA subtitle C by today's proposal would choose not to, or would not be able to, comply with either of these alternatives (*i.e.*, retrofit or clean closure), given the size of the units and the volume of CCRs involved. Therefore, EPA believes that the section 3005(j) requirements, for all practical purposes, will have the effect of requiring the closure of existing surface impoundments receiving CCRs within four years of the effective date of today's proposed rule (unless they already meet the liner requirements).¹³⁰

Section 3004(x), however, gives EPA the authority to modify section 3005(j) requirements, if the specific criteria listed in that section are met. In today's notice, EPA is proposing to modify the time required for retrofitting surface impoundments under section 3005(j), because of the special characteristics (*i.e.*, extremely large volumes) of CCRs and the practical difficulties associated with requiring facilities to cease to store CCRs within four years of the effective date of today's rule.

Therefore, EPA is proposing to modify the section 3005(j) requirements by extending the time limit for unit closure. The modified standard in today's proposal would require facilities operating surface impoundments that do not meet minimum technology

¹³⁰ The HSWA surface impoundment retrofit requirements, as they applied to impoundments in existence at the time RCRA was amended in 1984, went into effect in 1988. EPA is not aware of any facility owner/operator managing an existing surface impoundment at the time who chose to retrofit its impoundment, rather than to close it. EPA believes facilities managing surface impoundments today, will similarly choose to close the surface impoundment rather than retrofit.

requirements and are receiving CCRs to stop receiving those CCRs no later than five years after the effective date of the final regulation and to close the unit within two years after that date. In other words, the time required for closure would be up to seven years rather than four years.

EPA believes that the four-year deadline in RCRA section 3005(j) receiving CCRs will be extraordinarily difficult if not impossible for many facilities to meet, given the size of the units and limitations in available alternative subtitle C disposal capacity. Facility owners choosing to close surface impoundments may have to make significant engineering and process changes, *e.g.*, to convert from wet- to dry-handling of wastes, which cannot necessarily be accomplished within four years. For example, USWAG has raised concerns that there is limited manufacturing capacity for key conversion equipment, which could reasonably be expected to complicate the utilities' ability to collectively make the necessary engineering changes within a four-year timeframe. An additional consideration is that EPA expects that many facilities would need to obtain permits for new units or find alternative subtitle C capacity to receive the wastes diverted from surface impoundments. Also, facilities that use surface impoundments receiving CCRs to manage stormwater and nonhazardous wastewater will have to site and get permits for new stormwater management units before facility owners can cease utilizing existing units. The amount of time to achieve either of these alternatives relies, to some extent, on events beyond the facility's control; for example, the timeframes to obtain a permit for a new unit can vary substantially and, in large measure, are ultimately dictated by the permitting authority, rather than the applicant. This may be further complicated by the fact that location standards or on-site space limitations can restrict the opportunity for siting new units at the generating facility, requiring utilities to find off-site disposal facilities able to receive the special waste in the volumes in question.

In the 1984 amendments, Congress only allowed surface impoundments four years to cease receiving hazardous waste (or comply with minimum technological design requirements, etc.). Given the enormously greater volume of waste involved with CCR surface impoundments and the process changes that the facilities will need to implement to convert to dry handling, EPA believes it not practicable to require surface impoundments to cease

receiving CCR waste or comply with the minimum technological requirements four years and that additional time is appropriate. (As noted below, facilities in most states will have significantly more time for planning, because the rules will not become effective in states authorized for the RCRA program before those states have amended their requirements consistent with today's rule; the state regulatory process will likely take several years.) On the other hand, as the risks predicted in the risk assessment are extraordinarily high (up to 2×10^{-2}), EPA believes that closure within the shortest practicable time is important.

Any modifications of section 3005(j) must meet the section 3004(x) stricture that the modification must still "assure protection of human health and the environment (42 U.S.C. 6924(x))." EPA believes that allowing three additional years for closure, under today's proposal, would be protective because surface impoundments subject to the closure requirements would be required (during this interim period) to have groundwater monitoring systems sufficient to detect releases of hazardous constituents into the groundwater, and take corrective action where releases were detected above drinking water levels.¹³¹ Additionally, the median number of years until peak well water concentrations are reached for selenium and arsenic are estimated at 74 and 78 years, respectively, for unlined surface impoundments and 90 and 110 years, respectively, for clay-lined surface impoundments, reducing the likely risks posed over this five-year period.

In addition, although not directly relevant to leaching from these surface impoundments, we would also note (as described previously in this section) that the facility would be required to have an independent registered professional engineer certify that design of the impoundment is in accordance with recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices (RAGAGEP)¹³² for the maximum volume of CCR slurry and wastewater that will be impounded therein, and

¹³¹ The Agency is also modifying the requirement that surface impoundments be dredged annually, based on RCRA section 3004(x). This is discussed in detail in section v (Proposed Land Disposal Restrictions) below.

¹³² Recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices (RAGAGEPs) are engineering, operation, or maintenance activities based on established codes, standards, published technical reports or recommended practices (RP) or a similar document. RAGAGEPs detail generally approved ways to perform specific engineering, inspection or mechanical integrity activities. See http://www.osha.gov/OshDoc/Directive_pdf/CPL_03-00-010.pdf.

that the design and management features ensure dam stability. Finally, the facilities will be required to conduct weekly inspections to ensure that any potentially hazardous condition or structural weakness will be quickly identified. Therefore, the additional timeframe that EPA is proposing to allow—needed to address practical realities—will "assure protection of human health and the environment. While groundwater monitoring, corrective action, and close oversight of these units is not, we believe, the most appropriate long-term solution, we do believe that these steps will protect public health and the environment in the short term while the permanent solutions are being implemented.

EPA recognizes that the costs of these requirements will be significant, especially for existing surface impoundments and similar units that handle wet CCRs. EPA also acknowledges that the date by which impoundments have to close is an important issue, affecting the costs of phase-out of wet handling and the ability of industry to comply. USWAG has argued strenuously against a closure requirement in the first place, and has asserted that, if such a requirement were imposed, industry would require ten years to comply.¹³³

EPA is not persuaded by these comments. We appreciate the cost considerations but also believe it is important that these surface impoundments cease receiving wet-handled CCRs and proceed to closure as soon as practicable. The Agency believes that the time period proposed today is sufficient to provide industry the time necessary to convert from wet handling to dry handling of these wastes, close out existing units, and find or put in place new disposal capacity for these wastes. In addition, the Agency notes that TVA and other utilities have already decided, or are being required by states, to close existing impoundments, regardless of the requirements of today's proposed rule. As a result, EPA believes today's proposal would have less effect than industry commenters suggest because some facilities may be making these changes anyway and they reflect best management practices in today's environment. However, EPA solicits comments on whether seven years (5 years to cease receiving waste and 2 years to close) from the effective date to implement these provisions is an achievable time for facilities to comply.

¹³³ In developing cost estimates for closing its surface impoundments, TVA also assumed that the process would take place over ten years.

EPA is interested in comments on procedural, as well as technical, issues (e.g., time to allow permit modifications for new capacity or EPA or state approval of closure plans). As stated earlier, EPA does note that, in the 1984 amendments to RCRA, Congress required existing hazardous waste surface impoundments without liners to retrofit within four years if they are to continue operating. Congress also required impoundments which place hazardous wastes into impoundments to either treat the wastes first, or to use minimum technology impoundments, including a requirement to dredge the impoundment annually. *See* discussion of section 3005(j)(11) and implementing regulations above. As a practical matter, this meant that all but a very few surface impoundments ceased receiving hazardous wastes within this time period. Thus, a requirement that surface impoundments cease receiving liquid wastes in five years and close in seven years is consistent with Congressional direction on appropriate time periods to phase out the management of CCRs in surface impoundments. Further, as noted previously, these specific requirements will not go into effect in most cases until a state is authorized for this aspect of the RCRA program, which normally takes from two to five years after the regulations become federally effective (with some estimates as long as eight years), giving facilities substantial advance notice. (*See* discussion on when the rules become effective in section VII of this preamble.) For commenters who suggest a longer time period is needed, EPA solicits comment on how a longer time period would meet the section 3004(x) risk standard.

Whatever time period EPA selects, the Agency solicits comment on whether it should include a provision that would allow the regulatory Agency to provide additional time on a case-by-case basis because of site-specific issues (e.g., particular technical difficulties or equipment availability outside the utility's control, as well as permitting delays). This provision might be modeled after the provision of 40 CFR 264.112 and 265.112 (Amendment of Plans), allowing facilities to delay closure of hazardous waste management units.

Commenters have also stated that, while it may be appropriate to require closure of most existing impoundments, some may be clearly safe. For example, existing impoundments theoretically may already have a composite liner, and present minimal threat of release (e.g., because they are below grade or not far above grade). EPA solicits comment on whether a variance process would be

appropriate allowing some impoundments or similar units that manage wet-handled CCRs to remain in operation because they present minimal risk to groundwater (e.g., because they have a composite liner) and minimal risk of a catastrophic release (e.g., as indicated by a low potential hazard rating under the Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety established by the Federal Emergency Management Agency). It should be noted that the statute already provides such a mechanism in section 3005 (j)(4) and (5) (based on making a so-called 'no-migration' demonstration—evidently Congress' view of what level of control is considered protective for hazardous waste impoundments not utilizing minimum technology controls¹³⁴) and commenters should address whether this existing case-by-case mechanism should be utilized here. In such cases, the wastes might also meet current LDR treatment standards.

v. Proposed Land Disposal Restrictions

Through RCRA sections 3004 (d), (e), (f), and (g), Congress has prohibited the land disposal of hazardous waste unless the waste meets treatment standards established by EPA before the waste is disposed of, or is disposed of in units from which there will be no migration of hazardous constituents for as long as the waste remains hazardous. The treatment standards may be either a treatment level or a specified treatment method, and the treatment must substantially diminish the toxicity of the waste or substantially reduce the likelihood of migration of hazardous constituents from the waste so that short-term and long-term threats to human health and the environment are minimized (RCRA section 3004(m)). If the hazardous waste has been treated to the level or by a method specified in the regulations (or if the waste as generated meets the treatment standard), the waste is not subject to any land disposal prohibition and may be disposed of in a land disposal unit which meets the requirements of 40 CFR parts 264 or 265 (the exception being for surface impoundments discussed in the preceding subsection and further below). For hazardous wastes identified or listed under RCRA section 3001 after the date of the 1984 amendments to RCRA subtitle C (the situation here), EPA is required to determine whether

the waste shall be prohibited from one or more methods of land disposal within six months after the date of such identification or listing, and if EPA determines that one or more methods are prohibited, the Agency is also required to specify treatment levels or methods of treatment for the waste (RCRA section 3004(g)(4)).

In an effort to make treatment standards as uniform as possible, while adhering to the fundamental requirement that the standards must minimize threats to human health and the environment before hazardous wastes can be land disposed, EPA developed the Universal Treatment Standards (UTS) (codified at 40 CFR 268.48). Under the UTS, whenever technically and legally possible, the Agency adopts the same technology-based numerical limit for a hazardous constituent regardless of the type of hazardous waste in which the constituent is present. *See* 63 FR 28560 (May 26, 1998); 59 FR 47982 (September 19, 1994). The UTS, in turn, reflect the performance of Best Demonstrated Available Technologies (BDAT) of the constituents in question. These treatment standards can be met by any type of treatment, other than impermissible dilution, and wastes can satisfy the treatment standards as generated (*i.e.*, without being treated).

As explained above, section 3004(x) of RCRA authorizes the EPA Administrator to modify the requirements of sections (d), (e), (f), and (g) of section 3004 for Bevill wastes, including CCRs that EPA determines to regulate as hazardous, to take into account the special characteristics of the wastes, the practical difficulties associated with implementation of the requirements, and site-specific characteristics, so long as such modified requirements assure protection of human health and the environment.

In conjunction with a proposed listing, EPA is proposing to prohibit the land disposal of CCRs, unless they meet the applicable treatment standards. In addition, although CCRs could be disposed of without treatment in landfills and impoundments from which there will be no migration of hazardous constituents for as long as the waste remains hazardous, EPA doubts that such a unit exists, given the volumes of CCRs and their many (documented) release pathways discussed above. In any case, no-migration determinations are necessarily made on a case-by-case basis, and the burden is on petitioners to show that individual land disposal units satisfy the exacting standard. *See* 40 CFR section 268.6.

¹³⁴ See RCRA section 3004 (d), (e), (f), and (g) all of which define a land disposal unit as protective of human health and the environment if "it has been demonstrated to a reasonable degree of certainty that there will be no migration of hazardous constituents from the disposal unit * * * for as long as the wastes remain hazardous".

2. Proposed Treatment Standards for Non-Wastewaters (Dry CCRs)

For non-wastewaters (*i.e.*, dry CCRs), EPA is proposing that CCRs be subject to the UTS. As EPA has found repeatedly, this standard reflects the performance of Best Demonstrated Available Technology and so satisfies the requirements of section 3004 (m) (*see Hazardous Waste Treatment Council v. EPA*, 886 F. 2d 355, 363 (D.C. Cir. 1989)), and also does not force treatment past the point at which threats to human health and the environment are minimized (*see* 55 FR 6640, 6641–42 (Feb. 26, 1990)). These standards should be achievable by application of various available technologies, although data¹³⁵ indicate that a great portion (if not virtually all) dry CCRs meet these standards as generated.

3. Proposed Treatment Standards for Wastewaters (Wet-Handled CCRs)

EPA is also proposing standards for wastewater CCRs. As an initial matter, EPA is proposing to adopt a specific and different definition of wastewater for CCRs. Under the existing RCRA subtitle C rules, a wastewater is defined as one that contains less than 1% by weight total organic carbon (TOC) and less than 1% by weight total suspended solids (*i.e.*, the current wastewater definition for purposes of LDRs; *see* 40 CFR part 268.2 (f)). Functionally, the current definition of wastewaters would not include slurried fly ash or slurried FGD from wet air pollution control systems. EPA believes it important to distinguish between nonwastewaters which involve dry coal ash and surface impoundment systems which are commonly viewed as involving wastewaters. EPA, therefore, is proposing to create the distinction between wastewater and nonwastewater CCRs by classifying CCRs as wastewaters if the moisture content of the waste exceeds 50%. Thus, if CCRs contain more water than solids, the CCR would be classified as a wastewater, and would be subject to the LDR treatment standard for wastewaters. By proposing the criteria at 50% moisture, EPA believes new methods for pumping and disposal of high solids material without free liquids are still viable. EPA is proposing this definition to appropriately address risks associated with CCRs surface impoundments, which contain free liquids. However, the Agency requests comment on this alternative definition of wastewaters for purposes of determining which treatment standards the CCRs would be subject to.

As part of the proposed treatment standard, EPA is proposing that these wastewaters undergo solids removal so that the wastewaters contain no greater than 100 mg/l total suspended solids (TSS) and meet the UTS for wastewaters. This proposed level is consistent with wastewater treatment requirements based on Best Practicable Control Technology Currently Available for the Electric Power Generating Point Source Category (40 CFR section 423.12).¹³⁶ Solids separation is a base level water pollution control technology, which assures that the vast majority of coal ash and associated contaminants are removed and managed in landfills.

EPA is proposing that wastewaters meet the UTS for wastewaters at 40 CFR section 268.48 as the treatment standard for the liquid fraction. (The CCR solids removed from the wastewater stream would be a non-wastewater and would be subject to the UTS for non-wastewaters.) EPA believes dry disposal of the CCR solids will protect human health and the environment. As previously discussed, this is borne out by the results of the Agency's risk assessment and damage case assessments, which show that wet disposal poses the greatest risks of contaminant releases.

The Agency believes the proposed treatment methods will diminish the toxicity of the waste or substantially reduce the likelihood of migration of toxic constituents from the waste so that short-term and long-term threats to human health and the environment are minimized. If finalized, EPA will add new treatment method codes to the table of Technology Codes and Description of Technology-Based Standards at 40 CFR 268.42. EPA seeks comments on the proposed treatment standards.

4. Effective Date of the LDR Prohibitions

Land disposal prohibitions are to be effective immediately unless EPA finds that there is insufficient alternative protective treatment, recovery or disposal capacity for the wastes. RCRA section 3004(h)(2). National capacity variances can be for up to two years from the date of the prohibition. During the duration of a national capacity

variance, the wastes do not require treatment in order to be land disposed. If they are disposed of in a landfill or surface impoundment, however, that unit must meet the minimum technology requirements of RCRA section 3004(o). RCRA section 3004 (h) and 40 CFR section 268.5 (h).¹³⁷

In this case, EPA is proposing that the prohibition and treatment standards for nonwastewaters take effect within 6 months from the date of promulgation of the listing of CCRs as a special waste. We are proposing 6 months to allow time for owners and operators to set up analytic capacity and record-keeping mechanisms for dry CCR wastes, as well as for federal and state agencies to assure that implementation mechanisms are in place. We are not allocating additional time for treatment because our expectation is that all or virtually all dry CCRs meet the proposed treatment standards as generated. However, EPA solicits comment on this issue. EPA also notes that the proposed LDR prohibition and treatment standards would not take effect until programs in authorized states are authorized and the state implementing rules take effect, so this proposal effectively is for the prohibition and treatment standard requirement to take effect 6 months following the conclusion of the authorization process and effective date of authorized state rules. This should be ample time to come into compliance.

For wastewaters, however, under the authority of section 3004 (x), we are proposing that the prohibition and treatment standards take effect within five years of the prohibition. In practice, these requirements will have the effect of prohibiting disposal of wet-handled CCRs in surface impoundments after that date. The proposed date for the wastewater treatment standards would thus be the same as the proposed date that impoundments would stop receiving CCRs, and is being proposed for many of the same reasons. Surface impoundments, of course, are the land disposal units in which wastewaters are managed, so the issues are necessarily connected. As discussed in section VI. B. above, the statute allows owners and operators up to four years to retrofit existing surface impoundments to meet

¹³⁶ Although TSS is not a hazardous constituent, it is a reasonable surrogate of effective treatment performance here because TSS necessarily contain the metal hazardous constituents which are the object of treatment, and these metals will necessarily be removed as TSS are removed. *See e.g.: National Lime Ass'n v. EPA*, 234 F. 3d 625, 639 (D.C. Cir. 2000) (even though particulate matter is not a hazardous air pollutant, it can be used as a permissible surrogate for treatment of hazardous air pollutant metals since those metals are removed by treatment as PM is removed).

¹³⁷ EPA is also authorized to grant up to a one-year extension, renewable for another year, of a prohibition effective date on a case-by-case basis. RCRA section 3004 (h)(3). Applicants must demonstrate that adequate alternative treatment, recovery, or disposal capacity for the petitioners waste cannot reasonably be made available by the effective date due to circumstances beyond the applicant's control, and that the petitioner has entered into a binding contractual commitment to construct or otherwise provide such capacity. 40 CFR 268.5.

¹³⁵ EPA's CCR constituent database which is available from the docket to this proposal.

the minimum technology requirements (or to close such surface impoundments), and EPA has interpreted this provision as applying to treatment surface impoundments receiving hazardous wastes otherwise prohibited from land disposal. See RCRA sections 3005 (j)(6) and 3005 (j)(11). As further explained above, EPA believes that an additional three years is needed for owners and operators to close surface impoundments—*i.e.* seven years in all—and is thus proposing a two year national capacity variance (as provided in RCRA section 3004(h)(2)) and a five year period for impoundment retrofitting yielding a seven year extension.

The legal basis for the proposal is 3004 (x) (which specifically authorizes modification of the section 3005 (j) requirements). Section 3005 (j) (11) allows untreated wastewaters to be managed in surface impoundments that do not meet the minimum technology requirements, but requires that residues in the impoundment be dredged at least annually for management elsewhere. Given the enormous volume of CCRs currently managed in surface impoundments, estimated at 29.4 million tons per year (within EPA's estimated range of 23.5 to 30.3 million tons for the total available U.S. hazardous waste disposal capacity), and the absence of alternative disposal capacity in the short-term, EPA believes annual dredging is impractical and would defeat the purpose of providing additional time to convert to the dry handling of CCRs. Moreover, in this short time, the utilities will be working to convert their processes to dry handling and it is not practicable or necessary to impose this additional requirement. Finally, as discussed previously, in the interim period before surface impoundments cease taking waste and are closed, numerous safeguards will be in place to protect public health and the environment, including ground water monitoring and the requirement to act on any releases quickly. Thus, while such measures are not a long-term solution, they will "assure protection of human health and the environment" in the short-term.

As this discussion clarifies, the issue of a national capacity extension for CCR wastewaters is really an issue of how long it will take to convert to dry handling and to find management capacity for solids dredged from impoundments, *i.e.* issues arising under section 3005 (j)(11) of the statute. EPA, therefore, believes it has the authority and that it is appropriate to use section 3004 (x) to extend the national capacity

period in order to convert to dry handling.¹³⁸

EPA is further proposing that during the national capacity variance (the initial two years of the proposed two years plus five year extension of otherwise-applicable requirements), CCR wastewaters could continue to be managed in impoundments that do not meet the minimum technology requirements. The reasons are identical to those allowing such impoundments to receive CCRs for the remainder of the proposed extension period.

EPA solicits comment on these proposals, including comment on whether further time extensions are actually needed in light of the already extended time which will be afforded by the state authorization process.

C. Applicability of Subtitle C Regulations

The discussion in this section describes the existing technical standards required in 40 CFR parts 264/265/267. However, persons who generate and transport CCRs, under the subtitle C alternative, would also be subject to the generator (40 CFR part 262) and transporter (40 CFR part 263) requirements. Although EPA presents this to provide the public with background information as noted previously, EPA is not proposing to modify these standards, nor to reopen the requirements.

1. *General Facility Requirements, including Location Restrictions.* Under the existing regulations, all of the following requirements would apply: the general facility standards of 40 CFR parts 264/265/267 (Subpart B), the preparedness and prevention standards of 40 CFR parts 264/265/267 (Subpart C), the contingency plan and emergency procedures of 40 CFR parts 264/265/267 (Subpart D), and the manifest system, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements of 40 CFR parts 264/265/267 (Subpart E). Consistent with section 264.18, the regulations would include location standards prohibiting the siting of new treatment, storage, or disposal units in a 100-year floodplain (unless the facility made a specific

demonstration)¹³⁹ and seismic impact areas would be prohibited.¹⁴⁰

2. *Ground water monitoring/corrective action for regulated units.* The subtitle C alternative to today's proposed rule would require the current ground water monitoring and corrective action requirements of 40 CFR parts 264/265 for regulated landfills and surface impoundments, without modification. Consistent with 40 CFR 265.90, existing CCR disposal units would be required to install groundwater monitoring systems within one year of the effective date of these regulations. The facility would operate under the self-implementing interim status requirements of 40 CFR part 265 until the regulatory authority imposed the specific requirements of 40 CFR part 264 through the RCRA permitting process. Generally, 40 CFR parts 264/265 require groundwater monitoring systems that consist of enough wells, installed at appropriate locations and depths, to yield ground water samples from the uppermost aquifer that represent the quality of background groundwater that has not been affected by leakage from the disposal unit. A detection monitoring program would be required to detect releases to groundwater of CCR constituents listed in the facility permit (these constituents, we believe, would be the metals typically identified as constituents of concern in CCRs). Monitoring frequency is determined by the EPA Regional Administrator or, more typically the authorized state, and required in the RCRA permit. If any of the constituents listed in the facility permit are detected at levels that constitute statistically significant evidence of contamination, the owner or operator must initiate a compliance monitoring program to determine whether the disposal units are in

¹³⁹ A 100-year flood means a flood that as a one-percent or greater chance of recurring in any given year or a flood of a magnitude equaled or exceeded once in 100 years on the average over a significantly long period.

¹⁴⁰ A seismic impact area means an area with a two percent or greater probability that the maximum horizontal acceleration in lithified earth material, expressed as a percentage of the earth's gravitational pull (g), will exceed 0.10 g in 50 years. Note that in the pre-1997 editions of the NEHRP (National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program) provisions, seismic hazards around the nation were defined at a uniform 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years. Since the 1997 NEHRP Provisions, however, the seismic design maps have been redefined such that for most regions of the nation, the maximum considered earthquake ground motion is defined with uniform probability of exceedance of 2 percent in 50 years. The change in the exceedance probability (from 10% to 2%) was responsive to comments that the use of 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years is not sufficiently conservative in the central and eastern United States where earthquakes are expected to occur infrequently.

¹³⁸ EPA notes in addition that it is authorized under section 3004 (x) to modify the requirements of LDR prohibitions under section 3004 (g), and EPA views capacity variances related to such prohibitions as within the scope of that section 3004 (x) authorization.

compliance with the groundwater protection standards established by EPA or the state and specified in the permit. (See 40 CFR part 264, subpart F.)

Under 40 CFR part 264, subpart F, if the results of the compliance monitoring program indicate exceedances of any of the constituent levels listed in the permit for the groundwater protection standard, the owner or operator would have to initiate corrective action to achieve compliance with the groundwater protection standards.

3. *Storage.* EPA is not proposing to modify the existing 40 CFR parts 264/265/267 storage standards. These regulations establish design and operating requirements for containers, tanks, and buildings used to treat or store hazardous wastes. For containers, the regulations establish requirements for the storage of hazardous waste, including a requirement for secondary containment. However, if the wastes do not contain free liquids, they need not require a secondary containment system, provided the storage area is sloped or is otherwise designed and operated to drain and remove liquid resulting from precipitation or the containers are elevated or otherwise protected from contact with accumulated liquid.

For new tanks, owners or operators must submit to EPA or the authorized states an assessment certified by an independent registered professional engineer that the foundation, structural support, seams, connections, and pressure controls (if applicable) are adequately designed and that the tank system has sufficient structural strength, compatibility with the waste(s) to be stored or treated, and corrosion protection to ensure that the tank will not collapse, rupture, or fail. Tank systems are required to have secondary containment under section 264.193, unless they receive a specific variance; however, tanks that contain no free liquids and are in buildings with an impermeable floor do not require secondary containment. New tanks (that are required to have secondary containment) must have secondary containment when constructed; existing tanks (that are required to have secondary containment) must come into compliance within two years of the rule's effective date (or when the tank has reached fifteen years of age). Section 264.193 specifically describes the secondary containment required, and the variance process.

Containment buildings must be completely enclosed with a floor, walls, and a roof to prevent exposure to the elements (e.g., precipitation, wind, run-on), and to assure containment of the

managed wastes. Buildings must be designed so that they have sufficient structural strength to prevent collapse or other failure, and all surfaces to be in contact with hazardous wastes must be chemically compatible with those wastes.

Recently, representatives of the utility industry have stated their view that CCRs cannot be practically or cost effectively managed under the existing 40 CFR parts 264/265/267 storage standards, and that these standards impose significant costs without meaningful benefits when applied specifically to CCRs.¹⁴¹ In particular, they cite the very large volume of wastes that must be handled on a daily basis, and the extensive storage and other infrastructure already in place that might have to be retrofitted if the existing 40 CFR parts 264/265/267 storage requirements applied. For example, they state that some CCRs are stored prior to disposal in silos which are not located within a building and may contain free liquids. As a result, under the subtitle C requirements, the owner or operator would be required to construct a building with an impermeable floor, or construct a secondary containment system around the silo (alternatively, they could go through a variance process with the regulatory Agency).

EPA believes that the variance process allowing alternatives to secondary containment would address the concerns raised by industry. The Agency, however, recognizes that the variance process imposes time and resource burdens not only on industry, but on the regulatory agencies. EPA notes that, in the case of larger volume, higher toxicity mineral processing materials being reclaimed, the Agency developed special storage standards under RCRA subtitle C, and it solicits comments on whether those or similar-type standards would be appropriate for CCRs.¹⁴²

Namely, in 40 CFR 261.4(a)(17), EPA required that tanks, containers, and buildings handling this material must be free standing and not a surface impoundment (as defined in the definitions section of this proposal) and

be manufactured of a material suitable for storage of its contents. (While not specifically mentioned in this section, we would also consider a requirement that such materials meet appropriate specifications, such as those established either by the American Society of Testing Materials (ASTM), the American Petroleum Institute (API), or Underwriters Laboratories, Inc. (UL) standards.) Buildings must be man-made structures and have floors constructed from non-earthen materials, have walls, and have a roof suitable for diverting rainwater away from the foundation. A building may also have doors or removable sections to enable trucks or machines access.

EPA solicits comments on the practicality of the proposed subtitle C storage requirements for CCRs, the workability of the existing variance process, and the alternative requirements based, for example, on the mining and mineral processing wastes storage requirements. EPA has not developed cost estimates for managing CCRs in compliance with the 40 CFR parts 264/265/267 storage standards. EPA solicits specific comments on these potential costs.

4. *Closure and Post-Closure Care.* Under the RCRA subtitle C alternative to this co-proposal, all of the requirements for closure and post-closure care of landfills and surface impoundments would apply to those landfills that continue to receive CCRs, or otherwise actively manage them, and to those surface impoundments that have not completed closure, when the requirements of a final rule become effective. The 40 CFR parts 264/265 landfill and surface impoundment requirements establish cover requirements (e.g., the cover must have a permeability less than or equal to the permeability of any bottom liner system and must minimize the migration of liquids through the closed landfill). These requirements are generally applied through a closure-plan or permit approval process. Also, the regulations require 30 years of post-closure care, including maintenance of the cap and ground-water monitoring, unless an alternative post-closure period is established by EPA or the authorized state.

5. *Corrective action.* EPA is also not proposing to modify the existing corrective action requirements, including the facility-wide corrective action requirements of RCRA under section 3004(u), section 3008(h), and 40 CFR 264.101. Under these requirements, landfills that continue to receive CCRs or otherwise actively manage them, and surface impoundments that have not

¹⁴¹ While the utility industry did not specifically mention the 40 CFR part 267 storage standards, we presume that they would make the same technical arguments with respect to those standards.

¹⁴² Land Disposal Restrictions Phase IV: Final Rule Promulgating Treatment Standards for Metal Wastes and Mineral Processing Wastes; Mineral Processing Secondary Materials and Bevill Exclusion Issues; Treatment Standards for Hazardous Soils, and Exclusion of Recycled Wood Preserving Wastewaters: Final Rule (<http://www.epa.gov/EPA-WASTE/1998/May/Day-26/f989.html>).

completed closure on the date the final rule becomes effective, will be required to characterize, and as necessary remediate, releases of CCRs or hazardous constituents. Section 3004(x) provides EPA the flexibility to modify corrective action requirements for facilities managing CCRs, including facility-wide corrective action (assuming EPA can reasonably determine that an alternative is protective of human health and the environment). The facility-wide corrective action requirement applies to all solid waste management units from which there have been releases of hazardous wastes or hazardous constituents; however, EPA does not see a compelling reason to change the corrective action requirements. Imposing corrective action requirements, including facility-wide corrective action, will assure that closed and inactive units at the facility are properly characterized and, if necessary, remediated, especially since many of these closed or inactive units are unlined. Nevertheless, EPA solicits comment on whether EPA should modify the corrective action requirements under section 3004(x) of RCRA. Commenters should specifically address the issue of how other alternatives could be protective without mandating corrective action as needed for all solid waste management units from which there have been releases of hazardous waste or hazardous constituents at the facility.

6. Financial assurance. EPA is also not proposing to modify the existing financial assurance requirements at 40 CFR parts 264/265/267, subpart H. Financial assurance must be adequate to cover the estimated costs of closure and post-closure care (including facility-wide corrective action, as needed), and specific levels of financial assurance are required to cover liability for bodily injury and property damage to third parties caused by sudden accidental occurrences arising from operations of the facility. Allowable financial assurance mechanisms are trust funds, surety bonds, letters of credit, insurance policies, corporate guarantees, and demonstrations and documentation that owners or operators of the facility have sufficient assets to cover closure, post-closure care, and liability. The regulations also require financial assurance for corrective action under section 264.101.

As we have estimated that 53 local governments own and operate coal-fired electric utilities, EPA seeks comment on whether a financial test similar to that in 40 CFR 258.74(f) in the Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills should

be established for local governments that own and operate coal-fired power plants.

7. Permitting requirements. Under the RCRA subtitle C alternative, facilities that manage CCRs (in this case, facilities with landfills and surface impoundments, and other possible management units used to store or dispose of CCRs, or generating facilities that store CCRs destined for off-site disposal) must obtain a permit from EPA or from the authorized state. The effect of EPA's proposed listing would extend these permitting requirements to those facilities managing special wastes regulated under subtitle C of RCRA. Parts 124, 267 and 270 detail the specific procedures for the issuance and modification of permits, including public participation, and through the permit process regulatory agencies impose technical design and management standards of 40 CFR parts 264/267. Facilities with landfills that are in existence on the effective date of the regulation (which in this case would generally be the effective date of the state regulations establishing the federal CCR requirements)—which receive CCRs or actively manage CCRs—are eligible for "interim status" under federal regulations, providing they comply with the requirements of 40 CFR section 270.70. By contrast, facilities with surface impoundments that have not completed closure as outlined in this proposal would be subject to the existing permitting requirements, irrespective of whether they continue to receive CCRs into the unit or to actively manage CCRs. While facilities are in interim status, they are subject to the largely self-implementing requirements of 40 CFR part 265. As noted previously, in a final regulation, EPA would make conforming changes to these parts of the CFR to make it clear that the requirements apply to facilities that manage either hazardous wastes or special wastes regulated under subtitle C.

8. EPA is Not Proposing to Apply the Subtitle C Requirements to CCRs from Certain On-Going State or Federally Required Cleanups. Under the subtitle C alternative, the Agency is proposing to allow state or federally-required cleanups commenced prior to the effective date of the final rule to be completed in accordance with the requirements determined to be appropriate for the specific cleanup. EPA's rationale for this decision is two-fold. First, for state or federally required cleanups that already commenced and are continuing, the state or federal government has entered into an administrative agreement with the

facility owner or operator which specifies remedies, clean-up goals, and timelines that were determined to be protective of human health and the environment, based on the conditions at the site. The overseeing Agency will also be able to ensure that the cleanup waste, if sent off-site (which may sometimes be necessary) will go to appropriately designed and permitted facilities. Second, altering the requirements for cleanups currently underway would be disruptive and could cause significant delays in achieving clean-up goals. Once the rule becomes final, EPA or the state will be able to avail themselves of regulations under RCRA designed specifically for cleanup. However, the Agency takes comment on this proposed provision.

D. CERCLA Designation and Reportable Quantities

Under current law and regulations, all hazardous wastes listed under RCRA and codified in 40 CFR 261.31 through 261.33, and special wastes under 261.50 if the proposed special waste listing is finalized, as well as any solid waste that is not excluded from regulation as a hazardous waste under 40 CFR 261.4(b) and that exhibits one or more of the characteristics of a RCRA hazardous waste (as defined in §§ 261.21 through 261.24), are hazardous substances under CERCLA, as amended (*see* CERCLA section 101(14)(C)). CERCLA hazardous substances are listed in Table 302.4 at 40 CFR 302.4 along with their reportable quantities (RQs). If a hazardous substance is released in an amount that equals or exceeds its RQ within a 24-hour period, the release must be reported immediately to the National Response Center (NRC) pursuant to CERCLA section 103.

Thus, under this subtitle C alternative, and as EPA does with any other listed waste, the Agency is proposing to also list CCRs as a CERCLA hazardous substance in Table 302.4 of 40 CFR 302.4. The key constituents of concern in CCRs are already listed as hazardous substances under CERCLA (*i.e.*, arsenic, cadmium, mercury, selenium), and therefore persons who spill or release CCRs already have reporting obligations, depending on the volume of the spill. Typically, under current CERCLA requirements, a person releasing CCRs, for example, would report depending on his estimate of the amount of arsenic or other constituents contained in the release.

Typically, when EPA lists a new waste subject to RCRA subtitle C, the statutory one-pound RQ is applied to the waste. However, EPA is proposing two alternative methods to adjust the

one-pound statutory RQ. The first method, one traditionally utilized by the Agency, adjusts the RQ based on the lowest RQ of the most toxic substance present in the waste. The second method, as part of the Agency's effort to review and re-evaluate its methods for CERCLA designation and RQ adjustment, adjusts the one-pound statutory RQ based upon the Agency's characterization and physical properties of the complex mixtures which comprise the waste to be designated as S001. The Agency invites comment on both methods, and may, based upon these comments and further information, decide to go forward with either method or both methods.

1. Reporting Requirements

Under CERCLA section 103(a), the person in charge of a vessel or facility from which a CERCLA hazardous substance has been released in a quantity that is equal to or exceeds its RQ within a 24-hour period must immediately notify the NRC as soon as that person has knowledge of the release. The toll-free telephone number of the NRC is 1-800-424-8802; in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, the number is (202) 267-2675. In addition to the reporting requirement under CERCLA, section 304 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) requires owners or operators of certain facilities to report releases of extremely hazardous substances and CERCLA hazardous substances to state and local authorities. The EPCRA section 304 notification

must be given immediately after the release of an RQ (or more) within a 24-hour period to the community emergency coordinator of the local emergency planning committee (LEPC) for any area likely to be affected by the release and to the state emergency response commission (SERC) of any state likely to be affected by the release.

Under section 102(b) of CERCLA, all hazardous substances (as defined by CERCLA section 101(14)) have a statutory RQ of one pound, unless and until the RQ is adjusted by regulation. In this rule, EPA is proposing to list CCRs that are generated by electric utility and independent power producers that are intended for disposal (and not beneficially used), as special wastes subject to regulation under subtitle C of RCRA. In order to coordinate the RCRA and CERCLA rulemakings with respect to the new special waste listing, the Agency is also proposing adjustments to the one-pound statutory RQs for this special waste stream.

2. Basis for RQs and Adjustments

EPA's methodology for adjusting the RQs of individual hazardous substances begins with an evaluation of the intrinsic physical, chemical, and toxicological properties of each hazardous substance. The intrinsic properties examined, called "primary criteria," are aquatic toxicity, mammalian toxicity (oral, dermal, and inhalation), ignitability, reactivity, chronic toxicity, and potential carcinogenicity.

Generally, for each intrinsic property, EPA ranks the hazardous substance on a five-tier scale, associating a specific range of values on each scale with an RQ value of 1, 10, 100, 1,000, or 5,000 pounds. The data for each hazardous substance are evaluated using the various primary criteria; each hazardous substance may receive several tentative RQ values based on its particular intrinsic properties. The lowest of the tentative RQs becomes the "primary criteria RQ" for that substance.

After the primary criteria RQ are assigned, the substances are further evaluated for their susceptibility to certain degradative processes, which are used as secondary adjustment criteria. These natural degradative processes are biodegradation, hydrolysis, and photolysis (BHP). If a hazardous substance, when released into the environment, degrades relatively rapidly to a less hazardous form by one or more of the BHP processes, its RQ (as determined by the primary RQ adjustment criteria) is generally raised by one level. Conversely, if a hazardous substance degrades to a more hazardous product after its release, the original substance is assigned an RQ equal to the RQ for the more hazardous substance, which may be one or more levels lower than the RQ for the original substance. Table 7 presents the RQ for each of the constituents of concern in CCRs taken from Table 302.4—List of Hazardous Substances and Reportable Quantities at 40 CFR 302.4.

TABLE 7—REPORTABLE QUANTITIES OF CONSTITUENTS OF CONCERN

Hazardous waste No.	Constituent of concern	RQ Pounds (Kg)
S001	Antimony	5000 (2270)
	Arsenic	1 (0.454)
	Barium	No RQ
	Beryllium	10 (4.54)
	Cadmium	10 (4.54)
	Chromium	5000 (2270)
	Lead	10 (4.54)
	Mercury	1 (0.454)
	Nickel	100 (45.4)
	Selenium	100 (45.4)
	Silver	1000 (454)
	Thallium	1000 (454)

The standard methodology used to adjust the RQs for RCRA wastes is based on an analysis of the hazardous constituents of the waste streams. EPA determines an RQ for each hazardous constituent within the waste stream and establishes the lowest RQ value of these constituents as the adjusted RQ for the waste stream. EPA is proposing to use

the same methodology to adjust RQs for listed special wastes. In this notice, EPA is proposing a one-pound RQ for listed CCRs based on the one pound RQs for arsenic and mercury (*i.e.*, the two constituents within CCRs with the lowest RQ). In this same rule, however, EPA is also proposing that an alternative method for adjusting the RQ of the CCR

wastes also can be used in lieu of the one pound RQ.

3. Application of the CERCLA Mixture Rule to Listed CCR

Although EPA is proposing a one-pound RQ for CCRs listed as a special waste, we are also proposing to allow the owner or operator to use the

maximum observed concentrations of the constituents within the listed CCR wastes in determining when to report releases of the waste.

For listed CCR wastes, where the actual concentrations of the hazardous constituents in the CCRs are not known and the waste meets the S001 listing description, EPA is proposing that persons managing CCR waste have the

option of reporting on the basis of the maximum observed concentrations that have been identified by EPA (*see* Table 8 below). Thus, although actual knowledge of constituent concentrations may not be known, assumptions can be made of the concentrations based on the EPA identified maximum concentrations. These assumptions are based on actual sampling data,

specifically the maximum observed concentrations of hazardous constituents in CCRs.¹⁴³ Table 7 identifies the hazardous constituents for CCRs, their maximum observed concentrations in parts per million (ppm), the constituents' RQs, and the number of pounds of CCRs needed to contain an RQ of each constituent for the CCR to be reported.

TABLE 8—POUNDS REQUIRED TO CONTAIN RQ FOR EACH CONSTITUENT OF LISTED CCR

Waste stream constituent	Maximum ppm	RQ (lbs)	Pounds required to contain RQ
CCR	1	
Antimony	3,100	5,000	1,612,903
Arsenic	773	1	1,294
Barium	7,230	No RQ	No RQ
Beryllium	31	10	322,581
Cadmium	760	10	13,158
Chromium	5,970	5,000	837,521
Lead	1,453	10	6,883
Mercury	384	1	2,604
Nickel	6,301	100	15,871
Selenium	673	100	148,588
Silver	338	1,000	2,958,580
Thallium	100	1,000	10,000,000

For example, if listed CCR wastes are released from a facility, and the actual concentrations of the waste's constituents are not known, it may be assumed that the concentrations will not exceed those listed above in Table 8. Thus, applying the mixture rule, the RQ threshold for arsenic in this waste is 1,294 pounds—that is, 1,294 pounds of listed CCR waste would need to be released to reach the RQ for arsenic. Reporting would be required only when an RQ or more of any hazardous constituent is released.

Where the concentration levels of all hazardous constituents are known, the traditional mixture rule would apply. Under this scenario, if the actual concentration of arsenic is 100 ppm, 10,000 pounds of the listed CCR waste would need to be released to reach the RQ for arsenic. As applied to listed CCR waste, EPA's proposed approach reduces the burden of notification requirements for the regulated community and adequately protects human health and the environment.

The modified interpretation of the mixture rule (40 CFR 302.6) as it applies to listed CCR wastes in this proposal is consistent with EPA's approach in a final rule listing four petroleum refining wastes (K169, K170, K171, and K172) as RCRA hazardous wastes and CERCLA hazardous substances (*see* 63 FR 42110,

Aug. 6, 1998). In that rule, the Agency promulgated a change to the regulations and its interpretation of the mixture rule to allow facilities to consider the maximum observed concentrations for the constituents of the petroleum refining wastes in determining when to report releases of the four wastes. EPA codified this change to its mixture rule interpretation in 40 CFR 302.6(b)(1) as a new subparagraph (iii). In another rule, EPA also followed this approach in the final rule listing two chlorinated aliphatic production wastes (K174 and K175) as RCRA hazardous wastes and CERCLA hazardous substances (*see* 65 FR 67068, Nov. 8, 2000). If the proposed subtitle C alternative becomes final, EPA may modify 40 CFR section 302.6(b)(1) to extend the modified interpretation of the mixture rule to include listed CCR wastes.

4. Correction of Table of Maximum Observed Constituent Concentrations Identified by EPA

When the final rule that listed Chlorinated Aliphatics Production Wastes was published in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), the existing table that provided the maximum observed constituent concentrations for petroleum refining wastes (K169, K170, K171, and K172) was inadvertently replaced instead of amended to add the

maximum observed constituent concentrations for the chlorinated aliphatic production wastes (K174 and K175). Therefore, the Agency is at this time proposing to correct that inadvertent removal of the petroleum refining wastes by publishing a complete table that includes, the petroleum refining wastes, the chlorinated aliphatic production wastes, and now the CCR wastes (*e.g.*, K169, K170, K171, K172, K174, K175, and S001).

E. Listing of CCR as Special Wastes To Address Perceived Stigma Issue

Commenters suggested that the listing of CCRs as a hazardous waste will impose a stigma on their beneficial use, and significantly curtail these uses. EPA questions this assertion, in fact, our experience suggests that the increased costs of disposal of CCRs as a result of regulation of CCRs under RCRA subtitle C would create a strong economic incentive for increased beneficial uses of CCRs. We also believe that the increased costs of disposal of CCRs, as a result of regulation of CCR disposal, but not beneficial uses, should achieve increased usage in non-regulated beneficial uses, simply as a result of the economics of supply and demand. The economic driver—availability of a low-cost, functionally equivalent or often

¹⁴³ EPA's CCR constituent concentrations database is available in the docket to this notice.

superior substitute for other raw materials—will continue to make CCRs an increasingly desirable product. Furthermore, it has been EPA's experience in developing and implementing RCRA regulation and elsewhere that material inevitably flows to less regulated applications.

However, with that said, the electric utility industry, the states, and those companies that beneficially use CCRs have nevertheless commented that listing of CCRs as a RCRA subtitle C waste will impose a stigma on their beneficial use and significantly curtail these uses. In their view, even an action that regulates only CCRs destined for disposal as RCRA subtitle C waste, but retains the Bevill exemption for beneficial uses, would have this adverse effect. Finally, the states particularly have commented that, by operation of state law, the beneficial use of CCRs would be prohibited under many states' beneficial use programs, if EPA were to designate CCRs destined for disposal as a RCRA subtitle C waste. Unlike the incentive effect introduced by increased disposal costs in which firms rationally try to avoid higher costs or seek lower cost of raw materials, the idea that there will be a stigma effect rests on an assumption that stigma would alter consumer preferences thereby decreasing end-users' willingness to pay for products that include CCPs. This would have the practical effect of shifting the aggregate CCP demand curve downward.

Some of the other comments that have been made include: (1) Beneficially used CCRs are the same material as that which would be considered hazardous; this asymmetry increases confusion and the probability of lawsuits, however, unwarranted, (2) while the supply of CCRs to be beneficially used may increase given the additional incentives to avoid disposal costs, the consumer demand may decrease as negative perceptions are not always based on reason, (3) any negative impact on beneficial use will require more reliance on virgin materials with higher GHG and environmental footprints, (4) state support may be weakened or eliminated, even in states that are friendly to beneficial use, (5) competitors who use virgin or other materials are taking advantage of the hazardous waste designation by using scare tactics and threats of litigation to get customers to stop using products containing CCRs, (6) customers are already raising questions about the safety of products that contain CCRs, and (7) uncertainty is already hurting business as customers are switching to products where there is less regulatory

risk and potential for environmental liabilities. For example, one commenter stated that they have received requests to stop selling boiler slag for ice control due to potential liability.

EPA is concerned about potential stigma and, as we have stated previously, we do not wish to discourage environmentally sound beneficial uses of CCRs. In looking to evaluate this issue, we believe it is first important to understand that the proposed rule (if the subtitle C alternative is finalized) would regulate CCRs under subtitle C of RCRA only if they are destined for disposal in landfills and surface impoundments, and would leave the Bevill determination in effect for the beneficial use of CCRs. That is, the legal status of CCRs that are beneficially used would remain entirely unchanged (*i.e.*, they would not be regulated under subtitle C of RCRA as a hazardous waste, nor subject to any federal non-hazardous waste requirements). EPA is proposing to regulate the disposal of CCRs under subtitle C of RCRA because of the specific nature of disposal practices and the specific risks these practices involve—that is, the disposal of CCRs in (often unlined) landfills or surface impoundments, with millions of tons placed in a concentrated location. The beneficial uses that EPA identifies as excluded under the Bevill amendment, for the most part, present a significantly different picture, and a significantly different risk profile. As a result, EPA is explicitly not proposing to change their Bevill status (although we do take comment on whether “unconsolidated uses” of CCRs need to be subject to federal regulation). (For further discussion of the beneficial use of CCRs, see section IV. D in this preamble.)

Furthermore, in today's preamble, we make it clear that certain uses of CCRs—*e.g.*, FGD gypsum in wallboard—do not involve “waste” management at all; rather, the material is a legitimate co-product that, under most configurations, has not been discarded in the first place and, therefore, would not be considered a “solid waste” under RCRA. Moreover, EPA's experience suggests that it is unlikely that a material that is not a waste in the first place would be stigmatized, particularly when used in a consolidated form and while continuing to meet long established product specifications.

In fact, EPA's experience with past waste regulation, and with how hazardous waste and other hazardous materials subject to regulation under subtitle C are used and recycled, suggests that a hazardous waste “label” does not impose a significant barrier to

its beneficial use and that non-regulated uses will increase as the costs of disposal increase. There are a number of examples that illustrate these points, although admittedly many of these products are not used in residential settings:

- Electric arc furnace dust is a listed hazardous waste (K061), and yet it is a highly recycled material. Specifically, between 2001 and 2007, approximately 42% to 51% of K061 was recycled (according to Biennial Reporting System (BRS) data). Both currently and historically, it has been used as an ingredient in fertilizer and in making steel, and in the production of zinc products, including pharmaceutical materials. Slag from the smelting of K061 is in high demand for use in road construction.¹⁴⁴ In fact, there is little doubt that without its regulation as a hazardous waste, a significantly greater amount of electric arc further dust would be diverted from recycling to disposal in non-hazardous waste landfills.

- Electroplating wastewater sludge is a listed hazardous waste (F006) that is recycled for its copper, zinc, and nickel content for use in the commercial market. In 2007, approximately 35% of F006 material was recycled (according to BRS data). These materials do not appear to be stigmatized in the marketplace.

- Chat, a Superfund mining cleanup waste with lead, cadmium and zinc contamination, is used in road construction in Oklahoma and the surrounding states.¹⁴⁵ In this case, the very waste that has triggered an expensive Superfund cleanup is successfully offered in the marketplace as a raw material in road building. The alternative costs of disposal in this case are a significant driver in the beneficial use of this material, and the Superfund origin of the material has not served as a barrier to its use.

- Used oil is regulated under RCRA subtitle C standards. While used oil that is recycled is subject to a separate set of standards under subtitle C (and is not identified as a hazardous waste), “stigma” does not prevent home do-it-yourselfers from collecting used oil, or automotive shops from accepting it and sending it on for recovery. Collected used oil may be re-refined, reused, or used as fuel in boilers, often at the site

¹⁴⁴ According to the most recently available data, in 2008 *Horsehead* produced about 300,000 tons per year of an Iron-Rich Material (IRM) as a by-product of its dust recycling process, and in 2009 *Inmetco* produced close to 20,000 tons per year. PADEP asserts that these plants cannot meet the demands for use of the slag by PennDOT.

¹⁴⁵ 40 CFR part 260, 39331–39353.

where it is collected. Safety Kleen reported that in 2008, the company recycled 200 million gallons of used oil. (This example is almost directly analogous to the situation with respect to CCRs, although for CCRs, we are not proposing to subject them to any management standards when used or recycled, but, as in the case of used oil, this alternative would avoid labeling CCR's as "hazardous waste," even while relying on subtitle C authority.)

- Spent etchants are directly used as ingredients in the production of a copper micronutrient for livestock; and
- Spent solvents that are generated from metals parts washing and are generally hazardous wastes before reclamation are directly used in the production of roofing shingles.

Furthermore, common products and product ingredients routinely used at home (e.g., motor oil; gasoline; many common drain cleaners and household cleaners; and cathode ray tube monitors for TVs and computers) are hazardous wastes in other contexts. This includes fluorescent lamps (and CFLs) which are potentially hazardous because of mercury. Consumers are generally comfortable with these products, and their regulatory status does not discourage their use. Given this level of acceptance, EPA questions whether CCR-based materials that might be used in the home, like concrete or wallboard, would be likely to raise concerns where they are safely incorporated into a product.

Certain commenters have also expressed the concern that standards-setting organizations might prohibit the use of CCRs in specific products or materials in their voluntary standards. Recently, chairpersons of the American Standards and Testing Materials (ASTM) International Committee C09, and its subcommittee, C09.24, in a December 23, 2009 letter indicated that ASTM would remove fly ash from the project specifications in its concrete standard if EPA determined that CCRs were a hazardous waste when disposed. However, it remains unclear whether ASTM would ultimately adopt this position, in light of EPA's decision not to revise the regulatory status of CCRs destined for beneficial use. Further ASTM standards are developed through an open consensus process, and they currently apply to the use of numerous hazardous materials in construction and other activities. For example, ASTM provides specifications for the reuse of solvents and, thus, by implication, does not appear to take issue with the use of these recycled secondary materials,

despite their classification as hazardous wastes.¹⁴⁶

Others take a different view on how standard-setting organizations will react. Most notably, a U.S. Green Building Council representative was referenced in the New York Times as saying that LEED incentives for using fly ash in concrete would remain in place, even under an EPA hazardous waste determination.¹⁴⁷ If the Green Building Council (along with EPA) continues to recognize fly ash as an environmentally beneficial substitute for Portland cement, the use of this material is unlikely to decrease solely because of "stigma" concerns. Additionally, we believe it is unlikely that ASTM will prohibit the use of fly ash in concrete under its standards solely because of a determination that fly ash is regulated under subtitle C of RCRA when it is discarded, especially given that this use of fly ash is widely accepted throughout the world as a practice that improves the performance of concrete, it is one of the most cost-effective near-term strategies to reduce GHG emissions, and there is no evidence of meaningful risk, nor any reason to think there might be, involved with its use in cement or concrete.

Finally, many states commented that their statutes or regulations prohibit the use of hazardous wastes in their state beneficial use programs and, therefore, that if EPA lists CCRs as hazardous wastes (even if only when intended for disposal), their use would be precluded in those states. EPA reviewed the regulations of ten states with the highest consumption of fly ash and concluded that, while these states do not generally allow the use of hazardous waste in their beneficial use programs, this general prohibition would not necessarily prohibit the beneficial use of CCRs under the proposal that EPA outlines in this rule. Beneficially used CCRs would remain Bevill-exempt solid wastes, or in some cases, would not be considered wastes at all and thus, the legal status of such CCRs may not be affected by EPA's proposed RCRA subtitle C rule. As an example, the use of slag derived from electric furnace dust (K061) is regulated under Pennsylvania's beneficial use program, despite the fact that it is derived from

a listed hazardous waste. However, we are also aware that, in the case of Florida, its state definition of hazardous waste would likely prohibit the beneficial use of CCRs were the co-proposed RCRA subtitle C regulation finalized and were there no change to Florida's definition of hazardous waste.

The primary concern raised by these commenters is the fact that CCRs would be labeled a "hazardous waste" (even if only when disposed) and will change the public perception of products made from CCRs. To address this concern, EPA is proposing, as one alternative, to codify the listing in a separate, unique section of the regulations. Currently, hazardous wastes are listed in 40 CFR 261, Subpart D, which identifies the currently regulated industrial wastes, and which is labeled, "Lists of Hazardous Wastes." EPA would create a new Subpart F and label the section as "List of Special Wastes Subject to Subtitle C," to distinguish it from the industrial hazardous wastes. The regulations would identify CCRs as a "Special Waste" rather than a K-listed hazardous waste, so that CCRs would not automatically be identified with all other hazardous wastes. See sections V through VII for the full description of our regulatory proposal.

EPA believes that this action could significantly reduce the likelihood that products made from or containing CCRs would automatically be perceived as universally "hazardous." When taken in combination with (1) the fact that beneficially used CCRs will remain exempt and (2) EPA's continued promotion of the beneficial use of CCRs, we believe this will go a long way to address any stigmatic impact that might otherwise result from the regulation of CCRs under subtitle C of RCRA. We are seeking comment on other suggestions on how EPA might promote the beneficial use of CCRs, as well as suggestions that would reduce any perceived impacts resulting from "stigma" due to the identification of CCRs as "special wastes regulated under subtitle C authority."

In summary, based on our experiences, we expect that it will be more likely that the increased costs of disposal of CCRs as a result of regulation of CCR disposal under subtitle C would increase their usage in non-regulated beneficial uses, simply as a result of the economics of supply and demand. The economic driver—availability of a low-cost, functionally equivalent or often superior substitute for other raw materials—would continue to make CCRs an increasingly desirable product.

¹⁴⁶ See, for example, ASTM Volume 15.05, Engine Coolants, Halogenated Organic Solvents and Fire Extinguishing Agents; Industrial and Specialty Chemicals, at <http://www.normas.com/ASTM/BOS/volume1505.html>. See also ASTM D5396—04 Standard Specification for Reclaimed Perchloroethylene, at <http://www.astm.org/Standards/D5396.htm>.

¹⁴⁷ See <http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2020/01/13/13greenwire-recycling-questions-complicate-epa-coal-ash-de-90614.html>.

VII. How would the proposed subtitle C requirements be implemented?

A. Effective Dates

If EPA were to finalize the subtitle C regulatory alternative proposed today, the rule, as is the case with all RCRA subtitle C rules, would become effective six months after promulgation by the appropriate regulatory authority—that is, six months after promulgation of the federal rule in States and other jurisdictions where EPA implements the hazardous waste program (Iowa, Alaska, Indian Country, and the territories, except Guam) and in authorized States, six months after the State promulgates its regulations that EPA has approved via the authorization process (unless State laws specify an alternative time). This means that facilities managing CCRs must be in compliance with the provisions of these regulations on their effective date, unless the compliance date is extended. For this proposed regulatory alternative, the compliance dates for several of the proposed requirements for existing units are being extended due to the need for additional time for facilities to modify their existing units. The precise dates that facilities will need to be in compliance with the various requirements will depend on whether they are in a jurisdiction where EPA administers the RCRA subtitle C program or whether they are in a State authorized to administer the RCRA subtitle C program.

To summarize, (1) In States and jurisdictions where EPA administers the RCRA program (Iowa, Alaska, the territories [except Guam], and Indian Country), most of the subtitle C requirements go into effect and are enforceable by EPA six months after promulgation of the final rule. This includes the generator requirements, transporter requirements, including the manifest requirements, permitting requirements for facilities managing CCRs, interim status standards, surface impoundment stability requirements, and the Land Disposal Restriction (LDR) treatment standards for non-wastewaters in 40 CFR part 268. However, we are proposing that existing CCR landfills and surface impoundments (as defined in this regulation) will be given additional time to comply with several of the proposed requirements as specified later in this section. Any new CCR landfills, including lateral expansions (as defined in the regulation), must be in compliance with all the requirements of any final regulation before CCRs can be placed in the unit.

(2) In States that are authorized to administer the RCRA program, the requirements that are part of the RCRA base program (*i.e.*, those promulgated under the authority of RCRA and not the HSWA amendments) will not be effective until the State develops and promulgates its regulations. Once those regulations are effective in the States, they are enforceable as a matter of State law and facilities must comply with those requirements under the schedule established by the State. These RCRA base requirements will become part of the RCRA authorized program and enforceable as a matter of federal law once the State submits and EPA approves a modification to the State's authorized program. (See the State Authorization section (section VIII) for a more detailed discussion.) The requirements that are more stringent or broader in scope than the existing regulations and are promulgated pursuant to HSWA authority will become effective and federally enforceable on the effective date of the approved state law designating CCRs as a special waste subject to subtitle C—that is, they are federally enforceable without waiting for authorization of the program revision applicable to the HSWA provisions. On the other hand, any requirements that are promulgated pursuant to HSWA authority, but are less stringent than the existing subtitle C requirements (*e.g.*, modifications promulgated pursuant to Section 3004(x)) will become effective only when the State promulgates those regulations (and federally enforceable when the State program revision is authorized), as the State has the discretion to not adopt those less stringent requirements.

B. What are the requirements with which facilities must comply?

It is EPA's intention that this proposed alternative, if finalized, will be implemented in the same manner as previous regulations under RCRA subtitle C have been. The following paragraphs describe generally how this proposal will be implemented. While this notice provides some details on specific requirements, it is EPA's intention that, unless otherwise noted, all current Subtitle C requirements become applicable to the facilities generating, transporting, or treating, storing or disposing of CCRs listed as special wastes. While in this notice EPA has described the major subtitle C requirements, EPA has not undertaken a comprehensive description of all of the subtitle C regulatory requirements which may be applicable; therefore, we encourage commenters to refer to the

regulations at 40 CFR parts 260 to 268, 270 to 279, and 124 for details.

1. Generators and Transporters

i. Requirements

Under this proposed regulation, regulated CCRs destined for disposal become a newly listed special waste subject to the subtitle C requirements. Persons that generate this newly identified waste is required to notify EPA within 90 days after the wastes are identified or listed ¹⁴⁸ (by EPA or the state) and obtain an EPA identification number if they do not already have one in accordance with 40 CFR 262.12. (If the person who generates regulated CCRs already has an EPA identification number, EPA is proposing not to require that they re-notify EPA; however, EPA is seeking comment on this issue.) Moreover, on the effective date of this rule in the relevant state, generators of CCRs must be in compliance with the generator requirements set forth in 40 CFR part 262. These requirements include standards for waste determination (40 CFR 262.11), compliance with the manifest (40 CFR 262.20 to 262.23), pre-transport procedures (40 CFR 262.30 to 262.34), generator accumulation (40 CFR 262.34), record keeping and reporting (40 CFR 262.40 to 262.44), and the import/export procedures (40 CFR 262.50 to 262.60). It should be noted that the current generator accumulation provisions of 40 CFR 262.34 allow generators to accumulate hazardous wastes without obtaining interim status or a permit only in units that are container accumulation units, tank systems or containment buildings; the regulations also place a limit on the maximum amount of time that wastes can be accumulated in these units. If these wastes are managed in landfills, surface impoundments or other units that are not tank systems, containers, or containment buildings, these units are subject to the permitting requirements of 40 CFR parts 264, 265, and 267 and the generator is required to obtain interim status and seek a permit (or modify interim status or a permit, as appropriate). These requirements would be applied to special wastes as well. Permit requirements are described in Section VII.D below.

Transporters of CCRs destined for disposal will be transporting a special waste subject to subtitle C on the effective date of this regulation. Persons who transport these newly identified wastes will be required to obtain an EPA identification number as described

¹⁴⁸ See section 3010 of RCRA.

above and must comply with the transporter requirements set forth in 40 CFR part 263 on the effective date of the final rule. In addition, generators and transporters of CCRs destined for disposal should be aware that an EPA identified waste subject to the EPA waste manifest requirements under 40 CFR part 262 meets the definition for a hazardous material under the Department of Transportation's Hazardous Materials Regulations (HMR; 49 CFR parts 171–180) and must be offered and transported in accordance with all applicable HMR requirements, including materials classification, packaging, and hazard communication.¹⁴⁹

ii. Effective Dates and Compliance Deadlines

Generators must notify EPA within 90 days after the date that CCRs are identified or listed as special wastes (by EPA or the state). The other requirements for generators and transporters (in 40 CFR parts 262 and 263) are effective and generators and transporters must be in compliance with these requirements on the effective date of the final rules. The effective date of these rules is six months after promulgation of the federal rule in non-authorized States and in authorized States generally six months after promulgation of the State regulations. (See previous section for a more detailed discussion of effective dates.)

2. Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDs)

i. Requirements

Facilities treating, storing, or disposing of the newly listed CCRs are subject to the RCRA 3010 notification requirements, the permit requirements in 40 CFR part 270, and regulations in 40 CFR part 264 or 267 for permitted facilities or part 265 for interim status facilities, including the general facility requirements in subpart B, the preparedness and prevention requirements in subpart C, the contingency plan and emergency procedure requirement in subpart D, the manifest, recordkeeping and reporting requirements in subpart E, the closure and post-closure requirements in subpart G, the corrective action requirements, including facility-wide corrective action in subpart F, and the financial assurance requirements in subpart H.

C. RCRA Section 3010 Notification

Pursuant to RCRA section 3010 and 40 CFR 270.1(b), facilities managing these special wastes subject to subtitle C must notify EPA of their waste management activities within 90 days after the wastes are identified or listed as a special waste. (As noted above, for facilities in States where EPA administers the program, this will be 90 days from the date of promulgation of the final federal regulation; in authorized States, it will be 90 days from the date of promulgation of listing CCRs as a special waste by the state, unless the state provides an alternative timeframe.) This requirement may be applied even to those TSDs that have previously notified EPA with respect to the management of hazardous wastes. The Agency is proposing to waive this notification requirement for persons who handle CCRs and have already: (1) Notified EPA that they manage hazardous wastes, and (2) received an EPA identification number because requiring persons who have notified EPA and received an EPA identification number would be duplicative and unnecessary, although the Agency requests comment on whether it should require such persons to re-notify the Agency that they generate, transport, treat, store or dispose of CCRs. However, any person who treats, stores, or disposes of CCRs and has not previously received an EPA identification number for other waste must obtain an identification number pursuant to 40 CFR 262.12 to generate, transport, treat, store, or dispose of CCRs within 90 days after the wastes are identified or listed as special wastes subject to subtitle C, as described above.

D. Permit Requirements

As specified in 40 CFR 270.1(b), six months after promulgation of a new regulation, the treatment, storage or disposal of hazardous waste or special waste subject to subtitle C by any person who has not applied for and received a RCRA permit is prohibited from managing such wastes. Existing facilities, however, may satisfy the permit requirement by submitting Part A of the permit application. Timely submission of Part A and the notification qualifies a facility for interim status under section 3005 of RCRA and facilities with interim status are treated as having been issued a permit until a final decision is made on a permit application.

The following paragraphs provide additional details on how the permitting requirements would apply to various categories of facilities:

1. Facilities Newly Subject to RCRA Permit Requirements

Facilities that treat, store, or dispose of regulated CCRs at the time the rule becomes effective would generally be eligible for interim status pursuant to section 3005 of RCRA. (See section 3005(e)(1)(A)(ii) of RCRA).¹⁵⁰ EPA believes most, if not all utilities generating CCRs and most if not all off-site disposal sites will be in this situation. In order to obtain interim status based on treatment, storage, or disposal of such newly listed CCRs, eligible facilities are required to comply with 40 CFR 270.70(a) and 270.10(e) (or more likely with analogous state regulations) by providing notice under RCRA section 3010 (if they do not have an EPA identification number) and submitting a Part A permit application no later than six months after date of publication of the regulations which first require them to comply with the standards. (In most cases, these would be the state regulations implementing the federal program; however, in those States and jurisdictions where EPA implements the program, the deadline will be six months after promulgation of the final federal rule.) Such facilities are subject to regulation under 40 CFR part 265 until EPA or the state issues a RCRA permit. In addition, under section 3005(e)(3) and 40 CFR 270.73(d), not later than 12 months after the effective date of the regulations that render the facility subject to the requirement to have a RCRA permit and which is granted interim status, land disposal facilities newly qualifying for interim status under section 3005(e)(1)(A)(ii) also must submit a Part B permit application and certify that the facility is in compliance with all applicable ground water monitoring and financial responsibility requirements. If the facility fails to submit these certifications and the Part B permit application, interim status will terminate on that date.

2. Existing Interim Status Facilities

EPA is not aware of any utilities or CCR treatment or disposal sites in RCRA interim status currently, and therefore

¹⁴⁹ See the definition for "hazardous waste" in 49 CFR 171.8.

¹⁵⁰ Section 3005(e) of RCRA states, in part, that "Any person who * * * is in existence on the effective date of statutory or regulatory changes under this Act that render the facility subject to the requirement to have a permit under this section * * * shall be treated as having been issued such permit until such time as final administrative disposition of such application is made, unless the Administrator or other plaintiff proves that final administrative disposition of such application has not been made because of the failure of the applicant to furnish information reasonably required or requested in order to process the application."

EPA does not believe the standard federal rules on changes in interim status will apply. However, in case such a situation exists, EPA describes below the relevant provisions. Again, EPA is describing the federal requirements, but because the proposed requirements that subject these facilities to permitting requirements are part of the RCRA base program, authorized state regulations will govern the process, and the date those regulations become effective in the relevant state will trigger the process.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 270.72(a)(1), all existing hazardous waste management facilities (as defined in 40 CFR 270.2) that treat, store, or dispose of newly identified hazardous wastes and are currently operating pursuant to interim status under section 3005(e) of RCRA, must file an amended Part A permit application with EPA no later than the effective date of the final rule in the State where the facility is located. By doing this, the facility may continue managing the newly listed wastes. If the facility fails to file an amended Part A application by such date, the facility will not receive interim status for management of the newly listed wastes (in this case CCRs) and may not manage those wastes until the facility receives either a permit or a change in interim status allowing such activity (40 CFR 270.10(g)). This requirement, if applicable to any electric utilities, will be applied to those facilities managing CCRs destined for disposal since these facilities will now be managing CCRs subject to the subtitle C requirements.

3. Permitted Facilities

EPA also believes that no electric utilities treating, storing, or disposing of CCRs currently has a RCRA permit for its CCR management unit(s), nor is EPA aware of any on-going disposal of CCRs at permitted hazardous waste TSDs, although the latter situation is a possibility. Federal procedures for how permitted hazardous waste facilities manage newly listed hazardous wastes are described below, but again in practice (with the exception of those jurisdictions in which EPA administers the hazardous waste program), the authorized state regulations will govern the process.

Under 40 CFR 270.42(g), facilities that already have RCRA permits must request permit modifications if they want to continue managing the newly listed wastes (*see* 40 CFR 270.42(g) for details). This provision states that a permittee may continue managing the newly listed wastes by following certain requirements, including submitting a

Class 1 permit modification request on or before the date on which the waste or unit becomes subject to the new regulatory requirements (*i.e.*, the effective date of the final federal rule in those jurisdictions where EPA administers the program or the effective date of the State rule in authorized States), complying with the applicable standards of 40 CFR parts 265 and 266 and submitting a Class 2 or 3 permit modification request within 180 days of the effective date of the final rule. Again, these requirements, if applicable to any electric utilities, will be applied to those facilities managing CCRs destined for disposal since they are now subject to the subtitle C requirements.

E. Requirements in 40 CFR Parts 264 and 265

The requirements of 40 CFR part 264 and 265 for permitted facilities or part 265 for interim status facilities, including the general facility standards in subpart B, the preparedness and prevention requirements in subpart C, the contingency plan and emergency procedure requirements in subpart D, the manifest, recordkeeping and reporting requirements in subpart E, the corrective action requirements, including facility-wide corrective action in subpart F, and the financial assurance requirements in Subpart H, are applicable to TSDs and TSDs must be in compliance with those requirements on the effective date of the final (usually state) regulation, except as noted below. These requirements will apply to those facilities managing CCRs destined for disposal.

Moreover, all units in which newly identified hazardous wastes are treated, stored, or disposed of after the effective date of the final (usually state) rule that are not excluded from the requirements of 40 CFR parts 264, 265 and 267 will be subject to both the general closure and post-closure requirements of subpart G of 40 CFR parts 264 and 265 and the unit-specific closure requirements set forth in the applicable unit technical standards in subparts 40 CFR parts 264 or 265 (*e.g.*, subpart N for landfill units). In addition, EPA promulgated a final rule that allows, under limited circumstances, regulated landfills or surface impoundments, (or land treatment units which is not used for the management of CCR waste) to cease managing hazardous waste, but to delay subtitle C closure to allow the unit to continue to manage non-hazardous waste for a period of time prior to closure of the unit (*see* 54 FR 33376, August 14, 1989). Units for which closure is delayed continue to be subject

to all applicable 40 CFR parts 264 and 265 requirements. Dates and procedures for submittal of necessary demonstrations, permit applications, and revised applications are detailed in 40 CFR 264.113(c) through (e) and 265.113(c) through (e). As stated earlier, these requirements will be applicable to those facilities managing CCRs destined for disposal, since they will be managing a newly listed waste subject to subtitle C requirements.

Except as noted below, existing facilities are required to be in compliance with the surface impoundment stability requirements, the LDR treatment standards for non-wastewaters, and the fugitive dust controls on the effective date of the final rule.

For certain of the other requirements, existing facilities will have:

(a) 60 days from the effective date of the final rule to install a permanent identification marker on each surface impoundment as required by 40 CFR 264.1304(d) and 40 CFR 265.1304(d).

(b) 1 year from the effective date of the final rule:

To submit plans for each surface impoundment as required by 264.1304(b) and 265.1304(b).

To adopt and submit to the Regional Administrator a plan for carrying out the inspection requirements for each surface impoundment in 40 CFR 264.1305 and 40 CFR 265.1305.

To comply with the groundwater monitoring requirements for each landfill and surface impoundment in 40 CFR 264, Subpart F and 265, Subpart F.

(c) 2 years from the effective date of the final rule:

To install, operate, and maintain run-on and run-off controls as required by 264.1304(g) and 265.1304(g) for surface impoundments and by 264.1307(d) and 265.1307(d) for landfills.

(d) 5 years from the effective date of the final rule:

To comply with the LDR wastewater treatment standard.

To stop receiving CCR waste in surface impoundments.

(e) 7 years from the effective date of the final rule to close surface impoundments handling CCRs.

Any new CCR landfills, including lateral expansions of existing landfills (as defined in the regulation), must be in compliance with all the requirements of the final regulation before CCRs can be placed in the unit.

The table below (Table 9) provides a summary of the effective dates for the various requirements:

TABLE 9—CCR RULE REQUIREMENTS

	Compliance date non authorized state	Compliance date authorized state
Remove Bevill Exclusion	6 months after promulgation of final rule	6 months after State adopts regulations (under State law); federally enforceable when state program revision is authorized.
Listing CCRs as a Special Waste Subject to subtitle C.	Same	Same.
Notification (generators and TSDs)	90 days after rule promulgation (that is, the date the CCRs are listed as a Special Waste subject to subtitle C.	90 days after State rule promulgation (that is, the date the CCRs are listed as a Special Waste subject to subtitle C.
Generator requirements (40 CFR part 262)	6 months after promulgation	On the effective date of the State regulations.
Transporter Requirements (40 CFR part 263) ...	6 months after promulgation	On the effective date of State regulations.
Permit Requirement/Interim Status	File Part A of the permit application within six months of effective date of final rule.	File Part A of the permit application within six months of effective date of State final rule.
Facility Standards in Part 264/265	On effective date unless specifically noted	On effective date of state regulation unless specifically noted.
Install a permanent identification marker on each surface impoundment as required by 40 CFR 264.1304(d) and 40 CFR 265.1304(d).	60 days from the effective date of the final rule.	60 days from the effective date of the State regulation.
Submit plans required by 264.1304(b) and 265.1304(b).	1 year from the effective date of the final rule	1 year from the effective date of the State regulation.
Adopt and submit to the Regional Administrator a plan for carrying out the inspection requirements in 40 CFR 264.1305 and 40 CFR 265.1305.	1 year from the effective date of the final rule	1 year from the effective date of the State regulation.
Comply with ground water monitoring requirements in 40 CFR 264 Subpart F and 40 CFR 265 Subpart F.	1 year from the effective date of the final rule	1 year from the effective date of the State regulation.
Install, operate, and maintain run-on and run-off controls as required by 264.1304 (g) and 265.1304 (g) for surface impoundments and by 264.1307 (d) and 265.1307 (d) for landfills.	2 years from the effective date of the final rule	2 years from the effective date of the State regulation.
Comply with the LDR wastewater treatment standard.	5 years from the effective date of the final rule	5 years from the effective date of the State regulation.
Close surface impoundments receiving CCR waste.	7 years from the effective date of the final rule	7 years from the effective date of the State regulation.

VIII. Impacts of a Subtitle C Rule on State Authorization

A. Applicability of the Rule in Authorized States

Under section 3006 of RCRA, EPA authorizes qualified states to administer their own hazardous waste programs in lieu of the federal program within the state. Following authorization, EPA retains enforcement authority under sections 3008, 3013, and 7003 of RCRA, although authorized states have primary enforcement responsibility. The standards and requirements for state authorization are found at 40 CFR part 271.

Prior to enactment of the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA), a state with final RCRA authorization administered its subtitle C hazardous waste program in lieu of EPA administering the federal program in that state. The federal requirements no longer apply in the authorized state, and EPA could not issue permits for any facilities in that state, since only the state was authorized to issue RCRA permits. When new, more stringent federal requirements are promulgated, the state was obligated to enact

equivalent authorities within specified time frames (one to two years). The new more stringent federal requirements did not take effect in the authorized state until the state adopted the federal requirements as state law, and the state requirements are not federally enforceable until EPA authorized the state program. This remains true for all of the requirements issued pursuant to statutory provisions that existed prior to HSWA.

In contrast, under RCRA section 3006(g) (42 U.S.C. 6926(g)), which was added by HSWA, new requirements and prohibitions imposed under HSWA authority take effect in authorized states at the same time that they take effect in unauthorized states. EPA is directed by the statute to implement these requirements and prohibitions in authorized states, until the state is granted authorization to do so. While states must still adopt new more stringent HSWA related provisions as state law to retain final authorization, EPA implements the HSWA provisions in authorized states until the states do so.

Authorized states are required to modify their programs only when EPA

enacts federal requirements that are more stringent or broader in scope than the existing federal requirements. RCRA section 3009 allows the states to impose standards more stringent than those in the federal program (*see* also 40 CFR 271.1). Therefore, authorized states may, but are not required to, adopt federal regulations, both HSWA and non-HSWA, that are considered less stringent than previous federal regulations.

This alternative of the co-proposal is considered more stringent and broader in scope than current federal regulations and therefore States would be required to adopt regulations and modify their programs if this alternative is finalized.

B. Effect on State Authorization

If finalized, a subtitle C rule for CCRs would affect state authorization in the same manner as any new RCRA subtitle C requirement; *i.e.*, (1) this alternative of the co-proposal would be considered broader in scope and more stringent than the current federal program, so authorized states must adopt regulations so that their program remains at least as stringent as the federal program; and (2) they must receive authorization from

EPA for these program modifications. The process and requirements for modification of state programs at 40 CFR 271, specifically 271.21, will be used.

However, this process is made more complex due to the nature of this particular rulemaking and the fact that some of the provisions of this alternative, if finalized, would be finalized pursuant to the RCRA base program authority and some pursuant to HSWA authority. For RCRA base program or non-HSWA requirements, the general rule, as explained previously, is that the new requirements do not become enforceable as a matter of federal law in authorized states until states adopt the regulations, modify their programs, and receive authorization from EPA. For HSWA requirements, the general rule is that HSWA requirements are enforceable on the effective date of the final federal rule. If an authorized State has not promulgated regulations, modified their programs, and received authorization from EPA, then EPA implements the requirements until the State receives program authorization.

In accord with 271.2(e)(2), authorized states must modify their programs by July 1 of each year to reflect changes to the federal program occurring during the “12 months preceding the previous July 1.” Therefore, for example, if the federal rule is promulgated in December 2011, the states would have until July 1, 2013 to modify their programs. States may have an additional year to modify their programs if an amendment to a state statute is needed. *See* 40 CFR 271.21(e)(2)(v).

As noted above, this alternative to the co-proposal is proposed pursuant in part to HSWA authority and in part to non-HSWA or RCRA base program authority. The majority of this alternative is proposed pursuant to non-HSWA authority. This includes, for example, the listing of CCRs destined for disposal as a special waste subject to subtitle C and the impoundment stability requirements. These requirements will be applicable on the effective date of the final federal rule only in those states that do not have final authorization for the RCRA program. These requirements will be effective in authorized states once a state promulgates the regulations and they will become a part of the authorized RCRA program and thus federally enforceable, once the state has submitted a program modification and received authorization for this program modification.

The prohibition on land disposal unless CCRs meet the treatment

standards and modification of the treatment standards in 40 CFR part 268 are proposed pursuant to HSWA authority and would normally be effective and federally enforceable in all States on the effective date of the final federal rule. However, because the land disposal restrictions apply to those CCRs that are regulated under subtitle C, until authorized states revise their programs and become authorized to regulate CCRs as a special waste subject to RCRA subtitle C, the land disposal restriction requirements would apply only in those States that currently do not exclude CCRs from subtitle C regulation (that is, CCRs are regulated under subtitle C if they exhibit one or more of the characteristics) and the CCRs in fact exhibit one or more of the RCRA subtitle C characteristics. However, once the state has the authority to regulate CCRs as a special waste, the LDR requirements become federally enforceable in all States.

In addition, the tailored management standards promulgated pursuant to section 3004(x) of RCRA are also proposed pursuant to HSWA authority. However, as these tailored standards are less stringent than the existing RCRA subtitle C requirements, States would not be required to promulgate regulations for these less stringent standards—should a State decide not to promulgate such regulations, the facilities in that state would be required to comply with the full subtitle C standards. Therefore, the tailored management standards will be effective in authorized States only when States promulgate such regulations.

Therefore, the Agency would add this rule to Table 1 in 40 CFR 271.1(j), if this alternative to the co-proposal is finalized, which identifies the federal program requirements that are promulgated pursuant to HSWA and take effect in all states, regardless of their authorization status. Table 2 in 40 CFR 271.1(j) would be modified to indicate that these requirements are self-implementing. Until the states receive authorization for the more stringent HSWA provisions, EPA would implement them, as described above. In implementing the HSWA requirements, EPA will work closely with the states to avoid duplication of effort. Once authorized, states adopt an equivalent rule and receive authorization for such rule from EPA, the authorized state rule will apply in that state as the RCRA subtitle C requirement in lieu of the equivalent federal requirement.

IX. Summary of the Co-Proposal Regulating CCRs Under Subtitle D Regulations

A. Overview and General Issues

EPA is co-proposing and is soliciting comment on an approach under which the May 2000 Regulatory Determination would remain in place, and EPA would issue regulations governing the disposal of CCRs under sections 1008(a), 2002, 4004 and 4005(a) of RCRA (*i.e.*, “Subtitle D” of RCRA). Under this approach, the CCRs would remain classified as a non-hazardous RCRA solid waste, and EPA would develop national minimum criteria governing facilities for their disposal. EPA’s co-proposed subtitle D minimum criteria are discussed below.

Statutory standards for Subtitle D approach. Under RCRA 4005(a), upon promulgation of criteria under 1008(a)(3), any solid waste management practice or disposal of solid waste which constitutes the “open dumping” of solid waste is prohibited. The criteria under RCRA 1008(a)(3) are those that define the act of open dumping, and are prohibited under 4005(a), and the criteria under 4004(a) are those to be used by states in their planning processes to determine which facilities are “open dumps” and which are “sanitary landfills.” EPA has in practice defined the two sets of criteria identically. *See, e.g.*, Criteria for Classification of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities and Practices, 44 FR 53438, 53438–39 (Sept. 13, 1979). EPA has designed today’s co-proposed subtitle D criteria to integrate with the existing open dumping criteria in this respect, as reflected in the proposed changes to 257.1.

Section 4004(a) of RCRA provides that EPA shall promulgate regulations containing criteria distinguishing which facilities are to be classified as sanitary landfills and which are open dumps. This section provides a standard that varies from that under RCRA subtitle C. Specifically, subtitle C provides that management standards for hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities are those “necessary to protect human health or the environment.” *See, e.g.*, RCRA 3004(a). By contrast, Section 4004(a) provides that

[a]t a minimum, the such criteria shall provide that a facility may be classified as a sanitary landfill and not an open dump only if there is no reasonable probability of adverse effects on health or the environment from disposal of solid waste at such facility. Such regulations may provide for the classification of the types of sanitary landfills.

Thus, under the RCRA subtitle D regulatory standard in 4004, EPA is to

develop requirements based on the adverse effects on health or the environment from disposal of solid waste at a facility, and accordingly, EPA looked at such effects in developing today's co-proposed Subtitle D rule.

At the same time, EPA believes that the differing standards, in particular the reference to the criteria as those which are needed to assure that there is "no reasonable probability" of adverse effects, allows the Agency the ability to adopt standards different from those required under the subtitle C proposal where appropriate. EPA notes that the 4004(a) standard refers to the "probability" of adverse effect on health or the environment. In EPA's view, this provides it the discretion to establish requirements that are less certain to eliminate a risk to health or the environment than otherwise might be required under Subtitle C, and allows additional flexibility in how those criteria may be applied to facilities. At the same time, however, EPA notes that the requirements meeting the "no reasonable probability" standard are those "at a minimum"—thus, EPA is not constrained to limit itself to that standard should it determine that additional protections are appropriate.

Statements in the legislative history of 4004(a) are also consistent with EPA's interpretation of the statutory language. While it provides little in the way of guidance on the meaning of the "reasonable probability" standard, the legislative history does indicate that Congress was aware of effects from solid waste disposal facilities that included surface runoff, leachate contamination of surface- and groundwaters, and also identified concerns over the location and operations of landfills. *See* H. Rep. 94-1491, at 37-8. In addition, the legislative history confirms that the standard in 4004(a) was intended to set a minimum for the criteria. *See* H. Rep. 94-1491, at 40 ("This legislation requires that the Administrator define sanitary landfill as disposal site at which there is no reasonable chance of adverse effects on health and the environment from the disposal of discarded material at the site. *This is a minimum requirement of this legislation and does not preclude additional requirements.*" Emphasis added.)

1. Regulatory Approach

In developing the proposed RCRA subtitle D option for CCRs, EPA considered a number of existing requirements as relevant models for minimum national standards for the safe disposal of CCRs. The primary source was the existing requirements under 40 CFR part 258, applicable to municipal

solid waste landfills, which provide a comprehensive framework for all aspects of disposal in land-based units, such as CCR landfills. Based on the Agency's substantial experience with these requirements, EPA believes that the part 258 criteria represent a reasonable balance between ensuring the protection of human health and the environment from the risks of these wastes and the practical realities of facilities' ability to implement the criteria. The engineered structures regulated under part 258 are very similar to those found at CCR disposal facilities, and the regulations applicable to such units would be expected to address the risks presented by the constituents in CCR wastes. Moreover, CCR wastes do not contain the constituents that are likely to require modification of the existing part 258 requirements, such as organics; for example, no adjustments would be needed to ensure that groundwater monitoring would be protective, as the CCR constituents are all readily distinguishable by standard analytical chemistry. As discussed throughout this preamble, each of the provisions adopted for today's subtitle D co-proposal relies, in large measure, on the record EPA developed to support the 40 CFR part 258 municipal solid waste landfill criteria, along with the other record evidence specific to CCRs, discussed throughout the co-proposed subtitle C alternative. EPA also relied on the Agency's Guide for Industrial Waste Management (EPA530-R-03-001, February 2003), to provide information on existing best management practices that facilities have likely adopted.

The Guide was developed by EPA and state and tribal representatives, as well as a focus group of industry and public interest stakeholders chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and reflects a consensus view of best practices for industrial waste management. It also contains recommendations based on more recent scientific developments, and state-of-the-art disposal practices for solid wastes.

In addition, EPA considered that many of the technical requirements that EPA developed to specifically address the risks from the disposal of CCRs as part of the subtitle C alternative, would be equally justified under a RCRA subtitle D regime. Thus, for example, EPA is proposing the same MSHA-based standards for surface impoundments that are discussed as part of the subtitle C alternative. The factual record—*i.e.*, the risk analysis and the damage cases—supporting such requirements is the same, irrespective of the statutory authority under which the Agency is

operating. Although the statutory standards under subsections C and D differ, EPA has historically interpreted both statutory provisions to establish a comparable level of protection, corresponding to an acceptable risk level ranging between 1×10^{-4} to 1×10^{-6} . In addition, EPA does not interpret section 4004 to preclude the Agency from establishing more stringent requirements where EPA deems such more stringent requirements appropriate. Thus, several of the provisions EPA is proposing under RCRA subtitle D either correspond to the provisions EPA is proposing to establish for RCRA subtitle C, or are modeled after the existing subtitle C requirements. These provisions include the following regulatory provisions specific to CCRs that EPA is proposing to establish: Scope, and applicability (*i.e.*, who will be subject to the rule criteria/requirements), the Design Criteria and Operating Criteria (including provisions for surface impoundment integrity), and several of the provisions specifying appropriate pollution control technologies. Additional support for EPA's decision to specify appropriate monitoring, corrective action, closure, and post-closure care requirements (since the specific requirements correlate closely with the existing 40 CFR 258 requirements) is found in the risk analysis and damage case information. Finally, many of the definitions are the same in each section.

However, both the RCRA subtitle C proposals and the existing 40 CFR part 258 requirements were developed to be implemented in the context of a permitting program, where an overseeing authority evaluates the requirements, and can adjust them, as appropriate to account for site specific conditions. Because there is no corresponding guaranteed permit mechanism under the RCRA subtitle D regulations proposed today, EPA also considered the 40 CFR part 265 interim status requirements for hazardous waste facilities, which were designed to operate in the absence of a permit. The interim status requirements were particularly relevant in developing the proposed requirements for surface impoundments, since such units are not regulated under 40 CFR part 258. Beyond their self-implementing design, these requirements provided a useful model because, based on decades of experience in implementing these requirements, EPA has assurance that they provide national requirements that have proven to be protective for a variety of wastes, under a wide variety

of site conditions. Past experience also demonstrates that facilities can feasibly implement these requirements.

Taking all of these considerations into account, EPA has generally designed the proposed RCRA subtitle D criteria to create self-implementing requirements. These self-implementing requirements typically consist of a technical design standard (e.g., the composite liner requirement for new CCR landfills and surface impoundments). In addition, for many of these requirements, the Agency also has established performance criteria that the owner or operator can meet, in place of the technical design standard, which provides the facility with flexibility in complying with the minimum national criteria. EPA generally has chosen to propose an alternate performance standard for a number of reasons. In several cases, the alternative standard is intended to address the circumstances where the appropriate requirement is highly dependent on site-specific conditions (such as the spacing and location of ground-water wells); consequently, uniform, national standards that assure the requisite level of protection are extremely difficult to establish. EPA could establish a minimum national requirement, but to do so, EPA would need to establish the most restrictive criteria that would ensure protection of the most vulnerable site conditions. Because this would result in overregulation of less vulnerable sites, EPA questions whether such a restrictive approach would be consistent with the RCRA section 4004 standard of ensuring “no *reasonable* probability of adverse effects.” (emphasis added). The existing 40 CFR part 258 requirements provide the flexibility to address this issue by establishing alternate performance standards and relying on the oversight resulting from state permitting processes, and supported by EPA approval of state plans. Indeed, EPA made clear in the final MSWLF rule that this was the reason that several of the individual performance standards in the existing 40 CFR part 258 requirements are available only in states with EPA approved programs. *See, e.g.*, 56 FR 51096 (authorizing alternative cover designs). However, EPA cannot rely on these oversight mechanisms to implement the RCRA 4004 subtitle D requirements. Under these provisions of RCRA, EPA lacks the authority to require state permits, approve state programs, and to enforce the criteria. Moreover as discussed in Section IV, the level of state oversight varies appreciably among states. Consequently, for these provisions EPA is also

proposing to require the owner or operator of the facility to obtain certifications by independent registered professional engineers to provide verification that these provisions are properly applied. EPA has also proposed to require certifications by independent professional engineers more broadly as a mechanism to facilitate citizen oversight and enforcement. As discussed in greater detail below, EPA is proposing to require minimum qualifications for the professionals who are relied upon to make such certifications. In general, EPA expects that professionals in the field will have adequate incentive to provide an honest certification, given that the regulations require that the engineer not be an employee of the owner or operator, and that they operate under penalty of losing their license.

EPA believes that these provisions allow facilities the flexibility to account for site conditions, by allowing them to deviate from the specific technical criteria, provided the alternative meets a specified performance standard, yet also provide some degree of third-party verification of facility practices. The availability of meaningful independent verification is critical to EPA’s ability to conclude that these performance standards will meet the RCRA section 4004 protectiveness standard. EPA recognizes that relying upon third party certifications is not the same as relying upon the state regulatory authority, and will likely not provide the same level of “independence.” For example, although not an employee, the engineer will still have been hired by the utility. EPA therefore broadly solicits comment on whether this approach provides the right balance between establishing sufficient guarantee that the regulations will be protective, and offering facilities sufficient flexibility to be able to feasibly implement requirements that will be appropriate to the site conditions. In this regard, EPA would also be interested in receiving suggestions for other mechanisms to provide facility flexibility and/or verification.

There is a broad range of the extent to which states already have some of these requirements in place under their current RCRA subtitle D waste management programs established under state law, as explained previously in this preamble. EPA and certain commenters, however, have identified significant gaps in state programs and current practices. For example, EPA does not believe that many, if any, states currently have provisions that would likely cause the closure of existing surface impoundments, such as the

provisions in today’s proposed rule that surface impoundments must either retrofit to meet all requirements, such as installing a composite liner, or stop receiving CCRs within a maximum of five years of the effective date of the regulation. The RCRA subtitle D proposal outlined here is intended to fill such gaps and ensure national minimum standards. EPA intends to provide a complete set of requirements, designed to ensure there will be no reasonable probability of adverse effects on health or the environment caused by CCR landfills or surface impoundments. EPA’s co-proposed RCRA subtitle D minimum criteria are discussed below.

2. Notifications

In response to EPA’s lack of authority to require a state permit program or to oversee state programs, EPA has sought to enhance the protectiveness of the proposed RCRA subtitle D standards by providing for state and public notifications of the third party certifications, as well as other information that documents the decisions made or actions taken to comply with the performance criteria. As discussed in the section-by-section analysis below, documentation of how the various standards are met must be placed in the operating record and the state notified.

The owner or operator must also maintain a web site available to the public that contains the documentation that the standard is met. EPA is proposing that owners and operators provide notification to the public by posting notices and relevant information on an internet site with a link clearly identified as being a link to notifications, reports, and demonstrations required under the regulations. EPA believes the internet is currently the most convenient and widely accessible means for gathering information and disseminating it to the public. However, the Agency solicits comments regarding the methods for providing notifications to the public and the states. EPA also solicits comments on whether there could be homeland security implications with the requirement to post information on an internet site and whether posting certain information on the internet may duplicate information that is already available to the public through the state.

The co-proposed subtitle D regulation accordingly includes a number of public notice provisions. In particular, to ensure that persons residing near CCR surface impoundments are protected from potential catastrophic releases, we are proposing that when a potentially hazardous condition develops regarding

the integrity of a surface impoundment, that the owner or operator immediately notify potentially affected persons and the state. The Agency is also proposing to require that owners or operators notify the state, and place the report and other supporting materials in the operating record and on the company's internet site of various demonstrations, documentation, and certifications. Accordingly, notice must be provided: (1) Of demonstrations that CCR landfills or surface impoundments will not adversely affect human health or the environment; (2) of demonstrations of alternative fugitive dust control measures; (3) annually throughout the active life and post-closure care period that the landfill or surface impoundment is in compliance with the groundwater monitoring and corrective action provisions; (4) when documentation related to the design, installation, development, and decommission of any monitoring wells, piezometers and other measurement, sampling, and analytical devices has been placed in the operating record; (5) when certification of the groundwater monitoring system by an independent registered professional engineer or hydrologist has been placed in the operating record; (6) when groundwater monitoring sampling and analysis program documentation has been placed in the operating record; (7) when the use of an alternative statistical method is to be used in evaluating groundwater monitoring data and a justification for the alternative statistical method has been placed in the operating record; (8) when the owner or operator finds that there is a statistically significant increase over background for one or more of the constituents listed in Appendix III of the proposed rule, at any groundwater monitoring well; (9) when a notice of the results of assessment monitoring that may be required under the groundwater monitoring program is placed in the operating record; (10) when a notice is placed in the operating record that constituent levels that triggered assessment monitoring have returned to or below background levels; (11) when a notice of the intent to close the unit has been placed in the operating record; and (12) when a certification, signed by an independent registered professional engineer verifying that post-closure care has been completed in accordance with the post-closure plan, has been placed in the operating record. Please consult the proposed subtitle D regulation provided with this notice for all the proposed notification and documentation requirements.

As explained earlier, the RCRA subtitle D approach relies on state and citizen enforcement. EPA believes that it cannot conclude that the RCRA subtitle D regulations will ensure there is no reasonable probability of adverse effects on health or the environment, unless there is a mechanism for states and citizens to monitor the situation, such as when groundwater monitoring shows exceedances, so that they can determine when intervention is appropriate. EPA also believes that notifications, such as those described above, will minimize the danger of owners or operators abusing the self-implementing system through increased transparency and by facilitating the citizen suit enforcement mechanism.

EPA is proposing that owners and operators provide notification to the public by posting notices and relevant information on an internet site with a link clearly identified as being a link to notifications, reports, and demonstrations required under the regulations. EPA believes the internet is currently the most convenient and widely accessible means for gathering information. However, the Agency solicits comments regarding the methods for providing notifications to the public and the states.

B. Section-by-Section Discussion of RCRA Subtitle D Criteria

1. Proposed Modifications to Part 257, Subpart A

EPA is proposing to modify the existing open dumping criteria found in 40 CFR 257.1, *Scope and Purpose*, to recognize the creation of a new subpart D, which consolidates all of the criteria adopted for determining which CCR Landfills and CCR Surface impoundments pose a reasonable probability of adverse effects on health or the environment under sections 1008(a)(3) and 4004(a) of the Act. Facilities and practices failing to satisfy these consolidated subpart D criteria violate RCRA's prohibition on open dumping. The proposed regulation also excludes CCR landfills and surface impoundments subject to proposed subpart D from subpart A, except as otherwise provided in subpart D.

In general, these provisions are intended to integrate the new requirements with the existing open dumping criteria, and have only been modified to clarify that the proposed RCRA subtitle D regulations define which CCR landfills and surface impoundments violate the federal standards, and therefore may be enforced by citizen suit under RCRA 4005(a) and 7002. EPA has also

proposed language to make clear that those CCR landfills and surface impoundments that are subject to the new proposed Subpart D would not also be subject to Subpart A, with the exception of three of the existing Subpart A criteria (257.3–1, *Floodplains*, 257.3–2 *Endangered Species*, 257.3–3 *Surface water*) that would continue to apply to these facilities. The applicability of these three provisions to CCR disposal facilities is discussed later in this preamble.

Finally, EPA also notes that its intent in excluding CCR landfills and surface impoundments from 40 CFR 257 Subpart A in this manner is to consolidate the requirements applicable to those particular facilities in one set of RCRA subtitle D regulations. EPA does not intend to modify the coverage of 40 CFR 257 subpart A as to other disposal facilities and practices for CCRs, such as beneficial uses of CCRs when they are applied to the land used for food-chain crops. It is EPA's intent that such activities would continue to be subject to the existing criteria under Subpart A.

2. General Provisions

The proposed general provisions address the applicability of the new proposed RCRA Subpart D requirements, the continuing applicability of certain of the existing open dumping criteria, provide for an effective date of 180 days after promulgation, and define key terms for the proposed criteria.

Applicability. The applicability provisions identify those solid waste disposal facilities subject to the new proposed RCRA Subpart D (*i.e.*, CCR landfills and CCR surface impoundments as defined under proposed 257.40(b)). The applicability section also identifies three of the existing subpart A criteria that would continue to apply to these facilities: 257.3–1, *Floodplains*, 257.3–2 *Endangered Species*, 257.3–3 *Surface water*. The applicability of these provisions to CCR disposal facilities is discussed later in this preamble.

The applicability section also specifies an effective date of 180 days after publication of the final rule. EPA believes that, with the specific exceptions discussed below, this time frame strikes a reasonable balance between the time that owners and operators of CCR units would need in order to come into compliance with the rule's requirements, and the need to implement the proposed requirements in a timeframe that will maximize protection of health and the environment. We note that 180 days is

the timeframe for persons to come into compliance with most of the requirements under RCRA subtitle C, and believe that if persons can meet the hazardous waste provisions within this time period under RCRA subtitle C, that it is reasonable to conclude that persons should be able to meet those same or similar requirements under RCRA subtitle D. EPA also notes that pending finalization of any regulations, facilities continue to be subject to the existing part 257 open dumping criteria as they may apply.

3. Definitions

This section of the proposed regulation discusses the definitions of some of the key terms used in the proposed RCRA subtitle D rule that are necessary for the proper interpretation of the proposed criteria. Because EPA is creating a separate section of the regulations specific to CCR units, EPA is also consolidating the existing definitions in this section. However, by simply incorporating these unmodified definitions into this new section of the regulations, EPA is not proposing to reopen, or soliciting comments on these requirements. Nor, for definitions where the only modification relates to an adjustment specific to CCRs, is EPA proposing to revise or reopen the existing part 257 or part 258 definitions as they apply to other categories of disposal facilities, as those will remain unaltered. Accordingly, EPA will not respond to any comments on these definitions.

Aquifer. EPA has defined aquifer for this proposal as a geologic formation, group of formations, or portion of a formation capable of yielding significant quantities of ground water to wells or springs. This is the same definition currently used in EPA's hazardous waste program and MSWLF criteria in 40 CFR 258.2 and differs from the original criteria definition (40 CFR 257.3–4(c)(1)) only in that it substitutes the term “significant” for “usable.” The Agency is proposing to adopt the modified definition to make the subtitle C and subtitle D alternatives consistent.

Coal Combustion Residuals (CCRs) means fly ash, bottom ash, boiler slag, and flue gas desulfurization wastes. CCRs are also known as coal combustion wastes (CCWs) and fossil fuel combustion (FFC) wastes.

CCR Landfill. The co-proposed criteria includes a definition of “CCR landfill” to mean an area of land or an excavation, including a lateral expansion, in which CCRs are placed for permanent disposal, and that is not a land application unit, surface impoundment, or injection well. For

purposes of this proposed rule, landfills also include piles, sand and gravel pits, quarries, and/or large scale fill operations. EPA modeled this definition after the definition of “Municipal solid waste landfill (MSWLF) unit” contained in the existing criteria for those facilities. Although this is somewhat different than the definition proposed under the subtitle C alternative (which is based on the existing part 260 definition), EPA intends for this proposed definition to capture those landfills and other large-scale disposal practices that are described in EPA's damage cases and risk assessments discussed in sections II, VI, and the RIA.

CCR Surface Impoundment. EPA has proposed to define this term to mean a facility or part of a facility, including a lateral expansion, that is a natural topographic depression, human-made excavation, or diked area formed primarily of earthen materials (although it may be lined with human-made materials), that is designed to hold an accumulation of liquid CCR wastes or CCR wastes containing free liquids and that is not an injection well. EPA has included as examples of surface impoundments settling and aeration pits, ponds, and lagoons. This is the same definition that EPA is proposing as part of the subtitle C alternative, and is generally consistent with the definition of “surface impoundment or impoundment” contained in the existing 257.2 criteria.

EPA further proposes in the definition a description of likely conditions at a CCR surface impoundment, stating that CCR surface impoundments often receive CCRs that have been sluiced (flushed or mixed with water to facilitate movement), or wastes from wet air pollution control devices. EPA intends for this proposed definition to capture those surface impoundments that are described in EPA's damage cases and risk assessments described in sections II, VI, and the RIA.

Existing CCR Landfill/Existing CCR Surface Impoundment. EPA has included a proposed definition of this term to mean a CCR landfill or surface impoundment, which was in operation on, or for which construction commenced prior to the effective date of the final rule. The proposed definition states that a CCR landfill or surface impoundment has commenced construction if: (1) The owner or operator has obtained the Federal, State and local approvals or permits necessary to begin physical construction; and (2) either (i) a continuous on-site, physical construction program has begun; or (ii) the owner or operator has entered into

contractual obligations—which cannot be cancelled or modified without substantial loss—for physical construction of the CCR landfill or surface impoundment to be completed within a reasonable time. These definitions are identical to the co-proposed subtitle C definitions, described in section VI. EPA sees no reason to establish separate definitions of these units for purposes of RCRA subtitle D since the question of whether these units are existing should not differ between whether they are regulated under RCRA subtitles C or D.

Factor of Safety (Safety Factor). The proposed definition is the ratio of the forces tending to resist the failure of a structure to the forces tending to cause such failure as determined by accepted engineering practice. This definition is the same as the co-proposed subtitle C definitions, described in section VI. EPA sees no reason to establish a separate definition for this term for purposes of RCRA subtitle D since the question of “Factor of safety” should not differ between units that would be regulated under RCRA subtitles C or D.

Hazard potential classification. This term is proposed to be defined as the possible adverse incremental consequences that result from the release of water or stored contents due to failure of a dam (or impoundment) or misoperation of the dam or appurtenances.

The proposed definition further delineates the classification into four categories:

- High hazard potential surface impoundment** which is a surface impoundment where failure or misoperation will probably cause loss of human life;
- Significant hazard potential surface impoundment** which is a surface impoundment where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life, but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, disruption of lifeline facilities, or impact other concerns; and
- Low hazard potential surface impoundment** means a surface impoundment where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life and low economic and/or environmental losses. Losses are principally limited to the surface impoundment owner's property.
- Less than low hazard potential surface impoundment** means a surface impoundment not meeting the definitions for High, Significant, or Low Hazard Potential.

This definition, just like the proposed RCRA subtitle C definition, follows the

Hazard Potential Classification System for Dams, developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the National Inventory of Dams. This system is a widely-used definitional scheme for classifying the hazard potential posed by dams, and EPA expects that the regulated community's familiarity with these requirements will make their application to CCR surface impoundments relatively straightforward.

Independent registered professional engineer or hydrologist. This term is defined as a scientist or engineer who is not an employee of the owner or operator of a CCR landfill or surface impoundment who has received a baccalaureate or post-graduate degree in the natural sciences or engineering and has sufficient training and experience in groundwater hydrology and related fields as may be demonstrated by state registration, professional certifications, or completion of accredited university programs that enable that individual to make sound professional judgments regarding groundwater monitoring, contaminant fate and transport, and corrective action.

Because the proposed RCRA subtitle D requirements cannot presuppose the existence of a permit or state regulatory oversight, the criteria in today's proposed rule are self-implementing. However, as discussed earlier, to try to minimize the potential for overregulation, and to provide some degree of flexibility, EPA is proposing to allow facilities to deviate from the criteria upon a demonstration that the alternative meets a specified performance standard. But to provide for a minimum level of verification and to reduce the opportunity for abuse, the Agency believes it is imperative to have an independent party review, and certify the facility's demonstrations. The Agency also believes that those professionals certifying the requirements of today's proposed rule should meet certain minimum qualifications. The Agency is proposing to define a "qualified ground-water scientist" to be a scientist or engineer who has received a baccalaureate or post-graduate degree in the natural sciences or engineering and has sufficient training and experience in ground-water hydrology and related fields as may be demonstrated by State registration, professional certification, or completion of accredited university programs that enable that individual to make sound professional judgments regarding ground-water monitoring, contaminant fate and transport, and corrective action. This requirement is the same as the current requirement at

§ 258.50(f). The Agency believes that specialized coursework and training should include, at a minimum, physical geology, ground-water hydrology or hydrogeology, and environmental chemistry (e.g., soil chemistry or low temperature geochemistry). Some national organizations, such as the American Institute of Hydrology and the National Water Well Association, currently certify or register ground-water professionals. States may of course establish more stringent requirements for these professionals, including mandatory licensing or certification. As discussed above, EPA seeks comment on the proposed reliance on independent professionals in implementing the proposed flexibility of performance standards.

Lateral expansion means a horizontal expansion of the waste boundaries of an existing CCR landfill, or existing CCR surface impoundment made after the effective date of the final rule. This definition is identical to the co-proposed subtitle C definition, described in section VI. EPA sees no reason to establish a separate definition of this term for purposes of RCRA subtitle D since whether a lateral expansion has occurred at a CCR landfill or surface impoundment should not differ between those units regulated under RCRA subtitles C or D.

New CCR landfill means a CCR landfill from which there is placement of CCRs without the presence of free liquids, which began operation, or for which the construction commenced after the effective date of the rule. This definition is identical to the co-proposed subtitle C definition, described in section VI. EPA sees no reason to establish a separate definition for this term for purposes of RCRA subtitle D since whether a landfill is new should not differ between those landfills that are regulated under RCRA subtitles C or D.

New CCR surface impoundment means a CCR surface impoundment into which CCRs with the presence of free liquids have been placed, which began operation, or for which the construction commenced after the effective date of the rule. EPA sees no reason to establish a separate definition for this term for purposes of RCRA subtitle D since whether a surface impoundment is new should not differ between those surface impoundments that are regulated under RCRA subtitles C or D.

Recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices means engineering maintenance or operation activities based on established codes, standards, published technical reports, recommended practice, or similar

document. Such practices detail generally approved ways to perform specific engineering, inspection, or mechanical integrity activities. In several provisions, EPA requires that the facility operate in accordance with "recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices," or requires an independent engineer to certify that a design or operating parameter meets this standard. The definition references but does not attempt to codify any particular set of engineering practices, but to allow the professional engineer latitude to adopt improved practices that reflect the state-of-the-art practices, as they develop over time. This definition is the same as the definition EPA is proposing under the subtitle C alternative.

4. Location Restrictions

To provide for no reasonable probability of adverse effects on health or the environment from the disposal of CCRs at CCR landfills and surface impoundments, EPA believes that any RCRA subtitle D regulation would need to ensure that CCR disposal units were appropriately sited. The proposed location restrictions include requirements relating to placement of the CCRs above the water table, wetlands, fault areas, seismic impact zones, and unstable areas. In addition, as previously noted, the location standards in subpart A of 40 CFR part 257 for floodplains, endangered species, and surface waters would also continue to apply. Finally, the proposed regulations also address the closure of existing CCR landfills and surface impoundments.

The location standards in this proposal are primarily based on the location standards developed for municipal solid waste landfill units, and represent provisions to ensure that the structure of the disposal unit is not adversely impacted by conditions at the site, or that the location of a disposal unit at the site would not increase risks to human health or the environment. The criteria for municipal solid waste landfills provide restrictions on siting units in wetlands, fault areas, seismic impact zones, and unstable areas.¹⁵¹

¹⁵¹ The proposed definition of seismic impact zone was modified from the part 258 definition as explained in the "Discussion of Individual Location Requirements" section below. The part 258 criteria also include location restrictions relating to airport safety and floodplains, in 258.10 and 258.11, respectively. EPA has not proposed an analogue to 258.10 because the hazard addressed by that criterion, bird strikes to aircraft, is inapplicable in the context of CCR disposal units, which do not tend to attract birds to them. As discussed in the

Each of those factors is generally recognized as having the potential to impact the structure of a disposal unit negatively or increase the risks to human health and the environment. As discussed below in more detail, each of these provisions adopted for today's RCRA subtitle D co-proposal relies in large measure, on the record EPA developed to support the 40 CFR part 258 municipal solid waste landfill criteria. EPA's Guide for Industrial Waste Management (EPA530-R-03-001, February 2003) also identifies these location restrictions as appropriate for industrial waste management. These proposed requirements are all discussed in turn below, after a general explanation of the Agency's proposed treatment of new CCR disposal units compared to existing CCR disposal units.

a. Differences in Location Restrictions for Existing and New CCR Landfills and Surface Impoundments, and Lateral Expansions. EPA is proposing different sets of location restrictions under the Subtitle D approach, depending on whether a unit is a CCR landfill or surface impoundment, and whether it is an existing or new unit. Lateral expansions fall within the definitions of new units, and are treated accordingly.

While new landfills would be required to comply with all of the location restrictions, EPA is proposing to subject existing landfills to only two of the location restrictions—floodplains, and unstable areas—in today's rule. Existing landfills are already subject to the floodplains location restriction because it is contained in the existing 40 CFR part 257, subpart A criteria, which have been in effect since 1979. Because owners and operators of existing landfills already should be in compliance with this criterion, applying this location restriction will have no impact to the existing disposal capacity, while continuing to provide protection of human health and the environment.

The Agency decided to apply today's final unstable area location restriction to existing CCR landfills, because the Agency believes that the impacts to human health and the environment that would result from the rapid and catastrophic destruction of these units outweighs any disposal capacity concerns resulting from the closure of existing CCR disposal units.

On the other hand EPA is not proposing to impose requirements on existing CCR landfills in wetlands, fault areas, or seismic impact areas. We base this decision on the possibility that a

significant number of CCR landfills may be located in areas subject to this requirement. The Agency believes that such landfills pose less risks and are structurally less vulnerable than surface impoundments, and disposal capacity shortfalls, which could result if existing CCR landfills in these locations were required to close, raise greater environmental and public health concerns than the potential risks caused by existing units in these locations. For example, if existing CCR landfills located in wetlands were required to close, there would be a significant decrease in disposal capacity, particularly given the Agency's expectation that many existing surface impoundments will choose to close, in response to this proposed rule. In addition, wetlands are more prevalent in some parts of the country (e.g., Florida and Louisiana). In these States, the closure of all existing CCR landfills located in wetlands could potentially significantly disrupt statewide solid waste management. Therefore, the Agency believes that it may be impracticable to require the closure of existing CCR landfills located in wetlands. However, EPA seeks comment and additional information regarding the number of existing CCR landfills that are located in such areas.

Concern about impacts on solid waste disposal capacity as well as the lower level of risks and the structural vulnerability of landfills, as compared to surface impoundments, were also the primary reasons the Agency is not proposing to subject existing CCR landfills to today's proposed fault area location restrictions. The closure of a significant number of existing CCR landfills located in fault areas could result in a serious reduction of CCR landfill capacity in certain regions of the U.S. where movement along Holocene faults is common, such as along the Gulf Coast and in much of California and the Pacific Northwest. The Agency, however, does not have specific data showing the number of units and the distance between these disposal units and the active faults, and therefore, is unable to precisely estimate the number of these existing CCR landfills that would not meet today's fault area restrictions. EPA therefore solicits comment and additional data and information regarding the extent to which existing CCR landfills are currently located in such locations. However, given the potential for impacts on solid waste capacity and the lower levels of risk associated with landfills compared to surface impoundments, EPA has concluded that

it may not be appropriate to subject existing CCR landfills to the proposed fault area requirements.

Similarly, the Agency is not proposing to impose the seismic impact zone restrictions on existing CCR landfills located in these areas. As with the other location restrictions, the Agency anticipates that a significant number of existing CCR disposal units are located in these areas. EPA is concerned that such facilities would be unable to meet the requirements, because retrofitting would be prohibitively expensive and technically very difficult in most cases, and would therefore be forced to close.

EPA generally seeks comment and additional information regarding the extent to which CCR landfill capacity would be affected by applying these location restrictions to existing CCR landfills. Information on the prevalence of existing CCR landfills in such areas would be of particular interest to the Agency. EPA also notes that the proposed location requirements do not reflect a complete prohibition on siting facilities in such areas, but provide a performance standard that facilities must meet in order to site a unit in such a location. EPA therefore solicits comment on the extent to which facilities could comply with these performance standards, and the necessary costs that would be incurred to retrofit the unit to meet these standards.

As discussed earlier in this preamble, this proposed approach is generally consistent with the proposed approach to existing landfills under subtitle C of RCRA, and with Congressional distinctions between the risks presented by landfills and surface impoundments. Existing landfills that are brought into the hazardous waste system because they are receiving newly listed hazardous wastes are not generally required to be retrofitted with a new minimum-technology liner/leachate collection and removal system (or to close), and they would not be subject to such requirements under today's proposal. EPA sees no reason or special argument to adopt more stringent requirements under the co-proposed subtitle D criteria for CCR landfills, particularly given the volume of the material and the disruption that could be involved if these design requirements were applied to existing landfills.

By contrast, and consistent with its approach to existing surface impoundments under subtitle C, the proposed regulations would apply all of the location restrictions to existing surface impoundments. This means that facilities would need to either

main text, EPA is proposing to maintain the existing criterion in 257, subpart A for floodplains.

demonstrate that the surface impoundment meets the performance standard that serves as the alternative to the prohibition, retrofit the unit so that it can meet the performance standard, or close. EPA is making this distinction because, as discussed in sections IV–VI, the record indicates that the risks associated with CCR surface impoundments are substantially higher than the risks posed by CCR landfills. The impacts to human health and the environment that would result from the rapid and catastrophic destruction of these units could result in injuries to human health and the environment, that are far more significant, as illustrated by the impacts of the recent TVA spill in Tennessee. The risks to human health and the environment of such a catastrophic collapse far outweigh the costs of requiring surface impoundments to retrofit or close. Moreover, there are significant economic costs associated with the failure of a surface impoundment; as noted earlier, the direct cost to clean up the TVA spill is currently estimated to exceed one billion dollars. Surface impoundments also are more vulnerable to structural problems if located in unstable areas, fault areas and seismic impact areas. Finally, as already noted, the distinction EPA is making between existing landfills and existing surface impoundments is also consistent with Congressional direction; as discussed in section VI, Congress specifically required existing surface impoundments receiving hazardous wastes to retrofit to meet the new statutory requirements or to close, in direct contrast to their treatment of existing landfills.

Although many surface impoundments may close as a result of these requirements, EPA believes that it is proposing to take a number of actions to alleviate concerns that this will present significant difficulties with regard to disposal capacity in the short-term: e.g., “grandfathering” in existing CCR landfills, allowing CCR landfills to vertically expand without retrofitting, and delayed implementation dates. At the same time, as discussed in greater detail in section VI, with regard to the subtitle C co-proposal, EPA is soliciting comment on the appropriate amount of time necessary to meet these time frames as well as measures that could help to address the potential for inadequate disposal capacity. EPA notes, however, that unlike under the subtitle C co-proposal, EPA is not proposing to require facilities to cease wet handling. Thus EPA expects that both the impacts and the time frames

needed for facilities to come into compliance would be lower.

While the proposed requirements relating to the placement above the water table, wetlands, fault areas, and seismic impact zones would not apply to existing CCR disposal units, all of these restrictions apply to lateral expansions of existing CCR disposal units, as well as new CCR disposal units. Therefore, under the proposal, owners and operators of existing CCR landfills could vertically expand their existing facilities in these locations, but must comply with the provisions governing new units if they wish to laterally expand. EPA expects that allowing such vertical expansion will allow for increased capacity, which will be particularly important, if, as EPA expects, many surface impoundments would close, should this regulation be adopted. At the same time, EPA believes that the risks to human health or the environment will be mitigated because facilities will be required to otherwise comply with the more stringent environmental restrictions, such as the corrective action and closure provisions proposed below.

b. Discussion of Individual Location Requirements

Placement above the water table. The co-proposed subtitle D regulations would prohibit new CCR landfills and all surface impoundments from being located within two feet of the upper limit of the natural water table. EPA is proposing to define the natural water table as the natural level at which water stands in a shallow well open along its length and penetrating the surficial deposits just deeply enough to encounter standing water at the bottom. This is the level of water that exists, when uninfluenced by groundwater pumping or other engineered activities.

Floodplains. CCR landfills and surface impoundments are currently subject to the open dumping criteria contained in 40 CFR 257, Subpart A. These minimum criteria include restrictions on floodplain impacts under 257.3–1. As facilities should already be complying with this requirement, EPA is not proposing to modify it as part of today’s rule. Accordingly, EPA is not reopening this requirement.

Wetlands. The regulations require that the facility prepare and make available a written demonstration that such engineering measures have been incorporated into the unit’s design to mitigate any potential adverse impact, and require certification by an independent registered professional engineer either that the new CCR disposal unit is not in a prohibited area,

as defined by the regulation, or that the demonstration meets the regulatory standards.

Today’s proposed wetland provisions would apply only to new CCR landfills, including lateral expansions of existing CCR disposal units, and all surface impoundments. New CCR landfills, which include lateral expansions, as well as all surface impoundments, are barred from wetlands unless the owner or operator of the disposal unit can make the following demonstrations certified by an independent registered professional engineer or hydrologist. First, the owner or operator must rebut the presumption that a practicable alternative to the proposed CCR disposal unit or lateral expansion is available that does not involve wetlands. Second, the owner or operator must show that the construction or operation of the unit will not cause or contribute to violations of any applicable State water quality standard, violate any applicable toxic effluent standard or prohibition, jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species or critical habitats, or violate any requirement for the protection of a marine sanctuary. Third, the owner or operator must demonstrate that the CCR disposal unit or lateral expansion will not cause or contribute to significant degradation of wetlands. To this end, the owner or operator must ensure the integrity of the CCR disposal unit, and its ability to protect ecological resources by addressing: erosion, stability, and migration potential of native wetland soils, muds and deposits used to support the unit; erosion, stability, and migration potential of dredged and fill materials used to support the unit; the volume and chemical nature of the CCRs; impacts on fish, wildlife, and other aquatic resources and their habitat from release of CCRs; the potential effects of catastrophic release of CCRs to the wetland and the resulting impacts on the environment; and any additional factors, as necessary, to demonstrate that ecological resources in the wetland are sufficiently protected. Fourth, the owner or operator must demonstrate that steps have been taken to attempt to achieve no net loss of wetlands by first avoiding impacts to wetlands to the maximum extent practicable, then minimizing unavoidable impacts to the maximum extent practicable, and finally offsetting remaining unavoidable wetland impacts through all appropriate and practicable compensatory mitigation actions. The owner or operator must place the demonstrations in the operating record and the

company's Internet site, and notify the state that the demonstrations have been placed in the operating record.

For facilities that cannot make such a demonstration, this proposed provision effectively bans the siting of new CCR landfills or surface impoundments in wetlands, and would require existing surface impoundments to close.

EPA notes that this section of the proposal is consistent with regulatory provisions currently governing the CWA section 404 program, including the definition of wetlands contained in proposed 257.61. *See* 40 CFR 232.2(r). EPA believes that wetlands are very important, fragile ecosystems that must be protected, and has identified wetlands protection as a top priority. Nevertheless, EPA has proposed to continue to allow existing CCR landfills to be sited in wetlands to minimize the disruption to existing CCR disposal facilities, as it is EPA's understanding that many existing CCR landfills are located near surface water bodies, in areas that also may qualify as wetlands under the proposed criteria. Likewise, EPA is concerned that an outright ban of new CCR landfills in wetlands would severely restrict the available sites or expansion possibilities, given that EPA is proposing to impose other conditions on surface impoundments that may cause many to ultimately close. As noted in section VI, concerns have been raised regarding the potential for disposal capacity shortfalls, which could lead to other health and environmental impacts, such as the transportation of large volumes of CCRs over long distances to other sites. Accordingly to provide additional flexibility in the proposed RCRA Subtitle D rules, and to address concerns regarding the potential for disposal capacity shortfalls, EPA is not proposing an outright ban on siting of existing CCR disposal units in wetlands.

However, EPA continues to believe that siting new CCR disposal units in wetlands should only be done under very limited conditions. The Agency is therefore proposing a comprehensive set of demonstration requirements. In addition, the Agency believes that when such facilities are sited in a wetland, that the owner or operator should offset any impacts through appropriate and practicable compensatory mitigation actions (*e.g.*, restoration of existing degraded wetlands or creation of man-made wetlands). This approach is consistent with the Agency's goal of achieving no overall net loss of the nation's remaining wetland base, as defined by acreage and function. Specifically, § 257.61(a)(4) requires owners or operators of new CCR

landfills and surface impoundments to demonstrate that steps have been taken to achieve no net loss of wetlands (as defined by acreage and function) by first avoiding impacts to wetlands and then minimizing such impacts to the maximum extent feasible, and finally, offsetting any remaining wetland impacts through all appropriate and feasible compensatory mitigation actions (*e.g.*, restoration of existing degraded wetlands or creation of man-made wetlands).

The Agency has also included other requirements to ensure that the demonstrations required under the proposed rule are comprehensive and ensure no reasonable probability of adverse effects to human health and the environment. First, EPA has included language in § 257.61(a)(2) clarifying that the owner or operator must demonstrate that both the construction and operation of the unit will not result in violations of the standards specified in § 257.61(a)(2)(i)–(iv). Second, in § 257.61(a)(3) EPA proposes to identify the factors the owner or operator must address in demonstrating that the unit will not cause or contribute to significant degradation of wetlands. These factors, which were partially derived from the section 404(b)(1) guidelines, address the integrity of the CCR unit and its ability to protect the ecological resources of the wetland. In addition, EPA is proposing requirements for third-party certification and state/public notice, to provide some verification of facility practices, and to generally assist citizens' ability to effectively intervene and enforce the requirements, as necessary.

Fault Areas. The proposed rule would ban the location of new CCR landfills and any surface impoundment within 200 feet (60 meters) of faults that have experienced displacement during the Holocene Epoch. The Holocene is a unit of geologic time, extending from the end of the Pleistocene Epoch to the present and includes the past 11,000 years of the Earth's history. EPA is proposing to define a fault to include a zone or zones of rock fracturing in any geologic material along which there has been an observable amount of displacement of the sides relative to each other. Faulting does not always occur along a single plane of movement (a "fault"), but rather along a zone of movement (a "fault zone"). Therefore, "zone of fracturing," which means a fault zone in the context of the definition, is included as part of the definition of fault, and thus the 200-foot setback distance will apply to the outermost boundary of a fault or fault zone.

The 200-foot setback was first adopted by EPA in the criteria for municipal solid waste landfills (MSWLFs), codified at 40 CFR part 258. In the course of that proceeding, EPA documented that seismologists generally believed that the structural integrity of MSWLFs could not be unconditionally guaranteed when they are built within 200-feet of a fault along which movement is highly likely to occur. Moreover, EPA relied on a study that showed that damage to engineered structures from earthquakes is most severe when the structures were located within 200-feet of the fault along which displacement occurred. Because the engineered structures found at MSWLFs are similar to those found in CCR disposal units, EPA expects that the potential for damage to those structures would be similar in the event of an earthquake near a CCR landfill or surface impoundment. Therefore, EPA is proposing a similar setback requirement for new CCR landfills and all surface impoundments. In general, EPA believes that the 200-foot buffer zone is necessary to protect engineered structures from seismic damages. EPA also expects that the 200-foot buffer is appropriate for CCR surface impoundments, but seeks comment and data on whether the buffer zone should be greater for such units.

However, the Agency is also concerned that the 200-foot setback may be overly protective in some geologic formations, but it is unable to provide a clear definition of these geologic formations. Therefore, the Agency is proposing to allow the opportunity for an owner or operator of a new CCR disposal unit to demonstrate that an alternative setback distance of less than 200 feet will prevent damage to the structural integrity of facility and will be protective of human health and the environment. The demonstration must be certified by an independent registered professional engineer and the owner or operator of the CCR disposal unit must notify the state that the demonstration has been placed in the operating record and on the company's internet site. This approach is consistent with other sections of today's RCRA subtitle D co-proposal for alternatives to the specified self-implementing requirement.

Seismic Impact Zones. As noted, the proposed rule would also ban the location of new CCR landfills and any surface impoundments in seismic impact zones, unless owners or operators demonstrate that the unit is designed to resist the maximum horizontal acceleration in lithified earth material for the site. The design features

to be protected include all containment structures (*i.e.*, liners, leachate collection systems, and surface water control systems). The demonstration must be certified by an independent registered professional engineer and the owner or operator must notify the state that the demonstration has been placed in the operating record and on the company's internet site. For purposes of this requirement, EPA is proposing to define seismic impact zones as areas having a 10 percent or greater probability that the maximum expected horizontal acceleration in hard rock, expressed as a percentage of the earth's gravitation pull (*g*), will exceed 0.10*g* in 250 years. This is based on the existing part 258.14 definition of seismic impact. The maps for the 250-year intervals are readily available for all of the U.S. in the U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 82-1033, entitled "Probabilistic Estimates of Maximum Acceleration and Velocity in Rock in the Contiguous United States."

Another approach would be to adopt criteria of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) of the U.S. Geological Survey used to develop national seismic hazard maps. The NEHRP uses ground motion probabilities of 2, 5, and 10% in 50 years to provide a relative range of seismic hazard across the country. The larger probabilities indicate the level of ground motion likely to cause problems in the western U.S. The smaller probabilities show how unlikely damaging ground motions are in many places of the eastern U.S. The maps are available at <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/products/>. A 50 year time period is commonly used because it represents the typical lifespan of a building, and a 2% probability level is generally considered an acceptable hazard level for building codes. For areas along known active faults, deterministic and scenario ground motion maps could be used to describe the expected ground motions and effects of specific hypothetical large earthquakes (see <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/products/scenario/>). The Agency solicits comments on the proposed definition and whether there are variants like those used to develop the national seismic hazard maps that could lessen the burden on the industry and the geographic areas covered by the proposed definition. For additional information on the National Seismic Hazard Mapping Project, see <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/about/>.

Unstable Areas. EPA is proposing to require owners or operators of all CCR landfills, surface impoundments and

lateral expansions located in unstable areas to demonstrate that the integrity of the structural components of the unit will not be disrupted. EPA's damage cases have provided indirect evidence of the kind of environmental and human health risks that would be associated with failure of the structural components of the surface impoundment from subsidence or other instability of the earth at a CCR disposal unit. Accordingly, EPA believes that, to provide a reasonable probability of preventing releases and consequent damage to health and the environment from CCRs released from landfills or surface impoundments, limits on the siting of such disposal units is appropriate.

The proposed Subtitle D rule provides that "unstable areas" are locations that are susceptible to natural or human-induced events or forces capable of impairing the integrity of some or all of the CCR disposal unit's structural components responsible for preventing releases from such units. Unstable areas are characterized by localized or regional ground subsidence, settling (either slowly, or very rapidly and catastrophically) of overburden, or by slope failure. The owner or operator must consider the following factors when determining whether an area is unstable: (1) On-site or local soil conditions that may result in significant differential settling; (2) on-site or local geologic or geomorphologic features; and (3) on-site or local human-made features or events (on both the surface and subsurface). The structural components include liners, leachate collection systems, final cover systems, run-on and run-off control systems, and any other component used in the construction and operation of the CCR landfill, surface impoundment or lateral expansion that is necessary for protection of human health and the environment.

Unstable areas generally include:

(1) Poor foundation conditions—areas where features exist that may result in inadequate foundation support for the structural components of the CCR landfill, surface impoundment or lateral expansion (this includes weak and unstable soils);

(2) Areas susceptible to mass movement—areas where the downslope movement of soil and rock (either alone or mixed with water) occurs under the influence of gravity; and

(3) Karst terraces—areas that are underlain by soluble bedrock, generally limestone or dolomite, and may contain extensive subterranean drainage systems and relatively large subsurface voids

whose presence can lead to the rapid development of sinkholes.

Karst areas are characterized by the presence of certain physiographic features such as sinkholes, sinkhole plains, blind valleys, solution valleys, losing streams, caves, and big springs, although not all these features are always present. EPA's intent in this proposed requirement is to include as an unstable area only those karst terraces in which rapid subsidence and sinkhole development have been a common occurrence in recent geologic time. Many of the karst areas are shown on the U.S. Geological Survey's National Atlas map entitled "Engineering Aspects of Karst," published in 1984.

Specific examples of such natural or human-induced phenomena include: Debris flows resulting from heavy rainfall in a small watershed; the rapid formation of a sinkhole as a result of excessive local or regional ground-water withdrawal; rockfalls along a cliff face caused by vibrations set up by the detonation of explosives, sonic booms, or other mechanisms; or the sudden liquefaction of a soil with the attendant loss of shear strength following an extended period of constant wetting and drying. Various naturally-occurring conditions can make an area unstable and these can be very unpredictable and destructive, especially if amplified by human-induced changes to the environment. Such conditions can include the presence of weak soils, over steepened slopes, large subsurface voids, or simply the presence of large quantities of unconsolidated material near a watercourse.

The Agency recognizes that rapid sinkhole formation that occurs in some karst terraces can pose a serious threat to human health and the environment by damaging the structural integrity of dams, liners, caps, run-on/run-off control systems, and other engineered structures. However, EPA is not proposing an outright ban of CCR landfills and surface impoundments in all karst terraces because of concerns regarding the impacts of such a ban in certain regions of the country. For example, several States (*i.e.*, Kentucky, Tennessee) are comprised mostly of karst terraces and banning all CCR disposal facilities in karst terraces would cause severe statewide disruptions in capacity available for CCR disposal. Moreover, the Agency believes that some karst terraces may provide sufficient structural support for CCR disposal units and has accordingly tried to provide flexibility for siting in these areas. Therefore, EPA is proposing to allow the construction of new CCR units, and the continued operation of

existing CCR landfills and surface impoundments in karst terraces where the owner or operator can demonstrate that engineering measures have been incorporated into the landfill, surface impoundment, or lateral expansion design to ensure that the integrity of the structural components of the landfill or surface impoundment will not be disrupted. The demonstration must be certified by an independent registered professional engineer, and the owner or operator must notify the state that the demonstration has been placed in the operating record and on the company's internet site.

Closure of Existing CCR Landfills and Surface Impoundments. The proposed rule would require owners and operators of existing CCR landfills and surface impoundments that cannot make the demonstrations required under § 257.62(a) after the effective date of the rule, to close the landfill or surface impoundment within five years of the date of publication of the final rule. Closure and post-closure care must be done in accordance with § 257.100 and § 257.101. The proposed rule would also allow for a case-by-case extension for up to two more years if the facility can demonstrate that there is no alternative disposal capacity and there is no immediate threat to health or the environment. This demonstration must be certified by an independent registered professional engineer or hydrologist. The owner or operator must place the demonstration in the operating record and on the company's internet site and notify the state that this action was taken.

Thus, the proposed rule allows a maximum of 7 years from the effective date of the final rule if this alternative is finally promulgated for existing CCR landfills to comply with the unstable area restrictions, and existing CCR surface impoundments to comply with the location restrictions or to close. As discussed under the subtitle C option, EPA believes that five years will, in most cases, be adequate time to complete proper and effective facility closure and to arrange for alternative waste management. However, there may be cases where alternative waste management capacity may not be readily available or where the siting and construction of a new facility may take longer than five years. EPA believes the two-year extension should provide sufficient time to address these potential problems. EPA continues to believe that impacts on human health and the environment need to be carefully considered, and therefore, today's proposed rule requires the owner or operator to demonstrate that there is no

available alternative disposal capacity and there is no potential threat to human health and the environment before adopting the two-year extension. These time frames are consistent with those EPA is proposing under its subtitle C co-proposal for surface impoundments. EPA is aware of no reason that the time frames would need to differ under subtitle D, but solicits comment on this issue.

5. Design Requirements

The CCR damage cases and EPA's quantitative groundwater risk assessment clearly show the need for effective liners—namely composite liners—to very significantly reduce the probability of adverse effects. The co-proposed subtitle D design standards would require that new landfills and all surface impoundments that have not completed closure prior to the effective date of the rule, can only continue to operate if composite liners and leachate collection and removal systems have been installed. Units must be retrofitted or closed within five years of the effective date of the final rule, which is the time frame EPA is proposing for surface impoundments to retrofit or close under the subtitle C alternative. EPA is proposing to require the same liner and leachate collection and removal systems as part of the subtitle D criteria that are being proposed under the RCRA subtitle C co-proposal. The technical justification for these requirements is equally applicable to the wastes and the units, irrespective of the statutory authority under which the requirement is proposed.

EPA is also proposing to adopt the same approach to new and existing units under RCRA subtitle D that it is proposing under RCRA subtitle C. EPA would only require new landfills (or new portions of existing landfills) to meet these minimum technology requirements for liners and leachate collection and removal systems. Existing landfills that continue to receive CCRs after the effective date of the final rule, would not be required to be retrofitted with a new minimum-technology liner/leachate collection and removal system (or to close). They can continue to receive CCRs, and continue to operate as compliant landfills, without violating the open dumping prohibition. However, existing landfills would have to meet groundwater monitoring, corrective action, and other requirements (except as noted) of the subtitle D criteria, to assure that any groundwater releases from the unit were identified and promptly remediated. EPA sees no reason or special argument to adopt any different approach under

the co-proposed subtitle D regulations for CCR landfills, particularly given the volume of the material and the disruption that would be involved if these design requirements were applied to existing landfills.

By contrast, existing surface impoundments that have not completed closure by the effective date of the final rule would be required to retrofit to install a liner. This is consistent with, but not identical to, the approach proposed under the RCRA subtitle C alternative. Under the subtitle C alternative, EPA is not proposing to require existing surface impoundments to install the proposed liner systems because the impoundments would only continue to operate for a limited period of time. EPA's proposed treatment standards—dewatering the wastes—will effectively phase out wet handling of CCRs. During this interim period (seven years as proposed), EPA believes that it would be infeasible to require surface impoundments to retrofit, and that compliance with the groundwater monitoring and other subtitle C requirements would be sufficiently protective. EPA lacks the authority under RCRA subtitle D to establish a comparable requirement; EPA only has the authority under RCRA section 4004 to establish standards relating to “disposal,” not treatment, of solid wastes. Although EPA expects that many surface impoundments will choose to close rather than install a liner, wet-handling of CCRs can continue, even in existing units, and EPA's risk assessment confirms that the long-term operation of such units would not be protective without the installation of the composite liner and leachate collection system described below.

The composite liner would consist of two components: An upper component consisting of a minimum 30-mil flexible membrane liner (FML), and a lower component consisting of at least a two-foot layer of compacted soil with a hydraulic conductivity of no more than 1×10^{-7} cm/sec. The FML component would be required to be installed in direct and uniform contact with the compacted soil component. (In other words, the new landfill or new surface impoundment would be required to have a liner and leachate collection and removal system meeting the same design standard now included in EPA's municipal solid waste landfill criteria.) EPA solicits comment, however, on whether any subtitle D option should allow facilities to use an alternative design for new disposal units, so long as the owner or operator of a unit could obtain certification from an independent

registered professional engineer or hydrologist that the alternative design would ensure that the appropriate concentration values for a set of constituents typical of CCRs will not be exceeded in the uppermost aquifer at the relevant point of compliance—i.e., 150 meters from the unit boundary down gradient from the unit, or the property boundary if the point of compliance (i.e., the monitoring well) is beyond the property boundary. Although the existing part 258 requirements allow for such a demonstration, EPA is not proposing such a requirement in today's rule. EPA's risk assessment shows that only a composite liner would ensure that disposal of CCR will meet the RCRA section 4004 standard on a national level, even though site specific conditions could support the use of alternate liner designs in individual instances. In the absence of a strong state oversight mechanism, such as a permit, EPA is reluctant to allow facilities to modify this key protection. Nevertheless, EPA would be interested in receiving data and information that demonstrates whether under other site conditions, an alternative liner would be equally protective. In this regard, EPA would also be interested in information documenting the extent to which such conditions currently exist at CCR units. If EPA adopts such a performance standard, EPA anticipates adopting a requirement that is as consistent as possible with the existing part 258 requirements, and would require the same documentation and notification procedures as with the other self-implementing provisions in the co-proposed subtitle D option.

—*Stability requirements for surface impoundments.* In our recent assessment of surface impoundments managing CCRs, EPA has identified deficiencies in units currently receiving wet-handled CCRs.¹⁵² The damage cases also demonstrate the need for requirements to address the stability of surface impoundments, to prevent the damages associated with a catastrophic failure, such as occurred at the TVA facility in 2008. EPA is therefore proposing to adopt as part of the subtitle D operating criteria for surface impoundments, the same stability requirements that are proposed as part of the subtitle C alternative. As explained in that section, these are based on the long-standing MSHA requirements, with only minor

modifications necessary to tailor the requirements to CCR unit conditions.

For those surface impoundments which continue to operate, (i.e., both new and existing) the proposed regulation would require that an independent registered professional engineer certify that the design of the impoundment is in accordance with recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices for the maximum volume of CCR slurry and wastewater that will be impounded therein, and that together design and management features ensure dam stability. The proposed regulation also requires the facility to conduct weekly inspections to ensure that any potentially hazardous condition or structural weakness will be quickly identified. As with the co-proposed RCRA subtitle C option, the proposed RCRA subtitle D regulation also requires that existing and new CCR surface impoundments be inspected annually by an independent registered professional engineer to assure that the design, operation, and maintenance of the surface impoundment is in accordance with current, prudent engineering practices for the maximum volume of CCR slurry and CCR waste water which can be impounded. EPA has concluded, subject to consideration of public comment, that these requirements are necessary to ensure that major releases do not occur that would cause adverse effects on health or the environment.

6. Operating Requirements

EPA is proposing to establish specific criteria to address the day-to-day operations of the CCR landfill or surface impoundment. The criteria were developed to prevent the health and environmental impacts from CCR landfills and surface impoundments identified in EPA's quantitative risk groundwater risk assessment and the damage cases. Included among these criteria are controls relating to runoff and runoff from the surface of the facilities, discharges to surface waters, and pollution caused by windblown dust from landfills, and recordkeeping.

—*Existing criteria for Endangered Species and Surface Water.* CCR landfills and surface impoundments are currently subject to the open dumping criteria contained in 40 CFR 257, Subpart A. These minimum criteria include restrictions on impacts to endangered species under 257.3–2, and impacts to surface water under 257.3–3. As facilities should already be complying with these requirements, EPA is not proposing to modify these existing requirements in today's co-proposal. EPA notes that the surface

water criterion is not enforceable by RCRA citizen suit. The extent to which this criterion may be enforced is governed by the remedies available under the CWA, which is the source of the requirement, rather than RCRA. See, e.g., *Arc Ecology v. U.S. Maritime Admin.*, No. 02:07–cv–2320 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2010); Guidelines for the Development and Implementation of State Solid Waste Management Plans and Criteria for Classification of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities and Practices, 46 Fed. Reg. 47048, 47050 (Sept. 23, 1981).

—*Run-on and run-off controls.* The purpose of the run-on standard is to minimize the amount of surface water entering the landfill and surface impoundment facility. Run-on controls prevent (1) Erosion, which may damage the physical structure of the landfill; (2) the surface discharge of wastes in solution or suspension; and (3) the downward percolation of run-on through wastes, creating leachate. The proposed regulation requires run-on control systems to prevent flow onto the active portion of the CCR landfill or surface impoundment during the peak discharge from a 24-hour, 25-year storm. This helps to ensure that run-off does not cause an overflow of the surface impoundment or scouring of material from a landfill or the materials used to build the surface impoundment.

Run-off is one of the major sources of hazardous constituent releases from mismanaged waste disposal facilities, including CCR landfills and surface impoundments. Additionally, run-off control systems from the active portion of CCR disposal units are required to collect and control at least the water volume resulting from a 24-hour, 25-year storm. This protects surface water that would otherwise flow untreated into a body of water. The facility is required to prepare a report, available to the public, documenting how relevant calculations were made, and how the control systems meet the standard. A registered professional engineer must certify that the design of the control systems meet the standard. Also, the owner or operator is required to prepare a report, certified by an independent registered professional engineer, and documenting how relevant calculations were made, and how the control systems meet the standard. The state must be notified that the report was placed in the operating record for the site, and the owner or operator must make it available to the public on the owner's or operator's internet site. Under the existing part 257 requirements, to which CCR units are currently subject, runoff must not cause

¹⁵² For the findings of the assessment, see: <http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/nonhaz/industrial/special/fossil/surveys/index.htm#surveyresults>.

a discharge of pollutants into waters of the United States that is in violation of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) under section 402 of the Clean Water Act. (40 CFR 257.3–3). EPA is not proposing to revise the existing requirement, but is merely incorporating it here for ease of the regulated community.

The Agency chose the 24-hour period because it is an average that includes storms of high intensity with short duration and storms of low intensity with long duration. EPA believes that this is a widely used standard, and is also the current standard used for hazardous waste landfills and municipal solid waste landfill units under 40 CFR Part 258. EPA has no information that warrants a more restrictive standard for CCR landfills and surface impoundments than for MSWLFs and hazardous waste landfills.

Fugitive dust requirements. EPA has included under the co-proposed RCRA subtitle D regulation requirements similar to those included under the Subtitle C co-proposal, based upon its risk assessment findings that fugitive dust control at 35 µg/m³ or less is protective of human health or the environment. This is discussed in section VI above. Due to the lack of a permitting oversight mechanism under the RCRA Subtitle D alternative, and to facilitate citizen-suit enforcement of the criteria, EPA has provided for certification by an independent registered professional engineer, notification to the state that the documentation has been placed in the operating record, and provisions making available to the public on the owner's or operator's internet site documentation of the measures taken to comply with the fugitive dust requirements.

Recordkeeping requirements. EPA believes that it is appropriate for interested states and citizens to be able to access all of the information required by the proposed rule in one place. Therefore, the co-proposed Subtitle D alternative requires the owner or operator of a CCR landfill or surface impoundment to record and retain near the facility in an operating record which contains all records, reports, studies or other documentation required to demonstrate compliance with §§ 257.60 through 257.83 (relating to the location restrictions, design criteria, and operating criteria) and 257.90 through 257.101 (relating to ground water monitoring and corrective action, and closure and post-closure care).

The proposed rule would also require owners and operators of CCR surface impoundments that have not been closed in accordance with the closure

criteria to place in the operating record a report containing several items of information. The reports would be required beginning every twelfth months after existing CCR surface impoundments would be required to comply with the design requirements in section 257.71 (that is, no later than seven years after the effective date of the final rule) and every twelfth month following the date of the initial plan for the design, construction, and maintenance of new surface impoundments and lateral expansions required under § 257.72(b)) to address:

(1) Changes in the geometry of the impounding structure for the reporting period;

(2) Location and type of installed instruments and the maximum and minimum recorded readings of each instrument for the reporting period;

(3) The minimum, maximum, and present depth and elevation of the impounded water, sediment, or slurry for the reporting period;

(4) Storage capacity of the impounding structure;

(5) The volume of the impounded water, sediment, or slurry at the end of the reporting period;

(6) Any other change which may have affected the stability or operation of the impounding structure that has occurred during the reporting period; and

(7) A certification by an independent registered professional engineer that all construction, operation, and maintenance were in accordance with the plan. The owner or operator would be required to notify the state that the report has been placed in the operating record and on the owner's or operator's internet site.

These reporting requirements are similar to those required under MSHA regulations for coal slurry impoundments (30 CFR 77.216–4). As the Agency has stated previously, MSHA has nearly 40 years of experience writing regulations and inspecting dams associated with coal mining, which is directly relevant to the issues presented by CCRs in this proposal. In our review of the MSHA regulations, we found them to be comprehensive and directly applicable to and appropriate for the dams used in surface impoundments at coal-fired utilities to manage CCRs.

The proposed rule would also allow the owner or operator to submit a certification by an independent registered professional engineer that there have been no changes to the information in items (1)–(6) above to the surface impoundment instead of a full report, although a full report would be required at least every 5 years.

7. Groundwater Monitoring/Corrective Action

EPA's damage cases and risk assessments all indicate the potential for CCR landfills and surface impoundments to leach hazardous constituents into groundwater, impairing drinking water supplies and causing adverse impacts on human health and the environment. Indeed, groundwater contamination is one of the key environmental risks EPA has identified with CCR landfills and surface impoundments. Furthermore, as mentioned previously, the legislative history of RCRA section 4004 specifically evidences concerns over groundwater contamination from open dumps. To this end, groundwater monitoring is a key mechanism for facilities to verify that the existing containment structures, such as liners and leachate collection and removal systems, are functioning as intended. Thus, EPA believes that, in order for a CCR landfill or surface impoundment to show no reasonable probability of adverse effects on health or the environment, a system of routine groundwater monitoring to detect any such contamination from a disposal unit, and corrective action requirements to address identified contamination, is necessary.

Today's co-proposed subtitle D criteria require a system of monitoring wells be installed at new and existing CCR landfills and surface impoundments. The co-proposed criteria also provide procedures for sampling these wells and methods for statistical analysis of the analytical data derived from the well samples to detect the presence of hazardous constituents released from these facilities. The Agency is proposing a groundwater monitoring program consisting of detection monitoring, assessment monitoring, and a corrective action program. This phased approach to groundwater monitoring and corrective action programs provide for a graduated response over time to the problem of groundwater contamination as the evidence of such contamination increases. This allows for proper consideration of the transport characteristics of CCR constituents in ground water, while protecting human health and the environment, and minimizing unnecessary costs.

In EPA's view, the objectives of a groundwater monitoring and corrective action regime and analytical techniques for evaluating the quality of groundwater are similar regardless of the particular wastes in a disposal unit, and regardless of whether the unit is a

landfill or surface impoundment. Therefore, EPA has largely modeled the proposed groundwater monitoring and corrective action requirements for CCR landfills and surface impoundments after those for MSWLFs in the 40 CFR part 258 criteria, and for disposal units that may receive conditionally-exempt small quantity generator (CESQG) hazardous waste under 40 CFR part 257, subpart B. EPA believes that the underlying rationale for those requirements is generally applicable to groundwater monitoring and corrective action for CCR landfills and surface impoundments. Accordingly, EPA does not discuss these requirements at length in today's preamble. Rather, EPA refers the reader to the detailed discussions of these requirements in the preambles to the final and proposed rules for the MSWLF criteria for more information.¹⁵³ See Solid Waste Disposal Facility Criteria, 56 Fed. Reg. 50978 (Oct. 9, 1991) (final rule); Solid Waste Disposal Facility Criteria, 53 Fed. Reg. 33314 (Aug. 30, 1988) (proposed rule).

However, for a number of the requirements, EPA is proposing to modify or revise these requirements. Below, EPA discusses the particular areas where the Agency is proposing to make modifications, and solicits comment on those specific differences. EPA, more generally, solicits comment on whether relying on the existing groundwater monitoring and corrective action requirements for MSWLFs and CESQG facilities, as modified in today's proposal, are appropriate for CCR landfills and surface impoundments.

Relying on the existing criteria in 40 CFR 258 and 257 Subpart B has several advantages. Specifically, like the co-proposed Subtitle D regulations for CCR disposal, these requirements are structured to be largely self-implementing. In addition, states and citizens should already be familiar with those processes, which have been in place since 1991, and EPA expects that this familiarity with the processes may facilitate the states' creation of regulatory programs for CCR disposal facilities under state law, to the extent they do not already exist, and thus providing oversight (which EPA believes is important in implementing

these rules) that is already found through MSWLFs and CESQG landfill permitting programs. Furthermore, familiarity with the overall approach may facilitate the states' and citizens' oversight of CCR disposal activities through the citizen suit mechanism, which is available, regardless of whether a state has adopted a regulatory program under state law for CCR disposal facilities.

At the same time, however, EPA is mindful of the differences in the statutory authorities for establishing criteria for CCR landfills and surface impoundments versus MSWLFs and CESQG facilities, and in particular, the possibility that a state may lack a permit program for CCR disposal units. Accordingly, EPA has sought to tailor these proposed requirements in the CCR disposal context, in particular by including in several of the proposed requirements a certification by an independent registered professional engineer or, in some cases, hydrologist, in lieu of the state approval mechanisms that are used in the 40 CFR part 258/257, Subpart B criteria. Such certifications are found in proposed §§ 257.95(h) (establishment of an alternative groundwater protection standard for constituents for which MCLs have not been established); and 257.97(e) (determination that remediation of a release of an Appendix IV constituent from a CCR landfill or surface impoundment is not necessary). As discussed earlier in this preamble, EPA believes that this provides an important independent validation of the particular route chosen. EPA solicits comment in particular on the appropriateness of relying on such a mechanism under the proposed groundwater monitoring and corrective action criteria.

In other instances, however, EPA has decided not to propose to allow facilities to operate under an alternative standard, such as the existing provisions under 257.21(g) and 258.50(h) (establishing alternative schedules for groundwater monitoring and corrective action); and 258.54(a)(1) and (2), and 257.24(a)(1) and (2), which allow the Director of an approved State to delete monitoring parameters, and establish an alternative list of indicator parameters, under specified circumstances. EPA is proposing not to adopt these alternatives for CCR disposal facilities because groundwater monitoring is the single most critical set of protective measures on which EPA is relying to protect human health and the environment. EPA is not proposing to require existing landfills to retrofit to install a composite liner. Since these

units will continue to operate in the absence of a composite liner, groundwater monitoring is the primary means to prevent groundwater contamination. Although EPA is proposing to require existing surface impoundments to retrofit with composite liners, these units are more susceptible to leaking, and thus the need for a rigorous groundwater monitoring program is correspondingly high. Moreover, EPA is concerned that provisions allowing such modification of these requirements are particularly susceptible to abuse, since such provisions would allow substantial cost avoidance. Therefore, in the absence of a state oversight mechanism in place to ensure such modifications are technically appropriate, such a provision may operate at the expense of protectiveness. In addition, given the extremely technical nature of these requirements, EPA is concerned that such provisions would render the requirements appreciably more difficult for citizens to effectively enforce. In some instances, including these alternative standards would not be workable. For example, establishing alternative schedules under the groundwater monitoring and corrective action provisions (as currently provided under 257.21(g) and 258.50(h)) the Agency believes would not be workable in the context of a self-implementing rule, because there is no regulatory entity to judge the reasonableness of the desired alternatives. The Agency thus solicits comments on these omissions from today's proposed rule, and also on whether a more prescriptive approach could or should be developed under subtitle D of RCRA. EPA also solicits comment on whether the requirement for certification by an independent professional engineer would be effective or appropriate in such a case.

Applicability. The co-proposed subtitle D criteria require facilities to install a groundwater monitoring system at existing landfills and surface impoundments within one year of the effective date of the regulation so that any releases from these units will be detected, thus providing an opportunity to detect and, if necessary, take corrective action to address any releases from the facilities. The proposed rule also provides that new CCR landfills and surface impoundments comply with the groundwater monitoring requirements in the rule before CCRs can be placed in the units. EPA expects that the one-year timeframe for existing units is a reasonable time for facilities to install the necessary systems. This is the same time frame provided to

¹⁵³ The preambles to the CESQG rules have more limited discussions of these requirements. See Criteria for Classification of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities and Practices; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Requirements for Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Programs, 61 FR 34252, 34259–61 (July 1, 1996) (final rule); Criteria for Classification of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities and Practices; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Requirements for Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Programs, 60 FR 30964, 30975–77 (June 12, 1995) (proposed rule).

facilities under the existing part 265 interim status regulations, and past experience demonstrates this implementation schedule would generally be feasible. Although one year for the installation of groundwater monitoring is a shorter time frame than EPA provided to facilities as part of the original part 258 or part 257 subpart A requirements, there are good reasons to establish a shorter time frame here. As discussed in section IV, many of the existing units into which much of the CCR is currently disposed are unlined, and they are aging. Under these circumstances, EPA believes that installation of groundwater monitoring is critical to ensure that releases from these units are detected and addressed appropriately. Moreover, EPA offered a longer implementation period in 1991 based on a factual finding that a shortage of drilling contractors existed; in the 1995 rule establishing groundwater monitoring requirements for CESQG facilities, EPA determined that this shortage had ended. EPA is aware of no information to suggest that a similar shortage exists today, but specifically solicits comment on this issue.

EPA has not included provisions for suspension of ground water monitoring that is currently allowed under 257.21(b) and 258.50(b). This is one of those provisions discussed above, that EPA believes are potentially, particularly susceptible to abuse, and EPA is reluctant to adopt a comparable provision in the absence of an approved state permit program. In addition, since these proposed criteria are designed to be applied even in the absence of state action, EPA has not included provisions for state establishment of a compliance schedule under 257.21(d) and 258.50(d). EPA solicits comment on whether these types of provisions are appropriate for CCR landfills and surface impoundments.

Section 257.90 also requires that the owner or operator of the CCR landfill or surface impoundment must notify the state once each year throughout the active life and post-closure care period that such landfill or surface impoundment is in compliance with the groundwater monitoring and corrective action provisions of this subpart. This notification must also be placed on the owner or operator's internet site. EPA believes that annual notification will facilitate state oversight of the groundwater monitoring and corrective action provisions.

Groundwater monitoring systems. The co-proposed subtitle D criteria require facilities to install, at a minimum, one up gradient and three down gradient

wells at all CCR units. EPA is proposing this requirement based on the subtitle C interim status self-implementing requirements.

The design of an appropriate groundwater monitoring system is particularly dependent on site conditions relating to groundwater flow, and the development of a system must have a sufficient number of wells, installed at appropriate locations and depths, to yield groundwater samples from the uppermost aquifer that represents the quality of background groundwater that has not been affected by contaminants from CCR landfills or surface impoundments. EPA's existing requirements under parts 257, Subpart B, 258, and 264 all recognize this, and because they operate in a permitting context, these requirements do not generally establish inflexible minimum requirements. Because the same guarantee of permit oversight is not available under the criteria developed for this proposal, EPA believes that establishing a minimum requirement is necessary. Past experience demonstrates that these monitoring requirements will be protective of a wide variety of conditions and wastes, and that facilities can feasibly implement these requirements. Moreover, in many instances a more detailed groundwater monitoring system may need to be in place, and EPA is therefore requiring a certification by the independent registered professional engineer or hydrologist that the groundwater monitoring system is designed to detect all significant groundwater contamination.

Groundwater sampling and analysis requirements. Owners and operators need to ensure that consistent sampling and analysis procedures are in place to determine whether a statistically significant increase in the level of a hazardous constituent has occurred, indicating the possibility of groundwater contamination. The co-proposed subtitle D criteria would require the same provisions addressing groundwater sampling and analysis procedures with those already in use for CESQG and MSWLF facilities, since generally the same constituents and analysis procedures would be appropriate in both instances. However, EPA is requesting comment on one issue in particular. In the final MSWLF criteria, EPA noted that in order to ensure protection of human health and the environment at MSWLFs, it was important to make sure that the right test methodology from among those listed in this section was selected for the conditions present at a particular MSWLF. At the time, EPA indicated its

expectation that as states gained program approval, they would take on the responsibility of approving alternate statistical tests proposed by the facilities. See 56 Fed. Reg. 51071. Because states may choose not to create a regulatory oversight mechanism under the co-proposed subtitle D rule for CCR landfills and surface impoundments, however, EPA is requesting comment on whether the lack of such an oversight mechanism will impair selection of appropriate test methodologies, and whether EPA should instead adopt a different approach to ensure the protection of human health and the environment at CCR disposal facilities. For example, one approach might be for EPA to tailor a list of methodologies to particular site conditions. EPA would welcome suggestions from commenters on alternative approaches to this issue.

Detection monitoring program. The parameters to be used as indicators of groundwater contamination are the following: boron, chloride, conductivity, fluoride, pH, sulphate, sulfide, and total dissolved solids (TDS). In selecting the parameters for detection monitoring, EPA selected constituents that are present in CCRs, and would rapidly move through the subsurface and thus provide an early detection as to whether contaminants were migrating from the disposal unit. EPA specifically solicits comment on the appropriateness of this list of parameters.

In this provision of the proposed RCRA subtitle D co-proposed rule, EPA has decided not to include provisions parallel to 258.54(a)(1) and (2), and 257.24(a)(1) and (2) which allow the Director of an approved State to delete monitoring parameters, and establish an alternative list of indicator parameters, under specified circumstances. EPA is not including these provisions because it believes that a set of specified parameters are necessary to ensure adequate protectiveness, since EPA's information on CCRs indicates that their composition would not be expected to vary such that the parameters are inappropriate. Under the proposed rule, monitoring would be required no less frequently than semi-annually. EPA has again decided not to include a provision that would allow an alternative sampling frequency, because of the lack of guaranteed state oversight and potential for this provision to diminish protection of human health and the environment, as mentioned in the introductory discussions above. EPA solicits comments on whether it should allow deletion of monitoring parameters and alternative sampling frequencies, based on compliance with a performance standard that has been

documented by an independent registered professional engineer or hydrologist. Commenters interested in supporting such an option are encouraged to provide data to demonstrate the conditions under which such alternatives would be protective, as well as information to indicate the prevalence of such conditions at CCR facilities.

Assessment monitoring program. When a statistically significant increase over background levels is detected for any of the monitored constituents, the rule would require the facility to begin an assessment monitoring program to detect releases of CCR constituents of concern including aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, cadmium, chloride, chromium, copper, fluoride, iron, lead, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, pH, selenium, sulphate, sulfide, thallium, and total dissolved solids.

EPA specifically solicits comment on the appropriateness of this list of parameters. For the same reasons as discussed under the proposed requirements for detection monitoring, EPA has chosen not to include in the proposed requirements for assessment monitoring provisions for allowing a subset of wells to be sampled, the deletion of assessment monitoring parameters, or alternative sampling frequencies. EPA again solicits comment on whether these options are appropriate for CCR landfills and surface impoundments.

Assessment of corrective measures. The proposed rule also requires that whenever monitoring results indicate a statistically significant level of any appendix IV constituent exceeding the groundwater protection standard, the owner or operator must initiate an assessment of corrective action remedies. Unlike for the MSWLF and CESQG criteria, the proposed rule provides a discrete time frame for completion of the assessment, at 90 days, while the earlier criteria provided for its completion within a "reasonable period of time." EPA believes that without a state oversight mechanism, a finite time frame is appropriate. EPA selected 90 days as the period over which the assessment must be completed because it expects that this will be a sufficient length of time to complete the required activities. EPA solicits comment on the appropriateness of the 90-day timeframe.

Selection of Remedy. The proposed rule establishes a framework for remedy selection based upon the existing requirements for MSWLFs and CESQG facilities. These provisions have been modified to eliminate consideration of

"practicable capabilities" where such considerations have been included in the MSWLF and CESQG criteria. EPA believes that it does not have the discretion to include this consideration under the RCRA subtitle D co-proposal, because this consideration is explicitly required under the terms of RCRA section 4010. That section by its terms applies to facilities that may receive household hazardous wastes and CESQG wastes, and so is inapplicable to today's co-proposed standards for CCR landfills and surface impoundments. See 42 U.S.C. 6949a(c)(1). EPA solicits comment on these modifications, specifically, on how this modification may affect the ability of the regulated community to comply with the proposed criteria, and on how this modification may affect the protectiveness of the proposed standards for human health and the environment.

In the provisions discussing factors to be considered in determining whether interim measures are necessary, EPA has modified proposed 257.98(a)(3)(vi), to eliminate consideration of risks of fire or explosion, since EPA does not expect that these risks would be relevant to the disposal of CCRs in CCR landfills and surface impoundments.

Implementation of the corrective action remedy. The co-proposed subtitle D criteria require that the owner or operator comply with several requirements to implement the corrective action program, again modeled after the existing requirements for MSWLFs and CESQG facilities. Similar to proposed section 257.97, these provisions have been made consistent with the underlying statutory authorities for this proposed rule. See discussions above.

In these provisions, EPA has decided not to include a provision that is included in the MSWLF criteria in 258.58(e)(2) and 257.28(e)(2), allowing an alternative length of time during which the owner or operator must demonstrate that concentrations of constituents have not exceeded the ground water protection standards, in support of a determination that the remedy is complete. See proposed 257.98(e)(2). Instead, the proposed rule would require a set period of three consecutive years. EPA solicits comment on whether to allow for a different period of time. EPA is particularly concerned with whether such a provision would provide protection to human health or the environment because of the lack of a guaranteed state oversight mechanism.

8. Closure and Post-Closure Care

Effective closure and post-closure care requirements, such as requirements to drain the surface impoundment, are essential to ensuring the long-term safety of disposal units. Closure requirements, such as placing the cover system on the disposal unit, ensure that rainfall is diverted from the landfill or surface impoundment, minimizing any leaching that might occur based on the hydraulic head placed on the material in the unit. EPA's Guide for Industrial Waste Management, prepared in consultation with industry experts, a Tribal representative, state officials, and environmental groups, documents the general consensus on the need for effective closure and post-closure requirements.¹⁵⁴ Post-closure care requirements are also particularly important for CCR units because the time to peak concentrations for selenium and arsenic, two of the more problematic constituents contained in CCR wastes, is particularly long, and therefore the peak concentrations in groundwater may not occur during the active life of the unit. Continued groundwater monitoring is therefore necessary during the post-closure care period to ensure the continued integrity of the unit and the safety of human health and the receiving environment. For these provisions, then, EPA has again modeled its proposed requirements for CCR landfills on those already in place for MSWLFs with modifications to reflect the lack of a mandatory permitting mechanism, and other changes that it believes are appropriate to ensure that there is no reasonable probability of adverse effects from the wastes that remain after a unit has closed. For surface impoundments, EPA has modeled its proposed requirements on the part 265 interim status closure requirements for surface impoundments, as well as the MSHA requirements. EPA solicits comment on whether these proposed requirements are appropriate for CCR landfills and surface impoundments.

Requirements specific to closure of CCR landfills and surface impoundments include proposed 257.100(a)–(c). These provisions provide that prior to closure of any CCR unit, the owner or operator must develop a plan describing the closure of the unit, and a schedule for implementation. The plan must describe the steps necessary to close the CCR landfill or surface impoundment at any point during the active life in

¹⁵⁴ Guide for Industrial Waste Management, available at <http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/nonhaz/industrial/guide/index.htm>.

accordance with the requirements in paragraphs (c) and (d) or (e) of this section, as applicable, and based on recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices. EPA is proposing to define recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices in the same manner as it is proposing under the subtitle C alternative. The definition references but does not attempt to codify any particular set of engineering practices, but to allow the professional engineer latitude in adopting improved practices that reflect the state-of-the art practices, as they develop over time. The plan must be certified by an independent registered professional engineer. In addition, the owner or operator must notify the state that a plan has been placed in the operating record and on the owner's or operator's publically accessible Internet site.

These provisions are modeled after the closure plan requirements in 258.60(c). Of note here is that, while EPA rejected a certification requirement for MSWLF closure plans, EPA is proposing to require one here to increase the ability of citizens to effectively enforce the rules. In the MSWLF rule, EPA rejected a certification requirement because "it will be relatively easy to verify that the plan meets the requirements," due to the specific design criteria specified in the rule. However, this was in the context of a state program, where EPA could assure that states would play an active role in overseeing and enforcing the facility's implementation of the requirements.

EPA is also proposing that the closure plan provide, at a minimum, the information necessary to allow citizens and states to determine whether the facility's closure plan is reasonable. This includes an estimate of the largest area of the CCR unit ever requiring a final cover during the active life of the unit, and an estimate of the maximum inventory of CCRs ever on-site during the active life of the unit.

Proposed 257.100(b) of the rule allows closure of a CCR landfill or surface impoundment with CCRs in place or through CCR removal and decontamination of all areas affected by releases from the landfill or surface impoundment. Proposed paragraph (c) provides that CCR removal and decontamination are complete when constituent concentrations throughout the CCR landfill or surface impoundment and any areas affected by releases from the CCR landfill or surface impoundment do not exceed the numeric cleanup levels for those CCR constituents, to the extent that the state

has established such clean up levels in which the CCR landfill or surface impoundment is located. These "clean-closure" provisions are modeled after EPA's "Guide for Industrial Waste Management," found at <http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/nonhaz/industrial/guide/chap11s.htm>. As previously noted, the Guide represents a consensus view of best practices for industrial waste management, based on involvement from EPA, and state and tribal representatives, as well as a focus group of industry and public interest stakeholders chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. EPA has included this provision to allow some flexibility in the self-implementing scheme for facilities in their closure options, while providing protection for health and the environment under either option. Although EPA anticipates that facilities will mostly likely not clean close their units, given the expense and difficulty of such an operation, EPA believes that they are generally preferable from the standpoint of land re-use and redevelopment, and so wishes explicitly to allow for such action in the proposed subtitle D rule. EPA is also considering whether to adopt a further incentive for clean closure, under which the owner or operator of the CCR landfill or surface impoundment could remove the deed notation required under proposed 257.100(m), if all CCRs are removed from the facility, and notification is provided to the state. In the absence of state cleanup levels, metals should be removed to either statistically equivalent background levels, or to maximum contaminant levels (MCLs), or health-based numbers. One tool that can be used to help evaluate whether waste removal is appropriate at the site is the risk-based corrective action process (RBCA) using recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices such as the ASTM Ec0-RBCA process. EPA solicits comment on the appropriateness of this provision under a RCRA subtitle D rule, and information on the number of facilities that may take advantage of a clean-closure option.

For closure of surface impoundments with CCRs in place, EPA has developed substantive requirements modeled on a combination of the existing 40 CFR part 265 interim status requirements for surface impoundments, and the long-standing MSHA standards. At closure, the owner or operator of a surface impoundment would be required to either drain the unit, or solidify the remaining wastes. EPA is also proposing to require that the wastes be stabilized to a bearing capacity sufficient to

support the final cover. The proposed criteria further require that, in addition to the technical cover design requirements applicable to landfills, any final cover on a surface impoundment would have to meet requirements designed to address the nature of the large volumes of remaining wastes. Specifically, EPA is proposing that the cover be designed to minimize, over the long-term, the migration of liquids through the closed impoundment; promote drainage; and accommodate settling and subsidence so that the cover's integrity is maintained. Finally, closure of the unit is also subject to the general performance standard that the probability of future impoundment of water, sediment, or slurry is precluded. This general performance standard is based on the MSHA regulations, and is designed to ensure the long-term safety of the surface impoundment.

The proposed RCRA subtitle D regulation requires that CCR landfills and surface impoundments have a final cover system designed and constructed to have a permeability less than or equal to the permeability of any bottom liner system or natural subsoils present, or a permeability no greater than 1×10^{-5} cm/sec, whichever is less; it also requires an infiltration layer that contains a minimum of 18 inches of earthen material. The regulation also requires an erosion layer that contains a minimum of 6 inches of earthen material that is capable of sustaining native plant growth as a way to minimize erosion of the final cover. These requirements are generally modeled after the performance standard and technical requirements contained in the existing RCRA subtitle D rules for MSWLFs, in 258.60. EPA is also proposing, however a fourth requirement not found in those criteria modeled after the interim status closure requirements of 265.228(a)(iii)(D) that accounts for the conditions found in surface impoundments. Specifically, EPA is proposing that the final cover be designed to minimize the disruption of the final cover through a design that accommodates settling and subsidence. EPA believes that these requirements strike a reasonable balance between the costs of a protective final cover, and avoiding risks to health and the environment from the remaining wastes at the CCR landfill or surface impoundment. The regulation requires certification by an independent registered professional engineer that these standards were met. The design of the final cover system, including the certification, must be placed in the operating record and on the owner's or

operator's Internet site. Based on the MSHA standards, EPA is also proposing that unit closure must provide for major slope stability to prevent the sloughing of the landfill over the long term.

Alternatively, the rule allows the owner or operator of the CCR landfill or surface impoundment to select an alternative final cover design, provided the alternative cover design is certified by an independent registered professional engineer and notification is provided to the state that the alternative cover design has been placed in the operating record and on the owner's or operator's Internet site. The alternative final cover design must include a infiltration layer that achieves an equivalent reduction in infiltration, and an erosion layer that provides equivalent protection from wind and water erosion, as the infiltration and erosion layers specified in the technical standards in paragraph (d). Under this alternative, EPA expects that evapotranspiration covers may be an effective alternative, which are not appropriately evaluated based on permeability alone. For example, an independent registered professional engineer might certify an alternative cover design that prevents the same level of infiltration as the system described above (*i.e.*, no greater than 1×10^{-5} cm/sec, etc), based on: (1) hydrologic modeling and lysimetry or instrumentation using a field scale test section, or (2) Hydrologic modeling and comparison of the soil and climatic conditions at the site with the soil and climatic conditions at an analogous site with substantially similar cover design. In this case, the owner or operator of the disposal unit must obtain certification from an independent registered professional engineer that the alternative cover would minimize infiltration at least as effectively as the "design" cover described above. As with the other final covers, the design of the evapo-transpiration cover must be placed on the owner's or operator's Internet site.

EPA has included this alternative cover requirement to increase the flexibility for the facility to account for site-specific conditions. However, EPA is specifically soliciting comment on whether this degree of flexibility is appropriate, given the lack of guaranteed state oversight. In the final MSWLF rule, EPA adopted a comparable provision, but concluded that this alternative would not be available in States without approved programs. *See*, 56 FR 51096. Given that EPA can neither approve state programs, nor rely on the existence of a state permit process, EPA questions whether this kind of requirement is appropriate.

Commenters who believe this requirement would be appropriate are encouraged to include examples documenting the need for flexibility in developing cover requirements, as well as data and information to demonstrate that alternative cover designs would be protective. EPA would also welcome suggestions for other methods to allow owners and operators of CCR landfills and surface impoundment facilities to account for site-specific conditions that provide a lower degree of individual facility discretion, such as a list of approved cover designs.

The proposed rule includes the same 30- and 180-day deadlines for beginning and completing closure, respectively, that are contained in existing section 258.60(f) and (g) for MSWLFs. However, EPA has decided not to propose to include a provision under which the owner and operator could extend those deadlines under the MSWLF criteria. EPA believes that extending the closure deadlines in this context is inappropriate because, in the absence of an approved State program, the owner or operator could unilaterally decide to extend the time for closure of the unit, without any basis, or oversight by a regulatory authority.

The proposed closure requirements also include a provision addressing required deed notations. In this regard, EPA is considering whether to include a provision for removing the deed notation once all CCRs are removed from the facility, and notification is provided to the state of this action. In the MSWLF rule, we adopted such a provision, but determined that state oversight of such a provision was essential, given the potential for abuse. As we noted in the final MSWLF rule, "EPA strongly believes that a decision to remove the deed notation must be considered carefully and that in practice very few owners or operators will be able to take advantage of the provision." EPA solicits comment on the propriety of such a provision, and encourages commenters who are interested in supporting such an option, to suggest alternatives to state oversight to provide for facility accountability.

Following closure of the CCR management unit, the co-proposed subtitle D approach requires post-closure care modeled after the requirements in 258.60. The owner or operator of the disposal unit must conduct post-closure care for 30 years. EPA is proposing to allow facilities to conduct post-closure care for a decreased length of time if the owner or operator demonstrates that (1) the reduced period is sufficient to protect human health and the environment, as

certified by an independent registered professional engineer; (2) notice is provided to the state that the demonstration has been placed in the operating record and on the owner's or operator's Internet site; and (3) the owner or operator notifies the state of the company's findings. The proposed rule also allows an increase in this period, again, with notification to the state, if the owner or operator of the CCR landfill or surface impoundment determines that it is necessary to protect human health and the environment. The 30-year period is consistent with the period required under the criteria for MSWLFs, as well as under the subtitle C interim status requirements. EPA has no information to indicate that a different period would be appropriate for post-closure care for CCR disposal units. EPA recognizes that state oversight can be critical to ensure that post-closure care is conducted for the length of time necessary to protect human health and the environment; however, EPA also recognizes that there is no set length of time for post-closure care that will be appropriate for all possible sites, and all possible conditions. EPA therefore solicits comment on alternative methods to account for different conditions, yet still provide methods of oversight to assure facility accountability.

During post-closure care, the owner or operator of the disposal unit is required to maintain the integrity and effectiveness of any final cover, maintain and operate the leachate collection and removal system in accordance with the leachate collection and removal system requirements described above, maintain the groundwater monitoring system and monitor the groundwater in accordance with the groundwater monitoring requirements described above, and place the maintenance plan in the operating record and on the company's Internet site.

EPA is also considering whether to adopt a number of provisions to increase the flexibility available under these requirements. For example, EPA is considering a self-certified stoppage of leachate management, such as provided for in 258.61(a)(2), and is soliciting public comment on the need for such a provision, as well as its propriety, in light of the absence of guaranteed state oversight. EPA is also considering whether to adopt a provision to allow any other disturbance, provided that the owner or operator of the CCR landfill or surface impoundment demonstrates that disturbance of the final cover, liner or other component of the containment system, including any removal of CCRs,

will not increase the potential threat to human health or the environment. The demonstration would need to be certified by an independent registered professional engineer, and notification provided to the state that the demonstration had been placed in the operating record and on the owner's or operator's Internet site. In the MSWLF rule, EPA limited this option to approved states, on the ground that, "under very limited circumstances it may be possible or desirable to allow certain post-closure uses of land, including some recreational uses, without posing a significant threat to human health and the environment, but such situations are likely to be very limited and need to be considered very carefully." Commenters interested in supporting such an option should address why such a provision would nevertheless be appropriate in this context. In this regard, EPA would also be interested in suggestions for other mechanisms providing facility flexibility and/or oversight.

9. Financial Assurance

EPA currently requires showings of financial assurance under multiple programs, including for RCRA subtitle C hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities; the RCRA subtitle I underground storage tank program; and under other statutory authorities. Financial assurance requirements generally help ensure that owners and operators adequately plan for future costs, and help ensure that adequate funds will be available when needed to cover these costs if the owner or operator is unable or unwilling to do so; otherwise, additional governmental expenditures may otherwise be necessary to ensure continued protection of human health and the environment. Financial assurance requirements also encourage the development and implementation of sound waste management practices both during and at the end of active facility operations, since the associated costs of any financial assurance mechanism should be less when activities occur in an environmentally protective manner.

Today's proposed RCRA subtitle D alternative does not include proposed financial responsibility requirements. Any such requirements would be proposed separately. Specifically, on January 6, 2010, EPA issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking ("ANPRM"), identifying classes of facilities within the Electric Power Generation, Transmission, and Distribution industry, among others, as those for which it plans to develop, as necessary, financial responsibility

requirements under CERCLA § 108(b). See Identification of Additional Classes of Facilities for Development of Financial Responsibility Requirements under CERCLA Section 108(b), 75 FR 816 (January 6, 2010). EPA solicits comments on whether financial responsibility requirements under CERCLA § 108(b) should be a key Agency focus should it regulate CCR disposal under a RCRA subtitle D approach. (By today's proposed rule, EPA is not reopening the comment period on the January 2010 ANPRM, which closed on April 6, 2010. See Identification of Additional Classes of Facilities for Development of Financial Responsibility Requirements under CERCLA Section 108(b), 75 FR 5715 (Feb. 4, 2010) (extending comment period to April 6, 2010).) However, EPA also solicits comment on existing state waste programs for financial assurance for CCR disposal facilities, and whether and how the co-proposed RCRA subtitle D regulatory approach might integrate with those programs.

10. Off-Site Disposal

Under a subtitle D regulation, regulated CCR wastes shipped off-site for disposal would have to be sent to facilities that meet the standards above.

11. Alternative RCRA Subtitle D Approaches

A potential modification to the subtitle D option that was evaluated in our Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) is what we have termed a subtitle "D prime" option. Under this modification, the regulations would not require the closure or installation of composite liners in existing surface impoundments; rather, these surface impoundments could continue to operate for the remainder of their useful life. New surface impoundments would be required to have composite liners. The other co-proposed subtitle D requirements would remain the same. This modification results in substantially lower costs, but also lower benefits as described in section XII, which presents costs and benefits of the RCRA subtitle C, D, and D prime options. EPA solicits comments on this approach.

Finally, another approach that has been suggested to EPA is a subtitle D regulation with the same requirements as spelled out in the co-proposal, for example, composite liners for new landfills and surface impoundments, groundwater monitoring, corrective action, closure, and post-closure care requirements as co-proposed in this notice; however, in lieu of the phase-out of surface impoundments, EPA would

establish and fund a program for conducting annual (or other frequency) structural stability (assessments) of impoundments having a "High" or "Significant" hazard potential rating as defined by criteria developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the National Inventory of Dams. EPA would conduct these assessments and, using appropriate enforcement authorities already available under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the Clean Water Act, would require facilities to respond to issues identified with their surface impoundments. The theory behind this suggested approach is that annual inspections would be far more cost effective than the phase-out of surface impoundments—approximately \$3.4 million annually for assessments versus \$876 million annually for phase-out. EPA also solicits comments on this approach and its effectiveness in ensuring the structural integrity of CCR surface impoundments.

X. How would the proposed subtitle D regulations be implemented?

A. Effective Dates

The effective date of the proposed RCRA subtitle D alternative, if this alternative is ultimately promulgated, would be 180 days after promulgation of a final rule. Thus, except as noted below, owners and operators of CCR landfills and surface impoundments would need to meet the proposed minimum federal criteria 180 days after promulgation of the final rule. As noted elsewhere in today's preamble (see Section XI.), facilities would need to comply with the RCRA subtitle D criteria, irrespective of whether or not the states have adopted the standards. For the remaining requirements, the compliance dates would be as follows:

- For new CCR landfills and surface impoundments that are placed into service after the effective date of the final rule, the location restrictions and design criteria would apply the date that such CCR landfills and surface impoundments are placed into service.
- For existing CCR surface impoundments, the compliance date for the liner requirement is five years after the effective date of the final rule.
- For existing CCR landfills and surface impoundments, the compliance date for the groundwater monitoring requirements is one year after the effective date of the final rule.
- For new CCR landfills and surface impoundments, and lateral expansions of existing CCR landfills and surface impoundments, the groundwater monitoring requirement must be in place and in compliance with the

groundwater monitoring requirements before CCRs can be placed in the unit.

Note: As discussed in Section IX, if EPA determines that financial assurance requirements would be implemented pursuant to CERCLA 108(b) authority, the compliance date for this provision would be the date specified in those regulations.

B. Implementation and Enforcement of Subtitle D Requirements

As stated previously, EPA has no authority to implement and enforce the co-proposed RCRA subtitle D regulation. Therefore, the proposed RCRA subtitle D standards have been drafted so that they can be self implementing—that is, the facilities can comply without interaction with a regulatory agency. EPA can however take action under section 7003 of RCRA to abate conditions that “may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environment.” EPA could also use the imminent and substantial endangerment authorities under CERCLA, or under other federal authorities, such as the Clean Water Act, to address those circumstances where a unit may pose a threat.

In addition, the federal RCRA subtitle D requirements would be enforceable by states and by citizens using the citizen suit provisions of RCRA 7002. Under this section, any person may commence a civil action on his own behalf against any person, who (1) is alleged to be in violation of any permit, standard, regulation * * * which has become effective pursuant to this chapter” Because a RCRA subtitle D proposal relies heavily on citizen enforcement, our proposal requires facilities to make any significant information related to their compliance with the proposed requirements publicly available.

XI. Impact of a Subtitle D Regulation on State Programs

Under today’s co-proposal, EPA is proposing to establish minimum nationwide criteria under RCRA subtitle D as one alternative. If the Agency were to choose to promulgate such nationwide criteria, EPA would encourage the states to adopt such criteria; however, the Agency has no authority to require states to adopt such criteria, or to implement the criteria upon their finalization. Nor does EPA have authority in this instance to require federal approval procedures for state adoption of the minimum nationwide criteria. States would be free to develop their own regulations and/or permitting programs using their solid waste laws or other state authorities. While states are not required to adopt such minimum nationwide criteria,

some states (about 25) incorporate federal regulations by reference or have specific state statutory requirements that their state program can be no more stringent than the federal regulations (about 12, with varying degrees of exceptions). In those cases, EPA would expect that if the minimum nationwide criteria were promulgated, these states would adopt them, consistent with their state laws and administrative procedures.

If the states do not adopt or adopt different standards for the management of CCRs, facilities would still have to comply with the co-proposed subtitle D criteria, if finalized, independently of those state regulations. Thus, even in the absence of a state program, CCR landfills and CCR surface impoundments would be required to meet the proposed federal minimum criteria as set out in 40 CFR part 257, subpart D. As a result and to make compliance with the requirements as straightforward as possible, we have drafted the proposed criteria so that facilities are able to implement the standards without interaction with regulatory officials—that is, the requirements are self-implementing. Also, even in the absence of a state regulatory program for CCRs, these federal minimum criteria are enforceable by citizens and by states using the citizen suit provision of RCRA (Section 7002). EPA is also able to take action under RCRA Section 7003 to abate conditions that may pose an imminent and substantial endangerment to human health or the environment or and can rely on other federal authorities. See the previous section for a full discussion of this issue.

XII. Impacts of the Proposed Regulatory Alternatives

A. What are the economic impacts of the proposed regulatory alternatives?

EPA prepared an analysis of the potential costs and benefits associated with this action contained in the “Regulatory Impact Analysis” (RIA). A copy of the RIA is available in the docket for this action and the analysis is briefly summarized here. For purposes of evaluating the potential economic impacts of the proposed rule, the RIA evaluated baseline (*i.e.*, current) management of CCRs consisting of two baseline components: (1) The average annual cost of baseline CCR disposal practices by the electric utility industry, and (2) the monetized value of existing CCR beneficial uses in industrial applications. Incremental to this baseline, the RIA estimated (1) future industry compliance costs for CCR

disposal associated with the regulatory options described in today’s action, and (2) although not completely quantified or monetized, three categories of potential future benefits from RCRA regulation of CCR disposal consisting of (a) Groundwater protection benefits at CCR disposal sites, (b) CCR impoundment structural failure prevention benefits, and (c) induced future annual increases in CCR beneficial use. The findings from each of these main sections of the RIA are summarized below. These quantified benefit results are based on EPA’s initial analyses using existing information and analytical techniques.

1. Characterization of Baseline Affected Entities and CCR Management Practices

Today’s action will potentially affect CCRs generated by coal-fired electric utility plants in the NAICS industry code 221112 (*i.e.*, the “Fossil Fuel Electric Power Generation” industry within the NAICS 22 “Utilities” sector code). Based on 2007 electricity generation data published by the Energy Information Administration (EIA), the RIA estimated a total of 495 operational coal-fired electric utility plants in this NAICS code could be affected by today’s action. These plants are owned by 200 entities consisting of 121 companies, 18 cooperative organizations, 60 state or local governments, and one Federal Agency. A sub-total of 51 of the 200 owner entities (*i.e.*, 26%) may be classified as small businesses, small organizations, or small governments.

Based on the most recent (2005) EIA data on annual CCR tonnages generated and managed by electric utility plants greater than 100 megawatts nameplate capacity in size, supplemented with additional estimates made in the RIA for smaller sized electric utility plants between 1 and 100 megawatts capacity, these 495 plants generate about 140 million tons of CCRs annually, of which 311 plants dispose 57 million tons in company-owned landfills, 158 plants dispose 22 million tons in company-owned surface impoundments, and an estimated 149 plants may send upwards of 15 million tons of CCRs to offsite disposal units owned by other companies (*e.g.*, NAICS 562 commercial waste management service companies). Based on lack of data on the type of offsite CCR disposal units, and the fact that it costs much more to transport wet CCRs than dry CCRs (*i.e.*, CCRs which have been de-watered), the RIA assumes all offsite CCR disposal units are landfills. Because some plants use more than one CCR management method, these management plant counts exceed 495 total plants. Based on the estimates

developed for the RIA, total CCR disposal is about 94 million tons annually which is two-thirds of annual CCR generation. (EPA notes that the alternative, lower CCR generation and disposal estimates of 131 million tons and 75 million tons cited elsewhere in today's notice were derived from different and less comprehensive ACAA and EIA survey data sources, respectively, that do not include tonnage estimates for plants between 1 and 100 megawatt capacity.) In addition, 272 of the 495 plants supply CCRs which are not disposed for beneficial uses in at least 14 industries, of which 28 of the 272 plants solely supply CCRs for beneficial uses. As of 2005, CCR beneficial uses (*i.e.*, industrial applications) involved about 47 million tons annually representing one-third of annual CCR generation, which the RIA estimates may grow to an annual quantity of 62 million tons by 2009. For 2008, the American Coal Ash Association estimates CCR beneficial use has grown to 60.6 million tons.¹⁵⁵

2. Baseline CCR Disposal

For each of the 467 operating electric utility plants which dispose CCRs onsite or offsite (28 of the 495 total plants solely send their CCRs for beneficial use and not disposal), the RIA estimated baseline engineering controls at CCR disposal units and associated baseline disposal costs for two types of CCR disposal units: landfills and surface impoundments. Impoundments are sometimes named by electricity plant personnel as basins, berms, canals, cells, dams, embankments, lagoons, pits, ponds, reservoirs, or sumps. The baseline is defined as existing (current) conditions with respect to the presence or absence of 10 types of environmental engineering controls and eight ancillary regulatory elements, plus projection of future baseline conditions of CCR disposal units without regulation over the 50-year future period-of-analysis—2012 to 2061—applied in the RIA. A 50-year future period was applied in the RIA to account for impacts of the proposed regulatory options which are specific only to future new disposal units given average lifespans of over 40-years. Existing conditions were determined based on review of a sample of current state government regulations of CCR disposal in 34 states, as well as limited survey information on CCR disposal units from studies published in 1995, 1996, and 2006 about voluntary

engineering controls installed for CCR disposal units at some electric utility plants. The 10 baseline engineering controls evaluated in the RIA are (1) Groundwater monitoring, (2) bottom liners, (3) leachate collection and removal systems, (4) dust controls, (5) rainwater run-on and run-off controls, (6) financial assurance for corrective action, disposal unit closure, and post-closure care, (7) disposal unit location restrictions, (8) closure capping of disposal units, (9) post-closure groundwater monitoring, and (10) CCR storage design and operating standards prior to disposal (**Note:** Although listed here, this 10th element was not estimated in the RIA because of EPA's lack of information on baseline CCR storage practices). This specific set of engineering controls represents the elements of the RCRA 3004(x) custom-tailored technical standards proposed in today's notice for the RCRA subtitle C option. The eight ancillary elements evaluated in the RIA are (11) offsite transport and disposal, (12) disposal unit structural integrity inspections, (13) electricity plant facility-wide environmental investigations, (14) facility-wide corrective action requirements, (15) waste disposal permits, (16) state government regulatory enforcement inspections, (17) environmental release remediation requirements, and (18) recordkeeping and reporting to regulatory agencies. Some states require many of these technical standards for future newly-constructed CCR disposal units, some states require them for existing units, and some states have few or no regulatory requirements specific to CCR disposal and thus were not estimated in the baseline cost. Furthermore, some of the ancillary elements are only relevant to the regulatory options based on subtitle C as co-proposed in today's notice. The percentage of CCR landfills with baseline controls ranged from 61% to 81%, and the percentage of CCR surface impoundments with baseline controls ranged from 20% to 49%, depending upon the type of control. Based on this estimation methodology, the RIA estimates the electric utility industry spends an average of \$5.6 billion per year for meeting state-required and company voluntary environmental standards for CCR disposal. Depending upon state location for any given electricity plant (which determines baseline regulatory requirements), and whether any given plant disposes CCRs onsite or offsite, this baseline cost is equivalent to an average cost range of \$2 to \$80 per ton of CCRs disposed of.

3. Baseline CCR Beneficial Use

In addition to evaluating baseline CCR disposal practices, the RIA also estimated the baseline net benefits associated with the 47 million tons per year (2005) of industrial beneficial uses of CCRs. CCRs are beneficially used nationwide as material ingredients in at least 14 industrial applications according to the American Coal Ash Association: (1) Concrete, (2) cement, (3) flowable fill, (4) structural fill, (5) road base, (6) soil modification, (7) mineral filler in asphalt, (8) snow/ice control, (9) blasting grit, (10) roofing granules, (11) placement in mine filling operations,¹⁵⁶ (12) wallboard, (13) waste solidification, and (14) agriculture. The baseline annual sales revenues (as of 2005) received by the electric utility industry for sale of CCRs used in these industrial applications are estimated at \$177 million per year. In comparison, substitute industrial ingredient materials (*e.g.*, portland cement, quarried stone aggregate, limestone, gypsum) would cost industries \$2,477 million per year. Thus, the beneficial use of CCRs provides \$2,300 million in annual cost savings to these industrial applications, labeled economic benefits in the RIA. Based on the lifecycle materials and energy flow economic framework presented in the RIA, although only based on limited data representing 47% of annual CCR beneficial use tonnage involving only three of the 14 industrial applications (*i.e.*, concrete, cement and wallboard), baseline lifecycle benefits of beneficially using CCRs compared to substitute industrial materials are (a) \$4,888 million per year in energy savings, (b) \$81 million per year in water consumption savings, (c) \$365 million per year in greenhouse gas (*i.e.*, carbon dioxide and methane) emissions reductions, and (d) \$17,772 million per year in other air pollution reductions. Altogether, industrial beneficial uses of CCRs provide over \$23 billion in annual environmental benefits as of 2005. In addition, baseline CCR beneficial use provides \$1,830 million per year in industrial raw materials costs savings to beneficial users, and \$2,927 million per year in avoided CCR disposal cost to the electric utility industry as of 2005. The sum of environmental benefits,

¹⁵⁵ Note that ACAA's definition of beneficial use does not align with that used by EPA in this rulemaking. For example, ACAA includes minefilling as a beneficial use, where EPA classifies it as a separate category of use.

¹⁵⁶ While today's proposed rule does not deal directly with the mine filling of CCRs, the RIA includes it as a baseline beneficial use because the RIA uses the categories identified by the American Coal Ash Association (<http://acaaffiniscope.com/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=3>). However, as noted previously in today's notice, the Agency is working with OSM of the Department of Interior on the placement of CCRs in mine fill operations.

industrial raw materials costs savings, and CCR disposal cost savings, \$27.9 billion per year, gives the baseline level of what the RIA has labeled social benefits from the beneficial use of CCRs.

4. Estimated Costs for RCRA Regulation of CCR Disposal

The RIA includes estimates of the costs associated with the options described in today's notice are summarized here: (1) RCRA subtitle C regulation of CCRs as a "special waste"; (2) RCRA subtitle D regulation as "non-hazardous waste"; and (3) the subtitle "D prime" options. Full descriptions of each option are presented in a prior section of today's notice. The RIA assumes that the engineering controls that would be established under the RCRA subtitle C option would be tailored on the basis of RCRA section 3004(x). The controls for the RCRA subtitle D option are identical to the subtitle C option. The controls under the subtitle "D prime" option would be identical as well, except that existing surface impoundments would not have to close or be dredged and have composite liners installed within five years of the effective date of the regulation. The RIA also assumes all three options retain the existing Bevill exemption for CCR beneficial uses.

The estimated costs for each option are incremental to the baseline, and are estimated in the RIA using both an average annualized and a present value equivalent basis over a 50-year period-of-analysis (2012 to 2061) using both a 7% and an alternative 3% discount rate. These two alternative discount rates are required by the Office of Management and Budget's September 2003 "Regulatory Analysis" Circular A-4. For the purpose of summary here, only the 7% discount rate results are presented for each option because the 7% rate represents the "base case" in the RIA for the reason that most of the regulatory compliance costs will be incurred by industry (*i.e.*, private capital). On an average annualized basis, the estimated regulatory compliance costs for the three options are \$1,474 million (subtitle C special waste), \$587 million (subtitle D), and \$236 million (subtitle "D prime") per year. On a present value basis discounted at 7% over the 50-year future period-of-analysis applied in the RIA, estimated future regulatory compliance costs for the three options total \$20,349 million, \$8,095 million, and \$3,259 million present value, respectively. EPA requests public comment on all data sources and analytical approaches.

5. Benefits for RCRA Regulation of CCR Disposal

The potential environmental and public health benefits of CCR regulation estimated and monetized in the RIA include three categories:

1. Groundwater protection benefits consisting of (a) human cancer prevention benefits and (b) avoided groundwater remediation costs at CCR disposal sites;
 2. CCR impoundment structural failure prevention benefits (*i.e.*, cleanup costs avoided); and
 3. Induced future increase in industrial beneficial uses of CCRs.
- As was done with the cost estimates described above, the RIA estimated benefits both at the 7% and 3% discount rates using the same 50-year period-of-analysis. However, only the benefit estimates based on the 7% rate are summarized here. While the RIA focused on monetizing these three impact categories, there are also human non-cancer prevention benefits, ecological protection benefits, surface water protection benefits, and ambient air pollution prevention benefits, which are not monetized in the RIA, but qualitatively described below.

i. Groundwater Protection Benefits

The RIA estimated the benefits of reduced human cancer risks and avoided groundwater remediation costs associated with controlling arsenic leaching from CCR landfills and surface impoundments. These estimates are based on EPA's risk assessment (described elsewhere in today's notice), which predicts arsenic leaching rates using SPLP and TCLP data. Furthermore, recent research and damage cases indicate that these leaching tests under-predict risks from dry disposal.¹⁵⁷ Therefore, the groundwater protection benefits may be

¹⁵⁷ Recent EPA research demonstrates that CCRs can leach significantly more aggressively under different pH conditions potentially present in disposal units. In the EPA Office of Research & Development report "Characterization of Coal Combustion Residues from Electric Utilities—Leaching and Characterization Data," EPA-600/R-09/151, Research Triangle Park, NC, December 2009, CCRs from 19 of the 34 facilities evaluated in the study exceeded at least one of the Toxicity Characteristic regulatory values for at least one type of CCR (*e.g.*, fly ash or FGD residue) at the self-generated pH of the material. This behavior likely explains the rapid migration of constituents from disposal sites like Chesapeake, VA and Gambrills, MD. See also the EPA Office of Research & Development reports (a) "Characterization of Mercury-Enriched Coal Combustion Residues from Electric Utilities Using Enhanced Sorbents for Mercury Control," EPA 600/R-06/008, January 2006; and (b) Characterization of Coal Combustion Residues from Electric Utilities Using Wet Scrubbers for Multi-Pollutant Control, EPA/600/R-08/077, July 2008.

underestimated in the RIA. The RIA based estimation of future human cancer cases avoided on the individual "excess" lifetime cancer probabilities reported in the EPA risk assessment, although the RIA also used more recent (2001) science published by the National Research Council on arsenic carcinogenicity.

The RIA estimated groundwater protection benefits by categorizing electric utility plants according to their individual types of CCR disposal units (*i.e.*, landfill or impoundment) and presence/types of liners in those units. For each category, GIS data were used to determine the potentially affected populations of groundwater drinkers residing within 1-mile of the disposal units. Results from the risk assessment were applied to these populations by using a linear extrapolation, starting from a risk of zero to the peak future risk as demonstrated by the risk assessment. The count of people who might potentially get cancer was then adjusted upward to account for the more recent and more widely accepted arsenic carcinogenicity research by the National Research Council.¹⁵⁸ The RIA then segregated the future cancer counts into lung cancers and bladder cancers, as well as into those that were predicted to result in death versus those that were not. The RIA monetized each of these cancer sub-categories using EPA-published economic values for statistical life and cost of illness.

The RIA further adjusted these monetized future cancer counts, to take into account existing state requirements for groundwater monitoring at CCR disposal units, such that fewer cancer

¹⁵⁸ EPA's current Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) has a cancer slope factor for arsenic developed in 1995. This slope factor is based on skin cancer incidence and was used in the 2010 EPA risk assessment. Skin cancer is a health endpoint associated with lower fatality risk than lung and bladder cancers induced by arsenic. Since the IRIS slope factors were developed, quantitative data on lung and bladder cancers have become available, and the skin cancer based slope factors no longer represent the current state of the science for health risk assessment for arsenic. The National Research Council (NRC) published the report, "Arsenic in Drinking Water: 2001 Update" (2001) which reviewed the available toxicological, epidemiological, and risk assessment literature on the health effects of inorganic arsenic, building upon the NRC's prior report, "Arsenic in Drinking Water" (NRC 1999). The 2001 report, developed by an eminent committee of scientists with expertise in arsenic toxicology and risk assessment provides a scientifically sound and transparent assessment of risks of bladder and lung cancers from inorganic arsenic. EPA's Science Advisory Board is currently reviewing EPA's new proposed IRIS cancer slope factors based on bladder and lung cancer. Because the more recent NRC scientific information is available, the RIA (2010) uses the NRC arsenic cancer data for the estimate of benefits associated with cancers avoided by the proposed regulation of CCR.

cases than initially projected would ultimately occur from early detection of groundwater contamination in those states. Therefore, a baseline was established for the operation of state regulatory and remedial programs which led to a reduction in expected cancer cases in states with existing groundwater protection requirements. However, once groundwater contamination was found in those states, remediation costs would be incurred. Thus, the RIA also accounted for these costs under each of the regulatory options as well, thus avoiding possible double-counting of cancer cases and remediation costs. On an average annualized basis, the human cancer prevention component of the groundwater protection benefit category for the three options are \$37 million (RCRA subtitle C special waste), \$15 million (RCRA subtitle D), and \$8 million (subtitle “D prime”) per year. On a present value basis, the human cancer prevention benefit totals \$504 million, \$207 million, and \$104 million present value, respectively. On an average annualized basis, the estimated avoided groundwater remediation cost benefit component of the groundwater protection benefit category for the three options are \$34 million (RCRA subtitle C special waste), \$12 million (RCRA subtitle D), and \$6 million (subtitle “D prime”) per year. On a present value basis, the avoided remediation cost benefit totals to \$466 million, \$168 million, and \$84 million present value, respectively. Added together on an average annualized basis, these two groundwater protection benefit components total to \$71 million (RCRA subtitle C special waste), \$27 million (RCRA subtitle D), and \$14 million (subtitle “D prime”) per year. On a present value basis, the groundwater protection benefit category totals to \$970 million, \$375 million, and \$188 million present value, respectively.

ii. Impoundment Structural Failure Prevention Benefits

The December 2008 CCR surface impoundment collapse at the Tennessee Valley Authority’s Kingston, Tennessee coal-fired electricity plant illustrated that structural failures of large CCR impoundments can lead to catastrophic environmental releases and large cleanup costs. The RIA estimated the benefit of avoiding future cleanup costs for impoundment failures, which the structural integrity inspection requirement of all regulatory options, and the future conversion or retrofitting of existing or new impoundments (under the subtitle C, subtitle D, and

subtitle “D prime” options) would be expected to prevent.

The RIA based the estimate of future cleanup costs avoided on information contained in EPA’s 2009 mail survey¹⁵⁹ of 584 CCR impoundments operated by the electric utility industry. In response to the survey request for information on known spills or non-permitted releases from CCR impoundments within the last 10 years, revealed 42 CCR impoundment releases spanning 1995 to 2009. Particularly, there were five significant releases between 4,950 cubic yards and 5.4 million cubic yards of CCRs, and one catastrophic release of 5.4 million cubic yards of CCRs during this time period at coal fired power plants. Given these historic releases, the RIA projected the probability of future impoundment releases using a Poisson distribution. In addition to this approach, the RIA formulated two alternative failure scenarios based on 96 high-risk CCR impoundments identified as at least 40 feet tall and at least 25 years old. The two alternative failure scenarios assumed impoundment failure rates involving these 96 impoundments of 10% and 20%, respectively. On an average annualized basis ranging across these three alternative failure probability estimation methods (scenarios), the avoided cleanup cost benefit category for the three options is estimated at \$128 million to \$1,212 million (subtitle C special waste), \$58 million to \$550 million (subtitle D), and \$29 million to \$275 million (subtitle “D prime”) per year. On a present value basis, the avoided cleanup cost benefit category totals \$1,762 million to \$16,732 million (RCRA subtitle C special waste), \$793 million to \$7,590 million (RCRA subtitle D), and \$405 million to \$3,795 million present value (RCRA subtitle “D prime”), respectively.

iii. Benefit of Induced Future Increase in Industrial Beneficial Uses of CCRs

The third and final potential benefit category evaluated in the RIA includes the potential effects of RCRA regulation of CCR disposal on future annual tonnages of CCR beneficial use. As its base case, the RIA estimates an expected future increase in beneficial use induced by the increased costs of disposing CCR in RCRA-regulated disposal units. The RIA also evaluates the potential magnitude of a future decrease in beneficial use as a result of a potential “stigma” effect under the subtitle C option. Both scenarios are

based on a baseline consisting of (a) projecting the future annual tonnage of CCR generation by the electric utility industry in relation to the Energy Information Administration’s (EIA) future annual projection of coal consumption by the electric utility industry, and (b) projecting the future baseline growth in CCR beneficial use relative to the historical growth trendline (*i.e.*, absent today’s proposed regulation).

For the induced increase “base case” scenario, the compliance costs for each regulatory option represent an “avoided cost incentive” to the electric utility industry to shift additional CCRs from disposal to beneficial use. Proportional to the estimated cost for each option, the RIA applied a beneficial use market elasticity factor to the projected baseline future growth in beneficial use to simulate the induced increase. On an average annualized basis, the monetized value—based on the same unitized (*i.e.*, per-ton) monetized social values assigned to the lifecycle benefits of baseline CCR beneficial uses—of the estimated potential induced increases in future annual CCR beneficial use tonnage for the three options are \$6,122 million (RCRA subtitle C special waste), \$2,450 million (RCRA subtitle D), and \$980 million (subtitle “D prime”) per year. On a present value basis, the potential induced increases in beneficial use totals to \$84,489 million (RCRA subtitle C special waste), \$33,796 million (RCRA subtitle D), and \$13,518 million (subtitle “D prime”) present value, respectively.

The RIA also monetized the alternative “stigma” scenario of future reduction in beneficial use induced by the RCRA subtitle C option. The RIA formulated assumptions about the percentage future annual tonnage reductions which might result to some of the 14 beneficial use markets. For example, federally purchased concrete was assumed to stay at baseline levels because of the positive influence of comprehensive procurement guidelines that are already in place to encourage such types of beneficial uses. Conversely, the levels of non-federally purchased concrete were assumed to decrease relative to the baseline. On an average annualized basis, the monetized value—based on the same unitized (*i.e.*, per-ton) monetized social values assigned to the lifecycle benefits of baseline CCR beneficial uses—of the potential “stigma” reduction in future annual CCR beneficial use for the RCRA subtitle C option is \$16,923 million per year cost. On a present value basis, the potential “stigma” reduction in beneficial use totals to \$233,549 million

¹⁵⁹ Descriptive information and electric utility industry responses to EPA’s 2009 mail survey is available at the survey webpage <http://www.epa.gov/waste/nonhaz/industrial/special/fossil/surveys/>.

present value cost. The RIA did not estimate a potential “stigma” reduction effect on the RCRA subtitle D or subtitle “D prime” regulatory options.

B. Benefits Not Quantified in the RIA

1. Non-Quantified Plant and Wildlife Protection Benefits

EPA’s risk assessment estimated significant risks of adverse effects to plants and wildlife, which are confirmed by the existing CCR damage cases and field studies published in peer-reviewed scientific literature. Such reported adverse effects include: (a) Elevated selenium levels in migratory birds, (b) wetland vegetative damage, (c) fish kills, (d) amphibian deformities, (e) snake metabolic effects, (f) plant toxicity, (g) elevated contaminant levels in mammals as a result of environmental uptake, (h) fish deformities, and (i) inhibited fish reproductive capacity. Requirements in the proposed rule should prevent or reduce these impacts in the future by limiting the extent of environmental contamination and thereby reducing the levels directly available.

2. Non-Quantified Surface Water Protection Benefits

In EPA’s risk assessment, recreational fishers could be exposed to chemical constituents in CCR via the groundwater-to-surface water exposure pathway. Furthermore, State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) discharges from CCR wet disposal (*i.e.*, impoundments) likely exceed the discharges from groundwater to surface water. Thus, exposure to arsenic via fish consumption could be significant. However, EPA expects that most electric utility plants will eventually switch to dry CCR disposal (or to beneficial use), a trend which is discussed in the RIA. Such future switchover will reduce potential future exposures to these constituents from affected fish.

3. Non-Quantified Ambient Air Protection Benefits

Another impact on public health not discussed in the RIA is the potential reduction of excess cancer cases associated with hexavalent chromium inhaled from the air. As estimated in the RIA, over six million people live within the Census population data “zip code tabulation areas” for the 495 electric utility plant locations. Thus, the potential population health benefits of RCRA regulation may be quite large. Inhalation of hexavalent chromium has been shown to cause lung cancer.¹⁶⁰ By requiring fugitive dust controls, the proposed rule would reduce inhalation exposure to hexavalent chromium near CCR disposal units that are not currently required to control fugitive dust.

Furthermore, several non-cancer health effects associated with CCRs are a result of particulate matter inhalation due to dry CCR disposal. Human health effects for which EPA is evaluating causality due to particulate matter exposure include (a) Cardiovascular morbidity, (b) respiratory morbidity, (c) mortality, (d) reproductive effects, (e) developmental effects, and (f) cancer.¹⁶¹ The potential for and extent of adverse health effects due to fugitive dusts from dry CCR disposal was demonstrated in the 2009 EPA report “Inhalation of Fugitive Dust: A Screening Assessment of the Risks Posed by Coal Combustion Waste Landfills—DRAFT,” which is available in the docket for today’s co-proposed rules. The co-proposed rules’ fugitive dust controls would serve to manage such potential risks by bringing them to acceptable levels.

CCR dust (and other types of particulate matter) can also be carried over long distances by wind and then settle on ground or water. The effects of this settling could include: (a) Changing the pH of lakes and streams; (b) changing the nutrient balance in coastal waters and large river basins; (c) depleting nutrients in soil; (d) damaging sensitive forests and farm crops; and (e) affecting the diversity of ecosystems.¹⁶²

Additionally, fine particulates are known to contribute to haze.¹⁶³ Thus, the fugitive dust controls contained in the proposed rule would improve visibility, and reduce the environmental impacts discussed above.

C. Comparison of Costs to Benefits for the Regulatory Alternatives

For purposes of comparing the estimated regulatory compliance costs to the monetized benefits for each regulatory option, the RIA computed two comparison indicators: Net benefits (*i.e.*, benefits minus costs), and benefit/cost ratio (*i.e.*, benefits divided by costs). The results of each indicator are displayed in the following tables (Table 10, Table 11 and Table 12) for three regulatory options, based on the 7% discount rate and the 50-year period-of-analysis applied in the RIA. There are three tables because three different scenarios were analyzed concerning potential impacts on beneficial use of CCRs impact under the regulatory options.

The three tables below represent three possible outcomes regarding impacts of the rule upon the beneficial use of CCR. In the first table, EPA presents the potential impact scenario that we view to be most likely. This first scenario assumes that the increased cost of disposal from regulation under subtitle C will encourage industry to seek out additional markets and greatly increase their beneficial use of CCRs. In the second table, EPA presents a negative effect on beneficial use, based on stigma, and the possibility of triggering use restrictions under state regulation and private sector standards due to subtitle C regulation. In the final table, EPA presents a scenario where beneficial use continues on its current path, without any changes as a result of the rule. On the basis of past experience, EPA believes that it is likely that recycling rates will increase as presented in the first scenario. Comments are requested on the impact of stigma on the beneficial use of CCRs.

TABLE 10—COMPARISON OF REGULATORY BENEFITS TO COSTS

[\$Millions @ 2009\$ prices and @ 7% discount rate over 50-year future period-of-analysis 2012 to 2061]

	Subtitle C “Special Waste”	Subtitle D	Subtitle “D prime”
A. Present Values:			
1. Regulatory Costs (1A+1B+1C):	\$20,349	\$8,095	\$3,259.
1A. Engineering Controls	\$6,780	\$3,254	\$3,254.

¹⁶⁰ ATSDR Texas. Available at: <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxfaq.html>.

¹⁶¹ Source: EPA Office of Research & Development report “Integrated Science Assessment

for Particulate Matter: First External Review Draft,” EPA/600/R-08/139, 2008.

¹⁶² Source: U.S. EPA Office of Air & Radiation, Particulate Matter “Health and Environment” Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/particles/health.html>.

¹⁶³ *Ibid*; and also see http://www.intheairwebreathes.com/html/photo_gallery.html.

TABLE 10—COMPARISON OF REGULATORY BENEFITS TO COSTS—Continued
 [\$Millions @ 2009\$ prices and @ 7% discount rate over 50-year future period-of-analysis 2012 to 2061]

	Subtitle C “Special Waste”	Subtitle D	Subtitle “D prime”
1B. Ancillary Regulatory Requirements.	\$1,480	\$5	\$5.
1C. Conversion to Dry CCR Disposal.	\$12,089	\$4,836	\$0.
2. Regulatory Benefits (2A+2B+2C+2D):	\$87,221 to \$102,191	\$34,964 to \$41,761	\$14,111 to \$17,501.
2A. Monetized Value of Human Cancer Cases Avoided.	\$504	\$207	\$104.
2B. Groundwater Remediation Costs Avoided.	\$466	\$168	\$84.
2C. CCR Impoundment Failure Cleanup Costs Avoided.	\$1,762 to \$16,732	\$793 to \$7,590	\$405 to \$3,795.
2D. Included Future Increase in CCR Beneficial Use.	\$84,489	\$33,796	\$13,518.
3. Net Benefits (2–1)	\$66,872 to \$81,842	\$26,869 to \$33,666	\$10,852 to \$14,242.
4. Benefit/Cost Ratio (2/1)	4.286 to 5.022	4.319 to 5.159	4.330 to 5.370.
B. Average Annualized Equivalent Values*:			
1. Regulatory Costs (1A+1B+1C)	\$1,474	\$587	\$236.
1A. Engineering Controls	\$491	\$236	\$236.
1B. Ancillary Regulatory Requirements.	\$107	<\$1	<\$1.
1C. Conversion to Dry CCR Disposal.	\$876	\$350	\$0.
2. Regulatory Benefits (2A+2B+2C+2D):	\$6,320 to \$7,405	\$2,533 to \$3,026	\$1,023 to \$1,268.
2A. Monetized Value of Human Cancer Cases Avoided.	\$37	\$15	\$8.
2B. Groundwater Remediation Costs Avoided.	\$34	\$12	\$6.
2C. CCR Impoundment Failure Cleanup Costs Avoided.	\$128 to \$1,212	\$58 to \$550	\$29 to \$275.
2D. Included Future Increase in CCR Beneficial Use.	\$6,122	\$2,450	\$980.
3. Net Benefits (2–1)	\$4,845 to \$5,930	\$1,947 to \$2,439	\$786 to \$1,032.
4. Benefit/Cost Ratio (2/1)	4.286 to 5.022	4.319 to 5.159	4.330 to 5.370.

* Note: Average annualized equivalent values calculated by multiplying the 50-year present values by a 50-year 7% discount rate “capital recovery factor” of 0.07246.

TABLE 11—COMPARISON OF REGULATORY BENEFITS TO COSTS UNDER SCENARIO #2—INDUCED BENEFICIAL USE DECREASE

[\$Millions @ 2009\$ prices @ 7% discount rate over 50-year future period-of-analysis 2012 to 2061]

	Subtitle C “Special Waste”	Subtitle D	Subtitle “D prime”
A. Present Values:			
1. Regulatory Costs (1A+1B+1C):	\$20,349	\$8,095	\$3,259.
1A. Engineering Controls	\$6,780	\$3,254	\$3,254.
1B. Ancillary Costs	\$1,480	\$5	\$5.
1C. Conversion to Dry CCR Disposal.	\$12,089	\$4,836	\$0.
2. Regulatory Benefits (2A+2B+2C+2D):	(\$230,817) to (\$215,847)	\$1,168 to \$7,965	\$593 to \$3,983.
2A. Monetized Value of Human Cancer Risks Avoided.	\$504	\$207	\$104.
2B. Groundwater Remediation Costs Avoided.	\$466	\$168	\$84.
2C. CCR Impoundment Failure Cleanup Costs Avoided.	\$1,762 to \$16,732	\$793 to \$7,590	\$405 to \$3,795.
2D. Induced Impact on CCR Beneficial Use.	(\$233,549)	N/A	N/A.
3. Net Benefits (2–1)	(\$251,166) to (\$236,196)	(\$6,927) to (\$130)	(\$2,666) to \$724.
4. Benefit/Cost Ratio (2/1)	(11.343) to (10.607)	0.144 to 0.984	0.182 to 1.222.
B. Average Annualized Equivalent Values*:			
1. Regulatory Costs (1A+1B+1C):	\$1,474	\$587	\$236.
1A. Engineering Controls	\$491	\$236	\$236.
1B. Ancillary Costs	\$107	\$0.36	\$0.36.

TABLE 11—COMPARISON OF REGULATORY BENEFITS TO COSTS UNDER SCENARIO #2—INDUCED BENEFICIAL USE DECREASE—Continued

[\$Millions @ 2009\$ prices @ 7% discount rate over 50-year future period-of-analysis 2012 to 2061]

	Subtitle C “Special Waste”	Subtitle D	Subtitle “D prime”
1C. Conversion to Dry CCR Disposal.	\$876	\$350	\$0.
2. Regulatory Benefits (2A+2B+2C+2D):	(\$16,725) to (\$15,640)	\$85 to \$577	\$43 to \$289.
2A. Monetized Value of Human Cancer Risks Avoided.	\$37	\$15	\$8.
2B. Groundwater Remediation Costs Avoided.	\$34	\$12	\$6.
2C. CCR Impoundment Failure Cleanup Costs Avoided.	\$128 to \$1,212	\$57 to \$550	\$29 to \$275.
2D. Induced Impact on CCR Beneficial Use.	(\$16,923)	NA	NA.
3. Net Benefits (2–1)	(\$18,199) to (\$17,115)	(\$502) to (\$9)	(\$193) to \$52.
4. Benefit/Cost Ratio (2/1)	(11.347) to (10.610)	0.145 to 0.983	0.182 to 1.225.

* **Note:** Average annualized equivalent values calculated by multiplying 50-year present values by a 50-year 7% discount rate “capital recovery factor” of 0.07246.

TABLE 12—COMPARISON OF REGULATORY BENEFITS TO COSTS UNDER SCENARIO #3—NO CHANGE TO BENEFICIAL USE

[\$Millions @ 2009\$ prices @ 7% discount rate over 50-year future period-of-analysis 2012 to 2061]

Costs	Subtitle C “Special Waste”	Subtitle D	Subtitle “D prime”
A. Present Values:			
1. Regulatory Costs (1A+1B+1C):	\$20,349	\$8,095	\$3,259.
1A. Engineering Controls	\$6,780	\$3,254	\$3,254.
1B. Ancillary Costs	\$1,480	\$5	\$5.
1C. Dry Conversion	\$12,089	4,836	\$0.
2. Regulatory Benefits (2A+2B+2C+2D):	\$2,732 to \$17,702	\$1,168 to \$7,965	\$593 to \$3,983.
2A. Monetized Value of Human Cancer Risks Avoided.	\$504	\$207	\$104.
2B. Groundwater Remediation Costs Avoided.	\$466	\$168	\$84.
2C. CCR Impoundment Failure Cleanup Costs Avoided.	\$1,762 to \$16,732	\$793 to \$7,590	\$405 to \$3,795.
2D. Induced Impact on CCR Beneficial Use.	\$0	\$0	\$0.
3. Net Benefits (2–1)	(\$17,617) to (\$2,647)	(\$6,927) to (\$130)	(\$2,666) to \$724.
4. Benefit/Cost Ratio (2/1)	0.134 to 0.870	0.144 to 0.984	0.182 to 1.222.
B. Average Annualized Equivalent Values.			
1. Regulatory Costs (1A+1B+1C):	\$1,474	\$587	\$236.
1A. Engineering Controls	\$491	\$236	\$236.
1B. Ancillary Costs	\$107	\$0.36	\$0.36.
1C. Dry Conversion	\$876	\$350	\$0.
2. Regulatory Benefits (2A+2B+2C+2D):	\$198 to \$1,283	\$85 to \$577	\$43 to \$289.
2A. Monetized Value of Human Cancer Risks Avoided.	\$37	\$15	\$8.
2B. Groundwater Remediation Costs Avoided.	\$34	\$12	\$6.
2C. CCR Impoundment Failure Cleanup Costs Avoided.	\$128 to \$1,212	\$57 to \$550	\$29 to \$275.
2D. Induced Impact on CCR Beneficial Use.	\$0	\$0	\$0.
3. Net Benefits (2–1)	(\$1,277) to (\$192)	(\$502) to (\$9)	(\$193) to \$52.
4. Benefit/Cost Ratio (2/1)	0.134 to 0.870	0.145 to 0.983	0.182 to 1.225.

* **Note:** Average annualized equivalent values calculated by multiplying 50-year present values by a 50-year 7% discount rate “capital recovery factor” of 0.07246.

EPA seeks comment on data and findings presented in the RIA, as well as on the cost and benefit estimation uncertainty factors identified in the RIA.

D. What are the potential environmental and public health impacts of the proposed regulatory alternatives?

The potential environmental and public health impacts of CCR regulation assessed within the RIA include the following three categories:

- Groundwater Benefits (human health benefits and cleanup costs avoided)
- Catastrophic Failure Benefits (catastrophic and significant releases avoided)
- Beneficial Use Benefits

The analyses of the groundwater impacts for the RIA were derived based on results from the risk assessment that was conducted for coal combustion residue landfills and surface impoundments. The second category of catastrophic impacts in the RIA was assessed, primarily based upon data on releases, as reported in EPA's 2009 Information Collection Request. And finally, the RIA assessment of beneficial use impacts was conducted using life-cycle analyses of current types and quantities of CCR beneficial use in the U.S. While the RIA focuses on monetizing these three impact categories, EPA notes that there are also likely noncancer health impacts, ecological impacts, other surface water impacts, and impacts on the ambient air, which are not monetized in this RIA.

1. Environmental and Public Health Impacts Estimated in the RIA

Groundwater Impacts

In the RIA, EPA estimated the benefits of reduced cancer risks and avoided groundwater remediation costs associated with controlling arsenic from landfills and surface impoundments that manage coal combustion residuals (CCRs). These estimates are based on EPA's risk assessment, which predicts leaching behavior using SPLP and TCLP data. Furthermore, recent research and damage cases indicate that these leaching tests may under-predict risks from dry disposal.¹⁶⁴ Therefore, the

benefits estimated in this section are likely to underestimate the actual benefits provided by the proposed rule. EPA bases the cancer cases avoided on the individual "excess" lifetime cancer probabilities reported in the risk assessment, although for the present analysis, EPA uses more recent science on arsenic carcinogenicity, reflected in more recent NRC research.

The RIA began its groundwater impacts assessment by first segregating facilities by their individual type of liner and their respective Waste Management Unit (WMU) designations. For each class of facility, GIS data were used to determine the potentially affected populations of groundwater drinkers within 1-mile of the WMU. Results from the risk assessment were applied to these populations by using a linear extrapolation, starting from a risk of zero—to the peak future risk as demonstrated by the risk assessment. The number of people who might potentially get cancer was then adjusted to account for more recent research by the NRC.

Given the number of total potential cancers, EPA was able to use the same NRC data to split these cancers into lung cancers and bladder cancers, as well as into those that resulted in death versus those that did not. Once this subdivision was complete, EPA was then able to monetize these cancers using accepted economic values for a statistical life and cost of illness. In doing so, EPA was able to take account of both the potential lag in cancer cessation and the increase in value of a statistical life due to increases in income.

EPA also recognized that due to the relevant pre-existing state regulations in this area, fewer cancers than the number projected would ultimately occur. Therefore, a baseline was established for the operation of state regulatory and remedial programs. This led to the exclusion of some cancers where states would likely fill the gap in the absence of any EPA regulations. However, once contamination was found by states, cleanup costs would be incurred. Thus, EPA accounted for these costs under each of the regulatory options as well.

Once groundwater remediation costs and cancer costs under the baseline and each regulatory option were estimated, the aggregate benefits from each regulatory option were calculated (in comparison to the baseline). Net present value estimates were generated both at the 3% and 7% discount rate, as discussed in further detail within the RIA. To summarize, at a discount rate of 7%, the net present value of the groundwater benefits (including both

the avoided cleanup costs and the value of cancer cases avoided) from the proposed rule totaled \$970 million under the subtitle C option, and \$375 million under the subtitle D option.

Catastrophic Failure Impacts

The 2008 surface impoundment failure at the TVA's Kingston, TN power plant illustrated that the improper handling of CCRs can lead to catastrophic releases. EPA's co-proposal for the management of CCRs includes requirements that would lead to all plants with surface impoundments converting to dry handling in landfills within 5-years of rule implementation. In the RIA, EPA estimated the avoided catastrophic failures and associated cleanup cost savings resulting from this provision of the rule.

First, EPA began by characterizing the releases reported in its 2009 Information Collection Request. In this data set, 42 releases were reported for the years 1995 through 2009. Particularly, there were 5 significant releases of between 1 million and 1 billion gallons, and one catastrophic release of over 1 billion gallons during this time period at coal fired power plants. Given these historic releases, EPA projected the occurrence of future releases using a Poisson distribution. EPA then estimated future avoided cleanup costs under the two proposed rules, and determined net present values of these benefits using both a 3% and 7% discount rate across the average and upper percentiles of risk demonstrated by the results of the Poisson distribution. The full details of these analyses are reported in the RIA. To summarize the results here at the 7% discount rate, the estimated net present value of avoided releases under the subtitle C requirements total \$1,762 million on average (with the upper-bound estimates reaching from \$3,140 to \$4,177 million for the 90th and 99th percentiles). And under the subtitle D requirements and discount rate of 7%, the estimated net present value of avoided releases total \$793 million on average (with the upper-bound estimates reaching from \$1,413 to \$1,880 million for the 90th and 99th percentiles).

In addition, a second Poisson distribution was developed as a sensitivity analysis, using an alternative historical rate of occurrence. This was done to see to what extent an increased release rate would pose in terms of greater risks. Given the age of many CCR surface impoundments, an increase in the release rate might be expected. The cleanup costs avoided under the two co-proposed rules were again calculated as described above and included in the

¹⁶⁴ Recent EPA research demonstrates that CCRs can leach significantly more aggressively under different pH conditions potentially present in disposal units. In U.S. EPA (2009c), a recent ORD study of 34 facilities, CCRs from 19 facilities exceeded at least one of the Toxicity Characteristic regulatory values for at least one type of CCR (e.g., fly ash or FGD residue) at the self-generated pH of the material. This behavior likely explains the rapid migration of constituents from disposal sites like Chesapeake, VA and Gambrills, MD. See also U.S. EPA (2006, 2008b).

RIA, given this alternative higher occurrence rate. To summarize the results of this sensitivity analysis, at a 7% discount rate the estimated net present value of avoided releases under the subtitle C requirements total \$5,154 million on average (with the upper-bound estimates reaching from \$7,356 to \$9,423 million for the 90th and 99th percentiles). And under the subtitle D requirements and same discount rate of 7%, the estimated net present value of avoided releases total \$2,319 million on average (with the upper-bound estimates reaching from \$3,310 to \$4,240 million for the 90th and 99th percentiles).

Finally, a further sensitivity analysis was also performed to determine the extent to which these benefits would change if the catastrophic failures occurred sooner than projected by the Poisson distribution. Here, 96 impoundments were identified that were at least 40 feet tall and at least 25 years old. For the purposes of the assessment, benefit estimates were calculated based on assumed impoundment failure rates of both 10% and 20%. The RIA includes net present value estimates of the avoided cleanup costs under the two co-proposed rules for these two assumed failure rates, which are calculated using both 3% and 7% discount rates. Given the potential earlier releases, the analyses in the RIA find that at a 7% discount rate and a 10% failure rate, the net present value of avoided catastrophic failure costs is \$8,366 under subtitle C, versus \$3,795 million under subtitle D. Furthermore, when assuming a failure rate of 20% rather than 10%, the estimated net present value of avoided catastrophic failure costs increases to \$16,732 million under Subtitle C, versus \$7,590 million under subtitle D.

Beneficial Use Impacts

The last category of such impacts assessed within the RIA includes the potential effects that the different regulatory options for disposal of coal combustion residuals (CCRs) may have upon the quantities of CCRs that are being beneficially used. In the RIA, EPA estimates the expected increase in beneficial use associated with the increased costs of disposing CCRs, and also evaluates potential future changes in the beneficial uses of CCRs as a result of a potential "stigma" effect.

To begin, EPA projected the quantity of CCRs that will be produced in the future, based upon Energy Information Administration's (EIA) estimates of future coal supply and demand. At the same time, EPA also projected the growth in the percent of beneficial use

that would take place absent any EPA rule. Combining these, EPA was able to project the total quantities of beneficially used CCRs under the baseline of no federal rule.

However, it is anticipated that the increased CCR disposal costs associated with a federal RCRA subtitle C rule, and the continued application of the Bevill exclusion to CCRs that are beneficially used, would provide significant incentive to electric utilities avoid higher disposal costs by increasing the quantity of CCRs going to beneficial use. Using the cost projections from the RIA for CCR disposal, EPA assumed that there would initially be unit elasticity with respect to cost, but that the elasticity would decrease with increasing market saturation. Based upon these assumptions, EPA projected the increased growth in beneficial use under a subtitle C rule. EPA then took the monetized benefits of current beneficial use, and applied them to our projected increases in beneficial use under the rule.

When monetized, the values of these increases are extremely large, summing to a net present value of \$5,560 million in economic benefits at a 7% discount rate. Furthermore, when considering total social benefits (e.g., decreased GHG emissions) the numbers are even greater, resulting in \$84,489 million at a 7% discount rate. (Please note that because the total social benefits overlap with the economic benefits, these numbers should not be added together.) This number represents EPA's lower-bound estimate of the potential increase that it anticipates will occur.

On the basis of past experience, EPA believes it is realistic to expect that there is a possibility that recycling rates will increase under a subtitle C rule, increasing the beneficial use of CCRs. However, stakeholders have raised the potential issue of "stigma." Thus, the RIA also assesses this potential stigma effect and develops estimates of its potential impacts. Here, assumptions were made about what losses or reductions might result among the various sectors involved in the beneficial use of CCRs. For example, federally purchased concrete was assumed to stay at baseline levels because of the positive influence of comprehensive procurement guidelines that are already in place to encourage such types of beneficial uses. Conversely, for the purposes of assessing potential stigma effects, the levels of non-federally purchased concrete were assumed to decrease relative to the baseline.

When monetized, the values of these decreases are also large, summing to a

net present value of \$18,744 million in economic costs at a 7% discount rate. Furthermore, when considering total social benefits (e.g., GHG emissions) the numbers are even greater, resulting in \$233,549 million in economic costs at a 7% discount rate. This number represents EPA's estimate of the potential worst-case decrease that could occur in the event of potential stigma effect.

Since the potential increases in beneficial use as discussed above are driven largely by increases in disposal costs under the subtitle C option, EPA further estimated the effects that would result under a subtitle D rule by applying a ratio of the rule's respective costs under both the C and D options. Using the ratio of the subtitle D costs to the subtitle C costs (a ratio of 0.40:1); the net present value of social benefits associated with increased beneficial use under subtitle D would be approximately \$33,796 million (at an assumed discount rate of 7%). It is important to note further that under the subtitle D option for the proposed rule, no such stigma effect would exist and is, therefore, not accounted for in our analyses. However, to the extent that a stigma effect is real, it could just as easily decrease beneficial use under a subtitle D option.

2. Environmental and Public Health Impacts Not Estimated in the RIA Impacts on Plants and Wildlife

The risk assessment estimated significant risk of adverse effects to plants and wildlife, which is confirmed by the many impacts seen in the existing damage cases and field studies published in the peer-reviewed scientific literature. These include: elevated selenium levels in migratory birds, wetland vegetative damage, fish kills, amphibian deformities, snake metabolic effects, plant toxicity, elevated contaminant levels in mammals as a result of environmental uptake, fish deformities, and inhibited fish reproductive capacity. Requirements in the proposed rule should prevent or reduce these impacts in the future by limiting the extent of environmental contamination and thereby reducing the levels directly available.

Impacts on Surface Water Not Captured in the RIA

In EPA's risk assessment, recreational fishers could be exposed to constituents via the groundwater to surface water pathway. Furthermore, State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) and National Pollutant Discharge

Elimination System (NPDES) discharges from wet handling likely exceed the discharges from groundwater to surface water. Thus, exposure to arsenic via fish consumption could be significant. However, EPA expects that most facilities will eventually switch to dry handling of CCRs, a trend which is discussed in the RIA. This will reduce potential exposures to these constituents from affected fish.

Impacts on Ambient Air

Another impact on public health not discussed in the RIA is the potential reduction of excess cancer cases associated with hexavalent chromium inhaled from the air. Since over six million individuals are estimated to live within the Census population data “zip code tabulation areas” for the plant location zip codes of coal-fired power plants affected by this proposed rule,¹⁶⁵ the potential population health effects may be quite large. Inhalation of hexavalent chromium has been shown to cause lung cancer.¹⁶⁶ By requiring fugitive dust controls, the proposed rule would reduce inhalation exposure to hexavalent chromium near waste management units that are not currently required to control fugitive dust.

Non-Cancer Health Effects Associated With CCR Particulate Matter

There are several non-cancer health effects associated with CCRs are a result of particulate matter inhalation due to dry handling. Human health effects for which EPA is evaluating causality due to particulate matter exposure include cardiovascular morbidity, respiratory morbidity, and mortality, reproductive and developmental effects, and cancer.¹⁶⁷ The potential for and extent of adverse health effects due to fugitive dusts from dry handling of CCRs was demonstrated in U.S. EPA 2010b, “Inhalation of Fugitive Dust: A Screening Assessment of the Risks Posed by Coal Combustion Waste Landfills—DRAFT.” The proposed rule’s fugitive dust controls would serve to manage such potential risks by bringing them to acceptable levels.

Particles can also be carried over long distances by wind and then settle on ground or water. The effects of this

settling include: changing the pH of lakes and streams; changing the nutrient balance in coastal waters and large river basins; depleting nutrients in soil; damaging sensitive forests and farm crops; and affecting the diversity of ecosystems.¹⁶⁸ Additionally, fine particulates are known to contribute to haze.¹⁶⁹ Thus, the fugitive dust controls contained in the proposed rule would improve visibility, and reduce the environmental impacts discussed above.

XIII. Other Alternatives EPA Considered

In determining the level of regulation appropriate for the management of CCRs, taking into account both the need for regulations to protect human health and the environment and the practical difficulties associated with implementation of such regulations, the Agency considered a number of approaches in addition to regulating CCRs under subtitle C or subtitle D of RCRA. Specifically, the Agency also considered several combination approaches, such as regulating surface impoundments under subtitle C of RCRA, while regulating landfills under subtitle D of RCRA.

Under all of the approaches EPA considered, CCRs that were beneficially used would retain the Bevill exemption. In addition, under all the approaches, requirements for liners and ground water monitoring would be established, as well as annual inspections of all CCR surface impoundments by an independent registered professional engineer to ensure that the design, operation, and maintenance of surface impoundments are in accordance with recognized and generally accepted good engineering standards. However, the degree and extent of EPA’s authority to promulgate certain requirements, such as permitting, financial assurance, facility-wide corrective action, varies under RCRA subtitle C versus subtitle D. In addition, the degree and extent of federal oversight, including enforcement, varies based on whether a regulation is promulgated under RCRA subtitle C or subtitle D authority. (See Section IV. for a more detailed discussion on the differences in EPA’s authorities under RCRA subtitle C and subtitle D.)

Under one such approach, wet-handled CCRs—that is, those CCRs managed in surface impoundments or similar management units—would be regulated as a hazardous or special waste under RCRA subtitle C, while dry handled CCRs—that is, those CCRs

managed in landfills—would be regulated under RCRA subtitle D. Wet-handled CCR wastes would be regulated under the co-proposed subtitle C alternative described earlier in the preamble (see section VI), while dry-handled CCRs would be regulated under the co-proposed RCRA subtitle D alternative described earlier in the preamble (see section IX). In addition, EPA would retain the existing Bevill exemption for CCRs that are beneficially used. Under this approach, EPA would establish modified requirements for wet-handled CCRs, pursuant to RCRA 3004(x), as laid out in the co-proposed subtitle C alternative.

This approach would have many of the benefits of both of today’s co-proposed regulations. For example, this approach provides a high degree of federal oversight, including permit requirements and federally enforceable requirements, for surface impoundments and similar units that manage wet CCRs. Based on the results of our ground water risk assessment, it would also provide a higher level of protection for those wastes whose method of management presents the greatest risks (*i.e.*, surface impoundments). On the other hand, dry CCRs managed in landfills, while still presenting a risk if the CCRs are not properly managed, clearly present a lower risk, according to the risk assessment and, therefore, a subtitle D approach might be more appropriate. Also, landfills that manage CCRs are unlikely to present a risk of catastrophic failure, such as that posed by surface impoundments that contain large volumes of wet-handled CCRs. EPA also believes this approach could address the concerns of many commenters who expressed their views that subtitle C regulations would overwhelm off-site disposal capacity and would place a stigma on beneficial uses of CCRs.

Of course, this approach also shares the disadvantages of the subtitle C approach, as it applies to surface impoundments, and of the subtitle D approach, as it applies to landfills. For example, portions of the rules applicable to surface impoundments would not become enforceable until authorized states adopt the subtitle C regulations and become authorized; and rules applicable to landfills would not be directly federally enforceable. For a full discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the subtitle C and subtitle D options see sections VI and IX.

Under another approach considered by EPA, the Agency would issue the proposed subtitle C regulations, but they would not go into effect for some time

¹⁶⁵ U.S. EPA. Regulatory Impact Analysis for EPA’s Proposed Regulation of Coal Combustion Wastes Generated by the Electric Utility Industry, 2009. Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery.

¹⁶⁶ ATSDR Texas. Available at: <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxfaq.html>.

¹⁶⁷ Integrated Science Assessment for Particulate Matter: First External Review Draft. EPA/600/R-08/139. Research Triangle Park, NC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development. 2008.

¹⁶⁸ <http://www.epa.gov/particles/health.html>.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

period, such as three years, as an example, after promulgation. The rule would include a condition that would exclude CCRs from regulation under subtitle C of RCRA in states that: (1) Had developed final enforceable subtitle D regulations that are protective of human health and the environment,¹⁷⁰ (2) had submitted those regulations to EPA for review within two years after the promulgation date of EPA's subtitle C rule, and (3) EPA had approved within one year, through a process allowing for notice and comment, possibly comparable to the current MSW subtitle D approval process. If a state failed to develop such a program within the two year timeframe for state adoption of the regulations or if EPA did not approve a state program within the one-year timeframe for state approval, the hazardous waste or special waste listing would become effective. Under this alternative, each state would be evaluated individually, which could lead to a situation where CCRs were managed as hazardous or special wastes in certain states, while in other states, they would be managed as non-hazardous wastes. Such an approach could present some implementation issues, particularly if CCRs were transported across state lines. In addition, EPA has serious questions as to whether RCRA, as currently drafted, would allow EPA to promulgate such a regulation. However, EPA solicits comments on this option, both generally and with respect to the specific time frames.

Commenters also have suggested an approach similar to that proposed for cement kiln dust (CKD) in an August 20, 1999 proposed rule (*see* 64 FR 45632 available at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-WASTE/1999/August/Day-20/f20546.htm>). Under the CKD approach, the Agency would establish detailed management standards under subtitle D of RCRA. CCRs managed in accordance with the standards would not be a hazardous or special waste. However, CCRs that were in egregious violation of these requirements, such as disposal in land-based disposal units that were not monitored for groundwater releases or in new units built without liners, would be considered listed hazardous or special waste and subject to the tailored subtitle C requirements. (EPA is soliciting comment on this approach because commenters have suggested it;

interested commenters may wish to consult the CKD proposal for more detail on how it would work. *See* 64 FR 45632 available at <http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/nonhaz/industrial/special/ckd/ckd/ckd-fr.pdf>). Like the previous approach, EPA is evaluating (and in fact is re-evaluating) this approach, and whether RCRA provides EPA the authority to promulgate such a rule.

Other commenters suggested yet another approach whereby EPA would regulate CCRs going for disposal under RCRA subtitle C, but they assert that EPA would not have to specifically list CCR as a hazardous waste using the criteria established in 40 CFR 261.11. These commenters believe that RCRA § 3001(b)(3)(A) (the so-called Bevill Amendment) authorizes the Agency to regulate CCRs under subtitle C as long as the Agency determines that subtitle C regulation is warranted based on the consideration of the eight factors identified in RCRA § 8002(n). The commenters analysis of their approach is set forth in a memorandum submitted to the Agency and is in the docket for today's notice. EPA has not adopted the commenters suggested reading of the statute, but solicits comments on it. (*See* "EPA Has Clear Authority to Regulate CCW under RCRA's Subtitle C without Making a Formal Listing Determination," White Paper from Eric Schaeffer, Environmental Integrity Project which is available in the docket for this proposal.)

Finally, some commenters have suggested that EPA not promulgate any standards, whether it be RCRA subtitle C or D, but continue to rely on the states to regulate CCRs under their existing or new state authority, and that EPA could rely on RCRA section 7003 (imminent and substantial endangerment) authority, to the extent the Agency had information that a problem existed that it needed to address. The Agency does not believe that such an approach is at all acceptable, and that national regulations whether it be under RCRA subtitle C or D needs to be promulgated. First, RCRA was designed as a preventative statute and not one where EPA would get involved only after a problem has been discovered. Thus, such an approach would not be consistent with the purpose and objectives of RCRA. In addition, this approach would basically implement the status quo—that is, the control of CCRs over the last decade, which the Agency believes has not shown to be at all acceptable. Furthermore, imminent and substantial endangerment authority is facility-specific and resource intensive. That is, such authority can only be used when EPA has sufficient

information to determine that disposal of CCRs are contributing to an imminent and substantial endangerment. Thus, relying on this authority, without national regulations, is poorly suited to address the many problems that have occurred, and are likely to occur in the future. Nevertheless, the Agency solicits comment on such an approach.

EPA solicits comments on all of the approaches discussed above. The Agency is still considering all of these approaches, as well as our legal authorities to promulgate them, and will continue to do so as we move toward finalizing the regulations applicable to the disposal of CCRs.

XIV. Is the EPA soliciting comments on specific issues?

Throughout today's preamble, the Agency has identified many issues for which it is soliciting comment along with supporting information and data. In order to assist readers in providing EPA comments and supporting information, in this section EPA is identifying many of the major issues on which comments with supporting information and data are requested.

Management of CCRs

- Whether regulatory approaches should be established individually for the four Bevill CCR wastes (fly ash, bottom ash, boiler slag, and FGD sludges) when destined for disposal.
- The extent to which the information currently available to EPA reflects current industry practices at both older and new units.
- The regulatory approaches proposed in the notice and the alternative approaches EPA is considering as discussed in Section XIII of the preamble.
- The Agency has documented, through proven damage cases and risk analyses, that the wet handling of CCRs in surface impoundments poses higher risks to human health and the environment than the dry handling of CCRs in landfills. EPA seeks comments on the standards proposed in this notice to protect human health and the environment from the wet handling of CCRs. For example, in light of the TVA Kingston, Tennessee, and the Martins Creek, Pennsylvania CCR impoundment failures, should the Agency require that owners or operators of existing and new CCR surface impoundments submit emergency response plans to the regulatory authority if wet handling of CCRs is practiced?
- The degree to which coal refuse management practices have changed and the impacts of those changes or, for

¹⁷⁰ Under this approach, EPA also would establish minimum national standards that ensure that CCRs that are managed under the "D" regulations would be protective of human health and the environment.

example, groundwater monitoring and the use of liners.

- Information and data on CCRs that are generated by non-utility industries, such as volumes generated, characteristics of the CCRs, and whether they are co-managed with other wastes generated by the non-utility industry.

Risk Assessment

- Are there any additional data that are representative of CCR constituents in surface impoundment or landfill leachate (from literature, state files, industry or other sources) that EPA has not identified and should be used in evaluating the risks presented by the land disposal of CCRs?
- The screening analysis conducted to estimate risks from fugitive CCR dust; data from any ambient air monitoring for particulate matter that has been conducted; where air monitoring stations are located near CCR landfills or surface impoundments; and information on any techniques, such as wetting, compaction, or daily cover that are or can be employed to reduce such exposures.
- Whether site-averaged porewater data used in model runs in EPA's risk analyses are representative of leachate from surface impoundments.
- Information and data regarding the existence of drinking water wells that are down-gradient of CCR disposal units, any monitoring data that exists on those monitoring wells and the potential of these wells to be intercepted by surface water bodies.

Liners

- Whether, in addition to the flexibility provided by section 3004(o)(2), regulations should also provide for alternative liner designs based on, for example, a specific performance standard, such as the performance standard in 40 CFR 258.40(a)(1), or a site specific risk assessment, or a standard that the alternative liner, such as a clay liner, was at least as effective as the composite liner.
- Whether clay liners designed to meet a 1×10^{-7} cm/sec hydraulic conductivity might perform differently in practice than modeled in the risk assessment, including specific data on the hydraulic conductivity of clay liners associated with CCR disposal units.
- The effectiveness of such additives as organosilanes, including any analyses that would reflect long-term performance of the additives, as well as the appropriateness of a performance standard that would allow the use of these additives in lieu of composite liners.

Beneficial Use

- The growth and maturation of state beneficial use programs and the growing recognition that the beneficial use of CCRs is a critical component in strategies to reduce GHG emissions taking into account the potentially changing composition of CCRs as a result of improved air pollution controls and the new science on metals leaching.
- Information and data on the extent to which states request and evaluate CCR characterization data prior to the beneficial use of unencapsulated CCRs.
- The appropriate means of characterizing beneficial uses that are both protective of human health and the environment and provide benefits. EPA is also requesting information and data demonstrating where the federal and state programs could improve on being environmentally protective and, where states have, or are developing, increasingly effective beneficial use programs.
- Whether certain uses of CCRs (*e.g.*, uses involving unencapsulated uses of CCRs) warrant tighter control and why such tighter control is necessary.
- If EPA determines that regulations are needed for the beneficial use of CCRs, should EPA consider removing the Bevill exemption for such uses and regulate these uses under RCRA subtitle C, develop regulations under RCRA subtitle D or some other statutory authority, such as under the Toxic Substances Control Act?
- Whether it is necessary to define beneficial use better or develop detailed guidance on the beneficial use of CCRs to ensure protection of human health and the environment, including whether certain unencapsulated beneficial uses should be prohibited.
- Whether the Agency should promulgate standards allowing uses on the land, on a site-specific basis, based on site specific risk assessments, taking into consideration the composition of CCRs, their leaching potential under the range of conditions under which the CCRs would be managed, and the context in which CCRs would be applied, such as location, volume, rate of application, and proximity to water.
- If materials characterization is required, what type of characterization is most appropriate? If the CCRs exceed the toxicity characteristic at pH levels different from the TCLP, should they be excluded from beneficial use? When are totals levels relevant?
- Whether EPA should fully develop a leaching assessment tool in combination with the Draft SW-846 leaching test methods described in Section I. F. 2 and other tools (*e.g.*,

USEPA's *Industrial Waste Management Evaluation Model* (IWEM)) to aid prospective beneficial users in calculating potential release rates over a specified period of time for a range of management scenarios.

- Information and data relating to the agricultural use of FGD gypsum, including the submission of historical data, taking into account the impact of pH on leaching potential of metals, the variable and changing nature of CCRs, and variable site conditions.
 - Historically, EPA has proposed or imposed conditions on other types of hazardous wastes used in a manner constituting disposal (*e.g.*, maximum application rates and risk-based concentration limits for cement kiln dust used as a liming agent in agricultural applications (*see* 64 FR 45639; August 20, 1999); maximum allowable total concentrations for non-nutritive and toxic metals in zinc fertilizers produced from recycled hazardous secondary materials (*see* 67 FR 48393; July 24, 2002). Should EPA establish standards, such as maximum/minimum thresholds, or rely on implementing states to impose CCR site-specific limits based on front-end characterization that ensures individual beneficial uses remain protective?
 - Whether additional beneficial uses of CCRs have been established, since the May 2000 Regulatory Determination, that have not been discussed elsewhere in today's preamble. The Agency solicits comment on any new uses of CCR, as well as the information and data which support that CCRs are beneficially used in an environmentally sound manner.
 - Whether there are incentives that could be provided that would increase the amount of CCRs that are beneficially used and comment on specific incentives that EPA could adopt that would further encourage the beneficial use of CCRs.
 - Information and data on the best means for estimating current and future quantities and changes in the beneficial use of CCRs, as well as on the price elasticity of CCR applications in the beneficial use market.
- #### *Stigma*
- If EPA were to regulate CCRs as a "special waste" under subtitle C of RCRA, and stigma turns out to be an issue, suggestions on methods by which the Agency could reduce any stigmatic impact that might indirectly arise. We are seeking information on actual instances where "stigma" has adversely affected the beneficial use of CCRs and the causes of these adverse effects.
 - The issue of "stigma" and its impact on beneficial uses of CCRs, including

more specifics on the potential for procedural difficulties for state programs, and measures that EPA might adopt to try to mitigate these effects.

- For those commenters who argue that regulating CCRs under subtitle C of RCRA would raise liability issues, EPA requests that commenters describe the types of liability and the basis/data/information on which these claims are based.

- EPA furthermore welcomes ideas on how to best estimate these effects for purposes of conducting regulatory impact analysis, and requests any data or methods that would assist in this effort.

Today's Co-Proposed Regulations

General

- Some commenters have suggested that EPA not promulgate any standards, whether they be RCRA subtitle C or D, but continue to rely on the states to regulate CCRs under their existing or new state authorities. The Agency solicits comment on such an approach, including how such an approach would be protective of human health and the environment.

RCRA Subtitle C Regulations

- Whether EPA should modify the corrective action requirements for facility-wide corrective action under the subtitle C co-proposal under the authority of section 3004(x) of RCRA. If so, how such modification would be protective of human health and the environment.

- Pursuant to RCRA section 3010 and 40 CFR 270.1(b), facilities managing these special wastes subject to RCRA subtitle C must notify EPA of their waste management activities within 90 days after the wastes are identified or listed as a special waste. The Agency is proposing to waive this notification requirement for persons who handle CCRs and have already: (1) notified EPA that they manage hazardous wastes, and (2) received an EPA identification number. Should such persons be required to re-notify the Agency that they generate, transport, treat, store or dispose of CCRs?

- Representatives of the utility industry have stated their view that CCRs cannot be practically or cost effectively managed under the existing RCRA subtitle C storage standards, and that these standards impose significant costs without meaningful benefits when applied specifically to CCRs. Comments are solicited on the practicality of the proposed subtitle C storage requirements for CCRs, the workability of the existing variance process allowing

alternatives to secondary containment, and the alternative requirements based, for example, on the mining and mineral processing waste storage requirements.

RCRA Subtitle D Regulations

- EPA broadly solicits comment on the approach of relying on certifications by independent registered professional hydrologists or engineers of the adequacy of actions taken at coal-fired utilities to design and operate safe waste management systems.

- The Agency does not have specific data showing the number of CCR landfills located in fault areas where movement along Holocene faults is common, and the distance between these units and the active faults and, thus, is unable to precisely estimate the number of these existing CCR landfills that would not meet today's proposed fault area restrictions. Additional information regarding the extent to which existing landfills are currently located in such locations is solicited.

- In general, EPA believes that a 200-foot buffer zone is necessary to protect engineered structures from seismic damages and also expects that the 200-foot buffer is appropriate for CCR surface impoundments. The Agency seeks comment and data on whether the buffer zone should be greater for surface impoundments.

- Additional information regarding the extent to which landfill capacity would be affected by applying the proposed subtitle D location restrictions to existing CCR landfills.

- The proposed location requirements do not reflect a complete prohibition on siting facilities in areas of concern, but provide a performance standard that facilities must meet in order to site a unit in such a location. Information on the extent to which facilities could comply with the proposed performance standards, and the necessary costs that would be incurred to retrofit CCR disposal units to meet these standards is solicited.

- The proposed definition of seismic impact zones and whether there are variants that could lessen the burden on the industry and the geographic areas covered by the proposed definition.

- Whether the subtitle D option, if promulgated, should allow facilities to use alternative designs for new disposal units, so long as the owner or operator of a unit could obtain certification from an independent registered professional engineer or hydrologist that the alternative design would ensure that the appropriate concentration values for a set of constituents typical of CCRs will not be exceeded in the uppermost aquifer at the relevant point of

compliance (*i.e.*, 150 meters from the unit boundary down gradient from the unit, or the property boundary if the point of compliance is beyond the property boundary).

- Whether there could be homeland security implications with the requirement to post information on an internet site and whether posting certain information on the internet may duplicate information that is already available to the public through the State.

- Whether the subtitle "D prime" option is protective of human health and the environment.

- EPA is proposing that existing CCR landfills and surface impoundments that cannot make a showing that a CCR landfill or surface impoundment can be operated safely in a floodplain or unstable area must close within five years after the effective date of the rule. EPA solicits comment on the appropriate amount of time necessary to meet this requirement, as well as measures that could help to address the potential for inadequate disposal capacity.

- The effectiveness of annual surface impoundment assessments in ensuring the structural integrity of CCR surface impoundments over the long term.

Surface Impoundment Closeout

- Whether the Agency should provide for a variance process allowing some surface impoundments that manage wet-handled CCRs to remain in operation because they present minimal risk to groundwater (*e.g.*, because they have a composite liner) and minimal risk of a catastrophic release (*e.g.*, as indicated by a low or less than low potential hazard rating under the Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety established by the Federal Emergency Management Agency).

Surface Impoundment Stability

- The adequacy of EPA's proposals to address surface impoundment integrity under RCRA.

- Whether to address all CCR impoundments for stability, regardless of height and storage volume; whether to use the cut-offs in the MSHA regulations; or whether other regulations, approaches, or size cut-offs should be used. If commenters believe that other regulations or different size cut-offs should be adopted, we request that commenters provide the basis and technical support for their position.

- Whether surface impoundment integrity should be addressed under EPA's NPDES permit program, rather than the development of regulations under RCRA, whether it be RCRA subtitles C or D.

Financial Assurance

- EPA broadly solicits comments on whether financial assurance should be a key program element under a subtitle D approach, if the decision is made to promulgate regulations under RCRA subtitle D.
- Whether financial responsibility requirements under CERCLA § 108(b) should be a key Agency focus for ensuring that funds are available for addressing the mismanagement of CCRs.
- How the financial assurance requirements might apply to surface impoundments that cease receiving CCRs before the effective date of the rule.
- Whether a financial test similar to that in 40 CFR 258.74(f) in the Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills should be established for local governments that own and operate coal-fired power plants.

State Programs

- Detailed information on current and past individual state regulatory and non-regulatory approaches taken to ensure the safe management of CCRs, not only under State waste authorities, but under other authorities as well, including the implementation of those approaches.
- The potential of federal regulations to cause disruption to States' implementation of CCR regulatory programs under their own authorities, including more specifics on the potential for procedural difficulties for State programs, and measures that EPA might adopt to try to mitigate these effects.

Damage Cases

- EPRI's report and additional data regarding the proven damage cases identified by EPA, especially the degree to which there was off-site contamination.
- The report of additional damage cases submitted to EPA on February 24, 2010 by the Environmental Integrity Project and EarthJustice.

Regulatory Impact Analysis

- Data and findings presented in the RIA, as well as on the cost and benefit estimation uncertainty factors identified in the RIA.
- Data on the costs of converting coal fired power plants from wet handling to dry handling with respect to the various air pollution controls, transportation systems, disposal units, and other heterogeneous factors.
- Relevant RCRA corrective actions and related costs that would be useful in characterizing the potential costs for future actions.

- Information on other significant and catastrophic surface impoundment releases of CCRs or other similar materials and cleanup costs associated with these releases?

- Data on the costs of storage of CCRs in tanks or tank systems, on pads, or in buildings.

- EPA has also quantified and monetized the benefits of this rule to the extent possible based on available data and modeling tools, but welcomes additional data that may be available that would assist the Agency in expanding and refining our existing benefit estimates.

XV. Executive Orders and Laws Addressed in This Action

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review

Under section 3(f)(1) of Executive Order (EO) 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is an "economically significant regulatory action" because it is likely to have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more (section 3(f)(1)). This determination is based on the regulatory cost estimates provided in EPA's "Regulatory Impact Analysis" (RIA) which is available in the docket for this proposal. The RIA estimated regulatory implementation and compliance costs, benefits and net benefits for a number of regulatory options, including a subtitle C "special waste" option, a subtitle D option and, a subtitle "D prime" option. The subtitle D prime option was briefly described in the Preamble and is more fully discussed in the RIA to the co-proposal. On an average annualized basis, the estimated regulatory compliance costs for the three options in today's proposed action are \$1,474 million (subtitle C special waste), \$587 million (subtitle D), and \$236 million (subtitle "D prime") per year. On an average annualized basis, the estimated regulatory benefits for the three options in today's proposed action are \$6,320 to \$7,405 million (subtitle C special waste), \$2,533 to \$3,026 million (subtitle D), and \$1,023 to \$1,268 million (subtitle "D prime") per year. On an average annualized basis, the estimated regulatory net benefits for the three options in today's proposed action are \$4,845 to \$5,930 million (subtitle C special waste), \$1,947 to \$2,439 million (subtitle D), and \$786 to \$1,032 million (subtitle "D prime") per year. All options exceed \$100 million in expected future annual effect. Accordingly, EPA submitted this action to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review under EO 12866, and changes made in response to

OMB recommendations are documented in the docket for this proposal.

B. Paperwork Reduction Act

The information collection requirements contained in this proposed rule has been submitted for approval to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the *Paperwork Reduction Act*, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* The Information Collection Request (ICR) document prepared by EPA has been assigned EPA ICR number 1189.22.

Today's action co-proposes two regulatory alternatives that would regulate the disposal of CCRs under RCRA. The regulatory options described in today's notice contain mandatory information collection requirements. One of the regulatory options (subtitle C special waste option) would also trigger mandatory emergency notification requirements for releases of hazardous substances to the environment under CERCLA and EPCRA. The labor hour burden and associated cost for these requirements are estimated in the ICR "Supporting Statement" for today's proposed action. The Supporting Statement identifies and estimates the burden for the following nine categories of information collection: (the proposed options also contain other regulatory requirements not listed here because they do not involve information collection).

1. Groundwater monitoring
2. Post-closure groundwater monitoring
3. RCRA manifest cost (for subtitle C only)
4. Added cost of RCRA subtitle C permits for all offsite CCR landfills
5. Structural integrity inspections
6. RCRA facility-wide investigation (for subtitle C only)
7. RCRA TSDF hazardous waste disposal permit (for subtitle C only)
8. RCRA enforcement inspection (for subtitle C only)
9. Recordkeeping requirements

Based on the same data and cost calculations applied in the "Regulatory Impact Analysis" (RIA) for today's action, but using the burden estimation methods for ICRs, the ICR "Supporting Statement" estimates an average annual labor hour burden of 2.88 million hours for the subtitle C "special waste" option and 1.38 million hours for both the subtitle D and "D prime" options at an average annual cost of \$192.93 million for the subtitle C "special waste" option and \$92.6 million for both the subtitle D options. One-time capital and hourly costs are included in these estimates based on a three-year annualization period. The estimated number of likely respondents (under the options) ranges

from 90 to 495, depending on the information category enumerated above. Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.3(b). 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 EPA's regulations in 40 CFR 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 suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, EPA has established a public docket for this rule, which includes this ICR, under Docket ID number EPA-HQ-RCRA-2009-0640. Submit any comments related to the ICR to EPA and OMB. See **ADDRESSES** section at the beginning of this notice for where to submit comments to EPA. Send comments to OMB at the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention: Desk Office for EPA. Since OMB is required to make a decision concerning the ICR between 30 and 60 days after June 21, 2010, a comment to OMB is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it by July 21, 2010. The final rule will respond to any OMB or public comments on the information collection requirements contained in this proposal.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an Agency to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute unless the Agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions.

For purposes of assessing the impacts of today's rule on small entities in the electric utility industry, small entity is defined as: (1) A small fossil fuel electric utility plant as defined by NAICS code 221112 with a threshold of less than four million megawatt-hours of electricity output generated per year (based on Small Business Administration size standards); (2) a small governmental jurisdiction that is a government based on municipalities with a population of less than 50,000; and (3) a small organization that is any not-for-profit enterprise which is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field.

EPA certifies that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities (*i.e.*, no SISNOSE). EPA nonetheless continues to be interested in the potential impacts of the proposed rule on small entities and welcomes comments on issues related to such impacts, including our estimated count of small entities that own the 495 electric utility plants covered by this rule. This certification is based on the small business analysis contained in the RIA for today's proposal, which contains the following findings and estimates.

- The RIA identifies 495 electric utility plants likely affected by the proposed rule, based on 2007 data. The RIA estimates these 495 plants are owned by 200 entities consisting of 121 companies, 18 cooperative organizations, 60 state or local governmental jurisdictions, and one Federal government Agency. The RIA estimates that 51 of these 200 owner entities (*i.e.*, 26%) may be classified as small entities, consisting of 33 small municipal governments, 11 small companies, 6 small cooperatives, plus 1 small county government.

- The RIA includes a set of higher cost estimates for the regulatory options and the RFA evaluation is based on these estimates and therefore overestimates potential impacts of our proposed regulations. The RIA estimated that (a) None of the 51 small entities may experience average annualized regulatory compliance costs of greater than three percent of annual revenues, (b) one to five of the 51 small entities (*i.e.*, 2% to 10%) may experience regulatory costs greater than one percent of annual revenues, and (c) 46 to 50 of the small entities (*i.e.*, 90% to 98%) may experience regulatory costs less than one percent of annual revenues. These percentages constitute the basis for today's no-SISNOSE certification.

As analyzed in the RIA, there are two electricity market factors which may be expected to reduce or eliminate these potential revenue impacts on small entities, as well as for the other owner entities for the 495 plants:

- Electric utility plants have a mechanism to cover operating cost increases via rate hike petitions to public utility commissions in states which regulate public utilities, and via market price increases in the 18 states (as of 2008) which have de-regulated electric utilities, and
- The residential, commercial, industrial, and transportation sector economic demand for (*i.e.*, consumption of) electricity is relatively price

inelastic, which suggests that electric utility plants may succeed in passing through most or all regulatory costs to their electricity customers.

However, because the Agency is sensitive to any potential impacts its regulations may have on small entities, the Agency requests comment on its analysis, and its finding that this action is not expected to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538, requires Federal agencies, unless otherwise prohibited by law, to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. This co-proposal contains a Federal mandate that may result in expenditures of \$100 million or more for State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or for the private sector, in any one year.

The RIA includes a set of higher cost estimates for the regulatory options and the UMRA evaluation is based on these estimates and therefore overestimates the potential impacts of this co-proposal. Accordingly, EPA has prepared under section 202 of the UMRA a "Written Statement" (an appendix to the RIA) which is summarized below. Today's co-proposal will likely affect 495 electric utility plants owned by an estimated 200 entities, of which 139 private sector electric utility companies and cooperatives may incur between \$415 million to \$1,999 million in future annual direct costs across the high-end options in the RIA, which exceed the \$100 million UMRA direct cost threshold under each of the regulatory options. In addition, 60 entities are state or local governments which may incur between \$56 million to \$97 million in future annual direct costs across the regulatory options, the upper-end of which is slightly under the \$100 million UMRA direct cost threshold. The remainder single entity is a Federal government Agency (*i.e.*, Tennessee Valley Authority).

Although the estimated annual direct cost on state or local governments is less than the \$100 million UMRA threshold, (a) because the highest-cost regulatory option is only 3% less than the \$100 million annual direct cost threshold, and (b) because there are a number of uncertainty factors (as identified in the RIA) which could result in regulatory costs being lower or higher than estimated, EPA consulted with small governments according to EPA's UMRA interim small government consultation

plan developed pursuant to section 203 of the UMRA. EPA's interim plan provides for two types of possible small government input: technical input and administrative input. According to this plan, and consistent with section 204 of the UMRA, early in the process for developing today's co-proposal, the Agency implemented a small government consultation process consisting of two consultation components.

- A series of meetings in calendar year 2009 were held with the purpose of acquiring small government technical input, including: (1) A February 27 meeting with ASTSWMO's Coal Ash Workgroup (Washington, DC); (2) a March 22–24 meeting with ECOS at their Spring Meeting (Alexandria VA); (3) a April 15–16 meeting with ASTSWMO at their Mid-Year Meeting (Columbus OH), (4) a May 12–13 meeting at the EPA Region IV State Directors Meeting (Atlanta, GA), (5) a June 17–18 meeting at the ASTSWMO Solid Waste Managers Conference (New Orleans, LA), (6) a July 21–23 meeting at ASTSWMO's Board of Directors Meeting (Seattle, WA), and (7) an August 12 meeting at ASTSWMO's Hazardous Waste Subcommittee Meeting (Washington, DC). ASTSWMO is an organization with a mission to work closely with EPA to ensure that its state government members are aware of the most current developments related to their state waste management programs. ECOS is a national non-profit, non-partisan association of state and territorial environmental Agency leaders. As a result of these meetings, EPA received letters in mid-2009 from 22 state governments, as well as a letter from ASTSWMO expressing their stance on CCR disposal regulatory options.

Letters were mailed on August 24, 2009 to the following 10 organizations representing state and local elected officials, to inform them and seek their input for today's proposed rulemaking, as well as to invite them to a meeting held on September 16, 2009 in Washington, DC: (1) National Governors Association; (2) National Conference of State Legislatures, (3) Council of State Governments, (4) National League of Cities, (5) U.S. Conference of Mayors, (6) County Executives of America, (7) National Association of Counties, (8) International City/County Management Association, (9) National Association of Towns and Townships, and (10) ECOS. These 10 organizations of elected state and local officials are identified in EPA's November 2008 Federalism guidance as the "Big 10" organizations appropriate to contact for purpose of consultation with elected officials. EPA

has received written comments from a number of these organizations and a copy of their comments has been placed in the docket for this rulemaking. The commenters express significant concerns with classifying CCRs as a hazardous waste. Their major concerns are that federal regulation could undercut or be duplicative of State regulations; that any federal regulation will have a great impact on already limited State resources; and that such a rule would have a negative effect on beneficial use. A number of commenters also raise the issue of the cost to their facilities of a subtitle C rule, particularly increased disposal costs and the potential shortage of hazardous waste disposal capacity.

Consistent with section 205 of UMRA, EPA identified and considered a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives. Today's proposed rule identifies a number of regulatory options, and EPA's RIA estimates that the average annual direct cost to industry across the three originally considered options (e.g. as reflected in the RIA in Exhibit 7L) may range between \$415 million to \$1,999 million. Section 205 of the UMRA requires Federal agencies to select the least costly or most cost-effective regulatory alternative unless the Agency publishes with the final rule an explanation of why such alternative was not adopted. We are co-proposing two regulatory options in today's notice involving RCRA subtitle C "special waste" and subtitle D. The justification for co-proposing the higher-cost options is that this provides for greater benefits and protection of public health and the environment by phasing out surface impoundments, compared to the lower cost subtitle D prime option.

E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

Executive Order 13132, entitled "Federalism" (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" are defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have "substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government."

Under Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless

the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

EPA has concluded that this proposed rule may have federalism implications, because it may impose substantial direct compliance costs on State or local governments, and the Federal government may not provide the funds necessary to pay those costs. Accordingly, EPA provides the following federalism summary impact statement as required by section 6(b) of Executive Order 13132.

The RIA includes a set of higher cost estimates for the regulatory options and the Federalism evaluation is based on these estimates and, therefore, overestimates the potential impacts of our proposal.

Based on the estimates in EPA's RIA for today's action, the proposed regulatory options, if promulgated, may have federalism implications because the options may impose between \$56 million to \$97 million in annual direct compliance costs on 60 state or local governments. These 60 state and local governments consist of 33 small municipal government jurisdictions, 19 non-small municipal government jurisdictions, 7 state government jurisdictions, and one county government jurisdiction. In addition, the 48 state governments with RCRA-authorized programs for the proposed regulatory options may incur between \$0.05 million to over \$5.4 million in added annual administrative costs involving the 495 electric utility plants for reviewing and enforcing the various requirements. Based on these estimates, the expected annual cost to state and local governments for at least one of the regulatory options described in today's notice exceeds the \$25 million per year "substantial compliance cost" threshold defined in section 1.2(A)(1) of EPA's November 2008 "Guidance on Executive Order 13132: Federalism." In developing the regulatory options described in today's notice, EPA consulted with 10 national organizations representing state and local elected officials to ensure meaningful and timely input by state/local governments, consisting of two consultation components, which is described under the UMRA Executive Order discussion.

In the spirit of Executive Order 13132, and consistent with EPA policy to promote communications between EPA and State and local governments, EPA specifically solicits comment on this co-