Federal Register

4–20–04 Tuesday
Vol. 69 No. 76 Apr. 20, 2004

United States
Government
Printing Office
SUPERINTENDENT
OF DOCUMENTS
Washington, DC 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for Private Use $300

PERIODICALS
Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Government Printing Office
(ISSN 0097–6326)

Federal Register

4–20–04 Tuesday
Vol. 69 No. 76 Apr. 20, 2004

Pages 21039–21392

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** (ISSN 0097–6326) is published daily, Monday through Friday, except official holidays, by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, under the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. Ch. 15) and the regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register (1 CFR Ch. I). The Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 is the exclusive distributor of the official edition. Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, DC.

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** provides a uniform system for making available to the public regulations and legal notices issued by Federal agencies. These include Presidential proclamations and Executive Orders, Federal agency documents having general applicability and legal effect, documents required to be published by act of Congress, and other Federal agency documents of public interest.

Documents are on file for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register the day before they are published, unless the issuing agency requests earlier filing. For a list of documents currently on file for public inspection, *www.archives.gov*.

The seal of the National Archives and Records Administration authenticates the Federal Register as the official serial publication established under the Federal Register Act. Under 44 U.S.C. 1507, the contents of the **Federal Register** shall be judicially noticed.

The **Federal Register** is published in paper and on 24x microfiche. It is also available online at no charge as one of the databases on GPO Access, a service of the U.S. Government Printing Office.

The online edition of the **Federal Register** *www.access.gpo.gov/nara*, available through GPO Access, is issued under the authority of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register as the official legal equivalent of the paper and microfiche editions (44 U.S.C. 4101 and 1 CFR 5.10). It is updated by 6 a.m. each day the **Federal Register** is published and includes both text and graphics from Volume 59, Number 1 (January 2, 1994) forward.

For more information about GPO Access, contact the GPO Access User Support Team, call toll free 1-888-293-6498; DC area 202-512-1530; fax at 202-512-1262; or via email at *gpoaccess@gpo.gov*. The Support Team is available between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday–Friday, except official holidays.

The annual subscription price for the **Federal Register** paper edition is $749 plus postage, or $808, plus postage, for a combined **Federal Register, Federal Register** Index and List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA) subscription; the microfiche edition of the **Federal Register** including the **Federal Register** Index and LSA is $165, plus postage. Six month subscriptions are available for one-half the annual rate. The prevailing postal rates will be applied to orders according to the delivery method requested. The price of a single copy of the daily **Federal Register,** including postage, is based on the number of pages: $11 for an issue containing less than 200 pages; $22 for an issue containing 200 to 400 pages; and $33 for an issue containing more than 400 pages. Single issues of the microfiche edition may be purchased for $3 per copy, including postage. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or charge to your GPO Deposit Account, VISA, MasterCard, American Express, or Discover. Mail to: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954; or call toll free 1-866-512-1800, DC area 202-512-1800; or go to the U.S. Government Online Bookstore site, *bookstore@gpo.gov*.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the **Federal Register.**

How To Cite This Publication: Use the volume number and the page number. Example: 69 FR 12345.

Postmaster: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, Federal Register, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington DC 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

Printed on recycled paper.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND COPIES

PUBLIC

Subscriptions:

Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public subscriptions	**202–512–1806**
General online information	**202–512–1530; 1–888–293–6498**

Single copies/back copies:

Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public single copies	**1–866–512–1800 (Toll-Free)**

FEDERAL AGENCIES

Subscriptions:

Paper or fiche	**202–741–6005**
Assistance with Federal agency subscriptions	**202–741–6005**

What's NEW!

Federal Register Table of Contents via e-mail

Subscribe to FEDREGTOC, to receive the **Federal Register** Table of Contents in your e-mail every day.

If you get the HTML version, you can click directly to any document in the issue.

To subscribe, go to **http://listserv.access.gpo.gov** and select:

Online mailing list archives
FEDREGTOC-L
Join or leave the list

Then follow the instructions.

What's NEW!

Regulations.gov, the award-winning Federal eRulemaking Portal

Regulations.gov is the one-stop U.S. Government web site that makes it easy to participate in the regulatory process.

Try this fast and reliable resource to find all rules published in the *Federal Register* that are currently open for public comment. Submit comments to agencies by filling out a simple web form, or use available email addresses and web sites.

The Regulations.gov e-democracy initiative is brought to you by NARA, GPO, EPA and their eRulemaking partners.

Visit the web site at: **http://www.regulations.gov**

Contents

Federal Register

Vol. 69, No. 76

Tuesday, April 20, 2004

Separate Parts In This Issue

Reader Aids
Consult the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue for phone numbers, online resources, finding aids, reminders, and notice of recently enacted public laws.

To subscribe to the Federal Register Table of Contents LISTSERV electronic mailing list, go to http://listserv.access.gpo.gov and select Online mailing list archives, FEDREGTOC-L, Join or leave the list (or change settings); then follow the instructions.

CFR PARTS AFFECTED IN THIS ISSUE

A cumulative list of the parts affected this month can be found in the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue.

5 CFR
537.....21039

7 CFR
301.....21039

9 CFR
93.....21040
94.....21042
98.....21042
320.....21047
381.....21047

14 CFR
39.....21049
73.....21053

Proposed Rules:
61.....21073
91.....21073
119.....21073
121.....21073
135.....21073
136.....21073

15 CFR
738.....21055
740.....21055

16 CFR

Proposed Rules:
682.....21388

17 CFR
200.....21057

28 CFR
803.....21058
804.....21059

30 CFR

Proposed Rules:
917.....21075

33 CFR
117 (4 documents) 21061, 21062, 21064
147.....21065
165.....21067

38 CFR
20.....21068

Proposed Rules:
17.....21075

40 CFR

Proposed Rules:
63.....21198
264.....21198
265.....21198
266.....21198
270.....21198
271 (2 documents) 21077, 21198

49 CFR
595.....21069

50 CFR
229.....21070

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register
Vol. 69, No. 76
Tuesday, April 20, 2004

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

5 CFR Part 537

RIN 3206–AK37

Repayment of Student Loans

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Office of Personnel Management is issuing final regulations to implement provisions of the Federal Employee Student Loan Assistance Act which increase the maximum amounts Federal agencies are authorized to repay under the Federal student loan repayment program.

DATES: The regulations are effective April 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gene Holson by telephone at (202) 606–2858; by fax at (202) 606–0824; or by e-mail at *pay-performance-policy@opm.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is issuing final regulations to implement provisions of the Federal Employee Student Loan Assistance Act (Pub. L. 108–123, Nov. 11, 2003) which increase the maximum amounts Federal agencies are authorized to repay under the Federal student loan repayment program. The Act amended 5 U.S.C. 5379, which provides agencies with the authority to repay student loans on behalf of candidates for Federal jobs or current Federal employees to recruit and retain highly qualified personnel. The statutory amendment increases the limitations on payments authorized by an agency from $6,000 to $10,000 per employee in any calendar year and from $40,000 to a total of $60,000 for any one employee. Subsequently, section 1123 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Pub. L. 108–136, November 24, 2003) also contained an amendment to 5 U.S.C. 5379 to increase the maximum amount Federal agencies are authorized to repay under the Federal student loan repayment program from $6,000 to $10,000 for any one employee in a calendar year.

Waiver of Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Pursuant to section 553(b)(3)(B) of title 5 of the United States Code, I find that good cause exists for waiving the general notice of proposed rulemaking. Also, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), I find that good cause exists for making this rule effective in less than 30 days. These regulations implement Pub. L. 108–123, which became effective on November 11, 2003. The waiver of the requirements for proposed rulemaking and a delay in the effective date are necessary to ensure timely implementation of the law as intended by Congress.

E.O. 12866, Regulatory Review

The Office of Management and Budget has reviewed this rule in accordance with E.O. 12866.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

I certify that these regulations will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they will apply to only Federal agencies and employees.

List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 537

Administrative practice and procedure, Government employees, Wages.

Office of Personnel Management.

Kay Coles James,

Director.

■ Accordingly, OPM is amending 5 CFR part 537 as follows:

PART 537–REPAYMENT OF STUDENT LOANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 537 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 5379.

■ 2. In § 537.106, paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) are revised to read as follows:

§ 537.106 Procedures for making loan repayments.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(1) $10,000 per employee per calendar year; and

(2) A total of $60,000 per employee.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 04–8939 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–39–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

7 CFR Part 301

[Docket No. 03–082–2]

Golden Nematode; Regulated Area

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We are adopting as a final rule, with one change, an interim rule that amended the golden nematode regulations by adding a field in Steuben County, NY, to the list of generally infested regulated areas. In this document, we are making an editorial change in order to correct a reference in the regulations. The interim rule was necessary to prevent the artificial spread of golden nematode to noninfested areas of the United States.

DATES: *Effective Date:* May 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Vedpal Malik, Agriculturalist, Invasive Species and Pest Management, PPQ, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 134, Riverdale, MD 20737–1236; (301) 734–6774.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The golden nematode (*Globodera rostochiensis*) is a destructive pest of potatoes and other solanaceous plants. Potatoes cannot be economically grown on land which contains large numbers of the nematode. The golden nematode has been determined to occur in the United States only in parts of New York.

The golden nematode regulations (contained in 7 CFR 301.85 through 301.85–10 and referred to below as the regulations) list two entire counties and portions of seven other counties in the State of New York as regulated areas and restrict the interstate movement of regulated articles from those areas. Such restrictions are necessary to prevent the artificial spread of the golden nematode to noninfested areas of the United States.

In an interim rule effective and published in the **Federal Register** on January 5, 2004 (69 FR 247–249, Docket No. 03–082–1), we amended the regulations to add a field in Steuben County, NY, to the list of generally infested regulated areas. This action was necessary to prevent the artificial spread of golden nematode to noninfested areas of the United States.

We solicited comments concerning the interim rule for 60 days ending March 5, 2004. We did not receive any comments. However, after the interim rule was published, we noted an editorial error in the regulations. Specifically, the regulations at § 301.85(b)(6)(iii) incorrectly reference the location of certain treatment requirements for Irish potatoes harvested from a field where golden nematode is present. In this final rule, we are correcting that reference.

Therefore, for the reasons given in the interim rule and in this document, we are adopting the interim rule as a final rule with the change discussed in this document.

This final rule also affirms the information contained in the interim rule concerning Executive Order 12866 and the Regulatory Flexibility Act, Executive Orders 12372 and 12988, and the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Further, for this action, the Office of Management and Budget has waived its review under Executive Order 12866.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 301

Agricultural commodities, Plant diseases and pests, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Transportation.

■ Accordingly, the interim rule amending 7 CFR part 301 that was published at 69 FR 247–249 on January 5, 2004, is adopted as a final rule with the following change:

PART 301—DOMESTIC QUARANTINE NOTICES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 301 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7701–7772; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

Section 301.75–15 also issued under Sec. 204, Title II, Pub. L. 106-113, 113 Stat. 1501A–293; sections 301.75–15 and 301.75–16 also issued under Sec. 203, Title II, Pub. L. 106–224, 114 Stat. 400 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note).

§ 301.85 [Amended]

■ 2. In § 301.85, paragraph (b)(6)(iii) is amended by removing the words "paragraph (b)(6)(ii)(A), (B), or (C)" and adding the words paragraph (b)(6)(iii)(A), (B), or (C)" in their place.

Done in Washington, DC, this 14th day of April, 2004.

Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 04–8895 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Part 93

[Docket No. 99–071–3]

Cattle From Australia and New Zealand; Testing Exemptions

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We are amending the regulations regarding the importation of cattle to exempt cattle imported from Australia and from New Zealand from testing for brucellosis prior to their export to the United States. We have determined that the testing of cattle imported from Australia and New Zealand for brucellosis is not necessary to protect livestock in the United States from the disease. This action relieves certain testing requirements for cattle imported from Australia and New Zealand while continuing to protect against the introduction of communicable diseases of cattle into the United States.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Anne Goodman, Supervisory Staff Officer, Regionalization and Evaluation Services Staff, National Center for Import and Export, VS, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 38, Riverdale, MD 20737–1231; (301) 734–4356.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The regulations in 9 CFR part 93 (referred to below as the regulations) govern the importation into the United States of specified animals and animal products to prevent the introduction into the United States of various animal diseases, including brucellosis and tuberculosis. Brucellosis is a contagious disease affecting animals and humans, caused by bacteria of the genus *Brucella*. In its principal animal hosts, brucellosis may cause abortion and impaired fertility. Bovine tuberculosis is a contagious, infectious, and communicable disease caused by *Mycobacterium bovis*. It affects cattle, bison, deer, elk, goats, and other species, including humans. Bovine tuberculosis in infected animals and humans manifests itself in lesions of the lung, lymph nodes, and other body parts, causes weight loss and general debilitation, and can be fatal.

Paragraph (a) of § 93.406 includes procedures for the importation of cattle from other parts of the world into the United States. This paragraph details tuberculosis and brucellosis testing and certification requirements for all cattle offered for importation from any part of the world, except those intended for immediate slaughter.

On April 20, 2001, we published in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 20211–20213, Docket No. 99–071–1) a proposal to amend the regulations by exempting cattle from Australia and New Zealand from testing for brucellosis prior to their export to the United States, and by exempting cattle from Australia from testing for tuberculosis prior to their export to the United States. These proposed changes were based on requests from Australia and New Zealand. In accordance with the provisions of 9 CFR part 92 for requesting recognition of the animal health status of a country or other region, when Australia and New Zealand requested exemption from the brucellosis testing requirements and Australia from the tuberculosis testing requirements, both countries submitted extensive documentation to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) that included information regarding disease history and control, livestock demographics and marketing practices, surveillance, and veterinary policies and infrastructure. The information was considered in assessing the disease risk of importing live cattle from those two countries under the conditions of the proposed rule and documented Australia and New Zealand's freedom from the diseases in question. (The information submitted by Australia and New Zealand, along with the risk assessment, may be obtained from the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and may be viewed on the Internet at *http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html*.)

Following publication of the proposed rule, however, we were made aware of two outbreaks of tuberculosis that had occurred in Queensland, Australia, after we had completed our risk assessment. In order to take these outbreaks into account, we are conducting an updated assessment of the risk of tuberculosis from cattle imported from Australia and are not making final in this document our proposed provisions to exempt cattle from Australia from tuberculosis

testing. We intend to make the results of our updated assessment available to the public and to allow for public comment on the results of that assessment. We will then address any comments we receive on the updated assessment in a document to be published in the **Federal Register**. In addition to addressing comments we receive on our updated risk assessment in that document, we will address all comments we received regarding tuberculosis testing in Australia in response to our April 2001 proposed rule. In this final rule, therefore, we address only those issues raised by commenters that concern subjects other than tuberculosis testing in Australia.

We solicited comments concerning our April 2001 proposal for 60 days ending June 19, 2001. On June 4, 2001, we published in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 29921, Docket No. 99–071–2) a notice announcing that we would host a public hearing in Riverdale, MD, on June 19, 2001, to give the public an opportunity for the oral presentation of data, views, and arguments regarding the proposed rule. We received two written comments on the proposal by the June 19, 2001, close of the comment period and one oral comment at the public hearing. The comments were from representatives of a State animal health commission, an organization of research councils, and a cattle industry association. We discuss the comments below by topic.

One commenter said that testing requirements for cattle to be imported into the United States should not be reduced or eliminated until APHIS has independently verified the validity of documentation regarding the health of the livestock in the exporting region.

We are making no changes based on this comment. We are confident of the validity of brucellosis reporting in Australia and New Zealand. Brucellosis is notifiable in Australia and New Zealand to the national government animal health officials.

One commenter requested that, during quarantine in the United States, cattle from Australia and New Zealand be tested by APHIS for brucellosis to verify that the information provided by the exporting governments or entities is accurate.

In considering the import requests from Australia and New Zealand, we assessed the legal authority and veterinary infrastructure and organization of those countries, and determined them to be effective in recognizing, responding to, and giving notice of disease occurrences, and in providing reliable certification of the health status and testing history of animals intended for exportation. We accept the same type of official certification from Australia and New Zealand that those and other countries accept from the United States. Therefore, we believe that there is no need to conduct testing once the cattle arrive in the United States, and we are making no changes based on the comment.

One commenter stated that the data used in the risk assessment for Australia and New Zealand were from 1988 and 1989. The commenter asked whether there were more recent data available regarding disease surveillance in those countries.

There have been no reported diagnoses of brucellosis in Australia and New Zealand since the risk assessments were completed.

One commenter asked whether, in assessing the need for the tests to be required or not required, any distinction was made between those cattle that would ultimately move into slaughter channels and those that would go into the breeding herd.

When we conducted our risk assessments, no outbreaks of brucellosis had been reported in either New Zealand or Australia since 1989. (The statement in the risk assessment for cattle from Australia indicating the most recent outbreak there was in 1990 should read "1989" instead.) That information and the other data available to us, as discussed in our risk assessment, indicated cattle could be safely imported into the United States without testing for brucellosis. Likewise, we would not expect a trading partner to require that U.S. cattle intended for export be tested for a disease that had not been reported in the United States for more than 10 years.

One commenter stated there is no way to guarantee the health status of animals shipped through Australia or New Zealand from other countries for export to the United States.

The concern raised by the commenter is addressed by a number of safeguards. By protocol, we will not consider an animal that is moved into Australia or New Zealand to be part of the national herd of the country until 60 days following its release from all import quarantine restrictions in those countries, except that the waiting period is 90 days for offspring of animals or germplasm legally imported into Australia or New Zealand from a region not recognized by APHIS as being free of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest. With regard to the brucellosis status of animals moved into Australia or New Zealand, both of those countries have safeguards in place to ensure that animals imported from other countries are not affected by the disease.

New Zealand requires that all live cattle intended for export to that country have been resident in herds negative for brucellosis for at least 12 months prior to going into pre-export isolation at a facility managed by the national veterinary authority of the exporting country. Australia's quarantine regulations require that imported cattle originate from a herd or region recognized as free of brucellosis according to the standards of the World Organisation for Animal Health (also known as OIE).

One commenter recommended requiring permanent identification of cattle coming into the United States, particularly breeding animals.

We agree there would be benefits to establishing an identification plan for cattle entering the United States, as well as for domestic cattle, and are in the process of developing such a plan.

Therefore, for the reasons given in the proposed rule and in this document, we are adopting the proposed rule as a final rule, with the changes discussed in this document.

Effective Date

This is a substantive rule that relieves restrictions and, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553, may be made effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. Immediate implementation of this rule will provide relief to those persons who are adversely affected by testing requirements we no longer find warranted. Therefore, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this rule should be effective upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. The rule has been determined to be not significant for the purposes of Executive Order 12866 and, therefore, has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

Exempting cattle imports from Australia and New Zealand from brucellosis testing will reduce costs for exporters of cattle from these two countries to the United States. Impacts for U.S. entities will depend on the number of cattle exported to the United States, the cost savings per animal, and what portion of these savings may be passed on to U.S. buyers through lower prices.

To date, there have been no recorded imports of cattle from New Zealand.

Cattle imports by the United States from Australia have been minimal, as reflected by data for the last 5 years. Trade statistics divide cattle into two groups—purebred and not purebred. Purebred cattle imported from Australia numbered only 17 head in 1998 and 21 head in 1999. None were imported in 2000, 2001, or 2002. The small numbers imported in 1998 and 1999 represented only 0.4 percent of U.S. imports of purebred cattle in those 2 years.

The number of not purebred cattle imported from Australia averaged fewer than eight animals per year from 1998 through 2002. Given that annual total U.S. imports of not purebred cattle over this 5-year period averaged more than 2.2 million per year, the number that came from Australia is negligible. Because the United States has not imported cattle from New Zealand, we do not have comparable statistics for that country.

While these numbers are very small, the average value of cattle imported from Australia has been much higher than the value of imported cattle generally. For purebred cattle from Australia, the average value was $5,082 per head, compared to an average value for all purebred cattle imports of $1,051. For not purebred cattle from Australia, the average value was $3,083 per head, compared to an average value for all not purebred cattle imports of $556.

It is unlikely the number of cattle imported from Australia will be affected by removing testing requirements for brucellosis. Brucellosis testing costs, assumed to range between $7.50 and $15 per head including veterinary fees and handling expenses, represent from 0.15 percent to 0.30 percent of the value of purebred cattle imported from Australia in 1998 and 1999, and from 0.24 percent to 0.49 percent of the value of not purebred cattle imported from Australia from 1998 through 2002.

A small cost savings will be realized by exporters of Australian cattle for a negligible number of animals, if quantities imported in recent years continue into the future. Cost savings of such small proportion are not expected to affect the number of Australian cattle offered for export to the United States. Any benefit realized by U.S. buyers of cattle from Australia will be negligible as well. If cattle are imported from New Zealand, impacts of this rule for U.S. buyers are expected to be similarly negligible.

As a part of the rulemaking process, APHIS evaluates whether regulations will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. If any entities are affected by this rule, they will likely be U.S. cattle operations, nearly all of which are small entities. According to the 1997 Census of Agriculture, over 99 percent of farms with cattle sales had annual receipts that did not exceed $750,000, the small-entity criterion set by the Small Business Administration (SBA).

It is unlikely high-valued cattle imported from Australia would be destined for slaughter. Nonetheless, it is noted that feedlots that could purchase the cattle may or may not be small entities. SBA classifies cattle feedlots as small entities if their annual receipts are not more than $1.5 million. There were 95,189 feedlots in the United States in 2002, about 93,000 (nearly 98 percent) of which had capacities of fewer than 1,000 head and can be considered small entities. However, the 2 percent of the Nation's feedlots that have capacities of at least 1,000 head held 82 percent of all cattle and calves on feed on January 1, 2003. These larger feedlots have average annual receipts of over $9 million, well above the small-entity criterion.

In any case, the rule will have little, if any, impact on U.S. entities, large or small. Brucellosis testing exemptions will result in small cost savings for exporters of cattle from Australia or New Zealand. The rule is not expected to affect the negligible number of cattle imported from Australia or cause cattle to be imported from New Zealand for the first time.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12988

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule: (1) Preempts all State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with this rule; (2) has no retroactive effect; and (3) does not require administrative proceedings before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This final rule contains no information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 93

Animal diseases, Imports, Livestock, Poultry and poultry products, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

■ Accordingly, we are amending 9 CFR part 93 as follows:

PART 93—IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN ANIMALS, BIRDS, AND POULTRY, AND CERTAIN ANIMAL, BIRD, AND POULTRY PRODUCTS; REQUIREMENTS FOR MEANS OF CONVEYANCE AND SHIPPING CONTAINERS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 93 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1622 and 8301–8317; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.4.

■ 2. Section 93.406 is amended as follows:

■ a. In the introductory text of paragraph (a), in the first sentence, the words "in paragraph (d) of this section and" is added immediately after the words "Except as provided".

■ b. A new paragraph (d) is added to read as follows:

§ 93.406 Diagnostic tests.

* * * * *

(d) *Testing exemptions.* Cattle from Australia and New Zealand are exempt from the brucellosis testing requirements of paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

Done in Washington, DC, this 14th day of April, 2004.

Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 04–8894 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Parts 94 and 98

[Docket No. 98–090–7]

RIN 0579–AB03

Classical Swine Fever Status of France and Spain

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We are amending the regulations concerning the importation of animals and animal products to recognize France and Spain as regions in which classical swine fever (CSF) is not known to exist, and from which breeding swine, swine semen, and pork and pork products may be imported into the United States under certain conditions, in the absence of restrictions associated with other foreign animal diseases of swine. This rulemaking will ensure that breeding swine, swine

semen, and pork and pork products imported from France or Spain have originated in one of those countries or in any other region recognized by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service as free of CSF and that, prior to export to the United States, such animals and animal products have not been commingled with animals and animal products from regions where CSF exists.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Chip Wells, Senior Staff Veterinarian, Regionalization Evaluation Services Staff, National Center for Import and Export, VS, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 38, Riverdale, MD 20737–1231; (301) 734–4356.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture regulates the importation of animals and animal products to guard against the introduction of animal diseases into this country. The regulations pertaining to the importation of animals and animal products are set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), title 9, chapter I, subchapter D (9 CFR parts 91 through 99).

On June 25, 1999, we published in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 34155–34168, Docket No. 98–090–1) a proposal to, among other things, amend the regulations regarding the importation of swine and swine products from a specifically defined region in the European Union (EU) consisting of Austria, Belgium, France, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and parts of Germany and Italy. (For convenience, we refer to individual countries of this EU region as "Member States.") In proposing to recognize smaller regions within Germany and Italy as free of classical swine fever (CSF, which we referred to in the proposed rule as hog cholera), we defined the administrative units for purposes of regionalization in those two Member States as the kreis for Germany and the region for Italy. An administrative unit was considered to be the smallest administrative jurisdiction in the Member State with effective oversight of normal animal movements into, out of, and within that jurisdiction, and that, in association with national authorities, if necessary, has the responsibility for controlling animal diseases locally.

Before developing our proposed rule, we prepared a risk analysis to estimate the likelihood of introducing CSF from the EU region, and to determine what, if any, mitigation measures would be necessary. We assessed the likelihood of introducing CSF through the importation of live breeding swine, swine semen, and pork and pork products. We made the risk analysis available to the public during the comment period for the proposed rule.

We solicited comments concerning our proposed rule for 60 days ending August 24, 1999. One of the commenters expressed concerns with several aspects of our risk analysis. Based on the concerns expressed in that comment, and as recommended by the Department's Office of Risk Assessment and Cost Benefit Analysis, we revised our risk analysis and included a supplement that presented in more detail specific information about CSF outbreaks in the EU region. The revised risk analysis was titled "Risk Analysis for Importation of Classical Swine Fever Virus in Swine and Swine Products from the European Union—December 2000."

On April 7, 2003, we published in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 16922–16940, Docket No. 98–090–5) a final rule that, among other things, amended the regulations to recognize a smaller region in the EU consisting of Austria, Belgium, Greece, the Netherlands, Portugal, and parts of Germany and Italy as free of CSF. In the final rule, APHIS did not recognize France, Spain, or Luxembourg as free of CSF, and thus as part of the EU region free of CSF, as we had proposed to do in our June 1999 proposed rule, because CSF outbreaks had occurred in domestic swine in each of those Member States after the publication of the proposed rule.

In our April 2003 final rule, we continued to consider all of France, Spain, and Luxembourg to be affected with CSF, even though outbreaks in domestic swine had occurred only in limited areas of those Member States, because we had not yet defined the administrative units in those Member States that we would use for purposes of regionalization. When the outbreaks occurred, France, Spain, and Luxembourg took action to eradicate CSF. The last affected herds were depopulated in France on April 26, 2002, and in Spain on April 30, 2002. Because Luxembourg experienced an outbreak in domestic swine in August 2003 and continues to remain under restriction by the EU because of CSF in feral swine, Luxembourg was not considered for evaluation for CSF-free status at this time.

Following the elimination of CSF in domestic swine in France and Spain, on November 24, 2003, we published in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 65869–65871, Docket No. 98–090–6) a supplemental risk analysis which examined the risk of introducing CSF from the importation of swine and swine products from those two Member States. The supplemental risk analysis is available on the Internet at *http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html.*[1] For this analysis, we used the applicable information from the risk analyses we conducted for the June 1999 proposed rule and the April 2003 final rule, as well as information made available following the outbreaks, and subsequent elimination, of CSF in France and Spain. We concluded that the risk of importation of CSF virus in swine and swine products from France and Spain was low, based on the demonstrated ability of these two Member States to effectively contain CSF outbreaks in domestic swine. Recognition of the CSF status of France and Spain as equivalent to that of the other EU Member States or regions evaluated in the revised risk analysis of December 2000 was, therefore, judged to be appropriate.

We solicited comments concerning our supplemental risk analysis for 60 days ending January 23, 2004. We received three comments by that date. They were from the Government of Spain, a French pork producers' association, and the U.S. National Pork Board. Two of the commenters expressed concerns about certain aspects of the supplemental risk assessment. The comments are discussed below by topic.

One commenter referred to the hypothesis that the virus involved in the April 2002 CSF outbreak in France might have been introduced onto the affected premises by fomites, perhaps on the clothing or personal vehicle of a visiting farmer from Germany. The commenter also noted that the United States requires travelers to declare whether they have visited agricultural facilities during their international travel and recommends procedures for those who have, such as the disinfection of footwear prior to reentering the United States.

In our revised risk analysis of December 2000, we took into account the fact that travelers moving between EU Member States are not subject to border restrictions such as those imposed upon travelers entering or reentering the United States. We

[1] At the bottom of that Web site page, click on "Information previously submitted by Regions requesting export approval and their supporting documentation." At the next screen, click on the triangle beside "European Union—France/Spain/Swine, swine semen, pork/Classical Swine Fever," then on the triangle beside "Response by APHIS."

assumed that the EU region would likely continue to experience occasional CSF outbreaks in the future but concluded that the EU region evaluated in the risk analysis had adequate surveillance and control programs in place to detect and contain them. We therefore concluded that the risk of importing the CSF virus into the United States via imports of breeding swine, pork, pork products, or swine semen from the specified EU region under the conditions set out in the April 2003 final rule was low.

The commenter also discussed our use of the commune (municipality) as the administrative unit to be employed for regionalization purposes in France. The commune is the smallest administrative unit described in the assessment and, according to the commenter, falls under "only indirect supervision" of the Prefect for the department (a larger administrative unit roughly equivalent to several U.S. counties or a U.S. State) under which it is subsumed. Within each department there is a Direction Departementale des Services Veterinaires which serves under the direct authority of the Prefect and is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of animal health regulations at the department level. Although the specific question that the commenter was asking was not entirely clear, the commenter seemed to be expressing a concern over France's ability to manage and control disease at the commune level.

As noted earlier, in our June 1999 proposed rule, we explained the criteria we use for designating administrative units for the purpose of regionalization. An administrative unit is the smallest administrative jurisdiction that has effective oversight of normal animal movements into, out of, and within that jurisdiction, and that, in association with national authorities, if necessary, has the responsibility for controlling animal disease locally. In France, this unit is a commune. During its February 2003 site visit, the APHIS team had the opportunity to observe the functions of the veterinary authorities at the central, regional, and commune levels. Veterinary surveillance and control activities at all these levels appeared to be effective. APHIS concluded that France is able to manage and control CSF at the commune level and that, for the purposes of regionalization, the appropriate administrative unit is the commune.

An outbreak of CSF, however, would not necessarily be limited to a single administrative unit. If the zones affected in an outbreak cross administrative borders, the restricted area would include all of the administrative units affected by the outbreak.

The commenter also questioned France's strategy for controlling CSF in its wild boar population, noting that in zones known to be infected with CSF, all hunting has been prohibited. Based on the expectation that the CSF virus will develop freely in the wild boar population, this approach seeks to allow natural immunity to develop in the older animals, while susceptible, young animals die from the disease, thus creating an immune population to act as a barrier to further CSF spread. The approach differs significantly from that of Germany and Luxembourg, both of which encourage hunting to eliminate infected animals and use vaccine baits to establish immunity in the wild boar population. It was suggested by the commenter that with no other country using the French strategy for controlling CSF in wild boars, we have no historical comparison to determine its likelihood of success.

French officials have been aware for many years of the risk of the CSF virus spreading from infected wild boars to domestic swine. France conducts serological surveillance of both wild boars and domestic swine in high-risk areas. Our 2003 supplemental risk assessment found that adequate surveillance programs are in place to detect CSF and to allow for appropriate responses to ensure that disease spread is limited.

The same commenter also discussed concerns raised by a CSF outbreak that occurred in Spain during the period from June 2001 to May 2002. Spanish officials believe that the virus might have entered the country through the illegal importation from Eastern Europe of commercial swine for fattening in Spain. According to the commenter, while there have been some controls instituted for the local movement of swine within Spain, no evidence is provided in the supplemental risk assessment that Spain has instituted additional controls to prevent future illegal swine importation.

Live swine imported into the EU from third countries are required to be accompanied by an official health certificate issued by the exporting country and are subject to inspection at border posts upon entry into the EU. Spain does not have a land border with third (*i.e.*, non-EU) countries and is not directly involved in land border control. Consideration of imports from third countries was included in the previous evaluations upon which APHIS based its determination that imports from designated EU Member States did not pose a significant risk of introducing CSF into the United States.

Relevant to this, swine moving overland from Eastern Europe into the EU would be subject to entry requirements at the EU's eastern borders but could then proceed westward to Spain without encountering additional border controls. Therefore, the possibility that an illegal land shipment of swine from Eastern Europe may have reached Spain should not necessarily be seen to reflect poorly on Spain's internal surveillance or movement control programs. In fact, Spain has actively prosecuted cases of illegal swine movement within the country and imposed stiff penalties as a deterrent to future illegal movement. To ensure compliance with EU standards, the European Commission (EC) approves and lists border inspection posts in the Annex of Commission Decision 2001/881/EC. Furthermore the EC regularly inspects (at least once every 3 years) the infrastructure, equipment, and working practices of the border inspection posts.

The same commenter also referred to Spain's requirement that new, large swine facilities be constructed at least 1 km from existing large swine facilities. It is noted by the commenter that the Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentacion, which is the Spanish equivalent of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, intends to extend the requirement to existing holdings as well, but that compliance with the present requirement is not discussed in the supplemental risk assessment. In the December 2000 risk assessment, APHIS had determined that CSF spread was more likely in regions with high swine density compared to regions with low swine density, so information on producers' compliance with the existing 1-km requirement could be helpful in evaluating the risks of CSF transmission to U.S. swine posed by imports from Spain. The commenter also noted that the 1-km requirement appears only to apply to "large" swine farms. APHIS's 2000 risk assessment did not differentiate specifically between the risk of CSF transmission associated with large farms and that associated with small farms but focused on the risk associated with overall swine density.

Our 2003 supplemental risk assessment evaluated Spain's ability to detect, control, and eradicate CSF under the regulations existing at the time. We judged Spain to be equivalent in these areas to the other EU Member States or regions covered under the December 2000 revised risk assessment. We view the 1-km distance requirement as a useful mitigation of the risks of CSF transmission posed by high swine

density. Requiring a distance of 1 km between holdings can help limit spread of the disease from an infected holding.

The commenter also expressed concern over our intention to use the comarca as the administrative unit for regionalization purposes. Spain is comprised of 17 autonomous regions, each with its own government. The autonomous regions are further divided into provinces, which are comprised of local administrative units called comarcas. The commenter noted that if swine in a comarca were found to be positive for CSF, a request could potentially be made to exclude simply that single comarca from the regions declared free of the disease.

In Spain, APHIS considers the smallest administrative jurisdiction that has effective oversight of normal animal movements into, out of, and within that jurisdiction, and that, in association with national authorities, if necessary, has the responsibility for controlling animal disease locally, to be a comarca. Our evaluation led us to conclude that the necessary veterinary structures exist at the comarca level to allow for the implementation of an effective CSF control plan.

The Government of Spain, while expressing its satisfaction with the findings of the supplemental risk assessment, requested the inclusion in the text of a more specific description of the term comarca in order to clarify that the term refers to those geographic divisions established for animal health purposes. It is our view, however, that the description of comarca contained in the supplemental risk assessment was consistent with our usual practice and was adequate for the purposes of that document.

As noted earlier, in our supplemental risk analysis of November 2003, we concluded that the risk of importation of CSF virus in swine and swine products from France and Spain was low, based on the demonstrated ability of these two Member States to effectively contain CSF outbreaks in domestic swine. In this final rule, therefore, we are recognizing the CSF status of France and Spain as equivalent to that of the other EU Member States or regions evaluated in the revised risk analysis of December 2000. Specifically, we are adding France and Spain to the lists of CSF-free regions in §§ 94.9 and 94.10. We are also incorporating France and Spain into the larger CSF-free EU region designated in § 94.23 as a region from which pork, pork products, and live breeding swine may be imported into the United States under certain conditions and in § 98.38 as a region from which swine semen may be imported into the United States under certain conditions.

Effective Date

This is a substantive rule that relieves restrictions and, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553, may be made effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

This rule recognizes France and Spain as regions in which CSF does not exist. Although restrictions on the importation of animals and animal products from France and Spain may continue because of our concerns about other diseases and about the movement of products within the EU prior to export to the United States, a number of restrictions due to CSF are no longer warranted for imports from these two Member States. Therefore, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this rule should be effective upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. The rule has been determined to be not significant for the purposes of Executive Order 12866 and, therefore, has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

This final rule recognizes France and Spain as free of CSF and allows the importation into the United States of pork, pork products, live breeding swine, and swine semen from France and Spain under certain conditions.

U.S. entities that may be affected by this final rule are swine and pork producers and pork product wholesalers. The Small Business Administration (SBA) defines small hog and pig farms as those earning not more than $750,000 in annual receipts.[2] The National Agricultural Statistics Service, on the other hand, determines the size of hog farms based on hog inventories. Our analysis has determined that only those swine operations with inventories well in excess of 3,000 animals would likely earn more than $750,000 in yearly sales.[3] Since over 95 percent of U.S. swine operations hold inventories of fewer than 2,000 head, it is clear that most U.S. swine and pork producers fit the SBA's definition of small entities.

Likewise, pork product wholesalers are also mainly small entities. The SBA categorizes such businesses as small entities if they do not have more than 100 employees.[4] We do not know the size distribution of meat wholesalers, but the 1997 Economic Census (the most recent available) indicates that the average number of employees per establishment that year was 14.[5]

If a country has had a history of prior exports of a commodity to the United States, we can turn to that record as an indicator of import levels that may result from reinstated access to U.S. markets. However, APHIS has never before recognized France or Spain as a region in which CSF is not known to exist. Imports of swine and swine products from these two EU Member States have, therefore, been rare.[6] In order to assess the possible economic impacts of this final rule, we must look to the swine and swine product exports of France and Spain to other countries during a recent year and compare those exports to U.S. production and import levels and patterns. All of the following data are for calendar year 2000, and are considered representative in terms of U.S. swine and swine product import patterns.

France and Spain have been able to carry on trade in swine and swine products with other countries, as well as the rest of the EU, even though they have not been recognized as CSF-free by APHIS. France and Spain exported 283,000 head and 1,359,000 head of live swine, respectively, to other EU members in 2000, but neither Member State exported any live swine outside the EU.[7] U.S. imports of live swine that year, which amounted to over 5.7 million head, all entered from Canada,[8] except for 602 head from Norway.

Regarding pork, France and Spain exported 366,000 metric tons (MTs) and

[2] North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) 112210, Hog and pig farming.

[3] Assuming about a 6-month production cycle, one inventory unit would roughly represent two annual sale units. An average price of $102 per head (230 pounds selling weight, at $44.30 per cwt, the average of hog prices in 2001), implies a gross revenue of $204 per head of inventory, yielding $750,000/$204 per head = 3,676 head.

[4] NAICS 424420, Packaged frozen food merchant wholesalers, and NAICS 424470, Meat and meat product merchant wholesalers.

[5] As reported in the 1997 Economic Census of the U.S. Census Bureau, there were 3,557 meat and meat product wholesale establishments that had a total of 50,256 paid employees.

[6] According to U.S. Bureau of Census data, as reported by the World Trade Atlas, over the 10-year period 1994–2003, there were no imports of live swine or swine products from Spain into the United States. During this same period, live swine were imported from France in 2 of the 10 years: 72 head in 1994 (valued at $118,000, 0.16 percent of U.S. swine imports), and 239 head in 1995 ($378,000, 0.27 percent of imports). Very small amounts of pork were also imported from France in 2 of the 10 years: In 1995 (valued at $161,786, 0.4 percent of U.S. pork imports) and in 1997 ($21,678, a negligible share of imports).

[7] Live swine and pork export data for France and Spain are from FAS, GAIN Reports #FR0061 and #SP1035.

[8] U.S. live swine and pork import data are from U.S. Census Bureau, as reported by the World Trade Atlas.

345,000 MTs, respectively, to other EU members. France and Spain also exported 220,000 MTs and 19,000 MTs of pork, respectively, to countries outside the EU. It is reasonable to assume that a portion of these exports, in particular, of the exports to countries outside the EU, may be diverted to the United States upon publication of this rule. A principal deciding factor would be U.S. prices relative to those in other world markets. However, U.S. import patterns suggest that it is unlikely that any diversions will have a major effect on U.S. entities. Canada has been our major foreign supplier of pork, providing 85 percent of imports in 2000. Denmark, a distant second, supplied 13 percent that same year. Thus, all other countries exporting pork to the United States in 2000 supplied only 2 percent of U.S. imports.

Total commercial production of pork in the United States in 2000 was about 8.6 million MTs.[9] Total pork imports in 2000, which amounted to about 321,000 MTs, represented 3.7 percent of U.S. production. The 2 percent of pork imports not supplied by Canada or Denmark represented about 0.07 percent of U.S. production. Even if sizable shares of pork exports by France or Spain were to be sent to the United States as a result of this final rule, the impact for U.S. entities would be small.

It is unlikely that this rule will result in swine or swine product imports from France or Spain of any consequence, based on these representative statistics from 2000. We conclude that while the majority of U.S. enterprises that may be affected by swine and swine product imports from those two Member States are small entities, impacts will be minor.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12988

This final rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule: (1) Preempts all State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with this rule; (2) has no retroactive effect; and (3) does not require administrative proceedings before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This final rule contains no new information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects

9 CFR Part 94

Animal diseases, Imports, Livestock, Meat and meat products, Milk, Poultry and poultry products, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

9 CFR Part 98

Animal diseases, Imports.

■ Accordingly, we are amending 9 CFR parts 94 and 98 as follows:

PART 94—RINDERPEST, FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, FOWL PEST (FOWL PLAGUE), EXOTIC NEWCASTLE DISEASE, AFRICAN SWINE FEVER, CLASSICAL SWINE FEVER, AND BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY: PROHIBITED AND RESTRICTED IMPORTATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 94 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 450, 7701–7772, and 8301–8317; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.4.

■ 2. In § 94.9, paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

§ 94.9 Pork and pork products from regions where classical swine fever exists.

(a) Classical swine fever is known to exist in all regions of the world except Australia; Canada; Denmark; England; Fiji; Finland; Iceland; Isle of Man; the Mexican States of Baja California, Baja California Sur, Chihuahua, and Sinaloa; New Zealand; Northern Ireland; Norway; the Republic of Ireland; Scotland; Sweden; Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; Wales; and a single region in the European Union consisting of Austria, Belgium, France, Germany (except for the Kreis Uckermark in the Land of Brandenburg; the Kreis Oldenberg, the Kreis Soltau-Fallingbostel, and the Kreis Vechta in the Land of Lower Saxony; the Kreis Heinsberg and the Kreis Warendorf in the Land of Northrhine-Westphalia; the Kreis Bernkastel-Wittlich, the Kreis Bitburg-Prüm, the Kreis Donnersbergkreis, the Kreis Rhein-Hunsrüche, the Kreis Südliche Weinstrasse, and the Kreis Trier-Saarburg in the Land of Rhineland Palatinate; and the Kreis Altmarkkreis in the Land of Saxony-Anhalt), Greece, Italy (except for the Regions of Emilia-Romagna, Piemonte, and Sardegna), the Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain.[10]

* * * * *

■ 3. In § 94.10, paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

§ 94.10 Swine from regions where classical swine fever exists.

(a) Classical swine fever is known to exist in all regions of the world except Australia; Canada; Denmark; England; Fiji; Finland; Iceland; Isle of Man; the Mexican States of Baja California, Baja California Sur, Chihuahua, and Sinaloa; New Zealand; Northern Ireland; Norway; the Republic of Ireland; Scotland; Sweden; Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; Wales; and a single region in the European Union consisting of Austria, Belgium, France, Germany (except for the Kreis Uckermark in the Land of Brandenburg; the Kreis Oldenberg, the Kreis Soltau-Fallingbostel, and the Kreis Vechta in the Land of Lower Saxony; the Kreis Heinsberg and the Kreis Warendorf in the Land of Northrhine-Westphalia; the Kreis Bernkastel-Wittlich, the Kreis Bitburg-Prüm, the Kreis Donnersbergkreis, the Kreis Rhein-Hunsrüche, the Kreis Südliche Weinstrasse, and the Kreis Trier-Saarburg in the Land of Rhineland Palatinate; and the Kreis Altmarkkreis in the Land of Saxony-Anhalt), Greece, Italy (except for the Regions of Emilia-Romagna, Piemonte, and Sardegna), the Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain. No swine that are moved from or transit any region where classical swine fever is known to exist may be imported into the United States, except for wild swine imported into the United States in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section.

* * * * *

§ 94.23 [Amended]

■ 4. In § 94.23, the introductory text is amended by adding the word "France," after the word "Belgium," and by removing the words "and Portugal" and adding the words "Portugal, and Spain" in their place.

PART 98—IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL EMBRYOS AND ANIMAL SEMEN

■ 5. The authority citation for part 98 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1622 and 8301–8317; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.4.

§ 98.38 [Amended]

■ 6. In § 98.38, the introductory text is amended by adding the word "France," after the word "Belgium," and by removing the words "and Portugal" and

[9] Agricultural Statistics 2003, Table 7–66, converted from million pounds.

[10] *See also* other provisions of this part and parts 93, 95, and 96 of this chapter and part 327 of this title for other prohibitions and restrictions upon importation of swine and swine products.

adding the words "Portugal, and Spain" in their place.

Done in Washington, DC, this 14th day of April, 2004 .

Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 04–8893 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food Safety and Inspection Service

9 CFR Part 320 and 381

[Docket No. 01–034E]

Need To Complete New Registration Form

AGENCY: Food Safety and Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Extension of date by which businesses required to register with FSIS must do so.

SUMMARY: The Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) is announcing that all parties required to register with the Agency, including those that are currently registered, have until May 24, 2004, to file the new registration form that the Agency has developed. On June 25, 2003, FSIS announced that it had developed the new registration form, and that all businesses required to register with FSIS were to submit the form by March 22, 2004. FSIS is extending the deadline for submitting the new registration form because it was not available at the time FSIS projected that it would be available. This document addresses issues that have arisen concerning the registration requirement.

DATES: All parties required to register with FSIS, including those currently registered, must complete the new registration form and submit it to FSIS by May 24, 2004.

ADDRESSES: The new registration form (FSIS Form 5020–1) is available over the Internet at *http://www.fsis.usda.gov/fsisforms*. To obtain a copy of the registration form, parties may also write to USDA, FSIS, Program Evaluation, Enforcement and Review (PEER), Evaluation and Enforcement Division (EED), 300 West End Court Building, 1255 22nd Street, NW., Room 300, Washington, DC 20250–3700.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Arshad Hussain, Division Director, Data Analysis and Statistical Support Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture (202) 720–3219.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 25, 2003, FSIS published a document that announced the need for certain businesses to complete a new registration form that the Agency had developed, and that explained the importance of compliance with recordkeeping and registration requirements in the Federal meat and poultry products inspection regulations (68 FR 37730).

As explained in that document, the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) and Poultry Products Inspection Act (PPIA) prohibit any person, firm, or corporation from engaging in commerce as a meat or poultry products broker, renderer, animal food manufacturer, wholesaler of any carcasses, or parts or products of the carcasses of livestock (that is, cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines) or poultry, or public warehouseman storing any such articles in or for commerce, or from buying, selling, or transporting, or importing any dead, dying, disabled or diseased livestock or poultry or parts of the carcasses of livestock or poultry that died otherwise than by slaughter, unless they have registered their business as required by the regulations, 9 CFR 320.5 and 381.179 (see section 203 of the FMIA (21 U.S.C. 643) and section 11(c) of the PPIA (21 U.S.C. 460(c)). Sections 320.5(c) and 381.179(c) of 9 CFR provide that the registration requirements do not apply to persons that conduct any of the businesses listed above only at an official establishment. Therefore, official establishments are not required to register with FSIS.

Following publication of the June 25, 2003, document, a retail association contacted FSIS and asked whether retailers are required to register with FSIS, and whether warehouses and distribution centers owned by retail stores are required to register with FSIS. The Agency advises that retail stores that sell meat or poultry products to household consumers only are not required to register with FSIS. However, if they sell meat or poultry products to hotels, restaurants, institutions, or other retailers, they are wholesalers of such products and thus are subject to the registration requirement.

With regard to warehouses and to distribution centers that store product and thus function as warehouses, the statutes and regulations require that public warehouses register with FSIS but do not require that private warehouses register. Whether a warehouse is considered public or private turns on several factors. If a warehouse is owned by a retail store and stores only meat and poultry products that are the property of that retail store, the warehouse is a private warehouse and is not required to register with FSIS. However, if the warehouse stores any meat or poultry products that are not owned by the retail store that owns the warehouse, that warehouse would be considered a public warehouse and would be required to register with FSIS. For example, if a retail store has consigned meat or poultry products to a hotel, restaurant, institution, or other retailer, and the product is stored in the warehouse owned by the retail store, the warehouse is functioning as a public warehouse, because the retail store no longer owns the products, and would be required to register.

As explained in the June 25, 2003, document, registration information, along with business records, is critical in any FSIS investigation related to public health, food safety, or misbranding of meat or poultry products (68 FR 37730). Registration information and business records are crucial in tracing sources of foodborne disease associated with consumption of meat or poultry products and in tracing the sources of contamination of meat or poultry products. Registration information and business records are also crucial in preventing the spread of disease associated with the consumption of meat or poultry products.

According to §§ 320.5(a) and 381.179(a) of the regulations, parties required to register with FSIS must do so by filing a form with the Agency. These regulations require parties to register within 90 days after they begin to engage in any of the businesses that require them to register. Sections 320.5(b) and 381.179(b) of the regulations require that, whenever any change is made in the registrant's name, business address, or any trade or business name under which it conducts its business, the registrant must report such change in writing to the Administrator within 15 days after making the change.

As explained in the June 25, 2003, document, FSIS has developed a new registration form. Because the form asks for certain information that was not included on the previous form, including an e-mail address, phone number, and subsidiaries' hours of operation, all parties required to register, including those that are currently registered, need to complete the new form and submit it to FSIS. Parties must submit the form to FSIS by May 24, 2004.

FSIS previously announced that parties were required to submit the form by March 22, 2004. FSIS is extending

the deadline for submitting the new registration form to FSIS because the form did not become available when FSIS projected it would. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) reviewed information collection associated with the registration form in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act. On February 20, 2004, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approved information collection associated with the new registration form (OMB control No. 0583–0218).

The registration form (FSIS Form 5020–1) can be obtained over the Internet at *http://www.fsis.usda.gov/fsisforms.*

To obtain the form, parties can also write to USDA, FSIS, Program Evaluation, Enforcement and Review (PEER), Evaluation and Enforcement Division (EED), 300 West End Court Building, 1255 22nd Street, NW., Room 300, Washington, DC 20250–3700. The form will also be available from FSIS personnel that visit businesses required to register. Once parties complete the form, they should mail it to USDA, FSIS, Program Evaluation, Enforcement and Review (PEER), Evaluation and Enforcement Division (EED), 300 West End Court Building, 1255 22nd Street, NW., Room 300, Washington, DC 20250–3700 (the same address as for obtaining forms) or fax it to Director, Evaluation and Enforcement Division (EED) at (202) 418–8941.

FSIS intends to issue instructions to FSIS personnel concerning the registration requirement.

Comments

FSIS received two comments in response to the June 25, 2003, document on recordkeeping and registration, one from a consumer organization and one from the government of a foreign country that is eligible to export to the United States (U.S.) product from livestock covered by the FMIA.

The consumer group stated that FSIS should require additional registration information, such as the specific types of animals slaughtered and animal products processed, transported, or handled; whether the registrant operates on a seasonal basis, and if so, the hours of operation; whether the types of animals slaughtered, processed or transported change depending on the season; and the name and telephone number of a contact person in the event of an emergency, particularly during non-working hours. This commenter also recommended that FSIS re-examine the existing regulatory recordkeeping requirements to assure that the type and form of the records required to be kept would be sufficient for FSIS to conduct both a trace back and a trace forward in the event of a food emergency. Finally, the commenter recommended that FSIS work with the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) to assure that the strongest possible cattle identification system is in place so that animals can be traced back to their source as quickly as possible.

FSIS believes that existing registration and recordkeeping requirements are adequate to conduct both a trace back and a trace forward in the event of a food emergency. With regard to a cattle identification system, on December 30, 2003, Agriculture Secretary Veneman announced that USDA will begin implementation of a verifiable system of national animal identification.

The consumer organization also recommended additional measures, other than those concerning registration and recordkeeping, that FSIS should take to assure that the public is protected if Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) is ever discovered in the U.S. The commenter stated that the additional measures could include designation of certain tissues from all downer cattle and cattle over 24 months as Specified Risk Material (SRM) and banning vertebral columns and other potentially infectious tissues in advanced meat recovery (AMR) systems.

On January 12, 2004, FSIS published three interim final rules in response to the discovery of a BSE-positive cow in this country. These rules include provisions that are consistent with the consumer organization's comments (69 FR 1862, 1874, and 1885).

The government of the foreign country wanted assurances that registration and recordkeeping measures applied to products exported to the United States are not more trade restrictive than necessary to meet objectives; are based on sound risk assessments that address real risks; focus on outcomes rather than prescribing specific measures to achieve them; allow for the application of equivalence in achieving objectives; and avoid arbitrary or unjustifiable differences in the level of protection applied in different situations. That government also wanted assurances that the increased enforcement of registration and recordkeeping requirements and changes to current registration data will meet the U.S Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures agreement and the U.S. Technical Barriers to Trade agreement. In addition, the government asked for clarification on the timing of FSIS's increased enforcement of registration and recordkeeping requirements and asked whether this increased enforcement by FSIS would cause time delays and potential increases in costs at port of entry for exporters who endeavor to comply with registration requirements.

The government also wanted assurance that that country's export establishments would be allowed to maintain rendering facilities associated with their slaughtering premises and asked specific questions concerning the registration of the country's rendering facilities. The government also asked whether transport companies and other handlers of dead, dying, diseased, or disabled stock, other than the final handler (or exporter) of the product need to comply with FSIS registration and recordkeeping requirements.

Even though FSIS has developed a new registration form that requires that parties provide certain information that was not required on the previous form, FSIS did not impose any substantive new registration requirements or any new recordkeeping requirements in the June 25, 2003, document. The requirement that U.S. companies submit the new registration form will not result in a trade barrier.

For companies in foreign countries to be eligible to export to the U.S. product from livestock covered by the FMIA, the foreign country must have requirements equivalent to those in the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Federal meat inspection regulations that apply to establishments preparing product for export to the U.S. (§ 327.2). Therefore, the government that commented should have existing registration and recordkeeping requirements that are equivalent to those in the FMIA and Federal meat inspection regulations with which businesses in that country must comply. The June 25, 2003, statement did not affect the equivalency requirements in § 327.2 or the meat inspection requirements of the foreign country.

Additional Public Notification

Public awareness of all segments of rulemaking and policy development is important. Consequently, in an effort to better ensure that the public and in particular that minorities, women, and persons with disabilities are aware of this notice, FSIS will announce it on-line through the FSIS Web page located at *http://www.fsis.usda.gov.*

FSIS also will make copies of this **Federal Register** publication available through the FSIS Constituent Update, which is used to provide information regarding FSIS policies, procedures, regulations, **Federal Register** notices, FSIS public meetings, recalls, and other types of information that could affect or

would be of interest to our constituents and stakeholders. The update is communicated via Listserv, a free e-mail subscription service consisting of industry, trade, and farm groups, consumer interest groups, allied health professionals, scientific professionals, and other individuals who have requested to be included. The update is also available on the FSIS Web page. Through Listserv and the web page, FSIS is able to provide information to a much broader, more diverse audience.

Done in Washington, DC, on April 15, 2004.

Linda M. Swacina,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 04–8948 Filed 4–15–04; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 3410–DM–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2004–NE–07–AD; Amendment 39–13579; AD 2004–08–10]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Engine Components Incorporated (ECi) Reciprocating Engine Cylinders

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for Teledyne Continental Motors (TCM) models 520 and 550 series engines with certain ECi cylinders installed. This AD requires replacing certain serial-numbered (SN) cylinders supplied by ECi before further flight. This AD results from reports of 34 failures of cylinder heads marketed by ECi. We are issuing this AD to prevent loss of engine power due to cracks in the cylinder head and possible engine failure caused by separation of a cylinder head.

DATES: This AD becomes effective May 5, 2004.

We must receive any comments on this AD by June 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Use one of the following addresses to submit comments on this AD:

- By mail: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2004–NE–07–AD, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299.
- By fax: (781) 238–7055.
- By e-mail: *9-ane-adcomment@faa.gov.*

You can get the service information referenced in this AD from Engine Components, Inc., 9503 Middlex, San Antonio, TX 78217; Phone (210) 820–8100; fax (210) 820–3103.

You may examine the AD docket at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Stellar, Branch Manager, Special Certification Office, FAA, Rotorcraft Directorate, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth, TX 76193; telephone (817) 222–5199; fax (817) 222–5785.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 1, 2003, we received a report of an ECi cylinder head, part number (P/N) AEC65385, that separated from the barrel at the head-to-barrel junction. Since that report, we have received reports of 27 additional ECi cylinder heads that had the same condition. We also received reports of six cylinder heads that had a crack between the 9th and 10th head fin from the head-to-barrel junction. All of the reported separations and cracks were located between the ninth and tenth head fin from the head-to-barrel junction. All of the cracks started on the exhaust side of the head. The ECi cylinder head, P/N AEC65385, is part of ECi cylinder, P/N AEC631397. RAM Series III, IV, and VII reciprocating engines are the primary users of these cylinders. The RAM series engines are TCM TSIO–520–NB, –VB, and –WB engines that are modified by supplemental type certificate (STC) SE4327SW, STC SE09104SC, or STC SE09261SC for operation at 325 HP or greater. In addition, we approved the engine cylinders, ECi P/N AEC631397 for use on TCM models 520 and 550 series reciprocating engines under a Parts Manufacturer Approval (PMA). The Airmotive Engine Division of ECi holds the PMA. ECi markets the parts as ECi parts.

Results of Manufacturer's Investigation

An investigation by ECi revealed that cylinder heads, P/N AEC65385, manufactured between September 1, 2002, and May 12, 2003, SNs 1044 through 7708, are susceptible to an over-hardened condition, which reduces the fatigue strength of the cylinder. It also increases the chance that the cylinder will crack.

Relevant Service Information

We reviewed and approved the technical contents of RAM Aircraft Mandatory Service Bulletin (MSB) MSB2003–02, dated August 8, 2003, and ECi MSB S.I. No. 04–1, Revision 1, dated March 11, 2004, that describe procedures for identifying, inspecting, and replacing affected cylinders.

Differences Between This AD and the Service Information

RAM Aircraft MSB MSB2003–02, dated August 8, 2003, requires replacing only the No. 6 cylinder, ECi P/N AEC631397, on RAM Series III, IV, and VII engines. ECi MSB S.I. No. 04–1, Revision 1, dated March 11, 2004, requires identifying the suspect cylinders on TCM models 520 and 550 engines and inspecting them for cracks. This AD requires replacing all cylinders, ECi P/N AEC631397, on all RAM Series III, IV, and VII engines; a\nd all TCM model 520, and 550 series engines.

FAA's Determination and Requirements of This AD

The unsafe condition described previously is likely to exist or develop on other RAM Series III, IV, and VII engines; and TCM model 520, and 550 series engines of the same type design. We are issuing this AD to prevent loss of engine power due to cracks in the cylinder head and possible engine failure caused by separation of a cylinder head. This AD requires:

- Performing a check to identify cylinders, ECi P/N AEC631397, S/Ns 1044 through 7708, within 50 hours time-in-service after the effective date of this AD. and
- If a cylinder has an affected P/N and SN, replacing the cylinder before further flight if it was not inspected at ECi.

FAA's Determination of the Effective Date

Since an unsafe condition exists that requires the immediate adoption of this AD, we have found that notice and opportunity for public comment before issuing this AD are impracticable, and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective in less than 30 days.

Comments Invited

This AD is a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety and was not preceded by notice and an opportunity for public comment; however, we invite you to submit any written relevant data, views, or arguments regarding this AD. Send your comments to an address listed under **ADDRESSES.** Include "AD Docket No. 2004–NE–07–AD" in the subject line of your comments. If you want us to acknowledge receipt of your mailed comments, send us a self-addressed, stamped postcard with the docket

number written on it; we will date-stamp your postcard and mail it back to you. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the rule that might suggest a need to modify it. If a person contacts us verbally, and that contact relates to a substantive part of this AD, we will summarize the contact and place the summary in the docket. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend the AD in light of those comments.

We are reviewing the writing style we currently use in regulatory documents. We are interested in your comments on whether the style of this document is clear, and your suggestions to improve the clarity of our communications with you. You can get more information about plain language at *http://www.faa.gov/language* and *http://www.plainlanguage.gov*.

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD Docket (including any comments and service information), by appointment, between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. *See* **ADDRESSES** for the location.

Regulatory Findings

We have determined that this AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect 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.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that the regulation:

1. Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866;

2. Is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and

3. Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

We prepared a summary of the costs to comply with this AD and placed it in the AD Docket. You may get a copy of this summary by sending a request to us at the address listed under **ADDRESSES.** Include "AD Docket No. 2004–NE–07–AD" in your request.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

■ Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

2004–08–10 Engine Components Incorporated (ECi): Amendment 39–13579. Docket No. 2004–NE–07–AD.

Effective Date

(a) This airworthiness directive (AD) becomes effective May 5, 2004.

Affected ADs

(b) None.

Applicability

(c) This AD applies to Teledyne Continental Motors (TCM) TSIO–520–NB, –VB, and –WB engines that are modified by supplemental type certificate (STC) SE4327SW, STC SE09104SC, or STC SE09261SC for operation at 325 HP or greater, (the so-called RAM TSIO–520–NB, –VB, or –WB Series III, IV, and VII reciprocating engines; and Teledyne Continental Motors (TCM) model 520 and 550 series reciprocating engines with certain ECi reciprocating engine cylinders, part number (P/N) AEC631397, installed. These engines are installed on, but not limited to the airplanes listed in the following Table 1:

TABLE 1.—LIST OF AIRPLANES THAT USE THE AFFECTED ENGINES

Airplane manufacturer and model	Engine model
AERFER/AERMECCHI AM, 3.	GTSIO–520–C
AERO COMMANDER:	
200D	IO–520–A
500A COLEMILL CONVERSION.	IO–520–E
685	GTSIO–520–K
AISA: F20, PEGASO	IO–520–K
AMBROSIN MF–151	IO–520–F
AVIONES PIHAO	IO–520–D
BEAGLE (U.K.): B206S	GTSIO–520–C
BEECHCRAFT BARON:	
C55	IO–520–CB, –C
D55	IO–520–CB, –C
E55	IO–520–CB, –C
58	IO–520–CB
58P	TSIO–520–LB
58P	TSIO–520–L
58P	TSIO–520–WB
58TC	TSIO–520–LB
58TC	TSIO–520–L
58TC	TSIO–520–WB
BEECHCRAFT BONANZA:	
A36	IO–550–B
E33A	IO–520–BA
E33A	IO–520–BB
E33B	IO–520–B
F33	IO–520–BB
F33A	IO–520–B
F33A	IO–520–BA
F33A	IO–520–BB
S35	IO–520–B
ST35	TSIO–520–D
V35	IO–520–BB
V35A	IO–520–B
V35A–TC	TSIO–520–D
V35B	IO–520–B
V35B	IO–520–BA
V35B	IO–520–BB
A36	IO–520–B
A36	IO–520–BA
A36	IO–520–BB
A36–TC	TSIO–520–UB
BEECHCRAFT DEBONAIR: C33A.	IO–520–B
VIKING 300	IO–520–A
	IO–520–D
	IO–520–K
BONNAIRE 185	IO–520–D
BONNAIRE 188 CONVERSION.	IO–520–D
BURNS BA42	IO–520–D
CESSNA:	
SUPER SKYLANE A, B, C, D, E.	IO–520–A
TURBO SUPER SKYLANE.	TSIO–520–C
SKYWAGON A185 E,F	IO–520–D
SKYWAGON A185FII	IO–520–D
AG SPRAYER 188–300	IO–520–D
A188–230	IO–520–D
AG TRUCK (A 188B) –300.	IO–520–D
AG HUSKEY (A 188C) –310.	TSIO–520–T
AG WAGON (A 188B)	IO–520–D
SUPER SKYWAGON U206, A.	IO–520–A
U206B, C, D, E, F	IO–520–F
TURBO SKYWAGON TU206 A.	IO–520–C
TU206B, C, D, E, F	TSIO–520–C
STATIONAIR U206	IO–520–F
TU206	TIOS–520–C
U206FII–300	IO–520–F
U206G–300	IO–520–F
U206GII–300	IO–520–L
TU206G–310	TSIO–520–M
SUPER SKYLANE P206A.	IO–520–A
P206B, C, D, E	IO–520–A
TURBO P 206 A, B, C, D, E.	TSIO–520–C
SKYWAGON 207	IO–520–F
TURBO 207	TSIO–520–G
STATIONAIR 207A, 207AII.	IO–520–F
STATIONAIR 8, 811	IO–520–F
T–STATIONAIR 811	TSIO–520–M

TABLE 1.—LIST OF AIRPLANES THAT USE THE AFFECTED ENGINES—Continued

Airplane manufacturer and model	Engine model
210 CENTURION D, E, F, G, H.	IO–520–A
210 CENTURION J	IO–520–J
210 CENTURION K, L, M, N, R.	IO–520–L
210 CENTURION TURBO.	TSIO–520–C
210 CENTURION TURBO.	TSIO–520–H
210 CENTURION TURBO K, L.	TSIO–520–H
TURBO 210 J, K, L	TSIO–520–H
TURBO 210 MII, NII	TSIO–520–R
TURBO 210R	TSIO–520–R
PRESSURIZED CENTURION P210N.	TSIO–520–P
PRESSURIZED CENTURION P210NII.	TSIO–520–AF
PRESSURIZED CENTURION P210R.	TSIO–520–CE
T303 CRUSADER	TSIO–520–AE
T303 CRUSADER	LTSIO–520–AE
310R	IO–520–MB
310R	IO–520–M
TURBO 310 P, Q	TSIO–520–B
TURBO 310 R	TSIO–520–BB
TURBO 310 R	TSIO–520–B

TABLE 1.—LIST OF AIRPLANES THAT USE THE AFFECTED ENGINES—Continued

Airplane manufacturer and model	Engine model
EXECUTIVE SKYNIGHT D, E, F.	TSIO–520–B
335	TSIO–520–EB
340	TSIO–520–K
340A	TSIO–520–NB, –N
401 A, 401 B	TSIO–520–E
402 A, 402 B	TSIO–520–E
402C	TSIO–520–VB
404 TITAN	GTSIO–520–M
411, 411A	GTSIO–520–C
414	TSIO–520–J
414, 414 A	TSIO–520–NB, –N
421A	GTSIO–520–D
421B	GTSIO–520–H
421C	GTSIO–520–L
421C	GTSIO–520–N
JANOX JAVILON	IO–520–B
NAVION:	
RANGEMASTER MODEL H.	IO–520–B
RANGEMASTER MODEL H.	IO–520–BA
PIPER: MALIBU	TSIO–520–BE
PRINAIR:	
DE HAVILLAND HERON	IO–520–E
WINDECKER EAGLE	IO–520–C

Unsafe Condition

(d) This AD results from reports of 34 failures of ECi cylinder head. We are issuing this AD to prevent loss of engine power due to cracks in the cylinder head and possible engine failure caused by separation of a cylinder head.

Compliance

(e) You are responsible for having the actions required by this AD performed within the compliance times specified unless the actions have already been done.

Identifying Suspect Cylinders

(f) Within 50 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD, identify, and if necessary replace cylinders, ECi P/N AEC631397 as follows:

(1) Identify the cylinder serial number (SN) as follows:

(i) Determine the SN of the cylinder by looking in the engine records or by inspecting the cylinder for a SN on the intake port boss (see Figure 1) or on the flat area next to the head to barrel junction (see Figure 2). Disregard any dash numbers that might follow the four digit SN.



Figure 1.



Figure 2.

(ii) If the SN is 1043 or lower, or if it is 7709 or higher, no further action is required.

(2) If the cylinder SN is 1044 through 7708, do the following:

(i) Remove the rocker box cover from the cylinder.

(ii) Look at the left-front cylinder casting.

(iii) If the casting has AEC65385, and an "O" under the ECi logo, the cylinder is P/N AEC631397. See Figure 3.

Figure 3

(iv) If the cylinder is not ECi P/N AEC631397, no further action is required.

(3) If the cylinder is ECi P/N AEC631397, do the following:

(i) Look at the flange of the rocker box.

(ii) If there is a letter "A," "B," or "X" stamped on the flange of the rocker box, no further action is required. See Figure 4.



Figure 4.

(iii) If there is no letter "A," "B," or "X" stamped on the flange of the rocker box, replace the cylinder before further flight.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(g) The Manager, Special Certification Office, has the authority to approve alternative methods of compliance for this AD if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

Material Incorporated by Reference

(h) None.

Related Information

(i) ECi Mandatory Service Bulletin S.I. No. 04–1, revision 1, dated March 11, 2004, also pertains to this subject of this AD.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on April 9, 2004.

Francis A. Favara,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 04–8877 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 73

[Docket No. FAA–2003–16438; Airspace Docket No. 03–ASW–02]

RIN 2120–AA66

Modification of Restricted Areas 3801A, 3801B, and 3801C, Camp Claiborne, LA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action revises Restricted Area's 3801A (R–3801A), 3801B (R–3801B), and 3801C (R–3801C), Camp Claiborne, LA. This action responds to a request from the United States Air Force (USAF) to eliminate the area currently designated as R–3801A; expand the vertical limits of the areas currently designated as R–3801B and R–3801C; and reconfigure R–3801B and R–3801C into a new R–3801A, R–3801B, and R–3801C. Additionally, this action changes the controlling agency for R–3801A, B, and C from the FAA, Houston Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) to the U.S. Army, Fort Polk Approach Control. The FAA is taking this action to assist the USAF in fulfilling their training requirements for high altitude release bombing.

DATES: *Effective Date:* 0901 UTC, June 10, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Rohring, Airspace and Rules, Office of System Operations and Safety, ATO–R, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–8783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 6, 2004, the FAA proposed to revise R–3801A, R–3801B, and R–3801C, Camp Claiborne, LA, and change the controlling agency to assist the USAF in meeting new USAF training requirements for high altitude release bombing (69 FR 552). Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments on this proposal to the FAA. In response to the proposal, the FAA received two comments. The comments and our responses are discussed below.

In response to the proposal, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) supports the elimination of the current R–3801A, but expressed concern that raising the ceiling of R–3801B and R–3801C would reduce the availability of Federal Airway 212 (V–212) for use

by non-participating aircraft. We acknowledge AOPA's concern; however, we believe that raising the ceiling of R–3801B and R–3801C will have minimal impact on aircraft operations because R–3801C will only be activated when the Warrior 1 High and Low MOAs are active. Currently, we route non-participating aircraft around the Warrior 1 High and Low MOAs when they are active. V–212 also passes through the Warrior 1 High and Low MOAs, which are adjacent to and much larger than R–3801B and R–3801C. Any additional vectors around the new R–3801B and R–3801C should have a minimal impact.

Another commenter expressed concern regarding changing the controlling agency to the U.S. Army, Fort Polk Approach Control because the altitudes of the revised R–3801B and R–3801C will extend above the current ceiling (10,000 feet MSL) of the delegated Fort Polk Approach Control area. We agree with this commenter that some of the altitudes in question are above the approach control delegated airspace. However, coincidental with this action there will be new agreements between Houston ARTCC and Fort Polk Approach Control, delegating the control of the altitudes/airspace contained in the new R–3801B and R–3801C to the Fort Polk Approach Control when the restricted areas are active.

The Rule

As a result of new USAF training requirements, the FAA is amending Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 73 (part 73) by revising R–3801A, R–3801B, and R–3801C at Camp Claiborne, LA. This amendment responds to a USAF request that the FAA take action to eliminate the area currently designated as R–3801A, which is to become the new Claiborne Military Operations Area by a separate but concurrent, non-rulemaking action. This amendment also responds to a USAF request to expand the vertical limits of the areas currently designated as R–3801B and R–3801C from 14,000 feet MSL to FL 230 and reconfigure R–3801B and R–3801C into a new R–3801A, R–3801B, and R–3801C. The overall lateral boundaries of the new R–3801A, R–3801B, and R–3801C are the same as the overall boundaries of the current R–3801B and R–3801C. The altitude structure for the revised airspace areas are from the surface to 10,000 feet MSL to FL180 for R–3801B; and FL180 to FL230 for R–3801C. The additional airspace is required to fulfill new USAF training requirements. Specifically, the new training requirements call for practicing the release of bombs from higher altitudes than are currently available within the existing airspace areas. Additionally, the USAF has requested that the FAA take action to change the controlling agency of R–3801A, R–3801B, and R–3801C from the FAA, Houston ARTCC to the U.S. Army, Fort Polk Approach Control.

Section 73.38 of part 73 of the Federal Aviation Regulations was republished in FAA Order 7400.8L dated October 7, 2003.

The FAA has determined that this proposed regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. Therefore, this proposed regulation: (1) Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule, when promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Environmental Review

The USAF analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action in an Environmental Assessment (EA) dated December 2000. Based on the EA, the Air Force concludes that the proposed action will not produce significant impacts, either by itself or through cumulative effects of past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions. Further, the Air Force determined that the proposed action does not require preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Air Force issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) dated May 9, 2001.

The FAA has conducted an independent review of the Air Force's EA in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1D and the FAA/DOD Memorandum of Understanding of 1998 regarding Special Use Airspace Actions. After careful review and thorough consideration of the proposal, the FAA has determined that the Federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the National Environmental Policies Act of 1969 (NEPA) and that it will not significantly effect the quality of the human environment.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 73

Airspace, Navigation (air), Prohibited Areas, and Restricted Areas.

The Adoption of the Amendment

■ In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration will amend 14 CFR part 73 as follows:

PART 73—SPECIAL USE AIRSPACE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 73 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

§ 73.38 (Amended)

■ 2. § 73.38 is amended as follows:

* * * * *

R–3801A Camp Claiborne, LA (Amended)

By removing the current boundaries, designated altitudes, and controlling agency, and substituting the following:

Boundaries. Beginning at lat. 31°11′46″ N., long. 92°30′16″ W.; to lat. 31°05′16″ N., long. 92°34′51″ W.; to lat. 31°13′56″ N., long. 92°49′46″ W.; to lat. 31°18′01″ N., long. 92°46′31″ W.; to lat. 31°15′16″ N., long. 92°41′46″ W.; to lat. 31°17′11″ N., long. 92°40′11″ W.; to the point of beginning.

Designated altitudes. Surface to, but not including, 10,000 feet MSL.

Controlling agency. U.S. Army, Fort Polk Approach Control.

* * * * *

R–3801B Camp Claiborne, LA (Amended)

By removing the current boundaries, designated altitudes, and controlling agency and substituting the following:

Boundaries. Beginning at lat. 31°11′46″ N., long. 92°30′16″ W.; to lat. 31°05′16″ N., long. 92°34′51″ W.; to lat. 31°13′56″ N., long. 92°49′46″ W.; to lat. 31°18′01″ N., long. 92°46′31″ W.; to lat. 31°15′16″ N., long. 92°41′46″ W.; to lat. 31°17′11″ N., long. 92°40′11″ W.; to the point of beginning.

Designated altitudes. 10,000 feet MSL to, but not including, FL 180.

Controlling agency. U.S. Army, Fort Polk Approach Control.

* * * * *

R–3801C Camp Claiborne, LA (Amended)

By removing the current boundaries, designated altitudes, and controlling agency and substituting the following:

Boundaries. Beginning at lat. 31°11′46″ N., long. 92°30′16″ W.; to lat. 31°05′16″ N., long. 92°34′51″ W.; to lat. 31°13′56″ N., long. 92°49′46″ W.; to lat.

31°18'01" N., long. 92°46'31" W.; to lat. 31°15'16" N., long. 92°41'46" W.; to lat. 31°17'11" N., long. 92°40'11" W.; to the point of beginning.

Designated altitudes. FL 180 to FL 230.

Controlling agency. U.S. Army, Fort Polk Approach Control.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 14, 2004.

Reginald C. Matthews,

Manager, Airspace and Rules.

[FR Doc. 04–8922 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

15 CFR Parts 738 and 740

[Docket No. 040330104–4104–01]

RIN 0694–AC83

Addition of Aruba, Netherlands Antilles, East Timor, and Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Update of Country Names, in the Export Administration Regulations

AGENCY: Bureau of Industry and Security, Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) is amending the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) to update the Country Chart to add East Timor and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to establish separate export licensing requirements for Aruba and Netherlands Antilles, and to update references to certain countries to reflect their officially recognized names.

DATES: This rule is effective April 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bernie Kritzer, Office of Strategic Trade and Foreign Policy Controls, Bureau of Export Administration, Telephone: (202) 482–4196.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This final rule adds East Timor, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Aruba and Netherlands Antilles as separate entries on the Commerce Country Chart in Supplement No. 1 to part 738 of the EAR for export licensing purposes. East Timor attained independence from Indonesia on May 20, 2002. Democratic Republic of the Congo became the successor nation to Zaire in 1997. Aruba and the Netherlands Antilles, although dependencies of the Netherlands, maintain their own separate export control systems and therefore are treated as distinct from the Netherlands for export control purposes. The EAR now list two countries with "Congo" in their names: the Republic of the Congo, the capital city of which is Brazzaville, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the capital city of which is Kinshasa. This segregation of Aruba and Netherlands Antilles from the Netherlands is not meant as a departure from current export control policy as to the treatment of dependencies. The EAR will continue to treat territories, possessions or departments of foreign countries as having the same licensing requirements as their sovereigns on the Commerce Country Chart when such territories, possessions or departments are not separately listed on the Commerce Country Chart.

This final rule also updates references to certain countries in the EAR to reflect their officially recognized names, including Macedonia (the Former Yugoslav Republic of), Micronesia (Federated States of), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Serbia and Montenegro, and Antigua and Barbuda. Specifically, this rule amends the EAR as follows:

1. In Supplement No. 1 to part 738 of the EAR, Aruba, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), East Timor, and Netherlands Antilles are added to the Commerce Country Chart. As noted on the Chart, licensing requirements for exports and reexports to Aruba, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), East Timor and Netherlands Antilles are imposed, as applicable, on items subject to the EAR controlled for the following reasons: Chemical and biological weapons, nuclear nonproliferation, national security, missile technology, regional stability, and crime control. These controls reflect the status of these countries with respect to membership in multilateral regimes or in NATO. Zaire is deleted from the Commerce Country Chart. In order to reflect officially recognized country names, Congo (Republic of the), Macedonia (Former Yugoslav Republic of), Micronesia (Federated States of), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, and Serbia and Montenegro replace Congo, FYROM (Macedonia), Micronesia, St. Vincent, Western Samoa, and Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), Federal Republic of, respectively.

2. In Supplement No. 1 to part 740 of the EAR, Aruba, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), East Timor, and Netherlands Antilles are added to Country Group B. Zaire is removed from Country Group B. Antigua and Barbuda, Congo (Republic of the), Samoa, and Serbia and Montenegro replace, respectively, Antigua, Barbuda, Congo, Western Samoa, and Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), Federal Republic of.

3. In § 740.7 of the EAR, Aruba, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), East Timor, and Netherlands Antilles are added under Computer Tier 1 for License Exception CTP purposes. Bahamas (The), Congo (Republic of the), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Samoa replace Bahamas, Congo, St. Vincent and Grenadines, and Western Samoa, respectively, under Computer Tier 1. Zaire is removed from the Computer Tier 1 category. Serbia and Montenegro replaces Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) under Computer Tier 3.

Although the Export Administration Act expired on August 20, 2001, Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR, 2001 Comp., p. 783 (2002)), as extended by the Notice of August 7, 2003 (68 FR 47833, August 11, 2003), continues the Regulations in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.

Rulemaking Requirements

1. This final rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of E.O. 12866.

2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information, subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) (PRA), unless that collection of information displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number. This rule involves a collection of information subject to the PRA. This collection has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 0694–0088, "Multi-Purpose Application," which carries a burden hour estimate of which carries a burden hour estimate of 58 minutes for a manual or electronic submission. Send comments regarding these burden estimates or any other aspect of these collections of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to David Rostker, OMB, by e-mail to *David_Rostker@omb.eop.gov*, or by fax to (202) 395–7285; and to the Regulatory Policy Division, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 273, Washington, DC 20044.

3. This rule does not contain policies with Federalism implications as this term is defined under Executive Order 13132.

4. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553) requiring notice of proposed rulemaking, the opportunity for public

participation, and a delay in effective date, are inapplicable because this regulation involves a military and foreign affairs function of the United States (Sec. 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1)). Further, no other law requires that a notice of proposed rulemaking and an opportunity for public comment be given for this final rule. Because a notice of proposed rulemaking and an opportunity for public comment are not required to be given for this rule under 5 U.S.C. 553 or by any other law, the analytical requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) are not applicable.

Therefore, this regulation is issued in final form. Although there is no formal comment period, public comments on this regulation are welcome on a continuing basis. Comments should be submitted to Matthew Blaskovich, Regulatory Policy Division, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 273, Washington, DC 20044.

List of Subjects

15 CFR Part 738

Exports, Foreign trade.

15 CFR Parts 740

Administrative practice and procedure, Exports, Foreign trade, Reporting and record keeping requirements.

■ Accordingly, parts 738 and 740 of the Export Administration Regulations (15 CFR parts 730–799) are amended as follows:

PART 738—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for 15 CFR part 738 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 50 U.S.C. app. 2401 *et seq.*; 50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*; 10 U.S.C. 7420; 10 U.S.C. 7430(e); 18 U.S.C. 2510 *et seq.*; 22 U.S.C. 287c; 22 U.S.C. 3201 *et seq.*; 22 U.S.C. 6004; 30 U.S.C. 185(s), 185(u); 42 U.S.C. 2139a; 42 U.S.C. 6212; 43 U.S.C. 1354; 46 U.S.C. app. 466c; 50 U.S.C. app. 5; Sec. 901–911, Pub. L. 106–387; Sec 221, Pub. L. 107–56; E.O. 13026, 61 FR 58767, 3 CFR, 1996 Comp., p. 228; E.O. 13222, 66 FR 44025, 3 CFR, 2001 Comp., p. 783; Notice of August 7, 2003, 3 CFR, 2003 Comp., p. 328.

■ 2. Supplement No. 1 to Part 738 is amended by:

■ a. Adding "Aruba", "Congo (Democratic Republic of the)", "East Timor", and "Netherlands Antilles" in alphabetical order as set forth below;

■ b. Revising "Congo", "FYROM (Macedonia)", "Micronesia", "St. Vincent and Grenadines", "Western Samoa", and "Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), Federal Republic of" to read "Congo (Republic of the)", "Macedonia (The Former Yugoslav Republic of)", "Micronesia (Federated States of)", "Saint Vincent and the Grenadines", "Samoa", and "Serbia and Montenegro", respectively and placing them in appropriate alphabetical order; and

■ c. Removing "Zaire."

SUPPLEMENT NO. 1 TO PART 738—COMMERCE COUNTRY CHART

[Reason for control]

Countries	Chemical & biological weapons			Nuclear non-proliferation		National security		Missile tech	Regional stability		Fire-arms con-vention	Crime control			Anti-terrorism	
	CB 1	CB 2	CB 3	NP 1	NP 2	NS 1	NS 2	MT 1	RS 1	RS 2	FC 1	CC 1	CC 2	CC 3	AT 1	AT 2
Aruba	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X		
Congo (Democratic Republic of the)	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X		
East Timor	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X		
Netherlands Antilles	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X		

PART 740—[AMENDED]

■ 3. The authority citation for 15 CFR part 740 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 50 U.S.C. app. 2401 *et seq.*; 50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq .; Sec. 901–911, Pub. L. 106–387; E.O. 13026, 61 FR 58767, 3 CFR, 1996 Comp., p. 228; E.O. 13222, 66 FR 44025, 3 CFR,2001 Comp., p. 783; Notice of August 7, 2003, 3 CFR Comp., p. 328.

■ 4. Section 740.7, paragraph (c) (1), is amended by revising the following phrases:

■ a. "Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas" to read "Argentina, Aruba, Australia, Austria, Bahamas (The)";

■ b. "Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire" to read "Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), Congo (Republic of the), Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire";

■ c. "Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador" to read "Dominican Republic, East Timor, Ecuador, El Salvador";

■ d. "Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger" to read "Nepal, Netherlands, Netherlands Antilles, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger";

■ e. "St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Sao Tome & Principe, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles" to read "St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome & Principe, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles";

■ f. " Venezuela, Western Sahara, Western Samoa" to read " Venezuela, Western Sahara"; and

■ g. "Zaire, Zambia, and Zimbabwe" to read "Zambia, and Zimbabwe".

■ 5. Section 740.7, paragraph (d) (1), is amended by revising the following phrases:

■ a. "Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia" to read "Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Saudi Arabia"; and

■ b. " Vietnam, Yemen, and Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)" to read "Vietnam, and Yemen."

■ 6. Supplement No. 1 to part 740, Country Group B, is amended by:

■ a. Adding, in alphabetical order, "Antigua and Barbuda", "Aruba", "Congo (Democratic Republic of the)", "Congo (Republic of the)", "East Timor", "Netherlands Antilles", "Samoa", "Serbia and Montenegro" to Country Group B;

■ b. Removing "Antigua", "Barbuda", "Congo", "Western Samoa", "Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), Federal Republic of" and "Zaire" from Country Group B;

■ c. Revising the phrase "Bahamas" to read "The Bahamas";

■ d. Revising the phrase "Macedonia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of" to

read "Macedonia, The Former Yugoslav Republic of"; and

■ e. Revising the phrase "Saint Vincent" to read "Saint Vincent and the Grenadines".

Dated: April 12, 2004.

Peter Lichtenbaum,

Assistant Secretary, for Export Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8807 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–33–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

17 CFR Part 200

[Release No. 34–49562]

Revision of Rule Concerning Holding Period and Disclosure Requirements for Members' and Employees' Investment Company Transactions

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Securities and Exchange Commission is amending its rule covering member and employee securities transactions. The amended rule updates the definition of money market fund; removes the exception to the six-month holding period for shares of a unit investment trust having a term of less than six months; requires Commission members and employees to hold investment company shares for a minimum of 30 days before they are permitted to transfer those assets to another registered investment company within the same family of registered investment companies; and requires Commission members and employees to report every purchase or sale of investment company shares, other than money market fund shares.

DATES: *Effective Date:* May 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Lenox, Assistant Ethics Counsel, or Richard Connor, Assistant Ethics Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, at (202) 942–0970, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549–0303.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") is amending 17 CFR 200.735–5, its rule covering members' and employees' securities transactions. This rule was adopted as part of the Commission's Conduct Regulation in 1953. Until 1980, the rule prohibited Commissioners and all employees from purchasing securities of registered investment companies. In 1980, the rule was revised to permit employees, other than Commissioners and SES members in the Division of Investment Management, to purchase such securities. The rule was further revised in 1988 to allow employees to transfer funds within a family of registered investment companies without regard to the holding period previously established by the rule. In 1995, the rule was again amended to allow Commissioners and SES members in the Division of Investment Management and the Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations to purchase diversified mutual funds. In light of recent developments regarding trading practices in the investment company industry, and in furtherance of the Commission's tradition of imposing stringent trading limitations on its employees, the Commission is amending the rule to ensure that its employees' trading practices continue to adhere to the highest possible standards of ethical conduct.

First, the Commission is updating the definition of money market fund [1] to comport with the language used by the Division of Investment Management in other contexts.

Second, the Commission is modifying current exceptions to its six-month holding period for certain types of securities. The Commission's rule provides that "no member or employee shall effect or cause to be effected any transaction in a security except for bona fide investment purposes. Therefore, all securities purchased by a member or employee must be held for a minimum of six months." [2] The rule contains six exceptions to the six-month holding period requirement. One of the exceptions provides that the holding period is not applicable to "shares of a unit investment trust having a term of less than six months." [3] The Commission is removing this exception from the rule.

Another exception provides that the six-month holding period is not applicable to "the transferring of funds within a *family* of registered investment companies." [4] The Commission is amending this exception to provide that the six-month holding period is not applicable to the transferring of funds that have been held as shares in a registered investment company for a minimum of 30 days to another registered company within the same *family* of registered investment companies. This 30-day holding period will not apply to money market fund shares, which are already fully exempted from the six-month holding period.

Third, the Commission is increasing its reporting requirements for members and employees. The Commission's rule currently requires, with limited exceptions, that members and employees report every acquisition or sale of any security.[5] One of the exceptions applies to mutual fund transactions occurring after the initial purchase has been reported.[6] The Commission is amending this exception to require members and employees to report every purchase or sale of investment company shares, other than money market fund shares. With respect to money market fund shares, Commission members and employees will be required to report the initial purchase and final sale of such shares.

The Commission has determined that these amendments to its rule regulating member and employee securities holdings and transactions relate solely to the agency's organization, procedure or practice. Therefore, the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act regarding notice and comment are not applicable.[7] It follows that the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act do not apply.[8] These rule amendments also impose no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act.[9]

Statutory Basis

The amendments to the Commission's rule are adopted pursuant to section 23(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. 78w(a); section 19(a) of the Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. 77s(a); section 20(a) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, 15 U.S.C. 79t(a); section 319 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, 15 U.S.C. 77sss(a); section 38(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, 15 U.S.C. 80a–37(a); and section 211(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, 15 U.S.C. 80b–11(a).

List of Subjects in 17 CFR Part 200

Conflict of interests.

■ In accordance with the foregoing, Title 17 Chapter II of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

[1] Footenote 17 following 17 CFR 200.735–5(b)(1)(ii).

[2] 17 CFR 200.735–5(b)(1).

[3] 17 CFR 200.735–5(b)(1)(v).

[4] 17 CFR 200.735–5(b)(1)(vi).

[5] 17 CFR 200.735–5(m)(2).

[6] 17 CFR 200.735–5(m)(3).

[7] 5 U.S.C. 553(b).

[8] 5 U.S.C. 601–612.

[9] 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520.

PART 200—ORGANIZATION; CONDUCT AND ETHICS; AND INFORMATION AND REQUESTS

Subpart M—Regulation Concerning Conduct of Members and Employees and Former Members and Employees of the Commission

■ 1. The authority citation for subpart M continues to read as follows:

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 77s, 78w, 79t, 77sss, 80a–37, 80b–11; E.O. 11222, 3 CFR, 1964–1965 Comp.; 5 CFR 735.104 unless otherwise noted.

■ 2. Section 200.735–5 is amended by:

■ a. Revising footnote 17 appearing in paragraph (b)(1)(ii);

■ b. Adding at the end of paragraph (b)(1)(iv) the word "or";

■ c. Removing paragraph (b)(1)(v);

■ d. Redesignating paragraph (b)(1)(vi) as paragraph (b)(1)(v);

■ e. Revising newly redesignated paragraph (b)(1)(v); and

■ f. Revising paragraph (m)(3).

The revisions read as follows.

§ 200.735–5 Securities transactions.

* * * * *

(b)(1) * * *

(ii) * * *

[17] For purposes of this section a *money market fund* is defined as a registered open-end fund that complies with § 270.2a–7 of this chapter.

* * * * *

(v) The transferring of funds that have been held as shares in a registered investment company for a minimum of 30 days to another registered investment company within the same *family* of registered investment companies. This 30-day holding period does not apply to money market fund shares, which are exempted from the six-month holding period by paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section.

* * * * *

(m)(1) * * *

(3) Members and employees shall report only the initial purchase and final sale of shares in a money market fund.

* * * * *

Dated: April 14, 2004.

By the Commission.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–8890 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

28 CFR Part 803

[CSOSA–0007–F]

RIN 3225–AA05

Agency Seal

AGENCY: Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia (CSOSA or Agency) is adopting regulations on the use of its official seal and the official seal for the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency (PSA or Agency), an independent entity within CSOSA. Use by any person or organization may be made only with CSOSA's or PSA's prior written approval. Wrongful use of an official seal is subject to administrative action and/or criminal penalty.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Office of the General Counsel, CSOSA, Room 1253, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy Nanovic, Records Manager (telephone: (202) 220–5359; e-mail: *roy.nanovic@csosa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CSOSA is adopting regulations (28 CFR 803) on the use of its official seal and the official seal for PSA, an independent entity within CSOSA.

CSOSA and PSA have each developed a seal which signifies the authoritativeness of the item or document to which it is affixed as an official endorsement of the Agency. The seals are to be used for official Agency business or as approved under CSOSA's regulations.

Matters of Regulatory Procedure

Administrative Procedure Act

A proposed rule on this subject was published in the **Federal Register** on April 22, 2003 (68 FR 19770). The Agency received no comment on this proposed rule. Accordingly, the Agency is adopting the proposed rule as final without change.

Any interested person, however, who wishes to submit further comments on the rule may do so by writing or e-mailing the agency at the addresses given above in the **ADDRESSES** and **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** captions. These comments will be considered but will not necessarily receive a response in the **Federal Register**.

Executive Order 12866

This rule has been determined to be significant under Executive Order 12866 and has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

Executive Order 13132

This rule will not have substantial direct effects on the States; on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 13132, the Director of CSOSA had determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Director of CSOSA, in accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), has reviewed this rule and by approving it certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities. This rule pertains to agency management, and its economic impact is limited to the agency's appropriated funds.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100,000,000 or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, the Director of CSOSA has determined that no actions are necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 804 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of $1000,000,000 or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets.

Plain Language Instructions

We want to make CSOSA's documents easy to read and understand. If you have suggestions on how to

improve the clarity of these regulations, write, e-mail, or call Roy Nanovic at the address or telephone number given above in the **ADDRESSES** and **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** captions.

List of Subjects in CFR Part 803

Probation and parole, Seals and insignia.

Paul A. Quander, Jr.

Director.

■ Accordingly, we amend chapter VIII, Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations by adding part 803 as set forth below.

PART 803—AGENCY SEAL

Sec.
803.1 Description.
803.2 Authority to affix seal.
803.3 Use of the seal.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; Pub. L. 105–33, 111 Stat. 251, 712 (D.C. Code 24–1232, 24–1233).

§ 803.1 Description.

(a) The Agency seal of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia (CSOSA or Agency) is described as follows: General George Washington's coat of arms in red and white bounded by an outline of the District of Columbia and superimposed upon a blue field together with the dome of the United States Capitol building in gold; encircled by a banner with the words "Community, Accountability, and Justice" and gold laurel branches, with gold edges bearing the inscription "COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY" above three stars at either side of the words "DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA" in smaller letters in the base; letters and stars in gold. A reproduction of the Agency seal in black and white appears as follows.

(b) The Agency seal of the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency (PSA or Agency) is described as follows: General George Washington's coat of arms in red and white bounded by an outline of the District of Columbia and superimposed upon a blue field together with the dome of the United States Capitol building in gold; encircled by a banner with the words "Community, Accountability, and Justice" and gold laurel branches, with gold edges bearing the inscription "DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PRETRIAL SERVICES AGENCY"; letters in gold. A reproduction of the Agency seal in black and white appears as follows.

§ 803.2 Authority to affix seal.

The Director of CSOSA or PSA (as appropriate) and the Director's designees are authorized to affix the Agency seal (including replicas and reproductions) to appropriate documents, certifications, and other materials of all purposes authorized by this part.

§ 803.3 Use of the seal.

(a) The Agency seal is used by Agency staff for official agency business as approved by the appropriate Director or designee.

(b) Use of the Agency seal by any person or organization outside of the Agency may be made only with the appropriate prior written approval.

(1) Any request for such use must be made in writing to the Office of the General Counsel, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20004, and must specify, in detail, the exact use to be made. Any permission granted by the appropriate Director or designee applies only to the specific use for which it was granted and is not to be construed as permission for any other use.

(2) The decision whether to grant such a request is made on a case-by-case basis, with consideration of all relevant factors, which may include: the benefit or cost to the government of granting the request; the unintended appearance of endorsement or authentication by the Agency; the potential for misuse; the effect upon Agency security; the reputability of the use; the extent of the control by the Agency over the ultimate use; and the extent of control by the Agency over distribution of any products or publications bearing the Agency seal.

(c) Falsely making, forging, counterfeiting, mutilating, or altering the Agency seal or reproduction, or knowingly using or possessing with fraudulent intent an altered Agency seal or reproduction is punishable under 28 U.S.C. 506.

(d) Any person using the Agency seal or reproduction in a manner inconsistent with the provisions of this part is subject to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 1017, which states penalties for the wrongful use of an Agency seal, and other provisions of law as applicable.

[FR Doc. 04–8914 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3129–01–M

COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

28 CFR Part 804

[CSOSA–0008–F]

RIN 3225–AA06

Acceptance of Gifts

AGENCY: Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia (CSOSA) is adopting regulations on the acceptance or use of gifts by itself and by the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency (PSA), an independent entity within CSOSA. In accordance with specific statutory authority, CSOSA and PSA may accept and use gifts in the form of in-kind contributions of space and hospitality for the purpose of supporting offender and defendant programs and of equipment and vocational training services to educate and train offenders and defendants. These regulations delegate authority to the Director of PSA with respect to gifts supporting defendant programs and vocational training services, establish procedures for the public to follow when offering a gift, establish criteria for accepting and using gifts, and establish procedures for audit and public inspection of records pertaining to the acceptance and use of gifts. These regulations are intended to enhance CSOSA's and PSA's ability to provide appropriate treatment and support services that can assist defendants and offenders in reintegrating into the community.

DATES: *Effective Date:* May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Office of the General Counsel, CSOSA, Room 1253, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy Nanovic, Records Manager (telephone: (202) 220–5359; e-mail: *roy.nanovic@csosa.gov).*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CSOSA is adopting regulations (28 CFR part 804) on the acceptance or use of gifts by itself and by PSA, an independent entity within CSOSA.

Generally speaking, federal agencies are prohibited from accepting or soliciting gifts, donations, contributions, and similar items from the public. CSOSA's Director, however, has been granted specific authority by Congress to accept and use gifts in the form of in-kind contributions of space and hospitality to support offender and defendant programs and to enable the Agency to provide vocational training services to educate and train offenders and defendants (District of Columbia Appropriations Act of 2002, Public Law 107–96, 115 Stat. 923, 931).

These implementing regulations delegate authority to the Director of PSA with respect to gifts supporting defendant programs and vocational training services. The regulations also establish procedures for the public to follow when offering a gift, criteria for accepting and using gifts, and procedures for audit and public inspection of records pertaining to the acceptance and use of gifts. In establishing such procedures, CSOSA seeks to ensure that Agency employees may process requests for donations and remain in compliance with the general federal prohibition on solicitation of gifts.

Matters of Regulatory Procedure

Administrative Procedure Act

A proposed rule on this subject was published in the **Federal Register** on April 22, 2003 (68 FR 19771). The Agency received no comment on this proposed rule. Accordingly, the Agency is adopting the proposed rule as final without change.

Any interested person, however, who wishes to submit further comments on the rule may do so by writing or e-mailing the agency at the addresses given above in the **ADDRESSES** and **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** captions. These comments will be considered but will not necessarily receive a response in the **Federal Register**.

Executive Order 12866

This rule has been determined to be significant under Executive Order 12866 and has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

Executive Order 13132

This rule will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 13132, the Director of CSOSA has determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Director of CSOSA, in accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), has reviewed this rule and by approving it certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities. This rule pertains to agency management, and its economic impact is limited to the agency's appropriated funds.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100,000,000 or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, the Director of CSOSA has determined that no actions are necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 804 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets.

Plain Language Instructions

We want to make CSOSA's documents easy to read and understand. If you have suggestions on how to improve the clarity of these regulations, write, e-mail, or call Roy Nanovic at the address or telephone number given above in the **ADDRESSES** and **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** captions.

List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 804

Authority delegations (Government agencies), Government property, Probation and parole.

Paul A. Quander, Jr.,
Director.

■ Accordingly, we amend chapter VIII, Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations by adding a new part 804 as set forth below.

PART 804—ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS

Sec.
804.1 Purpose.
804.2 Delegation of authority.
804.3 Restrictions.
804.4 Submission and approval.
804.5 Audit and public inspection.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; Public Law 107–96, 115 Stat. 923, 931.

§ 804.1 Purpose.

By statute, the Director of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA or Agency) is authorized to accept and use gifts in the form of in-kind contributions of space and hospitality to support offender and defendant programs, and of equipment and vocational training services to educate and train offenders and defendants. The purpose of this part is to:

(a) Inform the public of the procedures to follow when offering a gift;

(b) Establish criteria for accepting and using gifts;

(c) Establish procedures for audit and public inspection of records pertaining to the acceptance and use of gifts; and

(d) Delegate gift acceptance authority to the Director of the Pretrial Services Agency (PSA or Agency).

§ 804.2 Delegation of authority.

The Director of CSOSA hereby delegates to the Director of PSA the authority to accept and use gifts in the form of in-kind contributions of space and hospitality to support defendant programs, and of equipment and vocational training services to educate and train defendants in accordance with the requirements of this part. This delegation of authority may not be further delegated.

§ 804.3 Restrictions.

(a) The Agency is not authorized to accept gifts of money, stock, bonds, personal or real property, or devises or bequests of such items, except as provided in this part.

(b) Agency employees may not solicit any type of gift to the Agency.

§ 804.4 Submission and approval.

(a) *Offender programs and equipment and vocational training services.* (1) Any person or organization wishing to donate as a gift in-kind contributions of space or hospitality to support offender programs, or equipment or vocational training services to educate and train offenders may submit the following information in writing to the Agency's Ethics Officer in the Office of the General Counsel:

(i) The name of the person or organization offering the gift;

(ii) A description of the gift;

(iii) The estimated value of the gift;

(iv) Any restrictions on the gift placed by the donor; and

(v) A signed statement that the gift is unsolicited.

(2) The Director, after consultation with the Agency's Ethics Officer, shall determine whether to accept or reject the gift.

(3) CSOSA staff shall advise the person offering the gift of the Agency's determination, including, if applicable, the reason for rejection. Reasons for rejecting a gift include findings that:

(i) There is a conflict of interest in accepting the gift;

(ii) Acceptance of the gift is otherwise unlawful or would create the appearance of impropriety;

(iii) Acceptance of the gift would obligate the Agency to an unbudgeted expenditure of funds; or

(iv) Operation of the program, equipment, or vocational training services would not be practicable.

(b) *Defendant programs and equipment and vocational training services.* (1) Any person or organization wishing to donate as a gift in-kind contributions of space or hospitality to support defendant programs, or equipment or vocational training services to educate and train defendants may submit the following information in writing to the Agency's Ethics Officer in the Office of the General Counsel:

(i) The name of the person or organization offering the gift;

(ii) A description of the gift;

(iii) The estimated value of the gift;

(iv) Any restrictions on the gift placed by the donor; and

(v) A signed statement that the gift is unsolicited.

(2) The General Counsel shall forward the request to PSA's Director with a recommendation whether to accept or reject the gift.

(3) PSA staff shall advise the person offering the gift of the Agency's determination, including the reason for rejection. Reasons for rejecting a gift include findings that:

(i) There is a conflict of interest in accepting the gift;

(ii) Acceptance of the gift is otherwise unlawful or would create the appearance of impropriety;

(iii) Acceptance of the gift would obligate the Agency to an unbudgeted expenditure of funds; or

(iv) Operation of the program, equipment, or vocational training services would not be practicable.

§ 804.5 Audit and public inspection.

(a) Records regarding the acceptance and use of gifts shall be made available for Federal Government audit.

(b) Public inspection of records regarding the acceptance and use of gifts shall be afforded through Freedom of Information Act requests (*see* 28 CFR part 802).

[FR Doc. 04–8915 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3129–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD05–04–071]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Manasquan River, NJ

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of temporary deviation from regulations and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District, has issued a temporary deviation from the drawbridge operation regulations to test an alternate drawbridge operation regulation for the Route 70 Bridge across Manasquan River, mile 3.4, at Riviera Beach, New Jersey. Under this temporary 90-day deviation, the draw of the bridge will open on signal on the hour, except that from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Friday and from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. every day the draw need not be opened. The purpose of this temporary deviation is to test an alternate drawbridge operation schedule for 90 days and solicit comments from the public.

DATES: This deviation is effective from May 1, 2004, through July 29, 2004. Comments must reach the Coast Guard on or before August 31, 2004.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (obr), Fifth Coast Guard District, Federal Building, 4th Floor, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704–5004, or they may be hand delivered to the same address between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays. The Commander (obr), Fifth Coast Guard District maintains the public docket for this deviation. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the above address.

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in evaluating this test schedule by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this deviation CGD05–04–071, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Waverly W. Gregory Jr., Bridge Administrator, Fifth Coast Guard District, at (757) 398–6222.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Effective on July 11, 2003, the bridge owner, the New Jersey Department of Transportation, was officially permitted to operate the Route 70 Bridge across Manasquan River with new regulations. The new operating regulations listed at 33 CFR 117.727 allows the draw of the bridge to open on signal on the hour, except that from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday and from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m., every day the draw need not be open.

Based on comments received on the new operating regulations of the bridge and in an effort to facilitate vessel and vehicular traffic while providing for the reasonable needs of navigation, the District Commander has offered a test period to reexamine the rush hour closure periods during the forthcoming recreational boating season. The new proposal will test a new rush hour period from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, as opposed to the current 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. regulatory hours. Therefore, the last drawbridge opening for vessels before the rush hour will occur at 4 p.m. and first opening following the rush hour will be at 7 p.m.

Under this 90-day temporary deviation, effective from May 1, 2004 through July 29, 2004, the Route 70 Bridge across Manasquan shall open on signal on the hour, except that from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Friday and from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m., every day the draw need not be opened.

This deviation from the operating regulations is authorized under 33 CFR 117.43.

Dated: April 12, 2004.

Waverly W. Gregory, Jr.,

Chief, Bridge Branch, Fifth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 04–8865 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD05–03–121]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation: Mantua Creek, NJ

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is changing the operating regulations for the Consolidated Rail Corporation (CONRAIL) Railroad Bridge across Mantua Creek at mile 1.4, in Paulsboro, New Jersey. The final rule for the CONRAIL Railroad Bridge will increase vessel openings and eliminate the need for a bridge tender by allowing the bridge to be operated by a train crewmember. The final rule will provide for the reasonable needs of navigation.

DATES: This rule is effective May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket CGD05–03–121 and are available for inspection or copying at Commander (obr), Fifth Coast Guard District, Federal Building, 4th Floor, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704–5004 between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Waverly W. Gregory, Jr., Bridge Administrator, Fifth Coast Guard District, at (757) 398–6222.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory History

On November 25, 2003, we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Mantua Creek, New Jersey" in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 66062). We received two letters commenting on the proposed rule. No public hearing was requested nor held.

Background and Purpose

CONRAIL, who owns and operates this movable (swing-type) bridge, requested changes to the operating procedure for the drawbridge located at mile 1.4 across Mantua Creek, in Paulsboro, New Jersey. Currently, 33 CFR 117.729(a) requires the bridge to open on signal except, that from December 1 through March 1, the draw must open on signal at all times upon four hours notice.

CONRAIL installed a new Programmable Logic Controller and associated mechanical, electrical and signal apparatus on the CONRAIL Railroad Bridge over Mantua Creek in Paulsboro, New Jersey. This rule allows a radio-controlled system to operate the opening and closing of the swing span from the cab of the locomotive. From March through November, the swing bridge will normally be left in the fully opened position displaying flashing green channel lights indicating that vessels may pass through. At all other times, the draw of the CONRAIL Railroad Bridge need only open on signal if at least four hours notice is given by calling (856) 231–2393.

Discussion of Comments and Changes

The Coast Guard received two comments on the NPRM. The first comment, from CONRAIL, noted that when the bridge is seated and locked down to vessels, the channel traffic lights will continue to flash red. The proposed rule, in paragraph (a) (1)(iv), stated that the channel traffic lights "will extinguish".

The second comment, from New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT), had expressed concerns that the method of signaling proposed by CONRAIL for the opening and closing of the span might cause boater confusion and reduce safety. The NJDOT operates the upstream Route 44 Bridge at mile 2.7 across Mantua Creek in Paulsboro, and uses the standard signaling for drawbridges delineated in 33 CFR 117.15. NJDOT correctly indicated that, at 33 CFR 117.15(a)(4), the sound signal for a horn to acknowledge that the drawbridge is about to open for vessels is one prolonged blast followed by a short blast. The proposed rule, in paragraph (a)(1)(iv), stated the horn would sound, "twice" followed by "five repeated blasts".

NJDOT also indicated that before closing a draw span to vessels, 33 CFR 117.15(a)(5) requires the acknowledging signal as five short blasts of the horn in rapid succession. The proposed rule, in paragraph (a)(1)(v), stated that the horn would sound "twice" then "two horn blasts".

The Coast Guard considers these changes proposed to be more reliable and the final rule was changed to reflect these procedures.

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. It is not "significant" under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). We reached this conclusion based on the fact that this final rule for the CONRAIL Railroad Bridge will provide for greater flow of vessel traffic than the current regulations for the drawbridge.

Under the current regulations, the CONRAIL Railroad Bridge remains closed and opens after proper signal from March 1 through November 30. The final rule will require the bridge to remain in the open position during this period, permitting vessels to pass freely. The bridge will close only for train crossings and bridge maintenance. This final rule will provide for the reasonable needs of navigation.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term "small entities" comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. The final rule will provide for the CONRAIL Railroad Bridge to remain in the open position

from March through November, allowing the free flow of vessel traffic. The bridge would only close for the passage of trains and maintenance.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we offered to assist small entities in understanding the rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process. In our notice of proposed rulemaking, we provided a point of contact to small entities who could answer questions concerning proposed provisions or option for compliance.

Collection of Information

This rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of $100,000,000 or more in any one year. Though this rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This rule will not affect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a "significant energy action" under that order because it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Environment

We have considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded that under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of Commandant Instruction M16475.lD, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. The final rule only involves the operation of an existing drawbridge and will not have any impact on the environment. A "Categorical Exclusion Determination" is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

■ For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); § 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

■ 2. Amend § 117.729 by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 117.729 Mantua Creek.

(a) The draw of the CONRAIL Railroad Bridge, mile 1.4 at Paulsboro, shall operate as follows:

(1) From March through November, the draw shall be left in the open position to vessels and will only be closed for the passage of trains and to perform periodic maintenance authorized in accordance with subpart A of this part.

(i) Trains shall be controlled so that any delay in opening of the draw shall not exceed ten minutes except as provided in § 117.31(b).

(ii) Before the bridge closes for any reason, an on-site train crewmember will observe the waterway for approaching craft, which will be allowed to pass. An on-site train crewmember will then operate the bridge by radiophone. The bridge shall only be closed if an on-site train crewmember's visual inspection shows that the channel is clear and there are no vessels transiting in the area.

(iii) While the CONRAIL Railroad Bridge is moving from the full open to the full closed position, an on-site train crewmember will maintain constant surveillance of the navigational channel to ensure no conflict with maritime traffic exists. In the event of failure or obstruction, the on-site train crewmember will stop the bridge and return the bridge to the open position.

(iv) During closing of the span, the channel traffic lights will flash red, the horn will sound five short blasts, and an audio voice warning device will announce bridge movement, and the bridge will close. When the bridge is seated and locked down to vessels, the channel traffic lights will continue to flash red. When the rail traffic has cleared the swing span, the horn will sound one prolonged blast followed by one short blast to signal the draw of the CONRAIL Railroad Bridge is about to return to its full open position to vessels.

(v) During open span movement, the channel traffic lights will flash red, the horn will sound one prolonged blast followed by one short blast, then a pause, and an audio voice warning will announce bridge movement until the bridge is in the full open position. In the full open position, the channel traffic lights will flash green.

(2) From December to February, the draw may be left in the closed position and opened on signal if at least four hours notice is given by telephone at (856) 231–2393.

* * * * *

Dated: April 13, 2004.

Sally Brice-O'Hara,

Rear Admiral, U. S. Coast Guard, Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 04–8864 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07–04–039]

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Royal Park (SR 704) Bridge, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Mile 1022.6, Palm Beach, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of temporary deviation from regulations.

SUMMARY: The Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District, has approved a temporary deviation from the regulations governing the operation of the Royal Park (SR 704) Bridge across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1022.6, Palm Beach, Florida. This deviation allows for bridge closures during certain times due to bridge alignment of the new spans.

DATES: This deviation is effective from 7 a.m. on April 15, 2004, until 5 p.m. on May 29, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket [CGD07–04–039] will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at Commander (obr), Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 SE. 1st Avenue, Miami, Florida 33131–3050 between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Barry Dragon, Project Officer, Seventh Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch at (305) 415–6744.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Royal Palm (SR 704) Bridge across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1022.6, Palm Beach, Florida, is a new double-leaf bascule bridge with a vertical clearance of 25 feet above mean high water (MHW) measured at the fenders in the closed position with a horizontal clearance of 125 feet. The current operating regulation in 33 CFR 117.261(v) requires that the Royal Park (SR 704) Bridge, mile 1022.6 at Palm Beach, shall open on signal, except that from October 1 through May 31, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, from 7:45 a.m. to 9:45 a.m. and from 3:30 p.m. to 5:45 p.m., the draw need open only at 8:45 a.m., 4:30 p.m., and 5:15 p.m., and from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., the draw need open only on the quarter-hour and three-quarter hour.

On March 2, 2004, the bridge owner, Florida Department of Transportation, requested a deviation from the current operating regulations to allow the owner and operator to close the bridge during certain times. On March 10, 2004, a meeting was held to determine an operating schedule for both the temporary bridge and the new bridge that would not unreasonably restrict navigation and allow for workers' safety during alignment of the new bridge. On April 2, 2004, this office received a revised schedule. Based on this paperwork, the following operating schedule has been approved:

From April 15 to April 20, 2004 the bridge will remain closed to navigation from 7:01 a.m. to 12:59 p.m. and 2:01 p.m. to 5:59 p.m. daily. From April 21 to May 16, 2004, from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily, the bridge will only open at 7 a.m., 8:30 a.m., 10 a.m., 11:30 a.m., 1 p.m., 2:30 p.m., 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. On May 17, 2004, the bridge will remain closed to navigation from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. From May 18 to May 22, 2004, the bridge will remain closed to navigation from 7:01 a.m. to 12:59 p.m. and 2:01 p.m. to 5:59 p.m. daily.

From May 24 to May 29, 2004, from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily, the bridge will only open at 7 a.m., 8:30 a.m., 10 a.m., 11:30 a.m., 1 p.m., 2:30 p.m., 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. This deviation is necessary to ensure workers' safety during the alignment of the bridge. The Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District has granted a temporary deviation from the operating requirements listed in 33 CFR 117.261(v) to complete the alignment of the new bridge leafs. Under this deviation, both the temporary Royal Park Bridge and the new Royal Park bridge (SR 704), Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway mile 1022.6, Palm Beach, Florida, shall remain closed to navigation from April 15 to April 20, 2004, from 7:01 a.m. to 12:59 p.m. and 2:01 p.m. to 5:59 p.m. daily. From April 21 to May 16, 2004, from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., the bridges will only open at 7 a.m., 8:30 a.m., 10 a.m., 11:30 a.m., 1 p.m., 2:30 p.m., 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. On May 17, 2004, the bridges will remain closed to navigation from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. From May 18 to May 22, 2004, the bridges shall remain closed to navigation from 7:01 a.m. to 12:59 p.m. and 2:01 p.m. to 5:59 p.m. daily. From May 24 to May 29, 2004, from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., the bridges will only open at 7 a.m., 8:30 a.m., 10 a.m., 11:30 a.m., 1 p.m., 2:30 p.m., 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. At all other times, the bridges shall open on signal, except Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, from 7:45 a.m. to 9:45 a.m. and from 3:30 p.m. to 5:45 p.m., the draw need open only at 8:45 a.m., 4:30 p.m., and 5:15 p.m., and, from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., the draw need open only on the quarter-hour and three-quarter hour.

Dated: April 9, 2004.

Greg Shapley,

Chief, Bridge Administration, Seventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 04–8863 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01–04–023]

Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Newtown Creek, Dutch Kills, English Kills, and Their Tributaries, NY

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of temporary deviation from regulations.

SUMMARY: The Commander, First Coast Guard District, has issued a temporary deviation from the drawbridge operation regulations for the Metropolitan Avenue Bridge, mile 3.4, across English Kills at New York City, New York. Under this temporary deviation the bridge may remain closed from 7 a.m. on April 26, 2004 through 4 p.m. on May 1, 2004, and from 7 a.m. on June 9, 2004 through 4 p.m. on June 12, 2004, to facilitate necessary bridge maintenance.

DATES: This deviation is effective from April 26, 2004 through June 12, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joe Arca, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, at (212) 668–7069.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) Metropolitan Avenue Bridge has a vertical clearance in the closed position of 10 feet at mean high water and 15 feet at mean low water. The existing drawbridge operation regulations are listed at 33 CFR 117.801(e).

NYCDOT, requested a temporary deviation from the drawbridge operation regulations to facilitate repairs to the electrical controls at the bridge. The bridge must remain in the closed position to perform these repairs.

Under this temporary deviation the NYCDOT Metropolitan Avenue Bridge may remain in the closed position from 7 a.m. on April 26, 2004 through 4 p.m. on May 1, 2004 and from 7 a.m. on June 9, 2004 through 4 p.m. on June 12, 2004.

This deviation from the operating regulations is authorized under 33 CFR *117.35*, and will be performed with all due speed in order to return the bridge to normal operation as soon as possible.

Dated: April 7, 2004.

John L. Grenier,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard , Acting Commander, First Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 04–8862 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 147

[CGD08–03–039]

RIN 1625–AA78

Safety Zone; Outer Continental Shelf Facility in the Gulf of Mexico for Mississippi Canyon 474

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a safety zone around a petroleum and gas production facility in Mississippi Canyon 474 "A" of the Outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico while the facility is being constructed and after the construction is completed. The construction site and facility need to be protected from vessels operating outside the normal shipping channels and fairways, and placing a safety zone around this area will significantly reduce the threat of allisions, oil spills and releases of natural gas. This rule prohibits all vessels from entering or remaining in the specified area around the facility's location except for attending vessels, vessels under 100 feet in length overall not engaged in towing, or vessels authorized by the Eighth Coast Guard District Commander.

DATES: This final rule is effective May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket [CGD08–03–039] and are available for inspection or copying at Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District (m), Hale Boggs Federal Bldg., 501 Magazine Street, New Orleans, LA, between 8 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant (LT) Kevin Lynn, Project Manager for Eighth Coast Guard District Commander, Hale Boggs Federal Bldg., 501 Magazine Street, New Orleans, LA 70130, telephone (504) 589–6271.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory History

On January 20, 2004, we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled "Safety Zone; Outer Continental Shelf Facility in the Gulf of Mexico for Mississippi Canyon 474" in the **Federal Register** (69 FR 2694). We received one comment on the proposed rule. No public hearing was requested, and none was held.

Background and Purpose

The Coast Guard is establishing a safety zone around a petroleum and gas production facility in the Gulf of Mexico: Na Kika Floating Oil and Gas Development System (FDS), Mississippi Canyon 474 "A" (MC 474 "A"), located at position 28°31′14.86″ N, 88°17′19.69″ W. The safety zone will be in effect while the facility is being constructed and after the construction is completed.

This safety zone is in the deepwater area of the Gulf of Mexico. For the purposes of this regulation it is considered to be in waters of 304.8 meters (1,000 feet) or greater depth extending to the limits of the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) contiguous to the territorial sea of the United States and extending to a distance up to 200 nautical miles from the baseline from which the breadth of the sea is measured. Navigation in the area of the safety zone consists of large commercial shipping vessels, fishing vessels, cruise ships, tugs with tows and the occasional recreational vessel. The deepwater area of the Gulf of Mexico also includes an extensive system of fairways. The fairways nearest the safety zone include the South Pass (Mississippi River) to Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet Channel Fairway and Southwest Pass (Mississippi River) to South Pass (Mississippi River) Safety Fairway. Significant amounts of vessel traffic occur in or near the various fairways in the deepwater area.

Shell Exploration and Production Company, hereafter referred to as "Shell" requested that the Coast Guard establish a safety zone in the Gulf of Mexico around the Na Kika FDS construction site and for the zone to remain in effect after construction is completed.

The request for the safety zone was made due to the high level of shipping activity around the site of the facility and the safety concerns for construction personnel, the personnel on board the facility after it is completed, and the environment. Shell indicated that the location, production level, and personnel levels on board the facility make it highly likely that any allision with the facility during and after construction would result in a catastrophic event.

The Coast Guard has evaluated Shell's information and concerns against Eighth Coast Guard District criteria developed to determine if an Outer Continental Shelf facility qualifies for a safety zone. Several factors were considered to determine the necessity of a safety zone for the Na Kika FDS construction site and for a safety zone to remain in effect after the facility is completed: (1) The construction site is located approximately 46 nautical miles east-southeast of the South Pass (Mississippi River) to Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet Channel Fairway and Southwest Pass (Mississippi River) to South Pass (Mississippi River) Safety Fairway, (2) the facility will have a high daily production capacity of petroleum oil and gas; (3) the facility will be manned; (4) the facility will be a semi-submersible; and (5) the semi-submersible will be moored by a 16-line permanent mooring system.

We conclude that the risk of allision to the facility and the potential for loss of life and damage to the environment resulting from such an accident during and following the construction of Na Kika FDS warrants the establishment of this safety zone. The regulation will significantly reduce the threat of allisions, oil spills and natural gas releases and increases the safety of life, property, and the environment in the Gulf of Mexico. This regulation is issued pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 85 and 43 U.S.C. 1333 as set out in the authority citation for 33 CFR part 147.

Discussion of Comment and Changes

We received one comment endorsing the proposed safety zone. The Coast Guard has made no changes to the provisions of this regulation.

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. It is not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

We expect the economic impact of this rule to be so minimal that a full regulatory evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary. The impacts on routine navigation are expected to be minimal because the safety zone will not overlap any of the safety fairways within the Gulf of Mexico.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term "small entities" comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Since the construction site for the Na Kika is located far offshore, few privately owned fishing vessels and recreational boats/yachts operate in the area. This rule will not impact an attending vessel or vessels less than 100 feet in length overall not engaged in towing. Alternate routes are available for all other vessels impacted by this rule. Use of an alternate route may cause a vessel to incur a delay of four to ten minutes in arriving at their destinations depending on how fast the vessel is traveling. Therefore, the Coast Guard expects the impact of this regulation on small entities to be minimal.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (*see* **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we offered to assist small entities in understanding this rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247).

Collection of Information

This rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of $100,000,000 or more in any one year. Though this rule will not result in such expenditure, we discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This rule will not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a "significant energy action" under that Order because it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded that there are no factors in this case that would limit the use of categorical exclusion under section 2.B.2 of the Instruction. Therefore, this rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1 paragraph (34)(g), of the instruction, from further environmental documentation because this rule is not expected to result in any significant environmental impact as described in NEPA.

A final "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a final "Categorical Exclusion Determination" are available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 147

Continental shelf, Marine safety, Navigation (water).

■ For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 147 as follows:

PART 147—SAFETY ZONES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 147 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 14 U.S.C. 85; 43 U.S.C. 1333; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add § 147.833 to read as follows:

§ 147.833 Na Kika FDS Safety Zone.

(a) *Description.* Na Kika FDS, Mississippi Canyon 474 "A" (MC 474

"A"), located at position 28°31′14.86″ N, 88°17′19.69″ W. The area within 500 meters (1640.4 feet) from each point on the structure's outer edge is a safety zone. These coordinates are based upon [NAD 83].

(b) *Regulation.* No vessel may enter or remain in this safety zone except the following: (1) An attending vessel;

(2) A vessel under 100 feet in length overall not engaged in towing; or

(3) A vessel authorized by the Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District.

Dated: April 5, 2004.

R.F. Duncan,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 04–8866 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD07–03–147]

RIN 1625–AA11

Regulated Navigation Area; Savannah River, Savannah, GA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is amending the regulated navigation area on the Savannah River to improve vessel traffic flow during Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) tankship transits. This change will allow all vessels greater than 1600 gross tons to transit the area during LNG tankship transits, provided they come no closer than 2 nautical miles to the LNG vessel without specific authorization from the Captain of the Port. This amendment will improve the flow of vessel traffic on the Savannah River during LNG transits while still providing for the safety of vessels on the navigable waterways.

DATES: This rule is effective May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket [CGD07–03–147] and are available for inspection or copying at Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Savannah, Juliette Gordon Low Federal Building, Suite 1017, 100 W. Oglethorpe, Savannah, Georgia 31401, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant Commander Lawrence Greene, Marine Safety Office Savannah; phone (912) 652–4353, extension 205.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

On November 19, 2003, we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled Regulated Navigation Area: Savannah River, Savannah GA, in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 65227). We received no public comments on the proposed rule. No public hearing was requested, and none was held. No other documents were published as part of this rulemaking.

Background and Purpose

The port of Savannah currently receives LNG tankships, ranging from two to eight vessels per month, at the Southern LNG Elba Island facility. The Coast Guard currently has a regulated navigation area (RNA) in effect for LNG tankship transits. The existing regulation restricts vessel movement and extends from Fort Jackson, which is upriver from the Elba Island LNG facility, down the length of the Savannah River and offshore to the Savannah River Channel Entrance Sea Buoy (67 FR 46865). After over two years of experience with LNG tankship transits on the Savannah River, the Coast Guard is changing the existing regulation in order to allow vessels of 1600 gross tons or greater to enter the RNA during LNG tankship transits, provided they come no closer than 2 nautical miles to the transiting LNG tankship. Vessels less than 1600 gross tons will still be permitted to transit the RNA during LNG tankship transits provided they maintain a safe distance from transiting LNG tankships. This rule will reduce port congestion during LNG transits and decrease delays to vessels, facilities and terminals on the Savannah River. A safe distance of two nautical miles for vessels 1600 gross tons and greater is necessary to protect the safety of life and property on the navigable waters from hazards associated with LNG activities.

Discussion of Comments and Changes

No comments were received and no changes were made in the proposed amendment to the Regulated Navigation Area.

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. It is not "significant" under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term "small entities" comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Delays for inbound and outbound traffic due to LNG transits will be minimized through this change and through pre-transit conferences between the pilots and the Coast Guard Captain of the Port. The RNA requirements under this final rule are less burdensome for smaller vessels, which are more likely to be small entities.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we offered to assist small entities in understanding the rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247).

Collection of Information

This rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132,

Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local

governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism. No comments were submitted regarding this section.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of $100,000,000 or more in any one year. Though this rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This rule will not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a "significant energy action" under that order, because it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.lD, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded that there are no factors in this case that would limit the use of a categorical exclusion under section 2.B.2 of the Instruction. Therefore, this rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Instruction, an "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a "Categorical Exclusion Determination" are not required for this rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Waterways.

■ For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1226, 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g), 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. In § 165.756, paragraph (d)(1)(i) is revised to read as follows:

§ 165.756 Regulated Navigation Area; Savannah River, Georgia.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(1) * * *

(i) Except for a vessel that is moored at a marina, wharf, or pier, and remains moored, no vessel 1600 gross tons or greater may approach within two nautical miles of a LNG tankship that is underway within the RNA without the permission of the Captain of the Port (COTP).

* * * * *

Dated: March 28, 2004.

H.E. Johnson,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 04–8867 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

38 CFR Part 20

RIN 2900–AL45

Board of Veterans' Appeals: Rules of Practice—Notice Procedures Relating to Withdrawal of Services by a Representative

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document amends the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) Board of Veterans' Appeals Rules of Practice to simplify notice procedures relating to withdrawal of services by a representative after certification of an appeal. We believe that these simplified notice procedures are adequate for establishing proof of service.

DATES: *Effective Date:* May 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven L. Keller, Senior Deputy Vice Chairman, Board of Veterans' Appeals, Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420 (202–565–5978). In a document published in the **Federal Register** on June 3, 2003 (68 FR 33040), we proposed amending Rule 608(b)(2) (38 CFR 20.608(b)(2)) to provide that, in cases involving a motion to withdraw services by a representative after certification of an appeal, proof of service will be accomplished by filing a statement with the Board of Veterans' Appeals (Board) certifying that the motion has been sent by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the appellant or that the response has been sent by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the representative, as applicable. The previous practice required mailing the motion, and any response to that motion, by certified mail. The purpose of this amendment is to shorten the time before the motion is ripe for determination by the Board, expediting the possibility of a transition, if appropriate, to a new representative.

We asked interested parties to submit comments on or before August 4, 2003. We received no comments. Based on the rationale noted above and as set forth in the proposed rule, we are adopting the proposed rule as a final rule without change.

Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget has reviewed this document under Executive Order 12866.

Unfunded Mandates

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 requires, at 2 U.S.C. 1532, that agencies prepare an assessment of anticipated costs and benefits before developing any rule that may result in an expenditure by State, local, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more in any given year. This final rule would have no such effect on State, local, or tribal governments, or the private sector.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The Secretary hereby certifies that this final rule contains no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501–3521).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Secretary hereby certifies that this regulatory amendment will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as they are defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601–612. This rule merely concerns requirements for proof of service of motions for withdrawal of services by a representative after certification of an appeal before the Board, and for proof of service of responses to such motions. Moreover, such motions and responses are events that occur in only a minor proportion of the cases before the Board. Any economic impact on small entities would be minimal. Therefore, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), this final rule is exempt from the initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis requirements of sections 603 and 604.

List of Subjects in 38 CFR Part 20

Administrative practice and procedure, Claims, Attorneys, Lawyers, Legal services, Procedural rules, Veterans.

Approved: March 18, 2004.

Anthony J. Principi,

Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

■ For the reasons set out in the preamble, 38 CFR part 20 is amended as set forth below:

PART 20—BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS: RULES OF PRACTICE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 20 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 38 U.S.C. 501(a) and as noted in specific sections.

§ 20.608 [Amended]

■ 2. Section 20.608, paragraph (b)(2) is amended by:

■ A. In the third sentence, removing "permitted." and adding, in its place, "permitted, and a signed statement certifying that a copy of the motion was sent by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the appellant, setting forth the address to which the copy was mailed."

■ B. Removing the sixth and seventh sentences.

■ C. In the eighth sentence, removing "motion." and adding, in its place, "motion and must include a signed statement certifying that a copy of the response was sent by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the representative, setting forth the address to which the copy was mailed."

■ D. Removing the ninth and tenth sentences.

[FR Doc. 04–8880 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 595

[Docket No. NHTSA–04–17536]

Retrofit On-Off Switches for Air Bags; Vehicle Modifications To Accommodate People With Disabilities

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Correcting amendment.

SUMMARY: This document corrects the regulation governing vehicle modifications made to accommodate people with disabilities.

DATES: The effective date of this final rule is April 20, 2004. Petitions for reconsideration must be submitted so they are received by the agency June 4, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Petitions for reconsideration must be identified by the Docket Number in the title to this document and submitted to: Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical and other non-legal issues, you may call Ms. Gayle Dalrymple of the NHTSA Office of Crash Avoidance Standards at (202) 366–5559.

For legal issues, you may call Mr. Chris Calamita, Office of Chief Counsel (Telephone: (202) 366–2992) (Fax: (202) 366–3820).

You may send mail to both of these officials at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The regulation that is subject to this correction is 49 CFR Part 595 subpart C, *Vehicle Modifications to Accommodate People with Disabilities.* On February 27, 2001, NHTSA issued a final rule establishing a limited exemption from a statutory provision that prohibits specified types of commercial entities from either removing safety equipment or features installed on motor vehicles pursuant to the Federal motor vehicle safety standards or altering the equipment or features so as to adversely affect their performance (66 FR 12638). The exemption allows repair businesses to modify certain types of federally-required safety equipment and features when passenger motor vehicles are modified for use by persons with disabilities.

Need for Correction

As published, the February 2001 final rule contained an error that needs correction. Included in the list of Federal standards that qualify for this limited exemption is Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 202, *Head restraints.* However, § 595.7, *Requirements for vehicle modifications to accommodate people with disabilities,* erroneously cites S3(b)(1) and S3(b)(2) of FMVSS No. 202, which do not exist. This correction amends § 595.7(c)(9) to cite S4.3(b)(1) and S4.3(b)(2) of FMVSS No. 202.

Correction of Publication

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 595

Imports, Motor vehicle safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

■ In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA is amending 49 CFR part 595 as follows:

PART 595—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 595 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 322, 30111, 30115, 30117, 30122, and 30166; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

■ 2. In § 595.7, paragraph (c)(9) is revised to read as follows:

§ 595.7 Requirements for vehicle modifications to accommodate people with disabilities.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(9) S4.3(b)(1) and (2) of 49 CFR 571.202, in any case in which the driver's head restraint must be modified to accommodate a driver with a disability.

* * * * *

Issued on: April 9, 2004.

Roger A. Saul,

Director, Office of Crashworthiness Standards.

[FR Doc. 04–8932 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 229

[Docket No.; I.D. 041404A]

Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan (ALWTRP)

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Temporary rule.

SUMMARY: The Assistant Administrator for Fisheries (AA), NOAA, announces temporary restrictions consistent with the requirements of the ALWTRP's implementing regulations. These regulations apply to lobster trap/pot and anchored gillnet fishermen in an area totaling approximately 1,347 square nautical miles (nm^2) (4,620 km^2) east of Boston, MA through April 30, 2004. The purpose of this action is to provide protection to an aggregation of North Atlantic right whales (right whales).

DATES: Effective beginning at 0001 hours April 22, 2004, through 2400 hours April 30, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the proposed and final Dynamic Area Management (DAM) rules, Environmental Assessments (EAs), Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team (ALWTRT) meeting summaries, and progress reports on implementation of the ALWTRP may also be obtained by writing Diane Borggaard, NMFS/Northeast Region, One Blackburn Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Borggaard, NMFS/Northeast Region, 978–281–9328 x6503; or Kristy Long, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, 301–713–1401.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

Several of the background documents for the ALWTRP and the take reduction planning process can be downloaded from the ALWTRP web site at *http://www.nero.noaa.gov/whaletrp/*.

Background

The ALWTRP was developed pursuant to section 118 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) to reduce the incidental mortality and serious injury of three endangered species of whales (right, fin, and humpback) as well as to provide conservation benefits to a fourth non-endangered species (minke) due to incidental interaction with commercial fishing activities. The ALWTRP, implemented through regulations codified at 50 CFR 229.32, relies on a combination of fishing gear modifications and time/area closures to reduce the risk of whales becoming entangled in commercial fishing gear (and potentially suffering serious injury or mortality as a result).

On January 9, 2002, NMFS published the final rule to implement the ALWTRP's DAM program (67 FR 1133). On August 26, 2003, NMFS amended the regulations by publishing a final rule, which specifically identified gear modifications that may be allowed in a DAM zone (68 FR 51195). The DAM program provides specific authority for NMFS to restrict temporarily on an expedited basis the use of lobster trap/pot and anchored gillnet fishing gear in areas north of 40° N. lat. to protect right whales. Under the DAM program, NMFS may: (1) require the removal of all lobster trap/pot and anchored gillnet fishing gear for a 15–day period; (2) allow lobster trap/pot and anchored gillnet fishing within a DAM zone with gear modifications determined by NMFS to sufficiently reduce the risk of entanglement; and/or (3) issue an alert to fishermen requesting the voluntary removal of all lobster trap/pot and anchored gillnet gear for a 15–day period and asking fishermen not to set any additional gear in the DAM zone during the 15–day period.

A DAM zone is triggered when NMFS receives a reliable report from a qualified individual of three or more right whales sighted within an area (75 nm^2 (139 km^2)) such that right whale density is equal to or greater than 0.04 right whales per nm^2 (1.85 km^2). A qualified individual is an individual ascertained by NMFS to be reasonably able, through training or experience, to identify a right whale. Such individuals include, but are not limited to, NMFS staff, U.S. Coast Guard and Navy personnel trained in whale identification, scientific research survey personnel, whale watch operators and naturalists, and mariners trained in whale species identification through disentanglement training or some other training program deemed adequate by NMFS. A reliable report would be a credible right whale sighting.

On April 9, 2004, NMFS Aerial Survey Team reported a sighting of nine right whales in the proximity of 42° 10.6′ N lat. and 68° 52.4′ W long. This position lies east of Boston, MA. Thus, NMFS has received a reliable report from a qualified individual of the requisite right whale density to trigger the DAM provisions of the ALWTRP.

Once a DAM zone is triggered, NMFS determines whether to impose restrictions on fishing and/or fishing gear in the zone. This determination is based on the following factors, including but not limited to: the location of the DAM zone with respect to other fishery closure areas, weather conditions as they relate to the safety of human life at sea, the type and amount of gear already present in the area, and a review of recent right whale entanglement and mortality data.

NMFS has reviewed the factors and management options noted above relative to the DAM under consideration. As a result of this review, NMFS prohibits lobster trap/pot and anchored gillnet gear in this area during the restricted period unless it is modified in the manner described in this temporary rule. In April, the DAM zone is bounded by the following coordinates:

42°30′N, 69°20′W (NW Corner)
42°30′N, 68°21′W
41°52′N, 68°21′W
42°10′N, 68°31′W
41°50′N, 69°20′W

On May 1, when the restrictions on anchored gillnet and lobster trap/pot fishing gear become effective in the SAM East area, the DAM zone is completely subsumed by SAM East and the anchored gillnet and lobster fishermen with gear in the DAM zone must comply with the requirements for fishing in SAM East.

In addition to those gear modifications currently implemented under the ALWTRP at 50 CFR 229.32, the following gear modifications are required in the DAM zone. If the requirements and exceptions for gear modification in the DAM zone, as described below, differ from other ALWTRP requirements for any overlapping areas and times, then the more restrictive requirements will apply in the DAM zone. Special note for gillnet fisherman: In April, this DAM

zone overlaps the Northeast multispecies' Rolling Closure Area II. This DAM action does not supersede Northeast multispecies closures found at 50 CFR 648.81.

Lobster Trap/Pot Gear

Fishermen utilizing lobster trap/pot gear within the portion of the Offshore Lobster Waters Area that overlap with the DAM zone are required to utilize all of the following gear modifications while the DAM zone is in effect:

1. Groundlines must be made of either sinking or neutrally buoyant line. Floating groundlines are prohibited;
2. All buoy lines must be made of either sinking or neutrally buoyant line, except the bottom portion of the line, which may be a section of floating line not to exceed one-third the overall length of the buoy line;
3. Fishermen are allowed to use two buoy lines per trawl; and
4. A weak link with a maximum breaking strength of 1,500 lb (680.4 kg) must be placed at all buoys.

Anchored Gillnet Gear

Fishermen utilizing anchored gillnet gear within the portion of the Other Northeast Gillnet Waters that overlap with the DAM zone are required to utilize all the following gear modifications while the DAM zone is in effect:

1. Groundlines must be made of either sinking or neutrally buoyant line. Floating groundlines are prohibited;
2. All buoy lines must be made of either sinking or neutrally buoyant line, except the bottom portion of the line, which may be a section of floating line not to exceed one-third the overall length of the buoy line;
3. Fishermen are allowed to use two buoy lines per string;
4. Each net panel must have a total of five weak links with a maximum breaking strength of 1,100 lb (498.8 kg). Net panels are typically 50 fathoms (91.4 m) in length, but the weak link requirements would apply to all variations in panel size. These weak links must include three floatline weak links. The placement of the weak links on the floatline must be: one at the center of the net panel and one each as close as possible to each of the bridle ends of the net panel. The remaining two weak links must be placed in the center of each of the up and down lines at the panel ends; and
5. All anchored gillnets, regardless of the number of net panels, must be securely anchored with the holding power of at least a 22–lb (10.0–kg) Danforth-style anchor at each end of the net string.

The restrictions will be in effect beginning at 0001 hours April 22, 2004, through 2400 hours April 30, 2004, unless terminated sooner by NMFS through another notification in the **Federal Register**.

The restrictions will be announced to state officials, fishermen, ALWTRT members; and other interested parties through e-mail, phone contact, NOAA website, and other appropriate media immediately upon filing with the **Federal Register**.

Classification

In accordance with section 118(f)(9) of the MMPA, the Assistant Administrator (AA) for Fisheries has determined that this action is necessary to implement a take reduction plan to protect North Atlantic right whales.

This action falls within the scope of alternatives and impacts analyzed in the Final EAs prepared for the ALWTRP's DAM program. Further analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act is not required.

NMFS provided prior notice and an opportunity for public comment on the regulations establishing the criteria and procedures for implementing a DAM zone. Providing prior notice and opportunity for comment on this action, pursuant to those regulations, would be impracticable because it would prevent NMFS from executing its functions to protect and reduce serious injury and mortality of endangered right whales. The regulations establishing the DAM program are designed to enable the agency to help protect unexpected concentrations of right whales. In order to meet the goals of the DAM program, the agency needs to be able to create a DAM zone and implement restrictions on fishing gear as soon as possible once the criteria are triggered and NMFS determines that a DAM restricted zone is appropriate. If NMFS were to provide prior notice and an opportunity for public comment upon the creation of a DAM restricted zone, the aggregated right whales would be vulnerable to entanglement which could result in serious injury and mortality. Additionally, the right whales would most likely move on to another location before NMFS could implement the restrictions designed to protect them, thereby rendering the action obsolete. Therefore, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the AA finds that good cause exists to waive prior notice and an opportunity to comment on this action to implement a DAM restricted zone to reduce the risk of entanglement of endangered right whales in commercial lobster trap/pot and anchored gillnet gear as such procedures would be impracticable.

For the same reasons, the AA finds that, under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), good cause exists to waive the 30-day delay in effective date. If NMFS were to delay for 30 days the effective date of this action, the aggregated right whales would be vulnerable to entanglement, which could cause serious injury and mortality. Additionally, right whales would likely move to another location between the time NMFS approved the action creating the DAM restricted zone and the time it went into effect, thereby rendering the action obsolete and ineffective. Nevertheless, NMFS recognizes the need for fishermen to have time to either modify or remove (if not in compliance with the required restrictions) their gear from a DAM zone once one is approved. Thus, NMFS makes this action effective 2 days after the date of publication of this action in the **Federal Register**. NMFS will also endeavor to provide notice of this action to fishermen through other means as soon as the AA approves it, thereby providing approximately 3 additional days of notice while the Office of the **Federal Register** processes the document for publication.

NMFS determined that the regulations establishing the DAM program and actions such as this one taken pursuant to those regulations are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the approved coastal management program of the U.S. Atlantic coastal states. This determination was submitted for review by the responsible state agencies under section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act. Following state review of the regulations creating the DAM program, no state disagreed with NMFS' conclusion that the DAM program is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the approved coastal management program for that state.

The DAM program under which NMFS is taking this action contains policies with federalism implications warranting preparation of a federalism assessment under Executive Order 13132. Accordingly, in October 2001 and March 2003, the Assistant Secretary for Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs, DOC, provided notice of the DAM program and its amendments to the appropriate elected officials in states to be affected by actions taken pursuant to the DAM program. Federalism issues raised by state officials were addressed in the final rules implementing the DAM program. A copy of the federalism Summary Impact Statement for the final

rules is available upon request *see* (**ADDRESSES**).

The rule implementing the DAM program has been determined to be not significant under Executive Order 12866.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.* and 50 CFR 229.32(g)(3)

Dated: April 14, 2004.

John Oliver,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 04–8916 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

Proposed Rules

Federal Register
Vol. 69, No. 76
Tuesday, April 20, 2004

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Parts 61, 91, 119, 121, 135, and 136

[Docket No. FAA–1998–4521; Notice No. 04–06]

RIN 2120–AF07

National Air Tour Safety Standards

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of public meetings and extension of the comment period.

SUMMARY: On October 22, 2003, the FAA published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that proposes regulations to govern commercial air tours throughout the United States. We are announcing two public meetings and are extending the comment period for the proposed rule. The public meetings and additional time for the public to comment will help us consider the concerns of those who may be most affected by the proposed rule.

DATES: The comment period for Notice No. 03–10, published on October 22, 2003 at 68 FR 60572, is extended until June 18, 2004. The FAA will hold public meetings in Washington, DC on May 11, 2004 and in Las Vegas, Nevada on May 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: The meetings will be held at the following locations:

May 11—Holiday Inn on the Hill, 415 New Jersey Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20001.

May 21—Clark County Government Center, Commission Chambers, 500 South Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada 89155.

You may continue to submit written comments to the docket, whether or not you participate in the public meetings. Address your comments to the Docket Management System, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room Plaza 401, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You must identify the docket number FAA–1998–4521 at the beginning of your comments, and you should submit two copies of your comments.

You may also submit comments through the Internet to *http://dms/dot.gov*. You may review the public docket containing comments to these proposed regulations in person in the Dockets Office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Dockets Office is on the plaza level at the Department of Transportation building at the address above. Also, you may review public dockets on the Internet at *http://dms.dot.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you wish to speak at the public meetings or if you have questions about the public meetings please contact: Mark Lawyer, Office of Rulemaking, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, Telephone: 202–493–4531, Fax: (202) 267–5075, Email: *mark.lawyer@faa.gov*.

If you have specific questions pertaining to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, please contact: Alberta Brown, Air Transportation Division, Flight Standards Service, AFS–200, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, Telephone (202) 267–8166 ext. 78321, Email: *Alberta.Brown@faa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

We published a notice of proposed rulemaking on October 22, 2003 (68 FR 60572) that proposes to regulate commercial air tours throughout the United States. The notice provided a 90-day comment period that was to end on January 20, 2004. We received significant response to this NPRM, including numerous requests to extend the comment period and to conduct public meetings. On January 16, 2004, we published a notice to extend the comment period an additional 90 days to April 19, 2004 (69 FR 2529). On February 10, 2004, we published a notice of public meeting on the Internet (69 FR 6218). We held a public meeting on the Internet from February 23, 2004 through March 5, 2004. Approximately 1,000 persons participated in the public meeting on the Internet. Members of the public, aviation organizations, and some members of Congress have asked us to hold traditional public meetings, in addition to the public meeting we held on the Internet.

Public Meetings

We have carefully considered the requests for traditional public meetings. The public meeting on the Internet was an effort to allow broad participation throughout the country. It accomplished this. The participation in the public meeting on the Internet significantly exceeded the participation we would expect to achieve at a typical face to face public meeting. Approximately 1,000 persons registered and many of them actively participated. Many who participated through the Internet were located in widely dispersed small communities throughout the country. Many of these persons would not have been able to participate in a traditional public meeting because of the time and expense of traveling to a fixed location. It would be impractical to conduct a public meeting in every community in America where someone could be affected by the proposed rule.

Those who participated in the public meeting on the Internet provided us with much useful information about the industry and many suggestions that will help us develop a rule that will promote safety without imposing unnecessary burdens on the industry. We have also received positive comments about our efforts to broaden participation through use of the Internet. Many of you, however, including aviation organizations and some members of Congress, have asked us to also hold some face to face public meetings to allow you an opportunity to express your concerns directly to an FAA representative. We agree that this is appropriate because of the strong interest in this proposed rule.

Where and When we Will Hold Public Meetings

We will hold public meetings at the following locations, dates, and times:

City	Date	Time	Location
Washington, DC	May 11, 2004	Registration, 8:30 a.m.–9 a.m., meeting begins 9 a.m.	Holiday Inn on the Hill, 415 New Jersey Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20001.
Las Vegas, Nevada	May 21, 2004	*Session One:* Registration, 8:30 a.m.–9 a.m., meeting begins 9 a.m. *Session Two:* Registration, 6 p.m.–6:30 p.m., meeting begins 6:30 p.m.	Clark County Government Center, Commission Chambers, 500 South Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada 89155.

Participation at the Public Meetings

We will explain the purpose and background of the NPRM at the beginning of each public meeting.

If you wish to present oral statements at the meeting, you must contact the FAA no later than Tuesday, May 4, 2004 for the May 11, 2004 meeting in Washington, DC and no later than Friday, May 14 for the May 21, 2004 meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada. You should submit requests to participate to Mark Lawyer as listed above in the section titled **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.** You should include a summary of any oral comments you wish to present and an estimate of how much time you need. Requests that we receive after the dates shown above will be scheduled if time is available; however, the name of those individuals may not appear on the written agenda. We will prepare an agenda of speakers. This agenda will be available at each meeting. To accommodate as many speakers as possible, the amount of time allocated to each speaker may be less than the amount of time requested. If you need audiovisual equipment, please let us know at least 7 days before the meeting where you will use the equipment.

Public Meeting Procedures

1. There will be no admission fee or other charge to attend or to participate in the public meetings. The meetings will be open to all persons who have requested in advance to present statements or who register during the registration period on the day of the meetings, subject to the availability of space in the meeting room.

2. Representatives of the FAA will conduct the public meetings. A panel of experts will be present to briefly summarize the NPRM and receive information presented by participants. The FAA chairperson will explain procedural rules specific to the meetings at the beginning of each meeting.

3. Participants must limit their presentations and submissions of data to the issues of the NPRM.

4. One purpose of the meetings is to provide a forum to present information that is not currently available to the FAA.

5. We will try to accommodate all speakers; therefore, it may be necessary to limit the time available for an individual or group. The meetings may be accelerated to enable adjournment in less than the time scheduled. Once all speakers have been called upon and all attendees have had an opportunity to comment, the meetings will adjourn.

6. We can make sign and oral interpretation available at the meetings, as well as an assistive listening device, if requested 10 calendar days before each meeting.

7. We will arrange to have a court reporter record the meetings. A transcript of the meetings and all material accepted by the panel during the meetings will be included in the public docket, unless protected from disclosure. Each person interested in purchasing a copy of the transcript should contact the court reporter directly. We will provide this information at each meeting.

8. We will review and consider all information presented at the public meetings. Position papers or materials presenting views or information related to the NPRM may be accepted at the discretion of the presiding officer. Please provide 10 copies of all material that you present at the public meetings so we will have copies for the panel members. You may provide additional copies for the audience at your discretion.

9. Statements made by members of the panel are intended to facilitate discussions of the issues or clarify issues. We will consider all comments made at the public meetings before we make a final decision on any final rule.

10. The meetings are designed to solicit public views and further information that is relevant to the NPRM. Therefore, we will conduct the meeting in an informal and nonadversarial manner.

The Purpose of the Public Meetings and What We Need From You

The purpose of the public meetings is to obtain information from you that we do not already have. Some of you have said in comments that we do not have complete information on the air tour industry. We welcome information that will give us a better understanding of the industry. We also welcome comments that will help us develop a rule that will promote safety without imposing unnecessary burdens on the industry. Some of you have already provided useful suggestions. We welcome further suggestions.

In addition to other information you may wish to provide, responses to the following questions, either from individual companies or data collected from industry groups, would give us information that may help us develop a final rule:

- Do you fly air tours under the 25-mile exception found in 14 CFR 119.1(e)(2)?
- How many air tour flight hours do you fly each year?
- How many air tours do you fly?
- How much revenue do you collect and what are your direct and indirect costs per air tour or per year?
- How many aircraft and what makes and models do you use to provide air tours?
- What percent of your aviation business is comprised of air tours?
- What are the sources of your other aviation revenues?
- How many pilots do you employ in air tours?
- If the pilots also fly for other purposes, what percentage of their time is spent flying air tours?
- Do you conduct air tours over national parks?
- What percent of your annual air tour flight hours are conducted over national parks?
- What percent of your total revenues are attributable to air tours?
- If the 25-mile exception is withdrawn, would you apply for a part 121 or 135 certificate?
- If you could no longer provide air tours, how would that affect your business?
- Are there ways we could achieve the results intended by the proposed rule that would impose fewer burdens on the industry?
- The NTSB has recommended that we eliminate the 25-mile exception and establish a database of air tour operators. Are there other approaches we could take that would achieve an equivalent level of safety and impose fewer burdens on the industry?

If you are unable to participate in the public meetings, you may continue to comment in the docket.

Extension of the Comment Period

We are extending the comment period to June 18, 2004, to allow you opportunity to comment further after the public meetings.

Issued in Washington, DC on April 15, 2004.

Anthony F. Fazio,

Director, Office of Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 04–8965 Filed 4–15–04; 4:32 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 917

[KY–246–FOR]

Kentucky Regulatory Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: We, OSM, are announcing the withdrawal of proposed regulatory changes to the Kentucky regulatory program (the "Kentucky program') under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA or the Act). Kentucky had proposed to amend its definition of "affected area," with respect to roads, but subsequently decided to withdraw the proposed changes from further consideration as a State program amendment.

EFFECTIVE DATES: April 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bill Kovacic, Director, Lexington Field Office, Telephone (859) 260–8400, e-mail: *bkovacic@osmre.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on the Kentucky Program
II. Submission of the Proposed Amendment
III. Disposition of Comments

I. Background on the Kentucky Program

Section 503(a) of the Act permits a State to assume primacy for the regulation of surface coal mining and reclamation operations on non-Federal and non-Indian lands within its borders by demonstrating that its program includes, among other things, "a State law which provides for the regulation of surface coal mining and reclamation operations in accordance with the requirements of the Act * * *; and rules and regulations consistent with regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to the Act" (*See* 30 U.S.C. 1253(a)(1) and (7)). On the basis of these criteria, the Secretary of the Interior conditionally approved the Kentucky program on May 18, 1982. You can find background information on the Kentucky program, including the Secretary's findings, the disposition of comments, and conditions of approval of the Kentucky program in the May 18, 1982, **Federal Register** (47 FR 21434). You can also find later actions concerning Kentucky's program and program amendments at 30 CFR 917.11, 917.12, 917.13, 917.15, 917.16, and 917.17.

II. Submission of the Proposed Amendment

By letter dated September 30, 2003, Kentucky sent us a proposed amendment to its program (KY–246, administrative record no. KY–1601) under SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1201 *et seq.*). Kentucky proposed to revise its definition of "affected area" as it relates to public roads at 405 Kentucky Administrative Regulations (KAR) 7:001, 8:001, 10:001, 12:001, 16:001, 18:001, 20:001, and 24:001. The revision specifies that the affected area will include every road used for the purposes of access to, or for hauling coal to or from, surface coal mining and reclamation operations, unless the road "is a state, county, or public road and the road is in existence as of the date of the submittal of the preliminary application under 405 KAR 8:010 Section 4." This would replace the current language, which Kentucky proposed to delete, that includes every road in the affected area except those: designated as a public road pursuant to jurisdictional laws where the road is located; maintained with public funds and constructed in a similar manner to other public roads of the same classification in the area; and, those with substantial public use.

We announced receipt of the proposed amendment in the November 20, 2003, **Federal Register** (68 FR 65424).

In the same document, we opened the public comment period and provided an opportunity for a public hearing or meeting on the submission. We did not hold a public hearing or meeting because no one requested one. The public comment period ended on December 22, 2003. On February 9, 2004, we received a letter from Kentucky requesting that we suspend rulemaking on its September 30, 2003, submittal concerning Kentucky's definition of "affected area," as it relates to the permitting of roads (administrative record no. KY–1614). In the letter, Kentucky stated that the regulations had not yet been promulgated at the state level, and were in fact under reconsideration. For these reasons, we are treating Kentucky's request as a withdrawal of the proposed amendment, and are accepting that withdrawal.

III. Disposition of Comments

Public Comments

We received five public comments on the proposed rule, as well as a copy of a recommendation of the Kentucky Environmental Quality Commission. Of these, four of the commenters, and the Kentucky Environmental Quality Commission, urged that the proposed program amendment not be approved. The other commenter indicated its approval of the proposal. Because OSM is discontinuing its consideration of the proposed State program amendment, we consider the substance of these comments moot at this time and thus not ripe for discussion.

Federal Agency Comments

We did not receive any Federal Agency comments on this proposed State program amendment.

Dated: April 1, 2004.

Brent Wahlquist,

Regional Director, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 04–8842 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

38 CFR Part 17

RIN 2900–AK29

Waivers

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document proposes to amend VA's medical regulations to give Fiscal Officers at VA medical facilities the authority to waive veterans' debts arising from the medical care copayments. These proposed changes codify an existing 1995 delegation of authority to Fiscal Officers from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; the purpose of this 1995 delegation was to increase the efficiency of the waiver processing.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 21, 2004..

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be submitted by: mail or hand-delivery to

Director, Regulations Management (00REG1), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Ave., NW., Room 1068, Washington, DC 20420; fax to (202) 273–9026; e-mail to *VAregulations@mail.va.gov;* or, through *http://www.Regulations.gov*. Comments should indicate that they are submitted in response to "RIN 2900-AK29." All comments received will be available for public inspection in the Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Room 1063B, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday (except holidays). Please call (202) 273–9515 for an appointment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tony Guagliardo, Deputy Director Policy Development, Chief Business Office (16), Veterans Health Administration, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420, (202) 254–0320. (This is not a toll-free telephone number.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By law, many veterans who receive medical care at VA facilities must agree to pay copayments for their care. There are different copayments for inpatient hospital care, outpatient medical services, medications, and extended care services. In the past, veterans with debts arising from failure to pay these copayments could request VA Committees on Waivers and Compromises to waive the debts. The Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA) operates these Committees. Due to the volume of waiver requests, VBA and the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) agreed that the authority to waive these debts should be delegated to Fiscal Officers at VA medical facilities. As a result, in 1995, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs delegated the authority to waive these debts to VHA Fiscal Officers. This proposed regulatory change would codify this delegation in VA regulations. It would also specify the form that veterans must complete and submit to VA to request this type of waiver. Finally, it would also correct inadvertent citation errors overlooked in an earlier recodification of part 17 and make other changes for clarification.

Requests for and decisions regarding waivers under this proposal will be subject to the applicable regulations governing the Committees on Waivers and Compromises. This means that Fiscal Officers will waive a debt if they determine that collection of the debt would be against equity and good conscience.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Secretary hereby certifies that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as they are defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612. The provisions of the proposed rule would not impose a significant economic impact on any entities since VA billing would not constitute a significant portion of any insurance company's business. Accordingly, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), this proposed rule is exempt from the initial and final regulatory flexibility analyses requirements of sections 603 and 604.

Executive Order 12866

This document has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to Executive Order 12866.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance numbers for the programs affected by this document are 64.005, 64.007, 64.008, 64.009, 64.010, 64.011, 64.012, 64.013, 64.014, 64.015, 64.016, 64.018, 64.019, 64.022, 64.024, and 64.025.

Paperwork Reduction Act

Although this document contains provisions constituting a collection of information in 38 CFR 17.105 (c) referencing VA Form 5655, under the provision of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501–3521), no new or proposed revised collections of information are associated with this proposed rule. The Office of Management and Budget has approved this information collection in VA Form 5655 under control number 2900–0165.

Unfunded Mandates

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act requires, at 2 U.S.C. 1532, that agencies prepare an assessment of anticipated costs and benefits before developing any rule that may result in an expenditure by State, local, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more in any given year. This rule will have no such effect on State, local, or tribal governments, or the private sector.

List of Subjects in 38 CFR Part 17

Administrative practice and procedure, Alcohol abuse, Alcoholism, Claims, Day care, Dental health, Drug abuse, Foreign relations, Government contracts, Grant programs-health, Grant programs-veterans, Health care, Health facilities, Health professions, Health records, Homeless, Medical and dental schools, Medical devices, Medical research, Mental health programs, Nursing homes, Philippines, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Scholarships and fellowships, Travel and transportation expenses, Veterans.

Approved: February 20, 2004.

Anthony J. Principi,

Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 38 CFR part 17 is proposed to be amended as set forth below:

PART 17—MEDICAL

1. The authority citation for part 17 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 38 U.S.C. 501, 1721, unless otherwise noted.

2. Section 17.105 is amended by:

A. In paragraph (a), removing "§ 17.101(a)" and adding, in its place, "§ 17.102".

B. Redesignating paragraph (c) as (d).

C. Adding a new paragraph (c).

D. Adding the OMB information collection approval number parenthetical at the end of the section.

The additions read as follows:

17.105 Waivers

* * * * *

(c) *Of charges for copayments.* If the debt represents charges for outpatient medical care, inpatient hospital care, medication or extended care services copayments made under §§ 17.108, 17.110 or 17.111 of this section, the claimant must request a waiver by submitting VA Form 5655 (Financial Status Report) to a Fiscal Officer at a VA medical facility where all or part of the debt was incurred. The claimant must submit this form within the time period provided in § 1.963(b) of this chapter and may request a hearing under § 1.966(a) of this chapter. The Fiscal Officer may extend the time period for submitting a claim if the Chairperson of the Committee on Waivers and Compromises could do so under § 1.963(b) of this chapter. The Fiscal Officer will apply the standard "equity and good conscience" in accordance with §§ 1.965 and 1.966(a) of this chapter, and may waive all or part of the claimant's debts. A decision by the Fiscal Officer under this provision is final (except that the decision may be reversed or modified based on new and material evidence, fraud, a change in law or interpretation of law, or clear and unmistakable error shown by the evidence in the file at the time of the prior decision as provided in § 1.969 of this chapter) and may be appealed in accordance with 38 CFR parts 19 and 20.

* * * * *

(Authority: 38 U.S.C. 501, 1721, 1722A, 1724)

(The Office of Management and Budget has approved the information collection requirements in this section under control number 2900–0165.)

[FR Doc. 04–8881 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[FRL–7649–9]

Indiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Indiana has applied to EPA for Final authorization of the changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). EPA has determined that these changes satisfy all requirements needed to qualify for Final authorization, and is proposing to authorize the State's changes through this proposed final action.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Gary Westefer, Indiana Regulatory Specialist, DM–7J, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. Please refer to Docket Number IN ARA19. We must receive your comments by May 20, 2004. You can view and copy Indiana's application from 9 am to 4 pm at the following addresses: Indiana Department of Environmental Management, 100 North Senate, Indianapolis, Indiana, (mailing address P.O. Box 6015, Indianapolis, Indiana 46206) contact Lynn West (317) 232–3593, or Steve Mojonnier (317) 233–1655; and EPA Region 5, contact Gary Westefer at the following address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gary Westefer, Indiana Regulatory Specialist, U.S. EPA Region 5, DM–7J, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–7450.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Why Are Revisions to State Programs Necessary?

States which have received final authorization from EPA under RCRA section 3006(b), 42 U.S.C. 6926(b), must maintain a hazardous waste program that is equivalent to, consistent with, and no less stringent than the Federal program. As the Federal program changes, States must change their programs and ask EPA to authorize the changes. Changes to State programs may be necessary when Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority is modified or when certain other changes occur. Most commonly, States must change their programs because of changes to EPA's regulations in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) parts 124, 260 through 266, 268, 270, 273 and 279.

B. What Decisions Have We Made in This Rule?

We conclude that Indiana's application to revise its authorized program meets all of the statutory and regulatory requirements established by RCRA. Therefore, we propose to grant Indiana Final authorization to operate its hazardous waste program with the changes described in the authorization application. Indiana has responsibility for permitting Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDFs) within its borders (except in Indian Country) and for carrying out the aspects of the RCRA program described in its revised program application, subject to the limitations of the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA). New Federal requirements and prohibitions imposed by Federal regulations that EPA promulgates under the authority of HSWA take effect in authorized States before they are authorized for the requirements. Thus, EPA will implement those requirements and prohibitions in Indiana, including issuing permits, until the State is granted authorization to do so.

C. What Is the Effect of Today's Authorization Decision?

This decision means that a facility in Indiana subject to RCRA will now have to comply with the authorized State requirements (listed in section F of this action) instead of the equivalent Federal requirements in order to comply with RCRA. Indiana has enforcement responsibilities under its State hazardous waste program for violations of such program, but EPA retains its authority under RCRA sections 3007, 3008, 3013, and 7003, which include, among others, authority to:

- Do inspections, and require monitoring, tests, analyses or reports
- enforce RCRA requirements and suspend or revoke permits
- take enforcement actions regardless of whether the State has taken its own actions

This action does not impose additional requirements on the regulated community because the regulations for which Indiana is being authorized by today's action are already effective, and are not changed by today's action.

D. What Happens If EPA Receives Comments That Oppose This Action?

If EPA receives comments that oppose this authorization, we will address all public comments in a later **Federal Register**. You may not have another opportunity to comment. If you want to comment on this authorization, you must do so at this time.

E. What Has Indiana Previously Been Authorized for?

Indiana initially received Final authorization on January 31, 1986, effective January 31, 1986 (51 FR 3955) to implement the RCRA hazardous waste management program. We granted authorization for changes to their program on October 31, 1986, effective December 31, 1986 (51 FR 39752); January 5, 1988, effective January 19, 1988 (53 FR 128); July 13, 1989, effective September 11, 1989 (54 FR 29557); July 23, 1991, effective September 23, 1991 (56 FR 33717); July 24, 1991, effective September 23, 1991 (56 FR 33866); July 29, 1991, effective September 27, 1991 (56 FR 35831); July 30, 1991, effective September 30, 1991 (56 FR 36010); August 20, 1996, effective October 21, 1996 (61 FR 43018); September 1, 1999, effective November 30, 1999 (64 FR 47692), January 4, 2001 effective January 4, 2001 (66 FR 733), and December 6, 2001 effective December 6, 2001 (66 FR 63331).

F. What Changes Are We Authorizing With Today's Action?

On March 26, 2003, Indiana submitted a final complete program revision application, seeking authorization of their changes in accordance with 40 CFR 271.21. We now make a final decision, subject to receipt of written comments that oppose this action, that Indiana's hazardous waste program revision satisfies all of the requirements necessary to qualify for Final authorization. Therefore, we propose to grant Indiana Final authorization for the following program changes:

Description of Federal Requirement (include checklist #, if relevant)	Federal Register date and page (and/or RCRA statutory authority)	Analogous State Authority
Mineral Processing Secondary Materials Exclusion Checklist 167D	May 26, 1998, 63 FR 28556.	329 IAC 3.1–6–1; 3.1–6–2(2). Effective May 4, 2001.
Land Disposal Restrictions Phase IV: Treatment Standards For Wood Preserving Wastes, Treatment Standards for Metal Wastes, Zinc Micronutrient Fertilizers, Carbamate treatment Standards, and K088 Treatment Standards Checklist 179.	May 11, 1999, 64 FR 25408.	329 IAC 3.1–6–1; 3.1–6–2(2); 3.1–7–1; 3.1–12–1; 3.1–12–2(5), (7). Effective May 4, 2001.
Guidelines Establishing Test Procedures for the Analysis of Oil and Grease and Non-Polar Material Under the Clean Water Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Checklist 180.	May 14, 1999, 64 FR 26315.	329 IAC 3.1–1–7; Effective May 4, 2001.
Hazardous Waste Management System; Modification of the Hazardous Waste Program; Hazardous Waste Lamps Checklist 181.	July 6, 1999, 64 FR 36466.	329 IAC 3.1–4–1; 3.1–4–1(b); 3.1–6–1; 3.1–9–1; 3.1–9–2(1); 3.1–10–1; 3.1–10–2(1),(2)(3); 3.1–12–1; 3.1–12–2(4); 3.1–13–1; 3.1–13–2(1),(2)(3); 3.1–13–3 through 3.1–13–17; 3.1–16–1; 3.1–16–2(a)(1); 3.1–16–2(a)(4); 3.1–16–2(a)(5); 3.1–16–2(a)(8); 3.1–16–2(b). Effective May 4, 2001.
NESHAPS: Final Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Hazardous Waste Combustors Checklist 182 as amended Checklist 182.1.	September 30, 1999, 64 FR 52827; November 19, 1999 64 FR 63209.	329 IAC 3.1–4–1; 3.1–4–1(b); 3.1–6–1; 3.1–9–1; 3.1–10–1; 3.1–11–1; 3.1–13–1. Effective May 4, 2001.
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; Technical Correction Checklist 183.	October 20, 1999, 64 FR 56469.	329 IAC 3.1–6–1; 3.1–6–2(17); 3.1–7–1; 3.1–12–1. Effective May 4, 2001.
180 Day Accumulation Time Under RCRA for Waste Water Treatment Sludges from the Metal Finishing Industry Checklist 184.	March 8, 2000, 65 FR 12378.	329 IAC 3.1–7–1. Effective May 4, 2001.
Organobromine Production Wastes; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Land Disposal Restrictions; Listing of CERCLA Hazardous Substances, Reportable Quantities Checklist 185.	March 17, 2000, 65 FR 14472.	329 IAC 3.1–6–1; 3.1–6–2(17),(18),(19); 3.1–12–1; 3.1–12–2(10). Effective May 4, 2001.
Organobromine Production Wastes; Petroleum Refining Wastes; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Land Disposal Restrictions; Final Rule and Correcting Amendments Checklist 187.	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36365.	329 IAC 3.1–6–1; 3.1–12–1. Effective May 4, 2001.
NESHAPS: Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Hazardous Waste Combustors; Final Rule, Technical Correction Checklist 188 as amended Checklist 188.1.	July 10, 2000, 65 FR 42292; May 14, 2001, 66 FR 24270.	329 IAC 3.1–6–1; 3.1–9–1;3.1–13–1. Effective July 3, 2002.
Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Chlorinated Alphatics Production Wastes; Land Disposal Restrictions for Newly Identified Wastes; CERCLA Hazardous Substance Designation and Reportable Quantities Checklist 189.	November 8, 2000, 65 FR 67068.	329 IAC 3.1–6–1; 3.1–6–2(17); 3.1–6–219),(20); 3.1–12–1. Effective July 3, 2002.
Deferral of Phase IV Standards for PCBs as a Constituent Subject to Treatment in Soil Checklist 190.	December 26, 2000, 65 FR 81373.	329 IAC 3.1–12–1. Effective July 3, 2002.
Storage, Treatment, Transportation, and Disposal of Mixed Waste Checklist 191	May 16, 2001, 66 FR 27218.	329 IAC 3.1–11–1. Effective July 3, 2002.
Hazardous Waste Identification Rule (HWIR) Revisions to the Mixture and Derived-From Rules Checklist 192A.	May 16, 2001, 66 FR 27266.	329 IAC 3.1–6–1. Effective July 3, 2002.
Land Disposal Restrictions Correction Checklist 192B	May 16, 2001, 66 FR 27266.	329 IAC 3.1–12–1. Effective July 3, 2002.
Change of Official EPA Mailing Address; Additional Technical Amendments and Corrections Checklist 193.	June 28, 2001, 66 FR 34374.	329 IAC 3.1–1–7. Effective July 3, 2002.

G. Where Are the Revised State Rules Different From the Federal Rules?

Indiana has excluded the non-delegable Federal requirements at 40 CFR 268.5, 268.6, 268.42(b), 268.44, and 270.3 in their Incorporation by Reference at 3.1–12–2 and 3.1–13–2(4). EPA will continue to implement those requirements.

H. Who Handles Permits After the Authorization Takes Effect?

Indiana will issue permits for all the provisions for which it is authorized and will administer the permits it issues. EPA will continue to administer any RCRA hazardous waste permits or portions of permits which we issued prior to the effective date of this authorization until they expire or are terminated. We will not issue any more new permits or new portions of permits for the provisions listed in the Table above after the effective date of this authorization. EPA will continue to implement and issue permits for HSWA requirements for which Indiana is not yet authorized.

I. How Does Today's Action Affect Indian Country (18 U.S.C. 1151) in Indiana?

Indiana is not authorized to carry out its hazardous waste program in "Indian Country", as defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151. Indian Country includes:

1. All lands within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations within or abutting the State of Indiana;
2. Any land held in trust by the U.S. for an Indian tribe; and
3. Any other land, whether on or off an Indian reservation that qualifies as Indian Country. Therefore, this action has no effect on Indian Country. EPA retains the authority to implement and administer the RCRA program in Indian Country. However, at this time, there is no Indian Country within the State of Indiana.

J. What Is Codification and Is EPA Codifying Indiana's Hazardous Waste Program as Authorized in This Rule?

Codification is the process of placing the State's statutes and regulations that comprise the State's authorized hazardous waste program into the Code of Federal Regulations. We do this by referencing the authorized State rules in 40 CFR part 272. Indiana's rules, up to and including those revised January 4, 2001, have previously been codified through the incorporation-by-reference effective December 24, 2001 (66 FR 53728, October 24, 2001). We reserve the amendment of 40 CFR part 272, subpart P for the codification of Indiana's program changes until a later date.

K. Administrative Requirements

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this action from the requirements of Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), and therefore this action is not subject to review by OMB. This action authorizes State requirements for the purpose of RCRA section 3006 and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by State law. Accordingly, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this action authorizes pre-existing requirements under State law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by State law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4). For the same reason, this action also does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Tribal governments, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action will not 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, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it merely authorizes State requirements as part of the State RCRA hazardous waste program without altering the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established by RCRA. This action also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant and it does not make decisions based on environmental health or safety risks. This action is not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

Under RCRA section 3006(b), EPA grants a State's application for authorization as long as the State meets the criteria required by RCRA. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a State authorization application, to require the use of any particular voluntary consensus standard in place of another standard that otherwise satisfies the requirements of RCRA. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This rule does not include environmental justice issues that require consideration under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994). As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996), in issuing this rule, EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct. EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the Attorney General's Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings issued under the executive order.

This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 271

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Confidential business information, Hazardous materials transportation, Hazardous waste, Indians-lands, Intergovernmental relations, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: This action is issued under the authority of sections 2002(a), 3006 and 7004(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act as amended 42 U.S.C. 6912(a), 6926, 6974(b).

Dated: March 30, 2004.

Bharat Mathur,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 04–8910 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 69, No. 76
Tuesday, April 20, 2004

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

[Docket No. ST04–05]

Plant Variety Protection Board; Open Meeting

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of a forthcoming meeting of the Plant Variety Protection Board.

DATES: May 26, 2004, 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., open to the public.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in the United States Department of Agriculture George Washington Carver Center, 5601 Sunnyside Avenue, Beltsville, Maryland. Written comments may be submitted before or after the meeting to the contact person identified herein at: 1301 Baltimore Blvd., Room 400 National Agricultural Library Building, Beltsville, MD 20705–2351.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Commissioner Paul M. Zankowski, Plant Variety Protection Office, Science and Technology Program, United States Department of Agriculture, Telephone number (301) 504–5518 or fax (301) 504–5291.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C. App.), this notice is given regarding a Plant Variety Protection Advisory Board meeting. The board is constituted under section 7 of the Plant Variety Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 2327).

The proposed agenda for the meeting will include discussions of: (1) The accomplishments of the Plant Variety Protection Office, (2) the financial status of the Plant Variety Protection Office, (3) review of the quality assurance program, (4) potential relocation of the Plant Variety Protection Office, (5) status of the migration of the existing database, (6) E-business plans, (7) process improvement (Six Sigma) plan, and (8) other related topics.

Upon entering the George Washington Carver Center, visitors should inform security personnel that they are attending the PVP Advisory Board Meeting. Identification will be required to be admitted to the building. Security personnel will direct visitors to the registration table located outside of Room 4–2223. Registration upon arrival is necessary for all participants.

If you require accommodations, such as sign language interpreter, please contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. The meeting will be recorded, and information about obtaining a transcript will be provided at the meeting.

Dated: April 15, 2004.

Kenneth C. Clayton,

Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

AGENDA

Plant Variety Protection (PVP) Board Meeting, USDA, George Washington Carver Center, 5601 Sunnyside Avenue, Beltsville, Maryland

May 26, 2004

8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Call to Order
Introductions
Opening Remarks
Adoption of Agenda
Adoption of March 2003 Board Meeting Minutes
Appeals to the Secretary of Agriculture
FY 2003 Accomplishment Report
PVPO Financial update
PVP Quality Assurance Program Update
PVP Office Relocation Discussion
Database Migration Update
E-business Update and Plans
Update on Business Process Improvement (Six Sigma) Plan
Topics brought forward by Board Members
Future Program Activities Meeting Summary
Adjourn

[FR Doc. 04–8897 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

Request for Extension of a Currently Approved Information Collection: Application for Payment of Amounts Due Persons Who Have Died, Disappeared or Have Been Declared Incompetent

AGENCY: Commodity Credit Corporation, USDA.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the intention of the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) to request the extension of a currently approved information collection. This information collection is used by CCC to document or determine whether heirs or beneficiaries of a producer are entitled to receive payments earned by a producer who dies, disappears, or is declared incompetent before receiving payments or other disbursements.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received on or before June 21, 2004 to be assured consideration.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS: Contact David Tidwell, Agricultural Program Specialist, Production, Emergencies, and Compliance Division, USDA, FSA, STOP 0517, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-0517, telephone (202) 720–4542.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Application for Payment of Amounts Due Persons Who Have Died, Disappeared, or Have Been Declared Incompetent.

OMB Control Number: 0560–0026.

Expiration Date: September 30, 2004.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: Persons desiring to claim payment due a person who has died, disappeared, or has been declared incompetent must do so on Form FSA–325, "Application for Payment of Amounts Due Persons Who Have Died, Disappeared, or Have Been Declared Incompetent". This information is used by FSA county office employees to document the relationship of heirs or beneficiaries and determine the order of precedence for disbursing payments to heirs or beneficiaries of the person who

has died, disappeared, or been declared incompetent.

Information is obtained only when a producer eligible to receive a payment or disbursement dies, disappears, or is declared incompetent, and documentation is needed to determine if any heirs or beneficiaries are entitled to receive such payments or disbursements.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average .5 hours (½ hour) per response.

Respondents: Individual producers.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 2,000.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 1.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 1,000.

Proposed topics for comment include: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collected; or (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of the information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments should be sent to the Desk Officer for Agriculture, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 and to David Tidwell, Agricultural Program Specialist, Production, Emergencies, and Compliance Division, USDA, FSA, STOP 0517, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250–0517, (202) 720–4542.

Copies of the information collection may be obtained from David Tidwell, at the above address.

Signed at Washington, DC, on April 12, 2004.

Verle E. Lanier,

Acting Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation.

[FR Doc. 04–8845 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Office of the Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Economics

Notice of Appointment to the Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture

AGENCY: Agricultural Research Service.

ACTION: Notice of appointment to the Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture.

SUMMARY: The Office of the Secretary of Agriculture announces members appointed to fill 9 vacancies on the Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. Those appointed are as follows: Daryl Buss, Dean, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI; Leon Corzine, Farmer/President, LPC Farms, Assumption, IL; Carole Cramer, Professor, Department of Plant Pathology, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA; Michael Dykes, Vice President, Government Affairs, Monsanto Company, St. Louis, MO; Carol Tucker Foreman, Director, Food Policy Institute, Consumer Federation of America; Randal Giroux, Scientific Lead, Corporate Agricultural Biotechnology, Cargill, Inc., Wayzata, MN; Margaret Mellon, Director, Food and Environment Program, Union of Concerned Scientists, Washington, DC; Ronald Olson, Vice President, Grain Division, General Mills, Minneapolis, MN; and Jerome Slocum, Farmer/President, North Mississippi Grain Company, Coldwater, MS.

DATES: Appointments by the Secretary are for a two-year term, effective February 13, 2004 until February 12, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Schechtman, Designated Federal Official, Office of the Deputy Secretary, USDA, 202B Jamie L. Whitten Federal Building, 12th and Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250; Telephone (202) 720–3817; Fax (202) 690–4265; E-mail *mschechtman@ars.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The members of the committee cover a broad range of agricultural disciplines and interests. The duties of the committee are solely advisory. The Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture (AC21) is charged with examining the long-term impacts of biotechnology on the U.S. food and agriculture system and USDA, and providing guidance to USDA on pressing individual issues, identified by the Office of the Secretary, related to the application of biotechnology in agriculture.

The AC21 was first appointed in February 2003 and at the time half of the appointments were for a one-year term and half for a two-year term. Due to the staggered appointments, the terms for 9 of the 18 members expired on February 12, 2004. Members of the AC21 may be reappointed by the Secretary of Agriculture but no member may serve more than six consecutive years. Members serve without pay, but with reimbursement of travel expenses and per diem for attendance at AC21 and subcommittee functions for those committee members who require assistance in order to attend the meetings.

Dated: April 13, 2004.

Rodney J. Brown,

Deputy Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Economics.

[FR Doc. 04–8847 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Farm Service Agency

Request for Revision and Extension of a Currently Approved Information Collection; Total Quality Systems Audit Program

AGENCY: Farm Service Agency, USDA.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the intention of the Farm Service Agency (FSA) to request a revision and extension of an information collection currently in effect with respect to the Total Quality Systems Audit (TQSA) program. This information collection allows FSA to determine compliance with the TQSA standards. The TQSA program was implemented to ensure that FSA commodity purchases meet customer requirements and needs. Suppliers of commodities covered by the TQSA program have had to meet quality control and food safety standards to assure the quality of the end product being purchased by FSA.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received on or before June 21, 2004, to be assured consideration.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS: Contact Howard Froehlich, Chief, USDA, Farm Service Agency, Warehouse and Inventory Division, Program Development Branch, STOP

0553, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-0553, (202) 720–7398; e-mail *Howard_Froehlich@wdc.fsa.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Total Quality Systems Audit Program.

OMB Control Number: 0560–0214.

Expiration Date: October 31, 2004.

Type of Request: Revision and extension of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: The information collected under OMB Control Number 0560-0214, as identified above, allows FSA to administer the TQSA program. The forms approved by this information collection are used by TQSA auditors, employed by FSA, or supplier representatives to secure and record information about the supplier's facility, audit information, and to submit corrective action plans to nonconformances previously found. The information collected is necessary to provide those charged with purchasing FSA commodities a basis to determine whether the supplier's quality management system meets applicable TQSA standards for contract bidding eligibility and to monitor the capability of the quality management system once approved supplier status is achieved. The information collected allows FSA to bill suppliers for the amount of hours TQSA auditors spent auditing supplier's quality management system.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this information collection is estimated to average 30 minutes per response.

Respondents: Commodity suppliers participating in the TQSA program.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 200.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 2.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 400 hours.

Proposed topics for comment include: (a) Whether the continued collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of FSA's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) enhancing the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; or (d) minimizing the burden of the collection of the information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments should be sent to the Desk Officer for Agriculture, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503, and to Howard Froehlich at the address listed above. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Signed at Washington, DC, on April 12, 2004.

Verle E. Lanier,

Administrator, Farm Service Agency.

[FR Doc. 04–8846 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign Agricultural Service

Trade Adjustment Assistance for Farmers

AGENCY: Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

The Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS), today denied a petition filed by a group of freshwater prawn producers from Kentucky for trade adjustment assistance (TAA) that was filed on February 23, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Jean-Louis Pajot, Coordinator, Trade Adjustment Assistance for Farmers, FAS, USDA, (202) 720–2916, e-mail: *trade.assistance@fas.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Upon investigation, the Administrator determined that the price information provided in the petition could not be validated. Thus Kentucky prawn prices could not be verified to have declined by more than 20 percent during the January–December 2002 marketing year, compared to the previous 5-year average, a condition required for certifying a petition for TAA.

Dated: April 9, 2004.

A. Ellen Terpstra,

Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service.

[FR Doc. 04–8892 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–841, A–560–817,A–583–840, A–549–823]

Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations:Bottle–Grade Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Resin from India,Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand

AGENCY: Import Administration, International TradeAdministration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Initiation of Antidumping DutyInvestigations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Riggle at (202) 482–0650 or Amber Musser at (202) 482–1777, AD/CVD Enforcement Office 5, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Initiation of Investigations

The Petition

On March 24, 2004, the U.S. Department of Commerce (the Department) received a petition filed in proper form by the United States PET Resin Producers Coalition (the petitioner). The Department received supplemental information from the petitioner on April 5, 2004.

In accordance with section 732(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the petitioner alleges that imports of polyethylene terephthalate resin (bottle–grade PET resin) from India, Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand are, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that imports from India, Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand are materially injuring, or are threatening to materially injure, an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that the petitioner filed the petition on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and it has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to each of the antidumping investigations that it is requesting the Department to initiate. *See infra*, "Determination of Industry Support for the Petition."

Periods of Investigation

The anticipated period of investigation (POI) for these

investigations is January 1, 2003, through December 31, 2003. *See* section 351.204(b)(1) of the Department's regulations (*Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27385 (May 19, 1997)).

Scope of Investigations

The merchandise covered by each of these investigations is bottle–grade polyethylene terephthalate (PET) resin, defined as having an intrinsic viscosity of at least 0.68 deciliters per gram but not more than 0.86 deciliters per gram. The scope includes bottle–grade PET resin that contains various additives introduced in the manufacturing process. The scope does not include post–consumer recycle (PCR) or post–industrial recycle (PIR) PET resin; however, included in the scope is any bottle–grade PET resin blend of virgin PET bottle–grade resin and recycled PET (RPET). Waste and scrap PET is outside the scope of the investigations. Fiber–grade PET resin, which has an intrinsic viscosity of less than 0.68 deciliters per gram, is also outside the scope of the investigations.

The merchandise subject to these investigations is properly classified under subheading 3907.60.0010 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS); however, merchandise classified under HTSUS subheading 3907.60.0050 that otherwise meets the written description of the scope is also subject to these investigations. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

During our review of the petition, we discussed the scope with the petitioner to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. As discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations (*Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we are setting aside a period for parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all parties to submit such comments within 20 calendar days of publication of this notice. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's Central Records Unit, Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determinations.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that the Department's industry support determination, which is to be made before the initiation of the investigations, be based on whether a minimum percentage of the relevant industry supports the petition. A petition satisfies this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for (1) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall either poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the "industry" as the producers of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether "the domestic industry" has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law.[1]

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as "a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title." Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is "the article subject to an investigation," *i.e.*, the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition.

In this case, the petition covers a single class or kind of merchandise, bottle–grade PET resin, as defined in the "Scope of Investigations" section above. The petitioner does not offer a definition of domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigations. Further, based on our analysis of the information presented to the Department by the petitioner, we have determined that there is a single domestic like product, which is consistent with the definition of the "Scope of the Investigations" section above, and have analyzed industry support in terms of this domestic like product.

The Department has determined that the petitioner has established industry support representing over 50 percent of total production of the domestic like product. *See* Antidumping Duty Initiation Checklist: Bottle–Grade Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Resin from India, Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand (Initiation Checklist) (April 13, 2004), on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce. Thus, no polling of the domestic industry by the Department pursuant to section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act is required. In addition, the Department received no opposition to the petition from domestic producers of the like product. Therefore, the petitioner and domestic producers who support the petition account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, and the requirements of section 732(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act are met. Furthermore, the petitioner and domestic producers who support the petition account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for or opposition to the petition. Thus, the requirements of section 732(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act also are met.

Accordingly, we determine that the petition is filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act. *See* Initiation Checklist at Attachment II.

Export Price and Normal Value

The following are descriptions of the allegations of sales at less than fair value upon which the Department based its decision to initiate these investigations.

[1] *See USEC, Inc., v. United States*, 132 F. Supp. 2d 1,8 (CIT 2001), citing *Algoma Steel Corp. Ltd., v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 642-44 (CIT 1988). *See also High Information Content Flat Panel Displays and Display Glass from Japan: Final Determination; Rescission of Investigation and Partial Dismissal of Petition*, 56 FR 32376, 32380-81 (July 16, 1991).

The sources of data for the deductions and adjustments relating to U.S. and home market prices, and constructed value (CV), are discussed in greater detail in the Initiation Checklist. The petitioner stated it was unable to obtain information regarding specific sales or offers for sale of subject merchandise in Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand or in any third country. Therefore for these three countries, the petitioner based normal value (NV) on CV. *See* Petition at 17–18. Should the need arise to use any of this information as facts available under section 776 of the Act in our preliminary or final determinations, we may re–examine the information and revise the margin calculations, if appropriate.

India

Export Price

The petitioner based export price (EP) on average unit values (AUVs) of bottle–grade PET resin imports from India for the POI. The petitioner derived such values from import statistics under the HTSUS subheading 3907.60.0010. The petitioner did not make any adjustments to the AUVs.

Normal Value

With respect to NV, the petitioner calculated an average home market price for bottle–grade PET resin based on information obtained from Reliance Industries' website. Reliance Industries' price information was considered a reasonable surrogate for all Indian producers as it is India's largest bottle–grade PET resin producer.

The petitioner calculated NV using a home market price quoted in Indian Rupees per kilogram and converted to U.S. cents per pound. NV was adjusted for export packing costs based on the assumption that export shipments to the United States were made in bulk containers. NV was not adjusted for home market packing costs, as it was assumed that home market shipments were made in bulk in an unpacked condition. In addition, NV was not adjusted for home market freight costs, as it was assumed that the published selling prices on Reliance Industries web page are ex–factory. *See* Initiation Checklist for details.

The estimated dumping margin for subject merchandise from India, based on a comparison of EP and NV based on the average home market price described above, is 35.51 percent.

Indonesia

Export Price

The petitioner based EP on AUVs of bottle–grade PET resin imports from Indonesia for the POI. The petitioner derived such values from import statistics under the HTSUS subheading 3907.60.0010. The petitioner did not make any adjustments to the AUVs.

Normal Value

Pursuant to sections 773(a)(4), 773(b) and 773(e) of the Act, the petitioner based NV for sales in Indonesia on CV. The petitioner calculated CV using the same cost of manufacture (COM), selling, general and administrative (SG&A) and interest expense figures used to compute the cost of production (COP).

According to section 773(b)(3) of the Act, COP consists of COM, SG&A expenses, financial expenses, and packing expenses. The petitioner calculated COM based on its own production experience, adjusted for known differences between costs incurred to produce bottle–grade PET resin in the United States and Indonesia using publicly available data. To calculate SG&A and interest, the petitioner relied upon amounts reported by an Indonesian PET resin producer in its 2001 financial statements, which were the most recent available. The petitioner did not include packing costs, as it was assumed that most home market shipments are made in bulk in an unpacked condition.

Consistent with section 773(e)(2) of the Act, the petitioner included in CV an amount for profit. For profit, the petitioner relied upon amounts reported by the same Indonesian bottle-grade PET resin producer in its 2001 financial statements. In addition, the petitioner added export packing costs to CV.

The estimated dumping margin for subject merchandise from Indonesia, based on a comparison of EP and NV based on CV, is 27.61 percent.

Taiwan

Export Price

The petitioner based EP on AUVs of bottle–grade PET resin imports from Taiwan for the POI. The petitioner derived such values from import statistics under the HTSUS subheading 3907.60.0010. The petitioner did not make any adjustments to the AUVs.

Normal Value

Pursuant to sections 773(a)(4), 773(b) and 773(e) of the Act, the petitioner based NV for sales in Taiwan on CV. The petitioner calculated CV using the same COM, SG&A and interest expense figures used to compute the COP.

According to section 773(b)(3) of the Act, COP consists of COM, SG&A expenses, financial expenses, and packing expenses. The petitioner calculated COM based on its own production experience, adjusted for known differences between costs incurred to produce bottle–grade PET resin in the United States and Taiwan using publicly available data. To calculate SG&A and interest, the petitioner relied upon amounts reported by a Taiwanese PET resin producer in its 2002 financial statements. The petitioner did not include packing costs, as it was assumed that most home market shipments are made in bulk in an unpacked condition.

Consistent with section 773(e)(2) of the Act, the petitioner included in CV an amount for profit. For profit, the petitioner relied upon amounts reported by the same Taiwanese PET resin producer in its 2002 financial statements. In addition, the petitioner added export packing costs to CV.

The estimated dumping margin for subject merchandise from Taiwan, based on a comparison of EP and NV based on CV, is 37.35 percent.

Thailand

Export Price

The petitioner based EP on AUVs of bottle–grade PET resin imports from Thailand for the POI. The petitioner derived such values from import statistics under the HTSUS subheading 3907.60.0010. The petitioner did not make any adjustments to the AUVs.

Normal Value

Pursuant to sections 773(a)(4), 773(b) and 773(e) of the Act, the petitioner based NV for sales in Thailand on CV. The petitioner calculated CV using the same COM, SG&A and interest expense figures used to compute the COP.

According to section 773(b)(3) of the Act, COP consists of COM, SG&A expenses, financial expenses, and packing expenses. The petitioner calculated COM based on its own production experience, adjusted for known differences between costs incurred to produce bottle–grade PET resin in the United States and Thailand using publicly available data. To calculate SG&A and interest, the petitioner relied upon amounts reported in an Indian PET resin producer's 2003 financial statements. We revised the petitioner's SG&A and financial expense rates calculation by using average SG&A and financial expense rates from the financial statements for two companies located in Thailand which are involved in industry sectors comparable to the bottle–grade PET resin industry. The SG&A and financial expense ratios were based on the financial statements of these two companies that were provided

by the petitioner as an alternative to using the Indian company's financial statements. The petitioner did not include packing costs, as it was assumed that most home market shipments are made in bulk in an unpacked condition. *See* Initiation Checklist at Attachment V for details.

Consistent with section 773(e)(2) of the Act, the petitioner included in CV an amount for profit. For profit, the petitioner relied upon amounts reported in an Indian PET resin producer's 2003 financial statements. We revised the petitioner's CV profit rate calculation by using an average profit rate from the financial statements of two companies located in Thailand which are involved in industry sectors comparable to the bottle–grade PET resin industry. The financial statements of the two Thai companies were provided by the petitioner as an alternative to using the Indian company's financial statements. In addition, the petitioner added export packing costs to CV. *See* Initiation Checklist at Attachment V for details.

The estimated dumping margin for subject merchandise from Thailand, based on a comparison of EP and NV based on CV, is 41.28 percent.

Fair Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by the petitioner, there is reason to believe that imports of bottle–grade PET resin from India, Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand are being, or are likely to be, sold at less than fair value.

Critical Circumstances

In its submission, the petitioner claims that, following the initiation of this case, there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances will exist with regard to imports of bottle–grade PET resin from India, Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand.

Section 733(e)(1) of the Act states that, if a petitioner alleges critical circumstances, the Department will find that such circumstances exist, at any time after the date of initiation, when there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that, under subparagraph (A)(i), there is a history of dumping and material injury by reason of dumped imports in the United States or elsewhere of the subject merchandise, or (ii) the person by whom, or for whose account, the merchandise was imported knew or should have known that the exporter was selling the subject merchandise at less than its fair value and that there was likely to be material injury by reason of such sales, and, under subparagraph (B), there have been massive imports of the subject merchandise over a relatively short period. Section 351.206(h) of the Department's regulations defines "massive imports" as imports that have increased by at least 15 percent over the imports during an immediately preceding period of comparable duration. Section 351.206(i) of the regulations states that "relatively short period" will normally be defined as the period beginning on the date the proceeding begins and ending at least three months later. To date, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the requirement of "massive imports . . . over a relatively short period" has been met.

The petitioner alleges that importers knew, or should have known, that bottle–grade PET resin was being sold at less than its fair value. Specifically, the petitioner alleges margins, as adjusted by the Department, of between 27.61 and 41.28 percent, a level high enough to impute importer knowledge that merchandise was being sold at less than its fair value. Additionally, the petitioner references the European Council Regulation (EC) No. 2604/2000 of 27 November 2000, which imposes a definitive antidumping duty and collects definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of bottle–grade PET resin from India, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Republic of Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand, to establish a history of dumping.

The petitioner requests that, pursuant to section 732(e) of the Act, the Department request U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to compile information on an expedited basis regarding entries of subject merchandise. We note that section 732(e) of the Act states that when there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect (1) there is a history of dumping in the United States or elsewhere of the subject merchandise, or (2) the person by whom, or for whose account, the merchandise was imported knew, or should have known, that the exporter was selling the subject merchandise at less than its fair value, the Department may request the Commissioner of Customs to compile information on an expedited basis regarding entries of the subject merchandise.

As noted above, the petitioner has not met the criteria for a finding of critical circumstances. Therefore, at this time, we have no reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist. However, the petitioner can resubmit its request for a finding of critical circumstances and, if the criteria for such a finding are met, we will issue a critical circumstances finding at the earliest possible date. *See Policy Bulletin 98/4*, 63 FR 55364 (October 15, 1998) (determination of critical circumstances may be made any time after initiation). In addition, we are considering the petitioner's request to obtain information from CBP for monitoring purposes, and will inform interested parties of our determination as soon as practicable.

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

The petitioner alleges that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of the cumulated imports from India, Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand of the subject merchandise sold at less than NV.

The petitioner contends that the industry's injured condition is evident in lost sales and customers, in the declining trends in prices, profits, and domestic market share, and in its reduced ability to reinvest and pursue research and development activities. The allegations of injury and causation are supported by relevant evidence including U.S. import data, affidavits supporting claims of lost sales and declining revenues, and pricing information. The petitioner also alleges the imminent threat of further material injury based on the likely increases in foreign production volume of bottle–grade PET resin, the likelihood of substantially increased imports, and the prices of these imports having the likely effect of depressing or suppressing domestic prices.

The Department has assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, causation, and threat of material injury, and has determined that these allegations are properly supported by accurate and adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation. *See* the Initiation Checklist at Attachment IV.

Initiation of Antidumping Investigations

Based upon our examination of the petition, we have found that it meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act. See the Initiation Checklist. Therefore, we are initiating antidumping duty investigations to determine whether imports of bottle–grade PET resin from India, Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless this deadline is extended, we will make our preliminary determinations no later than 140 days after the date of these initiations.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of the petition has been provided to the representatives of the governments of India, Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the petition to each exporter named in the petition, as provided for under 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiations as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will determine no later than May 10, 2004, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of bottle–grade PET resin from India, Indonesia, Taiwan, and Thailand are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination for any country will result in the investigation being terminated with respect to that country; otherwise, these investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits. This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: April 13, 2004.

Jeffrey May,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8938 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigations: Bottle–Grade Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Resin from India (C–533–842) and Thailand (C–549–824)

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Douglas Kirby (India) or Christian Hughes (Thailand) at (202) 482–3782 or (202) 482–0190 respectively, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Initiation of Investigations

The Petition

On March 24, 2004, the U.S. Department of Commerce (the Department) received a countervailing duty petition filed in proper form by the United States PET Resin Producers Coalition ("Petitioner"). The Department received supplemental information to the petition from the petitioner on April 5, 2004. In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), petitioner alleges that producers or exporters of bottle–grade PET resin in India and Thailand receive countervailable subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Act, and that imports from India and Thailand are materially injuring, or are threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that the petitioner filed the petition on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and it has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the countervailing duty investigations that it is requesting the Department to initiate. *See infra*, "Determination of Industry Support for the Petition."

Period of Investigation

The anticipated period of investigation (POI) for both investigations is January 1, 2003 through December 31, 2003. See section 351.204(b)(2) of the Department's regulations (*Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27385 (May 19, 1997)).

Scope of Investigations

The merchandise covered by each of these investigations is bottle–grade polyethylene terephthalate (PET) resin, defined as having an intrinsic viscosity of at least 0.68 deciliters per gram but not more than 0.86 deciliters per gram. The scope includes bottle–grade PET resin that contains various additives introduced in the manufacturing process. The scope does not include post–consumer recycle (PCR) or post–industrial recycle (PIR) PET resin; however, included in the scope is any bottle–grade PET resin blend of virgin PET bottle–grade resin and recycled PET (RPET). Waste and scrap PET is outside the scope of the investigations. Fiber–grade PET resin, which has an intrinsic viscosity of less than 0.68 deciliters per gram, is also outside the scope of the investigations.

The merchandise subject to these investigations is properly classified under subheading 3907.60.0010 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS); however, merchandise classified under HTSUS subheading 3907.60.0050 that otherwise meets the written description of the scope is also subject to these investigations. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

During our review of the petition, we discussed the scope with the petitioner to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. As discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations (*Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we are setting aside a period for parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all parties to submit such comments within 20 calendar days of publication of this notice. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's Central Records Unit, Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determinations.

Consultations

In accordance with Article 13.1 of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures and section 702(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act, we held separate consultations regarding this petition with the Government of India ("GOI") and the Government of Thailand on April 7, 2004. *See Memorandum to the File from Douglas Kirby: Consultations with the Government of India Regarding the Countervailing Duty Petition on PET Resin*, dated April 9, 2004; *see also Memorandum to the File from Christian Hughes: Consultations with the Government of Thailand Regarding the Countervailing Duty Petition on PET Resin*, dated April 8, 2004. Following consultations, the GOI provided information to support its statements at consultations regarding several of the GOI programs alleged by the petitioner. This information was placed in the record and provided to petitioner. *See Memorandum to the File from Dana Mermelstein*, "Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Bottle–Grade Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Resin from India: Information Submitted by the

Government of India," April 12, 2004, on file in the Import Administration Central Records Unit , Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce Building. The Department's consideration of this information is fully discussed in the *Countervailing Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Bottle–Grade Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Resin from India* (April 13, 2004) (India CVD Initiation Checklist).

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that the Department's industry support determination, which is to be made before the initiation of the investigations, be based on whether a minimum percentage of the relevant industry supports the petition. A petition satisfies this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for (1) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall either poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the "industry" as the producers of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether "the domestic industry" has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to the law.[1]

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as "a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title." Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is "the article subject to an investigation," *i.e.*, the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition.

In this case, the petition covers a single class or kind of merchandise, bottle–grade PET resin, as defined in the "Scope of Investigations" section, above. The petitioner does not offer a definition of domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigations. Further, based on our analysis of the information presented to the Department by the petitioner, we have determined that there is a single domestic like product, also bottle–grade PET resin, which is consistent with the definition in the "Scope of Investigations" section above and have analyzed industry support in terms of this domestic like product.

The Department has determined that the petitioner has established industry support representing over 50 percent of total production of the domestic like product. *See India CVD Initiation Checklist; see also Countervailing Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Bottle–Grade Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Resin from Thailand (Thailand CVD Initiation Checklist)* (April 13, 2004). Thus, no polling of the domestic industry by the Department pursuant to section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act is required. In addition, the Department received no opposition to the petition from domestic producers of the like product. Therefore, the petitioner and the domestic producers who support the petition account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, and the requirements of section 702(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act are met. Furthermore, the petitioner and the domestic producers who support the petition account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for or opposition to the petition. Thus, the requirements of section 702(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act also are met.

Accordingly, we determine that the petition is filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 702(b)(1) of the Act. *See India CVD Initiation Checklist* at Attachment II; *see also Thailand CVD Initiation Checklist*, at Attachment II, on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce.

Injury Test

Both India and Thailand are "Subsidies Agreement Countries" within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act. Therefore, section 701(a)(2) applies to each investigation. Accordingly, the ITC must determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from India and Thailand are materially injuring, or are threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States.

Allegations of Subsidies

Section 702(b) of the Act requires the Department to initiate a countervailing duty proceeding whenever an interested party files a petition, on behalf of an industry, that; (1) alleges the elements necessary for an imposition of a duty under section 701(a), and (2) is accompanied by information reasonably available to petitioner supporting the allegations.

India

We are initiating an investigation of the following programs alleged in the petition to have provided countervailable subsidies to manufacturers, producers and exporters of the subject merchandise in India (a full description of each program is provided in the India CVD Initiation Checklist):

1. The Duty Entitlement Passbook Scheme (DEPS)/ Post–Export Credits
2. Pre–Shipment and Post–Shipment Export Financing
3. Export Promotion Capital Goods Scheme (EPCGS)
4. Income Tax Exemption Scheme (Sections 10A, 10B, and 80 HHC)
5. Exemption of Export Credit from Interest Taxes
6. Export Processing Zones/Export–Oriented Units Program
7. Market Development Assistance (MDA)
8. Status Certificate Program
9. Loan Guarantees from the GOI
10. State of Maharashtra Program: Industrial Policy 2001
11. State of Gujurat Program: Sales–Tax Incentive Scheme
12. State of West Bengal Program: New Economic Policy on Industrial Development

[1] *See USEC, Inc., v. United States*, 132 F. Supp. 2d 1,8 (CIT 2001), citing *Algoma Steel Corp. Ltd., v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 642-44 (CIT 1988). *See also High Information Content Flat Panel Displays and Display Glass fram Japan: Final Determination; Rescission of Investigation and Partial Dismissal of Petition*, 56 FR 32376, 32380-81 (July 16, 1991).

Thailand

We are initiating an investigation of the following programs alleged in the petition to have provided countervailable subsidies to manufacturers, producers and exporters of the subject merchandise in Thailand (a full description of each program is provided in the *Thailand CVD Initiation Checklist*):

1. Section 28 of the Investment Promotion Act: Exemption from Payment of Import Duties on Machinery
2. Section 30 of the Investment Promotion Act: Reduction of Import Duties on Raw or Essential Materials
3. Section 31 of the Investment Promotion Act: Income Tax Exemptions
4. Section 35 of the Investment Promotion Act: Special Rights and Benefits Granted to Promoted Activities Located in Investment Promotion Zones

Critical Circumstances Allegation

In the petition, the petitioner claims that, following the initiation of these countervailing duty investigations, there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances will exist with regard to imports of bottle–grade PET resin from India and Thailand.

Section 703(e)(1) of the Act states that, if a petitioner alleges critical circumstances, the Department will find that such critical circumstances exist, at any time after the date of initiation, when there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that, under paragraph (A), the alleged countervailable subsidies are inconsistent with the Subsidies Agreement, and that, under paragraph (B), there have been massive imports of the subject merchandise over a relatively short period of time. Section 351.206(h) of the Department's regulations defines "massive imports" as imports that have increased by at least by 15 percent over the imports during an immediately preceding period of comparable duration. Section 351.206(i) of the regulations states that the "relatively short period" will normally be defined as the period beginning on the date the proceeding begins and ending at least three months later. To date, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the requirement of "massive imports . . . over a relatively short period" has been met.

The petitioner requests that, pursuant to section 702(e) of the Act, the Department request U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to compile information on an expedited basis regarding entries of subject merchandise. We note that section 702(e) of the Act states that if, at any time after initiation, there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that the alleged countervailable subsidies are inconsistent with the Subsidies Agreement, the Department may request the Commissioner of Customs to compile such information on an expedited basis. The petitioner alleges that certain programs listed in the petition with respect to both India and Thailand constitute export subsidies, which would be inconsistent with the Subsidies Agreement.

As noted above, the petitioner has not met the criteria for a finding of critical circumstances. Therefore, at this time, we have no reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist. However, the petitioner can resubmit its request for a finding of critical circumstances and, if the criteria for such a finding are met, we will issue a critical circumstances finding at the earliest possible date. *See Policy Bulletin 98/4*, 63 FR 55364 (October 15, 1998) (determination of critical circumstances may be made any time after initiation). In addition, we are considering the petitioner's request to obtain information from CBP for monitoring purposes, and will inform interested parties of our determination as soon as practicable.

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

The petitioner alleges that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of subsidized imports from India and Thailand of the subject merchandise.

The petitioner contends that the industry's injured condition is evident in lost sales and customers, in the declining trends in prices, profits, and domestic market share, and in its reduced ability to reinvest and pursue research and development activities. The allegations of injury and causation are supported by relevant evidence including U.S. import data, affidavits supporting claims of lost sales and declining revenues, and pricing information. The petitioner also alleges the imminent threat of further material injury based on the likely increases in foreign production volume of bottle–grade PET resin, the likelihood of substantially increased imports, and the prices of these imports having the likely effect of depressing or suppressing domestic prices.

The Department has assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury and causation and threat of material injury, and has determined that these allegations are properly supported by accurate and adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation. *See India CVD Initiation Checklist; see also Thailand CVD Initiation Checklist.*

Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigations

Based on our examination of the petition on bottle–grade PET resin, and petitioner's responses to our requests for supplemental information clarifying the petition, we have found that the petition meets the requirements of section 702(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 702(b) of the Act, we are initiating two countervailing duty investigations to determine whether manufacturers, producers, or exporters of bottle–grade PET resin from India and from Thailand receive countervailable subsidies. Unless the deadline is extended, we will make our preliminary determinations no later than 65 days after the date of this initiation.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 702(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of each petition has been provided to the representatives of the governments of India and Thailand. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the petition to each known exporter as provided for under 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiations, as required by section 702(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will determine no later than May 10, 2004, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of bottle–grade PET resin from India and Thailand are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in these investigations being terminated; otherwise, these investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits. This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: April 13, 2004.

Jeffrey May,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8937 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 121803D]

Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements; Regulatory Amendment to Modify Seafood Dealer Reporting Requirements

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notification of clearance of collection-of-information requirements.

SUMMARY: NMFS announces the clearance by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) of collection-of-information requirements for a regulatory amendment to modify the reporting and recordkeeping regulations for federally permitted seafood dealers participating in the summer flounder, scup, black sea bass, Atlantic sea scallop, Northeast (NE) multispecies, monkfish, Atlantic mackerel, squid, butterfish, Atlantic surfclam, ocean quahog, Atlantic herring, Atlantic deep-sea red crab, tilefish, Atlantic bluefish, skates, and/or spiny dogfish fisheries in the NE Region, whereby permitted dealers must report all purchases of fish via electronic means. The purpose of this notification is to announce to the public that OMB has cleared the collection-of-information requirements for that action.

ADDRESSES: Any comments regarding burden-hour estimates for collection-of-information requirements contained in this final rule should be sent to Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator, Northeast Regional Office, NMFS, One Blackburn Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930, and by e-mail to *David_Rostker@omb.eop.gov*, or by fax to (202) 395–7285.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Pentony, Senior Fishery Policy Analyst, (978)281–9283, fax (978)281–9135, email *Michael.Pentony@noaa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 23, 2004 (69 FR 13482), NMFS published a final rule to implement measures contained in a regulatory amendment to modify the reporting and recordkeeping regulations for federally permitted seafood dealers. Section 648.7(a), (d), (e), and (f) of that final rule contains collection-of-information requirements that apply to any seafood dealer that is permitted under § 648.6. The March 23, 2004, final rule, which becomes effective on May 1, 2004, requires daily electronic reporting of all fish purchased (including fish received) by federally permitted dealers who are determined to be large dealers, while delaying the daily reporting requirement for all small dealers who initially will be required to report electronically on a weekly basis. Also, it eliminates dealer reporting via the Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system; implements a trip identifier requirement for dealers; requires dealers to report the disposition of purchased fish; and modifies the dealer reporting requirements for the surfclam and ocean quahog fisheries to make them consistent with the requirements of other fisheries. Details concerning the justification for and development of the regulatory amendment and the implementing regulations were provided in the preambles to the proposed rule (69 FR 2870, January 21, 2004) and the final rule (69 FR 13482, March 23, 2004) and are not repeated here.

In the March 23, 2004, final rule, NMFS indicated that it would inform the affected public through a follow-up notification announcing OMB's clearance of the collection-of-information requirements related to § 648.7(a), (d), (e), and (f) of that rule. On April 14, 2004, OMB cleared the collection-of-information requirements under OMB control numbers 0648–0018 and 0648–0229. The intent of the notification is to inform the public of the OMB clearance of these requirements that become effective on May 1, 2004.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: April 14, 2004.

Alan D. Risenhoover,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. E4–884 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 122203A]

RIN 0648–AN17

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery; Amendment 13

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of partial approval of a fishery management plan amendment.

SUMMARY: NMFS announces that Amendment 13 to the NE Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (Amendment 13) has been partially approved by NMFS, acting on behalf of the Secretary of Commerce. Amendment 13 was developed by the New England Fishery Management Council (Council) to end overfishing and rebuild NE multispecies (groundfish) stocks managed under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and to make other changes in the management of the groundfish fishery. The intent of this announcement is to inform the public of the partial approval of Amendment 13 and of the availability of the Record of Decision (ROD) for Amendment 13 in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

DATES: Amendment 13 was partially approved on March 18, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Warren, Fishery Policy Analyst, 978–281–9347, fax: 978–281–9135; email: *thomas.warren@noaa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NMFS intends to comply with a Court-ordered implementation of Amendment 13 through publication of a final rule in the **Federal Register** by May 1, 2004.

A proposed rule to implement Amendment 13 published in the **Federal Register** on January 29, 2004 (69 FR 4362), with public comment ending on February 27, 2004. A total of 4,941 comments were received on Amendment 13. A summary of the comments received and NMFS's responses will be published in the final rule.

On March 18, 2004, NMFS approved all measures in Amendment 13 with the exception of the following proposed measures, which have been disapproved: 1) The Closed Area (CA) II Haddock Special Access Program (SAP) and the CA I Hook Gear Haddock SAP; 2) the prohibition on surfclam and ocean quahog dredge gear in NE multispecies closed areas (the result of this disapproval is that such gear will be allowed in the groundfish closure portion of the Nantucket Lightship Closed Area, the Western Gulf of Maine (WGOM) Closure Area, and the Cashes Ledge Closure Area); 3) the exemption for shrimp trawl gear in the WGOM Closure Area; 4) the abbreviated process to implement SAPs; 5) the Georges Bank Cod Trip Limit Program; and 6) the removal of the Flexible Area Action System. A full explanation of the reasons for disapproval will be included

in the final rule implementing Amendment 13.

NMFS is under a Court-ordered deadline to implement Amendment 13 by May 1, 2004. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2004 (Division H, Section 105), however, prohibited NMFS from expending funds to implement the Amendment during this fiscal year. However, on April 13, 2004, President Bush signed into law H.R. 2584, which contains a provision repealing Section 105 of division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2004, thus enabling NMFS to implement Amendment 13 and publish the final rule. NMFS will publish the final rule in the **Federal Register** in the near future.

In addition, the public is informed that the ROD for Amendment 13 in compliance with NEPA is available on the NMFS, Northeast Fisheries Science Center's website: *http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/groundfish/#mg*

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: April 14, 2004.

John Oliver,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 04–8766 Filed 4–15–04; 3:35 pm]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 041404E]

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Public Meetings

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meetings.

SUMMARY: The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) and its Fisheries Issues Focus Committee, Research Set-Aside Committee, Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Committee, Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Committee, and Executive Committee will hold public meetings.

DATES: The meetings will be held on Tuesday, May 4, through Thursday, May 6, 2004. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for specific dates and times.

ADDRESSES: This meeting will be held at the Crowne Plaza Meadowlands, Two Harmon Plaza, Secaucus, NJ 07094; telephone: 201-348-6900.

Council address: Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 300 S. New Street, Dover, DE 19904; telephone: 302-674-2331.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel T. Furlong, Executive Director, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; telephone: 302–674–2331, ext. 19.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Tuesday, May 4, 2004, 12 noon to 1 p.m.* – The Fisheries Issues Focus Committee will meet.

1 p.m. to 2 p.m. – The Research Set-Aside Committee will meet.

2 p.m. to 4 p.m. – The Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Committee will meet.

4 p.m. to 5 p.m. – The Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Committee will meet.

Wednesday, May 5, 2004, 8 a.m. to 9 a.m. – The Executive Committee will meet.

9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. – Council will meet.

3:30 to 4 p.m. – There will be a NMFS Outreach Briefing.

4 p.m. to 5 p.m. – There will be a South Atlantic Council Scoping Hearing on Amendment 15 to the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Fishery Management Plan.

Thursday, May 6, 2004, 8 a.m. until approximately noon – The Council will meet.

Agenda items for the Council's committees and the Council itself are: Review status of states recreational saltwater fishing license programs; Review of New England Council (NEC) process to incorporate research results into NMFS scientific data bases; Address strategies to optimize use of multi-year quota setting mechanisms for surfclams and ocean quahogs; Review action on herring and its impacts on mackerel; Receive report from annual Council Chairmen's meeting; Review and resolve Advisory Panel appointment issues; Receive update on Council's FY04 budget; Receive reports on Climatic Impacts on East Coast Fishery Stocks and Clean Ocean Zone Initiative; Review and adopt Framework 5 regarding multi-year total allowable landings (TALs) for summer flounder, scup, and black sea bass; Discuss items related to Dogfish Amendment 1; Receive a NMFS Outreach Briefing on the Northeast Regional Bycatch Workshop; the Council will also receive and hear committee and organizational reports, and act on any new and/or continuing business.

Although non-emergency issues not contained in this agenda may come before the Council for discussion, these issues may not be the subject of formal Council action during this meeting. Council action will be restricted to those issues specifically listed in this notice and any issues arising after publication of this notice that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, provided the public has been notified of the Council's intent to take final actions to address such emergencies.

Special Accommodations

These meetings are physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Kathy Collins at the Council (see **ADDRESSES**) at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: April 15, 2004.

Alan D. Risenhoover,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. E4–895 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 040504D]

Endangered Species; Permit No. 1198

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Issuance of permit modification.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a request for modification of scientific research Permit No. 1198 submitted by the Florida Marine Research Institute, Jacksonville Field Laboratory, 6134 Authority Avenue, Building 200, Jacksonville, FL 32221, has been granted.

ADDRESSES: The amendment and related documents are available for review upon written request or by appointment in the following offices:

Permits, Conservation and Education Division, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, 1315 East-West Highway, Room 13705, Silver Spring, MD 20910; phone (301)713–2289, fax (301)713–0376; and

Southeast Region, NMFS, 9721 Executive Center Drive North, St. Petersburg, FL 33702–2432; phone (727)570–5301; fax (727)570–5320.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carrie Hubard or Ruth Johnson, (301)713–2289.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The requested amendment has been granted under the authority of the Endangered

Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA; 16 U.S.C..1531 *et seq.*) and the provisions of 50 CFR 222.306 of the regulations governing the taking, importing, and exporting of endangered and threatened fish and wildlife (50 CFR 222–226).

The modification extends the expiration date of the Permit from March 31, 2004, to March 31, 2005, for takes of green (*Chelonia mydas*), loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*), leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*), hawksbill (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) and Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*) sea turtles.

Issuance of this amendment, as required by the ESA was based on a finding that such permit: (1) Was applied for in good faith; (2) will not operate to the disadvantage of the threatened and endangered species which are the subject of this permit; and (3) is consistent with the purposes and policies set forth in section 2 of the ESA.

Dated: April 14, 2004.

Stephen L. Leathery,

Chief, Permits, Conservation and Education Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 04–8888 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Sunshine Act; Meetings

TIME AND DATE: 11 a.m., Friday, May 7, 2004.

PLACE: 1155 21st St., NW., Washington, DC, Room 1012.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Surveillance Matters.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Jean A. Webb, (202) 418–5100.

Jean A. Webb,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04–9006 Filed 4–16–04; 11:52 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–M

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Sunshine Act; Meetings

TIME AND DATE: 11 a.m., Friday, May 14, 2004.

PLACE: 1155 21st St., NW., Washington, DC, Room 1012.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Surveillance Matters.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Jean A. Webb, (202) 418–5100.

Jean A. Webb,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04–9007 Filed 4–16–04; 11:52 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–M

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Sunshine Act; Meetings

TIME AND DATE: 11 a.m., Friday, May 21, 2004.

PLACE: 1155 21st St., NW., Washington, DC, Room 1012.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Surveillance Matters.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Jean A. Webb, (202) 418–5100.

Jean A. Webb,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04–9008 Filed 4–16–04; 11:52 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–M

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meetings

TIME AND DATE: 11 a.m., Friday, May 28, 2004.

PLACE: 1155 21st St., NW., Washington, DC, Room 1012.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Surveillance Matters.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Jean A. Webb, (202) 418–5100.

Jean A. Webb,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04–9009 Filed 4–16–04; 11:52 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary, Defense Science Board

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of advisory committee meetings.

SUMMARY: The Defense Science Board Task Force on Critical Homeland Installation Protection will meet in closed sessions on July 20–21, 2004; and August 26–27, 2004, at SAIC, 4001 N. Fairfax Drive, Suite 500, Arlington, VA. The Task Force will assess best practices for protecting U.S. homeland installations and recommend various approaches to enhancing security and protection of these facilities.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology & Logistics on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At these meetings, the Task Force will assess investments in technology and manpower in order to ensure proper security levels at our nation's high-value installations with particular emphasis on airports, harbors, nuclear power facilities and military bases. To that end, the Task Force will review existing best practices in force protection and security at civil, industrial and military complexes, assess shortfalls and deficiencies associated with operational security, identify promising technology and/or processes that will enhance security; and recommend methods for reducing overall manpower requirements without relinquishing robust security measures.

In accordance with Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. No. 92–463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. II), it has been determined that these Defense Science Board Task Force meetings concerning matters listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) and that, accordingly, the meetings will be closed to the public.

Dated: April 14, 2004.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 04–8879 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary; National Security Education Board Meeting

AGENCY: National Defense University.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Pub. L. 92–463, notice is hereby given of a forthcoming meeting of the National Security Education Board. The purpose of the meeting is to review and make recommendations to the Secretary concerning requirements established by the David L. Boren National Security Education Act, Title VIII of Pub. L. 102–183, as amended.

DATES: May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: The Crystal City Marriott Hotel, 1999 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Edmond J. Collier, Deputy Director,

National Security Education Program, 1101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1210, Rosslyn, Virginia 22209–2248; (703) 696–1991. Electronic mail address: *colliere@ndu.edu.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Board meeting is open to the Public.

Dated: April 14, 2004.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 04–8878 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Armed Forces Epidemiological Board; Meeting

AGENCY: Department of the Army; DoD.

ACTION: Notice of partially-closed meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of Public Law 92–463, The Federal Advisory Committee Act, announcement is made of the following meeting:

Name of Committee: Armed Forces Epidemiological Board (AFEB).

Dates: May 11, 2004 (Partially-closed meeting). May 12, 2004 (Open meeting).

Times: 7:30 a.m.–5:45 p.m. (May 11, 2004). 7:30 a.m.–5:15 p.m. (May 12, 2004).

Location: Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center, 1607 Porter Avenue, Fort Detrick, MD (May 11, 2004, 8:20 a.m.–12 p.m.) and U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases, 1425 Porter Street, Fort Detrick, MD 21702–5011 (May 12, 2004, *see* above).

Agenda: The purpose of the meeting is to address pending and new Board issues, provide briefings for Board members on topics related to ongoing and new Board issues, conduct subcommittee meetings, and conduct an executive working session.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Colonel (Sel) Roger Gibson, Executive Secretary, Armed Forces Epidemiological Board, Skyline Six, 5109 Leesburg Pike, Room 682, Falls Church, VA 22041–3258, (703) 681–8012/3.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the interest of national security, and in accordance with Title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.) Section 552b(c)(1), the morning session on May 11, 2004 may be closed to the public. In addition, any classified portions of the meeting minutes may be withheld from public disclosure in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552b(f)(2). The afternoon session on May 11, 2004 and the entire session on May 12, 2004 will be open to the public. Open sessions of the meeting will be limited by space accommodations. The meeting will be open to the public in accordance with Section 552b(c) of Title 5, U.S.C., specifically subparagraph (1) thereof and Title 5 U.S.C., appendix 1, subsection 10(d). Any interested person may attend, appear before or file statements with the committee at the time and in the manner permitted by the committee.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Alternate Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8935 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Board of Visitors, United States Military Academy

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), announcement is made of the following committee meeting:

Name of Committee: Board of Visitors, United States Military Academy.

Date: Wednesday, May 12, 2004.

Place of Meeting: Veteran Affairs Conference Room, Room 418, Senate Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

Start Time of Meeting: Approximately 10 a.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant Colonel Edward C. Clarke, United States Military Academy, West Point, NY 10996–5000, (845) 938–4200.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Proposed Agenda:* Spring Meeting of the Board of Visitors. Review of the Academic, Military and Physical Programs at the USMA. All proceedings are open.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Alternate Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8933 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Intent To Prepare a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Near-Term Ecosystem Restoration Plan for the Louisiana Coastal Area

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice; date correction.

SUMMARY: The scoping meeting dates of May 2004 published in the **Federal Register** on Thursday, April 8, 2004 (69 FR 18553) was in error. The correct date for these meetings is April 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. William P. Klein, Jr., (504) 862–2540.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Alternate Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8936 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–84–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. IC04–723–000]

Proposed Information Collection and Request for Comments; Errata Notice

April 12, 2004.

On April 9, 2004, the Commission issued a "Notice of Request for Office of Management and Budget Emergency Processing of proposed information collection and request for comments" in the above referenced proceeding. The notice omitted to include a question on possible impediments to adequate vegetation management. FERC–723 "Vegetation Management Report" is also to include the following:

"Describe any Federal or State regulatory provisions or practices that prevent or unduly delay adequate vegetation management. Also describe any other conditions or reasons (financial or otherwise) that prevent or unduly delay adequate vegetation management."

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–883 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. PR04–10–000]

Arkansas Western Gas Company; Notice of Petition for Rate Approval

April 13, 2004.

Take notice that on April 1, 2004, Arkansas Western Gas Company (AWG) filed pursuant to section 284.123(b)(2) of the Commission's regulations, a petition for rate approval requesting that the Commission approve the proposed rates as fair and equitable for firm and interruptible transmission services performed under section 311 of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA). Raptor proposes an effective date of April 1, 2004.

AWG states that it owns and operates intrastate transmission and local distribution facilities in several counties in Arkansas. AWG further states that it also owns and operates a local distribution system in northeast Arkansas that includes two 50′ pipeline stubs which cross the Arkansas/Missouri border and interconnect with United Cities Gas Company.

Any person desiring to participate in this rate proceeding must file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington DC 20426, in accordance with § 385.214 or 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission on or before the date as indicated below. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. This petition for rate approval is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the eLibrary link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits I the docket number field to access the document. For Assistant, call (202) 502–8222 or for TTY, (202) 502–8659. Comments, protests and interventions may be filed electronically via the Internet in lieu of paper. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See,* 18 CFR 385.2001(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's web site under the e-Filing link.

Intervention and Protest Date: April 28, 2004.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–877 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP04–252–000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

April 13, 2004.

Take notice that on April 6, 2004, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, Sixth Revised Sheet No. 500B, to be effective May 1, 2004.

In addition, Columbia tendered for filing the following Service Agreements for consideration and approval:

FTS Service Agreement No. 78533 between Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation and Columbia Natural Resources dated April 1, 2004

FTS Service Agreement No. 78534 between Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation and Fortuna Energy Inc. dated April 1, 2004

Columbia states that copies of its filing have been mailed to all firm customers, interruptible customers, and affected state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with § 385.214 or § 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed in accordance with § 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. This filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the eLibrary. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at (866) 208–3676, or TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See,* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's web site under the e-Filing link.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–879 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP04–255–000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

April 13, 2004.

Take notice that on April 8, 2004, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the revised tariff sheets listed on Appendix A to the filing, with a proposed effective date of May 8, 2004.

Columbia states that as an integral component of its efforts to prepare for 2004 re-contracting issues, it has undertaken a comprehensive review of the pro forma service agreements in its Tariff, and this review has led Columbia to propose several Tariff revisions.

Columbia states that these tariff revisions are intended to (1) correct/delete certain minor inconsistencies in Columbia's pro forma service agreements, and (2) to ensure that Columbia, when it agrees with its shippers in future service agreements on minimum pressures and/or hourly flow rates, can also agree with its shippers on conditions to those minimum pressures/hourly flow rates necessary to ensure the integrity of Columbia's pipeline system.

Columbia states that copies of its filing have been mailed to all firm customers, interruptible customers, and affected state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 or 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed in accordance with Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings.

Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. This filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the eLibrary. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at (866) 208–3676, or TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See,* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under the e-Filing link.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–881 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP04–179–001]

National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation; Notice of Compliance Filing

April 13, 2004.

Take notice that on April 9, 2004, National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation (National Fuel) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Fourth Revised Volume No. 1, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 478, with an effective date of April 15, 2004.

National Fuel states that the instant filing is being made in compliance with the Letter Order issued by the Commission on March 31, 2004, in Docket No. RP04–179–000, granting National Fuel's request for waiver of certain tariff provisions relating to cost contributions, financial assurance and real-time measurement in connection with transportation services for Fortuna Energy Inc. (Fortuna).

National Fuel states that in compliance with that directive, it submits Fourth Revised Sheet No. 478 and red-lined copies of Service Agreement Nos. F10702, F10703, F10704, and F10705.

National Fuel states that copies of this filing were served upon its customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed in accordance with Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. This filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the eLibrary link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at (866) 208–3676, or TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See,* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under the e-Filing link

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–878 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP00–404–013]

Northern Natural Gas Company; Notice of Compliance Filing

April 13, 2004.

Take notice that on April 8, 2004, Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern) tendered for filing to become part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Fifth Revised Volume No. 1 the following tariff sheets, with an effective date of June 1, 2004:

Eleventh Revised Sheet No. 2
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 305
First Revised Sheet No. 403A
First Revised Sheet No. 406
First Revised Sheet No. 407
First Revised Sheet No. 408
First Revised Sheet No. 409
Second Revised Sheet No. 410

Northern states that it will implement Market Area segmentation on June 1, 2004, and proposes certain administrative tariff changes associated with this implementation.

Northern further states that copies of the filing have been mailed to each of its customers and interested State Commissions.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with § 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed in accordance with § 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. This filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the eLibrary link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at (866) 208–3676, or TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See,* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under the e-Filing link.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–875 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP98–52–052]

Southern Star Central Gas Pipeline, Inc.; Notice of Compliance Report Filing

April 13, 2004.

Take notice that on April 7, 2004, Southern Star Central Gas Pipeline, Inc. (Southern Star) tendered for filing a Report in Compliance with Ordering Paragraph (C) of the Commission's March 30, 2004 Order on Initial Decision in this proceeding, *Southern Star Central Gas Pipeline, Inc,* 106 FERC ¶ 61,316. Southern Star states that such report details "the status of payment by Andover Oil on the liability associated with potential successors-in-interest to Andover Oil as well as the liability of Mr. Grant or Grant Oil."

Southern Star states that copies of the report are being mailed to Andover Oil's successor in interest (Global Santa Fe Corporation), Mr. Grant and Grant Oil, and all participants on the Commission's official service list in the proceeding.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with § 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and

Regulations. All such protests must be filed in accordance with § 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. This filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the eLibrary link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at (866) 208–3676, or TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See,* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under the e-Filing link.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–873 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP03–273–004]

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation; Notice of Report of Refund

April 13, 2004.

Take notice that on April 8, 2004, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco) tendered for filing its Report of Refund detailing the surcharges distributed to its customers, as applicable, in the referenced proceedings pursuant to section 154.501 of the Commission's Regulations.

Transco states that copies of its filing have been served upon all affected customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed on or before the protest date as shown below. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. This filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the eLibrary link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. Comments, protests and interventions may be filed electronically via the Internet in lieu of paper. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at (866) 208–3676, or TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See,* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under the e-Filing link.

Protest Date: April 20, 2004.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–876 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP04–253–000]

Transwestern Pipeline Company; Notice of Tariff Filing

April 13, 2004.

Take notice that on April 8, 2004, Transwestern Pipeline Company (Transwestern) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets to become effective May 10, 2004:

Twenty-Second Revised Sheet No. 48;
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 83;
First Revised Sheet No. 84A.

Transwestern states that it is filing concurrently with this filing an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to expand its San Juan Lateral by 375,000 Dth/day to move incremental San Juan supplies from the constrained San Juan basin to markets on the Transwestern mainline on the eastern end of its system. Transwestern states that subsequent to an open season conducted by them for its San Juan 2005 Expansion Project (San Juan Expansion Project), Transwestern has executed binding agreements with several shippers to participate in the San Juan Expansion Project for incremental San Juan capacity and for capacity to further move the gas on the mainline from the interconnection of the San Juan lateral at Thoreau to markets in the East of Thoreau Area. Transwestern states that although it intends to expand its San Juan lateral, it is able to serve the mainline portion of the agreements with available unsubscribed East of Thoreau capacity.

Transwestern states that it is filing the above-referenced tariff sheets to provide Transwestern the authority to reserve unsubscribed capacity to avoid construction of unnecessary facilities in conjunction with the San Juan Expansion Project and other future expansion projects.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 or 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed in accordance with Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. This filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the eLibrary. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at (866) 208–3676, or TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See,* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under the e-Filing link.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–880 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP97–28–012]

Wyoming Interstate Company, Ltd; Notice of Negotiated Rates

April 13, 2004.

Take notice that on April 8, 2004, Wyoming Interstate Company, Ltd. (WIC) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 2, the following tariff sheets to its FERC Gas Tariff, with an effective date of April 8, 2004:

Fourth Revised Sheet No. 110 and

Third Revised Sheet No. 111 through 113

WIC states that these tariff sheets describe four existing negotiated rate transactions that were previously filed for review under the Commission's material deviation policies.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 or 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed in accordance with Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. This filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the eLibrary. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at (866) 208–3676. or TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See*, 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under the e-Filing link.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–882 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER04–718–000, *et al.*]

Commonwealth Edison Company, *et al.*; Electric Rate and Corporate Filings

April 12, 2004.

The following filings have been made with the Commission. The filings are listed in ascending order within each docket classification.

1. Commonwealth Edison Company and PJM Interconnection, LLC

[Docket No. ER04–718–000]

Take notice that on April 6, 2004, Commonwealth Edison Company, (ComEd) and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM), tendered for filing with the Commission an unexecuted Service Agreement under PJM's OATT to meet the condition in the Commission's orders to hold harmless utilities in Michigan and Wisconsin from the financial impacts of loop flows and congestion resulting from the choice of ComEd to participate as a transmission-owning member of PJM. ComEd and PJM request that the Commission accept this submission for filing effective May 1, 2004.

ComEd and PJM state that a copy of the filing was served upon ComEd's transmission service customers, PJM's customers, the Midwest ISO, and the state regulatory commissions exercising jurisdiction over ComEd Companies.

Comment Date: April 16, 2004.

2. Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc.

[Docket No. ES04–18–000]

Take notice that on April, 2, 2004, Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Golden Spread) submitted an application pursuant to section 204 of the Federal Power Act requesting that the Commission authorize: (1) An increase to Golden Spread's current authorization to issue securities in the form of short-term and intermediate-term debt from $160 to $240 million; (2) issuance of new long-term debt in an amount not to exceed $150 million and; (3) Golden Spread's entrance into a Continuing Guarantee of performance, in favor of AEP Texas Central Company, in connection with the assignment of Golden Spread to Oklaunion Electric Generating Cooperative, Inc. of its obligations under a Purchase and Sale Agreement.

Golden Spread also requests a waiver from the Commission's competitive bidding and negotiated placement requirements at 18 CFR 34.2.

Comment Date: April 29, 2004.

3. Ameren Energy Generating Company

[Docket No. ES04–19–000]

Take notice that on April 5, 2004, Ameren Energy Generating Company (AEG) submitted an application pursuant to section 204 of the Federal Power Act requesting that the Commission: (1) Authorize issuance of up to $500 million of new long-term debt; and (2) authorize issuance of new short-term debt in the aggregate amount of up to $300 million.

AEG also requests a waiver from the Commission's competitive bidding and negotiated placement requirements at 18 CFR 34.2.

Comment Date: April 29, 2004.

Standard Paragraph

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest this filing should file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date, and, to the extent applicable, must be served on the applicant and on any other person designated on the official service list. This filing is available for review at the Commission or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov*, using the "FERRIS" link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number filed to access the document. For assistance, call (202) 502–8222 or TTY, (202) 502–8659. Protests and interventions may be filed electronically via the Internet in lieu of paper; *see* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under the "e-Filing" link. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–872 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 12187–000]

Price Dam Partnership, LTD; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment and Notice of Scoping and Soliciting Scoping Comments

April 13, 2004.

Take notice that the following hydroelectric application has been filed with the Commission and is available for public inspection:

a. *Type of Application:* Original Major License.

b. *Project No.:* 12187–000.

c. *Date filed:* June 3, 2002.

d. *Applicant:* Price Dam Partnership, LTD.

e. *Name of Project:* Price Dam Hydroelectric Project.

f. *Location:* Located on the Mississippi River in city of Alton, Wood River Township, Madison County, Illinois. The proposed project would be constructed on the U.S. Corps of

Engineers (Corps) Melvin Price Locks & Dam and the nearby Illinois shoreline of the Mississippi River and would affect a portion of 7.8 acres of federal lands (including six of the nine existing gate bays in the dam and a portion of the Illinois shoreline for the construction of a proposed transmission line).

g. *Filed Pursuant to:* Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. 791(a)–825(r).

h. *Applicant Contact:* Mr. James B. Price; Price Dam Partnership LTD; P.O. Box 5550; Aiken, SC 29804–5550; (803) 642–5581.

i. *FERC Contact:* Lee Emery, (202) 502–9379 or *lee.emery@ferc.gov*.

j. *Deadline for filing scoping comments:* 45 days from the issuance date of this notice.

All documents (original and eight copies) should be filed with: Magalie R. Salas, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426. Please indicate the project number (P–12187) on any comments or motions filed.

The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure require all interveners filing documents with the Commission to serve a copy of that document on each person on the official service list for the project. Further, if an intervener files comments or documents with the Commission relating to the merits of an issue that may affect the responsibilities of a particular resource agency, they must also serve a copy of the document on that resource agency.

Scoping comments may be filed electronically via the Internet in lieu of paper. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site (*http://www.ferc.gov*) under the "e-Filing" link.

k. This application is not ready for environmental analysis at this time.

l. The proposed Price Dam Project would use the U.S. Corps of Engineers' Melvin Price Locks & Dam and Reservoir, and would consist of the following facilities: (1) 192 individual, turbine/generator units grouped in six moveable steel modules 108.9-feet-long by 26.2-feet-wide by 44.0-feet-high, (a) each module contains 32 turbine/generator sets (two horizontal rows of 16 units each) that will be installed in stoplog slots on adjacent piers upstream from the Taintor gates, and (b) each turbine/generator unit includes a 550 kilowatt bulb-type generator, a fixed-blade propeller turbine, and a single draft tube for each two turbine/generating units; (2) flexible power cables, each connecting the six 32-turbine/generator-sets to six 7.2 kilovolt (kV) transformer and breaker sets on an adjacent pier; (3) lifting/access columns at the end of each module; (4) six air-operated spillway gates, 7-feet-high by 96-feet-long, installed on top of each module with each gate containing an inflatable rubber bladder; (5) a hallway housing the station service transformer, motor control center, and control system; (6) a slave terminal at the lockmaster's office and a control station located on the dam superstructure; (7) a 6.9-kV/138-kV step-up transformer located on a platform on the dam axis at elevation 479 feet National Geodetic Vertical Datum; (8) a mobile, 1,000 metric ton crane with an auxiliary crane riding on top of the module cranes' lifting beam; these cranes would lower and raise the power modules and operate the trash rake; (9) a fish bypass on each module; (10) a trashrack assembly with a two-inch clear spacing between the bars, and a crane-operated trash rake; (11) a 500-kilowatt generator; (12) a 0.8-mile-long, 138-kV transmission line connecting the project power to a Ameren, Incorporated substation; and (13) appurtenant facilities. The average annual generation is estimated to be 319,000 megawatt-hours and have an installed generating capacity of 92 megawatts (MW). All generated power would be sold to a local utility connected to the grid.

m. A copy of the application is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the "eLibrary" link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance. contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at 866–208–3676, or for TTY, 202–502–8659. A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in item h above.

You may also register online at *http://www.ferc.gov/esuscribenow.htm* to be notified via e-mail of new filings and issuances related to this or other pending projects. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support.

n. *Scoping Process:* The Commission intends to prepare a single Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed project in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act. The EA will consider both site-specific and cumulative environmental impacts and reasonable alternatives to the proposed action.

The Commission staff does not propose to conduct any on-site scoping meetings at this time. Instead, we will conduct paper scoping by soliciting comments, recommendations, information, and alternatives by issuing a Scoping Document (SD).

Copies of the SD outlining the subject areas to be addressed in the EA were distributed to the parties on the Commission's mailing list. Copies of the SD may be viewed on the web at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the "eLibrary" link.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4–874 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OA–2003–0009, FRL–7649–5]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Request for Obtaining Feedback on Public Involvement Activities and Processes; Reopening of Comment Period

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency is reopening the comment period for its Information Collection Request for Obtaining Feedback on Public Involvement Activities and Processes, published on February 13, 2004 (69 FR 7213).

DATES: Comments will be accepted until May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, referencing docket ID number OA–2003–0009, to EPA online using EDOCKET at *http://www.epa.gov/edocket*, by e-mail to *oei.docket@epa.gov*, or by mail to EPA Docket Center, OEI Docket MC 2822T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia Bonner at (202) 566–2204 or by e-mail: *bonner.patricia@epa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 13, 2004, EPA published a 60-day request for comment on an ICR for Obtaining Feedback on Public Involvement Activities and Processes with the incorrect closing date of March 15, 2004. The ICR presents draft questionnaires and plans to survey participants in EPA's public involvement activities. To review the ICR or submit comments, use the detailed instructions provided in the initial paragraphs of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of the February 13, 2004, **Federal Register** notice. If you have questions, please contact the

person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this notice.

Dated: April 14, 2004.

Elizabeth A. Shaw,

Director, Office of Environmental Policy Innovation, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation.

[FR Doc. 04–8909 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7649–7]

Notice of Proposed Administrative Settlement Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 122(h)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 6922(h)(1), notice is hereby given of a proposed administrative settlement concerning the Falcon Refinery Superfund Site (Site). The Site is located in Ingleside, San Patricio County, Texas, 1.7 miles southeast of State Highway 361 on FM 2725 at the northwest and southeast corners of FM 2725 and Bishop Road.

The settlement requires the Settling Party, National Oil and Recovery Corporation (NORCO) to pay a total of $120,078.52 for reimbursement of past response costs to the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund. The settlement includes a covenant not to sue which includes, but is not limited to: (1) Any direct or indirect claim for reimbursement from the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund pursuant to sections 106(b)(2), 107, 111, 112, and 113 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9606(b)(2), 9607, 9611, 9612, or 9613; (2) any claims arising out of the response actions at or in connection with the Site; and, (3) any claims against the United States pursuant to sections 107 and 113 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9607 and 9613, relating to the Site.

For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the settlement. The Agency will consider all comments received and may modify or withdraw its consent to the settlement if comments received disclose facts or considerations which indicate that the settlement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. The Agency's response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: The proposed settlement and additional background information relating to the settlement are available for public inspection at 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733. A copy of the proposed settlement may be obtained from Kenneth Talton, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733 at (214) 665–7475. Comments should reference the Falcon Refinery Superfund Site, Ingleside, Texas, EPA Docket Number 06–04–04 and should be addressed to Kenneth Talton at the address listed above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gloria Moran, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733 at (214) 665–3193.

Dated: April 13, 2004.

Richard E. Greene,

Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 04–8911 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7649–8]

Public Water System Supervision Program Revision for the State of North Carolina

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the State of North Carolina is revising its approved Public Water System Supervision Program. North Carolina has adopted drinking water regulations for Minor Revisions to the Lead and Copper Rule, Arsenic, Radionuclides and Filter Backwash. EPA has determined that these revisions are no less stringent than the corresponding Federal regulations. Therefore, EPA has tentatively decided to approve this State program revision.

DATES: All interested parties may request a public hearing. A request for a public hearing must be submitted by May 24, 2004, to the Regional Administrator at the address shown below. Frivolous or insubstantial requests for a hearing may be denied by the Regional Administrator. However, if a substantial request for a public hearing is made by May 24, 2004, a public hearing will be held. If no timely and appropriate request for a hearing is received and the Regional Administrator does not elect to hold a hearing on his own motion, this determination shall become final and effective on May 24, 2004. Any request for a public hearing shall include the following information: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the individual organization, or other entity requesting a hearing; (2) A brief statement of the requesting person's interest in the Regional Administrator's determination and a brief statement of the information that the requesting person intends to submit at such hearing; (3) The signature of the individual making the request, or, if the request is made on behalf of an organization or other entity, the signature of a responsible official of the organization or other entity.

ADDRESSES: All documents relating to this determination are available for inspection between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, at the following offices:

North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Public Water Supply Section, Parker-Lincoln Building, 2728 Capital Boulevard, Raleigh, North Carolina 27604.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, Drinking Water Section, 61 Forsyth Street Southwest, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Apanian, EPA Region 4, Drinking Water Section at the Atlanta address given above (telephone (404) 562–9477).

Authority: (section 1413 and section 1414 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (1996), and 40 CFR part 142).

Dated: April 7, 2004.

J.I. Palmer, Jr.,

Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 04–8912 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Farm Credit Administration Board; Sunshine Act; Regular Meeting

AGENCY: Farm Credit Administration.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)), of the regular meeting of the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board).

DATE AND TIME: The regular meeting of the Board will be held at the offices of the Farm Credit Administration in McLean, Virginia, on April 22, 2004,

from 9 a.m. until such time as the Board concludes its business.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeanette C. Brinkley, Secretary to the Farm Credit Administration Board, (703) 883–4009, TTY (703) 883–4056.

ADDRESSES: Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102–5090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This meeting of the Board will be open to the public (limited space available). In order to increase the accessibility to Board meetings, persons requiring assistance should make arrangements in advance. The matters to be considered at the meeting are:

Open Session

A. Approval of Minutes

—March 11, 2004 (Open and Closed)

B. Reports

—Allowance for Loan Losses—Bookletter and Informational Memorandum
—Farm Credit System Performance: A Four-Year Review
—Human Development and Investment Group Update

C. New Business

1. Regulations

—Preferred Stock—Draft Proposed Rule
—Other Financing Institution Lending—Draft Final Rule
—Farmer Mac Non-Program Investment and Liquidity—Draft Proposed Rule

2. Other

—Farm Management and Agricultural Trust Services Request

Dated: April 15, 2004.

Jeanette C. Brinkley,

Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. 04–8976 Filed 4–15–04; 4:49 pm]

BILLING CODE 6705–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission for Extension Under Delegated Authority

March 23, 2004.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments should be submitted on or before June 21, 2004. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments to Les Smith, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., Room 1–A804, Washington, DC 20554 or via the Internet to *Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Les Smith at (202) 418–0217 or via the Internet at *Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060–0570.

Title: Section 76.982, Continuation of Rate Agreements.

Form Number: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: State, local, or tribal governments.

Number of Respondents: 25.

Estimated Time per Response: 0.5 hours.

Frequency of Response: One-time reporting requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 13 hours.

Total Annual Cost: None.

Privacy Impact Assessment: No impact.

Needs and Uses: Franchise authorities that were regulating basic cable rates pursuant to a rate agreement executed before July 1, 1990, may continue to regulate rates during the remainder of the agreement. Franchise authorities must notify the FCC of their intentions to continue regulating rates under the rate agreement.

OMB Control Number: 3060–0562.

Title: Section 76.916, Petition for Recertification.

Form Number: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Businesses or other for-profit entities; and State, local, or tribal governments.

Number of Respondents: 10.

Estimated Time per Response: 10 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement; Third party disclosure.

Total Annual Burden: 100 hours.

Total Annual Costs: None.

Privacy Impact Assessment: No impact.

Needs and Uses: A franchising authority wishing to assume jurisdiction to regulate basic cable service and associated equipment rates after its request for certification has been denied or revoked, may file a petition for recertification with the FCC. The petition must be served on the cable operator and on any interested party that participated in the proceeding denying or revoking the original certification.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–8843 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Report No. AUC–04–56–B; DA 04–633]

Auction of 24 GHz Service Licenses Scheduled for July 28, 2004; Notice and Filing Requirements, Minimum Opening Bids, Upfront Payments and Other Auction Procedures

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document announces the procedures, minimum opening bids, and revised inventory for the upcoming auction of licenses in the 24 GHz Service in the 24.25–24.45 GHz and 25.05–25.25 GHz bands. This document is intended to familiarize prospective bidders with the procedures and minimum opening bids for this auction.

DATES: Auction No. 56 is scheduled to begin on July 28, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: *Auctions and Spectrum Access Division:*

For legal questions: Howard Davenport at (202) 418–0660, for general auction questions: Roy Knowles or Barbara Sibert at (717) 338–2888. *Media Contact:* For press inquiries: Lauren Patrich at (202) 418–7944. *Broadband Division:* For legal questions: Nancy Zaczek at (202) 418–2487, for technical questions: Michael Pollak at (202) 418–2487 or Steve Buenzow at (717) 338–2687.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice* released on March 12, 2004. The complete text of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice*, including attachments, is available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours at the FCC Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554. The *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice* may also be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Qualex International, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554, telephone 202–863–2893, facsimile 202–863–2898, or via e-mail *qualexint@aol.com*. This document is also available on the Internet at the Commission's Web site: *http://wireless.fcc.gov/auctions/56/*.

I. General Information

A. Introduction

1. The *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice* announces the procedures and minimum opening bids for the upcoming auction of licenses in the 24 GHz Service in the 24.25–24.45 GHz and 25.05–25.25 GHz bands scheduled for July 28, 2004 (Auction No. 56). On January 30, 2004, in accordance with the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, the Bureau released a public notice seeking comment on reserve prices or minimum opening bids and the procedures to be used in Auction No. 56. The Bureau received no comments in response to the *Auction No. 56 Comment Public Notice*, 69 FR 7219, February 13, 2004.

i. Background of Proceeding

2. On August 1, 2000, the Commission released the *24 GHz Report and Order*, 65 FR 59350, October 5, 2000, in which it determined that the 24 GHz band would be made available for licensing throughout the United States by Economic Areas ("EA"). Stations in the 24 GHz Service may render any kind of digital fixed communications service consistent with the Commission's rules and the regulatory status of the station to provide services on a common carrier or non-common carrier basis. The Commission adopted rules to license the 24 GHz band by EA because EAs not only offer economies of scale, but also serve the needs of a wider range of entities, including both large and small service providers.

ii. Licenses To Be Auctioned

3. Auction No. 56 will offer 880 licenses in the 24 GHz Service in the 24.25–24.45 GHz and 25.05–25.25 GHz bands. Five licenses will be offered in each of 172 EAs and four EA-like areas: Guam and Northern Mariana Islands; Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; American Samoa; and the Gulf of Mexico. A complete list of the licenses available in Auction No. 56 is included in Attachment A of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice*.

Channel number	Channel description	Frequency bands	Bandwidth (MHz)
	EA Licenses		
35	Two paired 40 MHz frequency blocks	24,250–24,290/25,050–25,090 MHz	80 MHz.
36	Two paired 40 MHz frequency blocks	24,290–24,330/25,090–25,130 MHz	80 MHz.
37	Two paired 40 MHz frequency blocks	24,330–24,370/25,130–25,170 MHz	80 MHz.
38	Two paired 40 MHz frequency blocks	24,370–24,410/25,170–25,210 MHz	80 MHz.
39	Two paired 40 MHz frequency blocks	24,410–24,450/25,210–25,250 MHz	80 MHz.
Grand Total			400 MHz.

B. Rules and Disclaimers

i. Relevant Authority

4. Prospective applicants must familiarize themselves thoroughly with the Commission's rules relating to the 24 GHz service contained in title 47, part 101, of the Code of Federal Regulations, and those relating to application and auction procedures, contained in title 47, part 1, of the Code of Federal Regulations. Prospective applicants must also be thoroughly familiar with the procedures, terms and conditions (collectively, "terms") contained in the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice;* the *Auction No. 56 Comment Public Notice; 24 GHz Report & Order* and the *24 GHz Reconsideration Order* (as well as prior and subsequent Commission proceedings regarding competitive bidding procedures).

5. The terms contained in the Commission's rules, relevant orders, and public notices are not negotiable. The Commission may amend or supplement the information contained in our public notices at any time, and will issue public notices to convey any new or supplemental information to applicants. It is the responsibility of all applicants to remain current with all Commission rules and with all public notices pertaining to this auction.

ii. Prohibition of Collusion

6. To ensure the competitiveness of the auction process, § 1.2105(c) of the Commission's rules prohibits applicants for any of the same geographic license areas from communicating with each other during the auction about bids, bidding strategies, or settlements unless such applicants have identified each other on their FCC Form 175 applications as parties with whom they have entered into agreements under § 1.2105(a)(2)(viii). Thus, applicants for any of the same geographic license areas must affirmatively avoid all discussions with each other that affect, or in their reasonable assessment have the potential to affect, bidding or bidding strategy. This prohibition begins at the short-form application filing deadline and ends at the down payment deadline after the auction. For purposes of this prohibition, § 1.2105(c)(7)(i) defines applicant as including all controlling interests in the entity submitting a short-form application to participate in the auction, as well as all holders of partnership and other ownership interests and any stock interest amounting to 10 percent or more of the entity, or outstanding stock, or outstanding voting stock of the entity submitting a short-form application, and all officers and directors of that entity.

7. Applicants for licenses in any of the same geographic license areas are encouraged not to use the same individual as an authorized bidder. A violation of the anti-collusion rule could

occur if an individual acts as the authorized bidder for two or more competing applicants, and conveys information concerning the substance of bids or bidding strategies between the applicants he or she is authorized to represent in the auction. A violation could similarly occur if the authorized bidders are different individuals employed by the same organization (*e.g.*, law firm or consulting firm). In such a case, at a minimum, applicants should certify on their applications that precautionary steps have been taken to prevent communication between authorized bidders and that applicants and their bidding agents will comply with the anti-collusion rule. However, the Bureau cautions that merely filing a certifying statement as part of an application will not outweigh specific evidence that collusive behavior has occurred, nor will it preclude the initiation of an investigation when warranted.

8. The Commission's anti-collusion rules allow applicants to form certain agreements during the auction, provided the applicants have not applied for licenses covering the same geographic areas. In addition, applicants that apply to bid for all markets will be precluded from communicating with all other applicants until after the down payment deadline. However, all applicants may enter into bidding agreements *before* filing their FCC Form 175, as long as they disclose the existence of the agreement(s) in their Form 175. If parties agree in principle on all material terms prior to the short-form filing deadline, those parties must be identified on the short-form application pursuant to § 1.2105(c), even if the agreement has not been reduced to writing. If the parties have not agreed in principle by the filing deadline, an applicant would not include the names of those parties on its application, and may not continue negotiations. By signing their FCC Form 175 short-form applications, applicants are certifying their compliance with § 1.2105(c).

9. Section 1.65 of the Commission's rules requires an applicant to *maintain* the accuracy and completeness of information furnished in its pending application and to notify the Commission within 30 days of any substantial change that may be of decisional significance to that application. Thus, § 1.65 requires auction applicants that engage in communications of bids or bidding strategies that result in a bidding agreement, arrangement or understanding not already identified on their short-form applications to promptly disclose any such agreement, arrangement or understanding to the Commission by amending their pending applications. In addition, § 1.2105(c)(6) requires all auction applicants to report prohibited discussions or disclosures regarding bids or bidding strategy to the Commission in writing immediately but in no case later than five business days after the communication occurs, even if the communication does not result in an agreement or understanding regarding bids or bidding strategy that must be reported under § 1.65.

10. Any applicant found to have violated the anti-collusion rule may be subject to sanctions, including forfeiture of its upfront payment, down payment or full bid amount, and may be prohibited from participating in future auctions.

11. A summary listing of documents issued by the Commission and the Bureau addressing the application of the anti-collusion rules may be found in Attachment G of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice.*

iii. Interference Protection

12. Among other licensing and technical rules, 24 GHz licensees must comply with the interference protection and coordination requirements set forth in §§ 101.509 of the Commission's rules. Incumbent 24 GHz Service Licensees (formerly Digital Electronic Message Service (DEMS) licensees when they were in the 18 GHz band) authorized to operate in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas ("SMSAs") shall retain exclusive rights to their channel(s) within their SMSA and must be protected. 24 GHz service licensees must also protect neighboring licensees. New EA licensees are encouraged to develop sharing agreements with these incumbents and other new EA licensees along the boundaries of their areas. Potential bidders seeking licenses for EAs that border Canada or Mexico are subject to coordination arrangements with those respective countries.

iv. Due Diligence

13. Potential applicants are reminded that there are a number of incumbent 24 GHz Service licensees operating on 24.25–24.45 GHz and 25.05–25.25 GHz bands that are subject to the upcoming auction. Incumbent licenses were originally granted in 1997 in 102 SMSAs. Incumbent systems are entitled to protection as specified under § 101.509 of the Commission's rules from co-channel interference by any new entrant who obtains a 24 GHz EA license at the auction. We therefore caution potential bidders in formulating their bidding strategies to investigate and consider the extent to which 24 GHz channels are occupied by incumbents. We note that the power flux density listed in subparagraph (e) under § 101.509 should read "–114" instead of "–14."

14. Potential applicants are solely responsible for identifying associated risks and for investigating and evaluating the degree to which such matters may affect their ability to bid on, otherwise acquire, or make use of licenses available in Auction No. 56.

15. Potential applicants also should be aware that certain applications (including those for modification), petitions for rulemaking, requests for special temporary authority ("STA"), waiver requests, petitions to deny, petitions for reconsideration, and applications for review may be pending before the Commission and relate to particular applicants, incumbent licensees, or the licenses available in Auction No. 56. In addition, certain judicial proceedings that may relate to particular applicants or incumbent licensees, or the licenses available in Auction No. 56, may be commenced, or may be pending, or may be subject to further review. We note that resolution of these matters could have an impact on the availability of spectrum in Auction No. 56. In addition, although the Commission will continue to act on pending applications, requests and petitions, some of these matters may not be resolved by the time of the auction.

16. In addition, potential applicants may research the licensing database for the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau on the Internet in order to determine which frequencies are already licensed to incumbent licensees. The Commission makes no representations or guarantees regarding the accuracy or completeness of information in its databases or any third party databases, including, for example, court docketing systems. Furthermore, the Commission makes no representations or guarantees regarding the accuracy or completeness of information that has been provided by incumbent licensees and incorporated into the database. Potential applicants are strongly encouraged to physically inspect any sites located in, or near, the service area for which they plan to bid.

17. Potential bidders may obtain information about licenses available in Auction No. 56 through the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau's licensing database on the World Wide Web at *http://wireless.fcc.gov/uls.* Potential applicants may query the database online and download a copy of their search results if desired. Detailed instructions on using License Search (including frequency searches and the

GeoSearch capability) and downloading query results are available online by selecting the "?" button at the upper right-hand corner of the License Search screen.

18. Potential applicants should direct questions regarding the search capabilities to the FCC Technical Support hotline at (202) 414–1250 (voice) or (202) 414–1255 (TTY), or via e-mail at *ulscomm@fcc.gov*.

v. Bidder Alerts

19. The FCC makes no representations or warranties about the use of this spectrum for particular services. Applicants should be aware that an FCC auction represents an opportunity to become an FCC licensee in this service, subject to certain conditions and regulations. An FCC auction does not constitute an endorsement by the FCC of any particular services, technologies or products, nor does an FCC license constitute a guarantee of business success. Applicants and interested parties should perform their own due diligence before proceeding, as they would with any new business venture.

20. As is the case with many business investment opportunities, some unscrupulous entrepreneurs may attempt to use Auction No. 56 to deceive and defraud unsuspecting investors.

21. Information about deceptive telemarketing investment schemes is available from the FTC at (202) 326–2222 and from the SEC at (202) 942–7040. Complaints about specific deceptive telemarketing investment schemes should be directed to the FTC, the SEC, or the National Fraud Information Center at (800) 876–7060. Consumers who have concerns about specific proposals regarding Auction No. 56 may also call the FCC Consumer Center at (888) CALL–FCC ((888) 225–5322).

vi. National Environmental Policy Act Requirements

22. Licensees must comply with the Commission's rules regarding the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"). The construction of a wireless antenna facility is a federal action and the licensee must comply with the Commission's NEPA rules for each such facility.

C. Auction Specifics

i. Auction Date

23. The auction will begin on Wednesday, July 28, 2004. The initial schedule for bidding will be announced by public notice at least one week before the start of the auction. Unless otherwise announced, bidding on all licenses will be conducted on each business day until bidding has stopped on all licenses.

ii. Auction Title

24. Auction No. 56—24 GHz Service.

iii. Bidding Methodology

25. The bidding methodology for Auction No. 56 will be simultaneous multiple round bidding. The Commission will conduct this auction over the Internet, and telephonic bidding will be available as well. As a contingency plan, bidders may also dial in to the FCC Wide Area Network. Qualified bidders are permitted to bid telephonically or electronically.

iv. Pre-Auction Dates and Deadlines

26. The following is a list of important dates related to Auction No. 56:

Auction Seminar—May 25, 2004.
Short-Form Application (FCC Form 175) Filing Window Opens—May 25, 2004; 12 p.m. e.t.
Short-Form Application (FCC Form 175) Filing Window Deadline—June 4, 2004; 6 p.m. e.t.
Upfront Payments (via wire transfer)—June 29, 2004; 6 p.m. e.t.
Mock Auction—July 23, 2004.
Auction Begins—July 28, 2004.

v. Requirements for Participation

27. Those wishing to participate in the auction must:

- Submit a short-form application (FCC Form 175) electronically by 6 p.m. e.t., June 4, 2004.
- Submit a sufficient upfront payment and an FCC Remittance Advice Form (FCC Form 159) by 6 p.m. e.t., June 29, 2004.
- Comply with all provisions outlined in the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice.*

vi. General Contact Information

28. The following is a list of general contact information related to Auction No. 56:

General Auction Information

General Auction Questions
Seminar Registration
FCC Auctions Hotline, (888) 225–5322, Press Option #2, or direct (717) 338–2888, Hours of service: 8 a.m.–5:30 p.m. e.t., Monday through Friday

Auction Legal Information

Auction Rules, Policies, Regulations
Auctions and Spectrum Access Division, Legal Branch (202) 418–0660

Licensing Information

Rules, Policies, Regulations
Licensing Issues
Due Diligence
Incumbency Issues
Broadband Division, (202) 418–2487

Technical Support

Electronic Filing
FCC Automated Auction System
FCC Auctions Technical Support Hotline, (202) 414–1250, (202) 414–1255 (TTY), Hours of service: 8 a.m.–6 p.m. e.t., Monday through Friday

Payment Information

Wire Transfers
Refunds
FCC Auctions Accounting Branch, (202) 418–0578, (202) 418–2843 (Fax)

Telephonic Bidding

Will be furnished only to qualified bidders

Press Information

Lauren Patrich (202) 418–7944

FCC Forms

(800) 418–3676 (outside Washington, DC), (202) 418–3676 (in the Washington Area), *http://www.fcc.gov/formpage.html*

FCC Internet Sites

http://www.fcc.gov, http://wireless.fcc.gov/auctions, http://wireless.fcc.gov/uls

II. Short-Form (FCC Form 175) Application Requirements

29. Guidelines for completion of the short-form (FCC Form 175) are set forth in Attachment D of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice.*

A. Ownership Disclosure Requirements (FCC Form 175 Exhibit A)

30. All applicants must comply with the uniform Part 1 ownership disclosure standards and provide information required by §§ 1.2105 and 1.2112 of the Commission's rules. Specifically, in completing FCC Form 175, applicants will be required to file an "Exhibit A" providing a full and complete statement of the ownership of the bidding entity. The ownership disclosure standards for the short-form are set forth in § 1.2112 of the Commission's rules.

B. Consortia and Joint Bidding Arrangements (FCC Form 175 Exhibit B)

31. Applicants will be required to identify on their short-form applications any parties with whom they have entered into any consortium

arrangements, joint ventures, partnerships or other agreements or understandings that relate in any way to the licenses being auctioned, including any agreements relating to post-auction market structure. Applicants will also be required to certify on their short-form applications that they have not entered into any explicit or implicit agreements, arrangements or understandings of any kind with any parties, other than those identified, regarding the amount of their bids, bidding strategies, or the particular licenses on which they will or will not bid.

32. A party holding a non-controlling, attributable interest in one applicant will be permitted to acquire an ownership interest in, form a consortium with, or enter into a joint bidding arrangement with other applicants for licenses in the same geographic license area provided that (i) the attributable interest holder certifies that it has not and will not communicate with any party concerning the bids or bidding strategies of more than one of the applicants in which it holds an attributable interest, or with which it has formed a consortium or entered into a joint bidding arrangement; and (ii) the arrangements do not result in a change in control of any of the applicants. While the anti-collusion rules do not prohibit non-auction related business negotiations among auction applicants, applicants are reminded that certain discussions or exchanges could touch upon impermissible subject matters because they may convey pricing information and bidding strategies.

C. Eligibility

i. Bidding Credit Eligibility (FCC Form 175 Exhibit C)

33. A bidding credit represents the amount by which a bidder's winning bids are discounted. The size of the bidding credit depends on the average of the aggregated annual gross revenues for each of the preceding three years of the bidder, its affiliates, its controlling interests, and the affiliates of its controlling interests.

34. In the *24 GHz Report and Order*, the Commission adopted bidding credits to promote and facilitate the participation of small businesses in the competitive bidding for licenses in the 24 GHz service. For Auction No. 56, bidding credits will be available to small businesses or consortia thereof, as follows:

- A bidder with attributed average annual gross revenues of not more than $40 million for the preceding three years ("entrepreneur") will receive a 15 percent discount on its winning bids;
- A bidder with attributed average annual gross revenues of not more than $15 million for the preceding three years ("small business") will receive a 25 percent discount on its winning bids;
- A bidder with attributed average annual gross revenues of not more than $3 million for the preceding three years ("very small business") will receive a 35 percent discount on its winning bids.

35. Small business bidding credits are not cumulative; a qualifying applicant receives the 15 percent, the 25 percent or 35 percent bidding credit on its winning bid, but only one credit per license.

36. To encourage the growth of wireless services in federally recognized tribal lands the Commission has implemented a tribal land bidding credit. *See* section V.F. of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice.*

37. *Attribution for entrepreneur, small business, and very small business eligibility.* In determining which entities qualify as entrepreneurs, small businesses, or very small businesses, the Commission will consider the gross revenues of the applicant, its affiliates, its controlling interests, and the affiliates of its controlling interests. The Commission does not impose specific equity requirements on controlling interest holders. Once the principals or entities with a controlling interest are determined, only the revenues of those principals or entities, the affiliates of those principals or entities, and the applicant and its affiliates, will be counted in determining small business eligibility.

38. Each member of a consortium of entrepreneurs, small businesses or very small businesses must disclose its gross revenues along with those of its affiliates, its controlling interests, and the affiliates of its controlling interests.

ii. Supporting Documentation

39. Applicants should note that they will be required to file supporting documentation to their FCC Form 175 short-form applications to establish that they satisfy the eligibility requirements to qualify as entrepreneur, small business, or very small business (or consortia of entrepreneurs, small businesses, or very small businesses) for this auction.

40. Applicants should further note that submission of an FCC Form 175 application constitutes a representation by the certifying official that he or she is an authorized representative of the applicant, has read the form's instructions and certifications, and that the contents of the application and its attachments are true and correct. Submission of a false certification to the Commission may result in penalties, including monetary forfeitures, license forfeitures, ineligibility to participate in future auctions, and/or criminal prosecution.

41. *Entrepreneur, small business, or very small business eligibility (Exhibit C).* Entities applying to bid as entrepreneurs, small businesses, or very small businesses (or consortia of entrepreneurs, small businesses, or very small businesses) will be required to disclose on Exhibit C to their FCC Form 175 short-form applications, *separately and in the aggregate*, the gross revenues for the preceding three years of each of the following: (i) The applicant, (ii) its affiliates, (iii) its controlling interests, and (iv) the affiliates of its controlling interests. Certification that the average annual gross revenues for the preceding three years do not exceed the applicable limit is not sufficient. A statement of the total gross revenues for the preceding three years is also insufficient. The applicant must provide separately for itself, its affiliates, its controlling interests, and the affiliates of its controlling interests, a schedule of gross revenues for *each* of the preceding three years, as well as a statement of total average gross revenues for the three-year period. If the applicant is applying as a consortium of entrepreneurs, small businesses, or very small businesses, this information must be provided for each consortium member.

C. Provisions Regarding Defaulters and Former Defaulters (FCC Form 175 Exhibit D)

42. Each applicant must certify on its FCC Form 175 application under penalty of perjury that the applicant, its controlling interests, its affiliates, and the affiliates of its controlling interests, as defined by § 1.2110, are not in default on any payment for Commission licenses (including down payments) and not delinquent on any non-tax debt owed to any Federal agency. In addition, each applicant must attach to its FCC Form 175 application a statement made under penalty of perjury indicating whether or not the applicant, its affiliates, its controlling interests, or the affiliates of its controlling interests, as defined by § 1.2110, have ever been in default on any Commission licenses or have ever been delinquent on any non-tax debt owed to any Federal agency. Applicants must include this statement as Exhibit D of the FCC Form 175.

43. "Former defaulters"—*i.e.*, applicants, including their attributable interest holders, that in the past have

defaulted on any Commission licenses or been delinquent on any non-tax debt owed to any Federal agency, but that have since remedied all such defaults and cured all of their outstanding non-tax delinquencies—are eligible to bid in Auction No. 56, provided that they are otherwise qualified. However, as discussed *infra* in section III.D.3, former defaulters are required to pay upfront payments that are fifty percent more than the normal upfront payment amounts.

D. Installment Payments

44. Installment payment plans will not be available in Auction No. 56.

E. Other Information (FCC Form 175 Exhibits E and F)

45. Applicants owned by minorities or women, as defined in 47 CFR 1.2110(c)(2), may attach an exhibit (Exhibit E) regarding this status. This applicant status information is collected for statistical purposes only and assists the Commission in monitoring the participation of "designated entities" in its auctions. Applicants wishing to submit additional information may do so on Exhibit F.

F. Minor Modifications to Short-Form Applications (FCC Form 175)

46. After the short-form filing deadline (6 p.m. e.t. June 4, 2004), applicants may make only minor changes to their FCC Form 175 applications. Applicants will not be permitted to make major modifications to their applications (*e.g.*, change their license selections, change the certifying official, change control of the applicant, or change bidding credits). *See* 47 CFR 1.2105. Permissible minor changes include, for example, deletion and addition of authorized bidders (to a maximum of three) and revision of exhibits. Applicants must make these modifications to their FCC Form 175 electronically and submit a letter, briefly summarizing the changes, by electronic mail to the attention of Margaret Wiener, Chief, Auctions and Spectrum Access Division, at the following address: *auction56@fcc.gov*. The electronic mail summarizing the changes must include a subject or caption referring to Auction No. 56. The Bureau requests that parties format any attachments to electronic mail as Adobe® Acrobat® (pdf) or Microsoft® Word documents.

47. A separate copy of the letter should be faxed to the attention of Kathryn Garland at (717) 338–2850.

G. Maintaining Current Information in Short-Form Applications (FCC Form 175)

48. Section 1.65 of the Commission's rules requires an applicant to maintain the accuracy and completeness of information furnished in its pending application and to notify the Commission within 30 days of any substantial change that may be of decisional significance to that application. Amendments reporting substantial changes of possible decisional significance in information contained in FCC Form 175 applications, as defined by 47 CFR 1.2105(b)(2), will not be accepted and may in some instances result in the dismissal of the FCC Form 175 application.

III. Pre-Auction Procedures

A. Auction Seminar

49. On Tuesday, May 25, 2004, the FCC will sponsor a free seminar for Auction No. 56 at the Federal Communications Commission, located at 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC. The seminar will provide attendees with information about pre-auction procedures, auction conduct, the FCC Automated Auction System, auction rules, and the 24 GHz service rules.

B. Short-Form Application (FCC Form 175)—Due June 4, 2004

50. In order to be eligible to bid in this auction, applicants must first submit an FCC Form 175 application. This application must be submitted electronically and received at the Commission no later than 6 p.m. e.t. on June 4, 2004. Late applications will not be accepted.

i. Electronic Filing

51. Applicants must file their FCC Form 175 applications electronically. Applications may generally be filed at any time beginning at noon e.t. on May 25, 2004, until 6 p.m. e.t. on June 4, 2004. Applicants are strongly encouraged to file early and are responsible for allowing adequate time for filing their applications. Applicants may update or amend their electronic applications multiple times until the filing deadline on June 4, 2004.

52. Applicants must press the "SUBMIT Application" button on the "Submission" page of the electronic form to successfully submit their FCC Form 175s. Any form that is not submitted will not be reviewed by the FCC. Information about accessing the FCC Form 175 is included in Attachment C of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice*. Technical support is available at (202) 414–1250 (voice) or (202) 414–1255 (text telephone (TTY)); hours of service are Monday through Friday, from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. e.t. In order to provide better service to the public, all calls to the hotline are recorded.

ii. Completion of FCC Form 175

53. Applicants should carefully review 47 CFR 1.2105, and must complete all items on the FCC Form 175. Instructions for completing the FCC Form 175 are in Attachment D of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice*.

iii. Electronic Review of FCC Form 175

54. The FCC Form 175 electronic review system may be used to locate and print applicants' FCC Form 175 information. There is no fee for accessing this system. *See* Attachment C of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice* for details on accessing the review system.

55. Applicants may also view other applicants' completed FCC Form 175s after the filing deadline has passed and the FCC has issued a public notice explaining the status of the applications.

Note: Applicants should not include sensitive information (*i.e.*, TIN/EIN) on any exhibits to their FCC Form 175 applications.

C. Application Processing and Minor Corrections

56. After the deadline for filing the FCC Form 175 applications has passed, the FCC will process all timely submitted applications to determine which are acceptable for filing, and subsequently will issue a public notice identifying: (i) Those applications accepted for filing; (ii) those applications rejected; and (iii) those applications which have minor defects that may be corrected, and the deadline for filing such corrected applications.

D. Upfront Payments—Due June 29, 2004

57. In order to be eligible to bid in the auction, applicants must submit an upfront payment accompanied by an FCC Remittance Advice Form (FCC Form 159) (Revised 2/03). All upfront payments must be received by Mellon Bank in Pittsburgh, PA by 6 p.m. e.t. on June 29, 2004. Failure to deliver the upfront payment by the June 29, 2004, deadline will result in dismissal of the application and disqualification from participation in the auction. For specific details regarding upfront payments, *see* III.D. of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice*.

i. Making Auction Payments by Wire Transfer

58. Wire transfer payments must be received by 6 p.m. e.t. on June 29, 2004. To avoid untimely payments, applicants should discuss arrangements (including bank closing schedules) with their banker several days before they plan to make the wire transfer, and allow sufficient time for the transfer to be initiated and completed before the deadline.

59. Applicants must fax a completed FCC Form 159 to Mellon Bank at (412) 209–6045 at least one hour before placing the order for the wire transfer (but on the same business day). On the cover sheet of the fax, write "Wire Transfer—Auction Payment for Auction Event No. 56." In order to meet the Commission's upfront payment deadline, an applicant's payment must be credited to the Commission's account by the deadline. Applicants are responsible for obtaining confirmation from their financial institution that Mellon Bank has timely received their upfront payment and deposited it in the proper account.

ii. Amount of Upfront Payment

60. In the *Part 1 Order*, 62 FR 13540, March 21, 1997, the Commission delegated to the Bureau the authority and discretion to determine appropriate upfront payment(s) for each auction. In addition, in the *Part 1 Fifth Report and Order*, 65 FR 52323, August 29, 2000, the Commission ordered that "former defaulters," *i.e.*, applicants that have ever been in default on any Commission license or have ever been delinquent on any non-tax debt owed to any Federal agency, be required to pay upfront payments 50 percent greater than non-"former defaulters." For purposes of this calculation, the "applicant" includes the applicant itself, its affiliates, its controlling interests, and affiliates of its controlling interests, as defined by § 1.2110 of the Commission's rules.

61. The amount of the upfront payment will determine the number of bidding units on which a bidder may place bids. In order to bid on a license, otherwise qualified bidders that applied for that license on Form 175 must have an eligibility level that meets or exceeds the number of bidding units assigned to that license. At a minimum, therefore, an applicant's total upfront payment must be enough to establish eligibility to bid on at least one of the licenses applied for on Form 175, or else the applicant will not be eligible to participate in the auction. An applicant does not have to make an upfront payment to cover all licenses for which the applicant has applied on Form 175, but rather to cover the maximum number of bidding units that are associated with licenses on which the bidder wishes to place bids and hold high bids at any given time.

62. For Auction No. 56 the Commission adopts upfront payments on a license-by-license basis using the following formula: $0.00015 * MHz * License Area Population with a minimum of $2,500 per license.

63. The specific upfront payments and bidding units for each license are set forth in Attachment A of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice*. Attachment A of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice* also includes the number of bidding units for each license.

64. In calculating its upfront payment amount, an applicant should determine the *maximum* number of bidding units on which it may wish to be active (bidding units associated with licenses on which the bidder has the standing high bid from the previous round and licenses on which the bidder places a bid in the current round) in any single round, and submit an upfront payment covering that number of bidding units. In order to make this calculation, an applicant should add together the upfront payments for all licenses on which it seeks to bid in any given round. Applicants should check their calculations carefully, as there is no provision for increasing a bidder's maximum eligibility after the upfront payment deadline.

65. Former defaulters should calculate their upfront payment for all licenses by multiplying the number of bidding units they wish to purchase by 1.5. In order to calculate the number of bidding units to assign to former defaulters, the Commission will divide the upfront payment received by 1.5 and round the result up to the nearest bidding unit.

iii. Applicant's Wire Transfer Information for Purposes of Refunds of Upfront Payments

66. The Commission will use wire transfers for all Auction No. 56 refunds. To ensure that refunds of upfront payments are processed in an expeditious manner, the Commission is requesting that the following pertinent information be supplied to the FCC: Name of Bank; ABA Number; Contact and Phone Number; Account Number to Credit; Name of Account Holder; FCC Registration Number (FRN); Taxpayer Identification Number; Correspondent Bank (if applicable); Account Number. All refunds will be returned to the payer of record as identified on the FCC Form 159 unless the payer submits written authorization instructing otherwise.

E. Auction Registration

67. Approximately ten days before the auction, the FCC will issue a public notice announcing all qualified bidders for the auction. Qualified bidders are those applicants whose FCC Form 175 applications have been accepted for filing and have timely submitted upfront payments sufficient to make them eligible to bid on at least one of the licenses for which they applied.

68. All qualified bidders are automatically registered for the auction. Registration materials will be distributed prior to the auction by two separate overnight mailings, one containing the confidential bidder identification number (BIN) and the other containing the SecurID cards, both of which are required to place bids. These mailings will be sent only to the contact person at the contact address listed in the FCC Form 175.

69. Applicants that do not receive both registration mailings will not be able to submit bids. Therefore, any qualified applicant that has not received both mailings by noon on Wednesday, July 21, 2004, should contact the Auctions Hotline at (717) 338–2888. Receipt of both registration mailings is critical to participating in the auction, and each applicant is responsible for ensuring it has received all of the registration material.

70. Qualified bidders should note that lost bidder identification numbers or SecurID cards can be replaced only by appearing *in person* at the FCC headquarters, located at 445 12th St., SW., Washington, DC 20554. Only an authorized representative or certifying official, as designated on an applicant's FCC Form 175, may appear in person with two forms of identification (one of which must be a photo identification) in order to receive replacements. Qualified bidders requiring replacements must call technical support prior to arriving at the FCC.

F. Remote Electronic Bidding

71. The Commission will conduct this auction over the Internet, and telephonic bidding will be available as well. As a contingency plan, bidders may also dial in to the FCC Wide Area Network. Qualified bidders are permitted to bid telephonically or electronically. Each applicant should indicate its bidding preference—electronic or telephonic—on the FCC Form 175. In either case, each authorized bidder must have its own SecurID card, which the FCC will provide at no charge. For security

purposes, the SecurID cards and the FCC Automated Auction System user manual are only mailed to the contact person at the contact address listed on the FCC Form 175. Each SecurID card is tailored to a specific auction; therefore, SecurID cards issued for other auctions or obtained from a source other than the FCC will not work for Auction No. 56. The telephonic bidding phone number will be supplied in the first overnight mailing, which also includes the confidential bidder identification number.

G. Mock Auction

72. All qualified bidders will be eligible to participate in a mock auction on Friday, July 23, 2004. The mock auction will enable applicants to become familiar with the FCC Automated Auction System prior to the auction. Participation by all bidders is strongly recommended.

III. Auction Event

73. The first round of bidding for Auction No. 56 will begin on Wednesday, July 28, 2004. The initial bidding schedule will be announced in a public notice listing the qualified bidders, which is released approximately 10 days before the start of the auction.

H. Auction Structure

i. Simultaneous Multiple Round Auction

74. The Commission will award all licenses in Auction No. 56 in a simultaneous multiple round auction. Unless otherwise announced, bids will be accepted on all licenses in each round of the auction. This approach allows bidders to take advantage of synergies that exist among licenses and is administratively efficient.

ii. Maximum Eligibility and Activity Rules

75. The amount of the upfront payment submitted by a bidder will determine the initial (maximum) eligibility (as measured in bidding units) for each bidder.

76. Note that each license is assigned a specific number of bidding units equal to the upfront payment listed in Attachment A of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice* on a bidding unit per dollar basis. The total upfront payment defines the maximum number of bidding units on which the applicant will be permitted to bid and hold high bids in a round. As there is no provision for increasing a bidder's eligibility after the upfront payment deadline, applicants are cautioned to calculate their upfront payments carefully. The total upfront payment does not affect the total dollar amount a bidder may bid on any given license.

77. In order to ensure that the auction closes within a reasonable period of time, an activity rule requires bidders to bid actively throughout the auction.

78. A bidder's activity level in a round is the sum of the bidding units associated with licenses on which the bidder is active. A bidder is considered active on a license in the current round if it is either the high bidder at the end of the previous bidding round and does not withdraw the high bid in the current round, or if it submits a bid in the current round (*see* "Minimum Acceptable Bids and Bid Increments" in section IV.B.iii). The minimum required activity is expressed as a percentage of the bidder's current bidding eligibility, and increases by stage as the auction progresses. Because these procedures have proven successful in maintaining the pace of previous auctions (as set forth under "Auction Stages" in section IV.A.iii and "Stage Transitions" in section IV.A.iv), we adopt them for Auction No. 56.

iii. Auction Stages

79. The Commission will conduct the auction in two stages and employ an activity rule. Listed are the activity levels for each stage of the auction. The FCC reserves the discretion to further alter the activity percentages before and/or during the auction.

Stage One: During the first stage of the auction, a bidder desiring to maintain its current eligibility will be required to be active on licenses encompassing at least 80 percent of its current bidding eligibility in each bidding round. Failure to maintain the required activity level will result in a reduction in the bidder's bidding eligibility in the next round of bidding (unless an activity rule waiver is used). During Stage One, reduced eligibility for the next round will be calculated by multiplying the bidder's current activity (the sum of bidding units of the bidder's standing high bids and bids during the current round) by five-fourths (5/4).

Stage Two: During the second stage of the auction, a bidder desiring to maintain its current eligibility is required to be active on 95 percent of its current bidding eligibility. Failure to maintain the required activity level will result in a reduction in the bidder's bidding eligibility in the next round of bidding (unless an activity rule waiver is used). During Stage Two, reduced eligibility for the next round will be calculated by multiplying the bidder's current activity (the sum of bidding units of the bidder's standing high bids and bids during the current round) by twenty-nineteenths (20/19).

Caution: Since activity requirements increase in each auction stage, bidders must carefully check their current activity during the bidding period of the first round following a stage transition. This is especially critical for bidders that have standing high bids and do not plan to submit new bids. In past auctions, some bidders have inadvertently lost bidding eligibility or used an activity rule waiver because they did not re-verify their activity status at stage transitions. Bidders may check their activity against the required activity level by using the bidding system's bidding module.

80. Because the foregoing procedures have proven successful in maintaining proper pace in previous auctions, we adopt them for Auction No. 56.

iv. Stage Transitions

81. The auction will generally advance to the next stage (*i.e.*, from Stage One to Stage Two) when the auction activity level, as measured by the percentage of bidding units receiving new high bids, is below 20 percent for three consecutive rounds of bidding in each Stage. The Bureau will retain the discretion to change stages unilaterally by announcement during the auction.

82. Thus, the Bureau will retain the discretion to regulate the pace of the auction by announcement. This determination will be based on a variety of measures of bidder activity, including, but not limited to, the auction activity level, the percentages of licenses (as measured in bidding units) on which there are new bids, the number of new bids, and the percentage increase in revenue. We believe that these stage transition rules are appropriate for use in Auction No. 56.

v. Activity Rule Waivers and Reducing Eligibility

83. Each bidder will be provided three activity rule waivers that may be used in any round during the course of the auction. Use of an activity rule waiver preserves the bidder's current bidding eligibility despite the bidder's activity in the current round being below the required level. An activity rule waiver applies to an entire round of bidding and not to a particular license.

84. The FCC Automated Auction System assumes that bidders with insufficient activity would prefer to use an activity rule waiver (if available) rather than lose bidding eligibility. Therefore, the system will automatically apply a waiver (known as an "automatic waiver") at the end of any round where

a bidder's activity level is below the minimum required unless: (i) There are no activity rule waivers available; or (ii) the bidder overrides the automatic application of a waiver by reducing eligibility, thereby meeting the minimum requirements. If a bidder has no waivers remaining and does not satisfy the required activity level, the current eligibility will be permanently reduced, possibly eliminating the bidder from the auction.

85. A bidder with insufficient activity that wants to reduce its bidding eligibility rather than use an activity rule waiver must affirmatively override the automatic waiver mechanism during the round by using the reduce eligibility function in the bidding system. In this case, the bidder's eligibility is permanently reduced to bring the bidder into compliance with the activity rules as described in "Auction Stages" (*see* section IV.A.iii discussion). Once eligibility has been reduced, a bidder will not be permitted to regain its lost bidding eligibility.

86. Finally, a bidder may proactively use an activity rule waiver as a means to keep the auction open without placing a bid. If a bidder submits a proactive waiver (using the proactive waiver function in the FCC Automated Auction System) during a round in which no bids are submitted, the auction will remain open and the bidder's eligibility will be preserved. However, an automatic waiver triggered during a round in which there are no new bids or withdrawals will not keep the auction open.

Note: Once a proactive waiver is submitted during a round, that waiver cannot be unsubmitted.

vi. Auction Stopping Rules

87. For Auction No. 56, the Commission will employ a simultaneous stopping rule, and retain discretion to invoke a modified version of the stopping rule. The modified version of the stopping rule would close the auction for all licenses after the first round in which no bidder submits a proactive waiver, a withdrawal, or a new bid on any license on which it is not the standing high bidder.

88. In addition, the Bureau may reserve the right to declare that the auction will end after a designated number of additional rounds ("special stopping rule"). If the Bureau invokes this special stopping rule, it will accept bids in the final round(s) only for licenses on which the high bid increased in at least one of the preceding specified number of rounds. The Bureau may exercise these options only in certain circumstances, such as where the auction is proceeding very slowly, where there is minimal overall bidding activity or where it appears likely that the auction will not close within a reasonable period of time.

vii. Auction Delay, Suspension, or Cancellation

89. By public notice or by announcement during the auction, the Bureau may delay, suspend, or cancel the auction in the event of natural disaster, technical obstacle, evidence of an auction security breach, unlawful bidding activity, administrative or weather necessity, or for any other reason that affects the fair conduct of competitive bidding. In such cases, the Bureau in its sole discretion, may elect to resume the auction starting from the beginning of the current round, resume the auction starting from some previous round, or cancel the auction in its entirety. Network interruption may cause the Bureau to delay or suspend the auction. Exercise of this authority is solely within the discretion of the Bureau, and its use is not intended to be a substitute for situations in which bidders may wish to apply their activity rule waivers.

I. Bidding Procedures

i. Round Structure

90. The initial bidding schedule will be announced in the public notice listing the qualified bidders, which is released approximately 10 days before the start of the auction. Each bidding round is followed by the release of round results. Multiple bidding rounds may be conducted in a given day. Details regarding round results formats and locations will also be included in the qualified bidders public notice.

91. The FCC has discretion to change the bidding schedule in order to foster an auction pace that reasonably balances speed with the bidders' need to study round results and adjust their bidding strategies. The Bureau may increase or decrease the amount of time for the bidding rounds and review periods, or the number of rounds per day, depending upon the bidding activity level and other factors.

ii. Reserve Price or Minimum Opening Bid

92. For Auction No. 56, the Bureau adopts the following license-by license formula for calculating minimum opening bids: $0.0003 * MHz * License Area Population with a minimum of $2,500 per license.

93. The minimum opening bids we adopt for Auction No. 56 are reducible at the discretion of the Bureau. We emphasize, however, that such discretion will be exercised, if at all, sparingly and early in the auction, *i.e.*, before bidders lose all waivers and begin to lose substantial eligibility. During the course of the auction, the Bureau will not entertain requests to reduce the minimum opening bid on specific licenses.

94. The specific minimum opening bids for each license available in Auction No. 56 are set forth in Attachment A of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice.*

iii. Minimum Acceptable Bids and Bid Increments

95. In the *Auction No. 56 Comment Public Notice*, we will use a smoothing methodology to calculate minimum acceptable bids. The smoothing methodology is designed to vary the increment for a given license between a maximum and minimum percentage based on the bidding activity on that license. This methodology allows the increments to be tailored to the activity on a license, decreasing the time it takes for licenses receiving many bids to reach their final prices. The formula used to calculate this increment is included as Attachment F of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice*. We will initially set the weighting factor at 0.5, the minimum percentage increment at 0.1 (10%), and the maximum percentage increment at 0.2 (20%). Hence, at these initial settings, the percentage increment will fluctuate between 10% and 20% depending upon the number of bids for the license. The Bureau will retain the discretion to change the minimum acceptable bids and bid increments if circumstances so dictate.

96. In each round, each eligible bidder will be able to place a bid on a particular license for which it applied in any of nine different amounts. The FCC Automated Auction System will list the nine bid amounts for each license.

97. Once there is a standing high bid on a license, the FCC Automated Auction System will calculate a minimum acceptable bid for that license for the following round, as described in Attachment F of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice*. The difference between the minimum acceptable bid and the standing high bid for each license will define the bid increment—*i.e.*, bid increment = (minimum acceptable bid)—(standing high bid). The nine acceptable bid amounts for each license consist of the minimum acceptable bid (the standing high bid plus one bid increment) and additional amounts calculated using

multiple bid increments (*i.e.*, the second bid amount equals the standing high bid plus two times the bid increment, the third bid amount equals the standing high bid plus three times the bid increment, etc.).

98. At the start of the auction and until a bid has been placed on a license, the minimum acceptable bid for that license will be equal to its minimum opening bid. Corresponding additional bid amounts will be calculated using bid increments defined as the difference between the minimum opening bid times one plus the percentage increment, rounded as described in Attachment F of the *Auction No. 56 Procedures Public Notice*, and the minimum opening bid—*i.e.*, bid increment = (minimum opening bid)(1 + percentage increment) {rounded} − (minimum opening bid). At the start of the auction and until a bid has been placed on a license, the nine acceptable bid amounts for each license consist of the minimum opening bid and additional amounts calculated using multiple bid increments (*i.e.*, the second bid amount equals the minimum opening bid plus the bid increment, the third bid amount equals the minimum opening bid plus two times the bid increment, etc.).

99. In the case of a license for which the standing high bid has been withdrawn, the minimum acceptable bid will equal the second highest bid received for the license. The additional bid amounts are calculated using the difference between the second highest bid times one plus the minimum percentage increment, rounded, and the second highest bid.

100. The Bureau retains the discretion to change the minimum acceptable bids and bid increments and the methodology for determining the minimum acceptable bids and bid increments if it determines that circumstances so dictate. The Bureau will do so by announcement in the FCC Automated Auction System. The Bureau may also use its discretion to adjust the minimum bid increment without prior notice if circumstances warrant.

iv. High Bids

101. At the end of each bidding round, the high bids will be determined based on the highest gross bid amount received for each license. A high bid from a previous round is sometimes referred to as a "standing high bid." A "standing high bid" will remain the high bid until there is a higher bid on the same license at the close of a subsequent round. Bidders are reminded that standing high bids count towards bidding activity.

102. In the event of identical high bids on a license in a given round (*i.e.*, tied bids), a Sybase® SQL pseudo-random number generator will be used to assign a random number to each bid. The remaining bidders, as well as the high bidder, will be able to submit a higher bid in a subsequent round. If no bidder submits a higher bid in a subsequent round, the high bid from the previous round will win the license. If any bids are received on the license in a subsequent round, the high bid will once again be determined on the highest gross bid amount received for the license.

v. Bidding

103. During a round, a bidder may submit bids for as many licenses as it wishes (subject to its eligibility), withdraw high bids from previous bidding rounds, remove bids placed in the same bidding round, or permanently reduce eligibility. Bidders also have the option of making multiple submissions and withdrawals in each round. If a bidder submits multiple bids for a single license in the same round, the system takes the last bid entered as that bidder's bid for the round. Bidders should note that the bidding units associated with licenses for which the bidder has removed or withdrawn its bid do not count towards the bidder's activity at the close of the round.

104. Please note that all bidding will take place remotely either through the FCC Automated Auction System or by telephonic bidding. (Telephonic bid assistants are required to use a script when entering bids placed by telephone. Telephonic bidders are therefore reminded to allow sufficient time to bid by placing their calls well in advance of the close of a round. Normally, five to ten minutes are necessary to complete a bid submission.)

105. A bidder's ability to bid on specific licenses in the first round of the auction is determined by two factors: (i) The licenses applied for on FCC Form 175 and (ii) the upfront payment amount deposited. The bid submission screens will allow bidders to submit bids on only those licenses for which the bidder applied on its FCC Form 175.

106. In order to access the bidding function of the FCC Automated Auction System, bidders must be logged in during the bidding round using the bidder identification number provided in the registration materials, and the password generated by the SecurID card. Bidders are strongly encouraged to print bid confirmations for each round *after* they have completed all of their activity for that round.

107. In each round, eligible bidders will be able to place bids on a given license in any of nine different amounts. For each license, the FCC Automated Auction System interface will list the nine acceptable bid amounts in a drop-down box. Bidders may use the drop-down box to select from among the nine bid amounts. The FCC Automated Auction System also includes an import function that allows bidders to upload text files containing bid information.

108. Finally, bidders are cautioned to select their bid amounts carefully because, as explained in the following section, bidders that withdraw a standing high bid from a previous round, even if the bid was mistakenly or erroneously made, are subject to bid withdrawal payments.

vi. Bid Removal and Bid Withdrawal

109. For Auction No. 56 the Commission adopts bid removal and bid withdrawal procedures. With respect to bid withdrawals, the Commission will limit each bidder to withdrawals in no more than two rounds during the course of the auction. The rounds in which withdrawals are used will be at the bidder's discretion.

110. *Procedures.* Before the close of a bidding round, a bidder has the option of removing any bids placed in that round. By using the "remove bid" function in the bidding system, a bidder may effectively "unsubmit" any bid placed within that round. A bidder removing a bid placed in the same round is not subject to withdrawal payments. Removing a bid will affect a bidder's activity for the round in which it is removed, *i.e.*, a bid that is removed does not count toward bidding activity. These procedures will enhance bidder flexibility during the auction.

111. Once a round closes, a bidder may no longer remove a bid. However, in later rounds, a bidder may withdraw standing high bids from previous rounds using the withdraw bid function in the FCC Automated Auction System (assuming that the bidder has not reached its withdrawal limit). A high bidder that withdraws its standing high bid from a previous round during the auction is subject to the bid withdrawal payments specified in 47 CFR 1.2104(g).

Note: Once a withdrawal is submitted during a round, that withdrawal cannot be unsubmitted.

112. The Bureau will limit the number of rounds in which bidders may place withdrawals to two rounds. These rounds will be at the bidder's discretion and there will be no limit on the number of bids that may be withdrawn in either of these rounds. Withdrawals

during the auction will be subject to the bid withdrawal payments specified in 47 CFR 1.2104(g). Bidders should note that abuse of the Commission's bid withdrawal procedures could result in the denial of the ability to bid on a market.

113. *Calculation.* Generally, the Commission imposes payments on bidders that withdraw high bids during the course of an auction. If a bidder withdraws its bid and there is no higher bid in the same or subsequent auction(s), the bidder that withdrew its bid is responsible for the difference between its withdrawn bid and the high bid in the same or subsequent auction(s). In the case of multiple bid withdrawals on a single license, within the same or subsequent auctions(s), the payment for each bid withdrawal will be calculated based on the sequence of bid withdrawals and the amounts withdrawn. No withdrawal payment will be assessed for a withdrawn bid if either the subsequent winning bid or any of the intervening subsequent withdrawn bids, in either the same or subsequent auctions(s), equals or exceeds that withdrawn bid. Thus, a bidder that withdraws a bid will not be responsible for any withdrawal payments if there is a subsequent higher bid in the same or subsequent auction(s).

114. In instances in which bids have been withdrawn on a license that is not won in the same auction, the Commission will assess an interim withdrawal payment equal to 3 percent of the amount of the withdrawn bids. The 3 percent interim payment will be applied toward any final bid withdrawal payment that will be assessed after subsequent auction of the license. The *Part 1 Fifth Report and Order* provides specific examples showing application of the bid withdrawal payment rule.

vii. Round Results

115. Bids placed during a round will not be made public until the conclusion of that bidding period. After a round closes, the Bureau will compile reports of all bids placed, bids withdrawn, current high bids, new minimum acceptable bids, and bidder eligibility status (bidding eligibility and activity rule waivers), and post the reports for public access. Reports reflecting bidders' identities for Auction No. 56 will be available before and during the auction. Thus, bidders will know in advance of this auction the identities of the bidders against which they are bidding.

viii. Auction Announcements

116. The FCC will use auction announcements to announce items such as schedule changes and stage transitions. All FCC auction announcements will be available by clicking a link on the FCC Automated Auction System.

IV. Post-Auction Procedures

A. Down Payments and Withdrawn Bid Payments

117. After bidding has ended, the Commission will issue a public notice declaring the auction closed and identifying winning bidders, down payments, final payments, and any withdrawn bid payments due.

118. Within ten business days after release of the auction closing notice, each winning bidder must submit sufficient funds (in addition to its upfront payment) to bring its total amount of money on deposit with the Commission for Auction No. 56 to 20 percent of the net amount of its winning bids (gross bids less any applicable entrepreneur, small business, or very small business bidding credits). In addition, by the same deadline, all bidders must pay any bid withdrawal payments due under 47 CFR 1.2104(g), as discussed in "Bid Removal and Bid Withdrawal," section IV.B.vi. (Upfront payments are applied first to satisfy any withdrawn bid liability, before being applied toward down payments.)

B. Final Payments

119. Each winning bidder will be required to submit the balance of the net amount of its winning bids within 10 business days after the deadline for submitting down payments.

C. Long-Form Application (FCC Form 601)

120. Within ten business days after release of the auction closing notice, winning bidders must electronically submit a properly completed long-form application (FCC Form 601) and required exhibits for each license won through Auction No. 56. Further filing instructions will be provided to auction winners at the close of the auction.

D. Default and Disqualification

121. Any high bidder that defaults or is disqualified after the close of the auction (*i.e.*, fails to remit the required down payment within the prescribed period of time, fails to submit a timely long-form application, fails to make full payment, or is otherwise disqualified) will be subject to the payments described in 47 CFR 1.2104(g)(2). In such event the Commission may re-auction the license or offer it to the next highest bidder (in descending order) at its final bid. In addition, if a default or disqualification involves gross misconduct, misrepresentation, or bad faith by an applicant, the Commission may declare the applicant and its principals ineligible to bid in future auctions, and may take any other action that it deems necessary, including institution of proceedings to revoke any existing licenses held by the applicant.

E. Refund of Remaining Upfront Payment Balance

122. All applicants that submit upfront payments but are not winning bidders for a license in Auction No. 56 may be entitled to a refund of their remaining upfront payment balance after the conclusion of the auction. No refund will be made unless there are excess funds on deposit from the applicant after any applicable bid withdrawal payments have been paid. All refunds will be returned to the payer of record, as identified on the FCC Form 159, unless the payer submits written authorization instructing otherwise.

123. Bidders that drop out of the auction completely may be eligible for a refund of their upfront payments before the close of the auction. Qualified bidders that have exhausted all of their activity rule waivers, have no remaining bidding eligibility, and have not withdrawn a high bid during the auction must submit a written refund request. If a bidder has completed the refund instructions electronically, then only a written request for the refund is necessary. If not, the request must also include wire transfer instructions, Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) and FCC Registration Number (FRN). Send refund request to: Federal Communications Commission, Financial Operations Center, Auctions Accounting Group, Gail Glasser, 445 12th Street, SW., Room 1–C864, Washington, DC 20554.

124. Bidders are encouraged to file their refund information electronically using the refund information portion of the FCC Form 175, but bidders can also fax their information to the Auctions Accounting Group at (202) 418–2843. Once the information has been approved, a refund will be sent to the party identified in the refund information.

Note: Refund processing generally takes up to two weeks to complete. Bidders with questions about refunds should contact Gail Glasser at (202) 418–0578.

Federal Communications Commission.

Gary Michaels,

Deputy Chief, Auction and Spectrum Access Division, WTB.

[FR Doc. 04–8844 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Report No. AUC–04–57–A (Auction No. 57); DA 04–954]

Automated Maritime Telecommunications System Spectrum Auction Scheduled for September 15, 2004; Comment Sought on Reserve Prices or Minimum Opening Bids and Other Auction Procedures

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document announces the auction of twenty Automated Maritime Telecommunications System licenses in Auction No. 57, scheduled to begin on September 15, 2004. This document also seeks comment on reserve prices or minimum opening bids and other auction procedures.

DATES: Comments are due on or before April 23, 2004, and reply comments are due on or before April 30, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments and reply comments must be sent by electronic mail to the following address: *auction57@fcc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For legal questions: Christopher Shields, (202) 418–0660. For general auction questions: Lyle Ishida (202) 418–0660, Lisa Stover (717) 338–2888. For service rule questions: Roberto Mussenden or Ghassan Khalek, (202) 418–0680.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the *Auction No. 57 Comment Public Notice* released on April 5, 2004. The complete text of the *Auction No. 57 Comment Public Notice*, including the attachments, is available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours at the FCC Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554. The *Auction No. 57 Comment Public Notice* may also be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Qualex International, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554, telephone (202) 863–2893, facsimile (202) 863–2898, or via e-mail *qualexint@aol.com.*

1. By the *Auction No. 57 Comment Public Notice*, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau ("Bureau") announces the auction of 20 Automated Maritime Telecommunications System (AMTS) licenses. This auction is scheduled to commence on September 15, 2004 (Auction No. 57). AMTS is a specialized system of coast stations which provide integrated and interconnected marine voice and data communications, somewhat like a cellular phone system, for tugs, barges, and other vessels on waterways. Service to units on land is permitted, so long as marine-originating communications receive priority. In Auction No. 57, two 500-kilohertz blocks of paired spectrum in the 217/219 MHz band will be offered in each of 10 AMTS Areas (AMTSAs).

2. A complete list of licenses available for Auction No. 57 is included as Attachment A of the *Auction No. 57 Comment Public Notice.*

The following table describes the licenses that will be auctioned in each of the AMTSAs:

Block	Frequency bands (MHz)	Total bandwidth	Pairing	Geographic area type	No. of licenses
A	217.5–218.0/219.5–220.0	1 MHz	2 × 500 kHz	AMTSA	10
B	217.0–217.7/219.0–219.5	1 MHz	2 × 500 kHz	AMTSA	10

Note: The table displays the band edges of spectrum blocks A and B using the twenty 25 kHz channels that comprise each block as listed in 47 CFR 80.385(a)(2). It should be noted that pursuant to 47 CFR 80.481, licensees are not required to use 25 kHz channelization and may choose any channelization scheme; however, regardless of the channelization scheme used, emissions at these band edges must be attenuated within the limitation that would be required under 47 CFR 80.211 if the licensee were using 25 kHz channels.

3. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 requires the Commission to "ensure that, in the scheduling of any competitive bidding under this subsection, an adequate period is allowed * * * before issuance of bidding rules, to permit notice and comment on proposed auction procedures. * * *" Consistent with the provisions of the Balanced Budget Act and to ensure that potential bidders have adequate time to familiarize themselves with the specific rules that will govern the day-to-day conduct of an auction, the Commission directed the Bureau, under its existing delegated authority, to seek comment on a variety of auction-specific procedures prior to the start of each auction. The Bureau therefore seeks comment on the following issues relating to Auction No. 57.

I. Auction Structure

A. Simultaneous Multiple-Round Auction Design

4. The Bureau proposes to award all licenses included in Auction No. 57 in a simultaneous multiple-round auction. This methodology offers every license for bid at the same time with successive bidding rounds in which bidders may place bids. The Bureau seeks comment on this proposal.

B. Upfront Payments and Bidding Eligibility

5. The Bureau has delegated authority and discretion to determine an appropriate upfront payment for each license being auctioned, taking into account such factors as the population in each geographic license area and the value of similar spectrum. The upfront payment is a refundable deposit made by each bidder to establish eligibility to bid on licenses. Upfront payments related to the specific spectrum subject to auction protect against frivolous or insincere bidding and provide the Commission with a source of funds from which to collect payments owed at the close of the auction. With these guidelines in mind for Auction No. 57, The Bureau proposes to calculate upfront payments on a license-by-license basis using the following formula:

$0.0075 * MHz * License Area Population with a minimum of $1,000 per license. Accordingly, in Attachment A of the *Auction No. 57 Comment Public Notice* the Bureau lists all licenses included in Auction No. 57 and the proposed upfront payment for each license. The Bureau seeks comment on this proposal.

6. The Bureau further proposes that the amount of the upfront payment submitted by a bidder will determine the maximum number of bidding units on which a bidder may place bids. This limit is a bidder's initial eligibility. Each license is assigned a specific number of bidding units equal to the upfront payment listed in Attachment A of the

Auction No. 57 Comment Public Notice, on a bidding unit per dollar basis. This number does not change as prices rise during the auction. A bidder's upfront payment is not attributed to specific licenses. Rather, a bidder may place bids on any combination of licenses as long as the total number of bidding units associated with those licenses does not exceed its current eligibility. Eligibility cannot be increased during the auction. Thus, in calculating its upfront payment amount, an applicant must determine the maximum number of bidding units it may wish to bid on (or hold high bids on) in any single round, and submit an upfront payment covering that number of bidding units. The Bureau seeks comment on this proposal.

C. Activity Rules

7. In order to ensure that the auction closes within a reasonable period of time, an activity rule requires bidders to bid actively throughout the auction, rather than wait until late in the auction before participating. Bidders are required to be active on a specific percentage of their current bidding eligibility during each round of the auction. A bidder that does not satisfy the activity rule will either lose bidding eligibility in the next round or must use an activity rule waiver (if any remain).

8. The Bureau proposes to divide the auction into two stages, each characterized by an increased activity requirement. The auction will start in Stage One. The Bureau proposes that the auction generally will advance to the next stage (*i.e.*, from Stage One to Stage Two) when the auction activity level, as measured by the percentage of bidding units receiving new high bids, is approximately twenty percent or below for three consecutive rounds of bidding. However, the Bureau further proposes that the Bureau retain the discretion to change stages unilaterally by announcement during the auction. In exercising this discretion, the Bureau will consider a variety of measures of bidder activity, including, but not limited to, the auction activity level, the percentage of licenses (as measured in bidding units) on which there are new bids, the number of new bids, and the percentage increase in revenue. The Bureau seeks comment on these proposals.

9. For Auction No. 57, the Bureau proposes the following activity requirements: *Stage One:* In each round of the first stage of the auction, a bidder desiring to maintain its current eligibility is required to be active on licenses representing at least 80 percent of its current bidding eligibility. Failure to maintain the requisite activity level will result in a reduction in the bidder's eligibility in the next round of bidding (unless an activity rule waiver is used). During Stage One, reduced eligibility for the next round will be calculated by multiplying the current round activity by five-fourths (5/4).

Stage Two: In each round of the second stage, a bidder desiring to maintain its current eligibility is required to be active on 95 percent of its current bidding eligibility. In this final stage, reduced eligibility for the next round will be calculated by multiplying the current round activity by twenty-nineteenths (20/19).

10. The Bureau seeks comment on these proposals. Commenters that believe these activity rules should be modified should explain their reasoning and comment on the desirability of an alternative approach. Commenters are advised to support their claims with analyses and suggested alternative activity rules.

D. Activity Rule Waivers and Reducing Eligibility

11. Use of an activity rule waiver preserves the bidder's current bidding eligibility despite the bidder's activity in the current round being below the required minimum level. An activity rule waiver applies to an entire round of bidding and not to a particular license. Activity waivers can be either proactive or automatic and are principally a mechanism for auction participants to avoid the loss of auction eligibility in the event that exigent circumstances prevent them from placing a bid in a particular round.

12. The FCC Automated Auction System assumes that bidders with insufficient activity would prefer to use an activity rule waiver (if available) rather than lose bidding eligibility. Therefore, the system will automatically apply a waiver (known as an "automatic waiver") at the end of any bidding period where a bidder's activity level is below the minimum required unless: (i) the bidder has no activity rule waivers available; or (ii) the bidder overrides the automatic application of a waiver by reducing eligibility, thereby meeting the minimum requirement. **Note:** If a bidder has no waivers remaining and does not satisfy the required activity level, its current eligibility will be permanently reduced, possibly eliminating the bidder from the auction.

13. A bidder with insufficient activity may wish to reduce its bidding eligibility rather than use an activity rule waiver. If so, the bidder must affirmatively override the automatic waiver mechanism during the bidding period by using the "reduce eligibility" function in the bidding system. In this case, the bidder's eligibility is permanently reduced to bring the bidder into compliance with the activity rules. Once eligibility has been reduced, a bidder will not be permitted to regain its lost bidding eligibility.

14. A bidder may proactively use an activity rule waiver as a means to keep the auction open without placing a bid. If a bidder submits a proactive waiver (using the proactive waiver function in the bidding system) during a bidding period in which no bids or withdrawals are submitted, the auction will remain open and the bidder's eligibility will be preserved. An automatic waiver invoked in a round in which there are no new bids or withdrawals will not keep the auction open. **Note:** Once a proactive waiver is submitted during a round, that waiver cannot be unsubmitted.

15. The Bureau proposes that each bidder in Auction No. 57 be provided with three activity rule waivers that may be used at the bidder's discretion during the course of the auction. The Bureau seeks comment on this proposal.

E. Information Relating to Auction Delay, Suspension, or Cancellation

16. For Auction No. 57, the Bureau proposes that, by public notice or by announcement during the auction, the Bureau may delay, suspend, or cancel the auction in the event of natural disaster, technical obstacle, evidence of an auction security breach, unlawful bidding activity, administrative or weather necessity, or for any other reason that affects the fair and efficient conduct of competitive bidding. In such cases, the Bureau, in its sole discretion, may elect to resume the auction starting from the beginning of the current round, resume the auction starting from some previous round, or cancel the auction in its entirety. Network interruption may cause the Bureau to delay or suspend the auction. Exercise of this authority is solely within the discretion of the Bureau, and its use is not intended to be a substitute for situations in which bidders may wish to apply their activity rule waivers. The Bureau seeks comment on this proposal.

II. Bidding Procedures

A. Round Structure

17. The Commission will conduct Auction No. 57 over the Internet. Telephonic bidding will also be available. As a contingency plan, the FCC Wide Area Network will be available as well. The telephone number through which the backup FCC Wide Area Network may be accessed will be

announced in a later public notice. Full information regarding how to establish such a connection will be provided in the public notice announcing details of auction procedures.

18. The initial bidding schedule will be announced in a public notice to be released at least one week before the start of the auction, and will be included in the registration mailings. The simultaneous multiple-round format will consist of sequential bidding rounds, each followed by the release of round results. Details regarding the location and format of round results will be included in the same public notice.

19. The Bureau has discretion to change the bidding schedule in order to foster an auction pace that reasonably balances speed with the bidders' need to study round results and adjust their bidding strategies. The Bureau may increase or decrease the amount of time for the bidding rounds and review periods, or the number of rounds per day, depending upon the bidding activity level and other factors. The Bureau seeks comment on this proposal.

B. Reserve Price or Minimum Opening Bid

20. The Balanced Budget Act calls upon the Commission to prescribe methods for establishing a reasonable reserve price or a minimum opening bid when FCC licenses are subject to auction, unless the Commission determines that a reserve price or minimum opening bid is not in the public interest. Consistent with this mandate, the Commission has directed the Bureau to seek comment on the use of a minimum opening bid and/or reserve price prior to the start of each auction.

21. Normally, a reserve price is an absolute minimum price below which an item will not be sold in a given auction. Reserve prices can be either published or unpublished. A minimum opening bid, on the other hand, is the minimum bid price set at the beginning of the auction below which no bids are accepted. It is generally used to accelerate the competitive bidding process. Also, the auctioneer often has the discretion to lower the minimum opening bid amount later in the auction. It is also possible for the minimum opening bid and the reserve price to be the same amount.

22. In light of the Balanced Budget Act's requirements, the Bureau proposes to establish minimum opening bids for Auction No. 57. The Bureau believes a minimum opening bid, which has been used in other auctions, is an effective bidding tool.

23. Specifically, for Auction No. 57, the Commission proposes the following license-by-license formula for calculating minimum opening bids:

$0.0075 * MHz * License Area Population with a minimum of $1,000 per license. The specific minimum opening bid for each license available in Auction No. 57 is set forth in Attachment A of the *Auction No. 57 Comment Public Notice*. The Bureau seeks comment on this proposal.

24. If commenters believe that these minimum opening bids will result in substantial numbers of unsold licenses, or are not reasonable amounts, or should instead operate as reserve prices, they should explain why this is so, and comment on the desirability of an alternative approach. Commenters are advised to support their claims with valuation analyses and suggested reserve prices or minimum opening bid levels or formulas. In establishing the minimum opening bids, the Bureau particularly seeks comment on such factors as the amount of spectrum being auctioned, levels of incumbency, the availability of technology to provide service, the size of the geographic service areas, issues of interference with other spectrum bands and any other relevant factors that could reasonably have an impact on valuation of the AMTS spectrum. The Bureau also seeks comment on whether, consistent with the Balanced Budget Act, the public interest would be served by having no minimum opening bid or reserve price.

C. Minimum Acceptable Bids and Bid Increments

25. In each round, eligible bidders will be able to place bids on a given license in any of nine different amounts. The FCC Automated Auction System interface will list the nine acceptable bid amounts for each license. Until a bid has been placed on a license, the minimum acceptable bid for that license will be equal to its minimum opening bid. In the rounds after a bid is placed on a license, the minimum acceptable bid for that license will be equal to the standing high bid plus the defined increment.

26. Once there is a standing high bid on a license, the FCC Automated Auction System will calculate a minimum acceptable bid for that license for the following round. The difference between the minimum acceptable bid and the standing high bid for each license will define the bid increment. The nine acceptable bid amounts for each license consist of the minimum acceptable bid (the standing high bid plus one bid increment) and additional amounts calculated using multiple bid increments (*i.e.*, the second bid amount equals the standing high bid plus two times the bid increment, the third bid amount equals the standing high bid plus three times the bid increment, *etc.*).

27. Until a bid has been placed on a license, the minimum acceptable bid for that license will be equal to its minimum opening bid. The additional bid amounts for licenses that have not yet received a bid will be calculated differently.

28. For Auction No. 57, the Bureau proposes to calculate minimum acceptable bids by using a smoothing methodology, as we have done in several other auctions. The smoothing formula calculates minimum acceptable bids by first calculating a percentage increment, not to be confused with the bid increment. The percentage increment for each license is based on bidding activity on that license in all prior rounds; therefore, a license that has received many bids throughout the auction will have a higher percentage increment than a license that has received few bids.

29. The calculation of the percentage increment used to determine the minimum acceptable bids for each license for the next round is made at the end of each round. The computation is based on an activity index, which is a weighted average of the number of bids in that round and the activity index from the prior round. The current activity index is equal to a weighting factor times the number of new bids received on the license in the most recent bidding round plus one minus the weighting factor times the activity index from the prior round. The activity index is then used to calculate a percentage increment by multiplying a minimum percentage increment by one plus the activity index with that result being subject to a maximum percentage increment. The Commission will initially set the weighting factor at 0.5, the minimum percentage increment at 0.1 (10%), and the maximum percentage increment at 0.2 (20%). Hence, at these initial settings, the percentage increment will fluctuate between 10% and 20% depending upon the number of bids for the license.

Equations

$A_i = (C * B_i) + ((1-C) * A_{i-1})$

I_{i+1} = smaller of $((1 + A_i) * N)$ and M

$X_{i+1} = I_{i+1} * Yi$

where,

A_i = activity index for the current round (round i)

C = activity weight factor

B_i = number of bids in the current round (round i)

A_{i-1} = activity index from previous round (round i − 1), A_0 is 0
I_{i+1} = percentage increment for the next round (round i+1)
N = minimum percentage increment or percentage increment floor
M = maximum percentage increment or percentage increment ceiling
X_{i+1} = dollar amount associated with the percentage increment
Y_i = high bid from the current round

30. Under the smoothing methodology, once a bid has been received on a license, the minimum acceptable bid for that license in the following round will be the high bid from the current round plus the dollar amount associated with the percentage increment, with the result rounded to the nearest thousand if it is over ten thousand or to the nearest hundred if it is under ten thousand.

Examples

License 1
C = 0.5, N = 0.1, M = 0.2

Round 1 (2 New Bids, High Bid = $1,000,000)

i. Calculation of percentage increment for round 2 using the smoothing formula:

$A_1 = (0.5 * 2) + (0.5 * 0) = 1$
I_2 = The smaller of ((1 + 1) * 0.1) = 0.2 or 0.2 (the maximum percentage increment)

ii. Calculation of dollar amount associated with the percentage increment for round 2 (using I_2):

$X_2 = 0.2 * \$1,000,000 = \$200,000$

iii. Minimum acceptable bid for round 2 = $1,200,000

Round 2 (3 New Bids, High Bid = $2,000,000)

i. Calculation of percentage increment for round 3 using the smoothing formula:

$A_2 = (0.5 * 3) + (0.5 * 1) = 2$
I_3 = The smaller of ((1 + 2) * 0.1) = 0.3 or 0.2 (the maximum percentage increment)

ii. Calculation of dollar amount associated with the percentage increment for round 3 (using I_3):

$X_3 = 0.2 * \$2,000,000 = \$400,000$

iii. Minimum acceptable bid for round 3 = $2,400,000

Round 3 (1 new bid, high bid = $2,400,000)

i. Calculation of percentage increment for round 4 using the smoothing formula:

$A_3 = (0.5 * 1) + (0.5 * 2) = 1.5$
I_4 = The smaller of ((1 + 1.5) * 0.1) = 0.25 or 0.2 (the maximum percentage increment)

ii. Calculation of dollar amount associated with the percentage increment for round 4 (using I_4):

$X_4 = 0.2 * \$2,400,000 = \$480,000$

iii. Minimum acceptable bid for round 4 = $2,880,000

31. Until a bid has been placed on a license, the minimum acceptable bid for that license will be equal to its minimum opening bid. The additional bid amounts are calculated using the difference between the minimum opening bid times one plus the minimum percentage increment, and the minimum opening bid. That is, I = (minimum opening bid)(1 + N){rounded} − (minimum opening bid). Therefore, when N equals 0.1, the first additional bid amount will be approximately ten percent higher than the minimum opening bid; the second, twenty percent; the third, thirty percent; etc.

32. In the case of a license for which the standing high bid has been withdrawn, the minimum acceptable bid will equal the second highest bid received for the license. The additional bid amounts are calculated using the difference between the second highest bid times one plus the minimum percentage increment, rounded, and the second highest bid.

33. The Bureau retains the discretion to change the minimum acceptable bids and bid increments if it determines that circumstances so dictate. The Bureau will do so by announcement in the FCC Automated Auction System. The Bureau seeks comment on these proposals.

D. High Bids

34. At the end of a bidding round, a high bid for each license will be determined based on the highest gross bid amount received for the license. In the event of identical high bids on a license in a given round (*i.e.*, tied bids), we propose to use a random number generator to select a single high bid from among the tied bids. If the auction were to end with no higher bids being placed for that license, the winning bidder would be the one that placed the selected high bid. However, the remaining bidders, as well as the high bidder, can submit higher bids in subsequent rounds. If any bids are received on the license in a subsequent round, the high bid again will be determined by the highest gross bid amount received for the license.

35. A high bid will remain the high bid until there is a higher bid on the same license at the close of a subsequent round. A high bid from a previous round is sometimes referred to as a "standing high bid." Bidders are reminded that standing high bids confer activity.

E. Information Regarding Bid Withdrawal and Bid Removal

36. For Auction No. 57, the Bureau proposes the following bid removal and bid withdrawal procedures. Before the close of a bidding period, a bidder has the option of removing any bid placed in that round. By removing selected bids in the bidding system, a bidder may effectively "unsubmit" any bid placed within that round. A bidder removing a bid placed in the same round is not subject to a withdrawal payment. Once a round closes, a bidder may no longer remove a bid.

37. A high bidder may withdraw its standing high bids from previous rounds using the withdraw function in the bidding system. A high bidder that withdraws its standing high bid from a previous round is subject to the bid withdrawal payment provisions of the Commission rules. The Bureau seeks comment on these bid removal and bid withdrawal procedures.

38. In the *Part 1 Third Report and Order*, 65 FR 52401, August 29, 2000, the Commission explained that allowing bid withdrawals facilitates efficient aggregation of licenses and the pursuit of efficient backup strategies as information becomes available during the course of an auction. The Commission noted, however, that, in some instances, bidders may seek to withdraw bids for improper reasons. The Bureau, therefore, has discretion, in managing the auction, to limit the number of withdrawals to prevent any bidding abuses. The Commission stated that the Bureau should assertively exercise its discretion, consider limiting the number of rounds in which bidders may withdraw bids, and prevent bidders from bidding on a particular market if the Bureau finds that a bidder is abusing the Commission's bid withdrawal procedures.

39. Applying this reasoning, the Bureau proposes to limit each bidder in Auction No. 57 to withdrawing standing high bids in no more than two rounds during the course of the auction. To permit a bidder to withdraw bids in more than two rounds would likely encourage insincere bidding or the use of withdrawals for anti-competitive purposes. The two rounds in which withdrawals may be utilized will be at the bidder's discretion; withdrawals otherwise must be in accordance with the Commission's rules. There is no limit on the number of standing high bids that may be withdrawn in either of the rounds in which withdrawals are utilized. Withdrawals will remain

subject to the bid withdrawal payment provisions specified in the Commission's rules. The Bureau seeks comment on this proposal.

F. Stopping Rule

40. The Bureau has discretion "to establish stopping rules before or during multiple round auctions in order to terminate the auction within a reasonable time." For Auction No. 57, the Bureau proposes to employ a simultaneous stopping rule approach. A simultaneous stopping rule means that all licenses remain available for bidding until bidding closes simultaneously on all licenses.

41. Bidding will close simultaneously on all licenses after the first round in which no new bids, proactive waivers, or withdrawals are received. Thus, unless circumstances dictate otherwise, bidding will remain open on all licenses until bidding stops on every license.

42. However, the Bureau proposes to retain the discretion to exercise any of the following options during Auction No. 57:

i. Utilize a modified version of the simultaneous stopping rule. The modified stopping rule would close the auction for all licenses after the first round in which no bidder submits a proactive waiver, withdrawal, or a new bid on any license on which it is not the standing high bidder. Thus, absent any other bidding activity, a bidder placing a new bid on a license for which it is the standing high bidder would not keep the auction open under this modified stopping rule. The Bureau further seeks comment on whether this modified stopping rule should be used at any time or only in stage two of the auction.

ii. Keep the auction open even if no new bids or proactive waivers are submitted and no previous high bids are withdrawn. In this event, the effect will be the same as if a bidder had submitted a proactive waiver. The activity rule, therefore, will apply as usual and a bidder with insufficient activity will either lose bidding eligibility or use a remaining activity rule waiver.

iii. Declare that the auction will end after a specified number of additional rounds ("special stopping rule"). If the Bureau invokes this special stopping rule, it will accept bids in the specified final round(s) only for licenses on which the high bid increased in at least one of a specified preceding number of rounds.

43. The Bureau proposes to exercise these options only in certain circumstances, for example, where the auction is proceeding very slowly, there is minimal overall bidding activity, or it appears likely that the auction will not close within a reasonable period of time. Before exercising these options, the Bureau is likely to attempt to increase the pace of the auction by, for example, increasing the number of bidding rounds per day, and/or increasing the amount of the minimum bid increments for the limited number of licenses where there is still a high level of bidding activity. We seek comment on these proposals.

III. Conclusion

44. Comments are due on or before April 23, 2004, and reply comments are due on or before April 30, 2004. Because of the disruption of regular mail and other deliveries in Washington, DC, the Bureau requires that all comments and reply comments be filed electronically. Comments and reply comments must be sent by electronic mail to the following address: *auction57@fcc.gov*. The electronic mail containing the comments or reply comments must include a subject or caption referring to Auction No. 57 Comments and the name of the commenting party. The Bureau requests that parties format any attachments to electronic mail as Adobe® Acrobat® (pdf) or Microsoft® Word documents. Copies of comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Public Reference Room, Room CY–A257, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. In addition, the Bureau requests that commenters fax a courtesy copy of their comments and reply comments to the attention of Kathryn Garland at (717) 338–2850.

45. This proceeding has been designated as a "permit-but-disclose" proceeding in accordance with the Commission's *ex parte* rules. Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentations must contain summaries of the substance of the presentations and not merely a listing of the subjects discussed. More than a one or two sentence description of the views and arguments presented is generally required. Other rules pertaining to oral and written *ex parte* presentations in permit-but-disclose proceedings are set forth in § 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules.

Federal Communications Commission.

Gary Michaels,

Deputy Chief, Auction and Spectrum Access Division, WTB.

[FR Doc. 04–9019 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Notice of Proposals to Engage in Permissible Nonbanking Activities or to Acquire Companies That Are Engaged in Permissible Nonbanking Activities

The companies listed in this notice have given notice under section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843) (BHC Act) and Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225) to engage *de novo*, or to acquire or control voting securities or assets of a company, including the companies listed below, that engages either directly or through a subsidiary or other company, in a nonbanking activity that is listed in § 225.28 of Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.28) or that the Board has determined by Order to be closely related to banking and permissible for bank holding companies. Unless otherwise noted, these activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Each notice is available for inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notice also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the question whether the proposal complies with the standards of section 4 of the BHC Act. Additional information on all bank holding companies may be obtained from the National Information Center website at *www.ffiec.gov/nic/*.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding the applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than May 14, 2004.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco (Tracy Basinger, Director, Regional and Community Bank Group) 101 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105–1579:

1. Cathay General Bancorp, Los Angeles, California; to acquire Broadway Financial Corporation, Los Angeles, California, and thereby acquire voting shares of Broadway Federal Bank, FSB, Los Angeles, California, and thereby engage in operating a savings and loan association, pursuant to section 225.28(b)(4)(ii) of Regulation Y.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, April 14, 2004.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 04–8869 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–S

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Federal Travel Regulation (FTR); Maximum Per Diem Rates for Montana, New York, Ohio, and Texas

AGENCY: Office of Governmentwide Policy, General Services Administration (GSA).

ACTION: Notice of Per Diem Bulletin 04–3, revised continental United States (CONUS) per diem rates.

SUMMARY: The General Services Administration (GSA) has reviewed the lodging rates of certain locations in the States of Montana, New York, Ohio, and Texas and determined that they are inadequate. The per diems prescribed in Bulletin 04–3 may be found at *http://www.gsa.gov/perdiem.*

DATES: This notice is effective April 20, 2004, and applies to travel performed 15 days after this date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For clarification of content, contact Patrick McConnell, Office of Governmentwide Policy, Travel Management Policy, at (202) 501–2362. Please cite FTR Per Diem Bulletin 04–3.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

After an analysis of the per diem rates established for FY 2004 (*see* the **Federal Register** notice at 68 FR 52035), the per diem rate is being changed in the following locations:

State of Montana

- Butte, including Silver Bow County,
- Missoula, including Missoula County,
- Polson/Kalispell, including Lake and Flathead Counties.

State of New York

- Schenectady, including Schenectady County.

State of Ohio

- Fairborn, including City limits of Fairborn.

State of Texas

- Killeen, including Bell County.

B. Procedures

Per diem rates are published on the Internet at *www.gsa.gov/perdiem* as an FTR Per Diem Bulletin and published in the **Federal Register** on a periodic basis. This process ensures timely increases or decreases in per diem rates established by GSA for Federal employees on official travel within CONUS. Notices published periodically in the **Federal Register**, such as this one, now constitute the only notification of revisions in CONUS per diem rates to agencies.

Dated: April 12, 2004.

Becky Rhodes,

Deputy Associate Administrator.

[FR Doc. 04–8905 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–14–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Administration on Aging

[Program Announcement No. AoA–04–02]

Fiscal Year 2004 Program Announcement; Availability of Funds and Notice Regarding Applications

AGENCY: Administration on Aging, HHS.

ACTION: Announcement of availability of funds and request for applications for the Alzheimer's Disease Demonstration Grants to States Program.

SUMMARY: The Administration on Aging announces that under this program announcement it will hold a competition for grant awards with two different project periods: (A) approximately two (2) to three (3) one-year projects at a Federal share of approximately $150,000–$225,000 per year for a project period of one year. A total of $450,000 has been allocated for these grants. (B) approximately 20 three-year projects at a Federal share of approximately $225,000–$350,000 (annually) for a period of three years. A total of $6,100,000 has been allocated for these grants.

Legislative Authority: The Alzheimer's Disease Demonstration Grants to States (ADDGS) Program was established under section 398 of the Public Health Service Act (Pub. L. 78–410) as amended by Pub. L. 101–157, and by Pub. L. 105–379, the Health Professions Education Partnerships Act of 1998. (Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance 93.051.)

Purpose of grant awards: The purpose of these projects is to:

1. Develop models of home and community based care for persons with Alzheimer's disease and their families, and

2. Improve the existing home and community based care system to better respond to the needs of persons with dementia and their families, through improving the coordination and integrated access to health and social support services.

Eligibility for grant awards and other requirements: Eligibility for grant awards is limited to State agencies. Only one application per State will be funded. Applicant agencies are encouraged to have the support and active involvement of the Single State Agency on Aging. One-year grants are open only to those States that have never applied for, or been funded, under the ADDGS Program (Delaware, New Jersey, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and all territories except Puerto Rico). Three-year grants are available to all States that will not be receiving ADDGS Program funds as of July 1, 2004. Applicants eligible for a three-year project include:

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Minnesota
Missouri
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oregon
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
Wisconsin
Wyoming
All territories except Puerto Rico

[

Note: States that are eligible for both the one-year and three-year projects may only apply for one of the project period options.]

Grantees are required to provide a non-Federal share, in cash or in-kind, which must equal at least 25% of the total project cost in the first year, 35% in the second year, and 45% in the third year. Executive Order 12372 is not applicable to these grant applications.

Screening Criteria: Applications must meet the application deadline date/criteria as identified below. Awards will be only made to agencies of State

governments. Applications must be no more than 20 single-sided pages, double-spaced, excluding work plan grid (if selecting to use suggested format), Standard Form (SF) 424, assurances, certification forms, budget forms and justification (up to 4 pages), and indirect cost agreements.

Review of applications: Applications will be evaluated against the following criteria: Purpose and Need for Assistance (10 points); Approach/Method—Workplan and Activities (40 points); Outcomes/Benefits/Impacts (25 points); and Level of Effort, Program Management, and Organizational Capacity (25 points).

DATES: The deadline date for the submission of applications is June 1, 2004. Applications must be postmarked by midnight, or hand-delivered by 5:30 p.m. Eastern Time, or submitted electronically by midnight, June 1, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Application kits are available by writing to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Center for Wellness and Community Based Services, Washington, DC 20201; by calling (202) 357–3452; or online at *http://www.grants.gov.*

Applications may be mailed to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Office of Grants Management, Washington, DC 20201, attn: Margaret Tolson (AoA 04–02).

Applications may be delivered to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Office of Grants Management, One Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Room 4604, Washington, DC 20001, attn: Margaret Tolson (AoA 04–02). If you elect to mail or hand deliver your application you must submit one original and two copies of the application; an acknowledgment card will be mailed to applicants. Instructions for electronic mailing of grant applications available at *http://www.grants.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Office of Grants Management, Washington, DC, 20201, telephone: (202) 357–3440.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: All grant applicants are required to obtain a D–U–N–S number from Dun and Bradstreet. It is a unique, nine-digit identification number, which provides unique identifiers of single business entities. The D–U–N–S number is free and easy to obtain from *https://eupdate.dnb.com/requestoptions.html?cmid=EOE100537.*

Dated: April 15, 2004.

Josefina G. Carbonell,

Assistant Secretary for Aging.

[FR Doc. 04–8871 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4154–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[60Day–04–42]

Proposed Data Collections Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations

In compliance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) will publish periodic summaries of proposed projects. To request more information on the proposed projects or to obtain a copy of the data collection plans and instruments, call the CDC Reports Clearance Officer on (404) 498–1210.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Send comments to Sandra Gambescia, CDC Assistant Reports Clearance Officer, 1600 Clifton Road, MS–E11, Atlanta, GA 30333. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Proposed Project

The National Death Index, (0920–0215)—Extension—National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Background

The National Death Index (NDI) is a national data base containing identifying death record information submitted annually to NCHS by all the state vital statistics offices, beginning with deaths in 1979. Searches against the NDI file provide the states and dates of death, and the death certificate numbers of deceased study subjects. Since the implementation of the NDI Plus service, researchers have the option of also receiving cause of death information for deceased subjects, thus reducing the need to request copies of death certificates from the states. The NDI Plus option currently provides the ICD codes for the underlying and multiple causes of death for the years 1979–2002. Health researchers must complete five administrative forms in order to apply for NDI services, and submit records of study subjects for computer matching against the NDI file. There is no cost to respondents except for their time.

Respondents	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondents	Average burden per response (in hrs.)	Total burden (in hrs.)
Government researchers	48	1	2	96
University researchers	60	1	2	120
Private industry researchers	12	1	2	24
Total				240

Dated: April 13, 2004.

Alvin Hall,

Director, Management Analysis and Services Office, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[FR Doc. 04–8874 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Monitoring Atypical HIV Strains Among Persons Newly Diagnosed With HIV Using Dried Blood Spots vs. Diagnostic Sera

Announcement Type: New.

Funding Opportunity Number: 04118.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number: 93.944.

Key Dates: Letter of Intent Deadline: May 20, 2004. Application Deadline: June 21, 2004.

I. Funding Opportunity Description

Authority: This program is authorized under the Public Health Service Act sections 301 and 318(b) (42 U.S.C. 241 and 247c), as amended.

Purpose: The purpose of the program is to expand the ability of health departments to perform surveillance of the prevalence of atypical strains of HIV, including drug resistant strains and non-B subtypes, by piloting the use of dried blood spots as an additional specimen type for this purpose. The use of serum from an HIV diagnostic blood draw for surveillance of atypical strains is the methodology used in several HIV resistance surveillance projects in various stages of implementation with different health departments. Some diagnostic sites and clinical centers cannot currently be included in these projects, due to logistical problems with specimen availability, processing or volume. The purpose of CDC funding for this activity is to allow state and local health departments, including both those already participating in atypical HIV strain surveillance and those not yet participating, to:

(1) Evaluate the feasibility and efficiency of routine use of dried blood spots (DBS) for surveillance of atypical strains of HIV, including drug resistant strains and non-B subtypes, in persons newly diagnosed with HIV.

(2) Monitor the prevalence of atypical HIV strains, including antiretroviral drug resistant strains and non-B subtypes, among persons newly diagnosed with HIV, including those for whom sera from a diagnostic blood draw are not available for surveillance purposes, and those for whom diagnostic sera are used for surveillance of atypical strains.

Compare the prevalence among the two groups.

This project will fulfill the purpose of monitoring prevalence of atypical strains by extending surveillance to sites that would currently be unable to provide sera for genotyping. DBS may also be collected for atypical strain surveillance in other sites where the collection of DBS may be more acceptable or require fewer resources than the collection of diagnostic sera. A comparison of resource requirements for the two methods in a variety of site types will be an important part of the evaluation. This program addresses the "Healthy People 2010" focus area(s) of HIV.

Measurable outcomes of the program will be in alignment with one (or more) of the following performance goal(s) for the National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention (NCHSTP): Strengthen the capacity nationwide to monitor the epidemic, develop and implement effective HIV prevention interventions and evaluate prevention programs.

The expected outcome is an enhanced ability to collect data on atypical HIV strains in persons newly diagnosed with HIV. Data from surveillance of atypical strains of HIV are used to identify emerging epidemics, monitor trends in transmission, target prevention resources and interventions to areas and populations most heavily affected, and evaluate programs designed to prevent the transmission of HIV.

Research Objectives: (1) To monitor the prevalence of HIV drug resistant strains and non-B HIV–1 subtypes in persons newly diagnosed with HIV in public or private settings, including those in which sera are not available for HIV genotyping and those in which sera are used.

(2) To compare the results of HIV genotyping for atypical strain surveillance purposes from both a serum or plasma specimen and a dried blood spot collected not more than three months after diagnosis for at least 20 newly diagnosed persons per area.

(3) To compare the prevalence of atypical strains of HIV among persons diagnosed at sites where HIV diagnostic specimens are used for HIV drug resistance and subtype surveillance, and sites where HIV diagnostic specimens cannot be used, such as:

a. Sites where blood draws are not used for HIV diagnosis.

b. Sites where blood draw volumes are consistently too low for 1 ml of serum to be set aside for HIV genotyping for the purpose of atypical strain surveillance.

c. Sites where the use of sera from the diagnostic blood draw for HIV genotyping is not practical because the time between blood draw and processing is consistently greater than 96 hours, rendering the amplification of virus for HIV drug resistance genotyping problematic.

d. Sites where the use of DBS for atypical HIV strain surveillance is more acceptable than the use of sera to staff or participants, or where fewer resources may be required to collect DBS than sera.

(4) To evaluate the resources needed and the logistics involved in collecting and transporting specimens and amplifying HIV for genotyping from DBS, compared with using HIV diagnostic sera, for routine atypical HIV strain surveillance.

Activities: Awardee activities for this program are as follows:

1. Identify HIV diagnostic sites, Counseling, Testing and Referral Centers, and/or clinical sites where HIV drug resistance surveillance in newly diagnosed persons cannot take place using the serum/plasma based methodology funded under PA 01194, PA 04017, and PA 00005 because of one of the following conditions:

a. Blood draws are not used for HIV diagnosis.

b. Blood draw volumes are consistently too low for 1 ml of serum to be set aside for HIV drug resistance genotyping.

c. The use of sera from the diagnostic blood draw for HIV genotyping is not practical because the time between blood draw and processing is consistently greater than 96 hours, rendering the amplification of virus for HIV drug resistance genotyping problematic.

d. DBS are more acceptable to staff or participants, or their collection, processing, and transport may require fewer resources than sera.

2. Identify the subset of those sites from which DBS could be obtained for equal to or greater than 90 percent of persons newly diagnosed with HIV in each site, either at the time of HIV diagnosis or no more than three months after diagnosis.

3. Identify comparison sites from which HIV diagnostic sera are being used, or can be used, for routine surveillance of atypical strains of HIV, in which logistics, resources, and staff time needed to collect and process specimens can be compared to those in sites where DBS will be collected. These sites may include, but are not limited to, sites already participating in atypical

HIV strain surveillance under PA 00005, PA 01194, or PA 04017.

4. Identify one or more sites in which paired specimens (sera or plasma + DBS) can be collected no more than three months after diagnosis from at least 20 persons newly diagnosed with HIV annually. (Note that the paired specimens may be collected from a blood draw required for routine surveillance or clinical purposes no more than three months following diagnosis, but need not necessarily be collected as part of a diagnostic blood draw.)

5. Develop and implement (after appropriate ethics review) a protocol to obtain and transfer DBS from selected sites identified in (2), sera from sites identified in (3), and at least 20 paired specimens consisting of sera or plasma + DBS from any atypical strain surveillance site, to a laboratory collaborating with CDC and local health department staff on surveillance of HIV drug resistance in newly diagnosed persons through HIV drug resistance genotyping under PA 00005, PA 01194, or PA 04017.

6. Record or download minimum specimen tracking and non-identifying demographic and clinical information, in formats currently used in HIV drug resistance surveillance funded under 00005, 01194, and 04017, to be transferred to CDC.

7. Make available the option for each participant to designate a provider to receive a clinician-friendly hard copy report of HIV drug resistance and subtype results from the genotyping laboratory, similar to that currently produced in current HIV drug resistance surveillance protocols.

8. Store HIV drug resistance genotyping data electronically and analyze them along with risk factor information for use in HIV prevention and public health programs.

9. Record minimum data to evaluate labor and resources used to collect and process DBS, and to collect and process diagnostic sera, for surveillance of atypical strains of HIV.

10. Collaborate with CDC in analyzing the data.

11. Provide results and share data with network participants, other collaborators in the field, and with CDC.

12. Attend an annual meeting to discuss project activities and methods for data and specimen collection to facilitate representative surveillance.

13. Collaborate with CDC in evaluating the feasibility and efficiency of using DBS to supplement or replace serum-based surveillance to monitor prevalence of HIV drug resistance and non-B HIV subtypes in persons newly infected or newly diagnosed with HIV. Further collaborate with CDC in planning the extension of the method as part of routine surveillance of atypical HIV strains, if the method proves successful and if funds are available.

In a cooperative agreement, CDC staff is substantially involved in the program activities, above and beyond routine grant monitoring.

CDC Activities for this program are as follows:

1. Assist in the development of a protocol or project description for Institutional Review Board (IRB) review at all cooperating institutions participating in the project to request a non-research determination. The IRB review at each cooperating institution will be done by an Office of Human Research Protection (OHRP)-approved IRB with either a single, multiple, or Federal-wide project assurance. The CDC IRB will review and approve the protocol initially and on at least an annual basis until the project is completed, or until a non-research determination is received.

2. Provide assistance in the design and conduct of the project and statistical analysis.

3. Provide assistance in training, if requested.

4. Provide assistance in locating or contracting with a laboratory participating in CDC-funded HIV drug resistance surveillance genotyping to provide HIV genotypic testing of the DBS and sera (or plasma). Work with participating laboratories to develop laboratory procedures to extend and validate current HIV genotyping methods for use with DBS.

5. Assist in the analysis of the data and the presentation and publication of results.

6. Collaborate with participants in evaluating the feasibility and cost effectiveness of using DBS to supplement or replace collection of diagnostic sera to monitor prevalence of atypical strains in persons newly infected or newly diagnosed with HIV. Further collaborate in planning the extension of the project as a long-term network, if the pilot is successful and if funds are available.

II. Award Information

Type of Award: Cooperative agreement.

CDC involvement in this program is listed in the Activities Section above.

Fiscal Year Funds: 2004.

Approximate Total Funding: $500,000.

Approximate Number of Awards: Six.

Approximate Average Award: $83,000 (This amount is for the first 12-month budget period, and includes both direct and indirect costs).

Floor of Award Range: None.

Ceiling of Award Range: $200,000 (This ceiling is for the first 12-month budget period.)

Anticipated Award Date: September 1, 2004.

Budget Period Length: 12 months.

Project Period Length: Five years.

Throughout the project period, CDC's commitment to continuation of awards will be conditioned on the availability of funds, evidence of satisfactory progress by the recipient (as documented in required reports), and the determination that continued funding is in the best interest of the Federal government.

III. Eligibility Information

III.1. Eligible Applicants

Applications may be submitted by health departments of States, U.S. territories or their *bona fide* agents, including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the six independently-funded city health departments of Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, New York City, Philadelphia, and San Francisco.

A *Bona fide agent* is an agency/organization identified by the State as eligible to submit an application under the State eligibility in lieu of a State application. If you are applying as a *bona fide* agent of a State or local government, you must provide a letter from the State or local government as documentation of your status. Place this documentation behind the first page of your application form.

Areas conducting these activities must have a sufficient volume of newly diagnosed HIV cases in order to assess the correlation in results between DBS and sera or plasma with adequate statistical precision.

Eligible applicants are limited to areas that have a HIV case reporting system in place as of April 1, 2004.

III.2. Cost Sharing or Matching

Matching funds are not required for this program.

III.3. Other

CDC will accept and review applications with budgets greater than the ceiling of the award range.

If your application is incomplete or non-responsive to the requirements listed in this section, it will not be entered into the review process. You will be notified that your application did not meet submission requirements.

Individuals Eligible to Become Principal Investigators: Any individual

with the skills, knowledge, and resources necessary to carry out the proposed research is invited to work with their institution to develop an application for support. Individuals from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups as well as individuals with disabilities are always encouraged to apply for CDC programs.

Note: Title 2 of the United States Code section 1611 states that an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that engages in lobbying activities is not eligible to receive Federal funds constituting an award, grant, or loan.

IV. Application and Submission Information

IV.1. Address To Request Application Package

To apply for this funding opportunity, use application form PHS 398 (OMB number 0925–0001 rev. 5/2001). Forms and instructions are available in an interactive format on the CDC Web site, at the following Internet address: *http://www.cdc.gov/od/pgo/forminfo.htm.*

Forms and instructions are also available in an interactive format on the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Web site at the following Internet address: *http://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/phs398/phs398.html.*

If you do not have access to the Internet, or if you have difficulty accessing the forms on-line, you may contact the CDC Procurement and Grants Office Technical Information Management Section (PGO–TIM) staff at: (770) 488–2700. Application forms can be mailed to you.

IV.2. Content and Form of Application Submission

Letter of Intent (LOI): Your LOI must be written in the following format:

- Maximum number of pages: three.
- Font size: 12-point unreduced.
- Single spaced.
- Paper size: 8.5 by 11 inches.
- Page margin size: One inch.
- Printed only on one side of page.
- Written in plain language, avoid jargon.

Your LOI must contain the following information:

- Descriptive title of the proposed research.
- Evidence that at least 40 cases of HIV were diagnosed in the area in the latest 12 months for which data are available, accompanied by a brief description of the method by which the figures were obtained (including the elimination of duplicates).
- Name, address, e-mail address, and telephone number of the Principal Investigator.
- Names of other key personnel.
- Participating institutions.
- Number and title of this Program Announcement (PA).

Application: Follow the PHS 398 application instructions for content and formatting of your application. For further assistance with the PHS 398 application form, contact PGO–TIM staff at (770) 488–2700, or contact GrantsInfo, telephone (301) 435–0714, e-mail: *GrantsInfo@nih.gov.*

Your research plan should address activities to be conducted over the entire five-year project period. Your detailed line-item budget narrative should cover the costs of activities for first one-year budget period.

You are required to have a Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number to apply for a grant or cooperative agreement from the Federal Government. Your DUNS number must be entered on line 11 of the face page of the PHS 398 application form. The DUNS number is a nine-digit identification number, which uniquely identifies business entities. Obtaining a DUNS number is easy and there is no charge. To obtain a DUNS number, access *www.dunandbradstreet.com* or call 1–866–705–5711.

For more information, *see* the CDC Web site at: *http://www.cdc.gov/od/pgo/funding/pubcommt.htm.*

This PA uses just-in-time concepts.

Additional requirements that may require you to submit additional documentation with your application are listed in section "VI.2. Administrative and National Policy Requirements."

IV.3. Submission Dates and Times

LOI Deadline Date: May 20, 2004.

CDC requests that you send a LOI if you intend to apply for this program. Although the LOI is not required, not binding, and does not enter into the review of your subsequent application, the LOI will be used to gauge the level of interest in this program, and to allow CDC to plan the application review.

Application Deadline Date: June 21, 2004.

Explanation of Deadlines: Applications must be received in the CDC Procurement and Grants Office by 4 p.m. eastern time on the deadline date. If you send your application by the United States Postal Service or commercial delivery service, you must ensure that the carrier will be able to guarantee delivery of the application by the closing date and time. If CDC receives your application after closing due to: (1) Carrier error, when the carrier accepted the package with a guarantee for delivery by the closing date and time, or (2) significant weather delays or natural disasters, you will be given the opportunity to submit documentation of the carriers guarantee. If the documentation verifies a carrier problem, CDC will consider the application as having been received by the deadline.

This announcement is the definitive guide on application submission address and deadline. It supersedes information provided in the application instructions. If your application does not meet the deadline above, it will not be eligible for review, and will be discarded. You will be notified that your application did not meet the submission requirements.

CDC will not notify you upon receipt of your application. If you have a question about the receipt of your application, first contact your courier. If you still have a question, contact the PGO–TIM staff at: 770–488–2700. Before calling, please wait two to three days after the application deadline. This will allow time for applications to be processed and logged.

IV.4. Intergovernmental Review of Applications

Your application is subject to Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs, as governed by Executive Order (EO) 12372. This order sets up a system for State and local governmental review of proposed Federal assistance applications. You should contact your State single point of contact (SPOC) as early as possible to alert the SPOC to prospective applications, and to receive instructions on your State's process. Click on the following link to get the current SPOC list: *http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html.*

IV.5. Funding Restrictions

Restrictions, which must be taken into account while writing your budget, are as follows:

Funding cannot be used for purchase of major laboratory equipment for the performance of HIV genotyping. (Laboratory supplies and labor for specimen processing may be included.)

If you are requesting indirect costs in your budget, you must include a copy of your indirect cost rate agreement. If your indirect cost rate is a provisional rate, the agreement should be less than 12 months of age.

Awards will not allow reimbursement of pre-award costs.

IV.6. Other Submission Requirements

LOI Submission Address: Submit your LOI by express mail, delivery service, fax, or e-mail to: Andrew Vernon,

Scientific Review Administrator, CDC, National Center for HIV, STD and TB Prevention, Office of the Associate Director for Science, 1600 Clifton Road, Mail-Stop E–07, Atlanta, Georgia, 30333; telephone number: 404–639–8000, fax: 404–639–8600, e-mail address: *avernon@cdc.gov.*

Application Submission Address: Submit the original and five hard copies of your application by mail or express delivery service to: Technical Information Management-PA# 04118, CDC Procurement and Grants Office, 2920 Brandywine Road, Atlanta, GA 30341.

Applications may not be submitted electronically at this time.

V. Application Review Information

V.1. Criteria

You are required to provide measures of effectiveness that will demonstrate the accomplishment of the various identified objectives of the cooperative agreement. Measures of effectiveness must relate to the performance goals stated in the "Purpose" section of this announcement. Measures must be objective and quantitative, and must measure the intended outcome. These measures of effectiveness must be submitted with the application and will be an element of evaluation.

The goals of CDC-supported research are to advance the understanding of biological systems, improve the control and prevention of disease and injury, and enhance health. In the written comments, reviewers will be asked to evaluate the application in order to judge the likelihood that the proposed research will have a substantial impact on the pursuit of these goals.

The scientific review group will address and consider each of the following criteria in assigning the application's overall score, weighting them as appropriate for each application. The application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact and thus deserve a high priority score. For example, an investigator may propose to carry out important work that by its nature is not innovative, but is essential to move a field forward.

The criteria are as follows:

Significance: Does this study address an important problem? If the aims of the application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge be advanced? What will be the effect of these studies on the concepts or methods that drive this field?

Approach: Applicants should demonstrate the ability to collect adequate numbers of DBS and sera specimens.

1. Areas having at least 100 newly diagnosed cases of HIV annually should demonstrate that they are able to provide all of the following:

a. At least 80 specimens (sera, plasma, or DBS) annually for atypical strain surveillance.

b. At least 30 dried blood spot specimens annually.

c. At least 20 paired sera or plasma + DBS annually.

2. Areas having 40–99 cases of HIV diagnosed annually should demonstrate that they are able to provide ALL of the following:

a. Specimens (sera, plasma, or DBS) from at least 80 percent of newly diagnosed cases annually for atypical strain surveillance.

b. DBS specimens from at least 20 HIV cases reported in the state or local area annually.

c. At least 20 paired sera or plasma /DBS specimens (these may include specimens in categories 2b and 2c).

Other issues to be examined in applicant's approach include:

- Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project?
- Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?
- Is there evidence that the health department has an agreement to collaborate with one or more sites in the area to collect DBS at the diagnostic blood draw or another routine blood draw from at least 90 percent of persons newly diagnosed with HIV at that site/ those sites annually?

Innovation: Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?

Investigator: Is the investigator appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other researchers (if any)?

Environment: Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Do the proposed experiments take advantage of unique features of the scientific environment or employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support? Has the applicant demonstrated collaborative planning by the State and local health department, the State or local HIV diagnostic laboratory, and one or more HIV diagnostic or clinical sites from which DBS can be obtained?

Protection of Human Subjects from Research Risks: Does the application adequately address the requirements of 45 CFR part 46 for the protection of human subjects? This will not be scored; however, an application can be disapproved if the research risks are sufficiently serious and protection against risks is so inadequate as to make the entire application unacceptable.

Inclusion of Women and Minorities in Research: Does the application adequately address the CDC Policy requirements regarding the inclusion of women, ethnic, and racial groups in the proposed research? This includes: (1) The proposed plan for the inclusion of both sexes and racial and ethnic minority populations for appropriate representation; (2) the proposed justification when representation is limited or absent; (3) a statement as to whether the design of the study is adequate to measure differences when warranted; and (4) a statement as to whether the plans for recruitment and outreach for study participants include the process of establishing partnerships with community(ies) and recognition of mutual benefits.

Budget: The reasonableness of the proposed budget and the requested period of support in relation to the proposed research.

V.2. Review and Selection Process

Applications will be reviewed for completeness by the Procurement and Grants Office (PGO) and for responsiveness by NCHSTP. Incomplete applications and applications that are non-responsive to the eligibility criteria will not advance through the review process. Applicants will be notified that their application did not meet submission requirements.

Applications that are complete and responsive to the PA will be evaluated for scientific and technical merit by an appropriate peer review group or charter study section convened by NCHSTP in accordance with the review criteria listed above. As part of the initial merit review, all applications may:

- Undergo a process in which only those applications deemed to have the highest scientific merit, generally the top half of the applications under review, will be discussed and assigned a priority score.
- Receive a written critique.
- Receive a second level review by the CDC, NCHSTP, Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention (DHAP) Senior Staff.

Award Criteria: Criteria that will be used to make award decisions include:

- Scientific merit (as determined by peer review).
- Availability of funds.

• Programmatic priorities.

V.3. Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates

September 17, 2004.

VI. Award Administration Information

VI.1. Award Notices

Successful applicants will receive a Notice of Grant Award (NGA) from the CDC Procurement and Grants Office. The NGA shall be the only binding, authorizing document between the recipient and CDC. The NGA will be signed by an authorized Grants Management Officer, and mailed to the recipient fiscal officer identified in the application.

Unsuccessful applicants will receive notification of the results of the application review by mail.

VI.2. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

45 CFR part 74 and part 92. For more information on the Code of Federal Regulations, *see* the National Archives and Records Administration at the following Internet address: *http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/cfr-table-search.html.*

The following additional requirements apply to this project:

• AR–1 Human Subjects Requirements.
• AR–2 Requirements for Inclusion of Women and Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Research.
• AR–4 HIV/AIDS Confidentiality Provisions.
• AR–5 HIV Program Review Panel Requirements.
• AR–7 Executive Order 12372.
• AR–9 Paperwork Reduction Act Requirements.
• AR–10 Smoke-Free Workplace Requirements.
• AR–11 Healthy People 2010.
• AR–12 Lobbying Restrictions.
• AR–14 Accounting System Requirements.
• AR–22 Research Integrity.
• AR–24 Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act Requirements.
• AR–25 Release and Sharing of Data.

Additional information on these requirements can be found on the CDC Web site at the following Internet address: *http://www.cdc.gov/od/pgo/funding/ARs.htm.*

VI.3. Reporting

You must provide CDC with an original, plus two hard copies of the following reports:

1. Interim progress report, (use form PHS 2590, OMB Number 0925–0001, rev. 5/2001 as posted on the CDC Web site) no less than 90 days before the end of the budget period. The progress report will serve as your non-competing continuation application, and must contain the following elements:
   a. Current Budget Period Activities Objectives.
   b. Current Budget Period Financial Progress.
   c. New Budget Period Program Proposed Activity Objectives.
   d. Budget.
   e. Additional Requested Information.
   f. Measures of Effectiveness.
2. Financial status report and annual progress report, no more than 90 days after the end of the budget period.
3. Final financial and performance reports, no more than 90 days after the end of the project period.

These reports must be mailed to the Grants Management Specialist listed in the "Agency Contacts" section of this announcement.

VII. Agency Contacts

For general questions about this announcement, contact: Technical Information Management Section, CDC Procurement and Grants Office, 2920 Brandywine Road, Atlanta, GA 30341; telephone: (770) 488–2700.

For scientific/research issues, contact: Diane Bennett, M.D., Extramural Project Officer, CDC, National Center for HIV, STD and TB Prevention, Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road, Mail-Stop E–47, Atlanta, Georgia 30333; telephone: (404) 639–5349, e-mail: *dbennett@cdc.gov.*

For questions about peer review, contact: Andrew Vernon, Scientific Review Administrator, CDC, National Center for HIV, STD and TB Prevention, Office of the Director, Associate Director for Science, 1600 Clifton Road, Mail-S top E–07, Atlanta, Georgia 30333; telephone: (404) 639–8000, e-mail: *avernon@cdc.gov.*

For financial, grants management, or budget assistance, contact: Brenda Hayes, Grants Management Specialist, CDC Procurement and Grants Office, 2920 Brandywine Road, Atlanta, GA 30341; telephone: 770–488–2741, e-mail: *bkh4@cdc.gov.*

For financial, grants management, or budget assistance in the territories, contact: Vincent Falzone, Contract Specialist, CDC Procurement and Grants Office, 2920 Brandywine Road, Atlanta, GA 30341; telephone: 770–488–2763, e-mail: *vcf6@cdc.gov.*

Dated: April 14, 2004.

William P. Nichols,

Acting Director, Procurement and Grants Office, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[FR Doc. 04–8875 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Administration for Children and Families

Grants and Cooperative Agreements; Notice of Availability

Federal Agency Contact Name: Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB).

Funding Opportunity Title: FY 2004 Basic Center Program (BCP).

Announcement Type: Initial.

Funding Opportunity Number: HHS–2004–ACF–ACYF–CY–0011.

CFDA Number: 93.623.

Due Dates for Applications: The due date for receipt of applications is June 4, 2004.

I. Funding Opportunity Description

A. Background: Basic Center Program

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act of 1974 was a response to widespread concern regarding the alarming number of youth who were leaving home without parental permission, crossing State lines and who, while away from home, were exposed to exploitation and other dangers of street life. The purpose of Part A of the RHY Act is to establish or strengthen locally-controlled, community-based and faith-based programs that address the immediate needs of runaway and homeless youth and their families. Services must be delivered outside of the law enforcement, child welfare, mental health and juvenile justice systems.

The Basic Center Program was one of the programs authorized under Part A of the Act to address the runaway and homeless youth problems. The goals of the Basic Center Program are as follows:

• Alleviate problems of runaway and homeless youth;
• Reunite youth with their families and encourage the resolution of intra-family problems through counseling and other services;
• Strengthen family relationships and encourage stable living conditions for youth; and
• Help youth decide upon constructive courses of action.

Each Basic Center program is required to provide outreach to runaway and homeless youth; temporary shelter for up to fifteen (15) days; food; clothing; individual, group and family counseling; aftercare and referrals, as appropriate. Basic Center programs are required to provide their services in residential settings. Some programs also provide some or all of their shelter

services through host homes (usually private homes under contract to the centers) with counseling and referrals being provided from a central location. Basic Center programs shelter youth through 18 years of age at risk of separation from the family and who have a history of running away from the family. Basic Centers must provide age appropriate services or referrals for homeless youth ages 18–21.

The primary presenting problems of youth who receive shelter and non-shelter services through FYSB-funded Basic Centers include: (1) Family conflicts; (2) physical, sexual and emotional abuse; (3) divorce, death or sudden loss of income; and (4) personal problems such as drug use, problems with peers, school attendance and truancy, bad grades, inability to get along with teachers and learning disabilities.

The Family and Youth Services Bureau has worked to promote a positive youth development framework for all FYSB funded grant programs (including the Basic Center Programs) and activities. Applicants are advised to be mindful of this fact in responding to the evaluation criteria.

The positive youth development approach is predicated on the understanding that all young people need support, guidance and opportunities during adolescence, a time of rapid growth and change. With this support, they can develop self-assurance and create a healthy, successful life.

Key elements of positive youth development are:

- Healthy messages to adolescents about their bodies, their behaviors and their interactions;
- Safe and structured places for teens to study, recreate and socialize;
- Strengthened relationships with adult role models, such as parents, mentors, coaches or community leaders;
- Skill development in literacy, competence, work readiness and social skills; and
- Opportunities to self-esteem.

If these factors are being addressed, young people can become not just "problem free" but "fully-prepared" and engaged constructively in their communities and society.

These key elements result in the following outcomes:

- Increased opportunities and avenues for the positive use of time;
- Increased opportunities for positive self-expression; and
- Increased opportunities for youth participation and civic engagement.

It is FYSB's hope and expectation that awareness of this positive youth development approach and its importance for serving youth will increase. The FYSB publication, Understanding Youth Development: Promoting Positive Pathways of Growth and Reconnecting Youth and Community: A Youth Development Approach is widely distributed as source documents for positive youth development concepts and applications. It is currently available from FYSB National Clearinghouse on Families and Youth (NCFY) at *http://www.ncfy.com* (301–608–8098). Additionally, a recent Statement of Principles for Positive Youth Development, endorsed by a broad range of agencies, institutions and organizations, may be found in the brochure: Toward A Blueprint For Youth: Making Positive Youth Development A National Priority. Multiple copies of this resource are available from NCFY or it can be found online at *http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb*.

B. Legislative Authority

Grants for Runaway and Homeless Youth programs are authorized by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974), as amended by the Runaway, Homeless, and Missing Children Protection Act of 2003, Public Law 108–96. Text of the statute may be found at *http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb*.

C. Definitions

These definitions may be found at section 387 of the RHY Act, as amended in 1999.

Homeless Youth—The term "homeless youth" means an individual who is not more than 21 years of age, in the case of a youth seeking shelter in a center under part A, not more than 18 years of age, and for the purposes of part B, not less than 16 years of age, for whom it is not possible to live in a safe environment with a relative; and who has no other safe alternative living arrangement.

Street Youth—The term "street youth" means an individual who is a runaway youth; or indefinitely or intermittently a homeless youth; and spends a significant amount of time on the street or in other areas that increase the risk to such youth for sexual abuse, sexual exploitation, prostitution, or drug abuse.

Youth at Risk of Separation from the Family—The term "youth at risk of separation from the family" means an individual who is less than 18 years of age; and who has a history of running away from the family of such individual whose parent, guardian, or custodian is not willing to provide for the basic needs of such individual; or who is at risk of entering the child welfare system or juvenile justice system as a result of the lack of services available to the family to meet such needs.

Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Services—The term "drug abuse education and prevention services" means services to runaway and homeless youth to prevent or reduce the illicit use of drugs by such youth; and may include individual, family, group, and peer counseling; drop-in services; assistance to runaway and homeless youth in rural areas (including the development of community support groups); information and training relating to the illicit use of drugs by runaway and homeless youth, to individuals involved in providing services to such youth; and activities to improve the availability of local drug abuse prevention services to runaway and homeless youth.

Home-Based Services—The term "home-based services" means services provided to youth and their families for the purpose of preventing such youth from running away, or otherwise becoming separated, from their families; and assisting runaway youth to return to their families; and includes services that are provided in the residences of families (to the extent practicable), including intensive individual and family counseling; and training relating to life skills and parenting.

Street-Based Services—The term "street-based services" means services provided to runaway and homeless youth, and street youth, in areas where they congregate, designed to assist such youth in making healthy personal choices regarding where they live and how they behave; and may include identification of and outreach to runaway and homeless youth, and street youth; crisis intervention and counseling; information and referral for housing; information and referral for transitional living and health care services; advocacy, education, and prevention services related to alcohol and drug abuse; sexual exploitation; sexually transmitted diseases, including human immunodeficiency virus (HIV); and physical and sexual assault.

Transitional Living Youth Project—The term "transitional living youth project" means a project that provides shelter and services designed to promote a transition to self-sufficient living and to prevent long-term dependency on social services.

Public Agency—The term "public agency" means any State, unit of local government, Indian tribe and tribal organization, combination of such States or units, or any agency, department, or

instrumentality of any of the foregoing. This definition applies to all runaway and homeless youth programs funded under this announcement.

Shelter—The term "shelter" includes host homes, group homes and supervised apartments. As currently understood in the field: "Host homes" are facilities providing shelter, usually in the home of a family, under contract to accept runaway and/or homeless youth assigned by the RHY service provider and are licensed according to State or local laws. "Group homes" are single-site residential facilities designed to house RHY clients who may be new to the program or may require a higher level of supervision. These dwellings operate in accordance with State or local housing codes and licensure. "Supervised apartment" is a single unit dwelling or multiple unit apartment house operated under the auspices of the TLP service provider for the purpose of housing program participants.

Street Based Outreach and Education—The term "street-based outreach and education" includes education and prevention efforts directed at youth that are victims of offenses committed by offenders who are and are not known to the victim.

Temporary Shelter—The term "temporary shelter" means the provision of short-term (maximum of 15 days) room and board and core crisis intervention services on a 24-hour basis.

State—The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas.

Training—The term "training" means the provision of local, State, or regionally based instruction to runaway and homeless youth service providers in skill areas that will directly strengthen service delivery.

Technical Assistance—The term "technical assistance" means the provision of expertise, consultation and/or support for the purpose of strengthening the capabilities of grantee organizations to deliver services.

II. Award Information

Funding Instrument Type: Grant.

Anticipated Total Priority Area Funding: $17.4 million in FY2004.

Anticipated Number of Awards: 180.

Ceiling on Amount of Individual Awards: $200,000 per budget period.

Floor of Individual Award Amounts: None.

Average Anticipated Award Amount: $128,000 per budget period.

Project Periods: This announcement invites applications for project periods up to three years. Awards, however, will be made on a competitive basis for a one-year budget period. Applications for continuation grants funded under these awards beyond the one-year budget period but within the three year project period will be entertained in subsequent years on a noncompetitive basis, subject to availability of funds, satisfactory progress of the grantee and a determination that continued funding would be in the best interest of the Government.

III. Eligibility Information

1. Eligible Applicants

County governments, city or township governments , special district governments, State controlled institutions of higher education, Native American tribal governments (federally recognized), Native American tribal organizations (other than federally-recognized tribal governments), nonprofits having a 501(c)(3) status, nonprofits that do not have a 501(c) with the IRS, other than institutions of higher education, and faith-based organizations.

Additional Information on Eligibility

Faith-based organizations are eligible applicants.

Current Basic Center grantees with project periods ending on or before September 29, 2004, and all other eligible applicants not currently receiving Basic Center funds may apply for a new competitive Basic Center grant under this announcement.

Current Basic Center Program grantees (including subgrantees) with one or two years remaining on their current grant and the expectation of continuation funding in FY 2004 may not apply for a new Basic Center grant for the community they currently serve. These grantees will receive instructions from their respective ACF Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) Regional Office contacts on the procedures for applying for noncompetitive continuation grants. Current grantees that have questions regarding their eligibility to apply for new funds, should consult with the appropriate Regional Office Youth Contact, listed in Part VIII, Appendix B, to determine if they are eligible to apply for a new grant award.

The funds available for new awards and continuations in each State and insular area are listed in the Table of Allocations by State (Part VIII, Appendix D). In this Table, the amounts shown in the "New Awards" column are the amounts available for competition under this announcement. The number of new awards made within each State depends upon the amount of the State's total allotment less the amount required for non-competing continuations, as well as on the number of acceptable applications. Therefore, where the amount required for non-competing continuations in any State equals or exceeds the State's total allotment, it is possible that no new awards will be made in the State. However, agencies in States where zero ($ -0-) funding is reflected on the BCP Table of Allocation are highly encouraged to apply for grant funding in the event that additional funding becomes available.

All applicants under this competitive grant area will compete with other eligible applicants in the State in which they propose to deliver services. In the event that there are insufficient numbers of applications approved for funding in any State or jurisdiction, the unused funds will be reallocated to other Basic Center Program applicants.

Non-profit organizations applying for funding are required to submit proof of their non-profit status.

Proof of non-profit status is any one of the following:

(a) A reference to the applicant organization's listing in the Internal Revenue Service's (IRS) most recent list of tax-exempt organizations described in the IRS code.

(b) A copy of a currently valid IRS tax exemption certificate.

(c) A statement from a State taxing body, State Attorney General, or other appropriate State official certifying that the applicant organization has a non-profit status and that none of the net earnings accrue to any private shareholders or individuals.

(d) A certified copy of the organization's certificate of incorporation or similar document that clearly establishes non-profit status.

(e) Any of the items in the subparagraphs immediately above for a State or national parent organization and a statement signed by the parent organization that the applicant organization is a local non-profit affiliate.

2. Cost Sharing or Matching

Yes.

Applicant Share of Project Costs: The applicant must provide a non-Federal share or match of at least ten percent (10%) of the Federal funds awarded. (There may be certain exceptions for tribes with "638" funding pursuant to Pub. L. 93–638, under which certain Federal grants may qualify as matching funds for other Federal grant programs, *e.g.*, those which contribute to the

purposes for which grants under section 638 were made.) The non-Federal share may be met by cash or in-kind contributions, although applicants are encouraged to meet their match requirements through cash contributions. Therefore, a three-year project costing $600,000 in Federal funds (based on an award of $200,000 per 12-month budget period) must provide a match of at least $60,000 ($20,000 per budget period).

3. Other

All applicants must have a DUNS & Bradstreet Number. On June 27, 2003, the Office of Management and Budget published in the **Federal Register** a new Federal policy applicable to all Federal grant applicants. The policy requires all Federal grant applicants to provide a Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number when applying for Federal grants or cooperative agreements on or after October 1, 2003. The DUNS number will be required whether an applicant is submitting a paper application or using the government-wide electronic portal (*http://www.Grants.gov*). A DUNS number will be required for every application for a new award or renewal/continuation of an award, including applications or plans under formula, entitlement and block grant programs, submitted on or after October 1, 2003.

Please ensure that your organization has a DUNS number. You may acquire a DUNS number at no cost by calling the dedicated toll-free DUNS number request line on 1–866–705–5711 or you may request a number on-line at *http://www.dnb.com.*

IV. Application and Submission Information

1. Address To Request Information

ACYF Operations Center, c/o the Dixon Group, Inc., 118 Q Street, NE., Washington, DC 20002–2132; telephone: 1–866–796–1591, e-mail: *FYSB@dixongroup.com.*

2. Content and Form of Application Submission

An original and two copies of the complete application are required. The original and two copies must include all required forms, certifications, assurances, and appendices, be signed by an authorized representative, have original signatures and be submitted unbound. All applications must be stapled well in the upper left corner to prevent separation of any part of the complete application and submitted in a single package. Applicants have the option of omitting from the application copies (not the original) specific salary rates or amounts for individuals specified in the application budget.

You may submit your application to us in either electronic or paper format. To submit an application electronically, please use the *http://www.Grants.gov* apply site. If you use Grants.gov, you will be able to download a copy of the application package, complete it off-line, and then upload and submit the application via the Grants.gov site. You may not e-mail an electronic copy of a grant application to us.

Please note the following if you plan to submit your application electronically via *http://www.Grants.Gov.*

- Electronic submission is voluntary.
- When you enter the Grants.gov site, you will find information about submitting an application electronically through the site, as well as the hours of operation. We strongly recommend that you do not wait until the application deadline date to begin the application process through Grants.gov.
- To use Grants.gov, you, as the applicant, must have a DUNS Number and register in the Central Contractor Registry (CCR). You should allow a minimum of five days to complete the CCR registration.
- You will not receive additional point value because you submit a grant application in electronic format, nor will we penalize you if you submit an application in paper format.
- You may submit all documents electronically, including all information typically included on the SF 424 and all necessary assurances and certifications.
- Your application must comply with any page limitation requirements described in this program announcement.
- After you electronically submit your application, you will receive an automatic acknowledgement from Grants.gov that contains a Grants.gov tracking number. The Administration for Children and Families will retrieve your application from Grants.
- We may request that you provide original signatures on forms at a later date.
- You may access the electronic application for this program on *http://www.Grants.gov.*
- You must search for the downloadable application package by the CFDA number.

Private non-profit organizations may voluntarily submit with their applications the survey located under "Grant Related Documents and Forms" titled "Survey for Private, Non-Profit Grant Applicants" at *http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofs/forms.htm.*

Application Requirements

Each application will be duplicated, therefore, do not use or include separate covers, binders, clips, tabs, plastic inserts, folded maps, brochures or any other items that cannot be processed easily on a photocopy machine with an automatic feed. Do not bind, clip, staple, or fasten in any way separate subsections of the application, including supporting documentation.

Project Description: Each application may include only one proposed project. Describe the project clearly in 40 pages or less (not counting budget narrative justification, supplemental documentation, letters of support) using the outline and guidelines for each program area. The description must be 12-point Times Roman font, double spaced, and single-sided on 8½ x 11 inches plain white paper with at least 1 inch margins. Pages over the limit will be removed from the application and will not be reviewed.

Project Summary/Abstract (one page maximum): Clearly mark this page with the applicant name as shown on item 5 of the SF 424 and the service area as shown in item 12 of the SF 424. Also, include telephone number and e-mail address. The summary description is limited to one page. Care should be taken to produce a summary which accurately and concisely reflects the proposed project. It should describe the objectives of the project, the approach to be used and the results and benefits expected.

Supplemental Documentation: The maximum number of pages for supplemental documentation is 10 pages. The supplemental documentation, subject to the 10-page limit, must be numbered and may include brief resumes, position descriptions, maps, organization charts, *etc.* Supplemental documentation over the 10-page limit will not be reviewed.

Letters of Support: Applicants are encouraged to provide letters of support, if appropriate or applicable, in relationship to the project description. Letters of support are limited to 10.

Sub-grant/Contractual Agreements: Applicants should provide brief summaries of proposed sub-grants or contractual agreements. Applicable agreements are those between the grantee and cooperating entities which support or complement the provision of mandated services to runaway and homeless youth as reflected in the project description. Summaries of agreements are not counted as part of the 40-page project description limit,

nor the 10-page supplemental documentation limit.

Forms and Certifications

An Application for Federal Assistance (Standard Form 424) must be fully completed and submitted by the due date to the address stated above. If more than one agency is involved in submitting a single application, one entity must be identified as the applicant organization which will have legal responsibility for the grant. Use the addition guidance below to complete the form:

- *Item 6:* Insure the accuracy of Employer Identification Number (EIN). This number is provided to an organization by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).
- *Item 10:* clearly state the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number (93.623) and title of the program (Basic Center Program).
- *Item 13:* Proposed Project Start Date is 09/30/2004; End Date is 09/29/2007.
- *Item 14:* Include the Congressional District where the applicant is located in (a) and other district(s) affected by the project in (b). An applicant may insure the accuracy of its district(s) via the following Web site address: *http://www.house.gov/writerep/*. Once in the site: Select your State, enter your zip code, including the 4-digit zip code extension, then click "contact my representative".

Standard Form 424A (Budget Information Form and Budget Justification): The budget justification includes a detailed budget and a narrative justification. Refer to the "Budget and Budget Justification" evaluation criteria in Part II for more guidance. The budget justification should be typed on standard size plain white paper. The detailed budget must include breakdowns for major budget categories. In the budget narrative, describe and justify all costs. List amounts and sources of all funds, both Federal and non-Federal, proposed for this project.

Note: Applicant should refer to the UPD Requirement guidance when preparing the budget and narrative budget justification. Place the budget/narrative budget justification after form 424A. These documents do not count against any page limitation.

Assurances Form: Applicants requesting financial assistance for non-construction projects must file the Standard Form 424B, "Assurances: Non-Construction Programs." Applicants must sign and return the Standard Form 424B with their applications.

Certification Regarding Lobbying, Standard Form LLL Disclosure of Lobbying Activities: Applicants must disclose lobbying activities on the form when applying for an award in excess of $100,000. Applicants who have used non-Federal funds for lobbying activities in connection with receiving assistance under this announcement shall complete a disclosure form to report lobbying. Applicants must sign and return the disclosure form, if applicable, with their applications.

Certification Regarding Environmental Tobacco Smoke: Applicants are not required to return a signed certification. As stated on the certification, by signing and submitting an application , the applicant certifies compliance with the requirements of Pub. L. 103227, part C, Environmental Tobacco Smoke.

Availability of Forms and Other Materials

Legislation referenced in section I of this announcement may be found at *http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb/grant.htm* (click on the link to "Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act").

Additional copies of this announcement may be downloaded from this Web site: *http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb.*

Many standard forms can also be downloaded and printed from the following ACF Web page: *http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofs/grants/form.htm.*

3. Submission Date and Time

The closing time and date for receipt of applications is 4:30 p.m. eastern standard time (e.s.t.) on June 4, 2004. Mailed or hand carried applications received after 4:30 p.m. on the closing date will be classified as late. Mailed applications shall be considered as meeting an announced deadline if they are received on or before the deadline time and date at the following address: ACYF Operations Center, c/o the Dixon Group, Inc., 118 Q Street, NE., Washington, DC 20002–2132; telephone: 1–866–796–1591.

Applicants are responsible for mailing applications well in advance, when using all mail services, to ensure that the applications are received on or before the deadline time and date.

Applications hand carried by applicants, applicant couriers, other representatives of the applicant, or by overnight/express mail couriers shall be considered as meeting an announced deadline if they are received on or before the deadline date, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., e.s.t., at the following address:

Late applications: Applications which do not meet the criteria above are considered late applications. ACF shall notify each late applicant that its application will not be considered in the current competition.

Extension of deadlines: ACF may extend application deadlines when circumstances such as acts of God (floods, hurricanes, etc.) occur, or when there are widespread disruptions of mails service. Determinations to extend or waive deadline requirements rest with the Chief Grants Management Officer.

REQUIRED FORMS AND DOCUMENTS

What to submit	Required content	Required form or format	When to submit
Project Description	Responsiveness to Evaluation Criteria.	Format described in Part V; 40-pages limit, 12 font, Times Roman, double spaced, single sided, 1 inch, margin.	By application due date.
Project Summary/Abstract	Summary of application request.	One page limit.	
SF 424, SF 424A	Per required form	May be found on *http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofs/forms.htm.*	By application due date.
SF 424B, Assurances—Non-Construction Programs.	Sign and submit	May be found on *http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofs/forms.htm.*	By application due date.
Certification regarding Lobbying and asssociated Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF LLL).	Sign and submit if applicable.	May be found on *http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofs/forms.htm.*	By application due date.

REQUIRED FORMS AND DOCUMENTS—Continued

What to submit	Required content	Required form or format	When to submit
Proof of Non-Profit Status	As described in Section IV.	Format described in Section IV	By application due date.

Additional Forms

Private non-profit organizations may voluntarily submit with their applications the survey located under "Grant Related Documents and Forms" titled "Survey for Private, Non-Profit Grant Applicants" at *http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofs/forms.htm.*

What to submit	Required content	Required form or format	When to submit
Survey for Private, Non-Profit Grant Applicants.	Per Required Form	*http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofs/forms.htm.*	By application due date.

4. Intergovernmental Review

Single Point of Contact (SPOC)

This program is covered under Executive Order (E.O.) 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs," and 45 CFR part 100, "Intergovernmental Review of Department of Health and Human Services Programs and Activities." Under the Order, States may design their own processes for reviewing and commenting on proposed Federal assistance under covered programs.

As of October 2003, of the most recent SPOC list, the following jurisdictions have elected not to participate in the Executive Order process. Applicants from these jurisdictions or for projects administered by federally-recognized Indian Tribes need take no action in regard to E.O. 12372: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Palau, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington and Wyoming.

Although the jurisdictions listed above no longer participate in the process, entities which have met the eligibility requirements of the program are still eligible to apply for a grant even if a State, Territory, Commonwealth, etc. does not have a SPOC. All remaining jurisdictions participate in the Executive Order process and have established SPOCs. Applicants from participating jurisdictions should contact their SPOCs as soon as possible to alert them of the prospective applications and receive instructions. Applicants must submit any required material to the SPOCs as soon as possible so that the program office can obtain and review SPOC comments as part of the award process. The applicant must submit all required materials, if any, to the SPOC and indicate the date of this submittal (or the date of contact if no submittal is required) on the Standard Form 424, item 16a. Under 45 CFR 100.8(a) (2), a SPOC has 60 days from the application deadline to comment on proposed new or competing continuation awards.

SPOCs are encouraged to eliminate the submission of routine endorsements as official recommendations. Additionally, SPOCs are requested to clearly differentiate between mere advisory comments and those official State process recommendations which may trigger the "accommodate or explain" rule.

When comments are submitted directly to ACF, they should be addressed to: Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Division of Discretionary Grants, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW., Washington, DC 20447.

The official list, including addresses, of the jurisdictions elected to participate in E.O. 12372 can be found on the following URL: *http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.htm.*

5. Funding Restrictions

Grant funds are not allowable for construction of a facility.

Grant funds are not allowable for pre-award costs.

A minimum of $100,000 will be awarded to each State, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. A minimum of $45,000 will be awarded to each of the four insular areas: Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas and the Virgin Islands.

6. Other Submission Requirements

Electronic Address to Submit Application: http://www.Grants.Gov.

Submission by Mail: Mailed applications shall be considered as meeting an announced deadline if they are received on or before the deadline time and date at:

ACYF Operations Center, c/o the Dixon Group, Inc., 118 Q Street, NE., Washington, DC 20002–2132; telephone: 1–866–796–1591.

Applicants are responsible for mailing applications well in advance, when using all mail services, to ensure that the applications are received on or before the deadline time and date.

Hand Delivery: Applications hand-carried by applicants, applicant couriers, other representatives of the applicant, or by overnight/express mail couriers shall be considered as meeting an announced deadline if they are received on or before the deadline date, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., e.s.t., at ACYF Operations Center, c/o the Dixon Group, Inc., 118 Q Street, NE., Washington, DC 20002–2132, telephone: 1–866–796–1591, between Monday and Friday (excluding Federal holidays). This address must appear on the envelope/package containing the application. Applicants are cautioned that express/overnight mail services do not always deliver as agreed. ACF cannot accommodate transmission of applications by fax.

Electronic Submission: Please *see* "Section IV. 2. Content and Form of Application Submission," for guidelines and requirements when submitting applications electronically.

Hard Copy Address Submission: ACYF Operations Center, c/o the Dixon Group, Inc., 118 Q Street, NE., Washington, DC 20002–2132.

V. Application Review Information

1. Criteria

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13)

Public Reporting Burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 20 hours per response, including the time for reviewing

instructions, gathering and maintaining the data needed and reviewing the collection information.

The project description is approved under OMB Control No. 0970–0139.

General Instructions for the Uniform Project Description

The following are instructions and guidelines on how to prepare the "project summary/abstract" and "Full Project Description" sections of the application. Under the evaluation criteria section, note that each criterion is preceded by the generic evaluation requirement under the ACF Uniform Project Description (UPD).

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.

Approach

Outline a plan of action which describes the scope and detail of how the proposed work will be accomplished. Account for all functions or activities identified in the application. Cite factors which might accelerate or decelerate the work and state your reason for taking the proposed approach rather than others. Describe any unusual features of the project such as design or technological innovations, reductions in cost or time, or extraordinary social and community involvement. Provide quantitative monthly or quarterly projections of the accomplishments to be achieved for each function or activity in such terms as the number of people to be served and the number of activities accomplished. When accomplishments cannot be quantified by activity or function, list them in chronological order to show the schedule of accomplishments and their target dates.

If any data is to be collected, maintained, and/or disseminated, clearance may be required from the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB). This clearance pertains to any "collection of information that is conducted or sponsored by ACF."

List organizations, cooperating entities, consultants, or other key individuals who will work on the project along with a short description of the nature of their effort or contribution.

Results or Benefits Expected

Identify the results and benefits to be derived. For example, describe how the intermediary's assistance to faith-based and community organizations will increase their effectiveness, enhance their ability to provide social services, diversify their funding sources, and create collaborations to better serve those most in need.

Objectives and Need for Assistance

Clearly identify the physical, economic, social, financial, institutional, and/or other problem(s) requiring a solution. The need for assistance must be demonstrated and the principal and subordinate objectives of the project must be clearly stated. Supporting documentation, such as letters of support and testimonials from concerned interests other than the applicant, may be included. Any relevant data based on planning studies should be included or referred to in the endnotes/footnotes. Incorporate demographic data and participant/beneficiary information, as needed. In developing the project description, the applicant may volunteer or be requested to provide information on the total range of projects currently being conducted and supported (or to be initiated), some of which may be outside the scope of the program announcement.

Staff and Position Data

Provide a biographical sketch for each key person appointed and a job description for each vacant key position. A biographical sketch will also be required for new key staff as appointed.

Organizational Profiles

Provide information on the applicant organization(s) and cooperating partners, such as organizational charts, financial statements, audit reports or statements from CPAs/Licensed Public Accountants, Employer Identification Numbers, names of bond carriers, contact persons and telephone numbers, child care licenses and other documentation of professional accreditation, information on compliance with Federal/State/local government standards, documentation of experience in the program area, and other pertinent information. Any non-profit organization submitting an application must submit proof of its non-profit status in its application at the time of submission.

Budget and Budget Justification

Provide line item detail and detailed calculations for each budget object class identified on the Budget Information form. Detailed calculations must include estimation methods, quantities, unit costs, and other similar quantitative detail sufficient for the calculation to be duplicated. The detailed budget must also include a breakout by the funding sources identified in Block 15 of the SF–424.

Provide a narrative budget justification that describes how the categorical costs are derived. Discuss the necessity, reasonableness, and allocability of the proposed costs.

General

The following guidelines are for preparing the budget and budget justification. Both Federal and non-Federal resources shall be detailed and justified in the budget and narrative justification. For purposes of preparing the budget and budget justification, "Federal resources" refers only to the ACF grant for which you are applying. Non-Federal resources are all other Federal and non-Federal resources. It is suggested that budget amounts and computations be presented in a columnar format: First column, object class categories; second column, Federal budget; next column(s), non-Federal budget(s), and last column, total budget. The budget justification should be a narrative.

Personnel

Description: Costs of employee salaries and wages.

Justification: Identify the project director or principal investigator, if known. For each staff person, provide the title, time commitment to the project (in months), time commitment to the project (as a percentage or full-time equivalent), annual salary, grant salary, wage rates, etc. Do not include the costs of consultants or personnel costs of delegate agencies or of specific project(s) or businesses to be financed by the applicant.

Fringe Benefits

Description: Costs of employee fringe benefits unless treated as part of an approved indirect cost rate.

Justification: Provide a breakdown of the amounts and percentages that comprise fringe benefit costs such as health insurance, FICA, retirement insurance, taxes, etc.

Travel

Description: Costs of project-related travel by employees of the applicant organization (does not include costs of consultant travel).

Justification: For each trip, show the total number of traveler(s), travel destination, duration of trip, per diem, mileage allowances, if privately owned vehicles will be used, and other transportation costs and subsistence allowances. Travel costs for key staff to attend ACF-sponsored workshops should be detailed in the budget.

Equipment

Description: "Equipment" means an article of nonexpendable, tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost which equals or exceeds the lesser of (a) the capitalization level established by the organization for the financial Statement purposes, or (b) $5,000.

(Note: Acquisition cost means the net invoice unit price of an item of equipment, including the cost of any modifications, attachments, accessories, or auxiliary apparatus necessary to make it usable for the purpose for which it is acquired. Ancillary charges, such as taxes, duty, protective in-transit insurance, freight, and installation shall be included in or excluded from acquisition cost in accordance with the organization's regular written accounting practices.)

Justification: For each type of equipment requested, provide a description of the equipment, the cost per unit, the number of units, the total cost, and a plan for use on the project, as well as use or disposal of the equipment after the project ends. An applicant organization that uses its own definition for equipment should provide a copy of its policy or section of its policy which includes the equipment definition.

Supplies

Description: Costs of all tangible personal property other than that included under the Equipment category.

Justification: Specify general categories of supplies and their costs. Show computations and provide other information which supports the amount requested.

Contractual

Description: Costs of all contracts for services and goods except for those which belong under other categories such as equipment, supplies, construction, etc. Third-party evaluation contracts (if applicable) and contracts with secondary recipient organizations, including delegate agencies and specific project(s) or businesses to be financed by the applicant, should be included under this category.

Justification: All procurement transactions shall be conducted in a manner to provide, to the maximum extent practical, open and free competition. Recipients and subrecipients, other than States that are required to use part 92 procedures, must justify any anticipated procurement action that is expected to be awarded without competition and exceed the simplified acquisition threshold fixed at 41 U.S.C. 403(11) (currently set at $100,000). Recipients might be required to make available to ACF pre-award review and procurement documents, such as request for proposals or invitations for bids, independent cost estimates, etc.

Note: Whenever the applicant intends to delegate part of the project to another agency, the applicant must provide a detailed budget and budget narrative for each delegate agency, by agency title, along with the required supporting information referred to in these instructions.

Indirect Charges

Description: Total amount of indirect costs. This category should be used only when the applicant currently has an indirect cost rate approved by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) or another cognizant Federal agency.

Justification: An applicant that will charge indirect costs to the grant must enclose a copy of the current rate agreement. If the applicant organization is in the process of initially developing or renegotiating a rate, it should immediately upon notification that an award will be made, develop a tentative indirect cost rate proposal based on its most recently completed fiscal year in accordance with the principles set forth in the cognizant agency's guidelines for establishing indirect cost rates, and submit it to the cognizant agency. Applicants awaiting approval of their indirect cost proposals may also request indirect costs. It should be noted that when an indirect cost rate is requested, those costs included in the indirect cost pool should not also be charged as direct costs to the grant. Also, if the applicant is requesting a rate which is less than what is allowed under the program, the authorized representative of the applicant organization must submit a signed acknowledgement that the applicant is accepting a lower rate than allowed.

Program Income

Description: The estimated amount of income, if any, expected to be generated from this project.

Justification: Describe the nature, source and anticipated use of program income in the budget or refer to the pages in the application which contain this information.

Non-Federal Resources

Description: Amounts of non-Federal resources that will be used to support the project as identified in Block 15 of the SF–424.

Justification: The firm commitment of these resources must be documented and submitted with the application in order to be given credit in the review process. A detailed budget must be prepared for each funding source.

Total Direct Charges, Total Indirect Charges, Total Project Costs

Self-explanatory.

Evaluation Criterion I: Approach (Maximum: 35 points)

The Program Performance Standards in Appendix A define the minimum standards of which RHY Basic Center projects funded by ACF must conform. They address operational features such as outreach, individual intake and group counseling, family counseling, service linkages, recreational program, case disposition, aftercare, individual client files, staffing and staff development, youth participation, ongoing center planning, periodic reports to the Secretary of HHS and Board of Directors/Advisory Body.

Applications will be evaluated based on the acceptability of the description of the factors below and plans and/or procedures for assuring all Basic Center Program Performance Standards are met.

Factors: a. Application describes the program's positive youth development philosophy and approach and indicate how it underlies and integrates all proposed activities, including provision of services to runaway and homeless youth and involvement of the youth's parents or legal guardians. Specific information must be provided on how youth will be involved in the design, operation and evaluation of the program.

b. Application states the expected or estimated ratio of staff to youth and explain how it will be sufficient to ensure adequate supervision and treatment.

c. Application describes how runaway and homeless youth and their families will be reached and how services will be provided consistent with the Basic Center Program Performance Standards listed in Part V, Appendix A.

d. Application describes the strategies and activities for encouraging awareness of and sensitivity to the diverse needs of runaway and homeless youth who are persons of low English proficiency, or represent particular ethnic and racial backgrounds, sexual orientations, or who are street youth.

e. Application describes plans for conducting an outreach program that, where applicable, will attract members of ethnic, cultural, and racial minorities and/or persons with limited ability to speak English.

f. Application proposes to serve a specific RHY population (*e.g.*, single-sex

programs, gay and lesbian youth, a particular ethnic group, etc.) and describe plans for providing focused services to meet the special needs of this population and how the applicant will make referrals or otherwise provide for the needs of RHY youth who are not in the specific population the applicant will serve.

g. Application describes the plans for ensuring coordination with schools to which runaway and homeless youth will return and for assisting the youth to stay current with the curricula of these schools.

h. Application describes procedures for dealing with youth who have run from foster care placements and from correctional institutions and must show that procedures are in accordance with Federal, State and local laws.

i. Application describes procedures for maintaining confidentiality of records on the youth and families served. Procedures must insure that no information on the youth and families is disclosed without the consent of the individual youth, parent or legal guardian. Disclosures without consent can be made to another agency compiling statistical records if individual identities are not provided or to a government agency involved in the disposition of criminal charges against an individual youth.

j. To provide optional home-based services, an applicant must include assurances that in providing such services the applicant will:

- Provide counseling and information to youth and the families (including unrelated individuals in the family households) of such youth, including services relating to basic life skills, interpersonal skill building, educational advancement, job attainment skills, mental and physical health care, parenting skills, financial planning, and referral to sources of other needed services;
- Provide directly, or through an arrangement made by the center, 7 day, 24-hour service to respond to family crises (including immediate access to temporary shelter for runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of separation from the family);
- Establish, in partnership with the families of runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of separation from the family, objectives and measures of success to be achieved as a result of receiving home-based services;
- Provide initial and periodic training of staff who provide home-based services; and
- Ensure that (a) caseloads will remain sufficiently low to allow for intensive (5 to 20 hours per week) involvement with each family receiving such services; and (b) staff providing such services will receive qualified supervision.

k. To provide optional drug abuse education and prevention services, an applicant must provide a description of:

- The types of such services that the applicant proposes to provide;
- The objectives of such services;
- The types of information and training to be provided to individuals providing such services to runaway and homeless youth; and
- An assurance that in providing such services the applicant must conduct outreach activities for runaway and homeless youth.

l. To provide optional street-based services, the applicant must include assurances that in providing such services the applicant will:

- Provide qualified supervision of staff, including on-street supervision by appropriately trained staff;
- Provide backup personnel for on-street staff;
- Provide initial and periodic training of staff who provide such services; and conduct outreach activities for runaway and homeless youth, and street youth.

Evaluation Criterion II: Results or Benefits Expected (Maximum: 20 points)

Applications will be evaluated based on the acceptability of the description of the following factors:

Factors: a. Application specifies the annual number of qualifying runaway and homeless youth (RHY) and their families expected to be directly served (*e.g.*, sheltered and counseled), the number of beds available for runaway and homeless youth (at least 4 youth and a maximum capacity of not more than 20 youth, except where the applicant assures that the State or local law or regulations that requires a higher maximum to comply with licensure requirements for child and youth serving facilities; and a ratio of staff to youth that is sufficient to ensure adequate supervision) and the types and quantities of services to be provided. (Runaway and homeless youth are distinct from other youth, *e.g.*, youth currently in foster care or other systems.)

b. Application describes the anticipated changes in attitudes, values and behavior of the youth served and improvements in individual and family functioning that will occur as a consequence of the services provided.

c. Application describes the criteria to be used to evaluate the results and success of the program.

Evaluation Criterion III: Objectives and Need for Assistance (Maximum: 15 points)

Applications will be evaluated based on the acceptability of the description of the following factors:

Factors: a. Application specifies the goals and objectives of the project and how implementation will fulfill the purposes of the legislation described above in the "Background"

b. Application states the need for assistance by describing the conditions of youth and families in the area to be served and the estimated number and characteristics of runaway and homeless youth and their families. The discussion must include matters of family functioning and the health, education, employment and social conditions of the youth, including at-risk conditions or behaviors such as drug use, school failure and delinquency.

c. Application proposing to focus services on a specific RHY population (*e.g.*, single-sex programs, gay and lesbian youth, a particular ethnic group, etc.) identifies the youth to be served. Additional information on "focused" services is requested under "Approach" criteria.

d. Application discusses the existing support systems for "youth at risk of separation from the family" in the area, with specific references to law enforcement, health and mental health care, social services, schools and child welfare. In addition, other agencies providing shelter and services to runaway and homeless youth in the area must be identified. Supporting documentation of need from other community groups may be included. Additional information about other organizations is requested under "Organizational Profile" Criteria. It must be clear that the applicant will complement or enhance, not duplicate, existing available services.

e. Application describes the area to be served, indicate the precise locations of program services and demonstrate that the services will be located in an area which is frequented by and/or easily accessible by runaway and homeless youth. Maps or other graphic aids may be included as part of the supplementary documentation 10-page limit.

Evaluation Criterion IV: Staff and Position Data (Maximum: 10 points)

Applications will be evaluated based on the acceptability of the description of the following factors:

Factors: a. Application discusses key staff experience in working with runaway, homeless, and the street youth populations.

b. Application includes information on skills, knowledge and experience of the project director and other key project staff. Biographical sketches or brief resumes of current and proposed staff, as well as job descriptions, should be included. Resumes must indicate what position the individual will fill and position descriptions must specifically describe the job as it relates to the proposed project. Such documents count against the 10-page supplemental documentation limit. They do not count against the overall 40-page project description limit.

c. Application lists consultants who will work on the program along with a short description of the nature of their effort or contribution.

d. Application provides information on plans for training project staff as well as staff of cooperating organizations and individuals.

Evaluation Criterion V: Organizational Profiles (Maximum 10 points)

Applications will be evaluated based on the acceptability of the description of the following factors:

Factors: a. Application discusses organizational experience in working with runaway, homeless and street youth populations. As required by the RHY Act, priority for funding shall be given to organizations with demonstrated experience providing long-term residential services to runaway, homeless and street youth. Application documents the services it provides to this specific population and the length of time the applicant has been involved in the provision of these services.

b. Application provides a short description of the applicant agency's organization; the types, quantities and costs of services it provides and must identify and briefly describe the role of other organizations or multiple sites of the agency that will be involved in direct services to runaway and homeless youth through this grant. List all these sites, including addresses, phone numbers and staff contact names if different from the address on the SF 424. If the agency is a recipient of funds from the Administration on Children and Families for services to runaway and homeless youth for programs other than that applied for in this application, show how the services supported by these funds are or will be integrated with the existing services. Organizational charts may be provided.

c. Application provides a plan for project continuance beyond grant support, including a plan for securing resources and continuing project activities after Federal assistance has ceased and a listing of applicant's funding sources. Applicant must describe how the activities implemented under this project will be continued by the agency once Federal funding for the project has ended and must describe specific plans for accomplishing program phase-out in the event the applicant cannot obtain new operating funds at the end of the 36-month project period.

d. Application includes letters of support and statements from community, public and commercial leaders and organizations that support the project proposed for funding.

(Note: Letters of support are limited to 10. They do not count against the 40-page project description limit nor the 10-page supplemental documentation limit.)

Evaluation Criterion VI: Budget and Budget Justification (Maximum: 10 points)

Applications will be evaluated based on the acceptability of the description the following factors:

Factors: a. Application provides a proposed detailed line item budget related to the types and quantities of activities to be implemented as discussed in the full project description for the first year (12 months) of the proposed project . The detailed line items must be consistent with the Budget Categories listed on standard form 424A, Section B. In this section of the form reflect total costs for each of the following categories: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual, other, total direct charges, indirect charges, and total budget. Non-Federal share must also be reflected among the same categories where appropriate.

b. Application includes a narrative budget that describes how each category of costs are derived, *i.e.*, detailed calculations that include estimation methods, quantities unit costs, etc., that equate to the total costs proposed in a particular category. Applicants must adhere to the following additional guidance in preparing the budget justification:

Note: Proposed indirect costs must be supported by a current indirect cost rate (IDC) agreement. Indirect Costs cannot be proposed as direct costs too. Place the budget/ narrative budget justification after grant application form 424A. These documents do not count against any page limitation. Applicant must include brief, concise summaries of proposed written agreements, if applicable, between grantee and sub-grantee or contractor or other cooperating entities which support or complement the provision of mandated services to runaway and homeless youth. Summaries of agreements do not count against the 40-page project description limit.)

c. Application describes the fiscal control that will be used to ensure prudent use, proper disbursement and accurate accounting of funds received under this program announcement.

(Note: Do not submit an entire audit report. If available, an applicant may provide an executive summary of the organization's current audit report.)

2. Review and Selection Process

Applications received by the due date will be reviewed and scored competitively. Experts in the field, generally persons from outside the Federal government, will use the evaluation criteria listed in Part V of this announcement to review and score the applications. The results (scores) of this review will be a primary factor in making funding decisions. ACF may also solicit comments from Regional Office staff. ACF may consider a variety of factors in addition to the review criteria identified above, including geographic and types of applicant organizations, in order to ensure that the interests of the Federal Government are met in making the final selections. Please note that applicants that do not comply with the requirements in the section titled "Eligible Applicants" will not be included in the review process.

Approved but Unfunded Applications: In cases where more applications are approved for funding than ACF can fund with the money available, the Grants Officer shall fund applications in their order of approval until funds run out. In this case, ACF has the option of carrying over the approved applications up to a year for funding consideration in a later competition of the same program. These applications need not be reviewed and scored again if the program's evaluation criteria have not changed. However, they must then be placed in rank order along with other applications in the later competition

VI. Award Administration Information

1. Award Notices

The successful applicant will be notified through the issuance of a Financial Assistance Award (FAA) document, signed by an authorized Grants Officer, which will set forth the amount of funds granted, the terms and conditions of the grant, the effective date of the grant, the budget period for which initial support will be given, the non-Federal share to be provided and the total project period for which support is contemplated.

Organizations whose applications will not be funded will be notified in writing by the Administration on Children, Youth and Families. The Compilation of Reviewers' Comments will also be made available to unsuccessful applicants as a means of providing technical assistance for preparing future proposals.

2. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Runaway Youth Program Administration Requirements (45 CFR part 1351). Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grant Awards (45 CFR parts 74 and 92).

3. Reporting Requirements

Programmatic Reports: Semi-annually with final report due 90 days after project end date.

Financial Reports: Semi-annually with final report due 90 days after project end date.

VII. Agency Contacts

1. Program Office Contact

Dorothy W. Pittard, Family and Youth Services Bureau, 330 C Street, SW., Washington, DC 20447.

E-mail: *dpittard@acf.hhs.gov*, telephone number: 202–205–8906.

2. Grants Management Office Contact

William Wilson, Office of Grants Management, 330 C Street, SW., Washington, DC 20447.

E-mail: *wwilson@acf.hhs.gov*, telephone number: 202–205–8913.

All Basic Center grants are managed out of the ACF Regional Offices. *See* ACF Regional Office Youth Contacts in your area listed in Appendix B.

VIII. Other Information

1. Special Requirements

By signing and submitting an application, the applicant is agreeing to the following special requirements:

RHYMIS (Runaway and Homeless Youth Management Information System)—Applicant must agree to keep adequate statistical records profiling the youth and families served under the Federal grant and to gather and submit program and client data required by FYSB. This information is required by the RHY program legislation and defined in user-friendly Runaway and Homeless Youth Management Information System (RHYMIS or RHYMIS-LITE). Recipients of a FYSB grant are required and expected to submit the data via RHYMIS or in an approved format which RHYMIS can receive. Grantees have the option of using RHYMIS for internal management improvement or for research and other program needs. A RHYMIS hotline/help desk is available at 888–749–64, and/or at *rhymis_help@csc.com*.

The Family and Youth Services Bureau will fund computer software for RHY program data collection through RHYMIS. An applicant lacking the computer equipment for RHYMIS data collection must include an estimated cost for such equipment in their proposed budget. If the applicant already has such equipment, this fact must be noted.

(Note: Existing grantees generally report that their staff has been able to easily train themselves to operate RHYMIS due to its user-friendliness, prompts and help features, and FYSB's technical support service.)

- *Research or Evaluation*—Applicant must agree to cooperate with any research or evaluation efforts sponsored by the Administration for Children and Families.
- *Annual Report*—Applicant must agree to submit data required for the Family and Youth Services Bureau Annual Report to the Secretary of HHS on program activities and accomplishments with statistical summaries describing the number and characteristics of runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of family separation, who participate in the project and the services provided to such youth by the project.
- *Other Reports*—Applicant must also agree to submit other required program and financial reports, as instructed by FYSB.

2. Appendices

Appendix A: Basic Center Program Performance Standards.

Appendix B: Administration for Children and Families Regional Office Youth Contacts.

Appendix C: Training and Technical Assistance Providers.

Appendix D: Table of Basic Center Program Allocations by State.

Dated: April 9, 2004.

Frank Fuentes,

Deputy Commissioner, Administration on Children, Youth and Families.

Appendix A. Basic Center Program Performance Standards

I. Background, Purpose, Goals and Objectives

The Program Performance Standards established by the Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) are minimum standards for its funded basic centers. They relate to the basic program components enumerated in section 312 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act as reauthorized and as further detailed in Regulations and other guidance from FYSB governing the implementation of the Act. They address the methods and processes by which the needs of runaway and homeless youth and their families are being met, as opposed to the outcome of the services provided to the clients served. Nine of these standards relate to service components (outreach, individual intake process, temporary shelter, individual and group counseling, family counseling, service linkages, aftercare services, recreational programs, and case disposition), and six to administrative functions or activities (staffing and staff development, youth participation, individual client files, reporting, ongoing project planning, and board of directors/advisory body).

Although fiscal management is not included as a program performance standard, it is viewed by FYSB as being an essential element in the operation of its funded projects. Therefore, as validation visits are made, the Regional ACF youth specialist and/or staff from the Office of Fiscal Operations will also review the project's financial management activities.

The standards are designed to serve as a developmental tool for use by the project staff and the Regional ACF staff specialists in identifying those services and administrative components of projects which require strengthening through internal action on the part of staff or through the provision of external technical assistance.

II. Basic Center Program Performance Standards

The following are the program performance standards applicable to funded basic centers:

1. Outreach

The project shall conduct outreach efforts directed towards community agencies, youth and parents based on a written plan that takes diversity into consideration.

2. Individual Intake Process

The project shall conduct an individual intake process with each youth seeking services from the project. The individual intake process shall provide for:

a. Direct access to project services on a 24-hour basis.

b. The identification of the emergency service needs of each youth and the provision of the appropriate services either directly or through referrals to community agencies and individuals.

c. An explanation of the services which are available and the requirements for participation, and the securing of a voluntary commitment from each youth to participate in project services prior to admitting the youth into the project.

d. The recording of basic background information on each youth admitted into the project.

e. The assignment of primary responsibility to one staff member for coordinating the services provided to each youth.

f. The contact of the parent(s) or legal guardian of each youth provided temporary shelter within the timeframe established by State law or, in the absence of State requirements, preferably within 24 but within no more than 72 hours following the youth's admission into the project.

3. Temporary Shelter

The project shall provide temporary shelter and food to each youth admitted into the project and requesting such services.

a. Each facility in which temporary shelter is provided shall be in compliance with State and local licensing requirements.

b. Each facility in which temporary shelter is provided shall accommodate at least 4 youth and no more than 20.

c. Temporary shelter funded by the Basic Center program shall not be provided for a period exceeding 15 days during a youth's given stay at the project.

d. Each facility in which temporary shelter is provided shall ensure nutritional needs are met as appropriate for individual youth.

e. At least one adult shall be on the premises whenever youth are using the temporary shelter facility.

f. The shelter shall maintain a ratio of staff to youth that is sufficient to ensure adequate supervision and treatment.

4. Individual and Group Counseling

The project shall provide individual and/or group counseling to each youth admitted into the project.

a. Individual and/or group counseling shall be available daily to each youth admitted into the project on a temporary shelter basis and requesting such counseling.

b. Individual and/or group counseling shall be available to each youth admitted into the project on a non-residential basis and requesting such counseling.

c. The individual and/or group counseling shall be provided by qualified staff.

5. Family Counseling

The project shall make family counseling available to each parent or legal guardian and youth admitted into the project.

a. Family counseling shall be provided to each parent or legal guardian and youth admitted into the project and requesting such services.

b. The family counseling shall be provided by qualified staff.

6. Service Linkages

The project shall establish and maintain linkages with community agencies and individuals for the provision of those services which are required by youth and/or their families but which are not provided directly by the centers.

a. Arrangements shall be made with community agencies and individuals for the provision of alternative living arrangements, medical services, psychological and/or psychiatric services, and the other assistance required by youth admitted into the project and/or by their families which are not provided directly by the project.

b. Specific efforts shall be conducted by the project directed toward establishing working relationships with law enforcement and other juvenile justice system personnel.

7. Recreational Program

The project shall provide a recreational/leisure time schedule of activities for youth admitted to the project for residential care.

8. Case Disposition

The project shall determine, on an individual case basis, the disposition of each youth provided temporary shelter, and shall assure the safe arrival of each youth home or to an alternative living arrangement.

a. To the extent feasible, the project shall provide for the active involvement of the youth, the parent(s) or legal guardian, and the staff in determining what living arrangement constitutes the best interest of each youth.

b. The project shall assure the safe arrival of each youth home or to an alternative living arrangement, following the termination of the crisis services provided by the project, by arranging for the transportation of the youth if he/she will be residing within the area served by the project; or by arranging for the meeting and local transportation of the youth at his/her destination if he/she will be residing beyond the area served by the project.

c. The project shall verify the arrival of each youth who is not accompanied home or to an alternative living arrangement by the parent(s) or legal guardian, project staff or other agency staff within 12 hours after his/her scheduled arrival at his/her destination.

9. Aftercare Services

The project shall provide for continuity of services to all youth served on a temporary shelter basis and/or their families following the termination of such temporary shelter both directly and through referrals to other agencies and individuals.

10. Individual Client Files

The project shall maintain an individual file on each youth admitted into the project.

a. The client file maintained on each youth should, at a minimum, include an intake form which minimally contains the basic background information needed by FYSB; counseling notations; information on the services provided both directly and through referrals to community agencies and individuals; disposition data; and, as applicable, any follow-up and evaluation data which are compiled by the center.

b. The file on each client shall be maintained by the project in a secure place and shall not be disclosed without the written permission of the client and his/her parent(s) or legal guardian except to project staff, to the funding agency(ies) and its (their) contractor(s), and to a court involved in the disposition of criminal charges against the youth.

11. Periodic Reports to the Secretary, HHS

The project shall meet its data reporting requirements via the Runaway and Homeless Youth Management Information System (RHYMIS) or in an approved form which RHYMIS can receive and shall submit reports as required by FYSB, including an annual report for the Secretary of HHS no later than 3 months after the end of each year in which Federal RHY funds were received.

a. The report to the Secretary shall include information regarding the activities carried out with RHY funds, the achievements of the project carried out by the applicant and statistical summaries describing the number and the characteristics of the runaway and homeless youth and youth at risk of family separation who participate in such project, and the services provided to such youth by such project, in the year for which the report is submitted.

b. The project shall submit timely and complete program and financial reports, and data reports under RHYMIS requirements, according to the instructions of FYSB.

12. Staffing and Staff Development

Each center is required to develop and maintain a plan for staffing and staff development.

a. The project shall operate under an affirmative action plan.

b. The project shall maintain a written staffing plan which indicates the number of paid and volunteer staff in each job category.

c. The project shall maintain a written job description for each paid and volunteer staff function which describes both the major tasks to be performed and the qualifications required.

d. The project shall provide training to all paid and volunteer staff (including youth) in both the procedures employed by the project and in specific skill areas as determined by the project.

e. The project shall evaluate the performance of each paid and volunteer staff member on a regular basis.

f. Case supervision sessions, involving relevant project staff, shall be conducted at least weekly to review current cases and the types of counseling and other services which are being provided.

13. Youth Participation

The center shall actively involve youth in the design and delivery of the services provided by the project.

a. Youth shall be involved in the ongoing planning efforts conducted by the project.

b. Youth shall be involved in the delivery of the services provided by the project.

14. Ongoing Center Planning

The center shall develop a written plan at least annually.

a. At least annually, the project shall review the crisis counseling, temporary shelter, and aftercare needs of the youth in the area served by the center and the existing services which are available to meet these needs.

b. The project shall conduct an ongoing evaluation of the impact of its services on the youth and families it serves.

c. At least annually, the project shall review and revise, as appropriate, its goals, objectives, and activities based upon the data generated through both the review of youth needs and existing services (13a) and the follow-up evaluations (13b).

d. The project's planning process shall be open to all paid and volunteer staff, youth, and members of the Board of Directors and/or Advisory Body.

15. Board of Directors/Advisory Body (Optional)

It is strongly recommended that the centers have a Board of Directors or Advisory Body.

a. The membership of the project's Board of Directors or Advisory Body shall be composed of a representative cross-section of

the community, including youth, parents, and agency representatives.

b. Training shall be provided to the Board of Directors or Advisory Body designed to orient the members to the goals, objectives, and activities of the project.

c. The Board of Directors or Advisory Body shall review and approve the overall goals, objectives, and activities of the project, including the written plan developed under standard 14.

Appendix B. Administration for Children and Families Regional Office Youth Contacts

Region I: Maryellen Connors, Administration for Children and Families, John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Room 2011, Boston, MA 02203, (CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT), (617) 565–1119.

Region II: Junius Scott, Administration for Children and Families, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 4114, New York, NY 10278, (NJ, NY, PR, VI), (212) 264–2890, Ext. 145.

Region III: Dick Gilbert, Administration for Children and Families, 150 S. Independence Mall West, Suite 864, Philadelphia, PA 19104–3499, (DC, DE, MD, PA, VA, WV), (215) 861–4031.

Region IV: Ruth Walker, Administration for Children and Families, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., Suite 4M60, Atlanta, GA 30303, (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN), (404) 562–2901.

Region V: Bill Clair, Administration for Children and Families, 233 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 400, Chicago, IL 60601, (IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI), (312) 353–0166.

Region VI: Ralph Rogers, Administration for Children and Families, 1301 Young Street, Dallas, TX 75202, (AR, LA, NM, OK, TX), (214) 767–2977.

Region VII: Dale Scott, Administration for Children and Families, Federal Office Building, Room 384, 601 East 12th Street, Kansas City, MO 64106, (IA, KS, MO, NE), (816) 426–5401, Ext. 181.

Region VIII: Al Martinez, Administration for Children and Families, Federal Office Building, 1961 Stout Street, 9th Floor, Denver, CO 80294, (303) 844–1172, (CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY), (303) 844–1167.

Region IX: Deborah Oppenheim, Administration for Children and Families, 50 United Nations Plaza, San Francisco, CA 94102, (AZ, CA, HI, NV, American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia), (415) 437–8426.

Region X: Steve Ice, Administration for Children and Families, 2201 Sixth Avenue, RX 32, Seattle, WA 98121, (AK, ID, OR, WA), (206) 615–2210.

Appendix C. Training and Technical Assistance Providers

The Family and Youth Services Bureau funds 10 regionally based organizations to provide training and technical assistance to programs funded under the Basic Center, Transitional Living and Street Outreach Programs, and to other agencies serving runaway and homeless youth.

Each of the training and technical assistance providers offers on-site consultations; regional, State and local conferences; information sharing and skill-based training.

For more information, contact the training and technical assistance provider in your region.

Region I

New England Network, 156 College Street, Suite 302, Burlington, VT 05401–8423.

Contact: Melanie Goodman, (802) 658–9182, Fax (802) 951–4201; *information@nenetwork.org.* CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT

Region II

Empire State Coalition of Youth and Family Services, 121—6th Avenue, Room 507, New York, NY 10013–1505.

Contact: Margo Hirsch, (212) 966–6477, Ext. 307, Fax (212) 226–6817; *EMPIREST@empireStatecoalition.org.* NJ, NY, PR, VI

Region III

Mid-Atlantic Network of Youth and Family Services, 135 Cumberland Road, Suite 201, Pittsburgh, PA 15237.

Contact: Nancy Johnson, (412) 366–6562, Fax (412) 366–5407; *Nancy@MANYNET.org.* DC, DE, MD, PA, VA, WV

Region IV

Southeastern Network of Youth and Family Services, 3780 C Via Del Rey, Bonita Springs, FL 34134.

Contact: Sherry Allen, (239) 949–4414, Ext. 14, Fax (239) 949–4911; *sherryallen@senetwork.org.* AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN

Region V

Youth Network Council, 200 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 400, Chicago, IL 60601.

Contact: Denis Murstein, (312) 704–1257, Fax (312) 704–1265; *Murstein@youthnetworkcouncil.org.* IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI

Region VI

Southwest Network of Youth Services, Inc., 2525 Wallingwood Drive, Suite 1503, Austin, TX 78746.

Contact: Theresa Tod, (512) 328–6860, Fax (512) 328–6863; *TTOD@TNOYS.org.* AR, LA, NM, OK, TX

Region VII

M.I.N.K Youth Services Network, 9082 Parkhill, Lenexa, KS 66215.

Contact: Amy Gray, (913) 888–5992, Fax (913) 888–5774; *MINKNET@aol.com.* IA, KS, MO, NE

Region VIII

Mountain Plains Network for Youth, 410 E. Thayer Avenue, #2, Bismarck, ND 58501.

Contact: Linda Garding, (701) 355–0721 or 1–800–665–8682, Fax (701) 255–0848; *MTNPLAINS@aol.com.* CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY

Region IX

Western States Youth Services Network, 1309 Ross Street, Suite B, Petaluma, CA 94954.

Contact: Nancy Fastenau, (707) 763–2213, Fax (707) 763–2704; *wsysn@aol.com.* AZ, CA, HI, NV, AS, GU, NMI, MI, MICRONESIA

Region X

Northwest Network for Youth, 603 Stewart Street, Suite 609, Seattle, WA 98101.

Contact: Gary Hammons, (206) 628–3760, Fax (206) 628–3746; *Gary@nwny.org.* AK, ID, OR, WA

Appendix D: Table of Basic Center Program Allocations by State

FY 2004 Basic Center Program: Allocation By State

	Continuations	New Awards	Totals
Region I:			
Connecticut	255,000	244,645	499,645
Maine	134,371	53,974	188,345
Massachusetts	705,892	203,145	909,037
New Hampshire	0	190,923	190,923
Rhode Island	221,382	0	221,382
Vermont	99,992	8	100,000
Region I Total	1,416,637	692,695	2,109,332
Region II:			
New Jersey	571,721	627,086	1,198,807
New York	2,315,166	500,328	2,815,494
Puerto Rico	344,149	303,452	647,601
Virgin Islands	0	45,000	45,000

FY 2004 BASIC CENTER PROGRAM: ALLOCATION BY STATE—Continued

	Continuations	New Awards	Totals
Region II Total	3,231,036	1,475,866	4,706,902
Region III:			
Delaware	37,857	80,744	118,601
District of Columbia	50,000	50,000	100,000
Maryland	300,000	510,672	810,672
Pennsylvania	673,568	1,103,956	1,777,524
Virginia	680,175	369,188	1,049,363
West Virginia	0	251,054	251,054
Region III Total	1,741,600	2,365,614	4,107,214
Region IV:			
Alabama	315,000	368,053	683,053
Florida	1,076,639	1,130,646	2,207,285
Georgia	708,974	585,472	1,294,446
Kentucky	350,000	253,070	603,070
Mississippi	447,299	0	447,299
North Carolina	724,578	451,943	1,176,521
South Carolina	328,906	290,779	619,685
Tennessee	568,981	274,827	843,808
Region IV Total	4,520,377	3,354,790	7,875,167
Region V:			
Illinois	526,501	1,414,832	1,941,333
Indiana	407,255	546,119	953,374
Michigan	1,181,542	392,199	1,573,741
Minnesota	640,272	145,984	786,256
Ohio	1,129,219	621,512	1,750,731
Wisconsin	320,790	525,580	846,370
Region V Total	4,205,579	3,646,226	7,851,805
Region VI:			
Arkansas	301,070	111,023	412,093
Louisiana	728,489	0	728,489
New Mexico	281,920	0	281,920
Oklahoma	165,060	379,807	544,867
Texas	2,417,036	1,084,111	3,501,147
Region VI Total	3,893,575	1,574,941	5,468,516
Region VII:			
Iowa	337,239	117,740	454,979
Kansas	203,844	229,893	433,737
Missouri	500,000	370,927	870,927
Nebraska	265,475	0	265,475
Region VII Total	1,306,558	718,560	2,025,118
Region VIII:			
Colorado	447,881	211,687	659,568
Montana	0	144,106	144,106
North Dakota	56,425	46,060	102,485
South Dakota	100,000	0	100,000
Utah	415,000	0	415,000
Wyoming	0	100,000	100,000
Region VIII Total	1,019,306	501,853	1,521,159
Region IX:			
American Samoa	.....	.....	.....
Arizona	615,265	192,725	807,990
California	2,829,188	2,437,297	5,266,485
Guam	45,000	0	45,000
Hawaii	174,214	0	174,214
Northern Marianas	.....	45,000	45,000
Nevada	171,878	123,832	295,710
Region IX Total	3,835,545	2,798,854	6,634,399
Region X:			

FY 2004 BASIC CENTER PROGRAM: ALLOCATION BY STATE—Continued

	Continuations	New Awards	Totals
Alaska	94,835	19,360	114,195
Idaho	0	224,955	224,955
Oregon	698,521	0	698,521
Washington	830,965	85,803	916,768
Region X Total	1,624,321	330,118	1,954,439
FY 2004 BCP TOTAL	26,794,534	17,459,517	44,254,051

Note: Agencies in States where zero ($ -0-) funding is reflected on the BCP Table of Allocation are highly encouraged to apply for grant funding in the event that additional funds becomes available.

[FR Doc. 04–8787 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4184–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration

Availability of Funds Announced in the HRSA Mini-Preview

AGENCY: Health Resources and Services Administration.

ACTION: General notice.

SUMMARY: Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) announces the availability of funds in the HRSA Mini-Preview for Spring 2004. The HRSA Preview is a comprehensive review of HRSA's fiscal year (FY) 2004 competitive grant programs. This supplemental edition provides information on programs not initially announced in the full HRSA Preview, which was published in the **Federal Register** on September 4, 2003. (Vol. 68, No. 171)

The purpose of the HRSA Preview is to provide the general public with a single source of program and application information related to the Agency's competitive grant offerings. The HRSA Preview is designed to replace the multiple **Federal Register** notices that traditionally advertised the availability of HRSA's discretionary funds for its various programs. It should be noted that additional program initiatives responsive to new or emerging issues in the health care area and unanticipated at the time of publication of the HRSA Preview may be announced through the **Federal Register** and the HRSA Web site, *http://www.hrsa.gov/grants.htm*. A list of these programs can also be found at the Grants.gov Web site: *http://www.grants.gov*. This notice does not change requirements appearing elsewhere in the **Federal Register**.

This notice is intended to serve as the HRSA Mini-Preview. The HRSA Mini-Preview contains a description of new competitive grant programs scheduled for awards in FY 2004 which were not included in the earlier HRSA Preview, and includes instructions on how to contact the Agency for information and receive application kits for these programs. Specifically, the following information is included in the HRSA Mini-Preview: (1) Program announcement number; (2) program announcement title; (3) program announcement code; (4) legislative authority; (5) Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) identification number; (6) purpose; (7) eligibility; (8) funding priorities and/or preferences; (9) application review criteria; (10) estimated dollar amount of competition; (11) estimated number of awards; (12) estimated project period; (13) application availability date; (14) letter of intent deadline (if any); (15) application deadline; (16) projected award date; and (17) programmatic contact, with telephone and e-mail addresses. Certain other information, including how to obtain and use the HRSA Preview and grant terminology, can also be found in the HRSA Mini-Preview.

This Fiscal Year HRSA began accepting grant applications online. Please refer to the HRSA Web site at *http://www.hrsa.gov/grants/preview/default.htm* for more information.

Dated: April 13, 2004.

Elizabeth M. Duke,

Administrator.

This notice describes funding for the following HRSA discretionary authorities and programs (receipt deadlines are also provided):

Health Professions Programs:
- HRSA–04–086 Nurse Faculty Loan Program (NFLP) 05/19/2004
- HRSA–04–087 Health Careers Adopt a School Demonstration Program (HCSDP) 06/01/2004
- HRSA–04–096 Clinical Experiences in Federally-Funded Community Health Centers for Nurse Practitioners and/or Nurse-Midwifery Students (CENS) 06/07/2004

HIV/AIDS Programs:
- HRSA–04–079 National Quality Improvement/Management Technical Assistance Center Cooperative Agreement (NQC) 06/30/2004

Maternal and Child Health Programs:
- HRSA–04–083 Awareness and Access to Care for Children and Youth with Epilepsy (AACYE) 06/01/2004
- HRSA–04–084 State Oral Health Collaborative Systems (SOHCS) 06/25/2004
- HRSA–04–085 Heritable Disorders Program (HDP) 06/30/2004
- HRSA–04–088 State Grants for Perinatal Depression (SGPD) 06/01/2004
- HRSA–04–094 State Maternal and Child Health Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (SECCS) 06/18/2004

Rural Health Policy Programs:
- HRSA–04–089 Public Access Defibrillation Demonstration Projects (PADDP) 06/10/2004
- HRSA–04–090 Rural Emergency Medical Service Training and Equipment Assistance Program (REMSTEP) 06/10/2004
- HRSA–04–091 Rural Health Best Practices and Community Development Cooperative Agreement (RHCD) 06/21/2004
- HRSA–04–092 Frontier Extended Stay Clinic Cooperative Agreement (FESC) 07/02/2004
- HRSA–04–093 Rural Policy Analysis Cooperative Agreement (RPACA) 06/30/2004

Special Programs—Grants:
- HRSA–04–082 State Planning Grants (SPGP) 06/15/2004
- HRSA–04–095 Media-Based Grass Roots Efforts to Increase Minority Organ Donations (MBMOD) 06/25/2004

How To Use and Obtain Copies of the HRSA Mini-Preview

It is recommended that you read the introductory materials, terminology section, and individual program category descriptions before contacting the toll-free number: 1–877–HRSA–123 (1–877–477–2123), M–F 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. e.s.t. Likewise, we urge applicants to fully assess their eligibility for grants before requesting kits. As a general rule, no more than one kit per category will be mailed to applicants.

To Obtain a Copy of the HRSA Mini-Preview

Unlike the full HRSA Preview, this Mini-Preview will not be available in booklet form. However, the HRSA Mini-Preview will be available on the HRSA homepage via the World Wide Web at: *http://www.hrsa.gov/grants.htm*. You can download this document in Adobe Acrobat format.

To Obtain Application Materials

You may apply for HRSA grants on-line or on paper. HRSA encourages you to apply on-line. HRSA's online system is designed to maximize data accuracy and speed processing. Multiple individuals may register and collaborate on applications, and institutional data is stored for you to re-use on future applications.

To apply online, go to *http://www.hrsa.gov/grants*. On that Web page, you will find basic instructions and links to the HRSA online application system, where you will be able to register, download application guidance for specific programs, and submit your grant application.

Please submit your application early, and pay strict attention to deadlines. Applications submitted after a program's deadline will not be accepted.

To obtain paper application materials, determine which kit(s) you wish to receive and call 1–877–477–2123 to be placed on the mailing list. Be sure to provide the information specialist with the Program Announcement Number, Program Announcement Code and the title of the grant program. You may also request application kits using the e-mail address *hrsagac@hrsa.gov*. Application kits are generally available 30–45 days prior to application deadline. If kits are available earlier, they will be mailed immediately. The guidance contained in the various kits contains detailed instructions, background on the grant program, and other essential information, such as the applicability of Executive Order 12372 and 45 CFR part 100, and additional information pertinent to the intergovernmental review process, as appropriate.

Grant Terminology

Application Deadlines

Applications will be considered on time if they are received on or before the established deadline. Applicants should check the application guidance material or the HRSA-Grants homepage for deadline changes. Applications sent to any address other than that specified in the application guidance are subject to being returned.

Authorization

The citation of the law authorizing the various grant programs is provided immediately following the title of the programs.

CFDA Number

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) is a Government-wide compendium of Federal programs, projects, services, and activities that provide assistance. Programs listed therein are given a CFDA Number.

Cooperative Agreement

A financial assistance mechanism (grant) used when substantial Federal programmatic involvement with the recipient is anticipated by the funding agency during performance of the project. The nature of that involvement will always be specified in the offering or application guidance materials, which HRSA considers to be part of the published program announcement.

DUNS Number

All applicants are now required to have a Dun and Bradstreet (DUNS) number to apply for a grant or cooperative agreement from the Federal Government. The DUNS number is a nine-digit identification number which uniquely identifies business entities. Obtaining a DUNS number is easy and there is no charge. To obtain a DUNS number, access *http://www.dunandbradstreet.com or call 1–866–705–5711*.

Eligibility

The status an entity must possess to be considered for a grant. Authorizing legislation and programmatic regulations specify eligibility for individual grant programs, and eligibility may be further restricted for programmatic reasons. Although program authorizing legislation and regulations provide specific eligibility requirements, generally, assistance is provided to public and nonprofit private organizations and institutions, including faith-based and community-based organizations, State/local governments and their agencies, Federally-recognized Indian Tribes or tribal organizations, and occasionally to individuals. For-profit organizations are eligible to receive awards under financial assistance programs when authorized by legislation.

Estimated Amount of Competition

The funding level listed is provided only as an estimate, and is subject to the availability of funds, Congressional action, and changing program priorities.

Funding Priorities and/or Preferences

Funding preferences, priorities, and special considerations may come from legislation, regulations, or HRSA program leadership decisions. They are not the same as review criteria. Funding preferences are any objective factors that would be used to place a grant application ahead of others without the preference on a list of applicants recommended for funding by a review committee. Some programs give preference to organizations that have specific capabilities such as telemedicine networking, or have established relationships with managed care organizations. Funding priorities are factors that cause a grant application to receive a fixed amount of extra rating points—which may similarly affect the order of applicants on a funding list. Special considerations are other factors considered in making funding decisions that are neither review criteria, preferences, nor priorities, *e.g.*, ensuring that there is an equitable geographic distribution of grant recipients, or meeting requirements for urban and rural proportions.

Letter of Intent

To help in planning the application review process, many HRSA programs request a letter of intent from the applicant in advance of the application deadline. Letters of intent are neither binding nor mandatory. Details on where to send letters can be found in the guidance materials contained in the application kit.

Matching Requirements

Several HRSA programs require a matching amount, or percentage of the total project support, to come from sources other than Federal funds. Matching requirements are generally mandated in the authorizing legislation for specific categories. Also, matching or other cost-sharing requirements may be administratively required by the awarding office. Such requirements are set forth in the application kit.

Program Announcement Code

The program announcement code is a unique identifier for each program funded by HRSA. The three-seven character acronyms are located in parentheses immediately at the end of each program title and must be used to request application materials either from the HRSA Grants Application Center or online at *hrsagac@hrsa.gov*.

Be sure to use the program announcement number, program announcement code and the title of the grant progam when requesting an application kit.

Program Announcement Number

A unique program announcement (HRSA) number is located at the beginning of each program announcement in the HRSA Preview, Mini-Preview and **Federal Register** notices and includes the Fiscal Year and sequence number for announcement; for example, HRSA 04–001.

This number is used with the program title and program announcement code to order application materials.

Project Period

The project period is the total time for which support of a discretionary project has been programmatically approved. The project period usually consists of a series of budget periods of one-year duration. Once approved through initial review, continuation of each successive budget period is subject to satisfactory performance, availability of funds, and program priorities.

Review Criteria

The following are generic review criteria applicable to HRSA programs:

(1) *Need*—The extent to which the application describes the problem and associated contributing factors to the problem.

(2) *Response*—The extent to which the proposed project responds to the "Purpose" included in the program description. The clarity of the proposed goals and objectives and their relationship to the identified project. The extent to which the activities (scientific or other) described in the application are capable of addressing the problem and attaining the project objectives.

(3) *Evaluative Measures*—The effectiveness of the method proposed to monitor and evaluate the project results. Evaluative measures must be able to assess (1) to what extent the program objectives have been met and (2) to what extent these can be attributed to the project.

(4) *Impact*—The extent and effectiveness of plans for dissemination of project results, and/or the extent to which project results may be national in scope and/or the degree to which a community is impacted by delivery of health services, and/or the degree to which the project activities are replicable, and/or the sustainability of the program beyond Federal funding.

(5) *Resources/Capabilities*—The extent to which project personnel are qualified by training and/or experience to implement and carry out the project. The capabilities of the applicant organization, and quality and availability of facilities and personnel to fulfill the needs and requirements of the proposed project. For competing continuations, past performance will also be considered.

(6) *Support Requested*—The reasonableness of the proposed budget in relation to the objectives, the complexity of the activities, and the anticipated results.

(7) *Specific Program Criteria*—Additional specific program criteria, if any, are included in the program description and in the individual guidance material provided with the application kit.

The specific review criteria (that is, specific information detailing each of the above generic criteria) which will be used to review and rank applications are included in the individual guidance material provided with the application kit. Applicants should pay strict attention to addressing these criteria, as they are the basis upon which the reviewers will judge their applications.

Technical Assistance

A contact person is listed for each program and his/her e-mail address and telephone number provided. Some programs may have also scheduled workshops and conference calls. If you have questions concerning individual programs or the availability of technical assistance, please contact the person listed. Also check your application materials and the HRSA Web site at *http://www.hrsa.gov/* for the latest technical assistance information.

Frequently Asked Questions

1. Where Do I Submit Grant Applications?

The address for submitting your grant application will be shown in the guidance document included in the application kit.

2. How Do I Learn More About a Particular Grant Program?

If you want to know more about a program before you request an application kit, an e-mail/telephone contact is listed. This contact person can provide information concerning the specific program's purpose, scope and goals, and eligibility criteria. Usually, you will be encouraged to request the application kit so that you will have clear, comprehensive, and accurate information available to you. When requesting application materials, you must state the program announcement number, the program code and title of the program. The application kit lists telephone numbers for a program expert and a grants management specialist who will provide information about your program of interest if you are unable to find the information within the written materials provided.

In general, the program contact person provides information about the specific grant offering and its purpose, and the grants management specialist provides information about the grant mechanism and business matters, though their responsibilities often overlap.

Information specialists at the toll-free number provide only basic information and administer mailings.

3. The Dates Listed in the HRSA Mini-Preview and the Dates in the Application Kit Do Not Agree. How Do I Know Which Is Correct?

HRSA Mini-Preview dates for application kit availability and application receipt deadlines are based upon the best known information at the time of publication, often several months in advance of the competitive cycle. Occasionally, the grant cycle does not begin as projected and dates must be adjusted. The deadline date stated in your application kit is generally correct. If the application kit has been made available and subsequently the date changes, notification of the change will be mailed to known recipients of the application kit, and also posted on the HRSA home page.

4. Are Programs Announced in the HRSA Mini-Preview Ever Cancelled?

Infrequently, announced programs may be withdrawn from competition. If this occurs, a cancellation notice will be provided in the **Federal Register**, as well as through the HRSA Mini-Preview at the HRSA home page at *http://www.hrsa.gov/grants.htm*. If practicable, an attempt will be made to notify those who have requested a kit for the cancelled program by mail.

HRSA Program Competitions

Health Professions Program

HRSA–04–086 Nurse Faculty Loan Program (NFLP)

CFDA: 93.264.

Legislative Authority: Public Health Service Act, Title VIII, Section 846A.

Purpose: The Nurse Faculty Loan Program authorizes a school of nursing to establish and operate a student loan fund to increase the number of qualified nurse faculty. The school of nursing makes loans from the fund to students enrolled full-time in an advanced degree program in nursing that will prepare students to teach at a school of nursing. Loan recipients who complete the education program may cancel up to 85% of the loan in exchange for serving as full-time nurse faculty at a school of nursing.

Eligibility: Only collegiate schools of nursing are eligible to apply. Schools of nursing must be accredited as defined in section 801(3) of the Public Health Service (PHS) Act and offer full-time advanced degree programs in nursing that prepare students to serve as nurse faculty.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $4,800,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 80.

Estimated Project Period: 1 year.

HRSA–04–086 Nurse Faculty Loan Program (NFLP)

Application Availability: April 18, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: Not required

Application Deadline: May 19, 2004.

Project Award Date: June 30, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Denise Thompson.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–6333.

Program Contact E-Mail: *dthompson@hrsa.gov.*

HRSA–04–087 Health Careers Adopt a School Demonstration Program (HCSDP)

CFDA: 93.822.

Legislative Authority: Public Health Service Act, Title VII, Section 739.

Purpose: The purpose of the HCSDP program is to stimulate the development of partnerships between community-based organizations, schools, and health professionals, exposing under-represented minority (URM) and disadvantaged students to health careers, introducing health career curriculum, improving academic achievement, and promoting healthy lifestyles through education. The HCSDP program is intended to provide models that can be replicated and utilized by schools (middle and high school), community-based organizations and other educational or health related entities, in partnership, to increase the interest, preparation and pursuit of health careers among URM and disadvantaged students. The final product of each project supported by this grant will be the demonstration of the Adopt A School educational curriculum, and a technical assistance presentation detailing the implementation of the model, intended to enhance and support the portability of the program. For FY 2004, funding is available for five to ten (5–10) HCSDP demonstration grants activities. Activities will include: (a) Identifying and recruiting partners; (b) implementing the Adopt A School educational curriculum for middle or high school students; and (c) creating models and procedures for carrying out educational activities utilizing the resource of partners.

Eligibility: Middle schools, high schools, community colleges, universities, non-profit faith-based and community-based organizations, and health or education professional organizations.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $400,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 5–10.

Estimated Project Period: 1 year.

HRSA–04–087 Health Careers Adopt a School Demonstration Program (HCSDP)

Application Availability: April 30, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: Not required.

Application Deadline: June 1, 2004.

Project Award Date: Prior to September 30, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Stuart Weiss.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–5644.

Program Contact E-Mail: *sweiss@hrsa.gov.*

HRSA–04–096 Clinical Experience in Federally-Funded Community Health Centers for Nurse Practitioners and/or Nurse-Midwifery Students (CENS)

CFDA: 93.247.

Legislative Authority: Public Health Service Act, Title VIII, Section 811(f).

Purpose: To establish partnerships between accredited schools of nursing and a Community Health Center (CHC) funded under the Section 330(e) of the Consolidated Health Center Program, Public Health Service (PHS) Act in order to provide nurse practitioner and/or nurse-midwifery graduate students with clinical learning experiences within CHCs. The goal of the grant is to provide nurse practitioner and nurse-midwifery students with clinical experience serving underserved populations, to introduce the students to chronic disease management, and to introduce them to integrated mental health and substance abuse services within the CHC's primary care clinics. Based on increased exposure to nurse practitioner and nurse-midwifery students, an expected outcome of this grant includes increased CHC recruitment of graduate nurse practitioners and nurse-midwives.

Eligibility: Applicants must either be an accredited School of Nursing with a Nurse Practitioner or a Nurse-Midwifery Program, or a CHC funded under section 330(e) of the PHS Act.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $250,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 10.

Estimated Project Period: 1 year.

HRSA–04–096 Clinical Experience in Federally-Funded Community Health Centers for Nurse Practitioners and/or Nurse-Midwifery Students (CENS)

Application Availability: May 3, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: Not required.

Application Deadline: June 7, 2004.

Project Award Date: Prior to September 30, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Carolyn Aoyama, MPH, CNM, RN.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–1272.

Program Contact E-Mail: *caoyama@hrsa.gov.*

HIV/AIDS Programs

HRSA–04–079 National Quality Improvement/Management Technical Assistance Center Cooperative Agreement (NQC)

CFDA: 93.145.

Legislative Authority: Public Health Service Act sec. 2692, 42 U.S.C. 300ff-111.

Purpose: The goal of this Cooperative Agreement is to support the National Quality Improvement/ Management Technical Assistance Center (NQC). The NQC will provide technical assistance related to quality improvement and quality management to Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency (CARE) Act grantees as they improve the quality of care and services and respond to and implement quality management legislative mandates. The NQC is expected to serve as the primary resource for CARE Act grantees on issues related to quality improvement and quality management. There are six (6) main expectations for the NQC. The NQC will: (1) Establish a formal system to triage and field all requests for quality management consultation, (2) Offer

three levels of consultation/technical assistance (TA) to meet the varied quality improvement/management needs of the CARE Act grantees: Level (1) Information dissemination; Level (2) training and educational forums; and Level (3) intensive consultation on/off-site; (3) Measure achievement of program objectives and impact of the program and implement an internal continuous quality improvement program; (4) Actively collaborate with the HIV/AIDS Bureau (HAB), HAB's TA programs, grantees and subcontractors, and other identified contractors to achieve the program's expectations; (5) Within the TA strategy, incorporate responses to Congressionally-mandated reports, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), HRSA and HAB performance measures and other HAB quality management initiatives; and (6) Establish a Steering Committee or Advisory Board that is representative of the CARE Act grantees.

Eligibility: Eligible entities include public or private non-profit entities, including schools and academic health sciences centers. Faith-based and community-based organizations are eligible to apply. Applicants must have extensive experience in the field of quality improvement, working with Ryan White CARE Act grantees and providing technical assistance.

Federal Involvement: The scope of Federal involvement is included in the application kit.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $1,500,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 1.

Estimated Project Period: 5 years.

HRSA–04–079 National Quality Improvement/Management Technical Assistance Center Cooperative Agreement (NQC)

Application Availability: April 30, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: June 1, 2004.

Application Deadline: June 30, 2004.

Project Award Date: August 31, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Dr. Magda Barini-Garcia.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–6366.

Program Contact E-Mail: mbarini-garcia@hrsa.gov.

Maternal and Child Health Programs

HRSA–04–083 Awareness and Access To Care for Children and Youth With Epilepsy (AACYE)

CFDA: 93.110.

Legislative Authority: Social Security Act, Title V, Section 501(a)(2).

Purpose: The purpose of this initiative is to improve access to comprehensive, coordinated health care and related services for children and youth with epilepsy residing in medically underserved areas (MUAs). The initiative supports (1) development of an epilepsy demonstration program to improve access to health and other services regarding seizures and to encourage early detection and treatment for children and youth with epilepsy residing in medically underserved areas, especially rural medically underserved areas, and (2) establishment of a public education and awareness campaign directed toward racial and ethnic populations to improve access to care. Applications will be accepted in three priority areas: Priority #1 (grants): development of statewide demonstration grants to improve access to health and other services for children and youth residing in medically underserved areas; Priority #2 (cooperative agreement): development of a national Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) strategy using a learning collaborative model to support grantees funded through Priority #1 to improve access to and quality of care for children and youth with epilepsy; and Priority # 3 (cooperative agreement): development of a national public education and awareness campaign directed toward racial and ethnic populations to improve access to care for children and youth with epilepsy.

Eligibility: As cited in 42 CFR part 51a.3(a), any public or private entity, including an Indian tribe or tribal organization (as those terms are defined at 25 U.S.C. 450b), faith-based or community-based organization, is eligible to apply for these funds.

Funding Preferences: Applicants serving medically underserved areas and populations, including qualified rural and urban communities, are strongly encouraged to apply.

Federal Involvement: The scope of Federal involvement for Priorities 2 and 3 is included in the application kit.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $3,000,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: Priority #1: 6–8; Priority #2: 1; Priority #3: 1.

Estimated Project Period: 3 years.

HRSA–04–083 Awareness and Access To Care for Children and Youth With Epilepsy (AACYE)

Application Availability: April 16, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: April 30, 2004.

Application Deadline: June 1, 2004.

Project Award Date: Prior to September 30, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Bonnie Strickland.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–2370.

Program Contact E-Mail: bstrickland@hrsa.gov.

HRSA–04–084 State Oral Health Collaborative Systems (SOHCS)

CFDA: 93.110.

Legislative Authority: Social Security Act, Title V, Section 501(a)(2).

Purpose: This grant program has been developed with the intention of supporting States' efforts to develop, implement or otherwise strengthen State strategies to better integrate oral health into State MCH programs, address MCHB performance measures in oral health and stimulate action toward implementation of the Surgeon General's National Call to Action to Promote Oral Health as it affects women and children. The underlying goal of this grant program is to increase access to oral health services for Medicaid and State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) eligible children, and other underserved children and their families. Because of the cross-cutting oral health needs of women and children, collaborative strategies may range from broad-based interventions such as strategic planning, public/private partnerships and comprehensive integrated support systems to more narrowly focused interventions in such areas as early childhood dental decay, sealant and prevention programs.

Eligibility: Only State (defined in this offering as State and State Jurisdictions/Territories) oral health program offices are eligible to apply for State Oral Health Collaborative Systems grant funding. A State may specifically request and designate another government or non-government agency, so long as it provides a convincing justification for so doing. States designating another agency must submit an endorsement acknowledging that the applicant has consulted with the State and that the State has been assured that the applicant will work with the State on the proposed project. This endorsement must accompany the application. Without the endorsement, the application will not be considered for funding. Additionally, because of the importance of linking oral health activities with systems of care for children, the involvement of the State MCH program must be demonstrated either by a co-signed application or by a letter of support.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $3,835,000.00.
Estimated Number of Awards: 59.
Estimated Project Period: 3 years.

HRSA–04–084 State Oral Health Collaborative Systems (SOHCS)

Application Availability: April 27, 2004.
Letter of Intent Deadline: May 12, 2004.
Application Deadline: June 25, 2004.
Project Award Date: September 1, 2004.
Program Contact Person: Mark E. Nehring, DMD, MPH.
Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–3449.
Program Contact E-Mail: mnehring@hrsa.gov.

HRSA–04–085 Heritable Disorders Program (HDP)

CFDA: 93.110.
Legislative Authority: Social Security Act, Title V, Section 501(a)(2).
Purpose: Heritable Disorders Program (Program) was established to enhance, improve or expand the ability of State and local public health agencies to provide screening, counseling or health care services to newborns and children having or at risk for heritable disorders. This Program shall improve the access to newborn screening and genetic services for medically underserved populations and shall enhance such activities as: screening, follow-up services; augmentation of capacity needs: training, education; subspecialty linkage; expansion of long term follow-up activities; strengthening of linkage to medical homes; strengthening of linkage to tertiary care; strengthening of genetic counseling services; and enhancement of communication/education to families and health practitioners and other forms of information sharing.

This initiative, through the use of cooperative agreements, supports the Heritable Disorders Program through: (1) A national coordinating center; (2) regional genetic service and newborn screening collaboratives; and (3) increasing the screening capacity of newborn screening programs to improve early identification of infants with hyperbilirubinemia. The Program is divided into three projects:

Project 1: Regional Genetics and Newborn Screening Collaboratives National Coordinating Center—The Regional Genetics and Newborn Screening Collaboratives National Coordinating Center is to be responsive to the priorities of the Heritable Disorders Program as indicated under title V, section 501(a)(2) of the Social Security Act. The National Coordinating Center will serve to coordinate and monitor the implementation of MCHB-funded Regional Genetics and Newborn Screening Collaboratives projects and provide a community forum between the Regional Collaborative projects, MCHB, and other relevant organizational entities to identify and prioritize issues of importance to the genetics and newborn screening community, specifically regarding the utilization of genetic services at the National, State, and community levels.

Project 2: Regional Genetics and Newborn Screening Collaboratives—The Regional Genetics and Newborn Screening Collaboratives are to be responsive to the priorities of the Heritable Disorders Program as indicated under Title V, Section 501(a)(2) of the Social Security Act. The Regional Genetics and Newborn Screening Collaboratives project will enhance and support the genetics and newborn screening capacity of States across the nation by undertaking a regional approach toward addressing the maldistribution of genetic resources. These grants are expected to improve the health of children and their families by promoting the translation of genetic medicine into public health and health care services. In order to address capacity needs nationally, seven regions have been identified. These regions are:

Region 1: CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT
Region 2: DC, DE, MD, NY, NJ, PA, VA, WV
Region 3: AL, FL, GA, LA, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN, VI
Region 4: IL, IN, KY, MI, MN, OH, WI
Region 5: AR, IA, KS, MO, ND, NE, OK, SD
Region 6: AZ, CO, MT, NM, TX, UT, WY
Region 7: AK, CA, HI, ID, NV, OR, WA, Pacific Basin

Applicants must propose to serve one of the defined regions.

Project 3: Screening for Hyperbilirubinemia in the Term Newborn—The purpose of this project is to prospectively assess and validate one or more previously published methods that will predict the risk of a term or near-term newborn developing significant hyperbilirubinemia in the first two weeks of life. Potential methods to be assessed and validated include clinical risk factors analysis, hour specific nomogram for total serum bilirubin levels and transcutaneous measurements of serum bilirubin.

Eligibility: For all Projects: As cited in 42 CFR part 51a.3(a), any public or private entity, including a faith-based or community-based organization, an Indian Tribe or tribal organization (as those terms are defined in 25 U.S.C. 450b), is eligible to apply for Federal funding. For Project 2: Those eligible applicants must be based within the identified region it will serve and be part of a collaborative network of public health program entities responsible for genetic and/or newborn screening and services in at least 4 different States.

Federal Involvement: The scope of federal involvement with respect to all of the cooperative agreements is included in the application kit.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $3,950,000.00.
Estimated Number of Awards: Project 1: 1; Project 2: 7; Project 3: 1.
Estimated Project Period: 3 years.

HRSA–04–085 Heritable Disorders Program (HDP)

Application Availability: April 16, 2004.
Letter of Intent Deadline: April 23, 2004.
Application Deadline: June 30, 2004.
Project Award Date: September 30, 2004.
Program Contact Person: Michele A. Lloyd-Puryear, M.D., Ph.D.
Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–1080.
Program Contact E-Mail: mpuryear@hrsa.gov.

HRSA–04–088 State Grants for Perinatal Depression (SGPD)

CFDA: 93.110.
Legislative Authority: Social Security Act, Title V, 42 U.S.C. 701.
Purpose: The purpose of this grant program is to focus on expanding the capacity in State Maternal and Child Health programs to launch an intensive multi-lingual public health campaign that, at the grassroots level, will promote mental wellness for mothers and their families, as well as a better understanding of perinatal depression and the warning signs associated with it. The goals of this endeavor are to reduce the stigma associated with perinatal depression; to increase the number of women and their families who seek treatment; and, to increase the number of health and community-based providers to be able to recognize the signs and symptoms of perinatal depression, provide screening for perinatal depression and related mental health problems, and refer for further assessment and treatment as necessary. This initiative would require the States to work to decrease barriers to care for families with signs of perinatal depression and related mental health problems. To maximize the use of this one-time funding, the competition

would capitalize on existing State assets, such as a hotline that has the existing capacity to make referrals, an American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology chapter currently working on perinatal depression, one or more Healthy Start sites that screen and refer for treatment, Postpartum Support International chapters that offer support groups, or other similar endeavors that are already working to address the needs of mothers and their families in perinatal depression and other related mental health problems.

Eligibility: Any State Maternal and Child Health Department is eligible to apply. If designated by the State Title V agency as cited in 42 CFR part 51a.3(a), any public/private entity, including an Indian Tribe or tribal organization (as those terms are defined at 25 U.S.C. 450b), faith-based or community-based organization is eligible to apply for this Federal funding. Funding would be made available to States that have existing community-based activities in perinatal depression and related mental health problems, including infant mental health.

Special Consideration: For the purposes of this grant program, only one (1) applicant per State will be funded.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $1,000,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 4–5.

Estimated Project Period: 1 year.

HRSA–04–088 State Grants for Perinatal Depression (SGPD)

Application Availability: April 15, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: May 3, 2004.

Application Deadline: June 1, 2004.

Project Award Date: September 30, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Janice Berger.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–9992.

Program Contact E-Mail: *jberger@hrsa.gov.*

HRSA–04–094 State Maternal and Child Health Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (SECCS)

CFDA: 93.110.

Legislative Authority: Social Security Act, Title V, Section 502(a)(1).

Purpose: The purpose of these grants is to support States to plan, develop, and ultimately implement collaborations and partnerships to support families and communities in their development of children that are healthy and ready to learn at school entry. This grant initiative combines the thrust engendered in the Maternal and Child Health Bureau's (MCHB) Early Childhood Health Strategic Plan with the experience of the State and local systems building initiatives supported through MCHB's Community Integrated Services Systems (CISS) grants program since 1992. While funding will be in two stages, planning and implementation, only planning grants are offered at this time. Plans would anticipate the implementation of systems which would include, but not be limited to, the following initiatives: (1) Access to medical homes providing comprehensive physical and child development services for all children in early childhood including children with special health care needs and assessment, intervention, and referral of children with developmental, behavioral and psycho-social problems; (2) availability of services to address the needs of children at risk for the development of mental health problems, and service delivery pathways to facilitate entrance of at risk children into appropriate child development and mental health delivery systems; (3) early care and education services for children from birth through five years of age that support children's early learning, health, and development of social competence; (4) parenting education services that provide support to parents in their role as prime educators of their children; and (5) family support services that address the stressors impairing the ability of families to nurture and support the healthy development of their children.

Through Planning Grants, State Maternal and Child Health programs would be expected to provide leadership in the development of cross systems service integration. They would work closely with other State public and private agencies to coordinate their efforts into a common focus on assuring the availability of a broad range of early childhood intervention services. Examples of such agencies would be the State administrations for Mental Health, Public Welfare, Education, Child Welfare, local and county health departments, March of Dimes, Easter Seal Society, etc. This grant should facilitate: (1) A completed needs assessment with respect to early childhood intervention; (2) a completed plan for action based on the needs assessment; and (3) documented evidence of the contribution and commitment of their partners to carry out this plan. The achievement of these essential goals is requisite for States to apply for an implementation grant.

Eligibility: Only State (defined in this offering as State and State Jurisdictions/Territories) Title V Maternal and Child Health Program Offices are eligible to apply for State Maternal and Child Health Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems grant funding. Furthermore, this offering is limited to those States which have never received funding through this initiative or those States whose funding has been limited to a one-year project period.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $1,000,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 10.

Estimated Project Period: 2 years.

HRSA–04–094 State Maternal and Child Health Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (SECCS)

Application Availability: April 23, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: May 7, 2004.

Application Deadline: June 18, 2004.

Project Award Date: August 1, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Joseph Zogby, MSW.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–4393.

Program Contact E-Mail: jzogby@hrsa.gov.

Rural Health Policy Programs

HRSA–04–089 Public Access Defibrillation Demonstration Projects (PADDP)

CFDA: 93.259.

Legislative Authority: Section 330A of the PHS Act, note (42 U.S.C. 254c, note).

Purpose: The Public Access Defibrillation Demonstration Grant Program is designed to assist both urban and rural communities in increasing survivability from sudden cardiac arrest. This grant program provides funding for the purchase, placement, and training in the use of automated external defibrillators (AEDs).

Eligibility: Eligible applicants will include, but not be limited to: first responders (*e.g.*, EMS, law enforcement and fire departments) and local for and non-profit entities that may include, but are not limited to, long-term care facilities, rural health clinics, Federally Qualified Health Centers, Indian Health Service clinics and tribal EMS services, post offices, libraries and other civic centers, athletic facilities (*i.e.*, high school playing fields where a town may gather for games), senior citizen and child day care facilities, faith-based organizations and schools.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit. Pre-applications will be reviewed and scored based on how well applicants developed their abstract based on their need and the criteria provided in the

program guidance. Top applicants will be invited to submit a fully developed application which will be field reviewed.

Administrative Funding Preference: Applicants proposing to use a regional approach and distance learning to address common needs of one region are strongly encouraged to apply.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $900,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 3–5.

Estimated Project Period: 3 years.

HRSA–04–089 Public Access Defibrillation Demonstration Projects (PADDP)

Application Availability: May 10, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: Not required.

Application Deadline: June 10, 2004. HRSA will be using a pre-application process. Deadline to submit a nine-page pre-application is June 10, 2004. Pre-applications will undergo an internal review process and a subset of the reviewed proposals will be invited to submit a full and complete proposal, which will be due on July 30, 2004.

Project Award Date: Prior to September 30, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Blanca Fuertes.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–0612.

Program Contact E-Mail: bfuertes@hrsa.gov.

HRSA–04–090 Rural Emergency Medical Service Training and Equipment Assistance Program (REMSTEP)

CFDA: 93.912.

Legislative Authority: Public Health Service Act, Section 330J.

Purpose: The Rural EMS Training and Equipment Assistance Grant Program was enacted to assist rural and frontier communities in increasing access to desperately needed funding for EMS agencies serving such areas. This grant program provides funding for innovative solutions to continuing education, initial provider licensure, skill retention and expanding scopes of practice to support paramedicine as a source of primary care in rural and frontier communities. Medical direction and emergency medical dispatcher training is also eligible. In addition, assistance towards the purchase of life saving equipment may also be obtained via this program. Such equipment could include advanced airway adjuncts, manual defibrillators, intravascular (IV) access training and equipment, etc.

Eligibility: Eligible applicants will be emergency services training entities, State Offices of Rural Health, State EMS Offices (and regional affiliates), State EMS associations, local governmental entities, and individual EMS agencies. Former and current rural health grantees already involved in EMS are also encouraged to apply.

All services funded via this program must take place in an eligible rural area. Eligible rural counties may be found at *http://www.ruralhealth.hrsa.gov/ruralcol.htm* and Rural-Urban Commuting Area ZIP Codes may be found at *http://www.ruralhealth.hrsa.gov/ruralcoZIPII.htm*. Each listing is sorted by State. ZIP Code listings are to include rural census tracts of Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as determined by the most recent Goldsmith Modification, originally published in the **Federal Register** on February 27, 1992, 57 FR 6725. The applicant of record, however, may be located in an MSA if they can document in their application that serves non-MSA residents.

Matching Requirement: Mandatory 25 percent matching requirement.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit. Pre-applications will be reviewed and scored based on how well applicants developed their abstract based on their need and the criteria provided in the program guidance. Top applicants will be invited to submit a fully developed application which will be field reviewed.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $370,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 2–3.

Estimated Project Period: 3 years.

HRSA–04–090 Rural Emergency Medical Service Training and Equipment Assistance Program (REMSTEP)

Application Availability: May 10, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: Not required.

Application Deadline: June 10, 2004. HRSA will be using a pre-application process. Deadline to submit a nine page pre-application is June 10, 2004. Pre-applications will undergo an internal review process and a subset of the reviewed proposals will be invited to submit a full and complete proposal, which will be due on July 30, 2004.

Project Award Date: prior to September 30, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Blanca Fuertes.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–0612.

Program Contact E-Mail: bfuertes@hrsa.gov.

HRSA–04–091 Rural Health Best Practices and Community Development Cooperative Agreement (RHCD)

CFDA: 93.155.

Legislative Authority: Section 711(b) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 912(b).

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to develop and continue a number of projects that (1) help identify and promote best practices for rural health care providers in terms of quality of care and economic viability by addressing needs related to access to care, workforce, networking and performance improvement through a variety of approaches, including workshops, conferences, technical assistance and other outreach efforts; (2) provide resources to communities for help in shaping their local health care systems to best meet community need; (3) promote best practices to help rural communities with health quality initiatives; (4) identify and translate the key points from emerging policy issues to rural health care providers, researchers and policymakers; and (5) work with State-based entities such as State Offices of Rural Health and State Rural Health Associations to provide technical assistance in identifying key rural health challenges and programs and resources that will assist rural communities in addressing these challenges.

Eligibility: Eligibility is open to public and private non-profit organizations, faith-based and community-based organizations, State Governments and their agencies such as universities, colleges, research institutions, hospitals, State and local governments or their bona fide agents along with federally recognized Indian tribal governments, Indian tribes, and Indian tribal organizations. Applicants who currently receive funding through the HRSA Office of Rural Health Policy Rural Health Research Center Cooperative Agreement program are not eligible.

Federal Involvement: The scope of Federal involvement is included in the application kit.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $800,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 1.

Estimated Project Period: 5 years.

HRSA–04–091 Rural Health Best Practices and Community Development Cooperative Agreement (RHCD)

Application Availability: May 10, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: May 24, 2004.

Application Deadline: June 21, 2004.
Project Award Date: Prior to September 1, 2004.
Program Contact Person: Jennifer Riggle.
Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–7530.
Program Contact E-Mail: *jriggle@hrsa.gov.*

HRSA–04–092 Frontier Extended Stay Clinic Cooperative Agreement (FESC)

CFDA: 93.912.
Legislative Authority: Section 330A of the Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 254c.
Purpose: The purpose of this cooperative agreement program is to evaluate the effectiveness of a new type of provider, the "Frontier Extended Stay Clinic." Funds awarded under Category One/Model Development must be used for the support of activities related to the coordination of FESC efforts throughout a State, including the development of FESC protocols, licensure and certification criteria and program evaluation. Funds awarded under Category Two/Model Feasibility must be used to educate eligible providers about the FESC model and determine if the model would be viable for those providers.
Eligibility: Funds awarded under the authority of Section 330A of the Public Health Service Act must be awarded to a rural public or rural non-profit private entity. Funds awarded under this authority also require the development of a consortium of at least three separately owned organizations that provide health care services. For-profit organizations may be members of consortiums, but they are not eligible to be applicants. The purpose of the consortium requirement is to encourage creative and lasting collaborative relationships among service providers in rural areas. Members of a consortium might include hospitals, public health agencies, primary care service providers, rural health clinics, emergency services providers, and community and migrant health centers. Faith-based organizations are eligible to apply as members of a consortium. At least one member of the consortium must be an operational clinic or hospital, currently providing primary care services and located at least 75 miles from the nearest acute care or critical access hospital. The roles and responsibilities of each member organization must be clearly defined and each must contribute significantly to the goals of the project.

The applicant organization must not have received a grant under this subsection (other than for planning activities) for the same or a similar project.

Applicants for funds under Category One/Model Development of this program must also submit evidence of the support of the agency of their State's government responsible for the licensure and certification of health care entities.

Funding Preferences: Section 330A of the Public Health Service Act provides a funding preference for some applicants. Applicants receiving a preference will be placed in a more competitive position among the applicants that can be funded. A funding preference will be given to qualified applicants that can demonstrate either of the following two criteria:

A. Those applicants for which the service area is located in officially designated health professional shortage areas (HPSAs) OR medically underserved communities (MUCs) OR serve medically underserved populations (MUPs). To ascertain HPSA and MUP designation status, please refer to the following Web site: *http://bhpr.hrsa.gov/shortage/index.htm.*

To qualify as a Medically Underserved Community (MUC), the project must include facilities that are federally designated as one of the following:

(i) Community Health Centers;
(ii) Migrant Health Centers;
(iii) Health Care for the Homeless Grantees;
(iv) Public Housing Primary Care Grantees;
(v) Rural Health Clinics;
(vi) National Health Service Corps sites;
(vii) Indian Health Service sites;
(viii) Federally Qualified Health Centers;
(ix) Primary Medical Care Health Professional Shortage Areas;
(x) Dental Health Professional Shortage Areas;
(xi) Nurse Shortage Areas;
(xii) State or Local Health Departments;
(xiii) Ambulatory practice sites designated by State Governors as serving medically underserved communities; or

B. Those applicants whose projects focus on primary care, and wellness and prevention strategies.

To receive a funding preference, applicants must clearly identify and demonstrate which preference they are requesting as instructed in the program guidance and application instructions.

Prospective applicants are required to notify their State Office of Rural Health or other appropriate State government entity early in the application process to advise them of their intent to apply. The State Offices can often provide technical assistance to applicants.

Federal Involvement: The scope of Federal involvement is included in the application kit.
Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.
Estimated Amount of This Competition: $1,500,000.00.
Estimated Number of Awards: 6.
Estimated Project Period: 1 year.

HRSA–04–092 Frontier Extended Stay Clinic Cooperative Agreement (FESC)

Application Availability: April 16, 2004.
Letter of Intent Deadline: Not required.
Application Deadline: July 2, 2004.
Project Award Date: Prior to September 30, 2004.
Program Contact Person: Emily Costich.
Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–0502.
Program Contact E-Mail: *ecostich@hrsa.gov.*

HRSA–04–093 Rural Policy Analysis Cooperative Agreement (RPACA)

CFDA: 93.155.
Legislative Authority: Section 711(b) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 912(b).
Purpose: The purpose of this program is to (1) facilitate public dialogue on key rural policy issues by tracking emerging rural health policy issues, and synthesize them in a manner that provides for easy understanding by rural community leaders with particular emphasis on rural health care providers and systems; (2) identify opportunities for integrating health and human services in rural policy, program and evaluation in a local community context; (3) assist rural communities in understanding how geographic information systems technology can be brought to bear in rural community planning activities; and (4) provide community leaders with assistance in examining ways community colleges and workforce investment boards can help address rural health and human service workforce needs.
Eligibility: Eligibility is open to public and private non-profit organizations, faith-based and community-based organizations, State Governments and their agencies such as universities, colleges, research institutions, hospitals, State and local governments or their bona fide agents, along with Federally recognized Indian tribal governments, Indian tribes and Indian tribal organizations. Applicants who currently

receive funding through the HRSA Office of Rural Health Policy Rural Health Research Center Cooperative Agreement program are not eligible.

Federal Involvement: The scope of Federal involvement is included in the application kit.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $175,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 1.

Estimated Project Period: 3 years.

HRSA–04–093 Rural Policy Analysis Cooperative Agreement (RPACA)

Application Availability: April 23, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: May 30, 2004.

Application Deadline: June 30, 2004.

Project Award Date: Prior to September 1, 2004

Program Contact Person: Nisha Patel.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–6894.

Program Contact E-Mail: *npatel@hrsa.gov.*

Special Programs—Grants

HRSA–04–082 State Planning Grants (SPGP)

CFDA: 93.256.

Legislative Authority: Public Law 108–199.

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to ensure that every citizen in every State has access to affordable health insurance benefits similar in scope to the Federal Employee Benefit Plan, Medicaid, benefits offered to State employees, or other similar quality benchmarks. Each new State grantee is to develop a plan or propose options to meet this objective. Continuation Limited Competition Grants will be awarded to complete and/or enhance existing work. Pilot Planning Limited Competition Grants will be awarded to plan for a pilot project to expand insurance based on options previously developed.

Eligibility: For new grants, eligible applicants are any public State entity designated by the Governor of that State. Applicant States for new grants may not have previously received a State Planning Grant. For continuation and pilot planning limited competition grants, eligible applicants are any public State entity that has previously received a State Planning Grants Program grant. Only one overall application per State is accepted.

Review Criteria: Final review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $14,800,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 7 new grants; 24 Continuation Limited Competition grants; 8 Pilot Planning Limited Competition grants.

Estimated Project Period: 1 year.

HRSA–04–082 State Planning Grants (SPGP)

Application Availability: April 16, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: May 7, 2004.

Application Deadline: June 15, 2004.

Project Award Date: Prior to September 1, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Judy Humphrey.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–2309.

Program Contact E-Mail: *jhumphrey@hrsa.gov.*

HRSA–04–095 Media-Based Grass Roots Efforts To Increase Minority Organ Donation (MBMOD)

CFDA: 93.134.

Legislative Authority: Public Health Service Act, Section 371(a)(3), 42 U.S.C. 273(a)(3) as Amended.

Purpose: The goal of this grant program is to promote multifaceted interventions that use broadcast media to increase intent to donate solid organs in minority communities. Specifically, HRSA's Division of Transplantation (DoT) wishes to fund projects that consist of a television or television and radio component with complementary community donation education programs in multiple venues (*e.g.*, schools, worksites, faith institutions). Projects must target an ethnic minority group in a geographic area with particularly high numbers of that population. Funds from this grant program are primarily to support the media component of the intervention. No less than 80 percent of grant funds may be used to purchase media air time. No grant funds shall be used for development of radio or television ads. Projects must use existing ads that are appropriate for the target population (such as those produced by the Coalition on Donation, Division of Transplantation grants, or other organizations). Only if media ads do not exist for the target population may applicants justify use of grant funds for ad development. In all cases, up to 20 percent of grant funds may be used to support evaluation and grass roots activities.

Eligibility: Federally designated organ procurement organizations and other private not-for-profit entities eligible for funds under section 371(a)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 273(a)(3).

Special Considerations: HRSA reserves the option to achieve a balance among funded projects with respect to various parameters, *e.g.*, target populations, geography, and intervention diversity.

Review Criteria: Review criteria are included in the application kit.

Estimated Amount of This Competition: $1,250,000.00.

Estimated Number of Awards: 4–5.

Estimated Project Period: 2 years.

HRSA–04–095 Media-Based Grass Roots Efforts To Increase Minority Organ Donation (MBMOD)

Application Availability: May 11, 2004.

Letter of Intent Deadline: June 4, 2004.

Application Deadline: June 25, 2004.

Project Award Date: September 30, 2004.

Program Contact Person: Judy Ceresa.

Program Contact Phone Number: (301) 443–8727.

Program Contact E-Mail: *judy.ceresa@hrsa.gov.*

HRSA News—Additional Information

Guidance and Policy Statement of Religious Nondiscrimination in Grant Eligibility and Service Delivery Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations

The Department, in formulating and developing policies with implications for faith-based organizations and other community organizations, assists in furthering the national effort to expand opportunities for, and strengthen the capacity of, faith-based and other community organizations so that they may better meet social needs in America's communities. In awarding grant funding, the Department follows these fundamental principles regarding faith-based and other community organizations:

(a) Federal financial assistance for grant programs will be distributed in the most effective and efficient manner possible;

(b) The Nation's social service capacity will benefit if all eligible organizations, including faith-based and other community organizations, are able to compete on an equal footing for the Department's grant funding;

(c) No organization will be discriminated against on the basis of religion or religious belief in the administration or distribution of these grant funds;

(d) All organizations that receive such Departmental grant funding will be prohibited from discriminating against beneficiaries or potential beneficiaries of the funded programs on the basis of religion or religious belief. Accordingly, organizations, in providing services

supported in whole or in part with these grant funds, and in their outreach activities related to such services, cannot discriminate against current or prospective program beneficiaries on the basis of religion, a religious belief, a refusal to hold a religious belief, or a refusal to actively participate in a religious practice;

(e) Organizations that engage in inherently religious activities, such as worship, religious instruction, and proselytization, must offer those services separately in time or location from any programs or services supported with direct grant funding, and participation in any such inherently religious activities must be voluntary for the beneficiaries of the grant program; and

(f) A faith-based organization that applies for or participates in a Departmental grant program may retain its independence and may continue to carry out its mission, including the definition, development, practice, and expression of its religious beliefs, provided that it does not use direct Departmental grant funding to support any inherently religious activities, such as worship, religious instruction, or proselytization. Among other things, faith-based organizations that receive Departmental grant funding may use their facilities to provide the grant funded activities without removing or altering religious art, icons, scriptures, or other symbols from these facilities. In addition, a faith-based organization that receives Departmental grant funding may retain religious terms in its organization's name, select its board members on a religious basis, and include religious references in its organization's mission statements and other chartering or governing documents.

Key Facts About the Grants.gov Program Spring 2004

www.grants.gov. Find. Apply. Succeed.

Overview

Grants.gov has simplified the grants management process, and created a centralized, online process to find and apply for over 600 grant programs from the 26 Federal grant-making agencies. Grants.gov has streamlined the process of awarding $360+ billion annually to state and local governments, academia, not-for-profits and other organizations. This program is one of the 24 Federal cross-agency e-government initiatives focused on improving access to services via the Internet. The vision for grants.gov is to produce a simple, unified source to electronically find, apply, and manage grant opportunities. Additionally, the grants.gov initiative will facilitate efficient operations for Federal grant agencies and the grant community.

Agencies will allow applicants for Federal grants to apply for and ultimately manage grant funds online through a common Web site, simplifying grants management and eliminating redundancies.

(The President's FY 2002 Management Agenda)

Standardizing Federal grant management activities is a priority for the Administration and Congress, as evidenced by Public Law 106–107, legislation that mandates streamlining and improved accountability for Federal grants, and related references in the President's Management Agenda.

Benefits

Grants.gov will serve as the common face for Federal grant program information and applications. Key benefits include: (1) A single source for finding grant opportunities, helping applicants locate and learn more about funding opportunities in a standardized manner; and (2) a single, secure and reliable source for applying for Federal Grants online, simplifying the grant application process and reducing paperwork

Grants.gov will provide a unified interface for all agencies to announce their grant opportunities, and for all potential grantees to find and apply for grants. Grants.gov simplifies the entire application process, while also creating avenues for consolidation and best practices within each grant-making agency.

Progress and Next Steps

The first stage of Grants.gov was a successful pilot that enabled participating grantors to post and grant seekers to search for grant opportunities. Most Federal grant-making agencies are now posting all of their competitive grant opportunities to Grants.gov. Here's how it works: a grant seeker from an organization, for instance, visits the Grants.gov Web site to search for grant opportunities. Once a match is found, the organization downloads an electronic application to apply for the grant. The organization would complete the application and then submit it through the Grants.gov site. The application is time stamped and the appropriate Federal agency has immediate access to it. The agency will receive the application, sending confirmation back to the applicant through Grants.gov. Processing will be accelerated by avoiding the handling of paper applications. The Department of Health and Human Services, managing partner for the Grants.gov program, is supported by 10 additional "partner" agencies. A list of these agencies can be found on the Grants.gov Web site, at *http://www.grants.gov*. The Grants.gov team is also working closely with the grant community and organizations that represent them, to facilitate delivery of a system that will meet their needs. We are in close contact with the Council of State Governments, the National Council for Nonprofit Associations, and the Federal Demonstration Partnership, to name just a few. Questions? Visit *http://www.grants.gov* to access past and current materials on the Grants.gov program or e-mail your questions to *info@grants.gov*.

Office of Management & Budget Requirement—DUNS Number for all Federal Applicants

In order to improve the statistical reporting of federal grants and cooperative agreements, the Office of Management and Budget has directed federal agencies to require all applicants to provide a Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number when applying for Federal grants or cooperative agreements on or after October 1, 2003. The DUNS number is now required whether an applicant is submitting a paper or an electronic application, and whether an applicant is applying for a new award or renewal of a current award.

Use of the DUNS number government-wide will provide a cost-effective means to identify entities receiving those awards and their business relationships. The identifier will be used for tracking purposes, and to validate address and point of contact information. The DUNS number already is in use by the federal government to identify entities receiving federal contracts, and by some agencies in their grant and cooperative agreement processes.

Organizations should verify that they have a DUNS number or take the steps needed to obtain one as soon as possible. Organizations can receive a DUNS number at no cost by calling the dedicated toll-free DUNS Number request line at 1–866–705–5711. Individuals who would personally receive a grant or cooperative agreement award from the federal government apart from any business or non-profit organization they may operate, and foreign entities are exempt from this requirement.

If your organization does not have a DUNS number, and you anticipate that your organization will apply for a grant or cooperative agreement now or in the

future, you should take steps to obtain a DUNS number in advance of the application deadline. If your organization does not have a DUNS number, you may not be able to apply for Federal grants or cooperative agreements. Future potential applicants should also consider requesting a DUNS number now if there is any intention of applying for a Federal grant in the future. Further information can be found in the **Federal Register**, located at: *http://a257.gakamaitech.net/7/257/2422/14mar20010800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2003/pdf/03-16356.pdf.*

Register in the Central Contract Registry (CCR)

In order to help centralize information about grant recipients and provide a central location for grant recipients to change organizational information, the government will be using the Central Contractor Registry (CCR) for grant applicants and recipients. Use of the CCR is to provide one location for applicants and recipients to change information about their organization and enter information on where government payments should be made. The registry will enable recipients to make a change in one place and one time for all Federal agencies to use.

General Information

Organizations should register on how they want to do business. A separate registration in the CCR may be required if an organization wants to have a single unit conduct business and it has a direct payment flow to that organization, it would require a separate DUNS number specified for that unit (if a different address from the parent organization). If the same address, the organization could use the DUNS + 4 found in the CCR. For example, a university that wants to have its payment information flow through one central point for grants should register as the entity doing business with the government. This registration would require a specific DUNS number for that business.

Instructions for Registering

Information for registering in the CCR and online documents can be found at *http://www.ccr.gov.* Before registering applicants and recipients should review the Central Contractor Registration Handbook (March 2003). In the handbook is a Registration Worksheet. It is recommended that registrants print this worksheet and gather the needed information prior to starting the online registration process. The fastest and easiest method to register is by computer. To register via the computer, click on "Start New Registration." Registering in the CCR should be the first preparation step in the submission for a grant. Allow a minimum of 5 days to complete the CCR registration. Organizations can register independently of submitting a grant application.

Registration Worksheet for Grant Applicants/Recipients

General Information: Enter all information that has an M placed next to the line meaning Mandatory or Required.

Prior to registering in the CCR, an applicant organization must receive a DUNS number. This can be done by telephone and the numbers are on the bottom of the worksheet. Many of the items are self-explanatory. Identified below are some items that may not be familiar to grant applicants and recipients.

Cage Code: For U.S. applicants, do not enter a Cage Code, one will be assigned. For foreign applicants, follow the instructions in the CCR.

Legal Business Name: Enter the name of the business or entity as it appears on legal documents.

Business Name: Enter the name of the organization/entity under which it is applying for a grant.

Annual Revenue: For some organizations/entities this can be an annual budget.

Type of Organization: In this section, indicate whether the organization/entity is Tax Exempt or Not. Indicate what type or how the organization is recognized. Use "Other" if the organization does not fit in the designated categories.

Owner Information: Fill-in if a sole proprietorship.

Business Types: As indicated, check all that apply. Check the ones that are the closest description to your organization. Most grant applicants can use "Nonprofit Institution" plus any other type that may fit the description. (The listing is being revised to include grant applicants business types.)

Party Performing Certification: Enter information only if the organization has a certification from SBA. Most grant recipients and applicants do not fall into this category.

Goods and Services: This section is required. It will require the grant applicant/recipient to look up a code and enter the ones that best fit the type of services the organization provides. It is not required to fill-in all the spaces provided for the codes.

NAICS Code: Is required. Follow the instructions.

SIC Code: Is required. Follow the instructions.

Financial Information: Follow the instructions found in the CCR Handbook on page 14.

Registration Acknowledgment and Point of Contact Information

This section is very important and needs to have names and telephone numbers put in for specific purposes. For grant applicants and recipients the M fields are required.

CCR Point of Contact: Mandatory. Enter the name of the person that knows and acknowledges that the information in the CCR is current, accurate and complete. The person named here will be the only person within the registering organization to receive the Trading Partner Identification Number (TPIN) via e-mail or U.S. mail services. The registrant and the alternate are the only people authorized to share the information with the CCR Assistance Center personnel. An e-mail address is required. An alternate is also required for registration.

Government Business Point of Contact: Not mandatory; review CCR Handbook.

Electronic Business Point of Contact: Mandatory. Grant applicants/ recipients must provide a name of an individual who will be responsible for approving the Role Manager for the organization. The Role Manager will be required to approve individuals who are authorized to submit grant applications on behalf of the organization. E-mail and telephone number are required. An alternate is required.

Past Performance Point of Contact: Not required.

Marketing Partner ID (MPIN): Mandatory for grants.gov submission. This is a self-defined access code that will be shared with authorized electronic partner applications. The MPIN will act as your password in other systems. The MPIN must be nine positions and contain at least one alpha character, one number and no spaces or special characters.

Registration Notification: Once the registration is completed, a TPIN will be e-mailed or sent via the U.S. Postal Service to the organization's point of contact. If registration is done electronically, notification will be sent via e-mail within five days of registration.

[FR Doc. 04–8889 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 416–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

National Institutes of Health

Proposed Collection: Comment Request; Survey of Family Physician's Use of Genomic Information in Primary Care

Summary: In compliance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects, the National Human Genome Research Institute (NHGRI), the National Institutes of Health (NIH) will publish periodic summaries of proposed projects to be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval.

Proposed Collection: Title: Survey of Family Physician's Use of Genomic Information in Primary Care. *Type of Information Collection Request:* New. *Need and Use of Information Collection:* The information collected via an on-line survey questionnaire will assist us to gain an understanding of the factors that influence American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP) members to participate in the utilization of educational modules and about factors that explain any differences seen among healthcare providers in their propensity to integrate genomics into practice. *Frequency of Response:* Prior to implementation of a year long on-line genomic curriculum, a one time baseline online survey will be requested of a randomly selected and representative sample of AAFP members. A sub-set of these providers registered or not registered for the web-based curriculum will comprise a cohort who will be asked to complete a pre-test survey prior to launching of the first module, and then again a post-test at the completion of the educational intervention. *Affected Public:* Members of the AAFP. *Type of Respondents:* Physicians. *Estimated Number of Respondents:* 5000 members will be invited to participate. A sub-set of 500 will be requested to participate in pre/post-test surveys. *Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:* The majority of respondents will have one response per respondent; maximum of three. *Average Burden Hours Per Response:* The majority of respondents will have an average burden of one hour per response. *Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours Requested:* The majority of respondents will have a total annual burden of one hour requested; maximum of three. *Costs:* There are no maintenance, operating, or capital costs.

Request for Comments: Written comments and/or suggestions from the public and affected agencies are invited on one or more of the following points: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the function of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on the proposed project or to obtain a copy of the data collection plans and instruments, contact Dr. Colleen McBride, Chief, Social and Behavioral Research Branch, NHGRI, NIH, 50 South Drive Building 50, Room 5351, Bethesda, MD 20892–8000, or call non-toll-free-number 301–594–6788 or e-mail your request, including your address to: < *cmcbride@mail.nih.gov* >.

Comments Due Date: Comments regarding this information collection are best assured of having their full effect if received within 60-days of the date of this publication.

Dated: April 12, 2004.

Linda Jacobson,

Chief Administrative Services Branch, NHGRI, National Institutes of Health.

[FR Doc. 04–8840 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), notice is hereby given of the following meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities Special Emphasis Panel ZMD1(02) Loan Repayment Programs: Extramural Clinical and Health Disparities Research.

Date: May 16–18, 2004.

Time: 5 p.m. to 1 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: Holiday Inn Select Bethesda, 8120 Wisconsin Ave., Bethesda, MD 20814.

Contact Person: Lorrita Watson, PhD, National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities, National Institutes of Health, 6707 Democracy Blvd, Suite 800, Bethesda MD 20892–5465, (301) 594–7784, *watson@ncmhd.nih.gov.*

Dated: April 13, 2004.

LaVerne Y. Stringfield,

Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 04–8838 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Board of Scientific Counselors, NHLBI.

The meeting will be closed to the public as indicated below in accordance with the provisions set forth in section 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended for the review, discussion, and evaluation of individual intramural programs and projects conducted by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, including consideration of personnel qualifications and performance, and the competence of individual investigators, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: Board of Scientific Counselors, NHLBI.

Date: May 27, 2004.

Time: 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate personal qualifications and performance, and competence of individual investigators.

Place: Hyatt Regency Bethesda, One Bethesda Metro Center, 7400 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda, MD 20814.

Contact Person: Elizabeth G. Nabel, MD, Scientific Director for Clinical Research,

National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, Division of Intramural Research, Building 10, Room 8C103, MSC 1754, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 496–1518.

Information is also available on the Institute's/Center's Home page: *http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/meetings/index.htm*, where an agenda and any additional information for the meeting will be posted when available.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.233, National Center for Sleep Disorders Research; 93.837, Heart and Vascular Diseases Research; 93.838, Lung Diseases Research; 93.839, Blood Diseases and Resources Research, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: April 13, 2004.

Laverne Y. Stringfield,

Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 04–8836 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Institute of Nursing Research; Notice of Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), notice is hereby given of a meeting of the National Advisory Council for Nursing Research.

The meeting will be open to the public as indicated below, with attendance limited to space available. Individuals who plan to attend and need special assistance, such as sign language interpretation or other reasonable accommodations, should notify the Contact Person listed below in advance of the meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C. as amended. The grant applications and/or contract proposals and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications and/or contract proposals, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Advisory Council for Nursing Research.

Date: May 19–20, 2004.

Open: May 19, 2004, 1 p.m. to 5 p.m.

Agenda: For discussion of program policies and issues.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Building 31, 31 Center Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892.

Closed: May 20, 2004, 9 a.m. to Adjournment.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications and/or proposals.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Building 31, 31 Center Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892.

Contact Person: Claudette Varricchio, Assistant Director, National Institute of Nursing Research, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Democracy Blvd., Room 710, Bethesda, MD 20892.

Any member of the public interested in presenting oral comments to the committee may notify the Contact Person listed on this notice at least 10 days in advance of the meeting. Interested individuals and representatives or organizations may submit a letter of intent, a brief description of the organization represented, and a short description of the oral presentation. Only one representative of an organization may be allowed to present oral comments and if accepted by the committee, presentations may be limited to five minutes. Both printed and electronic copies are requested for the record. In addition, any interested person may file written comments with the committee by forwarding their statement to the Contact Person listed on this notice. The statement should include the name, address, telephone number and when applicable, the business or professional affiliation of the interested person.

Information is also available on the Institute's/Center's home page: *www.nih.gov/ninr/a_advisory.html*, where an agenda and any additional information for the meeting will be posted when available.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.361, Nursing Research, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: April 13, 2004.

LaVerne Y. Stringfield,

Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 04–8837 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), notice is hereby given of the following meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Special Emphasis Panel, International Studies of AIDS-Associated Co-Infections (ISAAC).

Date: May 9–10, 2004.

Time: 6 p.m. to 6 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: Holiday Inn Downtown, 1158 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005.

Contact Person: Anna Ramsey-Ewing, PhD, Scientific Review Administrator, Scientific Review Program, Division of Extramural Activities, NIAID, NIH, Room 217, 6700–B Rockledge Drive, MSC 7616, Bethesda, MD 20892–7616, (301) 496–2550, *ar15o@nih.gov*.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.355, Allergy, Immunology, and Transplantation Research; 93.856, Microbiology and Infectious Diseases Research, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: April 13, 2004.

LaVerne Y. Stringfield,

Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 04–8839 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

[USCG–2004–17515]

Towing Safety Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of meetings.

SUMMARY: Two Working Groups of the Towing Safety Advisory Committee (TSAC) will meet to discuss issues relating to towing vessel safety. The Regulatory Review Working Group will discuss travel time for towing vessel officers. The Maritime Security Working Group will discuss implementation of security plan regulations and development of timely feedback to the Coast Guard on port, vessel and facility security plan requirements. The meetings will be open to the public.

DATES: The Regulatory Review Working Group will meet on Tuesday, April 27,

2004, from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. The Maritime Security Working Group will meet on Wednesday, April 28, 2004 from 8 a.m. to 12 noon. The meetings may close early if all business is finished. Written material and requests to make oral presentations should reach the Coast Guard on or before April 26, 2004. Requests to have a copy of your material distributed to each member of the Working Group should reach the Coast Guard on or before April 23, 2004.

ADDRESSES: The Working Group will meet in room 725 of the National Pollution Funds Center, 4200 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22203–1804, Phone: 202–493–6700. Send written material and requests to make oral presentations to Mr. Gerald Miante, Commandant (G–MSO–1), U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001. This notice and related documents are available on the Internet at *http://dms.dot.gov* under the docket number USCG–2004–17515.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Miante, Assistant Executive Director of TSAC, telephone (202) 267–0214, fax (202) 267–4570, or e-mail *gmiante@comdt.uscg.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice of the meeting is given under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. 2 (Pub. L. 92–463, 86 Stat. 770, as amended).

Discussion

The Regulatory Review Working Group's subject of travel time relates to problem of Towing Vessel Masters and Pilots having to drive or ride long distances to their vessels, then being required to get underway soon after arrival. In many instances, this travel time could be up to 4 to 10 hours or more, and the officer is then faced with a watch of at least 6 hours. Some consider this practice as work without sufficient rest.

The Maritime Security Working Group's subject of security plans involves studying the development, approval process, and implementation history of the newly required plans. They will attempt to identify any problems or deficiencies in the processes, develop methods of notifying the Coast Guard of their existence, and ascertain any best practices that have come to light.

Procedural

The meetings are open to the public. Please note that the meetings may close early if all business is finished. At the Chair's discretion, members of the public may make oral presentations during the meeting. If you would like to make an oral presentation at the meeting, please notify the Assistant Executive Director no later than April 26, 2004. Written material for distribution at the meeting should reach the Coast Guard no later than April 23, 2004.

Information on Services for Individuals With Disabilities

For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities or to request special assistance at the meeting, contact the Assistant Executive Director as soon as possible.

Dated: April 8, 2004.

Joseph J. Angelo,

Director of Standards, Marine Safety, Security & Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 04–8868 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–4907–N–11]

Notice of Proposed Information Collection: Comment Request; Use of Materials Bulletins Used in the HUD Building Products Standards and Certification Program

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

DATES: *Comments Due Date:* June 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number and should be sent to: Wayne Eddins, Reports Management Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., L'Enfant Plaza Building, Room 8003, Washington, DC 20410 or *Wayne_Eddins@hud.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth A. Cocke, Deputy Administrator, Office of Manufactured Housing Programs, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW., Washington, DC 20410, telephone (202) 708–6409 (this is not a toll free number) for copies of the proposed forms and other available information.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department is submitting the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35, as amended).

This Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

This Notice also lists the following information:

Title of Proposal: Use of Materials Bulletins Used in the HUD Building Products Standards and Certification Program.

OMB Control Number, if applicable: 2502–0526.

Description of the need for the information and proposed use: This proposed rule would adopt a number of Use of Material Bulletins (UM's) and references related to national voluntary consensus standards in accordance with OMB Circular 119A. This includes supplements to the HUD Building Product Standards and Certification Program.

Agency form numbers, if applicable: None.

Estimation of the total numbers of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response: The estimated number of burden hours needed to prepare the information collection is 200; the number of respondents is 10, generating approximately 10 annual responses; the frequency of response is on occasion; and the estimated time needed to prepare the response 20 hours.

Status of the proposed information collection: Extension of a previously approved collection.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C., chapter 35, as amended.

Dated: April 8, 2004.

Sean G. Cassidy,

General Deputy Assistance Secretary for Housing—Deputy Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 04–8858 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–27–M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–4907–N–12]

Notice of Proposed Information Collection: Comment Request; Minimum Property Standards for Housing

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

DATES: *Comments Due Date:* June 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number and should be sent to: Wayne Eddins, Reports Management Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., L'Enfant Plaza Building, Room 8003, Washington, DC 20410 or *Wayne_Eddins@hud.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth A. Cocke, Deputy Administrator, Office of Manufactured Housing Programs, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW., Washington, DC 20410, telephone (202) 708–6423 (this is not a toll free number) for copies of the proposed forms and other available information.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department is submitting the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35, as amended).

This Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

This Notice also lists the following information:

Title of Proposal: Minimum Property Standards for Housing.

OMB Control Number, if applicable: 2502–0321.

Description of the need for the information and proposed use: Information on local property standards for assisted multifamily housing and care-type facilities is collected from State and local governments to assess the equivalency of their existing housing standards in meeting HUD's minimum requirements. If such State or local codes are deemed equivalent, HUD assisted properties need only comply with such equivalent codes.

Agency form numbers, if applicable: None.

Estimation of the total numbers of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response: The estimated number of burden hours needed to prepare the information collection is 8,000; the number of respondents is 1,000 generating approximately 1,000 annual responses; the frequency of response is on occasion; and the estimated time needed to prepare the response eight hours.

Status of the proposed information collection: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C., chapter 35, as amended.

Dated: April 8, 2004.

Sean G. Cassidy,

General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Housing—Deputy Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 04–8859 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–27–M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–4907–N–13]

Notice of Proposed Information Collection: Comment Request; Application for Hospital Project Mortgage Insurance/Section 242

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

DATES: *Comments Due Date:* June 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number and should be sent to: Wayne Eddins, Reports Management Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., L'Enfant Plaza Building, Room 8003, Washington, DC 20410 or *Wayne_Eddins@hud.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chris Boesen, Director, Office of Insured Health Care Facilities, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20410, telephone (202) 708–0599 (this is not a toll free number) for copies of the proposed forms and other available information.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department is submitting the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35, as amended).

This Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including the use of appropriate automated

collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

This Notice also lists the following information:

Title of Proposal: Application for Hospital Project Mortgage Insurance/ Section 242.

OMB Control Number, if applicable: 2502–0518.

Description of the need for the information and proposed use: Information is collected to provide HUD with the data necessary to determine if a hospital qualifies for FHA insurance under section 242 of the National Housing Act. HUD reviews the information to determine if the proposed project meets basic eligibility criteria, underwriting standards, and adequacy of State and/or local certifications, approvals, and waivers.

Agency form numbers, if applicable: HUD–92013–HOSP.

Estimation of the total numbers of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response: The estimated number of burden hours needed to prepare the information collection is 17,280; the number of respondents is 18, generating approximately 18 annual responses; the frequency of response is on occasion; and the estimated time needed to prepare the response 960 hours.

Status of the proposed information collection: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C., chapter 35, as amended.

Dated: April 8, 2004.

Sean G. Cassidy,

General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Housing—Deputy Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 04–8860 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–27–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 90-Day Finding on a Petition To List the Colorado River Cutthroat Trout

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of 90-day petition finding.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce a 90-day finding for a petition to list the Colorado River cutthroat trout (CRCT) (*Oncorhynchus clarki pleuriticus*) as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. We find the petition and additional information available in our files did not present substantial scientific or commercial information indicating that listing this subspecies may be warranted. We will not be initiating a further status review in response to this petition. We ask the public to submit to us any new information that becomes available concerning the status of or threats to the species. This information will help us monitor and encourage the conservation of this species.

DATES: The finding announced in this document was made on April 8, 2004. You may submit new information concerning this species for our consideration at any time.

ADDRESSES: Information, data, or comments concerning this finding should be submitted to the Assistant Field Supervisor, Ecological Services, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 764 Horizon Drive, Building B, Grand Junction, Colorado 81506, or by e-mail to *al_pfister@fws.gov*. The petition, finding, supporting data, and comments are available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours, at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patty Schrader Gelatt, at the above address, by telephone at 970–243–2778, or by e-mail at *patty_schradergelatt@fws.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 4(b)(3)(A) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) (ESA), requires that within 90 days of receipt of a petition, to the maximum extent practicable, we make a finding on whether a petition to list, delist, or reclassify a species presents substantial scientific or commercial information indicating that the requested action may be warranted. The term "species" includes any subspecies of fish or wildlife or plants, and any distinct population segment of any species of vertebrate fish or wildlife that interbreeds when mature. The finding is based upon all information provided or referenced in the petition and all other information available to us at the time the finding was made. To the maximum extant practicable, this finding is to be made within 90 days of receipt of the petition, and the finding is to be published promptly in the **Federal Register**. If we find substantial information present, we are required to promptly commence a review of the status of the species (50 CFR 424.14). "Substantial information" is defined in 50 CFR 424.14(b) as "that amount of information that would lead a reasonable person to believe that the measure proposed in the petition may be warranted."

On December 16, 1999, we received a formal petition to list the CRCT as threatened or endangered in its occupied habitat within its known historic range, in accordance with provisions in section 4 of the ESA. The petition was filed by the Center for Biological Diversity, the Biodiversity Legal Foundation, Biodiversity Associates, Ancient Forest Rescue, Southwest Trout, Wild Utah Forest Campaign, Colorado Wild, and Mr. Noah Greenwald.

On January 12, 2000, we notified the petitioners that our Listing Priority Guidance, published in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 57114) on October 22, 1999, designated the processing of new listing petitions as a "Priority 4" activity, a lower priority than emergency listing (Priority 1), processing final decisions on proposed listings (Priority 2), and resolving the status of candidate species (Priority 3). We also informed the petitioners that due to staff and budget limitations, the petition could not be immediately addressed.

On August 8, 2000, we received a notice of intent to sue from the Center for Biological Diversity, Biodiversity Associates, Biodiversity Legal Foundation, Colorado Wild, Wild Utah Forest Campaign, and Mr. Noah Greenwald concerning our failure to produce a 90-day finding on the subject petition in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the ESA. We responded on August 31, 2000, reiterating that we would not be able to begin an evaluation of the CRCT petition until the work on the higher priority activities was completed. In the spring of 2003, the Service determined appropriate funds were available to address the subject petition.

In addition, the Service received correspondence from Mr. Noah Greenwald on September 20, 2002, providing additional information.

The September 20, 2002, correspondence from the petitioners recognized that some of the information presented in the original petition is outdated due to the passage of time. The petitioners discussed information provided by the states focusing on three specific issues—hybridization, competition, and predation from nonnatives; habitat degradation; and inadequacy of existing regulation. The petitioners again asserted that the range

of the CRCT has been reduced to a small fraction of its historic range, resulting in small isolated populations. They also stated that none of the populations can be considered secure because every one is threatened by nonnatives, limited stream length, small population size, habitat limitations, or a combination of these factors. The petitioners asserted that most CRCT populations are either hybridized or sympatric with nonnative trout species despite efforts to construct barriers and remove nonnatives. In addition, the States stock nonnative trout in CRCT historic range, which limits potential streams where CRCT can be recovered. The petitioners recommended that we use the same criteria to evaluate the status of the Colorado River cutthroat trout as was used for the Rio Grande cutthroat trout (*Onchorhynchus clarki virginalis*) candidate status review. The Service did not use these criteria in this 90-day finding because it does not constitute a status review under the ESA.

Biology and Distribution

The CRCT is the only salmonid (*i.e.*, salmon, trout, and their close relatives) native to the upper Colorado River basin, and is 1 of 14 subspecies of cutthroat trout recognized by Behnke (1992, 2002) that are native to interior regions of western North America. It has red or orange slash marks on both sides of the lower jaws and relatively large spots concentrated on the posterior part of the body. Sexually mature males exhibit brilliant colors; the ventral region can be bright crimson, with red along the lateral line, and the lower sides of the body are typically golden yellow (Behnke 1992).

The CRCT historically occupied portions of the Colorado River drainage in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico (Behnke 1992). Its original distribution probably included portions of larger streams, such as the Green, Yampa, White, Colorado, and San Juan Rivers. Behnke and Zarn (1976) suggested this subspecies was absent from the lower reaches of many large rivers because of summer thermal barriers. The CRCT still occurs throughout its historic range, but remaining populations now occur mostly in headwater streams and lakes.

The CRCT spawn over a gravel substrate in spring when water temperatures reach 7°C (45°F). The female digs out a nest in flowing water and, after fertilization, the eggs are covered with gravel and hatch in the summer (Behnke and Benson 1980). The CRCT feed on a wide range of invertebrates; larger CRCT prey on other fishes (Behnke and Benson 1980).

The States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming have implemented conservation efforts for CRCT for many years. Each State has developed plans to facilitate conservation action for CRCT within their respective States (Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) 1987; Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) 1992; Langlois *et al.* 1994; Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) 1997). The three States, U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), National Park Service, Ute Indian Tribe, and the Service formed a task force to address conservation efforts for CRCT on a rangewide basis. A Conservation Agreement and Strategy (CAS) (CRCT Task Force 1999, 2001) was developed to expedite implementation of conservation measures for the CRCT in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming as a collaborative and cooperative effort among resource agencies. The primary goal of the CAS is to assure the long-term prosperity of CRCT throughout their historic range by establishing two self-sustaining metapopulations, each consisting of five separate, viable but interconnected subpopulations, in each geographic management unit within the historic range. The short-term goal is to establish one metapopulation in each geographic management unit. Additional goals of the CAS are to maintain areas that currently support abundant CRCT and manage other areas for increased abundance; to maintain the genetic diversity of the subspecies; and to increase the distribution of CRCT where ecologically and economically feasible. The specific objective of the CAS is to maintain and restore 383 conservation populations in 2,823 stream kilometers (km) (1,754 stream miles (mi)) and 18 populations in 264 lake hectares (ha) (652 lake acres (ac)) in 14 geographic management units within the historic range.

The CAS (CRCT Task Force 2001) classifies CRCT populations according to their genetic purity using the criteria established in "Cutthroat Trout Management— a Position Paper. Genetic Considerations Associated with Cutthroat Trout Management" (UDWR 2000). This position paper was developed by fishery administrators and biologists from the following agencies—Idaho Department of Fish and Game; Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks; Nevada Division of Wildlife; New Mexico Game and Fish; UDWR; WGFD; the Service; USFS; and other technical experts. The Position Paper defines a "core conservation population" as a population that is >99 percent pure and represents the historic genome of the native cutthroat trout. Core conservation populations contain cutthroat trout that have not been impacted by genetic alteration linked to human intervention. A "conservation population" is defined as a reproducing and recruiting population of native cutthroat trout that has managed to preserve the historical genome and/or unique genetic, ecological, and/or behavioral characteristics. In general, a conservation population is at least 90 percent pure CRCT, but purity may be lower depending on circumstances and the values and attributes to be preserved.

The CAS established a CRCT Coordination Team to periodically update the population status information provided in the appendices. As of July 16, 2003, the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming reported 327 conservation populations, which include 286 populations in approximately 1,625 stream km (1,010 stream mi) and 41 populations in approximately 455 ha (1,124 ac) of lakes (CRCT Coordination Team, unpublished data). These populations include 221 populations that meet the Coordination Team's definition of core conservation populations. Of these 221 core conservation populations, 191 are found in approximately 1,101 km (684 mi) of streams and 30 are found in approximately 221 ha (545 ac) of lakes.

Since 1998, 125 stream populations and 29 lake populations have been added to the list of conservation populations (including core conservation populations and conservation populations) (CRCT Coordination Team, unpublished data). Most of the additions to the list of conservation populations are due to results of genetic testing that indicated genetic purity of at least 90 percent. Some waters were removed from the list due to the results of genetic testing. Other waters were added after reclamation and restocking were completed. Still other stream segments were removed because CRCT were extirpated due to competition from nonnative trout.

Assessment of the Petition and Other Available Information

The 1999 petition and subsequent 2002 letter provided information regarding the status and threats to CRCT. Soon after we received the petition, we made the document available on our web site. We also contacted natural resource agencies whose responsibilities include CRCT management and requested that these agencies review the petition and provide information on the current

status of the subspecies. In response to our request, we received information from UDWR, WGFD, CDOW, USFS, National Park Service, and BLM. We reviewed the information provided by these agencies, scientific journal articles, agency reports, and other information in our files to determine whether the information provided or cited in the petition or other information readily available to us met the ESA's standard for "substantial information." We respond to each of the major assertions made in the petition, organized by ESA listing factors. This 90-day finding is not a status assessment and does not constitute a status review under the ESA.

A. The Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Its Habitat or Range

With respect to factor A, the petition asserted that the CRCT has been reduced to small, unstable headwater drainages in less than 5 percent of its historic range and that this reduction in range is due to livestock grazing, water diversions, mining, logging, and roads. The petition presented an analysis of the reduction of historic range primarily based on information in a USFS Report (Young *et al.* 1996). While we consider this report a source of reliable information, it was based on a questionnaire distributed to various agency biologists and not all biologists responded. Therefore, Young *et al.* (1996) considered the data base presented as incomplete. The information contained in this report gave a general overview of the decline of the subspecies, but did not contain adequate information on the subspecies' status throughout its current or historical range to determine reduction in historic range. In fact, Young *et al.* (1996) stated, "comprehensive descriptions of the historical range of the CRCT are unavailable." However, for years, scientists have recognized that the current range of the CRCT has been greatly reduced from its historic range (Behnke and Zarn 1976; Binns 1977; Behnke and Benson 1980; Martinez 1988; CRCT Task Force 2001), and we concur with the conclusion that the range of the CRCT has been greatly reduced from historic levels. The ESA does not indicate threshold levels of historic range at which listing as either threatened or endangered becomes warranted. Instead the principal considerations in determining whether a species warrants listing are the threats that currently confront the species within its range and the likelihood that the species will persist in the foreseeable future.

The petition used two sources of information for the distribution and status of CRCT—Young *et al.* (1996) and the 1999 CAS (CRCT Task Force 1999). While the Service considered these adequate and reliable sources of information at the time of the original petition, new information is also available to the Service, including the latest information (CRCT Coordination Team, unpublished data) on numbers of conservation populations and core conservation populations by State.

While the total number of conservation populations (106) and core conservation populations (221) represents a relatively secure subspecies, total numbers of populations does not provide the full picture of the status of a species. The CAS (CRCT Task Force 2001) recognized that some past and present land management practices (overgrazing, heavy metal pollution, and water depletion and diversions) contribute to the isolation of upstream populations of CRCT. In some cases those practices serve to protect populations from invasion by nonnative salmonids, but they also cause fragmented stream segments that restrict movement between formerly connected populations, leaving small isolated populations that may be subject to extirpation and loss of genetic interchange (CRCT Task Force 2001). Many of these populations occur in headwater streams where water temperatures and small stream size make habitat conditions less than optimal. Harig and Fausch (2002) noted that cold summer water temperatures, typical of high elevation streams, tend to delay spawning, which reduces overwinter survival. They also found that many small streams lack sufficient pools deep enough for overwinter survival. The work of Novinger and Rahel (2003) also suggested that isolated headwater mountain streams lack some of the necessary habitat components based on the finding , in some cases, that isolation management (the process of constructing an artificial barrier, removal of brook trout, and stocking CRCT) resulted in more CRCT below the artificial barrier than above. However, small, isolated populations have persisted for many years in some situations, such as above waterfalls or in desert basins (Hilderbrand and Kershner 2000). It is unclear what population and habitat sizes are required for long-term population viability.

The scientific literature addresses species population viability in a theoretical manner, providing recommendations for minimum population size based on theoretical models (Franklin 1980; Gilpin and Soule 1986; Rieman and McIntyre 1993; Hilderbrand and Kershner 2000). Through modeling, Hilderbrand and Kershner (2000) estimated minimum stream length for several subspecies of cutthroat trout (Colorado River, Bonneville (*Oncorhynchus clarki utah*), and westslope (*Oncorhynchus clarki lewisi*)), in relation to population size. They estimated that a stream length of 3 km (2 mi) was required to support a population of 1,000 fish; 8 km (5 mi) to support 2,500 fish; and 17 km (10 mi) to support 5,000 fish. Recent data show stream lengths for core conservation populations vary from less than 1.5 km to 34 km (less than 1 mi to 21 mi), with 77 of the 191 (40 percent) core conservation populations in stream segments of 3 km (2 mi) or less (CRCT Coordination Team, unpublished data). Core conservation populations of CRCT ranged in size from 20 to 6,830 adult fish, with the majority (92 percent) of the adult populations having either fewer than 1,000 fish or no available population data. However, it is important to recognize that the Coordination Team has not adopted the population criteria discussed above and has not developed specific standards for population viability for CRCT (CRCT Task Force 2001). The Coordination Team considered using the criteria for demographic and habitat requirements for bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) as presented by Rieman and McIntyre (1993), but determined those criteria were not appropriate for CRCT. While limited habitat size, small population size, inappropriate water temperatures, and habitat fragmentation are a concern, its unclear how these factors affect the long-term viability of the subspecies.

When addressing a species with multiple populations, such as CRCT, population viability is just one factor to consider when determining the likelihood of species persistence. The CAS stresses the establishment of metapopulations to assure the long-term prosperity of CRCT (CRCT Task Force 2001). The CAS defines metapopulations as "a collection of localized populations that are geographically distinct yet are genetically interconnected through natural movement of individual fish between populations." Metapopulations are important for stabilizing population dynamics by maintaining genetic exchange (increasing genetic diversity) and providing individuals to repopulate stream segments where populations are lost due to stochastic environmental events (*i.e.*, fire, drought) (UDWR 1997). The long-term goal of the CAS is to

establish two self-sustaining metapopulations, each consisting of five separate, viable but interconnected subpopulations, in each geographic management unit within the historic range. Two of the 14 geographic management units currently meet the long-term goal of the CAS. The short-term goal is to establish one metapopulation in each geographic management unit. Seven additional geographic management units currently meet the CAS short-term goal. Overall, metapopulations currently exist in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, where 11 metapopulations meet the criteria of 5 separate but interconnected subpopulations and an additional 23 metapopulations contain 2 to 4 subpopulations (CRCT Core Coordination Team, unpublished data).

The States are actively working to establish metapopulations in each geographic management unit. For example, in Wyoming, a large restoration project is currently ongoing to establish a metapopulation in the LaBarge watershed in the southwestern portion of the State. Completion of this project is expected 2007, and will result in restoration of 58 stream miles, including 18 miles of LaBarge Creek and 40 stream miles of tributaries (Remmick 2002). Challenges in establishing metapopulations include difficulty in obtaining approval for chemical treatments, reinvasion of nonnative trout, funding, and landowner approval. Based on their work in Colorado, Brauch and Hebein (2003) found that current technical limitations of chemical treatments for reclamation limit potential reclamation sites to smaller streams with low flows of less than 0.42 cubic meter/second (15 cubic feet/second). State efforts to overcome these challenges continue.

The Service recognizes that overgrazing can be detrimental to trout habitat, and that overgrazing may occur in some habitats occupied by CRCT. The petition asserted that habitat conditions are degraded in a significant portion of the subspecies' range. Descriptions of habitat conditions are not available for the CRCT on a rangewide basis (Bruce May, USFS, pers. comm. 2003). The petition used the habitat limitations data field presented in Appendix A of the CAS to draw this conclusion. However, this data field is not adequate to determine the habitat condition of individual streams or lakes or to determine the condition of the habitat rangewide (Dan Brauch, CDOW, pers. comm. 2003). This data field was not applied consistently in the three States, nor was it applied consistently over time. In many cases, habitat limitations noted for the survey location did not apply to the entire stream reach. The CAS (CRCT Task Force 2001) stated that "habitat problems are viewed as site-specific and not an overall threat throughout the range," but no documentation was provided. The petition did not provide additional substantial information to determine the extent of overgrazing in CRCT habitat. Furthermore, the Service can not assume that all livestock grazing within the CRCT habitat is inappropriate. Proper grazing management can reduce or prevent the habitat and water quality degradation discussed in the petition.

The Service recognizes that water diversions can negatively impact CRCT habitat. The petition asserted 59 CRCT populations have been negatively impacted by water diversions. However, the petition relied primarily upon the habitat limitations data field presented in Appendix A discussed above. A rangewide inventory has not been conducted to determine if water diversions are a problem in just a few locations or throughout CRCT range. Many CRCT populations occur in stream segments upstream of water diversions, and some instream flows have been secured in CRCT streams in Colorado and Wyoming. In Utah, the State Engineer has the authority to deny any changes in water rights applications if such action "affects the natural stream environment or public recreation."

Additionally, the petition asserted mining, dams and reservoirs, oil and gas development, road building and logging may be detrimental to CRCT populations. The petition also asserted that mining, through isolation, and dams and reservoirs have preserved pure populations of CRCT. Information on the impacts of dams and reservoirs, oil and gas development, road building and logging is not available on a rangewide basis. The petition did not provide substantial information to determine the rangewide impact on CRCT habitat. We have no other information establishing these activities as significant threats to CRCT.

The USFS and the BLM are currently implementing conservation actions on Federal lands to improve habitat conditions for CRCT (USFS 2002, BLM 2003). These actions include grazing management by constructing fencing, building exclosures, and resting grazing allotments. Other vegetation management activities to improve riparian conditions include weed control and riparian plantings. The BLM has recently facilitated installation of a fish screen to prevent CRCT from entering a water diversion structure and implemented culvert improvements to provide fish passage. The USFS has moved campsites and excluded vehicle access to improve habitat for CRCT. The Federal agencies have partnered with the State agencies to monitor fish populations, build and maintain barriers, and remove nonnative fish. Some CRCT habitats are afforded protection from land use activities by special land use designations, such as habitats within Rocky Mountain National Park and USFS Wilderness Areas.

We find the petition did not provide substantial information to support its assertions that the threat of past and present destruction, modification, or curtailment of CRCT habitat is sufficient to cause further significant declines in this subspecies' range or extant populations. We conclude that the total number of conservation populations and core conservation populations represent a relatively secure subspecies. While limited habitat size, small population size, inappropriate water temperatures, and habitat fragmentation are a concern, it is unclear how these factors affect the long-term viability of the subspecies. State management efforts to establish metapopulations in each geographic management unit continue to improve the outlook for the CRCT. Further, the petition failed to provide substantial information to support the allegation that overgrazing, mining, logging, or roads pose a threat to the overall habitat or range of the CRCT.

B. Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes

With respect to factor B, the petition asserted that CRCT are threatened by recreational fishing, because CRCT are easy to catch and the state regulatory agencies lack sufficient funding to enforce protective regulations effectively. Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming all have special regulations that provide protection against overharvest of CRCT. These special regulations include catch-and-release requirements, very limited harvest, fishing closures, and tackle restrictions. Also, the remote locations of many CRCT streams provide protection from heavy fishing pressure (CRCT Task Force 2001).

The CDOW placed harvest and tackle restrictions on most conservation populations of CRCT in 1999. These regulations prohibit harvest of CRCT and allow anglers to only use flies and lures (*i.e.*, no bait). The CDOW reports that 49 waters with conservation populations are closed to cutthroat trout harvest and 1 lake is closed to fishing (Brauch and Hebein 2003). In Rocky

Mountain National Park, all waters that contain pure native cutthroat trout are limited to catch-and-release angling (except Caddis Lake and Lake Nanita, where there is a two-fish daily limit), and some waters are closed to angling while restoration efforts are being implemented (Rosenlund *et al.* 2001).

In the early 1980s, the WGFD implemented regulations to better manage CRCT waters. Some waters have complete fishing closures; other waters are catch-and-release only, reduced limits, and seasonal closures. The WGFD continually revises fishing regulations to protect species of concern (Remmick 2002). The WGFD assigned a warden to enforce fishing closures near CRCT habitat when roads were constructed in association with the Cheyenne Stage II Water Project in the Little Snake River drainage in Wyoming (Remmick 2002).

In Utah, the UDWR has established seasonal closures, reduced limits, size restrictions, and implemented fishing closures in areas of recent introductions to protect CRCT. The UDWR has not observed small, remote populations getting enough fishing pressure to influence numbers and size structure (Kimball 2001).

While the petition recognizes that existing fishing regulations are in most cases adequate, it raises concerns that funding for education and enforcement programs may be inadequate. However, the petition and information available in the Service's files fails to provide documentation to support this assertion.

Based on the existing regulations described above, we conclude that the scientific and commercial information available does not support the assertion that overutilization by recreational angling is a threat to CRCT. Furthermore, the petition failed to present substantial information regarding a lack of sufficient funding for education and enforcement of the regulations.

C. Disease or Predation

With respect to factor C, the petition asserted that CRCT are threatened by whirling disease and the CDOW stocks whirling disease-infected fish within the historic range of CRCT. Also, the petition asserted that CRCT are threatened by predation from brown, brook, and rainbow trout. In recent years, whirling disease has become a great concern to fishery managers in western States. Whirling disease is caused by the nonnative myxosporean parasite, *Myxobolus cerebralis*. This parasite was introduced to the United States from Europe in the 1950s and requires two separate host organisms to complete its life cycle. Its essential hosts are a salmonid fish and an aquatic worm, *Tubifex tubifex*. Field experiments have shown that CRCT are very susceptible to whirling disease, with an 85 percent mortality rate over a 4-month period when CRCT were exposed to the parasites in the Colorado River (Thompson *et al.* 1999). However, *Tubifex tubifex* is usually most abundant in areas of high sedimentation, low water temperatures, and low dissolved oxygen. Most populations of CRCT occur in cold water stream habitats at high elevations, where *Tubifex tubifex* is unlikely to be abundant. Thompson *et al.* (1999) found infection rates to be low when temperatures are less than 10°C (50°F). Out of the hundreds of CRCT populations reported by the States, only a few populations of CRCT in Utah and Wyoming have been infected by whirling disease (Kimball 2001, Remmick 2002). In Colorado, CDOW has not found any native cutthroat population infected with whirling disease (Nesler 2003). Wyoming reports that no core conservation populations or conservation populations have been infected (Remmick 2002). All three States have developed management activities to protect CRCT populations from whirling disease.

In Colorado, policies require that only fish that have tested negative for *Myxobolus cerebralis*, within the last 60 days are permitted to be released into CRCT waters. Colorado also requires disease-free certification and requires the use of isolation/quarantine units for CRCT stocks (CRCT Task Force 2001). Utah has some of the most stringent fish disease laws in the United States. Utah has a Fish Health Board that oversees the disease testing protocol. Utah does not allow stocking of fish that test positive for whirling disease anywhere (CRCT Task Force 2001). A couple of CRCT waters in Utah have been infected by whirling disease, and the UDWR is studying the effects of whirling disease on these populations (Kimball 2001). Wyoming has a policy that any fish testing positive for *Myxobolus cerebralis* will not be stocked (Remmick 2002).

We find that the scientific and commercial information available supports the allegation that CRCT are susceptible to whirling disease, but due to the physical characteristics of CRCT habitat and the current State policies, whirling disease does not pose a significant threat to CRCT.

Predation was recognized in the petition in association with the presence of nonnative trout in CRCT habitat. The CRCT are often replaced by nonnative trout, primarily brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*), where they occur in the same habitat; but the degree to which predation is a factor in this replacement has not been well studied (Peterson and Fausch 2002). We find that there is insufficient information to conclude that predation by nonnative fishes is a significant threat to CRCT.

D. The Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

With respect to factor D, the petition asserted that currently there are no regulations protecting the species from take or habitat degradation. The petition and subsequent correspondence failed to recognize all of the ongoing efforts of the signatories of the 2001 Conservation Agreement. The States of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado, and the Federal land management agencies all have ongoing programs to conserve the CRCT.

Colorado Division of Wildlife

The CDOW includes the CRCT on a list of species of special concern. Colorado fishing regulations provide restrictive regulations for some CRCT waters. These restrictions include angling limited to artificial flies and lures and immediate return of all trout alive to the water. A recent report outlines conservation activities conducted by the CDOW during 1999–2002 (Brauch and Hebein 2003). The CDOW reported that, during this period, 311 streams and lakes were targeted for conservation activities. Statewide conservation activities included restrictive tackle and catch-and-release regulations, regulations prohibiting nonnative stocking into conservation populations, and stocking CRCT for recreation into high lakes. Other conservation activities included development of subbasin brood stocks, removal of nonnative trout, protection of populations with barrier construction, genetic testing, and population monitoring. The Colorado Water Quality Control Division and Commission regulate water quality and set water quality standards to protect aquatic life in coldwater environments.

Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

Utah lists CRCT as a conservation species, which is defined as currently receiving sufficient special management under a conservation agreement to preclude listing as endangered, threatened, or species of special concern in Utah. Utah's stocking practices have changed in recent years to protect CRCT. Stocking of nonnative fishes no longer occurs near core conservation populations or conservation populations. In 2002, Utah discontinued

stocking rainbow trout in most streams and now only stocks sterile rainbow trout. Sterile rainbow trout are stocked only in areas that have no connection to CRCT habitat. All stocking of nonnative cutthroats was discontinued by 2000. Utah fishing regulations restrict harvest of CRCT and implement fishing closures during restoration activities.

Wyoming Game and Fish Department

Wyoming protects CRCT through fishing regulations and stocking procedures. Restrictions on angling include reduced bag limits, catch-and-release fishing, seasonal closures, and complete closures. The WGFD has filed for water rights on a total of 30 stream segments of CRCT habitat, for a total of 187 km (116 mi). Priority dates for these filings range from 1989 to 2002. To date, two instream flow rights have been approved. The Wyoming State Division of Environmental Quality implements water quality regulations and controls that apply to CRCT waters.

U.S. Forest Service

The USFS has designated CRCT as a sensitive species. According to the USFS, the petition misrepresented their aquatic habitat management program and land-use coordination by taking statements in reports out of context (USFS 2003). The U.S. Department of Agriculture policy directs the USFS to manage "habitat for all existing native and desired nonnative * * * species in order to maintain at least viable populations of such species and to avoid actions that may cause a species to become threatened or endangered." While specific population viability criteria have not been established by the CRCT Coordination Team, this policy requires the USFS to make a judgment on the viability of each individual population where authorized activities may impact CRCT.

The 2001 CAS was used as a basis for recovery and conservation strategies for Standards and Guidelines within individual Forest Plans, in combination with the Fisheries and Aquatic Ecology section of the Forest Planning Desk Guide. For example, the standards for the White River National Forest Plan in Colorado include provisions to: maintain or enhance existing CRCT habitat; reduce sediment from existing roads and trials; maintain pool depths; maintain riparian vegetation; and retain large woody debris in streams. Guidelines to implement these standards include restriction on new roads, rerouting existing roads, decommissioning old roads, altering timing of grazing, excluding sensitive or problem areas from grazing, and controlling livestock crossings. In the past 5 years, the USFS has completed 200 biological evaluations that address CRCT.

The USFS (2002) reported that the Rocky Mountain Region in 2002 implemented 51 conservation actions that positively influenced 64 lake ha (158 lake ac) and 727 stream km (452 stream mi) of CRCT habitat. Projects included inventory of existing and potential habitat, drought salvage, fencing to exclude cattle, stream assessment and monitoring, nonnative trout removal, building and maintaining barriers, moving dispersed campsites, and genetic analysis. Over the last 4 years the USFS has provided $2,097,100 for the implementation of 112 conservation actions.

Bureau of Land Management

The CRCT is on the BLM's Sensitive Species List. The BLM prepares Work Plans and Accomplishment Reports for conservation efforts on BLM lands in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Conservation actions are either planned or have been implemented on approximately 40 CRCT streams.

National Park Service

The current fisheries management objectives in Rocky Mountain National Park were established in 1969, when the stocking of nonnative and hybrid fishes was no longer permitted. Lakes that did not maintain reproducing populations of fish became fishless (Rosenlund *et al.* 2001). Five sites that contain core conservation populations within Rocky Mountain National Park are open to catch-and-release fishing, and four other sites have a two-fish limit. Most CRCT waters within the Park are in high-elevation remote locations, where angling pressure is very light. Livestock grazing, timber harvest, mining, or other development does not occur in Rocky Mountain National Park.

The scientific and commercial information available does not support the petition's assertion that there are no regulations protecting the species from take or habitat degradation. We conclude that take of the subspecies can be controlled by State regulations and that the Federal land management agencies have policies to manage sensitive species habitat.

E. Other Natural or Manmade Mechanisms

With respect to factor E, the petition asserted that a major threat to CRCT is competition and hybridization from nonnative trout species occurring in the same habitat as CRCT. It also asserted that small isolated populations of CRCT are vulnerable to stochastic events, such as fire or drought. Hybridization with nonnative fish species has been recognized as one of the most significant threats to CRCT (Behnke 1992; Young *et al.* 1996; CRCT Task Force 2001). Hybridization occurs when nonnative species interbreed with CRCT, and the offspring survive. The nonnative species that hybridize with CRCT are primarily rainbow trout and other subspecies of cutthroat trout. If the hybrids survive and interbreed with one or both of the parental species, it is called introgressive hybridization. This can lead to loss of genetic purity in the population and result in a population that consists entirely of individuals that contain genetic material from both species (*i.e.*, a hybrid swarm). Nonnative salmonids have been stocked in CRCT habitat since the late 1800s throughout CRCT historic range. The State agencies have spent considerable time and money in recent years testing populations to determine their genetic purity.

Determining genetic purity is a complex issue and a single standard has not been established. Methods used by the States to determine genetic purity have changed over the years. Analysis by meristics (counts of body parts) was used for many years, but now various molecular genetic techniques (*i.e.*, mitochondrial deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA), nuclear DNA, allozymes) are available and can detect very small amounts of introgression. Many of the core conservation populations have been confirmed to be pure (<1 percent introgression) with these molecular genetic techniques. Many other test results are pending. In general, scientists have found that genetic testing confirms the results of the earlier meristic techniques (Brauch and Hebein 2003; Hepworth *et al.* in press). All three States continue the process of genetic testing, using the latest techniques. An evaluation of known stocking history and genetic and meristic information is considered in determining core conservation populations.

Current policies preclude stocking of nonnative trout in CRCT habitat, and recent genetics work has added significantly to the number of core conservation populations (>99 percent pure). As of July 2003, 221 core conservation populations are known to exist in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. There are varying amounts of information available regarding the genetic purity of these core conservation populations. Since 1999, Wyoming has added 20 core conservation populations and Colorado has added 25 core

conservation populations as the result of genetic testing. Some populations are added to the list of core conservation populations, and others are dropped from the list as genetic testing continues. Far more populations have been added to the list of core conservation populations through genetic testing than have been removed (Brauch and Hebein 2003; Conway 2003; Stone 2003). In addition to the core conservation populations, there are 106 conservation populations that are classified as 90 to 99 percent pure.

Hybridization continues to be a threat where nonnative species, particularly rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and nonnative cutthroat trout, occur in the same habitat as CRCT. The most recent data show that only 8 of the 221 core conservation populations coexist with rainbow trout or another subspecies of nonnative cutthroat trout (although information on presence of nonnative salmonids is not available for 22 of the populations). Because core conservation populations are defined as >99 percent pure, one would expect a very low occurrence of other species or subspecies that are known to interbreed with CRCT in the core conservation population waters.

Competition from nonnative trout, especially brook trout, also has been recognized as a major threat to CRCT (Behnke 1992). Studies have shown CRCT are displaced when brook trout occur in the same habitat. A recent study conducted by Colorado State University found survival of young CRCT was greatly impacted by the presence of brook trout, while adult CRCT survival was not impacted (Peterson and Fausch 2002). Since 2001, four conservation populations in Colorado (Corral Creek, Cub Creek, Express Creek, and Nolan Creek) have been completely displaced by brook trout (Brauch and Hebein 2003).

Brook trout are no longer stocked in CRCT waters in Colorado, Utah, or Wyoming. Recent data (CRCT Coordination Team, unpublished data) show that brook trout are absent from 139 of the 199 core conservation populations that have been surveyed for nonnative salmonids. Recognizing the threat posed by brook trout, the responsible agencies are actively implementing management techniques, such as the construction of barriers, the removal of brook trout, and the curtailment of stocking brook trout within CRCT waters. Between 1999 and 2002, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming completed chemical treatments in 36 CRCT waters, for a total of 88 stream miles and 87 lake acres in 8 geographic management units (CRCT Coordination Team, unpublished data). Colorado also removed brook trout by electrofishing in 20 waters.

Fish barriers have been constructed on CRCT streams to prevent the upstream movement of nonnative salmonids. The CAS identifies the construction of barriers as a strategy to protect and restore existing habitat. It also recognizes that natural barriers can be effective. Recent data show 117 (53 percent) of the existing core conservation populations are currently protected by a natural or artificial barrier (CRCT Coordination Team, unpublished data). However, the Service recognizes that barriers are not a guarantee that non-natives will not be present in CRCT habitat. Thirty-two percent of the core conservation populations with barriers have nonnative salmonids present.

Ultimately, a larger watershed approach may be necessary for the long-term persistence of CRCT populations (Hilderbrand and Kershner 2000).

The Service recognizes that stochastic events can be detrimental to individual populations of CRCT. The primary goal of the CAS is to establish metapopulations within each geographic management unit to assure the long-term prosperity of CRCT. While all the specific metapopulation goals of the CAS have not been met, metapopulations connecting 2 or more streams do occur in 14 out of the 15 geographic management units (Table 3). The Service agrees with the assertion in the petition that once an isolated population is lost, there are no natural means for these populations to recruit new members. However, management actions have been taken by the States to repopulate CRCT streams after stochastic events. For example, during the 2002 drought, Colorado salvaged fish from Trapper Creek and West Antelope Creek and held the fish in refugia for return to the wild when conditions improved and for the establishment of broodstock for supplying fish for stocking into the respective hydrologic subbasins (Brauch and Hebein 2003).

Although some CRCT populations are threatened by hybridization, we conclude that the threat of hybridization is not pervasive to the extent that it poses a risk to the continued survival of CRCT. The Service recognizes that nonnatives can outcompete CRCT. However, brook trout are absent from 139 of the 199 core conservation populations that have been surveyed for nonnative salmonids. Management techniques such as the construction of barriers, the removal of brook trout and the curtailment of stocking brook trout within CRCT waters are currently being implemented by responsible agencies. Therefore, we conclude that the petition and other documents in our files do not provide evidence that competition with brook trout presents a significant threat to the subspecies within the foreseeable future. While stochastic events will always pose a threat to individual populations, the establishment of metapopulations and state management actions should minimize this impact.

Finding

We conclude that the petition and other documents in our files do not present substantial information to lead a reasonable person to believe that listing the CRCT as threatened or endangered may be warranted. After reviewing recent data, we conclude that there are a significant number of core conservation populations of CRCT distributed throughout historic range and that agencies are implementing management actions to improve the status of these populations. Since 1998, 125 stream populations and 29 lake populations have been added to the list of conservation populations for a total of 286 stream populations and 41 lake populations. This increase in population numbers can be attributable to results of genetic testing, removal of nonnatives, and stocking. The total number of conservation populations and core conservation populations represents a relatively secure subspecies. The States and the Federal agencies report that there are currently 11 metapopulations with 5 or more interconnected subpopulations and 23 metapopulations with 2 to 4 interconnected subpopulations. Work is ongoing to establish additional metapopulations throughout the CRCT's historic range. The Federal land management agencies are currently implementing conservation actions in CRCT habitat such as grazing management, recreation management, weed control, and riparian plantings. The State and Federal agencies work cooperatively to construct and maintain barriers, remove nonnative fish, and monitor fish populations.

The petition asserted that overgrazing, water diversions, mining, dams and reservoirs, oil and gas development, road-building and logging are detrimental to CRCT. The Service finds the information in the petition was not adequate to assess the impacts rangewide. While limited habitat size, small population size, inappropriate water temperatures, and habitat fragmentation are a concern, it is unclear how these factors affect the long-term viability of the subspecies.

We do not agree with the petitioners' conclusion that none of the populations can be considered secure because every one is threatened by nonnative fishes, limited stream length, habitat limitations, or a combination of these factors.

Historically, overharvest of CRCT may have significantly reduced the numbers of CRCT in some areas, but we find that fishing regulations enacted by the States and the National Park Service provide measures that preclude excessive take by recreational angling. The petition did not present substantial information indicating funding to enforce or educate the public about these regulations was inadequate. Also, many CRCT waters are located in remote locations that experience very light fishing pressure.

Whirling disease is a significant concern for trout in general, but very few CRCT populations have tested positive for the disease and all three States are implementing management actions to protect CRCT from whirling disease. Also, much of the habitat for CRCT is unlikely to be conducive to the whirling disease pathogen. Therefore, we do not agree with the petition's assertions that overutilization or whirling disease present significant threats to CRCT. With regard to predation by nonnative fishes, we find that there is insufficient information to conclude that this issue is a significant threat to CRCT.

The Federal land management agencies all have programs in place to regulate land management activities. The petition did not provide evidence to support its allegation that these programs are not providing adequate protection, and why they are not effective in conserving CRCT. Service files do not contain adequate information on habitat conditions to make an informed determination as to whether Federal lands are being adequately protected or enhanced by existing regulations and policies. Thus, the Service has no reason to assume the programs in place for CRCT management are inadequate.

Although some CRCT populations are threatened by hybridization, we conclude that significant numbers of populations have been determined to be core conservation populations (>99 percent pure). Further, the States have implemented policies to protect the genetic purity of the core conservation populations. Competition from brook trout is recognized as a threat to CRCT and the State and Federal agencies are implementing management techniques to offset this threat. Many core conservation populations (53%) are protected by natural or artificial barriers and the States have ongoing programs to remove brook trout from CRCT waters.

The petition failed to recognize the ongoing conservation efforts of the members of the CRCT Coordination Team. Numerous conservation efforts are ongoing in all three States and in general appear to be well funded. We conclude that the management programs currently in place for CRCT are improving the status of this subspecies and continued improvement is anticipated in the future. Therefore, as required by section 4(b)(3)(A) of the ESA, we conclude that the petition did not present substantial information to demonstrate that the listing may be warranted. This finding is based on all information available to us at this time.

References Cited: A complete list of all references cited herein is available upon request from the Grand Junction, Colorado Field Office (*see* **ADDRESSES**).

Author: The primary author of this document is Patty Schrader Gelatt, Colorado Field Office, Grand Junction, Colorado.

Authority: The authority for this action is the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Dated: April 8, 2004.

Elizabeth H. Stevens,

Acting Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 04–8633 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

NM–910–04–1020–PH

New Mexico Resource Advisory Council, Notice of Call for Nominations

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, New Mexico Resource Advisory Council (RAC) will meet as indicated below.

DATES: The meeting will be held on June 9–10, 2004, beginning at 8 a.m. at the Hilton Inn, 705 S. Telshor, Las Cruces, New Mexico, in the Soledad Room. The meeting will adjourn at approximately 5 p.m. on Wednesday, June 9, 2004, and 12 noon on Thursday, June 10, 2004. The two established RAC working groups may have a late afternoon or an evening meeting on Wednesday, June 9, 2004. An optional field trip is planned for Tuesday, June 8, 2004.

The public comment period is scheduled for Tuesday, June 8, 2004, from 6–7 p.m. The public may present written comments to the RAC. Depending on the number of persons wishing to comment and time available, individual oral comments may be limited.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The 15-member RAC advises the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Land Management, on a variety of planning and management issues associated with public land management in New Mexico. All meetings are open to the public. At this meeting, topics for discussion include: Division of Resources' issues, Fluid Minerals' report, Otero Mesa update, Field Managers' reports, and feedback from the RAC Chairs meeting in Phoenix.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Theresa Herrera, New Mexico State Office, Office of External Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, P.O. Box 27115, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502–0115, (505) 438–7517.

Dated: April 14, 2004.

Ron Dunton,

Acting State Director.

[FR Doc. 04–8876 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–FB–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

Notice of Proposed Information Collection for 1029–0124

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) is announcing its intention to request approval for the collection of information for Revegetation: Standards for Success required for surface mining activities and underground mining activities at 30 CFR 816.116 and 817.116. OSM submitted an emergency request to the Office of Management and Budget to seek approval for OSM to continue collecting the information required by these sections. OMB approved the request and assigned them clearance number 1029–0124.

DATES: Comments on the proposed information collection must be received

by June 21, 2004, to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to John A. Trelease, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, 1951 Constitution Ave., NW., Room 210—SIB, Washington, DC. 20240. Comments may also be submitted electronically to *jtreleas@osmre.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request a copy of the information collection request, explanatory information and related form, contact John A. Trelease, at (202) 208–2783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations at 5 CFR 1320, which implement provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13), require that interested members of the public and affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping activities (*see* 5 CFR 1320.8 (d)).

This notice identifies information collections at 30 CFR 816.116 and 817.116 that OSM will be submitting to OMB.

OSM previously received approval for collection activities for 30 CFR part 816 and part 817. They were assigned clearance number 1029–0047. However, OSM inadvertently failed to include in the clearance request existing collection requirements for §§ 816.116 and 817.116. These sections require State regulatory authorities to develop statistically valid sampling techniques, and for operators to document revegetation information during Phase 3 bond release. OSM requested and received an emergency clearance from OMB for the collection activities in §§ 816.116 and 817.116. They were assigned clearance number 1029–0124. Now, OSM is seeking a 3-year term of approval for these collections.

Comments are invited on: (1) The need for the collection of information for the performance of the functions of the agency; (2) the accuracy of the agency's burden estimates; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (4) ways to minimize the information collection burden on respondents, such as use of automated means of collection of the information. A summary of the public comments will accompany OSM's submission of the information collection request to OMB.

This notice provides the public with 60 days in which to comment on the following information collection activity:

Title: Revegetation: Standards for Success, 30 CFR 816.116 and 817.116.

OMB Control Number: 1029–0124.

Summary: Section 515 and 516 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 provides that permittees conducting coal mining operations shall meet all applicable performance standards of the Act. The information collected is used by the regulatory authority in inspecting surface and underground coal mining reclamation activities to ensure that they are revegetated in accordance with applicable State requirements.

Bureau Form Number: None.

Frequency of Collection: Once.

Description of Respondents: Coal mining operators and State regulatory authorities.

Total Annual Responses: 882.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 70,600.

Total Annual Non-Wage Costs: $44,000.

Dated: April 14, 2004.

Sarah E. Donnelly,

Acting Chief, Division of Regulatory Support.

[FR Doc. 04–8902 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. AA–1921–167 (Review)]

Pressure Sensitive Plastic Tape From Italy

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Scheduling of an expedited five-year review concerning the antidumping finding on pressure sensitive plastic tape from Italy.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(3)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping finding on pressure sensitive plastic tape from Italy would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. For further information concerning the conduct of this review and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 6, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jai Motwane (202–205–3176), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (*http://www.usitc.gov*). The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *http://edis.usitc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background. On April 6, 2004, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (69 FR 101, January 2, 2004) of the subject five-year review was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission did not find any other circumstances that would warrant conducting a full review.[1] Accordingly, the Commission determined that it would conduct an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Act.

Staff report. A staff report containing information concerning the subject matter of the review will be placed in the nonpublic record on May 10, 2004, and made available to persons on the Administrative Protective Order service list for this review. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to § 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission's rules.

Written submissions. As provided in § 207.62(d) of the Commission's rules, interested parties that are parties to the review and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,[2] and any party other than an interested party to the review may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the review. Comments are due on or before May 13, 2004, and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year review nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to the review by May 13, 2004. However, should the Department of Commerce extend the time limit for its

[1] A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's Web site.

[2] The Commission has found the response submitted by 3M Co. (including those submitted on behalf of Intertape Polymer Group, Inc.; Shurtape Technologies, Inc.; and Sekisui TA Industries, Inc.) to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (*see* 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

completion of the final results of its review, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce's final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce's results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must conform with the requirements of §§ 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means, except to the extent permitted by § 201.8 of the Commission's rules, as amended, 67 FR 68036 (November 8, 2002).

In accordance with §§ 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the review must be served on all other parties to the review (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Determination. The Commission has determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)(B).

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to § 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: April 14, 2004.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04–8882 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. AA–1921–188 (Review)]

Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand From Japan

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Scheduling of an expedited five-year review concerning the antidumping finding on prestressed concrete steel wire strand from Japan.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(3)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping finding on prestressed concrete steel wire strand from Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. For further information concerning the conduct of this review and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 6, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jai Motwane (202–205–3176), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server *(http://www.usitc.gov)*. The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *http://edis.usitc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On April 6, 2004, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (69 FR 101, January 2, 2004) of the subject five-year review was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission did not find any other circumstances that would warrant conducting a full review.[1] Accordingly, the Commission determined that it would conduct an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Act.

Staff report.—A staff report containing information concerning the subject matter of the review will be placed in the nonpublic record on May 10, 2004, and made available to persons on the Administrative Protective Order service list for this review. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to section 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission's rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in section 207.62(d) of the Commission's rules, interested parties that are parties to the review and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,[2] and any party other than an interested party to the review may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the review. Comments are due on or before May 13, 2004, and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year review nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to the review by May 13, 2004. However, should the Department of Commerce extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its review, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce's final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce's results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means, except to the extent permitted by section 201.8 of the Commission's rules, as amended, 67 FR 68036 (November 8, 2002).

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the review must be served on all other parties to the review (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Determination.—The Commission has determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)(B).

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: April 14, 2004.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04–8883 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[1] A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's web site.

[2] The Commission has found the responses submitted on behalf of American Spring Wire Corp., Insteel Wire Products Co., and Sumiden Wire Corp. to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (see 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[AAG/A Order No. 003–2004]

Privacy Act of 1974: System of Records

Pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a), the Department of Justice,

Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR), proposes to modify the following system of records previously published in full text in the **Federal Register** on December 10, 1998 (63 FR 68299 (1998)): Office of Professional Responsibility Record Index, JUSTICE/OPR–001. This system of records was last modified to add three routine uses in **Federal Register** notice of November 27, 2002 (67 FR 70967 (2002)).

OPR is adding one new routine use to this system of records. This routine use allows the disclosure of certain information to the subject of an investigation or inquiry conducted by OPR for the purpose of furthering the investigation or inquiry, or to give notice of the status or outcome of the investigation or inquiry. In addition, the Department is revising the existing routine use for disclosure of records in records management inspections, since the General Services Administration no longer conducts record management inspections.

Title 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(4) and (11) provides that the public be given a 30-day period in which to comment on the proposed new routine use disclosures. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which has oversight responsibilities under the Privacy Act, requires a 40-day period in which to conclude its review of any proposal to revise existing routine uses or add new routine use disclosures or make other major modifications.

You may submit any comments by May 20, 2004. The public, OMB and the Congress are invited to send comments to Mary Cahill, Management Analyst, Management and Planning Staff, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, Room 1400 National Place Building, Washington, DC 20530. If no comments are received, the proposal will be implemented without further notice in the **Federal Register**.

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552a(r), the Department has provided a report to OMB and the Congress on the proposed new routine use.

Dated: April 6, 2004.

Paul R. Corts,

Assistant Attorney General for Administration.

JUSTICE/OPR–001

SYSTEM NAME:

Office of Professional Responsibility Record Index

* * * * *

ROUTINE USES OF RECORDS MAINTAINED IN THE SYSTEM, INCLUDING CATEGORIES OF USERS AND THE PURPOSES OF SUCH USES:

* * * * *

* * * [Revise the current routine use (8) to read as follows.]

(8) a record may be disclosed to the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) in records management inspections conducted under 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906;

* * * * * *

* * * (13) relevant information contained in this system of records may be disclosed to a member of the judicial branch of Federal Government in response to a written request where disclosures are relevant to the authorized function of the recipient judicial office or court system. [Following this sentence insert the paragraph below.]

(14) information in this system may be disclosed to the subject of an investigation or inquiry conducted by OPR to further the investigation or inquiry, or to give notice of the status or outcome of the investigation or inquiry.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 04–8903 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–28–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–54,509]

Agilent Technologies, Andover, MA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on March 16, 2004 in response to a worker petition which was filed on behalf of workers at Agilent Technologies, Andover, Massachusetts.

The petitioners have requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 30th day of March, 2004.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E4–888 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–52,969B and TA–W–52,969C]

Agilent Technologies, Inc., Computer Test Equipment Division (Cte), Santa Rosa, CA and Including Employees of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Computer Test Equipment Division (Cte), Andover, MA; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on October 7, 2003, applicable to workers of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Computer Test Equipment Division (CTE), Santa Rosa, California. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on November 6, 2003 (68 FR 62834).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New information shows that worker separations have occurred involving employees of the Santa Rosa, California facility of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Computer Test Equipment Division (CTE) located in Andover, Massachusetts.

These employees provided research and development services supporting the production of drive test equipment in the PLPJ line at the subject firm.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include employees of the Santa Rosa, California facility of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Computer Test Equipment Div. (CTE), located in Andover, Massachusetts.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Computer Test Equipment (CTE) who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–52,969B is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Computer Test Equipment Division (CTE), Santa Rosa, California (TA–W–52,969B), including employees of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Computer Test Equipment Division (CTE), Andover, Massachusetts (TA–W–52,969C), engaged in employment related to the support of drive test equipment in the PLPJ product line who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after September 16, 2002, through October 7, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, DC, this 9th day of April 2004.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E4–891 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–54,322]

Dielectric Communications, Raymond, ME; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on February 20, 2004, in response to a petition filed by the State Agency (Maine) on behalf of workers at Dielectric Communications, Raymond, Maine.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 30th day of March, 2004.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E4–890 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–54,578]

Motion Picture Editors Guild International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, Moving Picture Technicians, Artists and Allied Crafts of the United States, Its Territorites And Canada (latse), Local 700 Los Angeles, CA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on March 24, 2004 in response to a worker petition filed by a state agency representative on behalf of the members of The Motion Picture Editors Guild, International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees Moving Picture Technicians, Artists and Allied Crafts of the United States, Its Territories and Canada, (IATSE), Local 700, Los Angeles, California.

Petitions for trade Adjustment Assistance must specify a particular worker group at a firm producing an article on behalf of whom the petition is being filed. The petition regarding the investigation does not meet these criteria and has been deemed invalid. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 31st day of March, 2004.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E4–886 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–54,537]

RBX Industries, Bedford, VA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on March 22, 2004 in response to a worker petition filed on behalf of workers at RBX Industries, Inc., Bedford, Virginia.

The petitioning group of workers is covered by an earlier petition filed on March 5, 2004 (TA–W–54,467) that is the subject of an ongoing investigation for which a determination has not yet been issued. Further investigation in this case would duplicate efforts and serve no purpose; therefore the investigation under this petition has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 30th day of March 2004.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E4–887 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–54,507]

Siemens Energy and Automation, Inc., A Subsidiary of Siemens Corporation, Tucker, GA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on March 16, 2004 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers of Siemens Energy and Automation, Inc., a subsidiary of Siemens Corporation, Tucker, Georgia.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 31st day of March 2004.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E4–889 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA–06385]

Ameriphone, Inc., a Wholly Owned Subsidiary of Plantronics, Inc., Garden Grove, CA; Notice of Revised Determination on Remand

The United States Court of International Trade (USCIT) granted the Secretary of Labor's motion for a voluntary remand for further investigation in *Former Employees of Ameriphone, Inc.* v. *U.S. Secretary of Labor* (Court No. 03–00243).

The Department's initial denial of NAFTA-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA–6385) for the workers of Ameriphone, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Plantronics, Inc., Garden Grove, California (hereafter "Ameriphone"), was issued on September 11, 2002 and published in the **Federal Register** on September 27, 2002 (67 FR 61160). The denial was based on the finding that the workers at the subject facility did not produce an article as required by Section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974.

On March 10, 2003, the Department issued a Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for NAFTA–6385 and published in the **Federal Register** on March 18, 2003 (68 FR 12938).

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner alleged that the workers were engaged in the final phase of production (inspecting, testing and modifying products) as well as prototype design and production. In the reconsideration investigation, the Department found that the articulated functions constituted a negligible portion of the work performed at the subject facility and that the workers were, in fact, service providers.

On voluntary remand, the Department contacted the company and requested detailed information regarding the workers' functions at the subject facility. The newly obtained information revealed that workers at the subject facility were engaged in production. The

new information also revealed that a significant portion of the production performed at the subject facility was shifted to Mexico impacting workers at the subject plant.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on remand, I conclude that a shift of production to Mexico of products like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers of Ameriphone, Inc., Garden Grove, California. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

"All workers of Ameriphone, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Plantronics, Inc., Garden Grove, California, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 24, 2001 through two years of this certification, are eligible to apply for NAFTA–TAA under Section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, DC, this 1st day of October, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

Editorial Note: This document was received in the Office of the Federal Register on April 15, 2004.

[FR Doc. E4–892 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. ICR–1218–0173 (2004)]

Course Evaluation Form; Extension of the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Approval of Information Collection (Paperwork) Requirements

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Labor.

ACTION: Request for comment.

SUMMARY: OSHA solicits comments concerning its request for an extension of the information collection requirements contained in the Course Evaluation Form.

DATES: Comments must be submitted by the following dates:

Hard Copy: You comments must be submitted (postmarked or received) by June 21, 2004.

Facsimile and electronic: Your comments must be submitted (postmarked or received) by June 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: I. *Submission of Comments. Regular mail, express delivery, hand-delivery, and messenger service:* Submit your comments and attachments to the OSHA Docket Office, Docket No. ICR–1218–0173 (2004), Room N–2625, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. OSHA Docket Office and Department of Labor hours of operation are 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m., EST.

Facsimile: If your comments, including any attachments, are 10 pages or fewer, you may fax them to the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693–1648. You must include the docket number of this document, Docket No. ICR 1218–0173 (2004), in your comments.

Electronic: You may submit comments, but not attachments, through the Internet at *http://ecomments.osha.gov/.*

II. *Obtaining Copies of the Supporting Statement for the Information Collection Request.* The Supporting Statement for the Information Collection Request is available for downloading from OSHA's Web site at *http://www.osha.gov.* The supporting statement is available for inspection and copying in the OSHA Docket Office, at the address listed above. A printed copy of the supporting statement can be obtained by contacting Todd Owen at (202) 693–2222.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gail Butler, Division of Administration and Training Information, OSHA Office of Training and Education, 2020 South Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005; telephone (not toll free) (847) 297–4810; e-mail: *gail.butler@osha.gov* or facsimile: (847) 297–4874.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Submission of Comments in This Notice and Internet Access to Comments and Submissions

You may submit comments in response to this document by (1) hard copy, (2) fax transmission (facsimile), or (3) electronically through the OSHA Web page. Please note you cannot attach materials such as studies or journal articles to electronic comments. If you have additional materials, you must submit three copies of them to the OSHA Docket Office at the address above. The additional materials must clearly identify your electronic comments by name, date, subject and docket number so that we can attach them to your comments. Because of security-related problems there may be a significant delay in the receipt of comments by regular mail. Please contact the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693–2350 for information about security procedures concerning the delivery of material by express delivery, hand delivery and messenger service.

II. Background

The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent (*i.e.*, employer) burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing information-collection requirements in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA–95) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(q)(A)). This program ensures that information is in the desired format, reporting burden (time and cost) is minimal, collection instruments are clearly understood, and OSHA's estimate of the information-collection burden is correct.

Section 21 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the "OSH Act") (*see* 29 U.S.C. 670) authorizes the Occupational Safety and Health Administration ("OSHA" or the ("Agency") to conduct training and employee education. Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 21 require, respectively, that the Agency: (a) "[C]onduct, directly or by grants or contracts, (1) education programs to provide an adequate supply of qualified personnel to carry out the purposes of this Act, and (2) informational programs on the importance of and proper use of adequate safety and health equipment"; (b) "[C]onduct, directly or by grants or contracts, short-term training of personnel engaged in work related to [their] responsibilities under the Act"; and (c) "(1) provide for the establishment and supervision of programs for the education and training of employers and employees in the recognition, avoidance, and prevention of unsafe and unhealthful working conditions in employments covered by this Act, and (2) consult with and advise employers and employees, and organizations representing employers and employees as to effective means of preventing occupational injuries and illnesses."

As authorized by section 21 of the Act, the OSHA Training Institute (the "Institute") provides basic, intermediate, and advanced training and education in occupational safety and health for Federal and State compliance officers, Agency professionals and technical-support personnel, employers, employees, organizations representing employees and employers, educators who develop curricula and teach occupational safety and health courses, and representatives of professional safety and health groups. This program includes courses on occupational safety

and health provided by the Institute at its national training facility in Arlington Heights, Illinois. The Institute also administers a program whereby several institutions in various locations throughout the United States have been authorized as OSHA Training Institute Education Centers. These Education Centers conduct various OSHA courses that are geared for private sector and other Federal Agency personnel. The goal of the Education Center program is to expand the accessibility of high-quality OSHA training courses.

All students completing training courses at the Institute and the Education Centers are requested to complete the Course Evaluation Form (OSHA Form 49, 08–98 edition) on the last day of class. Students may be Federal, State, private sector, local or tribal government employees. The Course Evaluation Form contains ten closed-ended questions. It requests participant feedback on ten elements of the program to assess communication and accomplishment of learning objectives, course content, training environment, relevance of topics in job, effectiveness of exercises, workshops, laboratories, field trips and audiovisuals, usefulness of course materials and handouts, and overall rating of the course. The feedback provides an overall impression of the student's training experience for the course. Students may provide more detailed feedback in the narrative sections of the form. The Course Evaluation Form provides a standardized tool for collecting quality data that OSHA uses to determine program successes and shortcomings. Data from this form has also assisted the Training Institute in directing resources where they can do the most good.

All Course Evaluation Forms are reviewed by the course chairperson, instructors, the Institute Director and the supervisor responsible for that course. Ratings provide baseline data from which to draw conclusions about the effectiveness and quality of the training courses and to assess the level of student satisfaction with the course. Evaluation data is used to determine which courses may need improvement. Problem areas are noted and the supervisor discusses them with the course chairperson. Courses needing further improvement are scheduled for a more comprehensive follow-up course evaluation with recommendations for improvement. Revised courses are closely monitored to determine if problem areas have been resolved.

III. Special Issues for Comment

OSHA has a particular interest in comments on the following issues:

- Whether the proposed information-collection requirements are necessary for the proper performance of the Agency's functions, including whether the information is useful;
- The accuracy of OSHA's estimate of the burden (time and cost) of the information-collection requirements, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- The quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on employers who must comply; for example, by using automated or other technological information-collection and -transmission techniques.

IV. Proposed Actions

OSHA is proposing to extend OMB's previous approval of the recordkeeping (paperwork) requirement specified in the Course Evaluation Form. The Agency will summarize the comments submitted in response to this notice, and will include this summary in its request to OMB to extend the approval of this information-collection requirement.

Type of Review: Extension of currently approved information-collection requirements.

Title: Course Evaluation.

OMB Number: 1218–0173.

Affected Public: Individuals; business or other for-profit organizations; Federal Government; State, local, or tribal governments.

Number of Respondents: 20,900.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Total Responses: 20,900.

Average Time per Response: 10 minutes.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 3,483.

Estimated Cost (Operation and Maintenance): $0.

V. Authority and Signature

John L. Henshaw, Assistant Secretary of labor for Occupational Safety and Health, directed the preparation of this notice. The authority for this notice is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506) and Secretary of Labor's Order No. 5–2002 (67 FR 65008).

Signed at Washington, DC, on April 14, 2004.

John L. Henshaw,

Assistant Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 04–8913 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

National Endowment for the Arts; Fellowships Advisory Panel

Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), as amended, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Fellowships Advisory Panel, Music section (NEA Jazz Masters category) to the National Council on the Arts will be held by teleconference on May 10, 2004 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. in Room 703 at the Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, 20506.

This meeting is for the purpose of Panel review, discussion, evaluation, and recommendations on financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended. In accordance with the determination of the Chairman of April 30, 2003, these sessions will be closed to the public pursuant to subsection (c)(6) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Kathy Plowitz-Worden, Office of Guidelines & Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC, 20506, or call 202/682–5691.

Dated: April 14, 2004.

Kathy Plowitz-Worden,

Panel Coordinator, Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 04–8917 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–P

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

National Endowment for the Arts; Fellowships Advisory Panel

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92–463), as amended, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Fellowships Advisory Panel, Literature section (Translation Projects in Poetry category) to the National Council on the Arts will be held on May 25, 2004 from 9 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. in Room 714 at the Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, 20506.

This meeting is for the purpose of Panel review, discussion, evaluation, and recommendations on financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including information given in confidence to the agency. In accordance with the determination of the Chairman of April 30, 2003, these sessions will be

closed to the public pursuant to subsection (c)(6) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Kathy Plowitz-Worden, Office of Guidelines & Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC, 20506, or call 202/682–5691.

Dated: April 2, 2004.

Kathy Plowitz-Worden,

Panel Coordinator, Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 04–8918 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–369 and 50–370]

Duke Energy Corporation; McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2; Exemption

1.0 Background

The Duke Energy Corporation (the licensee) is the holder of Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–9 and NPF–17 which authorizes operation of the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2 (McGuire). The license provides, among other things, that the facility is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of two pressurized-water reactors located in Mecklenburg County in North Carolina.

2.0 Request/Action

Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) part 73, appendix B, Section I.B.b.(1), "Vision," (a) states, "For each individual, distant visual acuity in each eye shall be correctable to 20/30 (Snellen or equivalent) in the better eye and 20/40 in the other eye with eyeglasses or contact lenses. If uncorrected distance vision is not at least 20/40 in the better eye, the individual shall carry an extra pair of corrective lenses. Near visual acuity, corrected or uncorrected, shall be at least 20/40 in the better eye. Field of vision must be at least 70° horizontal meridian in each eye. The ability to distinguish red, green, and yellow colors is required. Loss of vision in one eye is disqualifying. Glaucoma shall be disqualifying, unless controlled by acceptable medical or surgical means, provided such medications as may be used for controlling glaucoma do not cause undesirable side effects which adversely affect the individual's ability to perform assigned security job duties, and provided the visual acuity and field of vision requirements stated above are met. On-the-job evaluation shall be used for individuals who exhibit a mild color vision defect." The regulation at 10 CFR part 73, appendix B, Section III.A.IV, "Weapons qualification and requalification program," states, "Qualification firing for the handgun and rifle must be for daylight firing, and each individual shall perform night firing for familiarization with assigned weapon(s). The results of weapons qualification and requalification must be documented by the licensee or the licensee's agent. Each individual shall be requalified at least every 12 months. The licensee shall retain this documentation of each qualification and requalification as a record for three years from the date of the qualification or requalification, as appropriate.

A. Handgun—Guards, armed escorts and armed response personnel shall qualify with a revolver or semiautomatic pistol firing from the national police course, or an equivalent nationally recognized course. Qualifying score shall be an accumulated total of 70 percent of the maximum obtainable score.

B. Semiautomatic Rifle—Guards, armed escorts and armed response personnel, assigned to use the semiautomatic rifle by the licensee training and qualifications plan, shall qualify with a semiautomatic rifle by firing the 100-yard course of fire specified in section 17.5(1) of the National Rifle Association, High Power Rifle Rules book (effective March 15, 1976) or a nationally recognized equivalent course of fire. Targets used shall be as stated in section 17.5 for the 100-yard course. Time limits for individuals shall be as specified in section 8.2 of the NRA rulebook, regardless of the course fired. Qualifying scores shall be an accumulated total of 80 percent of the maximum obtainable score.

C. Shotgun—Guards, armed escorts and armed response personnel assigned to use the 12-gauge shotgun by the licensee training and qualifications plan shall qualify with a full choke or improved modified choke 12-gauge shotgun. To qualify, the individual shall be required to place 50 percent of all pellets (36) pellets within the black silhouette.

D. Requalification—Individuals shall be weapons requalified at least every 12 months in accordance with the NRC approved licensee training and qualifications plan, and in accordance with the requirements stated in A, B, and C of this section." In its letter of June 12, 2003, the licensee requested an exemption from the distant visual requirements of 10 CFR part 73, appendix B, Section I.B.b(1). The licensee's letter of June 12, 2003, is being withheld from public disclosure pursuant to 10 CFR 2.390(a)(6), because the letter contains information about an employee's personnel and medical records, a disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

3.0 Discussion

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, the Commission may, upon application by any interested person or upon its own initiative, grant exemptions from the requirements of 10 CFR part 50 when (1) the exemptions are authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to public health or safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security; and (2) when special circumstances are present.

The NRC staff has reviewed the individual's visual medical evaluations and has determined that granting the exemption will not jeopardize the health and safety of the public or be inimical to the common defense and security. The NRC staff's Safety Evaluation is provided in the Enclosure, that is being withheld from public disclosure because it also contains information about an employee's personnel and medical records, a disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2), the exemption requested by the licensee in its June 12, 2003, submittal should be granted.

4.0 Conclusion

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a), the exemption is authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security. Also, special circumstances are present. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants Duke Energy Corporation an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR part 73, appendix B, Section I.B.b(1), "Vision," for the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (69 FR 18655, April 8, 2004).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of April, 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ledyard B. Marsh,

Director, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E4–894 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–483]

Union Electric Company; Notice of Partial Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Union Electric Company (the licensee) to partially withdraw its June 27, 2003, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–30 for the Callaway Plant, Unit 1, located in Callaway County, Missouri.

The proposed amendment will approve the application of leak-before-break methodology for the accumulator and residual heat removal lines and installation of an opening the secondary shield wall in terms of the effect of the opening on occupational exposure. The shield wall opening is related to plant modifications that would facilitate maintenance on the replacement steam generators to be installed in Refueling Outage (RO) 14 (Fall 2005). The licensee withdrew the part of the amendment request that would apply LBB to the pressurizer surge line Alloy 82/182 weld location.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on July 22, 2003 (68 FR 43397). However, by letter dated April 5, 2004, the licensee partially withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated June 27, 2003, and the licensee's letter dated April 5, 2004, which partially withdrew the application for license amendment. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the internet at the NRC Web site, *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams/html.* Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1–800–397–4209, or 301–415–4737 or by email to *pdr@nrc.gov.*

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of April, 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jack N. Donohew,

Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate IV, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E4–893 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Generic Safety Issue (GSI)–191, "Assessment of Debris Accumulation on Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) Sump Performance;" Meeting

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Representatives from Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), utility groups and stakeholders will meet with the staff of Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to discuss the chemical effects test plan and test facility that will be used to conduct the tests. This is a joint test program between the NRC and the industry (represented by NEI and EPRI). The meeting is a followup to a meeting in January 2004 on the same subject. The meeting is open to the public and all interested parties may attend.

DATES: April 28, 2004, from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.

ADDRESSES: Nuclear Regulatory Commission, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Conference Room O–10B4, Rockville, Maryland, 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: T.Y. Chang, Mail Stop T–10D20, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Telephone: (301) 415–6450; fax: (301) 415–5074; Internet: *tyc@nrc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: One of the remaining open GSI–191 issues to be resolved is the chemical effects for PWR Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) recirculation, which relates to possible chemical reactions between sump/spray fluids and materials in containment. The NRC Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) has asked if chemical reaction products or precipitates in post-loss of coolant accident (LOCA) sump fluid could be generated in sufficient quantity to significantly increase pressure drop (head loss) across ECCS recirculation sump screen debris beds. This test program will generate data needed by both NRC and the industry to address this question. NRC and industry will conduct data analysis and reach conclusions independently. These results will be made publicly available.

Attendees are requested to notify T.Y. Chang at (301) 425–6450 of their planned attendance if special services, such as for the hearing impaired, are necessary.

The NRC is accessible to the White Flint Metro Station. Visitor parking near the NRC buildings is limited.

Date in Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of April, 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Anthony Hsia,

Acting Chief, Engineering Research Applications Branch, Division of Engineering Technology, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. E4–885 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Proposed Interim Enforcement Policy for Pilot Program on the Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution in the Enforcement Program Request for Comments

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Request for comments on pilot program.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is seeking public comment on a proposed pilot program to address the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in the enforcement program.

DATES: Submit comments on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods. Comments submitted in writing or in electronic format will be made available to the public in their entirety on the NRC rulemaking Web site. Personal information will not be removed from your comments. Mail comments to: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, ATTN: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

E-mail comments to: *SECY@nrc.gov.* If you do not receive a reply e-mail confirming that we have received your

comments, contact us directly (301) 415–1966. You may also submit comments via the NRC's interactive rulemaking Web site at *http://ruleforum.llnl.gov*. Address questions about our rulemaking Web site to Carol Gallagher at (301) 415–5905 (e-mail: *CAG@nrc.gov*).

Hand deliver comments to: 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays. (Telephone (301) 415–1966).

Fax comments to: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission at (301) 415–1101.

Publicly available documents related to this action may be viewed electronically on the public computers located at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), O1F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The PDR reproduction contractor will copy documents for a fee. Selected documents, including comments, may be viewed and downloaded electronically via the NRC's interactive rulemaking Web site at *http://ruleforum.llnl.gov*.

Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC after November 1, 1999, are available electronically at the NRC's Electronic Reading Room at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html*. From this site, the public can gain entry into the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the document located in ADAMS, contact the NRC PDR Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or e-mail to *pdr@nrc.gov*.

The NRC maintains the current Enforcement Policy on its Web site at *http://www.nrc.gov*, select What We Do, Enforcement, then Enforcement Policy.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nick Hilton, Senior Enforcement Specialist, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, (301) 415–2741, e-mail *ndh@nrc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission approved an NRC staff proposal to develop a pilot program on the use of "Alternative Dispute Resolution" (ADR) in cases involving the NRC's enforcement activities concerning allegations or findings of discrimination and other wrongdoing. *See* SECY–03–0115. "ADR" is a term that refers to a number of processes that can be used in assisting parties in resolving disputes and potential conflicts. Most of these processes are voluntary, where the parties to the dispute are in control of the decision on whether to participate in the process and whether to agree to any resolution of the dispute. The parties are assisted in their efforts to reach agreement by a neutral third party. As an initial step in the development of the pilot program, the NRC held a public workshop on December 10, 2003, to discuss multiple issues. These issues were summarized in a document on the NRC's Web site at *http://www.nrc.gov:* select What We Do, Enforcement, then Alternative Dispute Resolution. This document is also available in ADAMS at ML033290248.

The NRC staff has developed a proposed interim enforcement policy statement for implementation of the pilot program. The NRC staff believes this proposed program is responsive to many of its stakeholders' comments and concerns. A balance was attempted to be achieved between public confidence in the process and increased efficiency and effectiveness.

Several issues were identified for further discussion in SECY–03–0115, others were identified as the pilot program was outlined by the NRC, and stakeholder comments added a few more. Most of the concerns focused on Early ADR. Early ADR is defined for the pilot program purposes as ADR between a licensee or contractor and an employee who has raised a prima facie case of discrimination prior to any NRC investigation. The NRC believes many of the issues have been adequately addressed in the proposed pilot program. However, some issues remain and are described briefly below.

General Issues

Selection of a neutral agreeable to all parties is fundamental to the success of ADR. The parties must agree that the neutral is truly neutral and unbiased. Most stakeholders believed external neutrals, rather than internal NRC neutrals, were necessary to ensure that all parties viewed the neutral as unbiased. Some suggested a roster of neutrals should be available for the parties to select from. The NRC, based on input from internal and external experts, determined a list of organizations that have established rosters of neutrals will be provided on the Office of Enforcement's (OE) ADR Web page, with the allowance that any neutral the parties agree to will be acceptable.

Payment of neutral fees during Early ADR was considered at length. The NRC is sensitive to the fact that whistleblowers would not likely have the financial ability to pay half of a neutral's fee as is the typical custom in ADR. However, if licensees pay the entire fee, whistleblowers would likely be concerned about the neutral's bias. Therefore, the staff requested comments regarding how neutrals should be paid in Early ADR. Stakeholders agreed that the NRC should pay for the neutral's services and, at least through the pilot program, the NRC should assess licensee fees for the expense of neutrals in Early ADR through 10 CFR Part 171 After an investigation has been completed and the matter is under consideration for possible NRC enforcement action, the NRC and the licensee will be the parties to the ADR, with each paying half of the neutral's fee.

Issues Related to Early ADR

The NRC believes that, consistent with the existing Enforcement Policy and in addition to the NRC-sponsored Early ADR option, licensees should be encouraged to develop ADR programs of their own for use in conjunction with an employee concerns type program. However, licensees have made it clear that a significant impediment to both that type of program and the proposed NRC Early ADR program is the threat of an investigation after the case is settled. Many external stakeholders were explicit in stating that there must be certainty that if the parties arrive at a settlement, the NRC will not initiate an investigation or enforcement action regarding the same issue. The same stakeholders acknowledge an NRC review of a settlement for any restrictive agreements in violation of the Employee Protection regulations is important and should be conducted. Therefore, the NRC proposes that should an employee who alleges retaliation for engaging in protected activity utilize a licensee's program to settle the discrimination concern, no NRC investigation will be initiated until it is determined whether a settlement can be reached. If a settlement is reached through a licensee's program, the NRC would review the settlement for restrictive agreements in violation of 10 CFR 50.7(f) et al, and abuse of the ADR process. If an acceptable settlement is reached, the NRC will not investigate or take enforcement action.

The NRC is developing a booklet for whistleblowers who are considering requesting Early ADR. Most whistleblowers will not have any knowledge of the concept of ADR, either positive or negative, or the NRC's program. The ADR booklet will provide an overview of the NRC's Early ADR program and ADR in general, supplementing the allegation booklet

already provided to concerned individuals. In addition, information regarding the pilot program will be placed on the Office of Enforcement's web page and be available to any party.

The NRC believes the more timely resolution of discrimination concerns that should be brought about by Early ADR will be a greater benefit to the safety conscious work environment (SCWE) than the potential negatives associated with the process. However, some of the potential shortcomings of the process are worth discussion.

Stakeholders from the industry and those representing whistleblowers suggested that Early ADR settlements are not appropriate means for documenting SCWE corrective actions. Rather, the industry offered to use some other vehicle and suggested the NRC could address concerns related to the SCWE through the inspection process. However, the NRC notes that there would not be a prohibition from including SCWE corrective actions in a settlement agreement if the parties wanted to consider them as a possible element of a settlement. In fact, one of the parties may find it appropriate to consider such actions as part of the settlement. While the inspection process alone would allow the NRC an avenue to suggest necessary SCWE actions, the suggestions would not be binding as they may be if included in a settlement agreement.

Whistleblower representatives and several internal stakeholders have concerns regarding cases where deliberate misconduct appeared to have played a role in a discrimination case. The industry has suggested that the process will take care of the issue, *e.g.* the industry does not want management engaged in deliberate misconduct either and will independently take appropriate corrective action as warranted. On an individual case basis, the NRC believes that such abuse may be prevented by the whistleblowers who believe they have been wronged in a deliberate or malicious manner and therefore do not agree to Early ADR. The NRC believes that on an overall program basis, particularly egregious scenarios where discrimination could eventually be identified through the number of allegations at a particular facility. On average, only a few percent of the cases investigated each year result in a determination of deliberate discrimination. While the NRC recognizes that settlements in an Early ADR case have the potential to involve deliberate misconduct, the NRC believes that early settlements and corrective actions will limit the potential chilling effect at the site, thereby furthering the site's SCWE. Therefore, on balance, the NRC believes that early settlements outweigh the risk of not taking an enforcement action on a case involving deliberate misconduct.

The NRC's proposed pilot program includes a nominal time period of 90 days from an agreement to mediate between the parties for a settlement to be reached by the parties. This limitation is appropriate, particularly regarding Early ADR, to ensure the attempted negotiations do not significantly delay further processing of the case. A key assumption for the success of Early ADR is the quick resolution of issues between the licensee and whistleblower. Failure to reach an agreement quickly will detract from the potential benefits of Early ADR as well as potentially making subsequent investigation, if necessary, more difficult. For cases considered after the issuance of an OI report of investigation, the NRC will be a party and therefore more in control of the negotiation timetable.

Stakeholders representing both the industry and whistleblowers have made it clear that settlements resulting from the Early ADR process will take the form of an agreement resolving the conflict between the two parties, *i.e.*, the complainant and the licensee (or the licensee's contractor). This may give Early ADR the appearance of a Department of Labor (DOL) proceeding. However, the NRC, which is not a party to the negotiation, will not take any position on the merits of the case, and will not impose any personal remedy.

In order to provide additional assurance to a whistleblower that the pressure of a negotiation does not result in an agreement the whistleblower later regrets, a 3 day waiting period is included prior to a settlement in Early ADR going into full effect.

One representative of the public was concerned that Early ADR could reveal the existence of documentation to a licensee that, if the ADR session failed, could be destroyed prior to an investigation. The suggestion was to require an index of documents used (if any) during the ADR session. This list could be provided to the NRC as evidence of existence of those documents. After consideration, the staff concluded that maintaining records and documents produced during confidential ADR sessions may be problematic and the proposed scenario was unlikely. Both internal and external expert neutrals indicated that copies of all documents used in a joint session are routinely provided to all parties and that it is unlikely a "sensitive" document of this type would be offered at a joint session unless a party was comfortable with it. Therefore, the hypothetical destruction of evidence would be unlikely to succeed in that both parties have copies of the documents.

Accordingly, the proposed revision to the NRC Enforcement Policy reads as follows:

General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions

* * * * *

INTERIM ENFORCEMENT POLICIES

* * * * *

Interim Enforcement Policy Regarding Enforcement Discretion For Certain Fitness-for-Duty Issues (10 CFR Part 26)

* * * * *

Interim Policy for the Use of ADR in the Enforcement Program

I. Introduction

A. Background

This section sets forth the interim enforcement policy that the NRC will follow to undertake a pilot program testing the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in the enforcement program.

B. Scope

The pilot program scope consists of the trial use of ADR for cases involving: (1) Alleged discrimination for engaging in protected activity prior to an NRC investigation; and (2) both discrimination and other wrongdoing cases after the Office of Investigations has competed an investigation. Specific points in the enforcement process where ADR may be requested are specified below. Mediation will be the form of ADR typically utilized. Certain cases may only require facilitation, a process where the neutral's function is primarily to support the communication process rather than focusing on the parties reaching a settlement.

Note: Although the NRC's ADR program may cause the parties to negotiate issues which may also form the basis for a claim under Section 211 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of Labor's (DOL) timeliness requirements for filing a claim are in no way altered by the NRC's program.

In cases involving an allegation of discrimination, any underlying technical issue will be treated as a separate issue, or concern, within the allegation program. The allegation program will be used to resolve concerns (typically safety concerns) and issues other than the discrimination complaint.

II. General

A. Responsibilities and Program Administration

The Director, OE, is responsible for the overall program. In addition, the Director, OE, will serve as the lead NRC negotiator for cases involving discrimination after OI completes an investigation. The Director, OE, may also designate the Deputy Director, OE, to act as the lead negotiator.

Regional Administrators are designated as the lead NRC negotiator for cases involving wrongdoing other than discrimination. The Regional Administrator may designate the Deputy Regional Administrator to act as the lead negotiator or the Director or Deputy Director, OE, may also serve as the lead negotiator for other wrongdoing cases.

The Program Administrator will provide program oversight and support for each region and headquarters program offices. Program and neutral evaluations will be provided to the Program Administrator. The Program Administrator will serve as the intake neutral for post investigation ADR. An "intake neutral" develops information and processes information for mediation. As an intake neutral, the confidentiality provisions discussed below will apply.

The Office Allegation Coordinators (OACs) are normally a complainant's first substantive contact when a concern regarding discrimination is raised. As such, the OACs will also serve as an intake neutral who develops information and processes the necessary information for mediation under Early ADR. The confidentiality provisions in Section II.B.7 will apply to the OAC and Program Administrator. The OAC will also process documentation necessary to operate the program.

B. General Rules/Principles

Unless specifically addressed in a subsequent section, the rules described in this section apply generally throughout the ADR program, regardless of where in the overall enforcement process the ADR sessions occur.

1. *Voluntary.* Use of the NRC ADR program is voluntary, and any participant may end the mediation at any time. The goal is to obtain an agreement satisfactory to all participants on issues in controversy.

2. *Neutral qualification.* Generally, a neutral should be knowledgeable and experienced with nuclear matters or labor and employment law. However, any neutral that is satisfactory to the parties is acceptable.

3. *Roster of neutrals.* OE will maintain a list of organizations from which services of neutrals could be obtained. The parties may select a mediator from any of these organizations; however, the parties are not required to use the organizations provided and any neutral mutually agreeable to the parties is acceptable.

4. *Mediator selection.* If the parties have not selected a mediator within fourteen days, the Program Administrator or OAC may propose a mediator for the parties' consideration.

5. *Neutrality.* Mediators are neutral. The role of the mediator is to provide an environment where all participants will have an opportunity to resolve their differences. The parties should each consult an attorney or other professional if any question of law, content of a proposed agreement on issues in controversy, or other issues exists.

For Early ADR, the OAC will serve as an intake neutral. Should any party seek to discuss the NRC's enforcement ADR process in detail, the party should be referred to the OAC. The OAC will initiate discussion of the option to mediate and process the necessary documentation. Subsequently, for post investigation ADR, the program administrator will serve as the intake neutral. Due to the nature of conversations that typically occur between an intake neutral and the parties, these conversations will also be considered confidential.

6. *Mediation sessions.* Once selected by the parties and contracted by the OAC, the mediator will promptly contact each of the parties to discuss the mediation process under the Program, reconfirm party interest in proceeding, establish a date and location for the mediation session and obtain any other information s/he believes likely to be useful. The mediator will preside over all mediation sessions, and will be expected to complete the mediation within 90 days after referral unless the parties, and the NRC if not a party, agree otherwise. At the conclusion of the mediation, parties will be asked to fill out and submit an evaluation form for the mediator that will be sent to the Program Administrator.

Normally, a settlement is expected to be reached and signed within 90 days from when the parties agree to attempt ADR. A principal reason for Early ADR is the quick resolution of the claim, thereby improving the SCWE. If the parties cannot agree to a settlement within 90 days, the NRC must assume a settlement will not be reached and continue with the investigation and enforcement process. Where good cause is shown and all parties agree, the NRC may allow a small extension to the 90 day limit to allow for completion of a settlement agreement.

Settlement agreements in Early ADR will not be final until 3 days after the agreement has been signed. Either party may reconsider the settlement agreement during the 3 day period. Subsequent concerns regarding implementation of the settlement agreement should be directed to the neutral, or if necessary, the OAC.

7. *Confidentiality.* The mediator will specifically inform all parties and other attendees that all mediation activities under the Program are subject to the confidentiality provisions of the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act, 5 U.S.C. Sections 571–584; the Federal ADR Council's guidance document entitled "Confidentiality in Federal ADR Programs;" and the explicit confidentiality terms set forth in the Agreement to Begin Voluntary Mediation signed by the parties. The mediator will explain these confidentiality terms and offer to answer questions regarding them.

8. *Good Faith.* All participants will participate in good faith in the mediation process and explore potentially feasible options that could lead to the management or resolution of issues in controversy.

9. *Not legal representation.* A mediator is not a legal representative or legal counsel. The mediator will not represent any party in the instant case or any future proceeding or matter relating to the issues in controversy in this case. The mediator is not either party's lawyer and no party should rely on the mediator for legal advice.

10. *Mediator Fees.* If Early ADR (defined below) is utilized, the NRC, subject to the availability of funds, will pay the mediator's entire fee. For cases where a licensee requests ADR subsequent to the completion of an OI report, the licensee requesting ADR will pay half of the mediator's fee and the NRC, subject to the availability of funds, will pay half. The NRC will recover the mediator fees it pays through annual fees assessed to licensees under 10 CFR Part 171.

11. *Exceptions.* The only exception to the offering of Early ADR by the NRC will be abuse of the program, *e.g.*, a large number of repetitive requests for ADR by a particular facility, contractor or whistleblower. Should the NRC believe the ADR program has been abused in some manner by one of the parties potentially involved, the Director, OE will be notified.

To maximize the potential use of the ADR pilot program, for cases after an OI investigation is completed, the NRC will at least consider negotiating a settlement

with a licensee for any wrongdoing case if requested. However, there may be certain circumstances where it may not be appropriate for the NRC to engage in ADR.

12. *Number of settlement attempts.* Each case will be afforded a maximum of two attempts to reach a settlement on the same underlying issue through the use of ADR. An "attempt" is defined as one or more mediated sessions conducted at a specific point in the NRC's enforcement process (generally within a 90 day period). However, in general, settlement at any time without the use of a neutral is not precluded by the ADR program.

13. *Finality.* Cases that reach a settlement (and are acceptable to the NRC), either in Early ADR or after an OI investigation is complete, constitute a final enforcement decision on the case by the NRC.

III. ADR Opportunities

A. Licensee Sponsored Programs

Licensees are encouraged to develop ADR programs of their own for use in conjunction with an employee concerns type program. If an employee who alleges retaliation for engaging in protected activity utilizes a licensee's program to settle the discrimination concern, either before or after contacting the NRC, the licensee may voluntarily report the settlement to the NRC as a settlement within the NRC's jurisdiction. If notified of the settlement, the NRC will review the settlement for restrictive agreements potentially in violation of 10 CFR 50.7(f), *et al.* Assuming no such restrictive agreements exist, the NRC will not investigate or take enforcement action.

B. Early ADR

The term "Early ADR" refers to the use of ADR prior to an OI investigation. The parties to Early ADR will normally be the complainant and the licensee. If the complainant is an employee of a licensee contractor, the parties will be the complainant and the contractor. Generally, the Early ADR process will parallel and work in conjunction with the NRC allegation program.

The allegation process will be used through the determination of a prima facie case. If an Allegation Review Board (ARB) determines a prima facie case exists, the ARB will normally recommend the parties be offered the opportunity to use Early ADR. Exceptions to such a recommendation should be rare and be based solely on an identified and articulated abuse of the ADR process by a party who would be involved in the case under consideration. Exceptions will be approved by the Director, OE, prior to initiating an investigation based on denial of ADR.

Early ADR cases will be tracked in the Allegation Management System (AMS). However, the allegation process timeliness measurement will be stayed once the ARB determines that ADR should be offered until the point in time ADR is declined by either party or the case is settled.

When an agreement is reached, the mediator will record the terms of that agreement. The parties may sign the agreement at the mediation session, or any party may review the agreement with his/her attorney before the document is placed in final form and signed. However, as noted above, settlement agreements in Early ADR will not be final until at least 3 days after the agreement has been signed. No participant will hold the NRC liable for the results of the mediation, whether or not a resolution is reached.

A settlement agreement between the parties will be reviewed by the NRC. OE will coordinate the review with the Office of the General Counsel (OGC). The review will ensure that no restrictive agreements in violation of 10 CFR 50.7(f) et al, are contained in the settlement and will normally be completed within 5 working days of receipt. Given an acceptable settlement, the NRC will not investigate or take enforcement action.

The NRC expects that parties to Early ADR will agree to some form of confidentiality. However, that agreement cannot extend to the reporting of any safety concerns potentially discussed during the ADR sessions if one of the parties desires to report the concern. Either party may report safety concerns discussed during ADR sessions to the NRC without regard to confidentiality agreements. Safety concerns and their disposition may be discussed between the parties if desired. In cases where an Early ADR negotiation is between a licensee contractor and the contractor's employee, the NRC expects the contractor to ensure the licensee is aware of any safety issues discussed during the negotiations.

In addition to the settlement agreement, the licensee should provide the NRC with any planned or completed actions relevant to the safety conscious work environment that the licensee has determined to be appropriate.

Generally no press release or other public announcement will be made by the NRC for cases settled by early ADR. However, all documents, including the proposed settlement agreement, submitted to the NRC will be official agency records, and while not generally publicly available, still subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Documents associated with processing an Early ADR case will not generally be publicly available, consistent with the allegation program. However, documents may be subject to the FOIA and may be released, subject to redaction, pursuant to a FOIA request.

Some negotiations may fail to settle the case. When a settlement is not reached, the appropriate intake neutral will be notified, typically by the mediator, and an ARB will determine the appropriate action in accordance with the allegation program.

C. Post-Investigation ADR

Post-investigation ADR refers to the use of ADR anytime after an OI investigation is complete and an enforcement panel concludes that pursuit of an enforcement action appears warranted. Generally, post-investigation ADR processes will parallel and work in conjunction with the NRC enforcement program.

After an investigation is complete, there are generally three issues that can be resolved using ADR; whether a violation occurred, the appropriate enforcement action, and the appropriate corrective actions for the violation(s). If the parties agree, any or all three may be considered in an ADR session.

Two different types of enforcement cases will be eligible for ADR after an investigation is complete, discrimination and other wrongdoing cases. ADR will normally be considered at three places in the enforcement process after OI has completed an investigation: (1) After an enforcement panel has concluded there is the need to continue pursuing potential enforcement action based on an OI case and prior to the conduct of a predecisional enforcement conference (PEC); (2) after the initial enforcement action is taken, typically a Notice of Violation (NOV) and potentially a proposed civil penalty; and (3) after imposition of a civil penalty and prior to a hearing request.

The parties to an ADR session after an OI investigation is complete will be the licensee and the NRC. Fees associated with the neutral will be divided between the NRC and the licensee, each paying half of the total cost.

Settlement discussions are expected to be complete within 90 days of initiating ADR prior to a PEC. The NRC may withdraw from settlement discussions if negotiations have not completed in a timely manner.

The terms of a settlement agreement will normally be confirmed by order. Typically, the specific terms of settlement will be agreed to during the negotiation. The staff will then incorporate appropriate terms into a confirmatory order, a draft of which will then be agreed to by the licensee prior to issuance.

If an attempt to resolve a case using ADR prior to the conduct of a PEC fails, a predecisional enforcement conference will normally be offered to the licensee. The PEC will be conducted as described in the Enforcement Policy.

For cases within the scope of the pilot program, after a panel concludes that a case warrants continuation of the enforcement process, the responsible region or office will contact the licensee and offer either a PEC or ADR. Consistent with the Enforcement Policy, a written response could be offered at the staff's discretion.

Public notification of the settlement will normally be a press release and the confirmatory order will be published in the **Federal Register**.

Confidentiality with the NRC as a party will be determined by the parties as allowed by the ADR Act.

1. Discrimination Cases

Consistent with centralization of the discrimination enforcement process, the Director, Office of Enforcement, will normally negotiate for the NRC.

Normally the NRC will coordinate participation of the complainant. While the complainant will not be a party to the ADR process after OI issues an investigation report, the NRC will typically seek the complainant's input to the process. Normally, the NRC will at least seek input from the complainant regarding suggested corrective actions aimed at improving the safety conscious work environment.

OI reports (not including exhibits) will normally be provided to the licensee when the choice of ADR or a PEC is offered.

A licensee may request ADR for discrimination violations based solely on a finding by DOL. However, the staff will not negotiate the finding by DOL. The appropriate enforcement sanction and corrective actions will be the typical focus of settlement discussions.

2. Other Than Discrimination Wrongdoing

The regional administrator will normally be the principal negotiator for the NRC in ADR sessions on other wrongdoing cases. After imposition of a civil penalty or other order, the Director, Office of Enforcement and applicable regional administrator may determine that the Director would be the appropriate negotiator.

Typically, an enforcement panel will be conducted to discuss the NRC's specific interests in the case prior to the regional administrator attending the settlement discussions. A limited review of the settlement terms may be conducted in conjunction with the preparation of the confirmatory order.

The OI report will not routinely be offered to the licensee prior to ADR. However, the OI report may be provided, as necessary, during the negotiations with the licensee.

IV. Integration With Traditional Enforcement Policy

A. Potential Future Enforcement Actions Civil Penalty Assessments

Section VI.C.2 of the Enforcement Policy provides the method for determination of a civil penalty amount. One aspect of the determination uses enforcement history as a factor. If the staff considers a civil penalty for a future escalated enforcement action, settlements under the enforcement ADR program occurring after a formal enforcement action is taken (*e.g.* an NOV is issued) will count as an enforcement case for purposes of determining whether identification credit is considered. Settlements occurring prior to an OI investigation will not count as previous enforcement. The status of settlement agreements occurring after an investigation is completed but prior to an NOV being issued will be established as part of the negotiation between the parties.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of April, 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04–8872 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Proposed Collection, Comment Request

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement Board will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Title and Purpose of information collection: Designation of Contact Officials; New information collection. Coordination between railroad employers and the RRB is essential to properly administer the payment of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act (RRA) and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (RUIA). In order to enhance timely coordination activity, the RRB proposes the implementation of Form G–117a, Designation of Contact Officials. Form G–117a will be used by railroad employers to designate employees who are to act as point of contact with the RRB on a variety of RRA and RUIA-related matters.

The RRB estimates that about 100 G–117a's will be submitted annually. Completion is voluntary. One response is requested from each respondent. Completion time is estimated at 15 minutes.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information or to obtain a copy of the information collection justification, forms, and/or supporting material, please call the RRB Clearance Officer at (312) 751–3363 or send an e-mail request to *Charles.Mierzwa@RRB.GOV*. Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 N. Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611–2092 or send an e-mail to *Ronald.Hodapp@RRB.GOV*. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Charles Mierzwa,

Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8898 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7905–01–P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Summary: In accordance with the requirement of section 3506 (c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement

Board (RRB) will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Title and purpose of information collection: Employer Service and Compensation Reports; OMB 3220–0070. Section 2(c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (RUIA) specifies the maximum normal unemployment and sickness benefits that may be paid in a benefit year. Section 2(c) further provides for extended benefits for certain employees and for beginning a benefit year early for other employees. The conditions for these actions are prescribed in 20 CFR part 302.

All information about creditable railroad service and compensation needed by the RRB to administer section 2(c) is not always available from annual reports filed by railroad employers with the RRB (OMB 3220–0008). When this occurs, the RRB must obtain supplemental information about service and compensation.

The RRB utilizes Form UI–41, Supplemental Report of Service and Compensation, and Form UI–41a, Supplemental Report of Compensation, to obtain the additional information about service and compensation from railroad employers. Completion of the forms is mandatory. One response is required of each respondent.

The RRB proposes no changes to Form UI–41 and UI–41a. The completion time for Form UI–41 and UI–41a is estimated at 8 minutes per response. The RRB estimates that approximately 3,000 responses are received annually.

For Further Information Contact: To request more information or to obtain a copy of the information collection justification, forms, and/or supporting material, please call the RRB Clearance Officer at (312) 751–3363 or send an e-mail request to *Charles.Mierzwa@RRB.GOV*. Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611–2092 or send an e-mail to *Ronald.Hodapp@RRB.GOV*. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Charles Mierzwa,

Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8899 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7905–01–P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Agency Forms Submitted for OMB Review

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) has submitted the following proposal(s) for the collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval.

Summary of Proposal(s)

(1) *Collection title:* Withholding Certificate for Railroad Retirement Monthly Annuity Payments.

(2) *Form(s) submitted:* RRB–W–4P.

(3) *OMB Number:* 3220–0149.

(4) *Expiration date of current OMB clearance:* 07/31/2004.

(5) *Type of request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(6) *Respondents:* Individuals or households.

(7) *Estimated annual number of respondents:* 20,000.

(8) *Total annual responses:* 20,000.

(9) *Total annual reporting hours:* 1.

(10) *Collection description:* Under Public Law 98–76, railroad retirement beneficiaries' Tier II, dual vested and supplemental benefits are subject to income tax under private pension rules. Under Public Law 99–514, the non-social security equivalent benefit portion of Tier 1 is also taxable under private pension rules. The collection obtains the information needed by the Railroad Retirement Board to implement the income tax withholding provisions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Copies of the forms and supporting documents can be obtained from Charles Mierzwa, the agency clearance officer (312) 751–3363 or *Charles.Mierzwa@rrb.gov*.

Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611–2092 or *Ronald.Hodapp@rrb.gov* and to the OMB Desk Officer for the RRB, at the Office of Management and Budget, Room 10230, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Charles Mierzwa,

Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8900 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7905–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–49556; File No. SR–NASD–2004–059]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change by the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. Regarding an Interpretation to Its Trade Through Rule for Exchange-Listed Securities

April 12, 2004.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act")[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on April 2, 2004, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD"), through its subsidiary, The Nasdaq Stock Market, Inc. ("Nasdaq"), filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by Nasdaq. Nasdaq has designated this proposal as a stated policy, practice, or interpretation with respect to the meaning, administration, or enforcement of an existing rule pursuant to section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act,[3] and Rule 19b–4(f)(1)[4] thereunder, which renders the proposal effective upon filing with the Commission. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

Nasdaq proposes an interpretation to Rule 5262 ("Trade-Throughs") establishing that certain executions in exchange-listed securities will not be considered trade-throughs if a commitment to trade is sent contemporaneously via the Intermarket Trading System ("ITS") with the execution to another market center to fully satisfy that other market's quotation.

The text of the proposed rule change is below. Proposed new language is

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] 15 U.S.C 78s(b)(3)(A).

[4] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(1).

italicized; proposed deletions are in brackets.

* * * * *

Rule 5262. Trade-Throughs

(a)–(c) No Change.

* * * * *

IM 5262–1. Contemporaneous Sending of Commitments

The terms "trade-through" and "third participating market center trade-through" do not include the situation where a member who initiates the purchase (sale) of an ITS Security, at a price which is higher (lower) than the price at which the security is being offered (bid) in another ITS participating market, sends contemporaneously through ITS to such ITS participating market a commitment to trade at such offer (bid) price or better and for at least the number of shares displayed with that market center's better-priced offer (bid). A trade-through complaint sent in these circumstances is not valid, even if the commitment sent in satisfaction cancels or expires, and even if there is more stock behind the quote in the other market.

* * * * *

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, Nasdaq included statements concerning the purpose of, and basis for, the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. Nasdaq has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and the Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Nasdaq market center operates facilities for quoting and trading exchange-listed securities. Nasdaq's facilities are linked with exchanges that trade these securities via the Intermarket Trading System ("ITS"), which is governed by a national market system plan ("ITS Plan").[5] The ITS Plan requires each participant, including Nasdaq, to adopt a rule—Rule 5262—prohibiting participants from trading ITS securities at a price which is lower than the bid or higher than the offer displayed from an ITS Participant Exchange or ITS/CAES Market Maker.[6] The rationale for the so-called "Trade-Through Rule" is that superior priced quotations in a security displayed from other participant markets should be protected or satisfied if, in another participant market, an execution in the security occurs at an inferior price. Under Rule 5262, one remedy for a trade-through is that, upon a valid complaint of a trade-through, a commitment to trade, at the price and for the number of shares in the disseminated quotation, must be sent to the other participant market to fully satisfy such quotation.

The proposed interpretation of Rule 5262 recognizes that superior quotations are fully protected/satisfied if an ITS commitment is sent to trade with a bid/offer that would otherwise appear to have been traded through. That is, a trade will not be considered a trade-through if an ITS commitment is sent contemporaneously from the participant executing the trade for the purpose of being executed against the better-priced displayed bid or offer. A complaint is not valid even if a commitment cancels or expires and even if there is more stock behind the quote in the other market. Furthermore, the interpretation recognizes the impracticality of having to wait for the other market to revise its quotation as a result of trading with a satisfying commitment before trading activity may occur in other markets.

2. Statutory Basis

Nasdaq believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act, including section 15A(b)(6)[7] of the Act, which requires, among other things, that a registered national securities association's rules be designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanisms of a free and open market and a national market system, and to protect investors and the public interest. Nasdaq believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with these requirements because it will facilitate transactions in securities, remove impediments to a free and open market, and protect investors by improving the transparency and efficiency of transactions.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

Nasdaq does not believe that the proposed rule change will result in any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants or Others

Written comments were neither solicited nor received.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The foregoing rule change has become effective pursuant to section 19(b)(3)(A)(i)[8] of the Act, and subparagraph (f)(1) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[9] because it is concerned solely with the interpretation of the meaning, administration or enforcement of existing NASD Rule 5262.

At any time within 60 days of the filing of a rule change pursuant to section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act, the Commission may summarily abrogate the rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic comments:

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an e-mail to *rule-comments@sec.gov*. Please include File Number SR–NASD–2004–059 on the subject line.

Paper comments:

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Jonathan G. Katz, Secretary,

[5] The ITS Plan was approved on a permanent basis on January 27, 1983. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 19456 (January 27, 1983), 48 FR 4938. Signatories to the ITS Plan include the American Stock Exchange, LLC, the Boston Stock Exchange, Inc., the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc., the Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc., the Cincinnati Stock Exchange, Inc. (now known as the National Securities Exchange), the NASD, the New York Stock Exchange, Inc. ("NYSE"), the Pacific Exchange, Inc., and the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc.

[6] Capitalized terms are defined in NASD Rule 5210.

[7] 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(6).

[8] 15 U.S.C 78s(b)(3)(A)(i).

[9] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(1).

Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549–0609.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–NASD–2004–059. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*).

Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Section, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the NASD. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–NASD–2004–059 and should be submitted on or before May 11, 2004.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[10]

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–8861 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–49560; File No. SR–PCX–2004–23]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change and Amendment No. 1 Thereto by the Pacific Exchange, Inc. Relating to Exchange Fees and Charges

April 13, 2004.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act")[1], and Rule 19b–4[2] thereunder, notice is hereby given that on March 24, 2004, the Pacific Exchange, Inc. ("PCX") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III, below, which Items have been prepared by the PCX. On April 1, 2004, the PCX filed Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change, which replaces the original filing in its entirety.[3] The PCX filed the proposal pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act,[4] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder,[5] which renders the proposal effective upon filing with the Commission. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change, as amended, from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The PCX, through its wholly-owned subsidiary PCX Equities, Inc. ("PCXE"), proposes to amend its fee schedule for services provided to ETP Holders[6] that use the Archipelago Exchange ("ArcaEx") in order to correct a technical error in the fee schedule. The text of the proposed rule change, as amended, is set forth below. Proposed new language is in *italics*; proposed deletions are in [brackets].

* * * * *

SCHEDULE OF FEES AND CHARGES FOR EXCHANGE SERVICES

ARCHIPELAGO EXCHANGE: TRADE RELATED CHARGES

EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS

ETP Holders [and Sponsored Participants] [1]

* * * * * * *

ARCHIPELAGO EXCHANGE: OTHER FEES AND CHARGES

* * * * * * *

[USER] *ETP HOLDER* TRANSACTION CREDIT

* * * * * * *

MARKET DATA REVENUE SHARING CREDIT [2]

Tape A Securities:

Cross Order ..... 50% tape revenue credit per qualifying trade (applicable to any Cross Order, as defined in PCXE Rule 7.31(s), where the ETP Holder [or Sponsored Participant] represents all of one side of the transaction and all or a portion of the other side).

Tape B Securities:

Liquidity Provider Credit ..... 50% tape revenue credit per qualifying trade (applicable to limit orders that are residing in the Book and that execute against inbound marketable orders).

Directed Order ..... 50% tape revenue credit per qualifying trade (applicable to any market maker that executes against a Directed Order within the Directed Order Process, as defined in PCXE Rule 7.37(a)).

Cross Order ..... 50% tape revenue credit per qualifying trade (applicable to any Cross Order, as defined in PCXE Rule 7.31(s), where the ETP Holder [or Sponsored Participant] represents all of one side of the transaction and all or a portion of the other side.

[10] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* letter from Tania Blanford, Staff Attorney, Regulatory Policy, PCX, to Nancy J. Sanow, Assistant Director, Division of Market Regulation ("Division"), Commission, dated March 31, 2004. In Amendment No. 1, the PCX redesignated the filing from a filing under subparagraph (f)(2) of Rule 19b–4 to a filing under subparagraph (f)(6) of Rule 19b–4, as well as made a technical correction to the rule text. The substance of Amendment No. 1 is incorporated in this notice.

[4] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[5] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[6] *See* PCXE Rule 1.1(n) (defining "ETP Holder").

"Drop Copy" [3] Processing Fee ..... $0.001 per share (applicable to off-board trades in listed and Nasdaq securities)

[1] These transaction fees do not apply to: (1) Directed Orders, regardless of account type, that are matched within the Directed Order Process; (2) Directed Orders for the account of a retail public customer that are executed partially or in their entirety via the Directed Order, Display Order, Working Order, and Tracking Order processes (however, any unfilled or residual portion of a retail customer's order that is routed away and executed by another market center or participant will incur this transaction fee); (3) orders executed in the Opening Auction and the Market Order Auction; (4) Cross Orders; (5) commitments received through ITS; and (6) participants in the Nasdaq UTP Plan that transmit orders via telephone.

[2] For exchange-listed securities, *an ETP Holder* [User] that submits a Tracking Order instruction that subsequently matches against an inbound marketable order will not be entitled to receive the Liquidity Provider Credit.

[3] A "drop copy" is an electronic report of a transaction for an ETP Holder's account that is executed on another market center and that has been prepared for informational purposes (*e.g.*, Market Maker inventory tracking, surveillance audit trail). Market Maker transactions that are subject to this fee will not be eligible to receive the Market Maker Transaction Credit or [User] *ETP Holder* Transaction Credit.

* * * * * * *

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the PCX included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The PCX has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The PCX is proposing to correct a technical error in the fee schedule by deleting all references to the term "Sponsored Participant" [7] in the fee schedule. Pursuant to PCXE Rule 2.17, the PCX imposes certain dues, charges or fees upon an ETP Holder for the use of equipment or facilities or for services or privileges granted by the PCX. A Sponsored Participant may obtain authorized access to the ArcaEx by entering into a customer agreement with an ETP Holder.[8] The PCX, however, does not impose any fees, dues or charges on the Sponsored Participant.

Currently, the "Exchange Transactions" and "Market Data Revenue Sharing Credit" portions of the fee schedule incorrectly reference Sponsored Participants as entities billed or credited by the PCX.[9] Thus, the PCX wishes to delete references to Sponsored Participants in the fee schedule at this time.

2. Statutory Basis

The PCX believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act [10] in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act [11] in particular, in that it is designed to perfect the mechanisms of a free and open market and a national market system, and to protect investors and the public interest.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The PCX does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Written comments on the proposed rule change were neither solicited nor received.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The PCX has filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act [12] and subparagraph (f)(6) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder.[13]

Because the foregoing proposed rule change does not:

(i) significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest;

(ii) impose any significant burden on competition; and

(iii) become operative for 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder. At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission may summarily abrogate such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.[14] As required under Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii), the PCX provided the Commission with written notice of its intent to file the proposed rule change at least five business days prior to filing the proposal with the Commission, or such shorter period as designated by the Commission.

The PCX has requested that the Commission waive the 30-day operative delay. The Commission believes waiving the 30-day operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. Such waiver will permit the PCX to correct a technical error in its fee schedule and accordingly clarify the fees charged for services provided to ETP Holders. For these reasons, the Commission designates the proposal to be effective and operative upon filing with the Commission.[15]

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic comments:

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml);* or
- Send an E-mail to *rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR–PCX–2004–23 on the subject line.*

Paper comments:

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Jonathan G. Katz, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549–0609.

[7] *See* PCXE Rule 1.1(tt) (defining "Sponsored Participant").

[8] *See* PCXE Rule 7.29.

[9] Telephone conversation between Tania Blanford, Staff Attorney, Regulatory Policy, PCX, and Elizabeth MacDonald, Attorney, Division, Commission, April 13, 2004.

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[11] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[13] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[14] For the purposes of calculating the 60-day abrogation period, the Commission considers the proposed rule change to have been filed on April 1, 2004, the date the PCX filed Amendment No. 1.

[15] For purposes only of waiving the operative date of this proposal, the Commission has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–PCX–2004–23. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Section, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the PCX. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–PCX–2004–23 and should be submitted on or before May 11, 2004.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[16]

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–8891 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Advisory Panel Meeting

AGENCY: Social Security Administration (SSA).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

DATES: May 18, 2004, 9 a.m.–4:45 p.m.*; May 19, 2004, 9 a.m.–5 p.m.; May 20, 2004, 9 a.m.–1 p.m.

*The full deliberative panel meeting ends at 4:45 p.m. The standing committees of the Panel will meet from 4:45 p.m. until 6 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Hyatt Regency Bethesda, One Bethesda Metro Center, Bethesda, MD 20814, Phone: (301) 657–1234.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Type of meeting: This is a quarterly meeting open to the public. The public is invited to participate by coming to the address listed above. Public comment will be taken during the quarterly meeting. The public is also invited to submit comments in writing on the implementation of the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act (TWWIIA) of 1999 at any time.

Purpose: In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, SSA announces a meeting of the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Advisory Panel (the Panel). Section 101(f) of Pub. L. 106–170 establishes the Panel to advise the President, the Congress and the Commissioner of Social Security on issues related to work incentives programs, planning and assistance for individuals with disabilities as provided under section 101(f)(2)(A) of the TWWIIA. The Panel is also to advise the Commissioner on matters specified in section 101(f)(2)(B) of that Act, including certain issues related to the Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program established under section 101(a) of that Act.

Interested parties are invited to attend the meeting. The Panel will use the meeting time to receive briefings, hear presentations, conduct full Panel deliberations on the implementation of TWWIIA and receive public testimony. The topics for the meeting will include presentations on mental health, SSA work incentives, employment supports, advocacy and the Ticket, and agency updates from SSA.

The Panel will meet in person commencing on Tuesday, May 18, 2004 from 9 a.m. to 4:45 p.m. (standing committee meetings from 4:45 p.m. to 6 p.m.); Wednesday, May 19, 2004 from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.; and Thursday, May 20, 2004 from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Agenda: The Panel will hold a quarterly meeting. Briefings, presentations, full Panel deliberations and other Panel business will be held Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, May 18, 19, and 20, 2004. Public testimony will be heard in person Tuesday, May 18, 2004 from 3:45 p.m. to 4:45 p.m. and on Thursday, May 20, 2004 from 9 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. Members of the public must schedule a timeslot in order to comment. In the event that the public comments do not take up the scheduled time period for public comment, the Panel will use that time to deliberate and conduct other Panel business.

Individuals interested in providing testimony in person should contact the Panel staff as outlined below to schedule time slots. Each presenter will be called on by the Chair in the order in which they are scheduled to testify and is limited to a maximum five-minute verbal presentation. Full written testimony on TWWIIA Implementation, no longer than 5 pages, may be submitted in person or by mail, fax or email on an on-going basis to the Panel for consideration.

Since seating may be limited, persons interested in providing testimony at the meeting should contact the Panel staff by e-mailing Monique Fisher, at *Monique.Fisher@ssa.gov* or calling (202) 358–6435.

The full agenda for the meeting will be posted on the Internet at *http://www.ssa.gov/work/panel* approximately one week before the meeting or can be received in advance electronically or by fax upon request.

Contact Information: Anyone requiring information regarding the Panel should contact the TWWIIA Panel staff. Records are being kept of all Panel proceedings and will be available for public inspection by appointment at the Panel office. Anyone requiring information regarding the Panel should contact the Panel staff by:

- Mail addressed to Social Security Administration, Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Advisory Panel Staff, 400 Virginia Avenue, SW., Suite 700, Washington, DC, 20024.
- Telephone contact with Monique Fisher at (202) 358–6435.
- Fax at (202) 358–6440.
- E-mail to *TWWIIAPanel@ssa.gov*.

Dated: April 12, 2004.

Carol Brenner,

Designated Federal Official.

[FR Doc. 04–8946 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 4658]

Cultural Property Advisory Committee Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the provisions of the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 2601 *et seq.*) there will be a meeting of the Cultural Property Advisory Committee on Thursday, May 6, 2004, from approximately 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., at the United States Department of State, Annex 44, 301 4th St., SW., Washington, DC.

Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2605(g), the Committee will conduct a review of the "Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Italy Concerning the Imposition of Import

[16] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

Restrictions on Certain Categories of Archaeological Material Representing the Pre-Classical and Imperial Roman Periods of Italy." The Committee's review will focus primarily on Article II of the agreement.

Portions of the meeting will be closed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(9)(B). There will also be an open session to receive comments from interested parties regarding this agreement. The open portion of the meeting will be held from approximately 11 a.m. to 12 noon. Seating is limited. Persons wishing to attend this open portion of the meeting must notify the Cultural Property office at (202) 619–6612 by 5 p.m. (e.d.t.) Thursday, April 29, 2004, to arrange for admission. Persons wishing to make an oral presentation based on written comments at the open portion of the meeting, or to submit written comments for the Committee's consideration, must provide these comments in writing by 5 p.m., (e.d.t.) April 29, 2004. All written comments may be faxed to (202) 260–4893.

Oral presentations will be limited to ensure time for the Committee to pose questions.

Information about the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act and this agreement may be found at *http://exchanges.state.gov/culprop.*

Dated: April 15, 2004.

Miller Crouch,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 04–9020 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–05–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Trade Policy Staff Committee; Request for Public Comment on Review of Employment Impact of United States–Panama Free Trade Negotiations

AGENCIES: Office of the United States Trade Representative, Department of Labor.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Trade Policy Staff Committee (TPSC) gives notice that the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) and the Department of Labor (Labor) are initiating a review of the impact of the proposed U.S.-Panama free trade negotiations on United States employment, including labor markets. This notice seeks written public comment on potentially significant sectoral or regional employment impacts (both positive and negative) in the United States as well as other likely labor market impacts of the FTA.

DATES: USTR and Labor will accept any comments received during the course of the negotiations of the FTA. However, comments should be received by noon, May 24, 2004, to be assured of timely consideration in the preparation of the report.

ADDRESSES: Submissions by electronic mail: *FR0424@ustr.gov.* Submissions by facsimile: Gloria Blue, Executive Secretary, Trade Policy Staff Committee, at (202) 395–6143.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For procedural questions concerning public comments, contact Gloria Blue, Executive Secretary, TPSC, Office of the USTR, 1724 F Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508, telephone (202) 395–3475. Substantive questions concerning the employment impact review should be addressed to Jorge Perez-Lopez, Director, Office of International Economic Affairs, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210, telephone (202) 693–4883; or William Clatanoff, Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Labor, telephone (202) 395–6120.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Background Information

On November 18, 2003, in accordance with section 2104(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 2002, the United States Trade Representative notified the Congress of the President's intent to enter into negotiations on a free trade agreement with Panama. The notification letters to the Congress can be found on the USTR Web site at *http://www.ustr.gov/new/fta/Panama/2003–11–18-notification_letter.pdf.* We intend to launch negotiations the week of April 26, 2004.

In January 2004, the USTR requested the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) provide advice on probable economic effects. The ITC intends to provide this advice during the month of April 2004, prior to initiation of the negotiations.

2. Employment Impact Review

Section 2102(c)(5) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002, 19 U.S.C. 3802(c)(5), directs the President to "review the impact of future trade agreements on United States employment, including labor markets, modeled after Executive Order 13141 to the extent appropriate in establishing procedures and criteria, report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate on such review, and make that report available to the public." USTR and the Department of Labor will conduct the employment reviews through the TPSC.

The employment impact review will be based on the following elements, which are modeled to the extent appropriate after those in E.O. 13141. The review will be: (1) Written; (2) initiated through a **Federal Register** notice soliciting public comment and information on the employment impact of the FTA in the United States; (3) made available to the public in draft form for public comment, to the extent practicable; and (4) made available to the public in final form.

Comments may be submitted on potentially significant sectoral or regional employment impacts (both positive and negative) in the United States as well as other likely labor market impacts of the FTA. Persons submitting comments should provide as much detail as possible in support of their submissions.

3. Requirements for Submissions

To ensure prompt and full consideration of responses, the TPSC strongly recommends that interested persons submit comments by electronic mail to the following e-mail address: *FR0424@ustr.gov.* Persons making submissions by e-mail should use the following subject line: "Panama Employment Review." Documents should be submitted in WordPerfect, MSWord, or text (.TXT) files. Supporting documentation submitted as spreadsheets is acceptable in Quattro Pro or Excel format. For any document containing business confidential information submitted electronically, the file name of the business confidential version should begin with the characters "BC-", and the file name of the public version should begin with the character "P-". The "P-" or "BC-" should be followed by the name of the submitter. Persons who make submissions by e-mail should not provide separate cover letters; information that might appear in a cover letter should be included in the submission itself. To the extent possible, any attachments to the submission should be included in the same file as the submission itself, and not as separate files.

Written comments will be placed in a file open to public inspection pursuant to 15 CFR 2003.5, except confidential business information exempt from public inspection in accordance with 15 CFR 2003.6. Confidential business information submitted in accordance with 15 CFR 2003.6 must be clearly

marked "BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL" at the top of each page, including any cover letter or cover page, and must be accompanied by a non-confidential summary of the confidential information. All public documents and non-confidential summaries shall be available for public inspection in the USTR Reading Room in Room 3 of the Annex of the Office of the USTR, 1724 F Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508. An appointment to review the file may be made by calling (202) 395–6186. The USTR Reading Room is generally open to the public from 10 a.m–12 noon and 1–4 p.m. Monday through Friday. Appointments must be scheduled at least 48 hours in advance.

Carmen Suro-Bredie,

Chairman, Trade Policy Staff Committee.

[FR Doc. 04–8919 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Trade Policy Staff Committee; Request for Public Comment on Review of Employment Impact of United States—Thailand Free Trade Negotiations

AGENCIES: Office of the United States Trade Representative. Department of Labor.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Trade Policy Staff Committee (TPSC) gives notice that the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) and the Department of Labor (Labor) are initiating a review of the impact of the proposed United States-Thailand free trade agreement (FTA) on United States employment, including labor markets. This notice seeks written public comment on potentially significant sectoral or regional employment impacts (both positive and negative) in the United States as well as other likely labor market impacts of the FTA.

DATES: USTR and Labor will accept any comments received during the course of the negotiations of the FTA. However, comments should be received by noon, May 24, 2004, to be assured of timely consideration in the preparation of the report.

ADDRESSES: Submissions by electronic mail: *FR0425@ustr.gov*. Submissions by facsimile: Gloria Blue, Executive Secretary, Trade Policy Staff Committee, at (202) 395–6143.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For procedural questions concerning public comments, contact Gloria Blue, Executive Secretary, TPSC, Office of the USTR, 1724 F Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508, telephone (202) 395–3475. Substantive questions concerning the employment impact review should be addressed to Jorge Perez-Lopez, Director, Office of International Economic Affairs, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210, telephone (202) 693–4883; or William Clatanoff, Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Labor, telephone (202) 395–6120.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Background Information

On February 12, 2004, in accordance with section 2104(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 2002, the United States Trade Representative notified the Congress of the President's intent to enter into negotiations on a free trade agreement with Thailand. The notification letters to the Congress can be found on the USTR Web site at *http://www.ustr.gov/releases/2004/02/2004–02–12-letter-thailand-house.pdf* and *http://www.ustr.gov/releases/2004/02/2004–02–12-letter-thailand-senate.pdf* respectively. We intend to launch negotiations in June 2004.

On February 19, 2004, the USTR requested the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) to provide advice on probable economic effects. The ITC intends to provide this advice within six months of receipt of this request.

2. Employment Impact Review

Section 2102(c)(5) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002, 19 U.S.C. 3802(c)(5), directs the President to "review the impact of future trade agreements on United States employment, including labor markets, modeled after Executive Order 13141 to the extent appropriate in establishing procedures and criteria, report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate on such review, and make that report available to the public." USTR and the Department of Labor will conduct the employment reviews through the TPSC.

The employment impact review will be based on the following elements, which are modeled to the extent appropriate after those in EO 13141. The review will be: (1) Written; (2) initiated through a **Federal Register** notice soliciting public comment and information on the employment impact of the FTA in the United States; (3) made available to the public in draft form for public comment, to the extent practicable; and (4) made available to the public in final form.

Comments may be submitted on potentially significant sectoral or regional employment impacts (both positive and negative) in the United States as well as other likely labor market impacts of the FTA. Persons submitting comments should provide as much detail as possible in support of their submissions.

3. Requirements for Submissions

To ensure prompt and full consideration of responses, the TPSC strongly recommends that interested persons submit comments by electronic mail to the following e-mail address: *FR0425@ustr.gov*. Persons making submissions by e-mail should use the following subject line: "Thailand Employment Review." Documents should be submitted in WordPerfect, MSWord, or text (.TXT) files. Supporting documentation submitted as spreadsheets is acceptable in Quattro Pro or Excel format. For any document containing business confidential information submitted electronically, the file name of the business confidential version should begin with the characters "BC-", and the file name of the public version should begin with the character "P-". The "P-" or "BC-" should be followed by the name of the submitter. Persons who make submissions by e-mail should not provide separate cover letters; information that might appear in a cover letter should be included in the submission itself. To the extent possible, any attachments to the submission should be included in the same file as the submission itself, and not as separate files.

Written comments will be placed in a file open to public inspection pursuant to 15 CFR 2003.5, except confidential business information exempt from public inspection in accordance with 15 CFR 2003.6. Confidential business information submitted in accordance with 15 CFR 2003.6 must be clearly marked "BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL" at the top of each page, including any cover letter or cover page, and must be accompanied by a non-confidential summary of the confidential information. All public documents and non-confidential summaries shall be available for public inspection in the USTR Reading Room in Room 3 of the Annex of the Office of the USTR, 1724 F Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508. An appointment to review the file may be made by calling (202) 395–6186. The USTR Reading Room is generally open to the public from 10 a.m–12 noon and 1–4 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Appointments must be scheduled at least 48 hours in advance.

Carmen Suro-Bredie,

Chairman, Trade Policy Staff Committee.

[FR Doc. 04–8920 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Proposed Information Collection

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the FAA invites public comment on one new public information collection which will be submitted to OMB for approval.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed or delivered to the FAA at the following address: Ms. Judy Street, Room 613, Federal Aviation Administration, Standards and Information Division, APF–100, 800 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20591.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Judy Street at the above address or on (202) 267–9895.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 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. Therefore, the FAA solicits comments on the following collection of information in order to evaluate the necessity of the collection, the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden, the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and possible ways to minimize the burden of the collection in preparation for submission to approve the clearance of the following information collection.

Following is a summary of the new collection:

Title: Pilot Medical Certification Customer Service Survey.

Abstract: This proposed information collection activity will be conducted to comply with Executive Order 12862, Setting Customer Service Standards, and the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), through the Office of Aerospace Medicine (OAM) is responsible for the aeromedical certification of pilots, and certain other personnel in safety-related positions, to ensure that they are medically qualified to perform their duties safely. In the accomplishment of this responsibility, OAM provides a number of services to pilots, and has established goals for the performance of those services. This proposed information collection activity is designed to provide data describing customer satisfaction with the aeromedical certification services provided by or on behalf of the FAA to pilots. The completion of the survey is voluntary and the information collection will be conducted anonymously. The respondents will be an estimated 48,000 pilots over a six year timeframe. The survey will be conducted once every two years, for three rounds. Assuming a 30% response rate and a 15 minute completion time for each survey, this will total 3,600 hours over the six years.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 14, 2004.

Judith D. Street,

FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, APF–100.

[FR Doc. 04–8924 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. PE–2004–11A]

Petitions for Exemption; Summary of Petitions Received

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of petitions for exemption received and of dispositions of prior petitions.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to FAA's rulemaking provisions governing the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for exemption part 11 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR), this notice contains a summary of certain petitions seeking relief from specified requirements of 14 CFR, dispositions of certain petitions previously received, and corrections. The purpose of this notice is to improve the public's awareness of, and participation in, this aspect of FAA's regulatory activities. Neither publication of this notice nor the inclusion or omission of information in the summary is intended to affect the legal status of any petition or its final disposition.

DATES: Comments on petitions received must identify the petition docket number involved and must be received on or before May 10, 2004.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments [identified by DOT DMS Docket Number FAA–200X–XXXXX] by any of the following methods:

- *Web Site: http://dms.dot.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the DOT electronic docket site.
- *Fax:* 1–202–493–2251.
- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590–001.
- *Hand Delivery:* Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.
- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to *http://dms.dot.gov* at any time or to Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tim Adams (202) 267–8033, Sandy Buchanan-Sumter (202) 267–7271, Office of Rulemaking (ARM–1), Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

This notice is published pursuant to 14 CFR §§ 11.85 and 11.91.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 15, 2004.

Donald P. Byrne,

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Petitions for Exemption

Docket No.: FAA–2004–17285.

Petitioner: John Filippi.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 105.45(a)(1)(i)

Description of Relief Sought: To allow Mr. John Filippi to act as the parachutist in command for tandem jumps without meeting the requirements of 3 years in the sport of skydiving.

[FR Doc. 04–8923 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 97

[Docket No. 30410; Amdt. No. 3094]

Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment establishes, amends, suspends, or revokes Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs) for operations at certain airports. These regulatory actions are needed because of the adoption of new or revised criteria, or because of changes occurring in the National Airspace System, such as the commissioning of new navigational facilities, addition of new obstacles, or changes in air traffic requirements. These changes are designed to provide safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace and to promote safe flight operations under instrument flight rules at the affected airports.

DATES: This rule is effective April 20, 2004. The compliance date for each SIAP is specified in the amendatory provisions.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of April 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Availability of matters incorporated by reference in the amendment is as follows:

For Examination—

1. FAA Rules Docket, FAA Headquarters Building, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591;

2. The FAA Regional Office of the region in which the affected airport is located;

3. The Flight Inspection Area Office which originated the SIAP; or,

4. The Office of Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., Suite 700, Washington, DC.

For Purchase—Individual SIAP copies may be obtained from:

1. FAA Public Inquiry Center (APA–200), FAA Headquarters Building, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; or

2. The FAA Regional Office of the region in which the affected airport is located.

By Subscription—Copies of all SIAPs, mailed once every 2 weeks, are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald P. Pate, Flight Procedure Standards Branch (AMCAFS–420), Flight Technologies and Programs Division, Flight Standards Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Mike Monroney Aeronautical Center, 6500 South MacArthur Blvd., Oklahoma City, OK 73169 (Mail Address: PO Box 25082, Oklahoma City, OK 73125) telephone: (405) 954–4164.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This amendment to part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 97) establishes, amends, suspends, or revokes Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs). The complete regulatory description of each SIAP is contained in official FAA form documents which are incorporated by reference in this amendment under 5 U.S.C. 552(a), 1 CFR part 51, and § 97.20 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR). The applicable FAA Forms are identified as FAA Forms 8260–3, 8260–4, and 8260–5. Materials incorporated by reference are available for examination or purchase as stated above.

The large number of SIAPs, their complex nature, and the need for a special format make their verbatim publication in the **Federal Register** expensive and impractical. Further, airmen do not use the regulatory text of the SIAPs, but refer to their graphic depiction on charts printed by publishers of aeronautical materials. Thus, the advantages of incorporation by reference are realized and publication of the complete description of each SIAP contained in FAA form documents is unnecessary. The provisions of this amendment state the affected CFR (and FAR) sections, with the types and effective dates of the SIAPs. This amendment also identifies the airport, its location, the procedure identification and the amendment number.

The Rule

This amendment to part 97 is effective upon publication of each separate SIAP as contained in the transmittal. Some SIAP amendments may have been previously issued by the FAA in a National Flight Data Center (NFDC) Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) as an emergency action of immediate flight safety relating directly to published aeronautical charts. The circumstances which created the need for some SIAP amendments may require making them effective in less than 30 days. For the remaining SIAPs, an effective date at least 30 days after publication is provided.

Further, the SIAPs contained in this amendment are based on the criteria contained in the U.S. Standard for Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS). In developing these SIAPs, the TERPS criteria were applied to the conditions existing or anticipated at the affected airports. Because of the close and immediate relationship between these SIAPs and safety in air commerce, I find that notice and public procedure before adopting these SIAPs are impracticable and contrary to the public interest and, where applicable, that good cause exists for making some SIAPs effective in less than 30 days.

Conclusion

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore—(1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. For the same reason, the FAA certifies that this amendment will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 97

Air traffic control, Airports, Incorporation by reference, and Navigation (air).

Issued in Washington, DC on April 9, 2004.

James J. Ballough,

Director, Flight Standards Service.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 97) is amended by establishing, amending, suspending, or revoking Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, effective at 0901 UTC on the dates specified, as follows:

PART 97—STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES

1. The authority citation for part 97 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40106, 40113, 40114, 40120, 44502, 44514, 44701, 44719, 44721–44722.

2. Part 97 is amended to read as follows:

* * * *Effective May 13, 2004*

Erwin, NC, Harnett County, RNAV (GPS) RWY 5, Amdt 1
Erwin, NC, Harnett County, RNAV (GPS) RWY 23, Amdt 1
Erwin, NC, Harnett County, NDB RWY 23, Amdt 2

* * * *Effective June 10, 2004*

Headland, AL, Headland Muni, RNAV (GPS) RWY 9, Orig
Headland, AL, Headland Muni, RNAV (GPS) RWY 27, Orig
Kipnuk, AK, Kipnuk, RNAV (GPS) RWY 15, Orig
Kipnuk, AK, Kipnuk, RNAV (GPS) RWY 33, Orig
Kipnuk, AK, Kipnuk, GPS RWY 15, Orig-A, CANCELLED
Ruby, AK, Ruby, RNAV (GPS) RWY 3, Orig
Ruby, AK, Ruby, RNAV (GPS) RWY 21, Orig
Russian Mission, AK, Russian Mission, RNAV (GPS) RWY 17, Orig
Russian Mission, AK, Russian Mission, RNAV (GPS) RWY 35, Orig
Russian Mission, AK, Russian Mission, GPS RWY 17, Orig, CANCELLED
Russian Mission, AK, Russian Mission, GPS RWY 35, Orig, CANCELLED
Ontario, CA, Ontario Intl, ILS RWY 8L, Amdt 8
Daytona Beach, FL, Daytona Beach Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 7R, Orig
Daytona Beach, FL, Daytona Beach Intl, RNAV (GPS) Y RWY 7L, Orig
Daytona Beach, FL, Daytona Beach Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 25L, Orig
Daytona Beach, FL, Daytona Beach Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 25R, Orig
Daytona Beach, FL, Daytona Beach Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 16, Orig
Daytona Beach, FL, Daytona Beach Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 34, Amdt 1
Daytona Beach, FL, Daytona Beach Intl, RNAV (GPS) Z RWY 7L, Orig
Daytona Beach, FL, Daytona Beach Intl, VOR RWY 16, Amdt 18A
Daytona Beach, FL, Daytona Beach Intl, NDB RWY 7L, Amdt 26A
Bainbridge, GA, Decatur County Industrial Air Park, RNAV (GPS) RWY 9, Orig
Bainbridge, GA, Decatur County Industrial Air Park, RNAV (GPS) RWY 27, Orig
Bainbridge, GA, Decatur County Industrial Air Park, LOC/NDB RWY 27, Orig
Bainbridge, GA, Decatur County Industrial Air Park, NDB RWY 27, Amdt 2
Bainbridge, GA, Decatur County Industrial Air Park, GPS RWY 9, Orig, CANCELLED
Bainbridge, GA, Decatur County Industrial Air Park, VOR–A, Amdt 4
Des Moines, IA, Des Moines Intl, ILS OR LOC RWY 13, Amdt 9
Des Moines, IA, Des Moines Intl, ILS OR LOC RWY 31, Amdt 22, ILS RWY 31 (CAT II, III) Amdt 22
Des Moines, IA, Des Moines Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 5, Orig
Des Moines, IA, Des Moines Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 13, Orig
Des Moines, IA, Des Moines Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 23, Orig
Des Moines, IA, Des Moines Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 31, Orig
Des Moines, IA, Des Moines Intl, NDB RWY 31, Amdt 20
Des Moines, IA, Des Moines Intl, VOR/DME RWY 23, Orig
Des Moines, IA, Des Moines Intl, VOR OR GPS RWY 23, Amdt 2A, CANCELLED
Rexburg, ID, Rexburg-Madison County, RNAV (GPS) RWY 35, Amdt 1
Paola, KS, Miami County, RNAV (GPS) RWY 3, ORIG
Paola, KS, Miami County, RNAV (GPS) RWY 21, ORIG
Hamilton, MT, Ravalli County, RNAV (GPS)–B, Orig
Hamilton, MT, Ravalli County, RNAV (GPS)–A, Orig
Piqua, OH, Piqua Airport-Hartzell Field, RNAV (GPS) RWY 8, Orig
Piqua, OH, Piqua Airport-Hartzell Field, RNAV (GPS) RWY 26, Orig
Piqua, OH, Piqua Airport-Hartzell Field, VOR–A, Amdt 13
Piqua, OH, Piqua Airport-Hartzell Field, VOR/DME RNAV OR GPS RWY 26, Amdt 7, CANCELLED
Urbana, OH, Grimes Field, VOR–A, Amdt 5C
Urbana, OH, Grimes Field, RNAV (GPS) RWY 2, Orig
Urbana, OH, Grimes Field, RNAV (GPS) RWY 20, Orig
Idabel, OK, McCurtain County Regional, RNAV (GPS) RWY 2, Orig
Idabel, OK, McCurtain County Regional, RNAV (GPS) RWY 20, Orig
Buckhannon, WV, Upshur County Regional, VOR–A, Orig
Buckhannon, WV, Upshur County Regional, RNAV (GPS) RWY 11, Orig
Buckhannon, WV, Upshur County Regional, RNAV (GPS) RWY 29, Orig
Jackson, WY, Jackson Hole, VOR/DME RWY 1, Orig
Jackson, WY, Jackson Hole, VOR/DME RWY 19, Orig
Jackson, WY, Jackson Hole, VOR OR GPS–A, Amdt 6C, CANCELLED
Jackson, WY, Jackson Hole, VOR/DME OR GPS RWY 36, Amdt 4B, CANCELLED
Jackson, WY, Jackson Hole, ILS OR LOC RWY 19, Amdt 9
Jackson, WY, Jackson Hole, RNAV (GPS) RWY 1, Orig
Jackson, WY, Jackson Hole, RNAV (GPS) RWY 19, Orig

[FR Doc. 04–8808 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket Number 2004 17552]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel BLUE MOON.

SUMMARY: As authorized by Pub. L. 105–383 and Pub. L. 107–295, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket 2004–17552 at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Pub. L. 105–383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388 (68 FR 23084; April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388.

DATES: Submit comments on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2004–17552. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/*. All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying

at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Hokana, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR–830 Room 7201, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–0760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel BLUE MOON is:

Intended Use: "Chartered Services."

Geographic Region: "U.S. West Coast except for S.E. Alaska and Washington State."

Dated: April 13, 2004.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8854 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket Number 2004 17555]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel CONSIGLIRE.

SUMMARY: As authorized by Public Law 105–383 and Public Law 107–295, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket 2004–17555 at *http://dms.dot.gov.* Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Public Law 105–383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388 (68 FR 23084; April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388.

DATES: Submit comments on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2004 17555. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/.* All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Hokana, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR–830 Room 7201, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone (202) 366–0760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel CONSIGLIRE is:

Intended Use: "Day sailing, cruising, basic through offshore sailing instruction. I have no intent of operating in Alaska. Nor do I intend on operating in the State of Washington, with the Exception of San Juan County. Hopefully, that limited portion of the state will not pose a problem. If so, I suppose I could live with that exclusion also."

Geographic Region: "US West Coast excluding Alaska, but including Hawaii and San Juan County, Washington State."

Dated: April 13, 2004.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8850 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket Number 2004 17557]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel ELOUISE.

SUMMARY: As authorized by Public Law 105–383 and Public Law 107–295, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket 2004–17557 at *http://dms.dot.gov.* Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Public Law 105–383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388 (68 FR 23084; April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388.

DATES: Submit comments on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2004 17557. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/.* All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket

is available on the World Wide Web at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Hokana, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR–830 Room 7201, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–0760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel ELOUISE is:

Intended Use: "Charter Vessel."

Geographic Region: "Great Lakes."

Dated: April 13, 2004.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8848 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket Number 2004 17554]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel EUPHORIA.

SUMMARY: As authorized by Public Law 105–383 and Public Law 107–295, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket 2004–17554 at *http://dms.dot.gov.* Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Public Law 105–383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388 (68 FR 23084; April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388.

DATES: Submit comments on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2004 17554. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/.* All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Hokana, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR–830 Room 7201, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–0760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel EUPHORIA is:

Intended Use: "Sailboat rides for hire within 5 miles of Hailing Port.

Geographic Region: "Barnegat Bay, New Jersey."

Dated: April 13, 2004.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8851 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket Number 2004 17558]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel LOAFER'S GLORY.

SUMMARY: As authorized by Pub. L. 105–383 and Pub. L. 107–295, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket 2004–17558 at *http://dms.dot.gov.* Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Pub. L. 105–383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388 (68 FR 23084, April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388.

DATES: Submit comments on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2004 17558. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/.* All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Hokana, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR–830 Room 7201, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–0760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel LOAFER'S GLORY is:

Intended Use: "Day sail charter."

Geographic Region: "North Carolina."

Dated: April 13, 2004.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8855 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket Number 2004 17759]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel SOJOURN.

SUMMARY: As authorized by Pub. L. 105–383 and Pub. L. 107–295, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket 2004–17559 at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Pub. L. 105–383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388 (68 FR 23084; April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388.

DATES: Submit comments on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2004 17559. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/*. All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at *http://dms.dot.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Hokana, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR–830 Room 7201, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–0760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel SOJOURN is:

Intended Use: "Minor chartering for private individuals."

Geographic Region: "Narraganset Bay-Block Island Sound."

Dated: April 14, 2004.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8853 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket Number 2004–17556]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel STV UNICORN.

SUMMARY: As authorized by Public Law 105–383 and Public Law 107–295, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket 2004–17556 at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Public Law 105–383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388 (68 FR 23084; April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388.

DATES: Submit comments on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2004 17556. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/*. All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at *http://dms.dot.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Hokana, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR–830 Room 7201, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–0760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel STV UNICORN is:

Intended Use: "Executive leadership development, sail training on traditional wind ship, tall ship event vessel."

Geographic Region: "East Coast, New England including Long Island Sound."

Dated: April 13, 2004.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8849 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket Number 2004 17553]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel WHISPER.

SUMMARY: As authorized by Pub. L. 105–383 and Pub. L. 107–295, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by

MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket 2004–17553 at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Pub. L. 105–383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388 (68 FR 23084; April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388.

DATES: Submit comments on or before May 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2004–17553. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/*. All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at *http://dms.dot.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Hokana, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR–830 Room 7201, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–0760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel *WHISPER* is:

Intended Use: "Sailing charters."

Geographic Region: "Great Lakes and U.S. inland waters."

Dated: April 14, 2004.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–8852 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2004–17539; Notice 1]

Delphi Corporation, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Delphi Corporation (Delphi), has determined that at least one of the fittings on the ends of certain brake hose assemblies that it produced between January 2001 and February 2004 do not comply with S5.2.4 and S5.2.4.1 of 49 CFR 571.106, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 106, "Brake hoses." Delphi has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports."

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), Delphi has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of Delphi's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

Affected are a total of approximately 1534 aftermarket brake hoses produced between January 2001 and February 2004. S5.2.4 requires that:

> Each hydraulic brake hose assembly, except those sold as part of a motor vehicle, shall be labeled by means of a band around the brake hose assembly as specified in this paragraph or, at the option of the manufacturer, by means of labeling as specified in S5.4.1.

S5.4.1 states that:

> At least one end fitting of a hydraulic brake hose assembly shall be etched, stamped or embossed with a designation at least one-sixteenth of an inch high that identifies the manufacturer of the hose assembly.

Delphi believes that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that no corrective action is warranted. Delphi states that the subject brake hose assemblies meet the functional performance requirements of the standard for the hose, the fittings, and the assembly, and therefore will perform exactly as intended in the vehicle and will not in any way affect the safety of the vehicle. Delphi further states that the label on the brake hose fitting is redundant to the label on the brake hose itself when the manufacturer of the hose and the fitting are the same, and in this case the same manufacturer's logo that should be on the fittings is printed on all of the hose that is part of the same assembly.

Delphi states that, since S5.2.4 allows a band to be placed around the hose as an alternative to embossing the logo on one of the fittings, if the S5.2.4 option had been used, the band would be placed on top of the brake hose which already contains the same logo, which appears to be redundant. Delphi also asserts that, since the brake hose assemblies at issue are only sold by the vehicle manufacturer's parts division, if the vehicle owner desired to know the brake hose assembly manufacturer, the vehicle manufacturer could provide this information. Delphi states that since these brake hoses are specific to a specific vehicle, and are not sold at normal consumer automotive retail outlets, the person desiring to replace the brake hose assembly could only find them at the vehicle manufacturer's authorized outlet.

Delphi also states:

> There is precedence [sic] for finding that label requirements that are required by Crash Avoidance Standards (the 100 series) do not rise to the level of an unreasonable risk to motor vehicle safety. For example, in the tire standards it often happens that the tire is either not labeled or even mislabeled. NHTSA has consistently found that knowledgeable mechanics would not be misled in such cases and would install the proper tires even if the tire on the vehicle were mislabeled. In this case the vehicle manufacturer's outlet in most cases * * * is the automotive dealer [who] would look up the part number based on the model, the model year, and perhaps with specific equipment. The identification of the brake hose assembly manufacturer would not even come into play.
>
> The Motor Vehicle Safety Act S30117(b) requires manufacturers of motor vehicles and tires to maintain records of purchasers; however, no such requirement exists for other types of equipment. In those cases where a brake hose is replaced in a dealership, it might be possible to identify the owners of those vehicles; assuming that the vehicle was not sold after the brake hose assembly was replaced. In other cases where someone replaces the brake hose assembly oneself or after the warranty period has expired using a garage or body shop to replace them, it is not likely that the owner could be determined. This means that a percentage of the owners of the total brake hose assemblies replaced could not be identified for a recall.

Delphi also states that it is not aware of any vehicle customer complaints or any vehicle crashes that are a result of the absence of the logo in question.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the petition described above. Comments must refer to the

docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods. Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC. It is requested, but not required, that two copies of the comments be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays. Comments may be submitted electronically by logging onto the Docket Management System Web site at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Click on "Help" to obtain instructions for filing the document electronically. Comments may be faxed to 1–202–493–2251, or may be submitted to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: go to *http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment closing date: May 20, 2004. (Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120: delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8).

Issued on: April 14, 2004.

Kenneth N. Weinstein,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 04–8931 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2004–17440; Notice 1]

Hyundai Motor Company, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Hyundai Motor Company (Hyundai) has determined that certain vehicles that it produced do not comply with S5.3.5(a) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 105, "Hydraulic and electric brake systems"; and S5.5.5 of FMVSS No. 135, "Passenger car brake systems". Hyundai has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports."

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), Hyundai has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of Hyundai's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

S5.3.5 of FMVSS No. 105 requires that "Each indicator lamp shall display word, words or abbreviation * * * which shall have letters not less than 1/8-inch high." S5.5.5 of FMVSS No. 135 requires that "Each visual indicator shall display a word or words * * * [which] shall have letters not less than 3.2 mm (1/8 inch) high."

Approximately 237,994 vehicles are affected. Approximately 142,667 vehicles do not meet the letter height requirement for the abbreviation "ABS," where the letter height varies from 2.5 mm to 3.1 mm. These include MY 1998—2004 Accents, MY 1998—2004 Elantras, MY 2002—2004 Tiburons, MY 1999—2004 Sonatas, MY 2001—2004 XGs, and MY 2001—2004 Santa Fes. Approximately 95,327 vehicles do not meet the letter height requirements for the word "brake," where the letter height varies from 2.9 mm to 3.1 mm. These include MY 1998—1999 Accents and MY 1998—2001 Tiburons.

Hyundai believes that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety and that no corrective action is warranted. Hyundai states that the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) symbol for the ABS and the "ABS" lettering are part of the same ABS warning indicator, and both are simultaneously illuminated in yellow by the same lighting source. Hyundai explains that both identifications illuminate simultaneously during the instrument cluster warning lamp operation check, and also if an ABS malfunction occurs. Hyundai further states that although the ABS lettering that appears within the ISO symbol is slightly smaller than 3.2 mm in height, the overall height of the ABS warning lamp word/symbol combination significantly exceeds the standard on each of the affected models.

Hyundai says that on the two models where the "brake" lettering is slightly smaller than 3.2 mm in height, the ISO symbol for the brake system and the parking brake ISO symbol are part of the same brake warning indicator. Hyundai states that both the lettering and symbol identifications illuminate simultaneously in red during the instrument cluster warning lamp operation check, every time the parking brake is applied, and also if a brake system malfunction occurs. Hyundai further points out that although the "brake" lettering that appears below the ISO symbols is slightly smaller than 3.2 mm in height, the overall height of the "brake" warning lamp word and symbols combination exceeds the standard.

Hyundai asserts that this noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety for the following five reasons:

1. The visual indicators in the vehicles are visible to the driver under all driving conditions and therefore meet the requirements of S5.3.4(a) of FMVSS No. 101, "Controls and displays."

2. Unlike FMVSS Nos. 105 and 135, other FMVSSs do not have specific height dimensions for the display such as FMVSS No. 108, "Lamps, reflective devices and associated equipment"; FMVSS No. 121, "Air brake systems"; and FMVSS No. 208, "Occupant crash protection." The requirement in these standards is that the indicator or telltale be clearly visible, recognizable, or discernible, or that the telltale is an indicator to the driver. Hyundai states that the visual indicators in the subject Hyundai vehicles are in full compliance with these requirements.

3. NHTSA issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on September 23, 2003, to update and expand FMVSS No. 101. In this NPRM, NHTSA proposed a new definition of "telltale," as well as specific requirements for such telltales. Specifically, the telltale must be visible to the driver under certain conditions, must have certain illumination characteristics, must have certain color characteristics, and must be located in a specific place. The subject vehicles have visual indicators (telltales) that are in full compliance with these proposed requirements.

4. The owner's manual for each model contain graphic depictions of the indicators, both lettering and ISO symbols, as they appear in the vehicles with descriptions of their operations.

5. Hyundai is not aware of any consumer complaints, crashes, or injuries associated with the size or visibility of the affected visual indicators in the subject vehicles.

Hyundai asserts that the measure of inconsequentiality is whether there is any effect of the noncompliance on operational safety, and given the above five factors, Hyundai states the subject

noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the petition described above. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods. Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC. It is requested, but not required, that two copies of the comments be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 am to 5 pm except Federal Holidays. Comments may be submitted electronically by logging onto the Docket Management System Web site at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Click on "Help" to obtain instructions for filing the document electronically. Comments may be faxed to 1–202–493–2251, or may be submitted to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: go to *http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment closing date: May 20, 2004.

(Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120: delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: April 14, 2004.

Kenneth N. Weinstein,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 04–8929 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2004–17436; Notice 1]

Kia Motor Corporation, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Kia Motor Corporation (Kia) has determined that the rims on certain vehicles that it produced in 2001 through 2003 do not comply with S5.2(a) and S5.2(c) of 49 CFR 571.120, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 120, "Tire selection and rims for motor vehicles other than passenger cars." Kia has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports."

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), Kia has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of Kia's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

Affected are a total of approximately 69,160 model year 2002 and 2003 Sedona 4-door multipurpose passenger vehicles produced between May 1, 2001 and October 2, 2003. Also affected are a total of approximately 47,314 model year 2003 and 2004 Sorento 4-door multipurpose passenger vehicles produced between June 1, 2002 and October 2, 2003. S5.2 of FMVSS No. 120 requires that each rim be marked with certain information on the weather side, including "A designation which indicates the source of the rim's published nominal dimensions" (S5.2(a)), and "The symbol DOT" (S5.2(c)). The rims installed on the affected vehicles do not contain the markings required by S5.2(a) or S5.2(c).

Kia believes that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety and that no corrective action is warranted. Kia states that the affected rims are 6JJ × 15″ (Sedona) aluminum alloy and 7JJ × 16″ (Sorento), which are commonly available and utilized in the United States. They are a correct specification for mounting the 215/70R15 tires specified for all Sedona models and the P245/70R16 tires specified for all Sorento models, and are capable of carrying the GVWR of the vehicle. Kia first became aware of this noncompliance on the Sedona and Sorento vehicles during an internal FMVSS compliance audit.

Kia states that no accidents or injuries have occurred, and no customer complaints have been received related to the lack of the markings or any problem that may have resulted from the lack of the markings. Kia further states that the missing markings do not affect the performance of the wheels or the tire and wheel assemblies.

The rims are marked in compliance with S5.2(b), rim size designation; S5.2(d), manufacturer identification; and S5.2(e) month, day and year or month and year of manufacture. The rims are also marked with the Kia part number.

The tire size is marked on the tire sidewalls, and the owner's manual and tire inflation pressure label contain the appropriate tire size to be installed on the original equipment rims. Therefore, Kia does not believe there is a possibility of a tire and rim mismatch as a result of the missing rim markings.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the petition described above. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods. Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC. It is requested, but not required, that two copies of the comments be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays. Comments may be submitted electronically by logging onto the Docket Management System Webs site at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Click on "Help" to obtain instructions for filing the document electronically. Comments may be faxed to 1–202–493–2251, or may be submitted to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: go to *http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment closing date: May 20, 2004.

(Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120: delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: April 14, 2004.

Kenneth N. Weinstein,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 04–8927 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2004–17439; Notice 1]

Kia Motors America, Inc. and Kia Motors Corp., Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Kia Motors America, Inc. and Kia Motors Corp. (Kia), have determined that certain vehicles that Kia produced do not comply with provisions of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) Nos. 101, "Controls and displays;" 105, "Hydraulic and electric brake systems;" and 135, "Passenger car brake systems." Kia has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports."

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), Kia has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of Kia's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

Affected are a total of approximately 496,058 vehicles that do not meet the letter height requirements for brake system warning lights for the abbreviation "ABS" and in some cases the word "brake." FMVSS No. 101, "Controls and displays," Table 2, Column 3, "Identifying Words or Abbreviation," with regard to brake systems says, "* * * see FMVSS 105 and 135." S5.3.5 of FMVSS No. 105, "Hydraulic and electric brake systems," requires that "Each indicator lamp shall display word, words or abbreviation * * * which shall have letters not less than ⅛-inch high." S5.5.5 of FMVSS No. 135 requires that "Each visual indicator shall display a word or words * * * [which] shall have letters not less than 3.2 mm (⅛ inch) high."

A total of 460,792 vehicles do not meet the letter height requirements for the word "brake" and abbreviation "ABS" for brake warning systems. These noncompliant vehicles are 143,046 MY 2000–2001 Sephias with a "brake" letter height of 2.2 mm and an "ABS" letter height of 1.7 mm, 128,565 MY 2002–2004 Sedonas with a "brake" letter height of 1.9 mm and an "ABS" letter height of 1.9 mm, and 189,181 MY 2000–2004 Spectras with a "brake" letter height of 2.2 mm and an "ABS" letter height of 1.7 mm.

An additional 35,266 vehicles do not meet the letter height requirements for the abbreviation "ABS." These noncompliant vehicles are 957 MY 1995–1999 Sephias with an "ABS" letter height of 2.8 mm, 33,023 MY 2003–2004 Sorentos with an "ABS" letter height of 1.9 mm, and 1286 MY 2001–2004 Rios with an "ABS" letter height of 2.0 mm.

Kia believes that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that no corrective action is warranted. Kia states that the brake and ABS system warning lights are positioned for ready viewing by the driver, and that they are illuminated in red (brake warning light) or yellow (ABS light), colors that are generally understood by vehicle users to be indicators of unsafe condition.

Kia says that NHTSA has acted on four petitions involving brake system warning lights that were in noncompliance with the labeling requirements of FMVSS No. 101, 105, or 135. Kia summarizes these actions as follows:

> In 1982, NHTSA granted a Subaru of America, Inc. petition involving passenger vehicles which used the ISO symbol in conjunction with the word "brake," but where the lettering of "brake" was only 2.2 mm high. NHTSA agreed that the positioning of the warning light, combined with the ISO symbol, was an easily identifiable and very readable display. (47 FR 31347, 7/19/82). In 1985, NHTSA denied a Volkswagen of America, Inc. petition involving passenger vehicles which also used the ISO symbol instead of the word "brake." (50 FR 28678, 7/15/85). In 1986, recognizing the then growing use and acceptance of ISO symbols for vehicle controls and displays, NHTSA granted an Alfa Romeo, Inc. petition involving passenger vehicles which also used the ISO symbol instead of the word "brake." (51 FR 36769, 10/15/86). In 1994, NHTSA granted a Ford Motor Company petition involving passenger vehicles which, instead of having the brake system warning light identified by the word "brake," had it instead identified by the ISO symbol. (59 FR 40409, 8/8/94). In granting this petition, NHTSA commented that recognition of ISO symbols among the public had been increasing and was likely to increase still further over time.

Kia further states that the brake and antilock system warning lights in all the Kia vehicles involved in this petition include an ISO symbol combined with the word "brake" or the abbreviation "ABS." Kia asserts that NHTSA has stated that recognition of ISO symbols among the public has steadily increased over recent years, and NHTSA has recently proposed the adoption of ISO symbols for controls and displays in motor vehicles, including the same ISO symbols utilized by Kia in the affected vehicles. Kia quotes from NHTSA's notice of proposed rulemaking as follows: "The ISO symbol set has existed for many years. The great majority of vehicles manufactured for sale in the U.S. already use many of these symbols. As a result, U.S. drivers have become familiar with many of them through exposure in their current vehicles."

Kia states that it believes the ISO symbols which it uses in conjunction with the word "brake" and abbreviation "ABS" are commonly understood by the driving public. Kia says that, although the "brake" or "ABS" lettering within the warning light is less than the minimum letter height standard of 3.2 mm, the combined height of the entire brake or ABS warning light symbol and lettering ranges from a low of 6 mm for the brake light in the Kia Sephia to a high of 6.8 mm for the ABS light in the Kia Sedona, which significantly exceeds the 3.2 mm standard of FMVSS Nos. 101, 105, and 135. Kia asserts that all these factors (positioning, color, use of the ISO symbol, and combined size of both the lettering and symbol) combine to assure an easily identifiable and very readable display.

Kia asserts that, for the above reasons, it is very unlikely that a vehicle user would either fail to see or fail to understand the meaning of the brake or ABS warning light in the affected vehicles. Nor, Kia says, has it received any complaints regarding the size or visibility of either light.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the petition described above. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods. Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC. It is requested, but not required, that two copies of the comments be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal holidays. Comments may be submitted electronically by logging onto the Docket Management System Web site at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Click on "Help" to obtain instructions for filing the document electronically. Comments may be faxed to 1–202–493–2251, or may be submitted to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: go to *http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment closing date: May 20, 2004.

(Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120: delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8.)

Issued on: April 14, 2004.

Kenneth N. Weinstein,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 04–8926 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2004–17437; Notice 1]

PACCAR, Inc., Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

PACCAR, Inc. (PACCAR), has determined that the trailer antilock brake system (ABS) warning lights on certain vehicles that were produced by Peterbilt Motors Company (Peterbilt), a division of PACCAR, from April 3, 2003 to November 28, 2003 do not comply with S5.1.6.2(b) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 121, "Air brake systems." PACCAR has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports."

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), PACCAR has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of PACCAR's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

Approximately 4009 Peterbilt models 378, 379, 385, and 387 are affected. S5.1.6.2(b) of FMVSS No. 121 requires that "Each * * * truck tractor * * * shall * * * be equipped with an indicator lamp * * * which is activated whenever the [antilock brake system] malfunction signal circuit * * * receives a signal indicating an ABS malfunction on one or more towed vehicle(s)."

The affected vehicles have two types of fluorescent lights installed in the cab sleeper. These lights create an electromagnetic interference (EMI) with the trailer ABS malfunction signal manufactured by Power Line Carrier (PLC). The fluorescent lights, when on, can interfere with the proper operation of the PLC signal, preventing the telltale from functioning. The PLC signal and the telltale operate correctly when the fluorescent light in the sleeper is off.

PACCAR believes that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that no corrective action is warranted. PACCAR states that the in-cab trailer ABS malfunction warning lamp is redundant to the existing trailer ABS malfunction indicator lamp located on the exterior of the trailer and visible from the driver side mirror. PACCAR explains, "Prior to the in-cab warning lamp, the trailer mounted indicator was the only warning available to drivers. The indicator on the exterior of the trailer is not affected by this defect and would continue to warn the driver in the event of a trailer ABS malfunction. All trailers are required to be equipped with an external antilock malfunction indicator lamp through March 1, 2009."

PACCAR states that the in-cab warning lamp will not function only if the fluorescent light in the sleeper is on. PACCAR asserts that this is not likely to occur while the vehicle is being driven and if so, it would be a small percentage of the time.

PACCAR explains that not all suspect vehicles will exhibit the behavior, because due to manufacturing variances, some fluorescent lights emit more EMI than others. PACCAR states that the PLC signal strength from the trailer is also a factor. PACCAR explains that the telltale will operate normally in most cases with a strong trailer PLC signal and only marginal EMI; however the telltale will not operate with a normal to marginal trailer PLC signal and high EMI.

PACCAR also states that the foundation brakes on the trailer are not impacted.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the petition described above. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods. Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, 20590–0001. Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC. It is requested, but not required, that two copies of the comments be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 am to 5 pm except Federal Holidays. Comments may be submitted electronically by logging onto the Docket Management System Web site at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Click on "Help" to obtain instructions for filing the document electronically. Comments may be faxed to 1–202–493–2251, or may be submitted to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: go to *http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment closing date: May 20, 2004.

(Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120: delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8).

Issued on: April 14, 2004.

Kenneth N. Weinstein,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 04–8930 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2004–17438; Notice 1]

Pirelli Tire North America., Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Pirelli Pneumatici S.p.A has determined that certain tires it produced in 2003 do not comply with S4.3(d) and S4.3(e) of 49 CFR 571.109, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 109, "New pneumatic tires." Pirelli Tire LLC (Pirelli), as agent for Pirelli Pneumatici S.p.A, has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports."

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), Pirelli has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of Pirelli's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

A total of approximately 190 tires are involved. These are Pzero Asimmetrico 275/40ZR18 99Y (F) H405 tires, which Pirelli Pneumatici S.p.A produced intermittently during the period January to April, 2003. They are marked "reinforced" when in fact they are not, and are marked as two ply when they are one ply. Paragraph S4.3 of FMVSS No. 109 requires "each tire shall have permanently molded into or onto both sidewalls * * * (d) The generic name of each cord material used in the plies * * * of the tire; and (e) Actual number of plies in the sidewall, and the actual number of plies in the tread area if different."

Pirelli states that the incorrect sidewall inscription does not compromise in any way the integrity or the performance characteristics of the tires in question and does not constitute any safety-related issue. Therefore, Pirelli believes that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that no corrective action is warranted.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the petition described above. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods. Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC. It is requested, but not required, that two copies of the comments be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 am to 5 pm except Federal Holidays. Comments may be submitted electronically by logging onto the Docket Management System Web site at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Click on "Help" to obtain instructions for filing the document electronically. Comments may be faxed to 1–202–493–2251, or may be submitted to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: go to *http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment closing date: May 20, 2004.

(Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120: delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8).

Issued on: April 14, 2004.

Kenneth N. Weinstein,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 04–8928 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

April 12, 2004.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 11000, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before May 20, 2004, to be assured of consideration.

Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB)

OMB Number: New.

Form Number: TTB F 5000.31.

Type of Review: New collection.

Title: Pay.gov User Agreement.

Description: The Pay.gov User Agreement will be used to identify, validate, approve, and register qualified users to allow for submission of electronic forms using the Pay.gov System.

Respondents: Business of other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 5,800.

Estimated Burden Hours Per Respondent: 5 minutes.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Reporting Burden: 483 hours.

Clearance Officer: William H. Foster, (202) 927–8210, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Room 200 East, 1310 G. Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005.

OMB Reviewer: Joseph F. Lackey, Jr., (202) 395–7316, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Lois K. Holland,

Treasury PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8885 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–31–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

April 12, 2004.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 11000, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before May 20, 2004, to be assured of consideration.

Internal Revenue Service (IRS)

OMB Number: 1545–1589.

Revenue Procedure Number: Revenue Procedure 98–19.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Exceptions to the Notice and Reporting Requirements of section 6033(e)(1) and the Tax Imposed by section 6033(e)(2).

Description: Revenue Procedure 98–19 provides guidance to organizations exempt from taxation under 501(a) of the Internal Revenue code of 1986 on certain exceptions from the reporting and notice requirements of section 6033(e)(1) and the tax imposed by section 6033(e)(2).

Respondents: Not-for-profit institutions, Individuals or households, Farms.

Estimated Number of Respondents/ Recordkeepers: 15,000.

Estimated Burden Hours Respondent/ Recordkeeper: 10 hours.

Frequency of response: Annually.

Estimated Total Reporting/ Recordkeeping Burden: 150,000 hours.

OMB Number: 1545–1729.

Regulation Project Number: REG–107186–00 NPRM and Temporary.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Electronic Payee Statements.

Description: In general, under these regulations, a person required to furnish a statement on Form W–2 under Code sections 6041(d) or 6051, or Forms 1098-T under Code section 6050S, may furnish these statements electronically if the recipient consents to receive them electronically, and if the person furnishing the statement (1) makes certain disclosures to the recipient, (2) annually notifies the recipient that the statement is available on a Web site, and (3) provides access to the statement on that Web site for a prescribed period of time.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit, Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents/ Recordkeepers: 15,200.

Estimated Burden Hours Respondent/ Recordkeeper: 6 minutes.

Frequency of response: Annually.

Estimated Total Reporting/ Recordkeeping Burden: 28,844,950 hours.

OMB Number: 1545–1836.

Form Number: IRS Form 8734.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Support Schedule for Advance Ruling Period.

Description: Form 8734 is sued by charities to furnish financial information that Exempt Organization Determinations of IRS can use to classify a charity as a public charity.

Respondents: Not-for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents/ Recordkeepers: 16,000.

Estimated Burden Hours Respondent/ Recordkeeper:

Recordkeeping	29 hr., 39 min.
Learning about the law or the form.	1 hr., 27 min.
Preparing the form	2 hr., 56 min.
Copying, assembling, and sending the form to the IRS.	16 min.

Frequency of response: Other (one-time only).

Estimated Total Reporting/ Recordkeeping Burden: 549,120 hours.

Clearance Officer: Glenn P. Kirkland, (202) 622–3428, Internal Revenue Service, Room 6411–03, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20224.

OMB Reviewer: Joseph F. Lackey, Jr., (202) 395–7316, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Lois K. Holland,

Treasury PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8886 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

April 13, 2004.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 11000, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before May 20, 2004, to be assured of consideration.

Internal Revenue Service (IRS)

OMB Number: 1545–0927.

Form Number: IRS Form 8390.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Information Return for Determination of Life Insurance Company Earnings Rate Under Section 809.

Description: Life insurance companies are required to provide data so the Secretary of the Treasury can compute the (1) stock earnings rate of the 50 largest companies; and (2) average mutual earnings rate. These factors are used to compute the differential earnings rate which will determine the tax liability for mutual life insurance companies.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents/ Recordkeepers: 300.

Estimated Burden Hours Respondent/ Recordkeeper:

Recordkeeping	58 hr., 35 min.
Learning about the law or the form	2 hr., 28 min.
Preparing and sending the form to the IRS	3 hr., 33 min.

Frequency of Response: Annually.

Estimated Total Reporting/ Recordkeeping Burden: 19,386 hours.

OMB Number: 1545–1296.

Regulation Project Number: PS–27–91 Final.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Procedural Rules for Excise Taxes Currently Reportable on Form 720.

Description: Section 6302(c) authorizes the use of Government depositaries. These regulations provide reporting and recordkeeping rules relating to the use of Government depositaries for taxes imposed by chapter 33 of the Code.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents/ Recordkeepers: 9,000.

Estimated Burden Hours Respondent/ Recordkeeper: 22 minutes.

Frequency of Response: On occasion, Quarterly.

Estimated Total Reporting/ Recordkeeping Burden: 241,850 hours.

OMB Number: 1545–1577.

Regulation Project Number: REG–109704–97 NPRM.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: HIPAA Mental Health Parity Act; (Temporary) Interim Rules for Mental Health Parity.

Description: The regulations provide guidance for group health plans with mental benefits about requirements relating to parity in the dollar limits imposed on mental health benefits and medical/surgical benefits.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit, Not-for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents/ Recordkeepers: 7,053.

Estimated Burden Hours Respondent/ Recordkeeper: 28 minutes.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Reporting/ Recordkeeping Burden: 3,280 hours.

OMB Number: 1545–1592.

Revenue Procedure Number: Revenue Procedure 98–20.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Certification for No Information Reporting on the Sale of a Principal Residence.

Description: The revenue procedure applies only to the sale of a principal residence for $250,000 or less ($500,000 or less if the seller is married). The revenue procedure provides the written assurances that are acceptable to the Service for exempting a real estate reporting person from information reporting requirements for the sale of a principal residence.

Respondents: Individuals or households, Business or other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents/ Recordkeepers: 2,390,000.

Estimated Burden Hours Respondent/ Recordkeeper: 10 minutes.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Reporting/ Recordkeeping Burden: 420,500 hours.

OMB Number: 1545–1595.

Revenue Procedure Number: Revenue Procedure 98–25.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Automatic Data Processing.

Description: Revenue Procedure 98–25 specifies the basic requirements that the IRS considers to be essential in cases where a taxpayer's records are maintained within an Automatic Data Processing System (ADP). If machine-sensible records are lost, stolen, destroyed, or materially inaccurate, the Revenue Procedure requires that a taxpayer promptly notify its District Director and submit a plan to replace the affected records. The District Director will notify the taxpayer of any objection(s) to the taxpayer's plan. Also, the Revenue Procedure provides that a taxpayer who maintains machine-sensible records may request to enter into a Record Retention Limitation Agreement (RRLA) with its District Director. The taxpayer's request must identify and describe those records the taxpayer proposes not to retain and explain why those records will not become material to the administration of any Internal Revenue law. The District Director will notify the taxpayer whether or not the District Director will enter into a RRLA. Finally, Revenue Procedure 98–25 provides that the District Director may conduct an evaluation of a taxpayer's machine-sensible records and may initiate testing to establish the authenticity, readability, completeness, and integrity of such records.

Respondents: Business of other for-profit, Individuals or households, Not-for-profit institutions, Farms, Federal Government, State, local or tribal government.

Estimated Number of Respondents/ Recordkeepers: 3,000.

Estimated Burden Hours Respondent/ Recordkeeper: 40 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Reporting/ Recordkeeping Burden: 120.000 hours.

OMB Number: 1545–1708.

Publication Number: Publication 1345.

Type of Review: Revision.

Title: Handbook for Authorized IRS *e-file* Providers.

Description: Publication 1345 informs those who participate in the IRS *e-file* Program for Individual Income Tax Returns of their obligations to the Internal Revenue Service, taxpayers, and other participants.

Respondents: Business of other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents/ Recordkeepers: 145,000.

Estimated Burden Hours Respondent/ Recordkeeper: 25 hours, 5 minutes.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Reporting/ Recordkeeping Burden: 3,636,463 hours.

OMB Number: 1545–1873.

Revenue Procedure Number: Revenue Procedure 2004–15.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Waivers of Minimum Funding Standards.

Description: This revenue procedure describes the process for obtaining a waiver from the minimum funding standards set forth in section 412 of the Code.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit, Not-for-profit institutions, Farms, State, local or tribal government.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 55.

Estimated Burden Hours Respondent: 86 hours.

Frequency of Response: Other (one response).

Estimated Total Reporting Burden: 4,730 hours.

Clearance Officer: Glenn P. Kirkland, (202) 622–3428, Internal Revenue Service, Room 6411–03, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20224.

OMB Reviewer: Joseph F. Lackey, Jr., (202) 395–7316, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Lois K. Holland,

Treasury PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8887 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Fiscal Service

Surety Company Acceptable on Federal Bonds: Platte River Insurance Company

AGENCY: Financial Management Service, Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This is Supplement No. 14 to the Treasury Department Circular 570; 2003 Revision, published July 1, 2003, at 68 FR 39186.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Surety Bond Branch at (202) 874–6850.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A Certificate of Authority as an acceptable surety on Federal bonds is hereby issued to the following Company under 31 U.S.C. 9304 to 9308. Federal bond-approving officers should annotate their reference copies of the Treasury Circular 570, 2003 Revision, on page 39216 to reflect this addition: *Company Name:* Platte River Insurance Company. *Business Address:* P.O. Box 5900, Madison, WI 53705–0900. *Phone:* (860) 241–2008. *Underwriting Limitation b/:* $2,868,000. *Surety Licenses c/:* AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, DC, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, PI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY. *Incorporated in:* Nebraska.

Certificates of Authority expire on June 30 each year, unless revoked prior to that date. The Certificates are subject to subsequent annual renewal as long as the companies remain qualified (31 CFR part 223). A list of qualified companies are published annually as of July 1 in Treasury Department Circular 570, with details as to underwriting limitations, areas in which licensed to transact surety business and other information.

The Circular may be viewed and downloaded through the Internet at *http://www.fms.treas.gov/c570.* A hard copy may be purchased from the Government Printing Office (GPO) Subscription Service, Washington, DC, Telephone (202) 512–1800. When ordering the Circular from GPO, use the following stock number: 769–004–04643–2.

Questions concerning this Notice may be directed to the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Financial Management Service, Financial Accounting and Services Division, Surety Bond Branch, 3700 East-West Highway, Room 6F07, Hyattsville, MD 20782.

Dated: April 8, 2004.

Rose Brewer,

Acting Director, Financial Accounting and Services Division, Financial Management Service.

[FR Doc. 04–8841 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–35–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

[EE–44–78]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Regulation Project

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13(44 U.S.C.

3506(c)(2)(A)). Currently, the IRS is soliciting comments concerning an existing final regulation, EE–44–78 (TD 8100), Cooperative Hospital Service Organizations (§ 1.501(e)–1).

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before June 21, 2004, to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Glenn Kirkland, Internal Revenue Service, room 6411, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection should be directed to Allan Hopkins, at (202) 622–6665, or at Internal Revenue Service, room 6411, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224, or through the Internet, at *Allan.M.Hopkins@irs.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Cooperative Hospital Service Organizations.

OMB Number: 1545–0814.

Regulation Project Number: EE–44–78.

Abstract: This regulation establishes the rules for cooperative hospital service organizations which seek tax-exempt status under section 501(e) of the Internal Revenue Code. Such an organization must keep records in order to show its cooperative nature and to establish compliance with other requirements in Code section 501(c).

Current Actions: There is no change to this existing regulation.

Type of Review: Extension of OMB approval.

Affected Public: Not-for-profit institutions.

The recordkeeping requirement does not create any additional burden on taxpayers because the records which the regulations require would ordinarily be kept by a cooperative as a routine part of its day-to-day business operations.

The following paragraph applies to all of the collections of information covered by this notice:

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a valid OMB control number. Books or records relating to a collection of information must be retained as long as their contents may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law. Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential, as required by 26 U.S.C. 6103.

Request for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Approved: April 7, 2004.

Glenn P. Kirkland,

IRS Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8940 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

[REG–209020–86]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Regulation Project

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Currently, the IRS is soliciting comments concerning an existing notice of proposed rulemaking and temporary regulation, REG–209020–86 (TD 8210), Foreign Tax Credit; Notification and Adjustment Due to Foreign Tax Redeterminations (§§ 1.905–3T, 1.905–4T, 1.905–5T and 301.6689-IT).

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before June 21, 2004, to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Glenn Kirkland, Internal Revenue Service, room 6411, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection should be directed to Allan Hopkins, at (202) 622–6665, or at Internal Revenue Service, room 6407, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224, or through the Internet, at *Allan.M.Hopkins@irs.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Foreign Tax Credit; Notification and Adjustment Due to Foreign Tax Redeterminations.

OMB Number: 1545–1056.

Regulation Project Number: REG–209020–86 (formerly INTL–61–86).

Abstract: This regulation relates to a taxpayer's obligation under section 905(c) of the Internal Revenue Code to file notification of a foreign tax redetermination, to make adjustments to a taxpayer's pools of foreign taxes and earnings and profits, and the imposition of the civil penalty for failure to file such notice or report such adjustments.

Current Actions: There is no change to this existing regulation.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Individuals and business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 10,000.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 1 hour.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 10,000.

The following paragraph applies to all of the collections of information covered by this notice:

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a valid OMB control number. Books or records relating to a collection of information must be retained as long as their contents may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law. Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential, as required by 26 U.S.C. 6103.

Request for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including

through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Approved: April 8, 2004.

Glenn P. Kirkland,

IRS Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8941 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Announcement 2004–38

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Currently, the IRS is soliciting comments concerning Announcement 2004–38, Election of Alternative Deficit Reduction Contribution.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before June 21, 2004, to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Glenn P. Kirkland, Internal Revenue Service, room 6411, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the announcement should be directed to Carol Savage at Internal Revenue Service, room 6407, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20224, or at (202) 622–3945, or through the Internet at *CAROL.A.SAVAGE@irs.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Election of Alternative Deficit Reduction Contribution.

OMB Number: 1545–1883.

Announcement Number: Announcement 2004–38.

Abstract: Announcement 2004–38 describes the election that must be made in order for certain employers to take advantage of the alternative deficit reduction contribution described in section 102 of H.R. 3108.

Current Actions: There are no changes being made to the announcement at this time.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations, and not-for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 200.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 4 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 800.

The following paragraph applies to all of the collections of information covered by this notice:

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a valid OMB control number. Books or records relating to a collection of information must be retained as long as their contents may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law. Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential, as required by 26 U.S.C. 6103.

Request for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Approved: April 14, 2004.

Glenn P. Kirkland,

IRS Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8942 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Form 1099–INT

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Currently, the IRS is soliciting comments concerning Form 1099–INT, Interest Income.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before June 21, 2004, to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Glenn Kirkland, Internal Revenue Service, room 6411, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the form and instructions should be directed to Allan Hopkins, at (202) 622–6665, or at Internal Revenue Service, room 6407, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20224, or through the Internet, at *Allan.M.Hopkins@irs.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Interest Income.

OMB Number: 1545–0112.

Form Number: 1099–INT.

Abstract: Form 1099–INT is used for reporting interest income paid, as required by sections 6049 and 6041 of the Internal Revenue Code. The IRS uses the form to verify compliance with the reporting rules and to verify that the recipient has included the proper amount of interest on his or her income tax return.

Current Actions: There are no changes being made to the form at this time.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations, Federal Government, individuals or households, and not-for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Responses: 275,797,664.

Estimated Time Per Response: 12 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 54,979,533.

The following paragraph applies to all of the collections of information covered by this notice:

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a valid OMB control number. Books or records relating to a collection

of information must be retained as long as their contents may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law. Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential, as required by 26 U.S.C. 6103.

Request for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Approved: April 14, 2004,

Glenn P. Kirkland,

IRS Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8943 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Notice 88–30 and Notice 88–132

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Currently, the IRS is soliciting comments concerning two existing notices, Notice 88–30, Diesel Fuel and Aviation Fuel Taxes Imposed at Wholesale Level, and Notice 88–132, Diesel and Aviation Fuel Taxes; Rules Effective 1/1/89.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before June 21, 2004, to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Glenn Kirkland, Internal Revenue Service, room 6411, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the notices should be directed to Allan Hopkins, at (202) 622–6665, or at Internal Revenue Service, room 6407, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224, or through the Internet, at *Allan.M.Hopkins@irs.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Notice 88–30, Diesel Fuel and Aviation Fuel Taxes Imposed at Wholesale Level, and Notice 88–132, Diesel and Aviation Fuel Taxes; Rules Effective 1/1/89.

OMB Number: 1545–1043.

Notice Number: Notice 88–30 and Notice 88–132.

Abstract: Notice 88–30 and Notice 88–132 require certain persons involved with diesel or aviation fuel (1) To be registered with the Internal Revenue Service, (2) to maintain certain records, and (3) to provide certificates to support exempt purchases. Because of the Code amendments made by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, these requirements now apply only with respect to aviation fuel.

Current Actions: There are no changes being made to the notices at this time.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations, not-for-profit institutions, farms, and state, local or tribal governments.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 3,500.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 1 hour, 6 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 3,850.

The following paragraph applies to all of the collections of information covered by this notice:

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a valid OMB control number. Books or records relating to a collection of information must be retained as long as their contents may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law. Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential, as required by 26 U.S.C. 6103.

Request for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Approved: April 8, 2004.

Glenn P. Kirkland,

IRS Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8944 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Form 8866

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13(44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Currently, the IRS is soliciting comments concerning Form 8866, Interest Computation Under the Look-Back Method for Property Depreciated Under the Income Forecast Method.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before June 21, 2004, to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Glenn P. Kirkland, Internal Revenue Service, room 6411, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the form and instructions should be directed to Carol Savage at Internal Revenue Service, room 6407, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW.,

Washington, DC 20224, or at (202) 622–3945, or through the Internet at CAROL.A.SAVAGE@irs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Interest Computation Under the Look-Back Method for Property Depreciated Under the Income Forecast Method.

OMB Number: 1545–1622.

Form Number: Form 8866.

Abstract: Taxpayers depreciating property under the income forecast method and placed in service after September 13, 1995, must use Form 8866 to compute and report interest due or to be refunded under Internal Revenue Code 167(g)(2). The Internal Revenue Service uses the information on Form 8866 to determine if the interest has been figured correctly.

Current Actions: There are no changes being made to the form at this time.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Individuals or households, and business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 5,000.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 13 hours, 22 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 66,850.

The following paragraph applies to all of the collections of information covered by this notice:

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a valid OMB control number. Books or records relating to a collection of information must be retained as long as their contents may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law. Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential, as required by 26 U.S.C. 6103.

Request for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Approved: April 14, 2004.

Glenn P. Kirkland,

IRS Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–8945 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

Federal Register

Tuesday,
April 20, 2004

Part II

Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR Parts 63, 264, et al.
National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Proposed Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Hazardous Waste Combustors (Phase I Final Replacement Standards and Phase II); Proposed Rule

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 63, 264, 265, 266, 270, and 271

[FRL–7644–1]

RIN 2050–AE01

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Proposed Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Hazardous Waste Combustors (Phase I Final Replacement Standards and Phase II)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This action proposes national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) for hazardous waste combustors. These combustors include hazardous waste burning incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, industrial/commercial/institutional boilers and process heaters, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces, known collectively as hazardous waste combustors (HWCs). EPA has identified these HWCs as major sources of hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions. These proposed standards will, when final, implement section 112(d) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) by requiring hazardous waste combustors to meet HAP emission standards reflecting the application of the maximum achievable control technology (MACT).

The HAP emitted by facilities in the incinerator, cement kiln, lightweight aggregate kiln, industrial/commercial/institutional boiler, process heater, and hydrochloric acid production furnace source categories include arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, dioxins and furans, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, lead, manganese, and mercury. Exposure to these substances has been demonstrated to cause adverse health effects such as irritation on the lung, skin, and mucus membranes, effects on the central nervous system, kidney damage, and cancer. The adverse health effects associated with the exposure to these specific HAP are further described in the preamble. In general, these findings have only been shown with concentrations higher than those typically in the ambient air.

This action also presents our tentative decision regarding the February 28, 2002, petition for rulemaking submitted by the Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition to the Administrator, relating to EPA's implementation of the so-called omnibus permitting authority under section 3005(c) of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), which requires that each permit issued under RCRA contain such terms and conditions as are determined necessary to protect human health and the environment. In that petition, the Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition requests that we repeal the existing site-specific risk assessment policy and technical guidance for hazardous waste combustors and that we promulgate the policy and guidance as rules in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act if we continue to believe that site-specific risk assessments may be necessary.

DATES: Submit comments on or before July 6, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. OAR–2004–0022 by one of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- Agency Web site: *http://www.epa.gov/edocket*. EDOCKET, EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, is EPA's preferred method for receiving comments. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- E-mail: *http://www.epa.gov/edocket*.
- Fax: 202–566–1741.
- Mail: OAR Docket, Environmental Protection Agency, Mailcode: B102, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460. Please include a total of 2 copies.
- Hand Delivery: EPA/DC, EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Docket's normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. OAR–2004–0022. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at *http://www.epa.gov/edocket*, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through EDOCKET, regulations.gov, or e-mail. The EPA EDOCKET and the federal regulations.gov Web sites are "anonymous access" systems, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through EDOCKET or regulations.gov, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD-ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses. For additional information about EPA's public docket visit EDOCKET on-line or see the **Federal Register** of May 31, 2002 (67 FR 38102).

For additional instructions on submitting comments, go to unit II of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

Docket: All documents in the docket are listed in the EDOCKET index at *http://www.epa.gov/edocket*. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, *i.e.*, CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in EDOCKET or in hard copy at the OAR Docket, EPA/DC, EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the OAR Docket is (202) 566–1742.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information, call the RCRA Call Center at 1–800–424–9346 or TDD 1–800–553–7672 (hearing impaired). Callers within the Washington Metropolitan Area must dial 703–412–9810 or TDD 703–412–3323 (hearing impaired). The RCRA Call Center is open Monday–Friday, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., eastern standard time. For more information about this proposal, contact Michael Galbraith at 703–605–0567, or *galbraith.michael@epa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Regulated Entities

The promulgation of the proposed rule would affect the following North

American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) and Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes:

Category	NAICS code	SIC code	Examples of potentially regulated entities
Any industry that combusts hazardous waste as defined in the proposed rule.	562211	4953	Incinerator, hazardous waste.
	327310	3241	Cement manufacturing, clinker production.
	327992	3295	Ground or treated mineral and earth manufacturing.
	325	28	Chemical Manufacturers.
	324	29	Petroleum Refiners.
	331	33	Primary Aluminum.
	333	38	Photographic equipment and supplies.
	488, 561, 562	49	Sanitary Services, N.E.C.
	421	50	Scrap and waste materials.
	422	51	Chemical and Allied Products, N.E.C.
	512, 541, 561, 812	73	Business Services, N.E.C.
	512, 514, 541, 711	89	Services, N.E.C.
	924	95	Air, Water and Solid Waste Management.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be regulated by this action. This table lists examples of the types of entries EPA is now aware could potentially be regulated by this action. Other types of entities not listed could also be affected. To determine whether your facility, company, business, organization, etc., is regulated by this action, you should examine the applicability criteria in Part II of this preamble. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed in the preceding **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

II. What Should I Consider as I Prepare My Comments for EPA?

1. *Submitting CBI.* Do not submit this information to EPA through EDOCKET, regulations.gov or e-mail. Clearly mark the part or all of the information that you claim to be CBI. For CBI information in a disk or CD–ROM that you mail to EPA, mark the outside of the disk or CD–ROM as CBI and then identify electronically within the disk or CD–ROM the specific information that is claimed as CBI). In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public docket. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2.

2. *Tips for Preparing Your Comments.* When submitting comments, remember to:

A. Identify the rulemaking by docket number and other identifying information (subject heading, **Federal Register** date and page number).

B. Follow directions—The agency may ask you to respond to specific questions or organize comments by referencing a Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part or section number.

C. Explain why you agree or disagree; suggest alternatives and substitute language for your requested changes.

D. Describe any assumptions and provide any technical information and/or data that you used.

E. If you estimate potential costs or burdens, explain how you arrived at your estimate in sufficient detail to allow for it to be reproduced.

F. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns, and suggest alternatives.

G. Explain your views as clearly as possible, avoiding the use of profanity or personal threats.

H. Make sure to submit your comments by the comment period deadline identified.

Outline

Abbreviations and Acronyms Used in This Document

acfm—actual cubic feet per minute
Btu—British thermal units
CAA—Clean Air Act
CFR—Code of Federal Regulations
DRE—destruction and removal efficiency
dscf—dry standard cubic foot
dscm—dry standard cubic meter
EPA—Environmental Protection Agency
FR—**Federal Register**
gr/dscf—grains per dry standard cubic foot
HAP—hazardous air pollutant(s)
ICR—Information Collection Request
kg/hr—kilograms per hour
kW-hour—kilo Watt hour
MACT—Maximum Achievable Control Technology
mg/dscm—milligrams per dry standard cubic meter
MMBtu—million British thermal unit
ng/dscm—nanograms per dry standard cubic meter
NESHAP—national emission standards for HAP
ng—nanograms
POHC—principal organic hazardous constituent
ppmv—parts per million by volume
ppmw—parts per million by weight
Pub. L.—Public Law
RCRA—Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
SRE—system removal efficiency
TEQ—toxicity equivalence
ug/dscm—micrograms per dry standard cubic meter
U.S.C.—United States Code

Part One: Background and Summary

I. Background Information

A. What Criteria Are Used in the Development of NESHAP?

1. What Information Is Covered in This Preamble and How Is It Organized?

In this preamble, EPA summarizes the important features of these proposed standards that apply to hazardous waste burning incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces, known collectively as HWCs. This preamble describes: (1) The environmental, energy, and economic impacts of these proposed standards; (2) the basis for each of the decisions made regarding the proposed standards; (3) requests public comments on certain issues; and (4) discusses administrative requirements relative to this action.

2. Where in the Code of Federal Regulations Will These Standards Be Codified?

The Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) is a codification of the general and permanent rules published in the **Federal Register** by the Executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The code is divided into 50 titles that represent broad areas subject to Federal regulation. These proposed rules would be published in Title 40, Protection of the Environment, Part 63, Subpart EEE: National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Hazardous Waste Combustors.

3. What Criteria Are Used in the Development of NESHAP?

Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) requires EPA to promulgate regulations for the control of HAP emissions from each source category listed by EPA under section 112(c). The statute requires the regulations to reflect the maximum degree of reduction in emissions of HAP that is achievable taking into consideration the cost of achieving the emission reduction, any nonair quality health and environmental impacts, and energy requirements. This level of control is commonly referred to as MACT (*i.e.*, maximum achievable control technology). The MACT regulation can be based on the emission reductions achievable through application of measures, processes, methods, systems, or techniques including, but not limited to: (1) Reducing the volume of, or eliminating emissions of, such pollutants through process changes, substitutions of materials, or other modifications; (2) enclosing systems or processes to eliminate emissions; (3) collecting, capturing, or treating such pollutants when released from a process, stack, storage or fugitive emission point; (4) design, equipment, work practices, or operational standards as provided in subsection 112(h); or (5) a combination of the above. *See* section 112(d)(2) of the CAA.

For new sources, MACT standards cannot be less stringent than the emission control achieved in practice by the best-controlled similar source. *See* section 112(d)(3) of the Act. The MACT standards for existing sources can be less stringent than standards for new sources, but they cannot be less stringent than the average emission limitation achieved by the best-performing 12 percent of existing sources for categories and subcategories with 30 or more sources, or the best-performing 5 sources for categories or subcategories with fewer than 30 sources. *Id.* This level of control is usually referred to as the MACT "floor", the term used in the Legislative History.

In essence, MACT standards ensure that all major sources of air toxic (*i.e.*, HAP) emissions achieve the level of control already being achieved by the better-controlled and lower-emitting sources in each category. This approach provides assurance to citizens that each major source of toxic air pollution will be required to effectively control its emissions of air toxics. At the same time, this approach provides a level playing field, ensuring that facilities that employ cleaner processes and good emission controls are not disadvantaged relative to competitors with poorer controls.

B. What Is the Regulatory Development Background of the Source Categories in the Proposed Rule?

Today's notice proposes standards for controlling emissions of HAP from hazardous waste combustors. Hazardous waste combustors comprise several categories of sources that burn hazardous waste: incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces. We call incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns Phase I sources because we have already promulgated standards for those source categories. We call boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces Phase II sources because we intended to promulgate MACT standards for those source categories after promulgating MACT standards for Phase I sources. The regulatory background of Phase I and Phase II source categories is discussed below.

1. Phase I Source Categories

Phase I combustor sources are regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), which establishes a "cradle-to-grave" regulatory structure overseeing the safe treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste. We issued RCRA rules to control air emissions from incinerators in 1981, 40 CFR parts 264 and 265, subpart O, and from cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste in 1991, 40 CFR part 266, subpart H. These rules rely generally on risk-based standards to achieve the RCRA protectiveness mandate.

The Phase I source categories are also subject to standards under section 112(d) of the Clean Air Act. We promulgated standards for Phase I sources on September 30, 1999 (64 FR 52828). This final rule is referred to as the Phase I rule or 1999 final rule. These emission standards created a technology-based national cap for hazardous air pollutant emissions from the combustion of hazardous waste in these devices. The rule regulates emissions of numerous hazardous air pollutants: dioxin/furans, other toxic organics (through surrogates), mercury, other toxic metals (both directly and through a surrogate), and hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas. Where necessary, section 3005(c)(3) of RCRA provides the authority to impose additional conditions in a RCRA permit to protect human health and the environment.

A number of parties, representing interests of both industrial sources and of the environmental community, sought judicial review of the Phase I rule. On July 24, 2001, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (the Court) granted portions of the Sierra Club's petition for review and vacated the challenged portions of the standards. *Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition* v. *EPA*, 255 F. 3d 855 (D.C. Cir. 2001). The Court held that EPA had not demonstrated that its calculation of MACT floors met the statutory requirement of being no less stringent than (1) the average emission limitation achieved by the best performing 12 percent of existing sources and (2) the emission control achieved in practice by the best controlled similar source for new sources. 255 F.3d at 861, 865–66. As a remedy, the Court, after declining to rule on most of the issues presented in the industry petitions for review, vacated the "challenged regulations," stating that: "[W]e have chosen not to reach the bulk of industry petitioners' claims, and leaving the regulations in place during remand would ignore petitioners' potentially meritorious challenges." *Id.* at 872. Examples of the specific challenges the Court indicated might have merit were provisions relating to compliance during start up/shut down and malfunction events, including emergency safety vent openings, the dioxin/furan standard for lightweight aggregate kilns, and the semivolatile metal standard for cement kilns. *Id.* However, the Court stated, "[b]ecause this decision leaves EPA without standards regulating [hazardous waste combustor] emissions, EPA (or any of the parties to this proceeding) may file a motion to delay issuance of the mandate to request either that the current standards remain in place or that EPA be allowed reasonable time to develop interim standards." *Id.*

Acting on this invitation, all parties moved the Court jointly to stay the issuance of its mandate for four months to allow EPA time to develop interim standards, which would replace the vacated standards temporarily, until final standards consistent with the Court's mandate are promulgated. The interim standards were published on February 13, 2002 (67 FR 6792). EPA did not justify or characterize these standards as conforming to MACT, but rather as an interim measure to prevent the adverse environmental and other consequences that would result from the regulatory gap resulting from no standards being in place. *Id.* at 6795–96.

The motion also indicates that EPA will issue final standards which comply

with the Court's opinion by June 14, 2005, and it indicates that EPA and Petitioner Sierra Club intend to enter into a settlement agreement requiring us to promulgate final rules by that date, and that date be judicially enforceable. EPA and Sierra Club entered into that settlement agreement on March 4, 2002.

The joint motion also details other actions we agreed to take, including issuing a one-year extension to the September 30, 2002, compliance date (66 FR 63313, December 6, 2001), and promulgating several of the compliance and implementation amendments to the rule which we proposed on July 3, 2001 (66 FR 35126). These final amendments were published on February 14, 2002 (67 FR 6968).

2. Phase II Source Categories

Phase II combustors—boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces—are also regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) pursuant to 40 CFR part 266, subpart H, and (for reasons discussed below) are also subject to the MACT standard setting process in section 112(d) of the CAA. We delayed promulgating MACT standards for these source categories pending reevaluation of the MACT standard setting methodology following the Court's decision to vacate the standards for the Phase I source categories. We have also entered into a judicially enforceable consent decree with Sierra Club which requires EPA to promulgate MACT standards for the Phase II sources by June 14, 2005—the same date that (for independent reasons) is required for the replacement standards for Phase I sources.

C. What Is the Statutory Authority for This Standard?

Section 112 of the Clean Air Act requires that the EPA promulgate regulations requiring the control of HAP emissions from major and certain area sources. The control of HAP is achieved through promulgation of emission standards under sections 112(d) and (in a second round of standard setting) (f) and, in appropriate circumstances, work practice standards under section 112(h).

EPA's initial list of categories of major and area sources of HAP selected for regulation in accordance with section 112(c) of the Act was published in the **Federal Register** on July 16, 1992 (57 FR 31576). Incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, industrial/commercial/institutional boilers and process heaters, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces are among the listed 174 categories of sources. The listing was based on the Administrator's determination that they may reasonably be anticipated to emit several of the 188 listed HAP in quantities sufficient to designate them as major sources.

D. What Is the Relationship Between the Proposed Rule and Other MACT Combustion Rules?

The proposed amendments to the subpart EEE, part 63, standards for hazardous waste combustors would apply to the source categories that are currently subject to that subpart—incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste. Today's proposed rule, however, would also amend subpart EEE to establish MACT standards for the Phase II source categories—those boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste.

Generally speaking, you are an affected source pursuant to subpart EEE if you combust, or have previously combusted, hazardous waste in an incinerator, cement kiln, lightweight aggregate kiln, boiler, or hydrochloric acid production furnace. You continue to be an affected source until you cease burning hazardous waste and initiate closure requirements pursuant to RCRA. See § 63.1200(b). If you never previously combusted hazardous waste, or have ceased burning hazardous waste and initiated RCRA closure requirements, you are not subject to subpart EEE. Rather, EPA has promulgated or proposed separate MACT standards for sources that do not burn hazardous waste within the following source categories: commercial and industrial solid waste incinerators (40 CFR part 60, subparts CCCC and DDDD); Portland cement manufacturing facilities (40 CFR part 63, subpart LLL); industrial/commercial/institutional boilers and process heaters (40 CFR part 63, proposed subpart DDDDD); and hydrochloric acid production facilities (40 CFR part 63, subpart NNNNN). In addition, EPA considered whether to establish MACT standards for lightweight aggregate manufacturing facilities that do not burn hazardous waste, and determined that they are not major sources of HAP emissions. Thus, EPA has not established MACT standards for lightweight aggregate manufacturing facilities that do not burn hazardous waste.

Note that non-stack emissions points are not regulated under subpart EEE.[1] Emissions attributable to storage and handling of hazardous waste prior to combustion (*i.e.*, emissions from tanks, containers, equipment, and process vents) would continue to be regulated pursuant to either RCRA subpart AA, BB, and CC or an applicable MACT that applies to the before-mentioned material handling devices. Emissions unrelated to the hazardous waste operations may be regulated pursuant to other MACT rulemakings. For example, Portland cement manufacturing facilities that combust hazardous waste are subject to both subpart EEE and subpart LLL, and hydrochloric acid production facilities that combust hazardous waste may be subject to both subpart EEE and subpart NNNNN.[2] In these instances subpart EEE controls HAP emissions from the cement kiln and hydrochloric acid production furnace stack, while subparts LLL and NNNNN would control HAP emissions from other operations that are not directly related to the combustion of hazardous waste (*e.g.*, clinker cooler emissions for cement production facilities, and hydrochloric acid product transportation and storage for hydrochloric acid production facilities).

Note that if you temporarily cease burning hazardous waste for any reason, you remain an affected source and are still subject to the applicable Subpart EEE requirements. However, even as an affected source, the proposed emission standards or operating limits derived from the hazardous waste combustors do not apply if: (1) Hazardous waste is not in the combustion chamber and you elect to comply with other MACT (or CAA section 129) standards that otherwise would be applicable if you were not burning hazardous waste, *e.g.*, the nonhazardous waste burning Portland Cement Kiln MACT (subpart LLL); or (2) you are in a startup, shutdown, or malfunction mode of operation.

E. What Are the Health Effects Associated With Pollutants Emitted by Hazardous Waste Combustors?

Today's proposed rule protects air quality and promotes the public health by reducing the emissions of some of the HAP listed in section 112(b)(1) of the CAA. Emissions data collected in the development of this proposed rule show that metals, particulate matter, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, dioxins and furans, and other organic compounds are emitted from hazardous waste combustors. The HAP that would

[1] Note, however, that fugitive emissions attributable to the combustion of hazardous waste from the combustion device are regulated pursuant to subpart EEE.

[2] Hydrochloric acid production furnaces that combust hazardous waste would also be affected sources subject to subpart NNNNN if they produce a liquid acid product that contains greater than 30% hydrochloric acid.

be controlled with this rule are associated with a variety of adverse health affects. These adverse health effects include chronic health disorders (*e.g.*, irritation of the lung, skin, and mucus membranes and effects on the blood, digestive tract, kidneys, and central nervous system), and acute health disorders (*e.g.*, lung irritation and congestion, alimentary effects such as nausea and vomiting, and effects on the central nervous system). Provided below are brief descriptions of risks associated with HAP that are emitted from hazardous waste combustors. Note that a more detailed discussion of the risks associated with these emissions is included in Part Four.

Antimony

Antimony occurs at very low levels in the environment, both in the soils and foods. Higher concentrations, however, are found at antimony processing sites, and in their hazardous wastes. The most common industrial use of antimony is as a fire retardant in the form of antimony trioxide. Chronic occupational exposure to antimony (generally antimony trioxide) is most commonly associated with "antimony pneumoconiosis," a condition involving fibrosis and scarring of the lung tissues. Studies have shown that antimony accumulates in the lung and is retained for long periods of time. Effects are not limited to the lungs, however, and myocardial effects (effects on the heart muscle) and related effects (*e.g.*, increased blood pressure, altered EKG readings) are among the best-characterized human health effects associated with antimony exposure. Reproductive effects (increased incidence of spontaneous abortions and higher rates of premature deliveries) have been observed in female workers exposed in antimony processing facilities. Similar effects on the heart, lungs, and reproductive system have been observed in laboratory animals.

EPA recently assessed the carcinogenicity of antimony and found the evidence for carcinogenicity to be weak, with conflicting evidence from inhalation studies with laboratory animals, equivocal data from the occupational studies, negative results from studies of oral exposures in laboratory animals, and little evidence of mutagenicity or genotoxicity.[3] As a consequence, EPA concluded that insufficient data are available to adequately characterize the carcinogenicity of antimony and, accordingly, the carcinogenicity of antimony cannot be determined based on available information. However, IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer) in an earlier evaluation, concluded that antimony trioxide is "possibly carcinogenic to humans" (Group 2B).

Arsenic

Acute (short-term) high-level inhalation exposure to arsenic dust or fumes has resulted in gastrointestinal effects (nausea, diarrhea, abdominal pain), and central and peripheral nervous system disorders. Chronic (long-term) inhalation exposure to inorganic arsenic in humans is associated with irritation of the skin and mucous membranes. Human data suggest a relationship between inhalation exposure of women working at or living near metal smelters and an increased risk of reproductive effects, such as spontaneous abortions. Inorganic arsenic exposure in humans by the inhalation route has been shown to be strongly associated with lung cancer, while ingestion or inorganic arsenic in humans has been linked to a form of skin cancer and also to bladder, liver, and lung cancer. EPA has classified inorganic arsenic as a Group A, human carcinogen.

Beryllium

Beryllium is a hard, grayish metal naturally found in minerals, rocks, coal, soil, and volcanic dust. Beryllium dust enters the air from burning coal and oil. This beryllium dust will eventually settle over the land and water. It enters water from erosion of rocks and soil, and from industrial waste. Some beryllium compounds will dissolve in water, but most stick to particles and settle to the bottom. Most beryllium in soil does not dissolve in water and remains bound to soil. Beryllium does not accumulate in the food chain.

Beryllium can be harmful if you breathe it. The effects depend on how much you are exposed to and for how long. If beryllium air levels are high enough, an acute condition can result. This condition resembles pneumonia and is called acute beryllium disease. Long-term exposure to beryllium can increase the risk of developing lung cancer.

Cadmium

The acute (short-term) effects of cadmium inhalation in humans consist mainly of effects on the lung, such as pulmonary irritation. Chronic (long-term) inhalation or oral exposure to cadmium leads to a build-up of cadmium in the kidneys that can cause kidney disease. Cadmium has been shown to be a developmental toxicant in animals, resulting in fetal malformations and other effects, but no conclusive evidence exists in humans. An association between cadmium exposure and an increased risk of lung cancer has been reported from human studies, but these studies are inconclusive due to confounding factors. Animal studies have demonstrated an increase in lung cancer from long-term inhalation exposure to cadmium. EPA has classified cadmium as a Group B1, probable carcinogen.

Chlorine Gas

Acute exposure to high levels of chlorine in humans can result in chest pain, vomiting, toxic pneumonitis, and pulmonary edema. At lower levels chlorine is a potent irritant to the eyes, the upper respiratory tract, and lungs. Chronic exposure to chlorine gas in workers has resulted in respiratory effects including eye and throat irritation and airflow obstruction. Animal studies have reported decreased body weight gain, eye and nose irritation, nonneoplastic nasal lesions, and respiratory epithelial hyperplasia from chronic inhalation exposure to chlorine. No information is available on the carcinogenic effects of chlorine in humans from inhalation exposure. We have not classified chlorine for potential carcinogenicity.

Chromium

Chromium may be emitted in two forms, trivalent chromium (chromium III) or hexavalent chromium (chromium VI). The respiratory tract is the major target organ for chromium VI toxicity, for acute (short-term) and chronic (long-term) inhalation exposures. Shortness of breath, coughing, and wheezing have been reported from acute exposure to chromium VI, while perforations and ulcerations of the septum, bronchitis, decreased pulmonary function, pneumonia, and other respiratory effects have been noted from chronic exposure. Limited human studies suggest that chromium VI inhalation exposure may be associated with complications during pregnancy and childbirth, while animal studies have not reported reproductive effects from inhalation exposure to chromium VI. Human and animal studies have clearly established that inhaled chromium VI is a carcinogen, resulting in an increased risk of lung cancer. EPA has classified chromium VI as a Group A, human carcinogen.

Chromium III is less toxic than chromium VI. The respiratory tract is also the major target organ for

[3] *See* "Evaluating the Carcinogenicity of Antimony," Risk Assessment Issue Paper (98–030/07–26–99), Superfund Technical Support Center, National Center for Environmental Assessment, July 26, 1999.

chromium III toxicity, similar to chromium VI. Chromium III is an essential element in humans, with a daily intake of 50 to 200 micrograms per day recommended for an adult. The body can detoxify some amount of chromium VI to chromium III. EPA has not classified chromium III with respect to carcinogenicity.

Cobalt

Cobalt is a relatively rare metal that is produced primarily as a by-product during refining of other metals, primarily copper. Cobalt has been widely reported to cause respiratory effects in humans exposed by inhalation, including respiratory irritation, wheezing, asthma, and pneumonia. Cardiomyopathy (or damage to the heart muscle) has also been reported, although this effect is better known from oral exposure. Other effects of oral exposure in humans are polycythemia (an abnormally high number of red blood cells) and the blocking of uptake of iodine by the thyroid. In addition, cobalt is a sensitizer in humans by any route of exposure. Sensitized individuals may react to inhalation of cobalt by developing asthma or to ingestion or dermal contact with cobalt by developing dermatitis. Cobalt is a vital component of vitamin B_{12}, though there is no evidence that intake of cobalt is ever limiting in the human diet.

A number of epidemiological studies have found that exposures to cobalt are associated with an increased incidence of lung cancer in occupational settings. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC, part of the World Health Organization) classifies cobalt and cobalt compounds as "possibly carcinogenic to humans" (Group 2B). The American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH) has classified cobalt as a confirmed animal carcinogen with unknown relevance to humans (category A3). An EPA assessment concludes that under EPA's 1986 guidelines, cobalt would be classified as a probable human carcinogen (group B1) based on limited evidence of carcinogenicity in humans and sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity in animals, as evidenced by an increased incidence of alveolar/bronchiolar tumors in recent studies of both rats and mice. Under EPA's proposed cancer guidelines, cobalt is considered likely to be carcinogenic to humans.[4]

[4] See "Derivation of a Provisional Carcinogenicity Assessment for Cobalt and Compounds," Risk Assessment Issue Paper (00–122/1–15–02), Superfund Technical Support Center, National Center for Environmental Assessment, January 15, 2002.

Dioxins and Furans

Exposures to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (2,3,7,8-TCDD) at levels 10 times or less above those modeled to approximate average background exposure have resulted in adverse non-cancer health effects in animals. These effects include changes in hormone systems, alterations in fetal development, reduced reproductive capacity, and immunosuppression. Effects that may be linked to dioxin and furan exposures at low dose in humans include changes in markers of early development and hormone levels. Dioxin and furan exposures are associated with altered liver function and lipid metabolism changes in activity of various liver enzymes, depression of the immune system, and endocrine and nervous system effects. EPA in its 1985 dioxin assessment classified 2,3,7,8-TCDD as a probable human carcinogen. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) concluded in 1997 that the overall weight of the evidence was sufficient to characterize 2,3,7,8-TCDD as a known human carcinogen.[5] In 2001 the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services National Toxicology Program in their 9th Report on Carcinogens classified 2,3,7,8-TCDD as a known human carcinogen.[6]

Hydrogen Chloride/Hydrochloric Acid

Hydrogen chloride, also called hydrochloric acid, is corrosive to the eyes, skin, and mucous membranes. Acute (short-term) inhalation exposure may cause eye, nose, and respiratory tract irritation and inflammation and pulmonary edema in humans. Chronic (long-term) occupational exposure to hydrochloric acid has been reported to cause gastritis, bronchitis, and dermatitis in workers. Prolonged exposure to low concentrations may also cause dental discoloration and erosion. No information is available on the reproductive or developmental effects of hydrochloric acid in humans. In rats exposed to hydrochloric acid by inhalation, altered estrus cycles have been reported in females and increased fetal mortality and decreased fetal weight have been reported in offspring. EPA has not classified hydrochloric acid for carcinogenicity.

[5] IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer). (1997) IARC monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. Vol. 69. Polychlorinated dibenzo-para-dioxins and polychlorinated dibenzofurans. Lyon, France.

[6] The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Toxicology Program 9th Report on Carcinogens, Revised January 2001.

Lead

Lead is a very toxic element, causing a variety of effects at low dose levels. Brain damage, kidney damage, and gastrointestinal distress may occur from acute (short-term) exposure to high levels of lead in humans. Chronic (long-term) exposure to lead in humans results in effects on the blood, central nervous system (CNS), blood pressure, and kidneys. Children are particularly sensitive to the chronic effects of lead, with slowed cognitive development, reduced growth and other effects reported. Reproductive effects, such as decreased sperm count in men and spontaneous abortions in women, have been associated with lead exposure. The developing fetus is at particular risk from maternal lead exposure, with low birth weight and slowed postnatal neurobehavioral development noted. Human studies are inconclusive regarding lead exposure and cancer, while animal studies have reported an increase in kidney cancer from lead exposure by the oral route. EPA has classified lead as a Group B2, probable human carcinogen.

Manganese

Health effects in humans have been associated with both deficiencies and excess intakes of manganese. Chronic (long-term) exposure to low levels of manganese in the diet is considered to be nutritionally essential in humans, with a recommended daily allowance of 2 to 5 milligrams per day (mg/d). Chronic exposure to high levels of manganese by inhalation in humans results primarily in central nervous system (CNS) effects. Visual reaction time, hand steadiness, and eye-hand coordination were affected in chronically-exposed workers. Manganism, characterized by feelings of weakness and lethargy, tremors, a mask-like face, and psychological disturbances, may result from chronic exposure to higher levels. Impotence and loss of libido have been noted in male workers afflicted with manganism attributed to inhalation exposures. EPA has classified manganese in Group D, not classifiable as to carcinogenicity in humans.

Mercury

Mercury exists in three forms: elemental mercury, inorganic mercury compounds (primarily mercuric chloride), and organic mercury compounds (primarily methyl mercury). Each form exhibits different health effects. Various sources may release elemental or inorganic mercury; environmental methyl mercury is

typically formed by biological processes after mercury has precipitated from the air.

Acute (short-term) exposure to high levels of elemental mercury in humans results in central nervous system (CNS) effects such as tremors, mood changes, and slowed sensory and motor nerve function. High inhalation exposures can also cause kidney damage and effects on the gastrointestinal tract and respiratory system. Chronic (long-term) exposure to elemental mercury in humans also affects the CNS, with effects such as increased excitability, irritability, excessive shyness, and tremors. EPA has not classified elemental mercury with respect to cancer.

Acute exposure to inorganic mercury by the oral route may result in effects such as nausea, vomiting, and severe abdominal pain. The major effect from chronic exposure to inorganic mercury is kidney damage. Reproductive and developmental animal studies have reported effects such as alterations in testicular tissue, increased embryo resorption rates, and abnormalities of development. Mercuric chloride (an inorganic mercury compound) exposure has been shown to result in forestomach, thyroid, and renal tumors in experimental animals. EPA has classified mercuric chloride as a Group C, possible human carcinogen.

Nickel

Nickel is a commonly used industrial metal, and is frequently associated with iron and copper ores. Contact dermatitis is the most common effect in humans from exposure to nickel, whether via inhalation, oral, or dermal exposure. Cases of nickel-contact dermatitis have been reported following occupational and non-occupational exposure, with symptoms of itching of the fingers, wrists, and forearms. Many studies have also demonstrated dermal effects in sensitive humans from ingested nickel, invoking an eruption or worsening of eczema. Chronic inhalation exposure to nickel in humans results in direct respiratory effects, such as asthma due to primary irritation, or an allergic response and an increased risk of chronic respiratory tract infections.

Animal studies have reported a variety of inflammatory effects on the lungs, as well as effects on the kidneys and immune system from inhalation exposure to nickel. Significant differences in inhalation toxicity among the various forms of nickel have been documented, with soluble nickel compounds being more toxic to the respiratory tract than less soluble compounds (*e.g.*, nickel oxide). Animal studies have also reported effects on the respiratory and gastrointestinal systems, heart, blood, liver, kidney, and body weight from oral exposure to nickel, as well as to the fetus.

EPA currently classifies nickel refinery dust and nickel subsulfide (a major component of nickel refinery dust) as class A human carcinogens based on increased risks of lung and nasal cancer in human epidemiological studies of occupational exposures to nickel refinery dust, increased tumor incidences in animals by several routes of administration in several animal species, and positive results in genotoxicity assays. More recently, a pair of inhalation studies performed under the auspices of the National Toxicology Program (NTP) of the National Institutes of Health concluded that there was no evidence of carcinogenic activity of soluble nickel salts in rats or mice and that there was some evidence of carcinogenic activity of nickel oxide in male and female rats based on increased incidence of alveolar/bronchiolar adenoma or carcinoma and increased incidence of benign or malignant pheochromocytoma (a tumor of the adrenal gland) and equivocal evidence in mice based on marginally increased incidence of alveolar/bronchiolar adenoma or carcinoma in females and no evidence in males. The Tenth Annual Report on Carcinogens classifies nickel compounds as "known to be human carcinogens."[7] This is consistent with the International Agency for Cancer Research (IARC) which classifies nickel compounds as Group 1 human carcinogens.

Organic HAP

Organic HAPs include halogenated and nonhalogenated organic classes of compounds such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Both PAHs and PCBs are classified as potential human carcinogens, and are considered toxic, persistent and bioaccumulative. They include compounds such as benzene, methane, propane, chlorinated alkanes and alkenes, phenols and chlorinated aromatics. Adverse health effects of HAPs include damage to the immune system, as well as neurological, reproductive, developmental, respiratory and other health problems.

[7] Report on Carcinogens, Tenth Edition; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Toxicology Program, December 2002.

Particulate Matter[8]

Atmospheric PM is composed of sulfate, nitrate, ammonium, and other ions, elemental carbon, particle-bound water, a wide variety of organic compounds, and a large number of elements contained in various compounds, some of which originate from crustal materials and others from combustion sources. Combustion sources are the primary origin of trace metals found in fine particles in the atmosphere. Ambient PM can be of primary or secondary origin.[9]

A large body of evidence exists from epidemiological studies that demonstrates a relationship between ambient particulate matter (PM) and mortality and morbidity in the general population and, when combined with evidence from other studies (*e.g.*, clinical and animal studies), indicates that exposure to PM is a probable contributing cause to the adverse human health effects that have been observed. For example, many different studies report that increased cardiovascular and respiratory-related mortality risks are significantly associated with various measures (both long-term and short-term) of ambient PM. Some studies suggest that a portion of the increased mortality may be associated with concurrent exposures to PM and other criteria pollutants, such as SO_2. Much evidence exists of positive associations between ambient PM concentrations and increased respiratory-related hospital admissions, emergency room, and other medical visits. Additional findings implicate PM as likely associated with an increased occurrence of chronic bronchitis and a contributing factor in the exacerbation of asthmatic conditions. Recent reports from prospective cohort studies of long-term ambient PM exposures provide substantial evidence of an association between increased risk of lung cancer and PM, especially exposure to fine PM or its components.

PM has other effects, beyond the health effects to human beings. The major effect of atmospheric PM on ecosystems is indirect and occurs through the deposition of nitrates and sulfates and the acidifying effects of the associated hydrogen ions contained in

[8] The discussion of PM effects is drawn from the executive summary of the "Fourth External Review Draft of Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter," National Center for Environmental Assessment, Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA/600/P–99/002aD, June, 2003.

[9] Secondary PM is not emitted directly but is formed in the atmosphere by gas phase or aqueous phase reactions of emissions of various precursor compounds.

wet and dry deposition.[10] Acidification of surface waters can have long-term adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems, including effects on fish populations, macro invertebrates, species richness, and zooplankton abundance. In the soil environment, acid deposition has the potential to inhibit nutrient uptake, alter the ecological processes of energy flow and nutrient cycling, change ecosystem structure, and affect ecosystem biodiversity. In addition, ambient fine particles are well known as the major cause of visibility impairment. Visibility impairment (or haziness) is widespread in the U.S. and is greatest in the eastern United States and southern California. In addition, PM exerts important effects on materials, such as soiling, corrosion, and degradation of surfaces, and accelerates weathering of man-made and natural materials.

A large body of evidence exists from epidemiological studies that demonstrates a relationship between ambient particulate matter (PM) and mortality and morbidity in the general population and, when combined with evidence from other studies (*e.g.*, clinical and animal studies), indicates that exposure to PM is a probable contributing cause to the adverse human health effects that have been observed. For example, many different studies report that increased cardiovascular and respiratory-related mortality risks are significantly associated with various measures (both long-term and short-term) of ambient PM. Some studies suggest that a portion of the increased mortality may be associated with concurrent exposures to PM and other criteria pollutants, such as SO_2. Much evidence exists of positive associations between ambient PM concentrations and increased respiratory-related hospital admissions, emergency room, and other medical visits. Additional findings implicate PM as likely associated with an increased occurrence of chronic bronchitis and a contributing factor in the exacerbation of asthmatic conditions. Recent reports from prospective cohort studies of long-term ambient PM exposures provide substantial evidence of an association between increased risk of lung cancer and PM, especially exposure to fine PM or its components.

PM has other effects, beyond the health effects to human beings. The major effect of atmospheric PM on ecosystems is indirect and occurs through the deposition of nitrates and sulfates and the acidifying effects of the associated hydrogen ions contained in wet and dry deposition.[11] Acidification of surface waters can have long-term adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems, including effects on fish populations, macro invertebrates, species richness, and zooplankton abundance. In the soil environment, acid deposition has the potential to inhibit nutrient uptake, alter the ecological processes of energy flow and nutrient cycling, change ecosystem structure, and affect ecosystem biodiversity. In addition, ambient fine particles are well known as the major cause of visibility impairment. Visibility impairment (or haziness) is widespread in the U.S. and is greatest in the eastern United States and southern California. In addition, PM exerts important effects on materials, such as soiling, corrosion, and degradation of surfaces, and accelerates weathering of man-made and natural materials.

Selenium

Selenium occurs naturally in soils, is associated with copper refining, and several industrial processes, and has been used in pesticides. It is an essential element and bioaccumulates in certain plant species, and has been associated with toxic effects in livestock (blind staggers syndrome). Soils containing high levels of selenium (seleniferous soils can lead to high concentration of selenium in certain plants, and pose a hazard to livestock and other species. Bioaccumulation and magnification of selenium has also been observed in aquatic organisms and has been shown to be toxic to piscivorous fish. In humans, selenium partitions to the kidneys and liver, and is excreted through the urine and feces. Selenium intoxication in humans causes a syndrome known as selenosis. The condition is characterized by chronic dermatitis, fatigue, anorexia, gastroenteritis, hepatic degeneration, enlarged spleen and increased concentrations of Se in the hair and nails. Clinical signs of selenosis include a characteristic "garlic odor" of excess selenium excretion in the breath and urine, thickened and brittle nails, hair and nail loss, lowered hemoglobin levels, mottled teeth, skin lesions and CNS abnormalities (peripheral anesthesia, acroparesthesia and pain in the extremities). Aquatic birds are extremely sensitive to selenium; toxic effects include teratogenesis. Based on available data, both aquatic birds and aquatic mammals are sensitive ecological receptors.

[10] Nitrates and sulfates in PM are derived primarily from emissions of SO_X and NO_X.

[11] Nitrates and sulfates in PM are derived primarily from emissions of SO_X and NO_X.

II. Summary of the Proposed Rule

A. What Source Categories Are Affected by the Proposed Rule?

1. Incinerators That Burn Hazardous Waste

A hazardous waste burning incinerator is defined under § 63.1201(a) as a device that meets the definition of an incinerator in 40 CFR part 260.10 and that burns hazardous waste at any time. Hazardous waste incinerators are currently subject to the emission standards of part 63, subpart EEE.[12] Hazardous waste incinerator design types include rotary kilns, liquid injection incinerators, fluidized bed incinerators, and fixed hearth incinerators. Most incinerators have air pollution control equipment to capture particulate matter (and nonvolatile metals) and scrubbing equipment for the capture of acid gases. At least four incinerators are equipped with activated carbon injection systems or carbon beds to control dioxin/furan emissions (as well as other HAP emissions).

Incinerators can be further classified as either commercial or onsite. Commercial incinerators accept and treat, for a tipping fee, wastes that have been generated off-site. The purpose of commercial incinerators is to generate profit from treating hazardous wastes. On-site facilities treat only wastes that have been generated at the facility to avoid the costs of off-site treatment. In 2003, there were approximately 107 hazardous waste incinerators in operation, 15 of which were commercial facilities, the remaining being on-site facilities.

2. Cement Kilns That Burn Hazardous Waste

A hazardous waste burning cement kiln is defined under § 63.1201(a). Cement kilns that burn hazardous waste are currently subject to the emission standards of part 63, subpart EEE.[13] Cement kilns are long, cylindrical, slightly inclined rotating furnaces that are lined with refractory brick to protect the steel shell and retain heat within the

[12] Incinerators that burn hazardous waste will also remain subject to the RCRA hazardous waste incinerator emission limitations pursuant to § 264 subpart O until they demonstrate compliance with the interim MACT standards and remove the emission limitations from their RCRA permit. See § 270.42 appendix I, section a.8 and introductory paragraph to § 270.62.

[13] Cement kilns that burn hazardous waste will also remain subject to the RCRA Boilers and Industrial Furnace emission limitations pursuant to § 266 subpart H until they demonstrate compliance with the interim MACT standards and remove the emission limitations from their RCRA permit. See § 270.42 appendix I, section a.8 and introductory paragraph to § 270.66.

kiln. Cement kilns are designed to calcine, or expel carbon dioxide by roasting, a blend of raw materials such as limestone, shale, clay, or sand to produce Portland cement. The raw materials enter the kiln at the elevated end, and the combustion fuels generally are introduced into the lower end of the kiln where the clinker product is discharged. The materials are continuously and slowly moved to the lower end by rotation of the kiln. As they move down the kiln, the raw materials are changed to cementitious minerals as a result of increased temperatures within the kiln.

Portland cement is a fine powder, usually gray in color, that consists of a mixture of minerals comprising primarily calcium silicates, aluminates, and aluminoferrites, to which small amounts of gypsum have been added during the finish grinding operations. Portland cement is the key ingredient in Portland cement concrete, which is used in almost all construction applications.

Cement kilns covered by this proposal burn hazardous waste-derived fuels to replace some or all of normal fossil fuels, typically coal. Most kilns burn liquid waste; however, cement kilns also may burn solids and small containers containing viscous or solid hazardous waste fuels. The annual hazardous waste fuel replacement rate varies considerably across sources from approximately 25 to 85 percent.

In 2003, there were 14 Portland cement plants in nine states operating a total of 25 hazardous waste burning kilns. All cement kilns use either bag houses or electrostatic precipitators to control particulate matter emissions.

3. Lightweight Aggregate Kilns That Burn Hazardous Waste

A hazardous waste burning lightweight aggregate kiln is defined under § 63.1201(a). Lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste are currently subject to the emission standards of part 63, subpart EEE.[14] Raw materials such as shale, clay, and slate are crushed and introduced at the upper end of the rotary kiln. In passing through the kiln, the materials reach temperatures of 1,900–2,100 ° F. Heat is provided by a burner at the lower end of the kiln where the product is discharged. As the raw material is heated, it melts into a semi-plastic state and begins to generate gases that serve as the bloating or expanding agent. As temperatures reach their maximum, the semi-plastic raw material becomes viscous and entraps the expanding gases. This bloating action produces small, unconnected gas cells, which remain in the material after it cools and solidifies. Lightweight aggregate kilns are designed to expand the raw material by thermal processing into a coarse aggregate used in the production of lightweight concrete products such as concrete block, structural concrete, and pavement.

The lightweight aggregate kilns affected by this proposal burn hazardous waste-derived fuels to replace some or all of normal fossil fuels. Two of the facilities burn only liquid hazardous wastes, while the third facility burns both liquid and solid wastes. The annual hazardous waste fuel replacement rate is 100 percent.

In 2003, there were three lightweight aggregate kiln facilities in two states operating a total of seven hazardous waste-fired kilns. All lightweight aggregate kilns use baghouses to control particulate matter and one facility also uses a venturi scrubber to control acid gas emissions.

4. Boilers That Burn Hazardous Waste

Boilers that burn hazardous waste are currently regulated under RCRA at part 266, subpart H. We propose to use the RCRA definition of boiler under 40 CFR 260.10 for purposes of today's rulemaking for simplicity and continuity. This definition includes industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers as well as thermal units known in industry as process heaters. We propose to subcategorize boilers based on the type of fuel that is burned, which would result in separate emission standards for solid fuel-fired boilers and liquid fuel-fired boilers. We discuss subcategorization options in more detail in Part Two, Section II.

Boilers are typically described by either their design or type of fuel burned. Hazardous waste burning boilers comprise two basic different boiler designs—watertube and firetube. The choice of which design to use depends on factors such as the desired steam quality, thermal efficiency, size, economics, fuel type, and responsiveness. Watertube boilers are those that flow the water through tubes running the length of the boiler. The hot combustion gas surrounds these tubes, causing the water inside to get hot. Most hazardous waste burning boilers use this design. Watertube boilers can also burn a variety of fuel types including coal, oil, gas, wood, and municipal or industrial wastes. Firetube boilers are similar to watertube type, except the placement of the water and combustion gas is reversed. Here the hot combustion gas flows through the tubes, while the water surrounds the tubes. This design does have some disadvantages, however, in that they work well with only gas and liquid fuels.

Process heaters are similar to boilers (as conventionally defined), except they heat a fluid other than water. This fluid is often an oil or some other fluid with more suitable heating properties. Process heaters are often used in circumstances where the amount of heat needed is greater than what can be delivered by steam. For the purposes of this rulemaking and consistent with current RCRA regulations, process heaters would be classified as boilers.

Descriptions of liquid and solid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste are provided below.

a. Liquid Fuel-Fired Boilers. A liquid fuel-fired boiler is a device that meets the definition of a boiler under 40 CFR 260.10 and that burns any combination of liquid and gas fuels, but no solids. See proposed definition in § 63.1201(a). A liquid fuel is defined as a fuel that is pumpable (*e.g.*, liquid wastes, sludges, or slurries). Most liquid hazardous waste burning boilers co-fire natural gas, fuel oil, or process gases to achieve the proper combustion temperatures and a consistent steam supply.

There are approximately 104 liquid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste, 85 of which have not installed back-end air pollution control equipment. The rest of the liquid boilers use either a wet scrubber, electrostatic precipitator, or fabric filter. These boilers co-fire liquid hazardous waste with either natural gas or heating oil at heat input rates of 10% to 100%.

b. Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers. A solid fuel-fired boiler is a device that meets the definition of a boiler under 40 CFR 260.10 and that burns solid fuels, including both pulverized and stoker coal.[15] See proposed definition in § 63.1201(a). Boilers that co-fire solid fuel with liquid or gaseous fuels are solid fuel-fired boilers.

There are 12 solid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste. These boilers co-fire liquid hazardous waste with coal at heat input rates of 6% to 33%. Nine of these boilers are stoker-fired, and three burn pulverized coal. Two boilers are equipped with fabric filters to control particulate matter and

[14] Lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste will also remain subject to the RCRA Boilers and Industrial Furnace emission limitations pursuant to § 266 subpart H until they demonstrate compliance with the interim MACT standards and remove the emission limitations from their RCRA permit. See § 270.42 appendix I, section a.8 and introductory paragraph to § 270.66.

[15] Please note that the RCRA definition of boiler includes devices defined under part 63 as boilers and process heaters.

metals, and 10 are equipped with electrostatic precipitators.

5. Hydrochloric Acid Production Furnaces That Process Hazardous Waste

Hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste are currently regulated under RCRA at part 266, subpart H. We propose to use the RCRA definition of hydrochloric acid production furnace under 40 CFR 260.10 for purposes of today's rulemaking for simplicity and continuity. See proposed definition in § 63.1201(a).

Hydrochloric acid production furnaces burn chlorinated hazardous wastes to make an aqueous hydrochloric acid for on-site use as an ingredient in a manufacturing process. The hazardous waste feedstocks have a chlorine content of over 20% by weight. The hydrochloric acid produced by burning the chlorinated byproducts dissolves in the scrubber water to produce an acid product containing hydrochloric acid greater than 3% by weight. There are 17 hazardous waste burning hydrochloric acid production furnaces currently in operation.

Chlorine-bearing feedstreams, wastes, and auxiliary fuels (usually natural gas) are burned in these hydrochloric acid production furnaces in a refractory lined chamber similar to a liquid waste incinerator chamber. Combustion is maintained at a high temperature, with adequate excess hydrogen to ensure the conversion of chlorine in the feedstreams to hydrogen chloride in the combustion gases. Many furnaces also have waste heat boilers, similar to those used by some incinerators, to recover heat and return it to the production process. Others use a water spray quench to cool the combustion gases.

The cooled combustion flue gas is routed to an acid recovery system, consisting of multiple wet scrubbing absorption units. These units are usually packed tower or film tray scrubbers which operate with an acidic scrubbing solution. The scrubbing solution is recycled to concentrate the acid until it reaches the desired concentration level, at which point it is recovered for use as a valuable product. A final polishing scrubber, operated with a caustic liquid solution, is used to control emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas.

B. What HAP Are Emitted?

Incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste can emit high levels of dioxin/furans depending on the design and operation of the emission control equipment, and, for incinerators, whether a waste heat recovery boiler is used. Our data base shows that boilers that burn hazardous waste generally do not emit high levels of dioxin/furans.

All hazardous waste combustors can emit high levels of other organic HAP if they are not designed, operated, and maintained to operate under good combustion conditions.

Hazardous waste combustors can also emit high levels of metal HAP, depending on the level of metals in the waste feed and the design and operation of air emissions control equipment. Hydrochloric acid production furnaces, however, generally feed and emit low levels of metal HAP.

Hazardous waste combustors can also emit high levels of particulate matter, except that hydrochloric acid production furnaces generally feed wastes with low ash content and emit low levels of particulate matter.[16] The majority of particulate matter emissions from hazardous waste combustors is in the form of fine particulate (*i.e.*, 50% or more of the particulate matter emitted is 2.5 microns in diameter or less).[17] Particulate emissions from incinerators and liquid fuel-fired boilers depend on the ash content of the waste feed and the design and operation of air emission control equipment. Particulate emissions from cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns are not significantly affected by the ash content of the hazardous waste fuel because uncontrolled particulate emissions are attributable primarily to raw material entrained in the combustion gas. Thus, particulate emissions from kilns depend on operating conditions that affect entrainment of raw material, and the design and operation of the emission control equipment.

C. Does Today's Proposed Rule Apply to My Source?

The following sources that burn hazardous waste are considered to be affected sources subject to today's proposed rule: Incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces. Affected sources do not include: (1) Sources exempt from regulation under 40 CFR part 266, subpart H, because the only hazardous waste they burn is listed under 40 CFR 266.100(c); (2) research, development, and demonstration sources exempt under § 63.1200(b); and (3) boilers exempt from regulation under 40 CFR part 266, subpart H, because they meet the definition of small quantity burner under 40 CFR 266.108. See § 63.1200(b).

Affected sources also do not include emission points that are unrelated to the combustion of hazardous waste (*e.g.*, cement kiln clinker cooler stack emissions, hydrochloric acid production facility emissions originating from product or waste storage tanks and transfer operations, *etc.*). This is because subpart EEE only controls HAP emission points that are directly related to the combustion of hazardous waste. Under separate rulemakings, the Agency has or will establish MACT standards, where warranted, to control HAP emissions from non-hazardous waste related emission points.

Hazardous waste combustors are affected sources irrespective of whether they are major sources or area sources. As discussed in Part Two, Section I.A, we are proposing to subject area sources of boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces to the major source MACT standards for mercury, dioxin/furans, carbon monoxide/hydrocarbons, and destruction and removal efficiency pursuant to section 112(c)(6). As promulgated in the 1999 rule, both area source and major source incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns will continue to be subject to the full suite of Subpart EEE emission standards.

D. What Emissions Limitations Must I Meet?

Under today's proposal, you would have to comply with the emission limits in Tables 1 and 2. Note that these emission limitations are discussed in greater detail for each source category (and subcategory) in Part Two, Section VII thru XII. Note also that we are proposing several alternative emission standards: (1) You may elect to comply with an alternative to the particulate matter standard for incinerators and liquid fuel-fired boilers that would limit emissions of total metal HAP; and (2) you may elect to comply with an alternative to the total chlorine standard applicable to all source categories, except hydrochloric acid production furnaces, under which you may establish site-specific, risk-based emission limits for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas based on national

[16] Emissions of particulate matter are of interest because metal HAP, except notably for mercury, are in the particulate form in stack gas. Thus, controlling particulate matter controls metal HAP.

[17] Particulate size distributions are somewhat dependent on the type of combustor. See USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emission Estimates and Engineering Costs," March 2004, Chapter 7 for more information.

exposure standards. These alternative standards are discussed in Part Two, Section XVIII and Section XIII, respectively.

TABLE 1.—PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR EXISTING SOURCES

	Incinerators	Cement kilns	Lightweight aggregate kilns	Solid fuel-fired boilers [1]	Liquid fuel-fired boilers [1]	Hydrochloric acid production furnaces [1]
Dioxin/Furans (ng TEQ/dscm).	0.28 for dry APCD and WHB sources; [6] 0.40 for others.	0.20 or 0.40 + 400°F at APCD inlet.	0.40	CO or THC standard as a surrogate.	0.40 for dry APCD sources; CO or HC standard as surrogate for others.	0.40
Mercury	130 ug/dscm	64 ug/dscm [2]	67 ug/dscm [2]	10 ug/dscm	3.7E–6 lb/MMBtu [2,5].	Total chlorine standard as surrogate
Particulate Matter ...	0.015 gr/dscf [8]	0.028 gr/dscf	0.025 gr/dscf	0.030 gr/dscf [8]	0.032 gr/dscf [8]	Total chlorine standard as surrogate
Semivolatile Metals (lead + cadmium).	59 ug/dscm	4.0E–4 lbs/MMBtu [5].	3.1E–4 lb/MMBtu [5] and 250 ug/dscm [3].	170 ug/dscm	1.1E–5 lb/MMBtu [2,5].	Total chlorine standard as surrogate
Low Volatile Metals (arsenic + beryllium + chromium).	84 ug/dscm	1.4E–5 lbs/MMBtu [5].	9.5E–5 lbs/MMBtu [5] and 110 ug/dscm [3].	210 ug/dscm	1.1E–4 lb/MMBtu [4,5].	Total chlorine standard as surrogate
Total Chlorine (hydrogen chloride + chlorine gas).	1.5 ppmv [7]	110 ppmv [7]	600 ppmv [7]	440 ppmv [7]	2.5E–2 lb/MMBtu [5, 7].	14 ppmv or 99.9927% system removal efficiency
Carbon Monoxide (CO) or Hydrocarbons HWC.	100 ppmv CO or 10 ppmv HWC.	See Part Two, Section VIII.	100 ppmv CO or 20 ppmv HWC.	(2) 100 ppmv CO or 10 ppmv HWC		
Destruction and Removal Efficiency (DRE).	99.99% for each principal organic hazardous pollutant. For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, 99.9999% for each principal organic hazardous pollutant.					

Notes:

[1] Particulate matter, semivolatile metal, low volatile, and total chlorine standards apply to major sources only for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces.

[2] Standard is based on normal emissions data.

[3] Sources must comply with both the thermal emissions and emission concentration standards.

[4] Low volatile metal standard for liquid fuel-fired boilers is for chromium only. Arsenic and beryllium are not included in the low volatile metal total for liquid fuel-fired boilers.

[5] Standards are expressed as mass of pollutant contributed by hazardous waste per million Btu contributed by the hazardous waste.

[6] APCD denotes "air pollution control device", WHB denotes "waste heat boiler".

[7] Sources may elect to comply with site-specific, risk-based emission limits for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas based on national exposure standards. See Part Two, Section XIII.

[8] Sources may elect to comply with an alternative to the particulate matter standard. See Part Two, Section XVIII.

TABLE 2.—PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR NEW SOURCES

	Incinerators	Cement kilns	Lightweight aggregate kilns	Solid fuel boilers [1]	Liquid fuel boilers [1]	Hydrochloric acid production furnaces [1]
Dioxin/Furans (ng TEQ/dscm).	0.11 for dry APCD or WHBs [5]; 0.2 for others.	0.20 or 0.40 + 400°F at inlet to particulate matter control device.	0.40	Carbon monoxide (CO) or hydrocarbon (HC) as a surrogate.	0.015 or 400°F at the inlet to particulate matter control device for dry APCD; CO or HC standard as surrogate for others.	0.40
Mercury	8 ug/dscm	35 ug/dscm [2]	67 ug/dscm [2]	10 ug/dscm	3.8E–7 lb/MMBtu [2,4].	Tcl as surrogate
Particulate matter ...	0.00070 gr/dscf [7]	0.0058 gr/dscf	0.0099 gr/dscf	0.015 gr/dscf [7]	0.0076 gr/dscf [7] ..	TCL as surrogate
Semivolatile Metals (lead + cadmium).	6.5 ug/dscm	6.2E–5 lb/MMBtu [4].	2.4E–5 lb/MMBtu [4].	170 ug/dscm	4.3E–6 lb/MMBtu [2,4].	TCL as surrogate
Low Volatile Metals (arsenic + beryllium + chromium).	8.9 ug/dscm	1.4E–5 lb/MMBtu [4].	3.2E–5 lb/MMBtu [4].	190 ug/dscm	3.6E–5 lb/MMBtu in HW [3,4].	TCL as surrogate
Total Chlorine (Hydrogen chloride + chlorine gas).	0.18 ppmv [6]	78 ppmv [6]	600 ppmv [6]	73 ppmv [6]	7.2E–4 lb/MMBtu [4,6].	1.2 ppmv or 99.99937% SRE

TABLE 2.—PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR NEW SOURCES—Continued

	Incinerators	Cement kilns	Lightweight aggregate kilns	Solid fuel boilers [1]	Liquid fuel boilers [1]	Hydrochloric acid production furnaces [1]
Carbon monoxide CO or Hydrocarbons (HWC).	100 ppmv (CO) or 10 ppmv HWC.	See Part Two, Section VIII.	100 ppmv CO or 20 ppmv HWC.	100 ppmv CO or 10 ppmv HWC		
Destruction and Removal Efficiency.	99.99% for each principal organic hazardous pollutant. For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, 99.9999% for each principal organic hazardous pollutant.					

Notes:
[1] Particulate matter, semivolatile metal, low volatile metal, and total chlorine standards apply to major sources only for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces.
[2] Standard is based on normal emissions data.
[3] Low volatile metal standard for liquid fuel-fired boilers is for chromium only. Arsenic and beryllium are not included in the low volatile metal total for liquid fuel-fired boilers.
[4] Standards are expressed as mass of pollutant contributed by hazardous waste per million Btu contributed by the hazardous waste.
[5] APCD denotes "air pollution control device", WHB denotes "waste heat boiler".
[6] Sources may elect to comply with site-specific, risk-based emission limits for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas based on national exposure standards. See Part Two, Section XIII.
[7] Sources may elect to comply with an alternative to the particulate matter standard. See Part Two, Section XVIII.

E. What Are the Testing and Initial Compliance Requirements?

We are proposing testing and initial compliance requirements for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that are identical to those that are applicable to incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns already in place at §§ 63.1206, 63.1207, and 63.1208. Please note also that in Part Three of today's preamble we request comment on, or propose revisions to, several testing and initial compliance requirements. Any amendments to the testing and compliance requirements that we promulgate as a result of those discussions would be applicable to all hazardous waste combustors.

In addition, we are proposing to revise the existing initial compliance requirements for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. Under the proposed revision, owners and operators of incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns would be required to conduct the initial comprehensive performance test to document compliance with the replacement standards proposed today (§§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221) within 12 months of the compliance date. Owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces would be required to conduct an initial comprehensive performance test within six months of the compliance date, and periodic comprehensive performance tests every five years. The purpose of the comprehensive performance test is to document compliance with the emission standards, document that continuous monitoring systems meet performance requirements, and establish limits on operating parameters that would be monitored by continuous monitoring systems.

Owners and operators of liquid fuel-fired boilers equipped with a dry air pollution control device and hydrochloric acid production furnaces would be required to conduct a dioxin/furan confirmatory performance test 2.5 years after each comprehensive performance test (*i.e.*, midway between comprehensive performance tests). The purpose of the dioxin/furan confirmatory performance test is to document compliance with the dioxin/furan standard when operating within the range of normal operations. Owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, and liquid fuel-fired boilers that are not subject to a numerical dioxin/furan emission standard (*i.e.*, liquid fuel-fired boilers other than those equipped with an electrostatic precipitator or fabric filter), would be required to conduct a one-time dioxin/furan test to enable the Agency to evaluate the effectiveness of the carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon standard and destruction and removal efficiency standard in controlling dioxin/furan emissions for those sources. The Agency would use those emissions data when reevaluating the MACT standards under section 112(d)(6) and when determining whether to develop residual risk standards for these sources pursuant to CAA section 112(f)(2).

Owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces would be required to use the following stack test methods to document compliance: (1) Method 29 for mercury, semivolatile metals, and low volatile metals; and (2) Method 26A for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas; (3) either Method 0023A or Method 23 for dioxin/furans; and (4) either Method 5 or 5i for particulate matter.

The following is a proposed time-line for testing and initial compliance requirements for owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces: (1) The compliance date is three years from publication of the final rule; (2) you must place in the operating record a Documentation of Compliance by the compliance date identifying that the operating parameter limits you have determined using available information will ensure compliance with the emission standards; (3) you must commence the initial comprehensive performance test within six months of the compliance date; (4) you must complete the initial comprehensive performance test within 60 days of commencing the test; and (5) you must submit a Notification of Compliance within 90 days of completing the test documenting compliance with emission standards and CMS requirements.

F. What Are the Continuous Compliance Requirements?

We are proposing continuous compliance requirements for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that are identical to those already in place at § 63.1209 and applicable to incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. Please note, however, that in Part Three of today's preamble we request comment on, or propose revisions to, several continuous compliance requirements. Any amendments to the continuous compliance requirements that we promulgate as a result of those discussions would be applicable to all hazardous waste combustors.

Owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces would be required to use carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon continuous emissions monitors (as well as an oxygen continuous emissions monitor to correct the carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon values to 7% oxygen) to ensure compliance with the carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon emission limits.

Owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces would also be required to establish limits on the feedrate of metals, chlorine, and (for some source categories) ash, key combustor operating parameters, and key operating parameters of the control device based on operations during the comprehensive performance test. You must continuously monitor these parameters with continuous monitoring systems. See Part Two, Section XIV.C for a discussion of the specific parameters for which you must establish limits.

G. What Are the Notification, Recordkeeping, and Reporting Requirements?

We are proposing notification, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that are identical to those already in place at §§ 63.1210 and 63.1211 and applicable to incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. Please note, however, that we are proposing a new requirement applicable to all hazardous waste combustors that would require you to submit a Notification of Intent to Comply and a Compliance Progress Report. See Part Two, Section XVI.B.

The proposed notification, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements are summarized in Part Two, Section XVI.

Part Two: Rationale for the Proposed Rule

I. How Did EPA Determine Which Hazardous Waste Combustion Sources Would Be Regulated

A. How Are Area Sources Regulated?

We are proposing to subject area source boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces to the major source MACT standards for mercury, dioxin/furan, carbon monoxide/hydrocarbons, and destruction and removal efficiency pursuant to section 112(c)(6).[18] Both area source and major source incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns will continue to be subject to the full suite of Subpart EEE emission standards.[19]

Section 112(c)(6) of the CAA requires EPA to list and promulgate section 112(d)(2) or (d)(4) standards (*i.e.*, standards reflecting MACT) for categories and subcategories of sources emitting seven specific pollutants. Four of those listed pollutants are emitted by boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces: mercury, 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzofuran, 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin, and polycyclic organic matter. EPA must assure that source categories accounting for not less than 90 percent of the aggregated emissions of each enumerated pollutant are subject to MACT standards. Congress singled out the pollutants in section 112(c)(6) as being of "specific concern" not just because of their toxicity but because of their propensity to cause substantial harm to human health and the environment via indirect exposure pathways (*i.e.*, from the air through other media, such as water, soil, food uptake, etc.). Furthermore, these pollutants have exhibited special potential to bioaccumulate, causing pervasive environmental harm in biota and, ultimately, human health risks.

We estimate that approximately 1,800 pounds of mercury are emitted annually in aggregate from hazardous waste burning boilers in the United States.[20] Also, we estimate that hazardous waste burning boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces emit in aggregate approximately 1.1 and 1.6 grams TEQ per year of dioxin/furan, respectively. The Agency has already counted on the control of these pollutants from area sources in the industrial/commercial/institutional boiler source category when we accounted for at least 90 percent of the emissions of these hazardous air pollutants as being subject to standards under section 112(c)(6). See 63 FR 17838; April 10, 1998. Therefore, we are proposing to subject boiler and hydrochloric acid furnace area sources to the major source MACT standards for mercury, dioxin/furan, carbon monoxide/hydrocarbons, and destruction and removal efficiency pursuant to section 112(c)(6).

We are proposing that only major source boilers and hydrochloric acid furnaces would be subject to the full suite of subpart EEE emission standards we propose today. Section 112(c)(3) of the CAA requires us to subject area sources to the full suite of standards applicable to major sources if we find "a threat of adverse effects to human health or the environment" that warrants such action. We cannot make this finding for area source boilers and halogen acid production furnaces.[21] Consequently, area sources in these categories would be subject to the MACT standards for mercury, dioxin/furan, carbon monoxide/hydrocarbons, and destruction and removal efficiency standards only to control the HAP listed under section 112(c)(6). RCRA standards under Part 266, Subpart H for particulate matter, metals other than mercury, and hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas would continue to apply to these area sources unless an area source elects to comply with the major source standards in lieu of the RCRA standards. See proposed § 266.100(b)(3) and the proposed revisions to §§ 270.22 and 270.66.

B. What Hazardous Waste Combustors Are Not Covered by This Proposal?

1. Small Quantity Burners

Boilers that are exempt from the RCRA hazardous waste-burning boilers rule under 40 CFR 266.108 because they burn small quantities of hazardous waste fuel would also be exempt from today's proposed rule. Those boilers would be subject, however, to the MACT standards the Agency has proposed for industrial/commercial/institutional boilers. See 68 FR 1660, January 13, 2003.

The type and concentration of HAP emissions from boilers that co-fire small quantities of hazardous waste fuel with other fuels under § 266.108 should be characterized more by the metals and chlorine levels in the primary fuels and the effect of combustion conditions on the primary fuels than by the composition and other characteristics of the hazardous waste fuel. Under § 266.108, boilers that burn small quantities of hazardous waste fuel cannot fire hazardous waste at any time at a rate greater than 1 percent of the

[18] We are using carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons and destruction and removal efficiency as surrogates for control of polycyclic organic matter emissions.

[19] In support of the 1999 Final Rule, EPA determined incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns that are area sources can emit HAP at levels that pose a hazard to human health and the environment. Accordingly, EPA subjected area sources within those source categories to the same emission standards that apply to major sources. See 64 FR at 52837–38.

[20] See USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emission Estimates and Engineering Costs," March, 2004, Chapter 3.

[21] We believe that two or fewer boilers are area sources. We do not believe any hydrochloric acid production furnaces are area sources.

total fuel requirements for the boiler. In addition, a boiler with a stack height of 20 meters or less cannot fire more than 84 gallons of hazardous waste fuel a month, which would equate to an average firing rate of 0.5 quarts per hour. Finally, the hazardous waste fuel must have a heating value of 5,000 Btu/lb to ensure it is a bonafide fuel, and cannot contain hazardous wastes that are listed because they contain chlorinated dioxins/furans. Given these restrictions, we believe that HAP emissions are not substantially related to the hazardous waste fuels these boilers burn. Thus, these boilers are more appropriately regulated under the MACT standards proposed at part 63, subpart DDDDD, than the MACT standards proposed today for hazardous waste combustors.

Boilers that burn small quantities of hazardous waste fuel under § 266.108 would become subject to part 63, subpart DDDDD, three years after publication of the final rule for hazardous waste combustors (*i.e.*, the rules we are proposing today). Subpart DDDDD exempts "a boiler or process heater required to have a permit under section 3005 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act [*i.e.*, RCRA] or covered by 40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE (*e.g.*, hazardous waste combustors)." See 40 CFR 63.7491(d). Boilers that burn small quantities of hazardous waste fuel under § 266.108 are exempt from the substantive emission standards of part 266, subpart H, and the permit requirements of 40 CFR part 270 (establishing RCRA permit requirements). In addition, owners and operators of such boilers would not know whether they are covered by part 63, subpart EEE, until we promulgate the final rule for hazardous waste combustors. Thus, it is appropriate to require that these boilers begin complying with subpart DDDDD three years after we publish the final rule for hazardous waste combustors.

2. Sources Exempt From RCRA Emission Regulation Under 40 CFR Part 266.100(c)

Consistent with the Phase I Hazardous Waste Combustor MACT rule promulgated in 1999, we would not subject boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces to today's proposed requirements if the only hazardous waste combusted is exempt from regulation pursuant to § 266.100(c), including certain types of used oil, landfill gas, and otherwise exempt or excluded waste. This is appropriate because HAP emissions from sources that qualify for this exemption would not be significantly impacted by the combustion of hazardous waste. Thus, emissions from these sources would be more appropriately regulated by other promulgated MACT standards that specifically address emissions from these sources.

3. Research, Development, and Demonstration Sources

Consistent with the Phase I Hazardous Waste Combustor MACT rule promulgated in 1999, we would not subject boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that are research, development, and demonstration sources to today's proposed requirements. We explained at promulgation of the Phase I MACT standards that the hazardous waste combustor emission standards may not be appropriate for research, development, and demonstration sources because of their typically intermittent operations and small size. See 64 FR at 52839. Given that emissions from these sources are addressed under RCRA on case-by-case basis pursuant to § 270.65, we continue to believe this is appropriate, and we are today proposing the same exemption for boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces.

C. How Would Sulfuric Acid Regeneration Facilities Be Regulated?

Sulfuric acid regeneration facilities burn spent sulfuric acid and sulfur-bearing hazardous wastes or hazardous waste fuel to produce sulfuric acid and are subject to 40 CFR part 266, subpart H, (*i.e.*, the RCRA Boiler and Industrial Furnace Rule) as a listed industrial furnace. We are not proposing MACT standards for these sources because EPA did not list sulfuric acid regeneration facilities as a category of major sources of HAP emissions. See 57 FR 31576 (July 16, 1992). We obtained emissions and other data on these sources and confirmed that they emit very low levels of HAP.[22] Accordingly, these combustors will remain subject to RCRA regulations under part 266, subpart H.

II. What Subcategorization Considerations Did EPA Evaluate?

CAA section 112(d)(1) allows us to distinguish amongst classes, types, and sizes of sources within a category when establishing floor levels. Subcategorization typically reflects "differences in manufacturing process, emission characteristics, or technical feasibility." See 67 FR 78058. A classic example, provided in the legislative history to CAA 112(d), is of a different process leading to different emissions and different types of control strategies—the specific example being Soderberg and prebaked anode primary aluminum processes. See "A Legislative History of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990," vol. 1 at 1138–39 (floor debates on Conference Report). If we determine, for instance, that a given source category includes sources that are designed differently such that the type or concentration of HAP emissions are different we may subcategorize these sources and issue separate standards.

We have determined that it is appropriate to subcategorize sources that combust hazardous waste from those sources that do not. EPA published an initial list of categories of major and area sources of HAP selected for regulation in accordance with section 112(c) of the Act on July 16, 1992 (57 FR 31576). Hazardous waste incineration, Portland cement manufacturing, clay products manufacturing (including lightweight aggregate manufacturing), industrial/commercial/institutional boilers and process heaters, and hydrochloric acid production are among the listed 174 categories of sources. Although some cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, boilers and process heaters, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces burn hazardous waste, EPA did not list hazardous waste burning sources as separate source categories. Nonetheless, we generally believe that hazardous waste combustion sources can emit different types or concentrations of HAP emissions because hazardous waste combustors: (1) Have different fuel HAP concentrations; (2) use different control techniques (*e.g.*, feed control); and (3) have a different regulatory history given that their toxic emissions were regulated pursuant to RCRA standards. As a result, we believe it is appropriate to subcategorize each source category listed above to define sources that burn hazardous waste as a separate classes of combustors. We also assessed if further subdividing each class of hazardous waste burning combustors is warranted using both engineering judgement and statistical analysis. In our proposed approach, we first use engineering information and principles to identify potential subcategorization options. We then determine if there is a statistical difference in the emission characteristics between these options. See Part Two, Section VI.C for a discussion of this statistical analysis. Finally, we review the results of the statistical analysis to determine whether they are an appropriate basis for

[22] See U.S. EPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume II: HWC Emissions Data Base," March 2004.

subcategorization.[23] We describe below the subcategorization options we considered for each source category.

A. What Subcategorization Options Did We Consider for Incinerators?

We considered whether to propose separate standards for three hazardous waste incinerator subcategory options. First, we assessed whether government-owned incinerator facilities had different emission characteristics when compared to non-government facilities for the mercury, semivolatile metal, low volatile metal, particulate matter, and total chlorine floors. After evaluating the data, we determined that emission characteristics from these two subcategories are not statistically different, and, therefore are not proposing separate emission standards.

Second, we assessed whether liquid injection incinerators emitted significantly different levels of metals and particulate matter compared to incinerators that feed solid wastes (*e.g.*, rotary kilns, fluid bed units, and hearth fired units). We define liquid injection units as those incinerators that exclusively feed pumpable waste streams and solid feed units as those that feed a combination of liquid and solid wastes. We determined that emissions of metal HAP from these potential subcategories are not statistically different.[24] We, therefore, are not proposing separate emission standards for metal HAP. The statistical analysis for particulate matter shows that emissions from liquid feed injection incinerators are higher than emissions from solid feed injection units. However, we believe that separate standards for particulate matter are not warranted because the difference in emissions was more a factor of the types of back-end air pollution devices used by the sources rather than incinerator design. We would expect particulate emissions to be potentially higher for solid feed units, not lower, because solid feed units have higher ash feedrates and air pollution control device inlet particulate matter loadings. Therefore, we must conclude that the difference is the product of less effective back-end air pollution control.

Third, we assessed whether incinerators equipped with dry air pollution control devices and/or waste heat boilers have different dioxin/furan emission characteristics when compared to other sources, *i.e.*, sources with either wet air pollution control or no air pollution control devices. Our statistical analysis determined that dioxin/furan emissions from sources equipped with waste heat boilers and/or dry air pollution control devices are higher.[25] We believe use of wet air pollution control systems (and use of no air pollution control system) can result in different dioxin/furan emission characteristics because they have different post-combustion particle residence times and temperature profiles, which can affect dioxin/furan surface catalyzed formation reaction rates. As a result, we believe that it is appropriate to subcategorize these different types of combustors.

Note that we do not subcategorize based on the type of air pollution control device used. See 69 FR 394 (January 5, 2004). Dioxin/furan emission characteristics are unique in that they are not typically fed into the combustion device, but rather are formed in the combustor or post combustion within ductwork, a heat recovery boiler, or the air pollution control system. Wet and dry air pollution control systems are generally not considered to be dioxin/furan control systems because their primary function is to remove metals and/or total chlorine from the combustion gas. They generally do not remove dioxin/furans from the incinerator flue gas unless they are used in tandem with carbon injection systems or carbon beds. (In contrast, carbon injection systems and carbon beds are considered to be dioxin/furan air pollution control systems). Thus, the differences in dioxin formation here reflect something more akin to a process difference resulting in different emission characteristics, rather than a difference in pollution-capture efficiencies among pollution control devices. We thus are not proposing to subcategorize based on whether a source is equipped with a dioxin/furan control system.

We also considered whether to further subcategorize based on the presence of a waste heat boiler or dry air pollution control device. Our analysis determined that dioxin/furan emissions from incinerators with waste heat boilers are not statistically different from those equipped with dry air pollution control devices.[26] We conclude that further subcategorization is not necessary. See Part Two, Section VII.A for more discussion on the proposed dioxin/furan standards for incinerators.

B. What Subcategorization Options Did We Consider for Cement Kilns?

We considered subdividing hazardous waste burning cement kilns by the clinker manufacturing process: wet process kilns without in-line raw mills versus preheater/precalciner kilns with in-line raw mills. All cement kilns that burn hazardous waste use one of these clinker manufacturing processes. Based on available emissions data, we evaluated design and operating features of each process to determine if the features could have a significant impact on emissions. For the reasons discussed below, we believe that subcategorization is not warranted.

In the wet process, raw materials are ground, wetted, and fed into the kiln as a slurry. Twenty-two of the 25 cement kilns that burn hazardous waste use the wet process to manufacture clinker. In the preheater/precalciner kilns, raw materials are ground dry in a raw mill and fed into the kiln dry. The remaining three of the 25 cement kilns burning hazardous waste use preheater/precalciner kilns with in-line raw mills.

Combustion gases and raw materials move in a counterflow direction inside a cement kiln for both processes. The kiln is inclined, and raw materials are fed into the upper end while fuels are typically fired into the lower end. Combustion gases move up the kiln counter to the flow of raw materials. The raw materials get progressively hotter as they travel down the length of the kiln. The raw materials begin to soften and fuse at temperatures between 2,250 and 2,700 °F to form the clinker product.

Wet process kilns are longer than the preheater/precalciner kilns in order to facilitate evaporation of the water from the slurried raw material. The preheater/precalciner kilns begin the calcining process—heating of the limestone to drive off carbon dioxide to obtain lime (calcium oxide)—before the raw materials are fed into the kiln. This is accomplished by routing the flue gases from the kiln up through the preheater tower while the raw materials are passing down the preheater tower.

[23] For example, although the statistical analysis may find a significant difference in emission levels between potential subcategories, the emission levels may be more a function of the emission control equipment rather than a function of the design and operation of the combustors within the subcategories. If differences in emission levels are attributable to use of different emission control devices, and if there is nothing inherent in the design or operation of sources in both subcategories that would preclude applicability of those control devices, subcategorization would not be warranted.

[24] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards", March 2004, Chapter 4.

[25] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards", March 2004, Chapter 4.

[26] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards", March 2004, Chapter 4.

The heat of the flue gas is transferred to the raw material as they interact in the preheater tower. The precalciner is a secondary firing system—typically fired with coal—located at the base of the preheater tower.

Though not necessary in a wet process kiln, a preheater/precalciner kiln uses an alkali bypass designed to divert a portion of the flue gas to remove problematic volatile constituents such as alkalies (potassium and sodium oxides), chlorides, and sulfur that, if not removed, can lead to operating problems. In addition, removal of the alkalies is necessary so that their concentrations are below maximum acceptable levels in the clinker. An alkali bypass diverts between 10–30% of the kiln off-gas before it reaches the lower cyclone stages of the preheater tower. Without use of a bypass, the high concentration of volatile constituents at the lower cyclone stage of the preheater tower would create operational problems. Bypass gases are quenched and sent to a dedicated particulate matter control device to capture and remove the volatile constituents.

All preheater/precalciner kilns that burn hazardous waste use the hot flue gases to dry the raw materials as they are being ground in the in-line raw mill. Typically, the raw mill is operating or "on" approximately 85% of the time. The kilns with in-line raw mills must operate both in the "on" mode—gases are routed through the raw mill supporting raw material drying and preparation—and in the "off" mode—necessary down time for raw mill maintenance. Given that there are few preheater/precalciner cement kilns that burn hazardous waste, we had limited emissions data to evaluate to see if there was a significant difference in emissions. Moreover, we do not have any data from a preheater/precalciner kiln operating under similar operating conditions (*e.g.*, metals and chlorine feed concentrations) both for the "on" mode and "off" mode.

We evaluated whether there was a significant difference in HAP emissions between wet process kilns without in-line raw mills versus preheater/precalciner kilns with in-line raw mills. We found a statistically significant difference in mercury emissions between wet process kilns and preheater/precalciner kilns in the "off" mode.[27] But, we conclude that there is no significant difference in emissions of dioxin/furans, particulate matter, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, and total chlorine between these types of kiln systems.[28]

For wet process cement kilns without in-line raw mills, mercury remains in the vapor phase at the typical operating temperatures in the kiln and particulate matter control equipment, and exits the kiln as volatile stack emissions with only a small fraction partitioning to the clinker or cement kiln dust. In the preheater/precalciner kilns with in-line raw mill, we believe that a significant portion of the volatilized mercury condenses on to the surfaces of the cooler raw material in the operating raw mill. The raw material with adsorbed mercury ends up in the raw material storage bin which will eventually be fed to the kiln and re-volatilized. During the periods that the in-line raw mill is "on", mercury is effectively captured in the raw mill essentially establishing an internal recycle loop of mercury that builds-up within the system. Eventually, when the in-line raw mill switches to the "off" mode, the re-volatilized mercury exits the kiln as volatile stack emissions. Notwithstanding the apparent removal of mercury during periods that the in-line raw mill is "on" in a preheater/precalciner kiln, over time the mercury is emitted eventually as volatile stack emissions because system removal efficiencies for mercury are essentially zero. Thus, over a longer period of time (*e.g.*, one month), the mass of mercury emitted by a wet process kiln without an in-line raw mill and a preheater/precalciner kiln with an in-line raw mill (assuming identical mercury-containing feedstreams) would be the same. However, at any given point in time, the stack gas concentration of mercury of the two types of kilns could be significantly different.

As noted above, our data base shows a significant difference in mercury emissions between preheater/precalciner kilns when operating in the "off" mode and emissions both from wet process kilns and preheater/precalciner kilns in the "on" mode. In spite of this difference, we don't believe it is technically justified to subcategorize cement kilns for mercury.[29]

In conclusion, we propose not to subcategorize the hazardous waste burning class of cement kilns by wet process kilns and preheater/precalciner kilns with in-line raw mills.

C. What Subcategorization Options Did We Consider for Lightweight Aggregate Kilns?

Following promulgation of the September 1999 Final Rule, Solite Corporation filed a Petition for Review challenging the total chlorine standard for new kilns. For new sources, the Clean Air Act states that the MACT floor cannot be "less stringent than the emission control that is achieved by the best controlled similar source." Solite Corporation challenged the standard on the ground that Norlite Corporation, another hazardous waste-burning lightweight aggregate kiln source, should not be the best controlled similar source because they are designed to burn for purposes of treatment hazardous wastes containing high levels of chlorine and high mercury. Solite states that Norlite's superior emission control equipment is designed to control the chlorine and mercury in these wastes that are burned for treatment, rather than primarily as fuel for lightweight aggregate production. Thus, Solite states that Norlite's sources should be considered a separate class of lightweight aggregate kilns.

Though we believe that subcategorizing by the concentrations of HAP in the hazardous waste is not appropriate, we considered subdividing hazardous waste burning lightweight aggregate kilns by the types of hazardous waste they combust: low Btu wastes with higher concentrations of chlorine and mercury and high Btu wastes with lower concentrations of chlorine and mercury. We believe, however, that separate emission standards for lightweight aggregate kilns based on the types of hazardous waste they burn are unnecessary because the floor levels would not differ significantly under either approach.

Analysis of available total chlorine emissions from compliance testing indicates that the emissions are significantly different for sources burning hazardous waste with high levels of chlorine compared to sources burning wastes with much lower levels of chlorine. Total chorine emissions range from 14 to 116 ppmv for sources feeding higher concentrations of chlorine but using a venturi scrubber to control emissions and range from 500 to 2,400 ppmv for sources feeding waste with lower levels of chlorine and not using a wet scrubber. However, when we identify floor levels for these potential subcategories (both for existing and new sources), the calculated floor

[27] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards", March 2004, Chapter 4.

[28] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emission Estimates and Engineering Costs", March 2004, Chapter 4.

[29] We note that in the September 1999 final rule we established a provision that allows cement kilns operating in-line raw mills to average their emissions based on a time-weighted average concentration that considers the length of time the in-line raw mill is on-line and off-line. See § 63.1204(d).

level would be less stringent than the interim emission standard sources are currently achieving. Because all sources are achieving the more stringent interim standard, the interim standard becomes the default floor level. Therefore, subdividing would not affect the proposed floor level.

We have compliance test mercury emissions data representing maximum emissions for only one source, and we have snap-shot mercury emissions data within the range of normal emissions for all sources. Snap-shot mercury emissions range from: (1) 11 to 20 ug/dscm for sources with the potential to feed higher concentrations of mercury because they use a venturi scrubber to control emissions; and (2) 1 to 47 ug/dscm for sources that typically feed lower mercury containing wastes and do not use a wet scrubber to control mercury. We performed a statistical test and confirmed that there is no statistically significant difference in the snap-shot mercury emissions between sources that have the potential to feed higher levels of mercury because they are equipped with a wet scrubber and with other sources. Therefore, it appears that subcategorization for mercury is not warranted.[30]

D. What Subcategorization Options Did We Consider for Boilers?

We discuss below the rationale for proposing to subcategorize boilers by the physical form of the fuels they burn—solid fuel-fired boilers and liquid fuel-fired boilers. We also discuss further subcategorization options we considered for each of those subcategories and explain why we believe that further subcategorization is not warranted.

1. Subcategorization by Physical Form of Fuels Burned

There are substantial design differences and emission characteristics among boilers that cofire hazardous waste primarily with coal versus oil or gas. Because of these differences, it is appropriate to subcategorize boilers by the physical form of the fuel burned. We note that the Agency has already proposed that industrial/commercial/institutional boilers and process heaters that do not burn hazardous waste should be subcategorized by the physical form of fuels fired.[31]

Twelve boilers cofire hazardous waste with coal. These boilers are designed to handle high ash content solid fuels, including the relatively large quantities of boiler bottom ash and particulate matter that are entrained in the combustion gas. The coal also contributes to emissions of metal HAP. Approximately 104 boilers co-fire hazardous waste with natural gas or fuel oil. These units are not designed to handle the high ash loadings that are associated with coal-fired units, and the primary fuels for these boilers contribute little to HAP emissions. See "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume I: Description of Source Categories" (Chapter 2.4) and "Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards" (Chapter 4) for a discussion of the design differences between liquid and coal fuel-fired boilers.

Because the type of primary fuel burned dictates the design of the boiler and emissions control systems, and can affect the concentration of HAP, it is appropriate to subcategorize boilers by the physical form of the fuel.

2. Subcategorization Considerations Among Solid Fuel Boilers

We considered whether to subcategorize solid fuel-fired boilers to establish separate particulate matter standards. All 12 of the solid fuel-fired boilers co-fire hazardous waste with coal. Three of the 12 boilers burn pulverized coal while the remaining nine are stoker-fired boilers. Pulverized coal-fired boilers have higher uncontrolled emissions than stoker-fired boilers because the coal is pulverized to a talcum powder consistency and burned in suspension. Stoker-fired boilers burn lump coal partially or totally on a grate. Thus, much more of the coal ash is entrained in the combustion gas for pulverized coal-fired boilers than for stoker-fired boilers.

Although the pulverized coal-fired boilers have higher uncontrolled particulate matter emissions (*i.e.*, at the inlet to the emission control device), controlled emissions from the pulverized coal-fired boilers are not statistically different than emissions from the stoker-fired boilers, primarily because all solid fuel-fired boilers are equipped with either a baghouse or electrostatic precipitator.[32] Accordingly, we conclude that it is not appropriate to establish separate particulate matter standards for pulverized coal-fired boilers versus stoker-fired boilers. This is consistent with the proposal for industrial/institutional/commercial boilers and process heaters that do not burn hazardous waste.

3. Subcategorization Considerations for Liquid Fuel Boilers

We believe it is appropriate to combine liquid and gas fuel boilers into one subcategory because emissions from gas fuel boilers are within the range of emissions one finds from liquid fuel boilers. Also, most of the hazardous waste burning liquid fuel boilers, in fact, burn gas fossil fuels to supplement the liquid hazardous waste fuel. Even though there are no hazardous waste gas burning boilers currently in operation, today we propose to subject hazardous waste gas burning boilers that may begin operating in the future to the standards for liquid fuel-fired boilers. See proposed definition of liquid boiler in § 63.2101(a).

We also assessed whether liquid fuel-fired boilers equipped with dry air pollution control devices had different dioxin/furan emission characteristics when compared to other sources, *i.e.*, sources with either wet air pollution control devices or no air pollution control device. Our statistical analysis indicated that dioxin/furan emissions from sources equipped with dry air pollution control devices are higher.[33] We believe use of wet air pollution control systems (and use of no air pollution control system) can result in different dioxin/furan emission characteristics because they have different post-combustion particle residence times and temperature profiles, which can affect dioxin/furan surface catalyzed formation reaction rates. As a result, we believe that it is appropriate to have different subcategories for these different types of combustors. As discussed previously for incinerators in Part Two, Section II.A, the differences in dioxin formation here reflect something more akin to a process difference resulting in different emission characteristics, rather than a difference in pollution-capture efficiencies among pollution control devices. We thus are not subcategorizing based on whether a source is equipped with a dioxin/furan control system.

E. What Subcategorization Options Did We Consider for Hydrochloric Acid Production Furnaces?

Consistent with our incinerator subcategorization analysis (*see* Section A of this Part), we also considered whether to establish separate floor emission standards for dioxin/furans for

[30] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standard, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards", March 2004, Chapter 4.

[31] See 68 FR at 1670 (January 13, 2003).

[32] See USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 4.

[33] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards", March 2004, Chapter 4.

hydrochloric acid production furnaces equipped with waste heat recovery boilers versus those without boilers. As discussed below, we conclude that there is no significant statistical difference in dioxin/furan emissions between furnaces equipped with boilers and those without them. As a result we do not propose to have different subcategories for these sources.

Ten of the 16 hydrochloric acid production furnaces are equipped with waste heat recovery boilers, and all hydrochloric acid production furnaces are equipped with wet scrubbers that quench the combustion gas immediately after it exits the furnace or boiler. We have dioxin/furan emissions data for eight of the ten furnaces with boilers. Two furnaces have low dioxin/furan emissions—approximately 0.1 ng TEQ/dscm, while the other six furnaces have emissions ranging from 0.5 to 6.8 ng TEQ/dscm. We have dioxin/furan emissions data for five of the six furnaces without boilers. Dioxin/furan emissions for four furnaces are below 0.15 ng TEQ/dscm. But, one furnace has dioxin/furan emissions of 1.7 ng TEQ/dscm.

It appears that dioxin/furan emissions from hydrochloric acid production furnaces may not be governed by whether the furnace is equipped with a waste heat recovery boiler. We performed a statistical test and confirmed that there is no statistically significant difference in dioxin/furan emissions between furnaces equipped with boilers and those without boilers.[34] Thus, we conclude that it is not appropriate to establish separate dioxin/furan emission standards for furnaces with boilers and those without boilers.

III. What Data and Information Did EPA Consider To Establish the Proposed Standards?

The proposed standards are based on our hazardous waste combustor data base. The data base contains general facility information, stack gas emissions data, combustor design information, composition and feed concentration data for the hazardous waste, fossil fuel, and raw materials, combustion unit operating conditions, and air pollution control device operating information. We gathered the emissions data and information from test reports submitted by hazardous waste combustor facilities to EPA Regional Offices or State agencies. Many of the test reports were prepared as part of the compliance demonstration process for the current RCRA standards, and may include results from trial burns, certification of compliance demonstrations, annual performance tests, mini-burns, and risk burns.

A. Data Base for Phase I Sources

The current data base for Phase I sources contain test results for over 100 incinerators, 26 cement kilns, and 9 lightweight aggregate kilns. In many cases, especially for cement and lightweight aggregate kilns, the data base contain test reports from multiple testing campaigns. For example, our data base includes results for a cement kiln that conducted emissions testing for the years 1992, 1995, and 2000.

We first compiled a data base for hazardous waste burning incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns to support the proposed MACT standards in 1996 (61 FR 17358, April 19, 1996). Based on public comments, a revised Phase I data base was published for public comment (62 FR 960, January 7, 1997). The data base was again revised based on public comments, and we used this data base to develop the Phase I MACT standards promulgated in 1999 (64 FR 52828, September 30, 1999).

Following promulgation of the interim standards, we initiated a data collection effort in early 2002 to obtain additional test reports. The effort focused on obtaining test reports from sources for which we had no information, obtaining data from more recent testing, and updating the list of operating Phase I sources. Sources once identified as hazardous waste combustors, but that have since ceased operations as a hazardous waste combustor, were removed from the data base. This revised data base was noticed for public comment in July 2002 (67 FR 44452, July 2, 2002) and updated based on public comments. See USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume II: HWC Emissions Data Base," March 2004, Appendix A for comments and responses.

In comments on the data base notice, industry stakeholders question whether emissions data obtained for some sources are appropriate to use to identify MACT floor for today's proposed replacement standards. Stakeholders suggest that it is inappropriate to use emissions data from sources that tested after retrofitting their emission control systems to meet the emission standards promulgated in September 1999 (and since vacated and replaced by the February 2002 Interim Standards). Stakeholders refer to this as MACT-on-MACT: establishing MACT floor based on sources that already upgraded to meet the 1999 standards. Stakeholders identified emissions data from only approximately three of the Phase I sources (all incinerators) as being obtained after the source upgraded to meet the 1999 standards. None of these incinerator sources are consistently identified as a best performer when establishing the proposed MACT standards.

Notwithstanding stakeholder concerns, we believe it is appropriate to consider all of the data collected in the 2002 effort.[35] First, section 112(d)(3) states that floor standards for existing sources are to reflect the average emission achieved by the designated per cent of best performing sources "*for which the Administrator has emissions information*" (emphasis added). Second, the motivation for a source's performance is legally irrelevant in developing MACT floor levels. *National Lime Ass'n* v. *EPA*, 233 F. 3d at 640. In any case, it would be problematic to identify sources that upgraded their facilities (and reduced their emissions) for purposes of complying with the 1999 standards versus for other purposes (*e.g.*, normal replacement schedule). Moreover, the MACT-on-MACT formulation is not correct. Although the Interim Standards did result in reduction of emissions from many sources, those standards are not MACT standards, and do not purport to be. See February 13, 2002, Interim Standards Rulemaking, 67 FR at 7693. Finally, we note that, although we were prepared to use the same data base for today's proposed rules as we used for the September 1999 rule to save the time and resources required to collect new data, industry stakeholders wanted to submit new emissions data for us to consider in developing the replacement standards. Rather than allowing industry stakeholders to submit potentially selected emissions data, however, we agreed to undertake a substantial data collection effort in 2002. It is unfortunate that industry stakeholders now suggest that some portion of the new data is not appropriate for establishing MACT.

Notwithstanding our view that all of the 2002 data base should be considered in establishing MACT standards, we

[34] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards", March 2004, Chapter 4.

[35] However, we did not consider emissions data from Ash Grove Cement Company (Chanute, Kansas), an owner and operator of a new preheater/precalciner kiln, because the test report is a MACT comprehensive performance test demonstrating compliance with the new source standards of the September 1999 final rule. We judged these data are inappropriate for consideration for the floor analyses for existing sources.

specifically request comment on: (1) Whether emissions data should be deleted from the data base that were obtained from sources that owners and operators assert were upgraded to meet the 1999 rule; and (2) whether, because it may be problematic to identify such data, we should identify MACT using the original 1999 data base.

Stakeholders have also raised concerns that the Agency may be considering inappropriately emissions data in its MACT analyses based on the language of section 112(d)(3)(A) of the Clean Air Act. Section 112(d)(3)(A) says emissions standards for existing sources shall not be less stringent, and may be more stringent than—

> the average emission limitation achieved by the best performing 12 percent of the existing sources (for which the Administrator has emissions information), excluding those sources that have, within 18 months before the emission standard is proposed or within 30 months before such standard is promulgated, whichever is later, first achieved a level of emission rate or emission reduction which complies, or would comply if the source is not subject to such standard, with the lowest achievable emission rate (as defined by section 171) applicable to the source category and prevailing at the time, in the category or subcategory for categories and subcategories with 30 or more sources,

Section 171 pertains to nonattainment areas for a particular pollutant. The lowest achievable emission rate (LAER) for a pollutant in a nonattainment area is the most stringent emission limitation which is contained in the implementation plan of any State, or the most stringent emission limitation which is achieved in practice. Given that stakeholders neither identified any lowest achievable emission rates for any pollutants applicable to nonattainment areas nor identified any sources that are subject to such lowest achievable emission rates, we conclude that there are no sources to exclude.

B. Data Base for Phase II Sources

Phase II sources are comprised of boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste. The data base for Phase II sources was initially compiled by EPA in 1999. In developing this data base, we collected the most recent test report available for each source that included test results under compliance test operating conditions. The most recent test report, however, may have also included data used for other purposes (*e.g.*, risk burn to obtain data for a site-specific risk assessment), which are also included in the data base. In nearly all instances, the dates of the test reports collected were either 1998 or 1999.

After the initial compilation, we published the Phase II data base for public comment in June 2000 (65 FR 39581, June 27, 2000). Since the June 2000 notice, we have not collected additional emissions data for Phase II sources; however, we revised the data base to address public comments received in response to the June 2000 notice. We noticed the Phase II data base (together with the one for Phase I sources) for public comment in July 2002 (67 FR 44452, July 2, 2003) and revised the data base based on comments received. The current data base for Phase II sources contains test reports for over 115 boilers and 17 hydrochloric acid production furnaces. See USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume II: HWC Emissions Data Base," March 2004.

C. Classification of the Emission Data

The hazardous waste combustor data base[36] comprises emissions data from tests conducted for various purposes, including compliance testing, risk burns, annual performance testing, and research testing. Therefore, some emissions data represent the highest emissions the source has emitted in each of its compliance demonstrations, some data represent normal or typical operating conditions and emissions, and some data represent operating conditions and emissions during compliance testing in a test campaign where there are other compliance tests with higher emissions.

Hazardous waste combustors generally emit their highest emissions during RCRA compliance testing while demonstrating compliance with emission standards. For real-time compliance assurance, sources are required to establish limits on particular operating parameters that are representative of operating levels achieved during compliance testing. Thus, the emission levels achieved during these compliance tests are typically the highest emission levels a source emits under reasonably anticipable circumstances. To ensure that these operating limits do not impede normal day-to-day operations, sources generally take measures to operate during compliance testing under conditions that are at the extreme high end of the range of normal operations. For example, sources often feed ash, metals, and chlorine during compliance testing at substantially higher than normal levels (*e.g.*, by spiking the waste feed) to maximize the feed concentration, and they often detune the air pollution control equipment to establish operating limits on the control equipment that provide operating flexibility. By designing the compliance test to generate emissions at the extreme high end of the normal range of emissions, sources can establish operating limits that account for variability in operations (*e.g.*, composition and feedrate of feedstreams, as well as variability of pollution control equipment efficiency) and that do not impede normal operations.

The data base also includes normal emissions data that are within the range of typical operations. Sources will sometimes measure emissions of a pollutant during a compliance test even though the test is not designed to establish operating limits for that pollutant (*i.e.*, it is not a compliance test for the pollutant). An example is a trial burn where a lightweight aggregate kiln measures emissions of all RCRA metals, but uses the Tier I metals feedrate limit to comply with the mercury emission standard.[37] Other examples of emissions data that are within the range of normal emissions are annual performance tests that some sources are required to conduct under State regulations, or RCRA risk burns. Both of these types of tests are generally performed under normal operating conditions, and would not necessarily reflect day-to-day emission variability. However, such data may be appropriate to use to evaluate long-term average performance.

Other emissions tests may generate emissions in-between normal and the highest compliance test emissions. An example is a compliance test designed to demonstrate compliance with the particulate matter standard where: (1) The air pollution control equipment is detuned; and (2) the source measured lead and cadmium emissions even though it elected to comply with RCRA Tier 1 feedrate limits for those metals and, thus, does not spike those metals. We would conclude that lead and cadmium emissions—together they comprise the semivolatile metals—are between normal and the highest compliance test emissions. Emissions are not likely to be as high as

[36] Though the Phase I and II data bases were developed and titled separately, for purposes of today's proposal we are combining both into one data base termed the "hazardous waste combustor data base."

[37] A Tier 1 feedrate limit is a conservative compliance option offered pursuant to RCRA requirements which assumes all of the metal/chlorine that is fed to the combustion unit is emitted (uncontrolled). Sources electing to comply with Tier 1 limits are not required to conduct emissions testing and are not required to establish operating parameter limits based on a compliance test. See § 266.106.

compliance test emissions because the source did not use the test to demonstrate compliance with emission standards for the metals (and so did not spike the metals). However, emissions of the metals are likely to be higher than normal because the air pollution control equipment was detuned.

To distinguish between normal and compliance test data, we classified emissions data for each pollutant for each test condition as compliance test (CT); normal (N); in between (IB); or not applicable (NA).[38] These classifications apply on a HAP-by-HAP basis. For example, some HAP measured during a test condition may be classified as representing compliance test emissions for those HAP, while other HAP measured during the test condition may be classified as representing normal emissions. See USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume II: HWC Emissions Data Base," March 2004, Chapter 2, for additional details.

D. Invitation To Comment on Data Base

As previously discussed, we updated the data base based on comments received since it was last made publicly available. We believe the data base used to determine today's proposed standards is complete and accurate. However, given the complexity of the data base, we believe it is appropriate to once again solicit comments on the accuracy of the data. If you find errors, please submit the pages from the test report that document the missing or incorrect entries and the cover page of the test report as a reference. In addition, we identified several sources that are no longer burning hazardous waste and removed their emissions data and related information from the data base. We encourage owners and operators of hazardous waste combustors to review our list of operating combustors to ensure its accuracy. See USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards and Technologies," March 2004.

IV. How Did EPA Select the Format for the Proposed Rule?

The proposed rule includes emission limits for dioxin/furans, mercury, particulate matter, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, hydrogen chloride/chlorine gas, and carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons. We also propose percent reduction standards for: (1) Destruction and removal efficiency[39] for organic HAP; and (2) total chlorine control for hydrochloric acid production furnaces. Finally, sources would be required to establish operating parameter limits under prescribed procedures to ensure continuous compliance with the emission standards.

We discuss below the rationale for: (1) Selecting an emission limit format rather than a percent reduction format in most cases; (2) selecting a hazardous waste thermal emissions format for the emission limit in some cases, and an emissions concentration format in others; (3) selecting surrogates to control multiple HAP; and (4) using operating parameter limits to ensure compliance with emission standards.

A. What Is the Rationale for Generally Selecting an Emission Limit Format Rather Than a Percent Reduction Format?

Using emission limits as the format for most of the proposed standards provides flexibility for the regulated community by allowing a regulated source to choose any control technology or technique to meet the emission limits, rather than requiring each unit to use a prescribed method that may not be appropriate in each case. (See CAA section 112(h), relating to authority to adopt work place standards). Although a percent reduction format would allow flexibility in choosing the control technology to achieve the reduction, a percent reduction technology does not allow the option of achieving the standard by feed control—minimizing the feed of metals or chlorine. Consequently, we propose percent reduction standards only in special circumstances.

We are proposing a percent reduction standard for boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces, *i.e.*, a destruction and removal efficiency standard for organic HAP, because all sources currently comply with such a standard under RCRA and RCRA implementing rules. Further, we do not have emissions data on trace levels of organic HAP that would be needed to establish emission limits for particular compounds.

We also propose a total chlorine percent reduction standard as a compliance option for hydrochloric acid production furnaces in lieu of the proposed stack gas concentration limit because a stack gas concentration limit may ultimately result in limiting the feed of chlorine to furnaces with MACT emission control equipment. Given that these furnaces produce hydrochloric acid from chlorinated feedstocks, limiting the feed of chlorine is inappropriate. See Part Two, Section VI.A and XII for more discussion on the total chlorine standard for hydrochloric acid production furnaces.

B. What Is the Rationale for Selecting a Hazardous Waste Thermal Emissions Format for Some Standards, and an Emissions Concentration Format for Others?

We are proposing numerical emission limits in two formats: hazardous waste thermal emissions, and stack gas emissions concentrations. Hazardous waste thermal emissions are expressed as mass of pollutant contributed by hazardous waste per million Btu of heat contributed by hazardous waste. Emission concentration based standards are expressed as mass of pollutant (from all feedstocks) per unit of stack gas (*e.g.*, µg/dscm).

1. What Is the Rationale for the Hazardous Waste Thermal Emissions Format?

In the 1999 rule, we assessed hazardous waste feed control levels for metals and chlorine by evaluating each source's maximum theoretical emission concentration (MTEC) using the "aggregate MTEC" approach. See 64 FR at 52854. MTEC is defined as the metals or chlorine feedrate divided by the gas flow rate, and is expressed in µg/dscm. We used MTECs to assess feed control levels because it normalizes metal and chlorine feedrates across sources of different sizes. Industry stakeholders have claimed that use of MTECs to assess feed control levels for energy recovery units (*e.g.*, cement kilns) when establishing floor standards inappropriately penalizes sources that burn hazardous waste fuels at high firing rates (*i.e.*, percent of heat input from hazardous waste). This is because hazardous waste fuels generally have higher levels of metals and chlorine than the fossil fuels they displace, thus metal and chlorine feedrates and emissions may increase as the hazardous waste firing rate increases.

Although we are not using the aggregate MTEC approach to evaluate feed control in today's proposal, the SRE/Feed approach explained in Part Two, Section VI.A, does assess each source's metal and chlorine hazardous waste feed control levels. In order to avoid the hazardous waste firing rate bias discussed above for energy recovery

[38] NA means the normal versus compliance test classification is not applicable. Research testing data is an example of the type of data that would get a NA rating.

[39] Please note that we propose today a destruction and removal efficiency standard only for boilers and process heaters and hydrochloric acid production furnaces. We are not reproposing the destruction and removal efficiency standard in subpart EEE currently in effect for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns.

units, we believe it is appropriate to instead assess feed control for energy recovery units by ranking each source's thermal feed concentration, which is equivalent to the mass of metal or chlorine in the hazardous waste per million BTUs hazardous waste fired to the combustion unit. This approach not only normalizes metal and chlorine feedrates across sources of different sizes, but also normalizes these feedrates across energy recovery units with different hazardous waste firing rates. For example, a kiln that feeds hazardous waste with a given metal concentration to fulfill 100% of its energy demand would be an equally ranked feed control source when compared to an identical kiln that fulfills 50% of its energy demand from coal and 50% from hazardous waste with an identical metal concentration.

Similarly, it is our preference to express today's proposed emission standards for metals and chlorine in units of hazardous waste thermal emissions as opposed to expressing the standards in units of stack gas concentrations. As previously discussed, hazardous waste thermal emission standards are expressed as mass of HAP emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu hazardous waste fired to combustor. As with thermal feed concentration, thermal emissions normalizes emissions across energy recovery units with different hazardous waste firing rates. The hazardous waste thermal emissions format addresses two concerns. First, it avoids the above discussed bias against sources that burn hazardous waste fuels at high firing rates. We prefer not to discourage energy recovery from hazardous waste as opposed to potentially establishing standards that effectively restrict the hazardous waste firing rate in an energy recovery combustor. (See, for example, the requirement in CAA section 112(d)(2) to take energy considerations into account when promulgating MACT standards, as well as the objective in RCRA section 1003(b)(6) to encourage properly conducted recycling and reuse of hazardous waste).

Second, because the hazardous waste thermal emissions approach controls only emissions attributable to the hazardous waste feed (see discussion in following section), the rule can be simplified by not including waivers for sources that cannot meet the standard because of metals or chlorine contributed by nonhazardous waste feedstreams. To ensure that hazardous waste combustors will be able to achieve the standards if they use MACT control for metals and chlorine attributable to the hazardous waste feed, but irrespective of metals and chlorine in nonhazardous waste feedstreams, current MACT standards for cement and lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste provide alternative standards that sources can request under a petitioning procedure. See § 63.1206(b)(9–10). These alternative standards would be unnecessary under the hazardous waste thermal emissions approach because, by definition, the approach controls only hazardous waste-derived metals and chlorine.

2. Which Standards Would Use the Hazardous Waste Thermal Emissions Format?

We propose a hazardous waste thermal emissions format for mercury, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, and total chlorine (*i.e.,* the HAPs found in hazardous waste fuels) for source categories that burn hazardous waste fuels where we have data to calculate a hazardous waste thermal emissions limit. Cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns and liquid-fuel fired boilers burn hazardous waste fuels and are thus candidates for the hazardous waste thermal emission standards. Incinerators and solid fuel-fired boilers are not candidates for thermal emission standards because some sources within these source categories do not combust hazardous waste for energy recovery, *i.e.,* they burn low heating value hazardous waste for the purpose of treating the waste.[40] Consequently, these sources could not duplicate a hazardous waste thermal emissions standard based on emissions from sources that burn hazardous waste fuels, even though their stack gas emission concentrations could be as low or lower than emissions from a best performing source under the hazardous waste thermal emissions approach.

We propose a hazardous waste thermal emissions format for all HAP for which we can apportion emissions between the hazardous waste fuel feed and other feedstreams. Under this approach, we apportion total stack emissions between hazardous waste fuel and other feedstreams using the ratio of the feedrate contribution from hazardous waste to the total feedrate of the pollutant. Thus, the particulate matter, metals, and total chlorine standards are candidates because we often have data on hazardous waste and total feedrates of these pollutants.

We believe, however, that a hazardous waste thermal emissions format is not appropriate for particulate matter for cement and lightweight aggregate kilns because particulate matter emissions from cement and lightweight aggregate kilns are primarily entrained raw material, not ash contributed by the hazardous waste fuel. There is therefore no correlation between particulate matter emissions and hazardous waste thermal input rate.

In addition, please note that we could have expressed the proposed particulate matter standard for liquid boilers in units of hazardous waste thermal emissions since (unlike the case of kilns just discussed) particulate matter emissions are attributable to the hazardous waste fuel. However, for consistency, we elected to use the same format for all the particulate matter standards. We invite comment as to whether the particulate matter standard for liquid boilers should be expressed in units of hazardous waste thermal emissions.

We do not have adequate data to establish hazardous waste thermal emissions-based standards for several cases. An example is when we have only normal feedrate and emissions data (*e.g.,* the mercury standard for cement kilns). We prefer to establish emission standards under the hazardous waste thermal emissions format using compliance test data because the metals and chlorine feedrate information from compliance tests that we use to apportion emissions to calculate emissions attributable to hazardous waste are more reliable than feedrate data measured during testing under normal, typical operations.[41] Thus, as a general rule, we prefer to express emission standards for energy recovery units using the hazardous waste thermal emissions format only when we have sufficient compliance test feed data.[42] These situations are discussed below in more detail in Part Two, Sections VIII, IX, and XI where we discuss the rationale for the proposed emission standards for energy recovery units.

[40] Three of the 13 solid fuel-fired boilers burn low heating value hazardous waste for treatment.

[41] Feedrate data from testing during normal, typical operations may not be as accurate as data from compliance testing because of the sampling and analytical error associated with low feedrates. In contrast, sources generally spike metals and chlorine during compliance testing, so that measurement error is somewhat masked by the higher feedrate values.

[42] Two exceptions are the mercury and semivolatile metal standard for liquid fuel-fired boilers. We propose to express this standard in the hazardous waste thermal emissions format even though it is based on normal test data because we do not use feedrate data to apportion emissions in this case. Rather, we assume semivolatile metal emissions from liquid fuel-fired boilers are attributable solely to the hazardous waste given that these sources co-fire hazardous waste with natural gas or, in a few cases, fuel oil.

3. How Are Emissions From Other Feedstreams Regulated Under the Hazardous Waste Thermal Emissions Format?

Under the thermal emissions format, only emissions of HAP contributed by the hazardous waste are directly regulated by today's proposed standards. Non-mercury metal HAP emissions from raw materials and fossil fuels would be subject to MACT standards, even though it may not be feasible to directly control their feedrate. We are proposing standards for particulate matter as surrogates to control these HAP metals contributed by raw materials and fossil fuel.

C. What Is the Rationale for Selecting Surrogates To Control Multiple HAP?

HWCs can emit a wide variety of HAP, depending on the types and concentrations of pollutants in the hazardous waste feed. Because of the large number of HAP potentially present in emissions, we propose to use several surrogates to control multiple HAP. This will reduce the burden of implementation and compliance on both regulators and the regulated community.

1. Surrogates for Metal HAP

We are proposing to control metal HAP emissions attributable to the hazardous waste by subjecting sources to metal and particulate matter emission limitations.[43] We grouped metal HAP according to their volatility because volatility is a primary consideration when selecting an emission control technology.[44] We then considered the following to identify metals that would be "enumerated" and directly controlled with an emission limit: (1) The amount of available data for the metal HAP; (2) the potential for hazardous waste to contain substantial levels of a metal; and (3) the toxicity of the metal. Other, "nonenumerated" metal HAP would be controlled using particulate matter as a surrogate.

Mercury is highly volatile, especially toxic, and may not be controllable by the same air pollution control mechanisms as the other HAP metals, so we are proposing a standard for mercury individually. Two semivolatile metals can be prevalent in hazardous waste and are particularly hazardous: lead and cadmium. We group these two metals together and propose an emission standard for these metals, combined. The combined emissions of lead and cadmium cannot exceed the semivolatile metal emission limit. Three low volatile metals can be prevalent in hazardous waste and are particularly hazardous: arsenic, beryllium, and chromium. We group these three metals together and propose an emission standard for these metals, combined. The combined emissions of arsenic, beryllium, and chromium cannot exceed the low volatile metal emission limit.

The particulate matter standard generally serves as a surrogate to control non-enumerated metals in the hazardous waste as well as a surrogate to control relevant metal HAP in non-hazardous waste feed streams. We generally chose not to propose numerical metal HAP emission standards that would have accounted for all metal HAP for two reasons (note that such an approach would be in lieu of a proposed particulate matter standard because particulate matter is not a listed HAP). We generally do not have as much compliance test emissions information in our database for the nonenumerated metal HAP compared to the enumerated metal HAP. Thus it would be more difficult to assess the control levels for these additional metals. We also believe that a particulate matter standard, in lieu of emission standards that directly regulate all the metals, simplifies compliance activities in that sources would not have to monitor feed control levels of these nonenumerated metals on a continuous basis.

Note that particulate matter is not an appropriate surrogate where standards are based, in part (or in whole) on feedrate control. This is because, unlike the case where HAP metals are controlled by air pollution control devices, HAP metal reductions in hazardous waste feedrate are not necessarily correlated with particulate matter reductions, *i.e.*, hazardous waste feedrate reductions could reduce HAP metal emissions without a correlated reduction in particulate matter emissions. (See *National Lime*, 233 F. 3d at 639 noting this possibility.) Moreover, particulate matter that is emitted generally contain greater percentages of HAP metals when the metal concentrations in the hazardous waste feed increase. Thus, low particulate matter emissions do not necessarily guarantee low metal HAP emissions, especially in instances where the hazardous waste feeds are highly concentrated with metal HAP.

We do not believe that the proposed emission standards for semivolatile and low volatile metals serve as adequate surrogate control for the nonenumerated metal HAP. Compliance with the semivolatile and low volatile metal emission standards does not ensure that sources are using MACT back-end control devices because they could be achieving compliance by primarily implementing hazardous waste feed control for the enumerated metals. Thus, if a source uses superior feed control only for the enumerated metals, the nonenumerated metal emissions would not be controlled to MACT levels if it were not using a MACT particulate matter control device. The proposed semivolatile and low volatile metal standards are also inappropriate surrogates for controlling nonmercury metal HAP in the nonhazardous waste feedstreams for kilns and solid fuel-fired boilers for the same reason. These sources may comply with the proposed semivolatile and low volatile metal emission standards by implementing hazardous waste feed control. This would not assure that the nonmercury metal HAP emissions attributable to the nonhazardous waste feedstreams are controlled to MACT levels. A particulate matter standard provides this assurance.

Note that we are proposing that incinerators and liquid boilers that emit particulate matter at levels higher than the proposed standard but do not emit significant levels of non-mercury metal HAP can elect to comply with an alternative standard. Under the proposed alternative standard, these sources would be required to: (1) Limit emissions of all semivolatile metals, including nonenumerated semivolatile metals, to the emission limit for semivolatile metals; and (2) limit emissions of all low volatile metals, including nonenumerated low volatile metals, to the emission limit for low volatile metals. See Part Two, Section XVIII for more discussion on this alternative.

2. Surrogates for Organic HAP

For Phase II sources, we propose two standards as surrogates to control emissions of organic HAP: carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons, and destruction and removal efficiency.[45] Both of these standards control organic HAP by ensuring combustors are operating under good combustion

[43] As discussed later, we are also propsoing particulate matter standards to generally serve as surrogates to control relevant metal HAP in non-hazardous waste feed streams when appropriate.

[44] See 64 FR at 52845–47 (September 30, 1999).

[45] Please note that we are proposing the organic emission standards—carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons, and desturction and removal efficiency—for boilers and process heaters and hydrochloric acid production furnaces only. Requirements to comply with these standards are currently in effect under subpart EEE for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. We are not reporposing or reopening consideration of those standards in today's notice.

practices that should result in destruction of the organic HAP. Note that boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste are currently subject to RCRA requirements that regulate carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon emissions and destruction and removal efficiency standard under RCRA regulations. We propose to control dioxin/furans by a separate standard because dioxin/furan can also be formed post-combustion in ductwork, waste heat recovery boilers, or dry air pollution control devices (*e.g.*, electrostatic precipitators and fabric filters).

Hydrocarbon emissions are a direct measure of many organic compounds, including organic HAP. Carbon monoxide emissions are a more conservative indicator of hydrocarbon and organic HAP emissions because the presence of carbon monoxide at elevated levels is indicative of incomplete oxidation of organic compounds. Sources generally choose to comply with the carbon monoxide standard because carbon monoxide continuous emissions monitors are less expensive and easier to maintain than hydrocarbon monitors.

We also propose to use the destruction and removal efficiency standard to help ensure boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces operate under good combustion conditions. We propose to adopt the standard and implementation procedures that currently apply to these sources under RCRA regulations at § 266.104. We propose, however, to require a one-time only compliance requirement for destruction and removal efficiency, unless a source changes its design or operation in a manner that could adversely affect its ability to meet the destruction and removal efficiency standard. Further, previous destruction and removal efficiency testing performed under RCRA could be used to document the one-time compliance.

D. What Is the Rationale for Requiring Compliance With Operating Parameter Limits To Ensure Compliance With Emission Standards?

In addition to meeting emission limits, today's proposal would require sources to establish limits on key operating parameters for the combustor and emission control devices. Each source would establish site-specific limits for the parameters based on operations during the comprehensive performance test, using prescribed procedures for calculating the limits. The operating parameter limits would reasonably ensure that the combustor and emission control devices continue to operate in a manner that will achieve the same level of control as during the comprehensive performance test.

We selected the operating parameters for which sources would establish limits because: (1) The parameters can substantially affect emissions of HAP; (2) they are feasible to monitor continuously; (3) they are currently used to monitor performance under the Interim Standards Rule for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste; and (4) this is the same general compliance approach that is currently applicable to all hazardous waste combustion sources pursuant to the RCRA emission standard requirements.

V. How Did EPA Determine the Proposed Emission Limitations for New and Existing Units?

A. How Did EPA Determine the Proposed Emission Limitations for New Units?

All standards established pursuant to section 112 of the CAA must reflect MACT, the maximum degree of reduction in emissions of air pollutants that the Administrator, taking into consideration the cost of achieving such emission reduction, and any non-air quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements, determines is achievable for each category. The CAA specifies that the degree of reduction in emissions that is deemed achievable for new hazardous waste combustors must be at least as stringent as the emissions control that is achieved in practice by the best-controlled similar unit (as noted earlier, this specified level of minimum stringency is referred to as the MACT floor, the term used when the statutory provision was first introduced in Congress). However, EPA may not consider costs or other impacts in determining the MACT floor. EPA may adopt a standard that is more stringent than the floor (*i.e.*, a beyond-the-floor standard) if the Administrator considers the standard to be achievable after considering cost, environmental, and energy impacts.

B. How Did EPA Determine the Proposed Emission Limitations for Existing Units?

For existing sources, MACT can be less stringent than standards for new sources, but cannot be less stringent than the average emission limitation achieved by the best-performing 12 percent of existing sources for categories and subcategories with 30 or more sources. EPA may not consider costs or other impacts in determining the MACT floor. The EPA may require a control option that is more stringent than the floor (beyond-the-floor) if the Administrator considers the cost, environmental, and energy impacts to be reasonable.

It has been argued that EPA is limited in the level of performance it can evaluate in assessing which are the 12 percent existing best performing sources to standards codified in permits, or other regulatory limitations. The argument is based on use of the term "emission limitation" in section 112 (d) (3), the argument being that "emission limitation" is a term defined in section 302 (k) to mean "a requirement established by the State or the Administrator which limits the quantity, rate, or concentration of air pollutants * * *". EPA does not accept this argument, and indeed doubts that such an interpretation of the statute is even permissible. In brief:

(i) *Statutory text indicates that MACT floors for existing sources is to based on actual performance.* Section 112 (d) (3) (A) speaks to the actual performance of sources, and requires that the floor for existing sources reflect actual performance. The key statutory phrase is not just "emission limitation" but "emission limitation achieved", a phrase referring to actual performance, not just a limit simply set out in a permit or regulation. The floor is to be calculated using "emissions information", a reference again to actual performance. The provision likewise states that certain sources achieving a lowest achievable emission rate (LAER) level of performance without being subject to LAER (a regulatory limit) are not to be considered in assessing best performers, redundant language if only regulatory limits could be considered.

In fact, it is clear from context when Congress used the term "emission limitation" to refer to regulatory limits, and when it uses the term to refer to a level of performance actually achieved. Compare CAA section 111(b)(1)(B) (EPA is to consider "emissions limitations and percent reductions achieved in practice" when considering whether to revise new source performance standards) with section 110(a)(2)(A) (State Implementation Plans must contain "enforceable emission limitations").

(ii) *The argument leads to absurd and illegal results.* The argument that existing source MACT floors can only be based on regulatory limits leads to results that are illegal, absurd, or both. Congress enacted section 112 to assure technology-based control of HAP which had heretofore gone unregulated due to the vagaries and glacial pace of

implementing the previous risk-based regime for HAP. 1 *Legislative History* at 790, 860; 2 *Legislative History* at 3174–78, 3340–42. The result, at the time of the 1990 amendments is that there were widespread regulatory limits for only one of the 190 listed HAPs (lead, for which there was a National Ambient Air Quality Standard) plus NESHAPs for a half dozen other HAPs. Thus, "emission limitations", in the sense used in the argument, did not exist for most HAPs. This would lead necessarily to the result of no existing source floors because no "emission limitations" exist. This result is illegal. *National Lime* v. *EPA*, 233 F. 3d 625, 634 (D.C. Cir. 2000). Where regulatory limits are higher than actual performance levels, existing source floors likewise would be higher than performance levels, a result both absurd and illegal. *Sierra Club* v. *EPA*, 167 F. 3d 658, 662–63 (D.C. Cir. 1999). In fact, at the time of the 1999 rule for this source category (hazardous waste combustion), RCRA regulatory limits were higher than the level of performance achieved even by the very *worst* performing source in the category (for some HAPs, by orders of magnitude). Yet under the argument, the floor for existing sources would have to be higher than even this worst performing single source.

(iii) *Legislative History shows that Congress intended the existing source floor to reflect actual best performance.* The legislative history to the MACT floor provision for existing sources likewise makes clear that the standard was to reflect actual performance, not regulatory limits. 2 *Legislative History* pp. 2887, 2898; 3353; 1 *Legislative History* p. 870. The legislative history to the parallel provision for municipal waste combusters in section 129(a)(2) (which floor requirement reads identically to section 112(d)(3)) is equally clear, stating that the floor for such sources is to reflect emission limitations which either have been achieved in practice or are reflected in permit limitations, whichever is more stringent. See *Sierra Club* v. *EPA*, 167 F. 3d at 662 (noting this legislative history.)

(iv) *The argument has already been rejected in litigation.* The D.C. Circuit, in the three cases dealing with MACT floors, has held in all three cases that the floor standard must reflect actual performance. *Sierra Club*, 167 F. 3d at 162–63; *National Lime*, 233 F. 3d at 632; *Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition*, 255 F. 3d at 865–66.

For these reasons, we reject the argument that existing source floors are compelled to reflect only regulatory limits. Such limits may be a permissible means of establishing existing source floors, but only if regulatory limits "are a reasonable means of estimating the performance of the top 12 percent of [sources] in each [category or subcategory]." *Sierra Club*, 167 F. 3d at 661.

Somewhat ironically, there is a regulatory limit which is relevant in establishing floors for incinerators, cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns. The interim standards fix a level of performance for all of these sources. Thus, any floor standard can be no less stringent than this standard (see *National Lime* 233 F. 3d at 640 (reason for which a level of performance is being achieved is irrelevant in ascertaining MACT floors)). Based on actual performance, however, floors may be more stringent.

VI. How Did EPA Determine the MACT Floor for Existing and New Units?

We followed five basic steps to calculate the proposed MACT floors. First, we determined which MACT methodology approach is most appropriate to apply to the given pollutant for each source category. Second, we selected which of the available emissions data best represent each source's performance. Third, we evaluated whether it is appropriate to issue separate emissions standards for various subcategories. Fourth, we identified the best performing sources based on the chosen methodology and data. Finally, we calculated floor levels for new and existing sources. The following sections include a description of each of these steps. Please note that we are also proposing to invoke CAA section 112(d)(4) to establish risk-based standards on a site-specific basis for total chlorine for hazardous waste combustors (except for hydrochloric acid production furnaces). Under the proposed approach, sources may elect to comply with either risk-based standards or section 112(d) MACT standards. See Part Two, Section XIII for more details.

A. What MACT Methodology Approaches Are Used To Identify the Best Performers for the Proposed Floors, and When Are They Applied?

A MACT methodology approach is a set of procedures used to define and identify the best performing sources consistent with CAA section 112(d)(3). We have developed and used the following three different MACT methodologies to identify the best performing sources for the full suite of proposed floor standards for new and existing sources: (1) System Removal Efficiency (SRE)/Feed approach; (2) Air Pollution Control Technology Approach; and (3) Emissions-Based approach. These three methodologies, together with their rationales and when they are used, are described in the following sections. Note that each methodology described below assesses best performing sources for each pollutant or pollutant group independently, often resulting in different best performers for each pollutant. For a more detailed description of these methodologies and when they are applied, see USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapters 7 through 15.

1. What Is SRE/Feed Approach, and When Are We Proposing To Apply It?

The SRE/Feed MACT approach defines best performers as those sources with the best combined front-end hazardous waste feed control and back-end air pollution control efficiency as defined by our ranking procedure. The approach is applicable to HAP whose emissions can be controlled by controlling the hazardous waste feed of the HAP: metals and chlorine.[46]

These two parameters—feedrate of metals and chlorine in hazardous waste, and performance of the emission control device measured by system removal efficiency[47] determine emissions of metals and chlorine contributed by the hazardous waste feed. Back-end air pollution control is evaluated by assessing each source's pollutant system removal efficiency, which is a measure of the percentage of HAP that is emitted compared to the amount fed to the unit. In identifying system removal efficiency as a measure of best performing, the Agency is rejecting the notion that "best performing" must mean a source with the lowest absolute rate of emission of a HAP. A source emitting 300 pounds of a HAP, but removing that HAP at a rate of 99.9% from its emissions, can logically be considered a better performing source than one emitting 100 pounds of the same HAP but

[46] The particulate matter standard is used as a surrogate to control nonmercury metal HAP in the nonhazardous waste feedstreams and to control the nonenumerated metals in the hazardous waste. As explained Part Two, Section VI.A.2.b., control of ash feed may not be an effective technique to control metal HAP. Thus, we do not use the SRE/Feed approach to identify floor levels for particulate matter since ash feed control may not be a reliable indicator of performance.

[47] Although system removal efficiency measures primarily the performance of the back-end emission control device, it also measures any other internal control mechanisms, such as partitioning of metals to the product in a cement or lightweight aggregate kiln.

removing it at an efficiency of only 50 percent.

Use of feedrate and system removal efficiency as measures of performance is appropriate because these parameters incorporate the effects of the myriad factors that can indirectly affect emissions, such as level of maintenance of the combustor or emission control equipment, and operator training, as well as design and operating parameters that directly affect performance of the emission control device (*e.g.*, air to cloth ratio and bag type for a fabric filter; use of a power controller on an electrostatic precipitator). For example, an incinerator with a well-designed and operated fabric filter would have a higher performance rating measured by system removal efficiency than an identical incinerator equipped with the same fabric filter which is, in addition, poorly maintained because of inadequate operator training. Also, although feedrate of metals and chlorine in nonhazardous waste feedstreams such as raw materials and fossil fuels fed to a cement kiln can affect HAP emissions substantially, those emissions can be feasibly controlled only by back-end control (measured here by system removal efficiency).[48] This is because neither fuel switching nor raw material switching is practicable for production facilities such as cement and lightweight aggregate kiln facilities. Thus, feedrate of metals and chlorine contributed by the hazardous waste—the only controllable feed parameter for these sources—is an appropriate metric.

For incinerators and solid fuel-fired boilers, feed control is evaluated by assessing each source's hazardous waste pollutant maximum theoretical emission concentration.[49] Feed control for energy recovery units (cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and liquid fuel-fired boilers) are evaluated by assessing each source's hazardous waste pollutant thermal feed concentration when possible (*i.e.*, when EPA has sufficient data to make the calculation).

We rank each source's pollutant hazardous waste feed control level against all the other source's feed control level, assigning a relative rank of 1 to the source with the lowest, *i.e.*, best, feed control level and assigning the highest ranking score to the source with the highest, *i.e.*, worst, feed control level. We do the same with each source's system removal efficiency. We rank each source's pollutant system removal efficiency against all the other sources' system removal efficiencies, assigning a relative rank of 1 to the source with the highest, *i.e.*, best, system removal efficiency and assigning the highest ranking score to the source with the lowest, *i.e.*, worst, system removal efficiency. We then add each source's feed control ranking score and system removal efficiency ranking score to yield an SRE/Feed aggregated score. Each source's aggregated score is arrayed and ranked from lowest to highest, *i.e.*, best to worst, and, for existing sources, the best performers are the sources at the 12th percentile aggregate score and below. Floor levels are then calculated by using the emissions from these best performing sources. The SRE/Feed-based standards are expressed in units of hazardous waste thermal emissions when possible for energy recovery units.

Please note that the SRE/Feed approach can occasionally identify a floor level for new sources that is higher than the floor level for existing sources, as discussed below in Sections VII to XII. This is because the source with the best SRE/Feed aggregate score, and thus, the single best performing source under this approach, does not always achieve the lowest emissions among the best performing sources after accounting for emissions variability. In two cases only, the emissions for the best performing SRE/Feed source, after accounting for emissions variability, are higher than the average of the best performing five (or 12%) of sources—the floor for existing sources—after considering emissions variability.[50] For example, the single best performing SRE/Feed source may have both higher emissions and run variability than other best performing sources. This source's emissions are averaged with the other best performers to identify the floor level, and its run variability is dampened when we calculate the floor for existing sources by pooling run variability across the best performing sources. When the single best performer's emissions are evaluated individually, however, a relatively high run variability is not dampened. In those few situations where the best performing SRE/Feed source has higher emissions, after accounting for emissions variability (*i.e.*, the potential floor for new sources), than the floor for existing sources, we default to the floor for existing sources to identify the floor for new sources. We request comment on whether it would be more appropriate to identify the floor for new sources under the SRE/Feed approach by selecting the source with the lowest emissions among the best performing existing sources, after considering run variability, rather than the lowest SRE/Feed aggregate score.

The SRE/Feed methodology is generally applied only to HAP where we can accurately assess each source's relative hazardous waste feed control and back-end air pollution control: mercury, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, and total chlorine. Dioxin/furans are not considered to be feed control HAP because they generally are not fed into the combustor; rather, they are formed in the combustor and post combustion. Also, whereas particulate matter (for all source categories) and total chlorine (for hydrochloric acid production furnaces) could be considered to be feed-controlled and back-end controlled pollutants, we do not believe it is appropriate to assess feed control as a control mechanism for these situations for reasons discussed below in Section 2 (largely dealing with the inability to control HAP in raw material feed or in fossil fuel). As a result, we did not apply the SRE/Feed approach to these pollutants.

Finally, the SRE/Feed approach is also not applied when we do not have sufficient compliance test data to accurately assess each source's relative back-end control efficiency. This occurs in a limited number of circumstances when the majority of the emissions data reflect normal operations. The mercury and semivolatile metal standard for liquid boilers are examples of when we do not believe we possess sufficient data to accurately assess each source's back end control efficiency because we are concerned that the normal feed data are too sensitive to sampling and measurement error to provide a reliable

[48] *See* discussion in the proposed lime production MACT explaining why neither raw material or fossil fuel substitution are available means of controlling the feedrate of HAP. *See* 67 FR at 78059–61 (Dec. 20, 2002). The rationale for lime kilns also applies to cement and lightweight aggregate kilns. Briefly, in the context of floor control: (1) A kiln's principle raw materials (limestone for cement kilns and clay for lightweight aggregate kilns) are not available to other kilns; and (2) we are not aware of raw materials, or sources of coal or oil, that have characteristic and consistent (low) concentrations of HAP. In the context of beyond-the-floor control, additional issues include: (1) The cost of transporting raw materials with lower levels of HAP (if it were feasible to identify them) would be prohibitive; and (2) although switching from coal or oil to natural gas would reduce the feedrate of HAP, the limitations of the natural gas distribution infrastructure are such that natural gas is not readily available to many sources.

[49] In the 1999 rule, we developed the term maximum theoretical emissions concentration to compare metals and chlorine feed control levels across sources of different sizes. *See* 64 FR at 52854. Maximum theoretical emissions concentration is defined as the metals or chlorine feedrate divided by the gas flowrate, and is expressed in terms of µg/dscm. *See* Part Two, section IV.B.1 for more discussion on how we normalize feedrates and emissions across sources.

[50] This occurred for the low volatile metal standard for cement kilns and the mercury standard for solid-fuel fired boilers.

system removal efficiency that would be used reliably in the ranking procedure. Our preference is to use system removal efficiencies that are based on compliance testing because sources typically spike the pollutant feeds during these compliance tests to known elevated levels, resulting in calculated system removal efficiencies that are more reliable.

2. What Are the Air Pollution Control Technology Approaches, and When Are They Applied?

The air pollution control technology approach is applied in two situations where we consider it inappropriate to directly assess hazardous waste feed control—the particulate matter standard for all sources categories and the total chlorine standard for hydrochloric acid production furnaces. We apply slightly different methodologies to each of these situations, as discussed below.

a. What Methodology Was Used To Identify the Best Performing Sources for the Particulate Matter Floors? The best performing sources for the proposed particulate matter floor levels are determined using a methodology that is conceptually similar to that used in the Industrial Boiler MACT proposal. *See* 68 FR at 1660. We call this methodology the "air pollution control technology" approach because it defines best performers as those that use the best type of back-end air pollution control technology.

This methodology first assesses all the back-end control technologies used by all the sources within the source category, and ranks the general effectiveness of these control technologies from best to worst using engineering information and principles. For example, for particulate matter control, high efficiency particulate air filters may be ranked as the best air pollution control device, followed by baghouses, electrostatic precipitators, and high energy wet scrubbers. In this example, all sources equipped with a high efficiency particulate air (*i.e.*, HEPA) filter would get the best ranking (*e.g.*, "1"), and all sources equipped with high energy wet scrubbers would get the worst ranking (*e.g.*, 4).

The sources are arrayed and ranked from best to worst based on their control technology rankings. For existing sources, MACT control is defined as the control technology or technologies used by the best 12 percent of these sources. For example, using the previous particulate matter control rankings, if more than 12 percent of the sources within the source category were using high efficiency particulate air filters, then MACT control would be defined to be high efficiency particulate air filters. If 10 percent of all the sources were equipped with high efficiency particulate air filters, and 4 percent were equipped with baghouses, then MACT control would be defined as both high efficiency particulate air filters and baghouses.

After the MACT control technology or technologies are determined, the MACT floor levels are calculated using emissions data from those sources using MACT control. *See* Part Two, Section IV.D.3 for more discussion on the ranking procedure that is used to identify the best performing sources under this approach. Also *see* USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 9, for more information. This methodology consequently focuses on performance of the best pollution control device, but does not assess further control that might result from lower HAP feedrates.[51]

We believe it is appropriate to identify the best performing sources using particulate matter emissions from those using MACT back-end control without considering hazardous waste ash feedrate control. For cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and solid fuel-fired boilers, particulate emissions are largely contributed by non-hazardous waste feedstreams (*i.e.*, entrained raw material for kilns, and entrained coal ash for solid fuel-fired boilers). Thus, hazardous waste feed control is an inappropriate factor to consider when assessing particulate matter control efficiency. Assessment of, and control of, total ash feedrate (*i.e.*, hazardous waste plus raw materials and nonhazardous waste fuel ash feed) would also be inappropriate because, as discussed below, total ash feedrate may not be a reliable indicator of a source's emission control level for metal HAP, and could inappropriately result in a methodology that assesses (and controls) raw material and/or nonhazardous waste fuel input.

Although particulate matter emissions for incinerators and liquid fuel-fired boilers are more directly related to these devices' hazardous waste ash feedrate, the hazardous waste ash feedrate for these sources may not be a reliable indicator of a source's feedrate (and emissions) of nonenumerated metal HAP given that the ash feed into the combustor may contain high or low concentrations of regulated metal HAP. A source that feeds low levels of ash thus may not be a best performing source for metal HAP emissions if its metal concentration levels in its ash are relatively high. Such a source could be identified as a best performing source because its particulate matter emissions and ash feed is low, even though its metal HAP emissions are relatively high. This result would also inappropriately assess and control elements of the hazardous waste ash feed that are not regulated HAP (*e.g.*, silica input). For these reasons, using the air pollution control technology approach to establish particulate matter floors without explicitly considering ash feedrate is appropriate since it focuses on the control technology (*i.e.*, back-end air pollution control technology) that is known to control metal HAP emissions.[52]

b. What Methodology Is Used To Identify the Best Performing Sources for the Total Chlorine Floor for Hydrochloric Acid Production Furnaces? We apply the air pollution control technology approach to total chlorine for hydrochloric acid production furnaces differently. For this floor calculation, we are proposing to use the same methodology that the Agency used for the hydrochloric acid production MACT final rule for sources that do not burn hazardous waste. *See* 68 FR at 19076. This methodology defines best performers as those sources with the best total chlorine system removal efficiency. Each source's total chlorine system removal efficiency is arrayed and ranked from highest to lowest, and the best existing performers are the sources at the 12th percentile ranking and below. We calculate the system removal efficiency floor level using the total chlorine system removal efficiencies achieved by these best performing sources. Consistent with the non hazardous waste hydrochloric acid production MACT final rule, we also propose to allow sources to comply with a total chlorine stack gas concentration limit that is calculated by multiplying the highest hazardous waste chlorine maximum theoretical emission concentration in the data base by 1 minus the MACT system removal efficiency. This ensures that a source

[51] This methodology does not, however, expand the MACT pool to include sources with emission levels greater than those of the best 12 per cent of performers using MACT control (the approach the Court in *CKRC* held was inadequately justified as representing the 12 percent of best performing sources).

[52] Please note that, although we do not explicitly consider ash feedrate when establishing the particulate matter floor, ash feedrate is an appropriate and necessary compliance assurance parameter for incinerators and liquid fuel-fired boilers where ash from hazardous waste feedstreams contribute substantially (or entirely) to particulate emissions.

complying with the alternative concentration-based standard would not emit higher levels of total chlorine than a source equipped with wet scrubbers that achieve MACT system removal efficiency. We believe this alternative standard is appropriate because it gives sources the option of complying with the floor by implementing hazardous waste feed control.[53]

We believe this methodology is appropriate even though it does not directly assess hazardous waste total chlorine feed control because these sources are in the business of feeding highly chlorinated hazardous wastes so that they can recover the chlorine for use in their production process. Requiring these sources to minimize hazardous waste chlorine feed would be directly regulating their raw material and would directly affect their ability to produce their product. Again, in this situation, we believe it is appropriate to use a methodology approach that solely focuses on back-end control, since back-end control assures removal of the target pollutant without inappropriately requiring a source to control feedstreams in a manner that affects its ability to produce its intended product.

3. What Is the Emissions-Based Approach, and When Is It Applied?

The emissions-based approach defines best performers as those sources with the lowest emissions in our database. We array and rank each source's pollutant emission levels from lowest to highest. The best existing performers are the sources at the 12th percentile ranking and below. We calculate floor levels using the emission levels from these best performing sources. We express the emissions-based standards in units of hazardous waste thermal emissions when possible for energy recovery units, and use the approach whenever the SRE/Feed or air pollution control technology approaches are not used. Specifically, we use the emissions-based approach for the dioxin/furan floors for all source categories, and for the mercury and semivolatile metal floors for liquid fuel-fired boilers.

The SRE/Feed and air pollution technology-based approaches cannot be used for the dioxin/furan floors because dioxin/furans are generated in the combustor or post-combustion within the air pollution control device. Since dioxin/furans are generally not fed to the units, the SRE/Feed methodology would not properly assess dioxin/furan emission control performance. In theory, the technology-based approach for particulate matter could be applied to the dioxin/furan floors. However, such a technology approach would, for the most part, identify the same best performers as the emissions-based approach because there is only one primary control technology being used by all the sources—temperature control at the inlet to the dry air pollution control device.

The SRE/Feed approach cannot be used for the mercury and semivolatile metal floors for the liquid fuel-fired boilers because we do not have sufficient compliance test data to accurately assess each source's back-end control efficiency. The technology-based approach is also not appropriate because sources within this source category control these HAP both by feed control and by back-end control. As a result, a methodology that considers only one of the two primary control techniques may not be appropriate.

4. Why Doesn't EPA Simply Apply the Emissions-Based Approach to All Source Categories and HAP?

Under the most simplistic interpretation of CAA 112(d), we would apply the emissions-based approach to all source categories and HAP in calculating floors for existing sources. We considered proposing this option. As described later in Part Two, Section VI.G, it was one of three options for which we conducted a complete economics analysis. We discuss below, however, why we believe the air pollution control technology and SRE/Feed approaches more reasonably ascertains the performance of the average of the best 12 percent of existing sources.

a. Why Do We Prefer the SRE/Feed Approach Over the Emissions-Based Approach? We believe the SRE/Feed approach is a reasonable and appropriate MACT methodology for the hazardous waste combustion source categories because it better estimates the performance of the average of the 12 percent best performing sources, and (as a necessary corollary) assures that the floor standards would be achievable by such sources. As previously discussed, we apply the SRE/Feed approach to HAP that are actively controlled (via floor controls) by both hazardous waste feed control and back-end air pollution control. There are only two ways to control emissions of these HAP from these sources—limit the feedrate of metal and chlorine and remove them prior to venting the exhaust gas out the stack. These two control mechanisms are used simultaneously by all sources in this category at varying levels.

We do not believe the lowest emission levels in our data base in fact represent the full range of emissions achieved in practice by the best performing sources. Indeed, it would be unlikely if this were the case, since these data are necessarily "snapshots" of emissions from the source, obtained in one-time testing events.[54] Notwithstanding that such testing seeks to encompass much of the variability in system performance, no single test can be expected to do so. Thus, inherent variability such as feedrate fluctuation over time due to production process changes, uncertainties associated with correlations between operating parameter levels and emissions, precision and accuracy differences in different testing crews and analytical laboratories, and changes in emission of materials (SO_2 being an example) that may cause test method interferences. *See* generally 64 FR at 52857and 52587–59.

An emissions-based approach for cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and solid fuel-fired boilers that assesses performance based on stack gas concentrations (as opposed to hazardous waste thermal emissions) may not appropriately estimate the performance of the average of the 12 percent best performing sources given that those best performers may have low emissions in part because their raw material and/or fossil fuels contained low levels of HAP during the emissions test. We do not believe feed control of HAP in raw material and fossil fuel should be assessed as a MACT floor control primarily because it could result in floor levels that are not replicable by the best performing sources, nor duplicable by other sources. *See* Part Two, Section VI.A.1.

Moreover, although the emissions-based approach is not facially inconsistent with section 112 of the Act, there are serious questions as to whether its applicability here leads to limits that could be achieved even by the average of the best performing sources (under the emissions-based approach). The alternative emissions-based floor Options 1 and 2 discussed in Part Two, Section VI.G result in floor levels across all HAP that are achievable simultaneously by fewer than 6% of the sources for the cement kiln, incinerator, and liquid fuel-fired boiler source

[53] A source could operate with a "less than MACT" system removal efficiency provided that it controls its hazardous waste chlorine feed levels such that its emissions are lower than the emission standard.

[54] One-time testing events, however, are a necessity because Continuous Emission Monitors still do not exist for most of the HAPs emitted by these sources.

categories.[55] See USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapters 10 and 19, for a summary of the simultaneous achievability analysis. A reason the floors which would result from this methodology are so low is that there already have been at least one and, for many of the sources, two rounds of regulatory reduction of emissions from these sources (under the RCRA rules, and then under the Interim Standards MACT rules for incinerators and kilns). The emissions-based approach thus yields results more akin to new source standards, confirmation being that the levels are not even achievable as a whole by the average of the 12 percent best performing sources. The simultaneous achievability of today's proposed floors, for which we use the SRE/Feed approach for certain HAP preferentially over the emissions-based approach, is substantially better (but not dramatically more than 6%) for cement kilns and liquid fuel-fired boilers than the achievability under the emissions-based approach.

There are other reasons why the emissions-based approach results in such low simultaneous achievability percentages. If the emissions-based approach is applied to feed-controlled HAP, the best performers are defined as those sources that are either: (1) The lowest feeders; (2) the best back-end controlled units; or (3) the best combination of front-end control or back-end control. The emissions-based approach selects the lowest emitters from the previous three categories and does not necessarily account for the full range of emissions that are achieved in practice by well designed and operated feed control units, well designed and operated back-end controlled units, or well designed and operated combination of both front-end and back-end controlled units. As explained below, the SRE/Feed methodology better accounts for the range of emissions from these well designed and operated sources.[56]

For example, assume we have 100 sources in a hypothetical source category, and source A is the 5th best feed controlled source and the 30th best back-end controlled source. Source B, on the other hand, is the 30th best feed controlled source and the 5th best back-end controlled source. The SRE/Feed ranking procedure would score these two sources equally, even though their emissions may be different. Let's also assume that these two sources are among the best performers for the SRE/Feed approach. We would not expect their emission levels to be dramatically different under the SRE/Feed approach because source A is a superior front-end controlled source with a relatively poorer back-end control device, and source B is a superior back-end controlled source with relatively poorer feed control. Even though sources A and B do not have the same emissions, they are both considered to be well designed and operated sources because they both use a superior combination of front-end and back-end control. The difference in emissions merely reflects the range of emissions from well designed and operated sources.

If the emissions-based approach was applied in the source A and B example, the source with the higher emissions would have a worse emission ranking, and thus may not be identified as a best performer. Thus, even though we would consider this higher emitting source under the SRE/Feed approach to be a well-designed and operated source, it would not be capable of achieving the calculated floor level. We believe this outcome may be problematic, for example, because sources that are already operating with a well-designed and operated back-end control unit should not have to upgrade its back-end control technology simply because it is not achieving a floor level driven, in part, by other sources within the source category that are implementing lower feed control rates that are impractical for it to achieve.[57] It may be questionable to require these well controlled back-end units to implement better feed control to achieve this emission-based floor level because: (1) they may not be capable of implementing feed control without sending/diverting the waste elsewhere—yet these units are providing a needed and required service in treating hazardous waste; and (2) it could be argued that hazardous waste containing high levels of metals and chlorine should in fact be treated in the well-designed and operated back-end controlled units (see RCRA sections 3004 (d) to (m), requiring advanced treatment of hazardous waste before the waste can be land disposed).

Similarly, sources that are already achieving superior feedrate control should not necessarily have to upgrade their feedrate control further simply because they are not achieving a floor level driven, in part, by sources with superior back-end control. Improving already superior feedrate control may be problematic simply because they may not be capable of implementing additional feed control (*e.g.*, source reduction) at their facility, or having generators implement further feedrate control. EPA believes that hazardous waste feed control is an important element of what constitutes "best performing" sources from this source category, and does not wish to structure the rule to discourage the practice by developing standards which do not directly take this means of control into account. See CAA section 112(d)(2)(A) (feed control is an explicit means of achieving MACT); and see also the pollution prevention and waste minimization goals of both the CAA (sections 112(d) (2) and 101(c) and RCRA (section 1003(b)). The SRE/Feed approach thus better preserves the opportunity for sources to achieve the floor levels if they are using either superior front-end control or back-end control (or superior combination of both). At the same time, it addresses both means by which sources in this category can control their HAP emissions: hazardous waste feed control and back-end air pollution capture through control technology.

The example in the previous paragraph of the source using superior feed control is clearly applicable to incinerators and boilers that combust hazardous waste. These are somewhat unique source categories in that they are comprised of many different industrial sectors that may not be capable of achieving/duplicating the same metal and chlorine feedrate control levels of other sources within their respective source category given that hazardous waste feed control levels are directly influenced by amount of HAP that are generated in their specific production process. Similarly, other sources that comprise commercial hazardous waste combustors (*i.e.*, kilns and commercial incinerators) are subject to the feed control levels that are governed

[55] Simultaneous achievability percentages for lightweight aggregate kilns, solid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces must be interpreted differently given that there are significantly fewer than 30 sources within these source categories. As a result, we believe that the emission standards should be simultaneously achievable by at least two or three sources for these source categories given that CAA 112(d) defines best performing sources as the average of the best five sources.

[56] Note, however, that many of the best performing sources for the SRE/Feed approach are the same as those for emissions-based approach, primarily because there is a good correlation between the SRE/Feed aggregated ranking score and emissions in that the emission levels generally increase as the as the aggregate ranking score increases.

[57] Moreover, the superior low metal and chlorine feedrates that on-site incinerators and boilers are "achieving" may simply reflect the composition of the waste generated by the manufacturing operation.

primarily by third parties (*i.e.*, the generators or fuel blenders). The emissions-based approach identifies the best performers as those sources with the lowest emissions and does not consider differences in emission characteristics across all the industrial sectors that combust hazardous waste. We contemplated whether we should assess if subcategorization is appropriate based on the various industrial sectors that combust hazardous waste. We believe, however, that such an assessment would be difficult given the vast number of industrial sectors that generate hazardous waste which is treated by combustion.

The emissions-based approach could be identifying a suite of floor levels across HAP that would require sources to operate at feedrate control levels in the aggregate that are in theory achieved by few, if any, well-operated and designed feed controlled sources. For example, the best performing sources for the emissions-based approach for the incinerator semivolatile and low volatile metal floors are entirely different. This may occur because sources have different relative feed control levels for mercury, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, and total chlorine (*e.g.*, a source could have superior semivolatile metal feed control but only moderate low volatile metal feed control).

Finally, the emissions-based approach may result in low simultaneous achievability percentages because a back-end control technology for one pollutant may not control the emissions of another pollutant as efficiently. For example, wet air pollution control systems may control total chlorine emissions very well, but are not as efficient at limiting particulate matter emissions when compared to a baghouse. Thus, best performers under the emissions-based floor approach for total chlorine could be driven by sources with wet air pollution control systems, and the particulate matter floor could be driven by sources equipped with baghouses, resulting in a combined set of floors that are conceivably achieved by few sources, a result confirmed, as noted above, in that less than 6% of existing sources would be achieving floor standards developed using the emission-based approach.[58, 59]

We thus believe that using the SRE/Feed approach preferentially over the emissions-based approach and technology based approach is appropriate because use of the SRE/Feed approach results in floor levels that better reflect the range of emissions from well-designed and operated sources and also results in floor levels across all HAP that are achievable simultaneously by at least 6 percent of the sources within each source category.

b. Why Do We Prefer the Air Pollution Control Technology Approach Over the Emissions-Based Approach? As previously discussed, we apply the air pollution control technology approach in two situations where we consider it inappropriate to directly assess hazardous waste feed control using an SRE/Feed type approach: the particulate matter standard for all source categories; and, the total chlorine standard for hydrochloric acid production furnaces. We discuss below why the emissions-based approach is not our preferred methodology for these standards.

For particulate matter, the emissions-based approach identifies the lowest emitters as best performers, irrespective of the types of controls that were used. This would not necessarily reflect emissions that are in fact capable of being achieved by sources using MACT back-end control technology as defined by the air pollution control technology approach because, as discussed above, our data are "snapshots" of emissions from each source, obtained in one-time testing events. As a result, the particulate matter floors that are based on the emissions-based approach would not necessarily account for inherent variability such as ash feedrate fluctuation over time due to production process changes,[60] uncertainties associated with correlations between operating parameter levels and emissions, precision and accuracy differences in different testing crews and analytical laboratories, and changes in emission of materials (SO_2 being an example) that may cause test method interferences. The air pollution control technology approach may better account for this inherent variability because it assesses the emissions ranges from those sources that utilize the defined back-end MACT control devices, as opposed to merely selecting the lowest emitters irrespective of the type of control it uses.

Also, using the emissions-based approach for incinerators and liquid boilers (for the particulate matter standard) and hydrochloric acid production furnaces (for the total chlorine standard) is not our preferred approach because it assesses in part, hazardous waste ash and chlorine feed control. As discussed above, the emissions-based approach defines best performers as those sources with the lowest emissions, and thus inherently accounts for and assesses hazardous waste ash and chlorine feed control in that sources with lower ash feedrates and chlorine feedrates may have lower emissions.[61] This is not our preferred way of establishing floors for these HAP for the reasons discussed above in Section A.2.

B. How Did EPA Select the Data To Represent Each Source When Determining Floor Levels?

After we determine which MACT methodology is appropriate for a given pollutant and source category, we select which of the available emissions data to use for each source to: (1) Determine if subcategorization is warranted; (2)

[58] Although the SRE/Feed approach does not directly address this issue within the methodology, the simultaneous achievability of the SRE/Feed-based floors is substantially better (but not dramatically more than 6%) for cement kilns and liquid fuel-fired boilers than the achievability under the emissions-based approach.

[59] Note that we considered using a floor methodology that simultaneously assesses all the pollutant emissions from each source. This methodology would define best performers as those sources with the best aggregate emissions across all (or a subset of all) the HAP and would perhaps more directly achieve the goal of obtaining a full suite of emission standards that are achievable by at least 6% of the sources. We rejected this approach in the 1999 rule, since it could potentially result in least-common denominator source levels. *See* 64 FR at 52856. However, at least for incinerators and kilns, there is less potential concern with such a result because the Interim Standards have already reduced sources' emissions of all HAP considerably and the Interim Standards cap the level of floors for these sources. Nonetheless we may not have enough complete emissions information for all HAP for many source categories to adequately assess enough source's true "aggregate emissions." *See* Section VI.G.

[60] The emissions-based approach may not account for particulate matter emissions variability factors that are attributable to factors other than MACT control. For example, two sources with identical air pollution control devices could have different particulate matter emission concentrations merely because they process different types and amounts of raw material and/or nonhazardous waste fuels. From a MACT perspective, the source with the higher emissions would not be a poorer performer because feed control of raw material and nonhazardous waste fuels are not MACT floor controls.

[61] The best performers identified by the air pollution technology approach are less likely to be driven by low ash feeding facilities for the particulate matter standard because all the sources equipped with MACT-defined back-end control devices typically feed high levels of ash, thus we believe particulate matter emission levels from these sources are more a function of the air pollution control device control efficiency rather than the ash feed levels.

identify the best performing sources; and (3) calculate the floor levels. Our emissions data base is complex because it includes, in part, compliance test data, emissions data that is representative of the normal operating range of the source, and, for the Phase I sources, multiple emission test data that have been collected over a number of years. *See* Part Two, Section III for more discussion on data base issues.

We follow a general "data hierarchy" to determine which of these data types to use to represent each source's performance (with the performance being reassessed for each HAP). First, we prefer to explicitly use compliance test data rather than data representative of normal operations because compliance test data best reflect the upper range of emissions from each source and thus best accounts for day-to-day emissions variability. Use of compliance test data allows us to express emission floors as "short-term limits" (*e.g.*, hourly or twelve hour rolling averages), which is consistent with the current interim MACT standard format for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. Short-term limits are also consistent with the RCRA emission standards currently applicable to boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces. Finally, we prefer to use compliance test data because the majority of the available data are compliance test data.

Absent sufficient compliance test data for sources within the source category to calculate floor levels, we default to explicitly using data that are representative of the source's operating range under conditions not designed to assess performance variability. Since these so-called normal data do not typically reflect the upper range of emissions from each source, we believe it is necessary to account for emissions variability (in part) by expressing floors that are based on normal data as long-term, annual average emission limits (since the snap-shot data, by definition, do not reflect short-term variability).

We considered using all available emissions data to calculate the floors, irrespective of whether they were normal or compliance test data. We believe, however, that it is inappropriate to mix such dissimilar data when calculating floor levels because it would bring into question how to account for day-to-day emissions variability when setting the format of the standard. For example, if a floor were calculated using 50% percent normal data and 50% compliance data, should the standard be expressed as a long-term limit or short-term limit? This is critical because the averaging period associated with the numerical emission limitation affects the stringency of the standard. It is also unclear how mixing dissimilar data would affect the statistical variability factor we apply to each floor to assure that floor levels are achievable by the average of the best performing sources. As discussed in Part Two, Section VI.E, we apply the statistical variability factor to the floor levels to assure that the average of the best performing sources would be able to replicate the emission test results that were used to calculate the floor levels. Mixing dissimilar data not only complicates the analyses, but also could result in inconsistent evaluation of data (hence inconsistent results), primarily because the ratio of normal data to compliance data differs across HAP within each source and across all sources. We therefore believe it is appropriate to assess "like data" explicitly to assure results are consistent across HAP and source categories.

We prefer to use the most recent compliance test data to represent each source in situations where we have data from multiple test campaigns that were collected at different times. For example, we typically have multiple test campaign emission information for cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns because: (1) We conducted a comprehensive data collection effort for these sources to update the data base that was used to support the 1999 final rule; and (2) these sources, prior to receiving their RCRA permit, are required to conduct emissions tests every three years.

We believe it is appropriate to only use the most recent compliance test data for a source because those data best reflect current operations and emission levels. Older compliance test data may not be representative of current emissions because: (1) Permitted feed and air pollution control device operating levels may have been changed/upgraded; (2) combustion unit and associated air pollution control equipment design may have been changed/upgraded; and (3) standard operating practices that relate to maintenance and upkeep may have been changed/upgraded. As a result, we believe that a source's most recent compliance data best reflect a source's upper range of emissions. We considered using all of the sources historical compliance emissions data to perhaps better account for day-to-day emissions variability. We believe, however, that it is not appropriate to consider older compliance emission test data to account for day-to-day emission variability because: (1) The older compliance data may reflect varying emissions merely because the source was previously operating with poorer control levels, which is not an appropriate factor to consider when assessing day-to-day emission variability; and (2) the most recent compliance test data adequately accounts for day-to-day variability because the operating levels demonstrated during the most recent compliance test generally represent the maximum upper range of operations and emissions.[62]

We do not apply the concept of using the most recent emissions test information to normal emissions data (as previously discussed, we use normal emission data to calculate floor levels only in situations where we do not have sufficient compliance test data). We instead use all normal emissions data that are available because we are concerned that a source's most recent normal emissions may not be representative of its average emissions. The most recent normal emissions data could reflect emissions at the upper range of normal operations or the lower end of normal operations. If we were to use only the most recent normal emissions information, we may identify as best performers those sources that were operating below their average levels. This would be inappropriate because the floor level may be unachievable by the best performing sources.

Finally, for liquid fuel-fired and solid fuel-fired boilers, we eliminated emission test runs from the MACT analysis when we had information that the source conducted sootblowing during that emission test run. Boilers that burn fuels with high ash content are designed to blow the soot off the tubes periodically to maintain proper heat transfer. The soot can contain metal HAP, and emissions of these HAP can increase during sootblowing. Although the current RCRA particulate matter and metals emissions standards for these sources at §§ 266.105 and 266.106 do not require sootblowing during compliance testing, we have provided guidance recommending that sources blow soot during one of the three runs of a compliance test condition and calculate average emissions considering the frequency and duration of sootblowing.[63] We conclude that these sootblowing run data should not be

[62] Operating parameter limits are established based on compliance test operations to ensure emissions achieved during normal operations do not exceed the emissions that were demonstrated in the compliance test.

[63] USEPA, "Technical Implementation Document for EPA's Boiler and Industrial Furnace Regulations" EPA530–R–92–011, March 1992, NTIS # PB92–154 947.

considered when establishing MACT floor, however, for several reasons. We do not know if all sources that blow soot followed the guidance to blow soot during a run of the test condition. If they did not, they could be identified as a best performer but may not be able to achieve the floor level when blowing soot. In addition, several boilers that blew soot during a run of the test condition did not use our recommended approach to calculate time-weighted average emissions considering the frequency and duration of sootblowing. For these sources, we cannot calculate time-weighted average emissions. We also note that, for sources with emission control equipment, emissions during sootblowing runs are not significantly higher than when not blowing soot. This is because soot particles are relatively large and easily controlled. For sources with no emission control equipment, sootblowing increased particulate matter emissions for some sources, but not others. In addition, we could not use the sootblowing run to help address emissions variability by evaluating run variability because the (in some cases) higher emissions during sootblowing are unrelated to the factors affecting run variability that we are evaluating (*e.g.*, method precision and other largely uncontrollable factors that affect run-to-run emissions during a test condition). Finally, we note that the Agency did not propose to require sootblowing to demonstrate compliance with the MACT standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers and process heaters.[64] Although for these reasons we conclude that it is appropriate not to consider sootblowing run data to establish the MACT floor, we request comment on alternative views.[65]

Because we do not consider sootblowing when establishing floor levels, sootblowing would not be required during performance testing to demonstrate compliance with the standards for particulate matter and semivolatile and low volatile metals.[66]

[64] *See* 68 FR 1660 (January 13, 2003).

[65] We note that a floor level considering sootblowing may be higher than a floor level based on discounting sootblowing runs.

[66] The comparative risk assessment for this proposed rule did not evaluate the impact of sootblowing on average emissions. To ensure that RCRA permits are protective of human health and the environment, regulatory officials may determine that the effect of sootblowing on average emissions (*i.e.*, considering the frequency and duration of sootblowing) should be considered in some situations, such as a source with uncontrolled or poorly controlled particulate emissions and with relatively high particulate matter or toxic metal emissions.

C. How Did We Evaluate Whether It Is Appropriate To Issue Separate Emissions Standards for Various Subcategories?

The third step we use to calculate MACT floor levels evaluates subcategorization options. CAA section 112(d)(1) allows us to distinguish among classes, types, and sizes of sources within a category when establishing floor levels. Subcategorization typically reflects "differences in manufacturing process, emission characteristics, or technical feasibility." *See* 67 FR 78058.

We use both engineering principles and a statistical analysis to assess whether it is appropriate to subcategorize and issue separate emission standards. We first use engineering principles to determine potential subcategory options. These subcategory options are discussed in more detail in Part Two Section II for each source category. As discussed in greater detail below, we then determine if there is a statistical difference in the emission characteristics between these potential subcategory options. Finally, we conduct a technical analysis to determine if the statistical analysis results are consistent with sound engineering judgement.

"Analysis of Variance" (ANOVA) is the statistical test used to cross-check these engineering judgements. ANOVA, a conventional statistical method, evaluates whether there are differences in the mean of HAP emissions levels from two or more different potential subcategories (*i.e.*, do the different subcategories of HAP data come from distinctly different populations). Subcategories are considered significantly different using a 95% confidence level. ANOVA is used in combination with engineering principles to sequentially identify significant differences between various different combinations of potential subcategories. *See* U.S. EPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 4, for detailed steps and results of the ANOVA evaluation process.

D. How Did We Rank Each Source's Performance Levels To Identify the Best Performing Sources for the Three MACT Methodologies?

The fourth step used in determining the MACT floor levels involves ranking each source's performance level to identify the best performers. Below we discuss the general ranking procedure used for each of the three MACT methodologies and the statistical methodology used to perform the ranking process.

1. Emissions-Based Methodology Ranking Procedure

As previously discussed in Part Two, Section VI.A, the emissions-based approach defines best performers as those sources with the lowest emissions in our database. Each source's emission test runs are first converted to an upper 99% confidence level in order to rank performance not only on the average emission levels each source achieves, but also on the emissions variability each source demonstrates during the emissions tests. We believe this is appropriate because a source's ability to consistently control its emissions below the MACT floor levels is important in determining whether a source is in fact a well designed and operated source.[67] We then array and rank each source by its 99% upper confidence emission levels from best to worst (*i.e.*, lowest to highest). For existing source floors, we identify the best performers as either sources at the 12th percentile ranking and below or the lowest 5 ranked sources values if we have data from less than 30 sources. The best performing source for the new source floor is simply the source with the single lowest ranked 99% upper confidence emission level.

2. SRE/Feed Ranking Procedure

As previously discussed, the SRE/Feed methodology approach defines best performers as those sources with the best combined front-end hazardous waste feed control and back-end air pollution control efficiency as defined by our ranking procedure. The first step involves ranking each source's feed control level. As with the emissions-based approach, we first convert each source's feed control run levels (*i.e.*, hazardous waste maximum theoretical emission concentration level or thermal feed concentrations) to an upper 99% confidence level. We then array each source's 99% upper confidence feed control levels from best to worst (*i.e.*, lowest to highest). Next we assign a feed control ranking score to each source. The source with the lowest feed control value gets a ranking of 1, and the source with highest feed control value receives the highest numerical ranking.

The second step ranks each source's system removal efficiency, which is a measure of the percent of metal or

[67] For example, a source with average emissions of 100 and calculated variability of 10 would be ranked as a better performing source when compared to a source with average emissions of 100 and a calculated variability of 20.

chlorine that is emitted as compared to the amount fed to the combustion unit. Again, we first convert each source's system removal efficiency run values to an upper 99% confidence level value. We then array each source's 99% upper confidence levels from best to worst (*i.e.*, highest to lowest). Next we assign a system removal efficiency ranking score to each source. The source with the best system removal efficiency gets a ranking of 1, and the source with the worst system removal efficiency receives the highest numerical ranking.

As with the emissions ranking procedure discussed above, our feed control and system removal efficiency ranking procedure measures performance not only on the average feed control and system removal efficiency level each source achieves, but also on the feed and system removal efficiency variability each source demonstrates during the emissions tests. This is appropriate because a source's ability to consistently regulate its control mechanisms to achieve MACT emissions is important in determining whether a source is in fact a well designed and operated source.

Third, we add each source's feed control ranking score and system removal efficiency ranking score together in order to calculate an aggregated SRE/Feed score. We then array and rank each source's aggregated score from best to worst (*i.e.*, lowest to highest). For existing source floors, we identify the best performers as sources at the 12th percentile aggregate ranking and below or sources with the lowest 5 aggregated scores if we have data from less than 30 sources. The best performing source for the new source floor is simply the source with the single lowest aggregated score.

3. Technology Approach Ranking Procedure for the Particulate Matter Standard

As previously discussed in Part Two, Section VI.A.2.a, the best performing sources for the particulate matter proposed floor levels are determined from a pool of sources that use the MACT-defining back-end control technology. We assess only the emissions from those sources equipped with the MACT-defining control technology (or technologies), and, as with the previously discussed methodologies, we convert each source's emission run values to an upper 99% confidence level value. Emissions information from each source is then grouped based on the type of MACT control each source uses. The first group contains emissions information from sources equipped with the best ranked MACT control device; the second group includes emissions information from sources equipped with the second best ranked MACT control technology (if there is more than MACT control technology), and so on.

We then array and rank each source's 99% upper confidence emission levels from best to worst (*i.e.*, lowest to highest) within each of these groups. If there is only one defined MACT control technology, the best performing sources are those sources with the lowest 99% upper confidence emission levels amongst the sources using this MACT control technology. The lowest emitting sources are added to a list of best performers up until the number of sources that are included in this list is representative of 12 percent of sources within the source category (for the existing source floor determination). If there is more than one defined MACT control technology, the list of best performers first considers sources with the lowest 99% upper confidence emission levels that are equipped with the best ranked control device up until the number of sources that are included in this list is representative of 12 percent of sources within the sources category. If additional sources need to be added to this list to appropriately represent 12% of the sources within the source category, then sources with the lowest emissions that are equipped with the second best MACT control device are added until the appropriate number of best performing sources are obtained.[68] For the new source floor, the best performer is simply the single source equipped with the best ranked MACT control device with the lowest 99% upper confidence emission level.

4. Technology Approach Ranking Procedure for the Total Chlorine Floor for Hydrochloric Acid Production Furnaces

As previously discussed in Part Two, Section VI.A.2.b, the technology approach used to determine the total chlorine floor levels for hydrochloric acid production furnaces defines best performers as those sources with the best total chlorine system removal efficiency. The ranking procedure used for this methodology is identical to that used in the emissions-based approach with the exception that system removal efficiencies are ranked instead of emissions. Each source's total chlorine system removal efficiency run values are first converted to an upper 99% confidence level. We then array and rank each source's 99% upper confidence system removal efficiencies from best to worst (*i.e.*, highest to lowest). For existing source floors, we define best performers as either: (1) Sources at the 12th percentile ranking and below; or (2) sources with the lowest 5 rankings if we have data from less than 30 sources. The best performing source for the new source floor is simply the source with the single highest 99% upper confidence system removal efficiency.

5. Description of the Statistical Procedures Used To Identify the 99% Confidence Levels

As previously discussed, each source's performance level is first converted to an upper 99% confidence level in order to rank performance not only on the average performance level each source achieves, but also on the emissions variability each source demonstrates during the emissions tests. We believe this is appropriate because a source's ability to consistently control its emissions below the MACT floor levels is important in determining whether a source is in fact a well designed and operated source.

Sources are ranked based on their projected "upper 99% confidence limit" (or lower 99% confidence limit for system removal efficiency). For emissions and feedrates, upper 99% confidence limits are determined using a "prediction limit" calculation procedure. The prediction limit is an estimate of the level which will capture 99 out of 100 future test condition averages (where each average comprise three individual test runs). HAP emissions data within each source are determined to be normally distributed. The prediction limit is calculated for each source based on the average, standard deviation, and number of individual test runs.

For system removal efficiencies, the lower 99% confidence limit is determined using the "two parameter Beta distribution". The beta distribution is used for modeling proportions, *i.e.*, system removal efficiencies, is highly robust, and appropriately bounded by zero and 1. Beta distribution modeling parameters are determined based on the "method of moments" using the average and standard deviation of the individual source data. The lower 99% estimate comes directly from the Beta distribution model. *See* USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards,"

[68] Note that this methodolgy does not base the floor on the highest emitting source amongst these best performers (as did the "expanded MACT pool" did for 1999 rule). Rather, the floor is determined by calculating the average performance of all best performing sources.

March 2004, Chapter 8, for further discussion.

E. How Did EPA Calculate Floor Levels That Are Achievable for the Average of the Best Performing Sources?

The emissions data we used to establish MACT floor were obtained by manual sampling of stack gas. To ensure that the average of the best performing sources can routinely achieve the floor during future performance testing under the MACT standards, we must account for emissions variability.

We account for long-term emissions variability by: (1) Using compliance test emissions data, when available, to establish floors; (2) when other than compliance test data must be used to establish the floor, basing compliance on an annual average. In addition, we add a statistically-derived variability factor to the floor to account for run-to-run variability. This variability factor ensures that the average of the best performing sources can achieve the floor level in 99 of 100 future tests if the best performing sources replicate the operating conditions and other factors that affect the emissions we use to represent the performance of those sources.

1. How Does Using Compliance Test Data Account for Variability?

We use RCRA compliance test emissions data, when available, to establish the floors because compliance test data largely account for emissions variability. Under RCRA compliance testing, sources must establish operating limits based on operating conditions demonstrated during the test. Each source designs the compliance test such that the operating limits it establishes account for the variability of operating parameter levels it expects to encounter during its normal operations (*e.g.*, feedrate of metals and chlorine; air pollution control device operating parameters, production rate). Thus, operating conditions during these tests generally reflect the upper range of emissions from these sources. Using a source's compliance test emissions to establish the floor accounts largely for long-term emissions variability. However, this does not necessarily account for factors that affect variability. As previously discussed, our snap-shot data base emissions information does not necessarily account for inherent variability such as feedrate fluctuation over time due to production process changes, uncertainties associated with correlations between operating parameter levels and emissions, precision and accuracy differences that may result from using different stack sampling crews and analytical laboratories, and changes in emission of materials (SO_2 being an example) that may cause test method interferences.

Use of compliance test data also does not account for run-to-run variability. We thus use a statistically-derived variability factor to account for the variability in emissions that would result if the best performing sources were to replicate their compliance tests, as discussed below.[69]

In addition, use of compliance test data may not account for long-term variability of particulate matter emissions from sources equipped with a fabric filter. Accordingly, we also use a statistically-derived variability factor to account for this variability, as discussed below.

2. How Does Using Long-Term Averaging Account for Emissions Variability When Using Other Than Compliance Test Data?

RCRA compliance test emissions data are not available for some metals (mercury in particular) for some source categories. In these cases, we use other emissions test data to establish the floor. These other test data are snap shots of emissions within the range of normal emissions. To largely account for emissions variability when using emissions data assumed to represent the average of normal emissions, we propose to express the floor as a long-term, yearly, average. Sources would comply with the floor by establishing limits on metal feedrate and air pollution control device operating parameters. Compliance with the metal feedrate limits would be based on an annual average feedrate, while compliance with the air pollution control device operating limits would be based on short-term limits (*e.g.*, hourly rolling average). We propose short-term averages for air pollution control device operating parameters because the parameters may not correlate with emissions linearly; emissions resulting when an air pollution control device parameter is above the limit thus may not be offset by emissions resulting when the air pollution control device parameter is below the limit. *See* 1999 rule, 64 FR at 52920.

[69] EPA did not statistically assess run-to-run variability in the 1999 rule (although we noted that it existed; *see* 64 FR at 52857. The reason is that by using the expanded MACT pool approach to account for variability (using surrogate sources from outside the best performing to assess the best performing sources' variability) we felt we had accounted for all such run-to-run variability *Id.* Since we are not proposing to expand the MACT pool here, it is necessary to account for run-to-run variability by some other means.

As discussed above, we also use a statistically derived variability factor to account for the variability in emissions that would result if the best performing sources were to replicate the emissions tests we use to establish the floor, as discussed below.

We use the normal emissions data to represent the average emissions from a source even though we do not know where the emissions may fall within the range of normal emissions; the emissions may be at the high end, low end, or close to the average emissions. It may be reasonable to assume the emissions represent average emissions, given that we have emissions data from several sources, and that emissions for these sources in the aggregate could be expected to fall anywhere within the range of normal emissions. Note that, as previously discussed, we have not applied the concept of using the most recent emissions test information to normal emissions data because we are concerned a source's most recent normal emissions may not be representative of a source's true average emissions. These emissions could reflect emissions at the upper range of normal operations, or instead, could reflect emissions at the lower end of normal operations. If we were to use only the most recent normal emissions information, the MACT standard setting process may identify best performers as those sources that operate below their normal levels. This may be inappropriate because the floor level may be unachievable even by the best performing sources. We invite comment as to whether floors that are based on normal data are in fact achievable by the best performing sources, and whether there is perhaps a more appropriate method to identify floors that are based on normal data.

3. What Statistical Procedures Did EPA Use To Calculate Floor Levels?

In order to calculate a floor that would be achievable by the average of the best performing sources, we considered the variability in emissions across runs of the test conditions of the best performing sources. We also use statistical procedures to account for long-term variability in particulate matter emissions for sources equipped with fabric filters. We discuss these procedures and the rationale for using them below.

a. Run-to-Run Variability. The MACT floor level is determined by modeling a normally distributed population that has an average and variability that are equal to that of the "average" of the best performing MACT pool sources. The MACT floor is calculated using a

modified prediction limit procedure. The prediction limit is designed to capture 99 out of 100 future three-run averages from the "average" of the best performing MACT sources.

Specifically, the modified prediction limit for calculating the MACT floor is the sum of the average of the best performing sources and the "pooled" variability of the best performing sources. The pooled variability term accounts for the expected variability in future measurements due to variations resulting from system operation and measurement activities. The pooled variability term is based in part on the observed variance of individual runs within test conditions from the best performing MACT pool sources. The pooled variability term assumes that variability from the individual best performing sources are independent (not related), and thus are additive (and not averaged). The pooled variability term is a function of the variances of the individual MACT pool sources, the number of MACT pool sources, the desired 99% confidence level, and the number of future test runs for demonstrating compliance (assumed to be 3). *See* USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 7, for discussion of the detailed steps and prediction limit formula used to calculate the MACT floors.

b. Particulate Matter Variability for Fabric Filters. Compliance test emissions of particulate matter from sources that are equipped with a fabric filter may not account for long-term variability because it is difficult to maximize emissions during the compliance test.[70] Fabric filters control particulate matter emissions generally to the same concentration irrespective of the particulate matter loading at the inlet to the fabric filter. Because there are no operating parameters that can be readily changed to increase emissions, it is difficult to maximize emissions of particulate matter from a fabric filter during compliance testing.[71]

To address long-term variability in particulate matter emissions for fabric filters we developed a universal variability factor (UVF). The UVF represents the standard deviation of the pooled runs from multiple compliance tests for a source, and is imputed as a function of the source's emission concentration. We use the UVF to account for both long-term and run-to-run variability to calculate the floor using the procedures discussed above in lieu of the pooled variability term for the most-recent test condition run variability.

To develop the data base to calculate the UVF, we considered each best performing source that is equipped with a fabric filter and for which we have two or more compliance tests for particulate matter. We considered all compliance test particulate matter emissions data for these sources, including those test conditions we previously labeled as "IB" (representing in-between), indicating that emissions levels are lower than for another test condition of the compliance test campaign. We include historical test campaign data where available for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. Considering historical compliance test data and compliance test data labeled IB is appropriate because any differences in emission levels (over time or among compliance test results for a test campaign) should be indicative of emissions variability given that fabric filters generally produce constant emission concentrations and are difficult to detune to increase emissions for compliance testing. Finally, we combined test conditions for multiple on-site sources where both the combustor and fabric filter have similar design and operating characteristics. Combining the test conditions for such sources as if they represent emissions from a single source better accounts for emissions variability.

To calculate the UVF, we calculated the pooled standard deviation of the runs for each source for which we have data for two or more compliance tests and plotted this standard deviation versus particulate matter emission concentration for all such sources. It is reasonable to aggregate the data for sources across all source categories given that there is no reason to believe that the standard deviation/emissions relationship would vary from source category to source category. We then identified the best-fit curve for the data. The best fit curve is a power function that achieved a R^2 of 0.83, indicating a good power function correlation between standard deviation and emission concentration.[72]

We use the best-fit curve to impute a standard deviation for each best performing source (that is equipped with a fabric filter) as a function of the source's particulate matter emissions. We use the source's average compliance test emissions (*i.e.*, including historical compliance test emissions that we label in the data base as "WC" and "IB") to represent average emissions.

F. Why Did EPA Default to the Interim Standards When Establishing Floors?

When we calculate floor levels for several standards for the Phase I sources, the floor levels would be higher than the currently applicable interim standards at §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205. As explained earlier, we conclude that today's proposed floor levels can be no higher than the interim standards because all sources, not just the best performing sources, are achieving the interim standards. The most recent emissions data in our data base are from compliance testing in 2001 and do not represent emissions tests from sources used to demonstrate compliance with the interim standards, thus the data we used to calculate the proposed floor levels generally does not reflect the control upgrades necessary for compliance with the interim standards. The fact that we are "capping" the floor at the interim standard level does not mean our proposed methodology is less conservative than the methodology used in the 1999 rule. Our calculated floor levels can be higher than the interim standards for several reasons. As a result of our data collection effort, we have compiled more emissions information from some source categories that result in higher calculated floor levels (*e.g.*, dioxin/furans for lightweight aggregate

[70] We note that semivolatile and low volatile metal emissions, however, can be maximized during compliance testing for sources equipped with a fabric filter. Metals may be spiked in the hazardous waste feed to levels that account for long-term feedrate variability. Although the particulate matter emission concentration would not be expected to increase during a metals compliance test for a source equipped with a fabric filter, the semivolatile and low volatile metals emissions concentrations would increase. This is because the concentration of metals in the emitted particulate matter would increase.

[71] We note that this situation is unique for fabric filters. Sources equipped with other control devices—electrostatic precipitators, ionizing wet scrubbers, and wet scrubbers—can readily change the device's operating conditions (*e.g.*, power input to an electrostatic precipitator; pressure drop across a wet scrubber) during compliance testing to "detune" collection efficiency and increase emissions. In addition, these other control devices provide "percent reduction" control of pollutants whereby as inlet loading increases, emission concentrations also increase. Thus, increasing the inlet loading (*e.g.*, by spiking the ash feedrate to an incinerator) even without detuning the control device would also increase emissions of particulate matter for devices other than a fabric filter.

[72] The procedure we use to identify the universal variability factor for particulate matter emissions for sources equipped with fabric filters is discussed in detail in USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 5.3. Please note that we consider alternative approaches to identify the universal variability factor as discussed in the technical support document, and request comment on those alternatives.

kilns). Some of the instances where we "capped" the floor at the interim standard level occurred when the interim standard was a beyond-the-floor standard promulgated in 1999 (*e.g.*, semivolatile metals for lightweight aggregate kilns). Finally, some standards are "capped" because we used different types of data to calculate the proposed floors (*e.g.*, the 1999 rule generally considered normal mercury data to establish the mercury floor for incinerators, whereas today's proposed approach used compliance test data to calculate the mercury floor).

G. What Other Options Did EPA Consider?

We considered five other alternative approaches to establish the full suite of floor levels for each source category. The first two alternative options use different combinations of the three main methodology options to determine the proposed floors. Note that we also conducted a complete economics and benefits analysis for these first two alternative options. *See* USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emission Estimates and Engineering Costs," March, 2004 for more information. The third option identifies best performing sources by considering emissions of metals and particulate matter simultaneously, instead of pollutant by pollutant. The fourth option is an approach recommended by the Environmental Treatment Council. Finally, the fifth option identifies best performing sources as those sources with the best back-end control efficiencies, as measured by their associated system removal efficiencies. After review of comments we may use one or more of these approaches in toto or part to establish final standards. We explain below how these approaches work and the rationale for considering them.

1. What Is Alternative Option 1, and What Is the Rationale?

Under alternative option 1, we do not use the SRE/Feed methodology to calculate any floors. We use the emissions-based approach to establish all the floors, other than the exceptions that are explained below. We express emission standards for energy recovery units in units of hazardous waste thermal emissions when appropriate. All other emission standards under this approach are expressed as stack gas emission concentrations. The two exceptions under this option uses the technology-based approach for the particulate matter standard (for all source categories) and the total chlorine standard for hydrochloric acid production furnaces, as was done for today's proposed standards.

We evaluated this option because it is simpler and more straightforward to use than the SRE/Feed Approach. The best performing sources simply are those with the lowest emissions in our data base, irrespective of the level of feed control or back-end control a source achieves. The advantages of using the air pollution control technology approach and expressing emission standards using the hazardous waste thermal emissions format for energy recovery units are retained. Although we have doubts that standards based on these limits are achievable even by the best performing sources (as noted earlier) and that this approach could be based on unrepresentatively low hazardous waste feedrates, we invite comment as to whether this approach is appropriate. We present the results of using alternative option 1 to identify floor levels for existing sources in Table 3 below. *See* U.S. EPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapters 16, 17, and 18 for documentation of the floor levels.

TABLE 3.—FLOOR LEVELS FOR EXISTING SOURCES UNDER ALTERNATIVE OPTION 1

	Incinerators	Cement kilns	Lightweight aggregate kilns	Solid fuel-fired boilers [1]	Liquid fuel-fired boilers [1]	Hydrochloric acid production furnaces [1]
Dioxin/Furans (ng TEQ/dscm).	0.28 for dry APCD and WHB sources,[6] 0.20 or 0.40 + 400°F at APCD inlet for others.[7]	0.20 or 0.40 + 400°F at APCD inlet.[7]	0.20 or 400°F at kiln outlet.[7]	CO or THC standard as a surrogate.	3.0 or 400°F at APCD inlet for dry APCD sources; CO or THC standard as surrogate for others.	CO or THC standard as a surrogate.
Mercury	130 µg/dscm [7]	31 µg/dscm [2]	19 µg/dscm [2]	10 µg/dscm	3.7E–6 lb/MMBtu [2, 5].	Total chlorine standard as surrogate.
Particulate Matter	0.015 gr/dscf [7]	0.028 gr/dscf	0.025 gr/dscf [7]	0.063 gr/dscf	0.032 gr/dscf	Total chlorine standard as surrogate.
Semivolatile Metals (lead +cadmium).	19 µg/dscm	1.3E–4 lb/MMBtu [5].	3.1E–4 lb/MMBtu [5] and 250 µg/dscm.[3]	170 µg/dscm	1.1E–5 lb/MMBtu [2, 5].	Total chlorine standards as surrogate.
Low Volatile Metals (arsenic + beryllium + chromium).	14 µg/dscm	1.1E–5 lbs/MMBtu [5].	9.5E–5 lb/MMBtu [5] and 100 µg/dscm.[3]	210 µg/dscm	7.7E–5 lb/MMBtu [4, 5].	Total chlorine standard as surrogate.
Total Chlorine (hydrogen chloride + chlorine gas).	0.93 ppmv	41 ppmv	600 ppmv [7]	440 ppmv	5.7E–3 lb/MMBtu [5].	14 ppmv or 99.9927% system removal efficiency.

Notes:
[1] Particulate matter, semivolatile metal, low volatile metal, and total chlorine standards apply to major sources only for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces.
[2] Standard is based on normal emissions data.
[3] Sources must comply with both the thermal emissions and emission concentration standards.
[4] Low volatile metal standard for liquid fuel-fired boilers is for chromium only. Arsenic and beryllium are not included in the low volatile metal total for liquid fuel-fired boilers.
[5] Standards are expressed as mass of pollutant contributed by hazardous waste per million Btu contributed by the hazardous waste.
[6] APCD denotes "air pollution control device," WHB denotes "waste heat boiler."

[7] Floor level represents the "capped interim standard level," which means the floor level determined by the associated methodology was less stringent than the interim standard level.

2. What Is Alternative Option 2, and What Is the Rationale?

Under alternative option 2, we use the emissions-based approach to establish all floors and there are no exceptions. All floor levels are expressed in units of stack gas concentrations (we do not express any floors for energy recovery units in terms of thermal emissions). The best performing sources for all floors are those with the lowest emissions, on a stack gas concentration basis.

We are not proposing this alternative option because it has the disadvantages that the more complicated provisions of Option 1 (and to some extent Option 2) address: (1) By not using the SRE/Feed Approach for metals and total chlorine, it does not ensure that sources could use either feedrate control or back-end control to achieve the floor; (2) the approach may be inappropriately biased against sources that burn hazardous waste fuel at high firing rates because it does not express the standards in units of hazardous waste thermal emissions; (3) it inappropriately considers feed control for particulate matter and for hydrochloric acid production furnaces by not using the Air Pollution Control Device Approach for those floors; and (4) it may not appropriately estimate the performance of the average of the 12 percent best performing sources given that those best performers may have low emissions in part because their raw material and/or fossil fuels contained low levels of HAP during the emissions test (and because we do not believe feed control of HAP in raw material and fossil fuel should be assessed as a MACT floor control because it could result in floor levels that are not replicable by the best performing sources, nor duplicable by other sources).

We invite comment as to whether this alternative approach is appropriate, noting the doubts we have voiced above. We present the results of using this alternative option 2 to identify floor levels for existing sources in Table 4 below. *See* USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 16, for more information.

TABLE 4.—FLOOR LEVELS FOR EXISTING SOURCES UNDER ALTERNATIVE OPTION 2

	Incinerators	Cement kilns	Lightweight aggregate kilns	Solid fuel-fired boilers [1]	Liquid fuel-fired boilers [1]	Hydrochloric acid production furnaces [1]
Dioxin/Furans (ng TEQ/dscm).	0.28 for dry APCD and WHB sources; [5] 0.20 or 0.40 + 400°F at APCD inlet for others.[6]	0.20 or 0.40 + 400°F at APCD inlet.[6]	0.20 or 400°F at kiln outlet.[6]	CO or THC standard as a surrogate.	3.0 or 400°F at APCD inlet for dry APCD sources; CO or THC standard as surrogate for others.	CO or THC standard as a surrogate.
Mercury	130 µg/dscm [6]	31 µg/dscm [2]	19 µg/dscm [2]	10 µg/dscm	0.47 µg/dscm [2]	Total chlorine standard as surrogate.
Particulate Matter	0.0040 gr/dscf	0.016 gr/dscf	0.025 gr/dscf [6]	0.065 gr/dscf	0.0028 gr/dscf	Total chlorine standard as surrogate.
Semivolatile Metals (lead + cadmium).	19 µg/dscm	68 µg/dscm	130 µg/dscm	170 µg/dscm	8.7 µg/dscm [2]	Total chlorine standard as surrogate.
Low Volatile Metals (arsenic + beryllium + chromium).	14 µg/dscm	8.9 µg/dscm	82 µg/dscm	210 µg/dscm	28 µg/dscm [4]	Total chlorine standards as surrogate.
Total Chlorine (hydrogen chloride + chlorine gas).	0.93 ppmv	41 ppmv	600 ppmv [6]	440 ppmv	2.4 ppmv	2.0 ppmv.

Notes:
[1] Particulate matter, semivolatile metal, low volatile metal, and total chlorine standards apply to major sources only for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces.
[2] Standard is based on normal emissions data.
[3] Sources must comply with both the thermal emissions and emission concentration standards.
[4] Low volatile metal standard for liquid fuel-fired boilers is for chromium only. Arsenic and beryllium are not included in the low volatile metal total for liquid fuel-fired boilers.
[5] APCD denotes "air pollution control device", WHB denotes "waste heat boiler'.
[6] Floor level represents the "capped interim standard level", which means the floor level determined by the associated methodology was less stringent than the interim standard level.

3. What Is Alternative Option 3, and What Is the Rationale?

Under alternative option 3, we evaluated an approach to identify the best performing sources for particulate matter, semivolatile metals, and low volatile metals that considers how well a source is controlling these pollutants simultaneously. Simultaneous control of these pollutants is an appropriate consideration because these pollutants are controlled by the same emission control device, the particulate matter control device (*e.g.*, a wet scrubber, electrostatic precipitator, or fabric filter). We call this alternative approach the Simultaneous Achievability for Particulates (SAP) Approach. *See* USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapters 10 and 19.

We evaluated semivolatile metal and low volatile metal emissions for energy recovery sources—cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and liquid fuel-fired boiler—under two emissions-based SAP alternatives: hazardous waste thermal emissions, and stack gas concentrations. The hazardous waste thermal emissions option assesses semivolatile metal and low volatile metal thermal emissions for energy recovery units, while assessing particulate matter using the emissions-based stack gas concentration approach. The emissions-based stack-gas concentration approach assesses stack gas concentrations (as opposed to thermal emissions) for all HAP. Note that we did not evaluate hydrochloric acid production furnaces under this SAP approach because we propose to use the total chlorine standard as a surrogate to control emissions of particulate matter and metals for these sources.

Under the SAP approach, we rank emissions for each pollutant across the sources for which we have emissions data for that pollutant. For ranking, we use the upper 99% confidence interval for the average of the runs of the test condition for a source. For example, if we have semivolatile metal emissions data for 15 sources, the lowest semivolatile metal emissions level is ranked one and the highest is ranked 15. To identify the best performing sources for all three pollutants simultaneously, we calculate an aggregate rank score for each source. For example, if source A has a rank of 5 for particulate matter, a rank of 10 for semivolatile metals, a rank of 15 for low volatile metals, the aggregate rank score for that source is 10, the average rank across the pollutants. If we do not have emissions data for a pollutant for a source, there is no rank score for that pollutant, and that pollutant is not considered in the aggregate rank score for the source.

To identify the best performing sources in the aggregate, we rank the aggregate rank scores for the sources from lowest to highest. If we have emissions data for all three pollutants for all sources, the 5 (or 12% if we have data for more than 30 sources) sources with the lowest aggregate rank scores are the best performing sources. If we have incomplete data sets for some sources for a source category, the best performing sources for a pollutant (*i.e.*, particulate matter, semivolatile metals, or low volatile metals) are the sources with the lowest aggregate rank scores and for which we have emissions data.

We present the alternative MACT floors for existing sources under the SAP approach in Table 5 below.

TABLE 5.—FLOOR LEVELS FOR EXISTING SOURCES UNDER THE SAP APPROACH

Source category	Emissions-based approach	Particulate matter floor (gr/dscf)	Semivolatile metals floor	Low volatile metals floor
Incinerators	Stack Gas Conc.	0.0040	53 µg/dscm	50 µg/dscm.
Cement Kilns	Thermal Emissions	0.027	190 lb/trillion Btu	20 lb/trillion Btu.
	Stack Gas Con.	0.015	103 µg/dscm	14 µg/dscm.
Lightweight Aggregate Kilns	Thermal Emissions	0.019	300 lb/trillion Btu	95 lb/trillion Btu.
	Stack Gas Conc.	0.019	120 µg/dscm	89 µg/dscm.
Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers	Stack Gas Conc.	0.090	180 µg/dscm	230 µg/dscm.
Liquid Fuel-Fired Boilers	Thermal Emissions	0.0039	81 lb/trillion Btu	180 lb/trillion Btu.
	Stack Gas Conc.	0.0039	26 µg/dscm	210 µg/dscm.

We request comment on this alternative approach for identifying MACT floors. If we use this approach in the final rule to identify MACT floors, we would promulgate a beyond-the-floor standard for particulate matter of 0.030 gr/dscf for existing solid fuel-fired boilers for the same reasons we are proposing today a beyond-the-floor standard. *See* Part Two, Section X.C for a discussion of today's proposed beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard for solid fuel-fired boilers.

See USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapters 10 and 19, for a more detailed explanation of this SAP analysis.

4. What Is Alternative Option 4, and What Is the Rationale?

The Environmental Technology Council (ETC) recommends an approach to calculate floor levels for metals and chlorine that uses a low feedrate screen and addresses emissions variability differently than the options we evaluated.[73] We may use this approach in total or in part to support a final rule, and therefore request comment on the approach.

Under ETC's approach, test conditions are screened from further consideration if metals or chlorine were not fed at levels that challenge the emissions control system.[74] Feedrates of metals and chlorine in hazardous waste are normalized to account for size of the combustor by converting feedrates to maximum theoretical emissions concentrations. A low maximum theoretical emissions concentration filter is used to screen out emissions from low feed test conditions, where the filter is the lower 99% confidence limit of the mean of the maximum theoretical emissions concentrations for all test conditions for all sources within a source category.

ETC's approach also excludes specialty units, defined as sources that burn munitions and radiological waste (*i.e.*, Department of Defense and Department of Energy sources). ETC believes that these sources burn wastes with atypical concentrations of ash and metals that may inappropriately skew the calculation of floor levels. Under this approach, we would either subcategorize and issue separate emission standards for these specialty units, or omit these speciality units from the MACT analysis and require the specialty units to comply with the floor levels that are determined from emissions of the non-specialty units.

After applying the low maximum theoretical emissions concentration filter and excluding specialty units, this approach identifies the best performing sources by ranking emissions from

[73] Update on MACT Floor Evaluations Revised Data Base, Environmental Technology Council, February 2003.

[74] This approach therefore identifies a *de minimis* feed control level for each source category and does not evaluate emissions from these *de minimus* feeders in the MACT analysis because these *de minimis* feed control levels may not be feasible for other sources to duplicate. The screen is performed individually by pollutant so that if semivolatile metals were fed at rates that challenged the emissions control system but low volatile metals were not, only the low volatile metal emissions data for that test condition would be screened from further analysis.

lowest to highest.[75] Run variability is not considered at this point. For incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns where we may have historical compliance test emissions from several test campaigns for a source, test conditions from the campaign with the lowest compliance test emissions are used to identify the best performers.

The average of the emissions from the best performing sources are used to calculate the floor, and an emissions variability factor is added. For incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns where we may have historical compliance test emissions data from several test campaigns for a source, three approaches are considered to select representative emissions for each best performing source: (1) The highest compliance test emissions from any test campaign; (2) the average of the highest compliance test emissions from all test campaigns; and (3) the highest emissions during the most recent compliance test campaign. By identifying the best performers based on compliance test emissions from the test campaign with the lowest emissions and calculating the floor using compliance test emissions under these alternative approaches, emissions variability is addressed in part.[76]

Emissions variability is accounted for by adding an emissions variability factor to the average emissions for the best performing sources. The variability factor is a measure of the average run-to-run variability for the test conditions for the best performing sources. The variability factor is determined as the upper confidence limit (calculated at the 99% confidence interval) around the mean of the runs for each test condition for each best performer. (For sources with more than one compliance test condition, the variability factor for each source is first determined as the average of the variabilities associated with each compliance test condition).[77] The upper confidence limits are averaged across the best performing sources, and the average confidence limit is added to the average emissions from the best performers to identify the floor.

We invite comment as to whether this alternative approach is appropriate. We calculated alternative floor levels for new and existing sources with minor adjustments.[78] We present the results of applying that approach in Table 6 below. *See* USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapters 12 and 21, for more information on how we applied this approach to our data base.

TABLE 6.—FLOOR LEVELS FOR EXISTING SOURCES UNDER THE MODIFIED ETC APPROACH

	Data base	Incinerators		Cement kilns	Lightweight aggregate kilns	Solid fuel-fired boilers	Liquid fuel-fired boilers
		All	Excluding speciality units				
Mercury (µg/dscm)	Avg of historical CT data.	130 (308) [1]	130 (308) [1]	48	37		
	Most recent CT data ...	130 (308) [1]	130 (308) [1]	40	31	14	4.8
	Highest of historical CT data.	130 (308) [1]	130 (308) [1]	68	45		
Particulate Matter (gr/dscf).	Avg of historical CT data.	0.0043	0.0043	0.025	0.017		
	Most recent CT data ...	0.0043	0.0043	0.025	0.017	0.11	0.0090
	Highest of historical CT data.	0.0043	0.0043	0.030 (0.032) [1]	0.017		
Semivolatile Metals (µg/dscm).	Avg of historical CT data.	53	32	230	250 (901) [1]		
	Most recent CT data ...	53	32	160	250 (746) [1]	230	8.2
	Highest of historical CT data.	53	32	300	250 (1208) [1]		
Low Volatile Metals (µg/dscm).	Avg of historical CT data.	39	46	51	110 (119) [1]		
	Most recent CT data ...	39	36	42	110 (129) [1]	320	52
	Highest of historical CT data.	39	56	56 [1]	110 (133) [1]		
Total Chlorine (ppmv)	Avg of historical CT data.	1.4	1.8	85	600 (1655) [1]		
	Most recent CT data ...	1.4	1.8	86	600 (1811) [1]	410	3.2
	Highest of historical CT data.	1.4	1.8	89	600 (1823) [1]		

Notes: "CT" means Compliance Test.

[75] This low feed screen is not applied to cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns for the particulate matter standard because ash feedrate is not considered to be a dominant factor that influences particulate matter emissions (rather, particulate matter emissions are more a function of the back-end control device efficiency).

[76] This approach for partially accounting for emissions variability is effective only for those incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns for which we have emissions data for more than one test campaign.

[77] We do not use this step in our statistical analysis because we identify one test condition only as being representative of the emissions for each source. Alternatively, ETC's approach includes an option where the average of the historical compliance test conditions is considered for Phase I sources. Under this option, ETC's approach considers the average run-to-run variability for those historical compliance tests.

[78] Note that we modified part of ETC's suggested methodology in some instances, which has resulted in our calculated floor levels to differ from ETC's calculated floor levels. These modifications are discussed in USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 12.

[1] Floor would be capped by the Interim Standards. Number in parentheses represents the calculated floor level, the number preceding is the "capped" interim standard level.

5. What Is Alternative Option 5, and What Is the Rationale?

Alternative Option 5 would use system removal efficiency (SRE) to identify the best performing sources for the mercury, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, and total chlorine floor levels. This is similar to the approach we propose to establish the total chlorine standard for hydrochloric acid production furnaces. *See* discussion in Part Two, Section VI.A.2.b.

Floor levels would be expressed as an SRE or an emission concentration where the emission concentration is based on the emissions achieved by the best performing SRE sources.[79] A source could elect to comply with either floor. An emissions floor as an alternative to the SRE floor is appropriate because a source may be achieving emission levels lower than those achieved by the best performing SRE sources even though it may not be achieving MACT floor SRE. For example, a source may be achieving low emissions without achieving MACT SRE by using superior feedrate control.

The SRE floor is an SRE that the average of the best performing SRE sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under the conditions used to establish the SRE.[80] The emissions floor is a stack gas concentration, or thermal emission concentration for source categories that burn hazardous waste fuels, that the average of the best performing SRE sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under the conditions used to establish the SRE and emission level.

We note that this approach is not applicable for situations where sources in a source category do not use back-end control to control metals or total chlorine. For example, cement kilns do not use back-end control to control mercury or total chlorine.[81]

This approach is also not applicable for situations where our data base is comprised of normal emissions data. As discussed previously, SREs calculated from normal test conditions may be unreliable because a small error in the feedrate calculation at low feedrates can have a substantial impact on the calculated SRE.

In situations where this SRE-based approach is not applicable, we would use an alternative approach to identify MACT floor, such as the Emissions approach.

Floor levels for existing sources under this approach are presented in Table 7.

We also investigated a variation of this approach where sources with atypically high feedrates for metals or chlorine are excluded from the calculation of the alternative emission level. This variation may be appropriate to ensure that sources with high feedrates do not drive the alternative emission concentration-based floor inappropriately high even though the source may be a best performing SRE source. Under this variation, note that sources with high feedrates are used, however, to identify the best performing SRE sources and MACT SRE. This is because sources with the highest feedrates may employ the best performing back-end control systems to meet current standards or otherwise control emissions. As a measure of atypically high feedrates, we use the 99th upper percentile feedrate around the mean of feedrate data in the data set available for the analysis. To ensure that we continue to use 5 sources or 12 percent of sources to calculate the emission concentration-based floor under this variation, we replace a best performing SRE source that is screened out of the concentration-based floor analysis because of high feedrates with the source with the next best SRE.[82]

Floor levels for existing sources under this feedrate-screened variation are presented in Table 8.

We invite comment on these alternative floor approaches. For more information on how the approach would work, *see* USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapters 13 and 22.

[79] We note that an SRE option, in some form, could be added to any of the emission-based approaches previously discussed.

[80] Note that we only considered SREs associated with emission values designated as compliance test (CT) in the database. *See* USEPA "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapters 11 and 20, for more information.

[81] Although the alkalinity in cement kiln raw materials helps control total chlorine emissions, we are concerned that the system removal efficiencies achieved may not be readily reproducible.

[82] Since sources with atypically high feedrates may still have low emissions, sources with hazardous waste feed control levels above the threshold are flagged, but not immediately removed from the data set. Sources' SREs are ranked from best to worst, initially choosing the best ranked 5 or 12% of sources as the interim MACT pool. The remaining sources are temporarily set aside, and the sources comprising the interim MACT pool are ranked again from lowest to highest emissions. Sources from the interim MACT pool that have been flagged due to having feedrates above the upper 99th percentile are systematically (from highest to lowest emissions) removed from the MACT pool and replaced with sources with the next highest ranked SREs if the emissions from the next best source initially excluded from the interim MACT pool has lower emissions. The sources comprising the revised interim MACT pool now become the final MACT pool. Emissions from those sources are again used to calculate the MACT floor, with the resulting MACT floor again expressed as an emission standard.

TABLE 7.—FLOOR LEVELS FOR EXISTING SOURCES UNDER ALTERNATIVE OPTION 5

Source category	Mercury			Semivolatile metals			Low volatile metals			Total chlorine		
	SRE [1]	Emissions		SRE [1]	Emission concentration		SRE [1]	Emission concentration		SRE [1]	Emission concentration	
		Stack gas [2]	Thermal [3]		Stack gas [2]	Thermal [3]		Stack gas [2]	Thermal [3]		Stack gas [2]	Thermal [3]
Incinerators	27	20,000 [9]	n/a [8]	99.89	74	n/a [8]	99.969	33	n/a [8]	99.990	3.1	n/a [8]
Cement Kilns	n/a [4, 5]			99.966	71	140	99.989	11	22	n/a [4, 5]		
Lightweight Aggregate Kilns	n/a [4, 6]			99.78	330	310	99.89	100	95	n/a [4, 6]		
Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers	11		n/a [8]	99.78	180	n/a [8]	97.9	230	n/a [8]	n/a [4, 5]		
Liquid Fuel-Fired Boilers	n/a [4]			n/a [4]			90.4 [7]	27 [7]	45 [7]	99.70	25	55

[1] SRE is system removal efficiency expressed as a percent.
[2] Stack gas concentration is expressed in µg/dscm for all except total chlorine, which is expressed as ppmv.
[3] Thermal emission is expressed in lb/trillion Btu, except total chlorine which is expressed in lb/billion Btu.
[4] Unable to determine SRE due to normal feedrate data.
[5] No SRE due to no reliable back-end control.
[6] Only one source has back-end control.
[7] LVM Standards for liquid fuel-fired boilers are for Chromium, only.
[8] Thermal emissions not appropriate for source categories with sources that do not burn hazardous waste fuels.
[9] We believe this methodology yields inappropriate MACT mercury floors for incinerators because we have only 11 compliance test conditions, and the best performers spiked uncharacteristically high levels of mercury during their compliance test.

TABLE 8.—FLOOR LEVELS FOR EXISTING SOURCES UNDER ALTERNATIVE OPTION 5 WITH HIGH FEEDRATE SCREEN

Source category	Mercury			Semivolatile metals			Low volatile metals			Total chlorine		
	SRE [1]	Emissions		SRE [1]	Emission concentration		SRE [1]	Emission concentration		SRE [1]	Emission concentration	
		Stack gas [2]	Thermal [3]		Stack gas [2]	Thermal [3]		Stack gas [2]	Thermal [3]		Stack gas [2]	Thermal [3]
Incinerators	27	7,500 [9]	n/a [8]	99.89	64	n/a [8]	99.969	29	n/a [8]	99.990	1.3	n/a [8]
Cement Kilns	n/a [4, 5]			99.966	65	130	99.989	11	18	n/a [4, 5]		
Lightweight Aggregate Kilns	n/a [4, 6]			99.78	330	310	99.89	100	95	n/a [4, 6]		
Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers	11		n/a [8]	99.78	180	n/a [8]	97.9	230	n/a [8]	n/a [4, 5]		
Liquid Fuel-Fired Boilers	n/a [4]			n/a [4]			90.4 [7]	27 [7]	110 [7]	99.70	23	55

[1] SRE is system removal efficiency expressed as a percent.
[2] Stack gas concentration is expressed in µg/dscm for all except total chlorine, which is expressed as ppmv.
[3] Thermal emission is expressed in lb/trillion Btu, except total chlorine which is expressed in lb/billion Btu.
[4] Unable to determine SRE due to normal feedrate data.
[5] No SRE due to no reliable back-end control.
[6] Only one source has back-end control.
[7] LVM Standards for liquid fuel-fired boilers are for Chromium, only.
[8] Thermal emissions not appropriate for source categories with sources that do not burn hazardous waste fuels.
[9] We believe this methodology yields inappropriate MACT mercury floors for incinerators because we have only 11 compliance test conditions, and the best performers spiked uncharacteristically high levels of mercury during the their compliance test.

VII. How Did EPA Determine the Proposed Emission Standards for Hazardous Waste Burning Incinerators?

The proposed standards for existing and new incinerators that burn hazardous waste are summarized in the table below. See proposed § 63.1219.

PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR EXISTING AND NEW INCINERATORS

Hazardous air pollutant or surrogate	Emission standard [1]	
	Existing sources	New sources
Dioxin and furan—sources equipped with waste heat boilers or dry air pollution control system [2].	0.28 ng TEQ/dscm	0.11 ng TEQ/dscm.
Dioxin and furan—sources not equipped with waste heat boilers or dry air pollution control system [2].	0.2 ng TEQ/dscm; or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and temperature at inlet to the initial particulate matter control device ≤400°F.	0.20 ng TEQ/dscm.
Mercury	130 µg/dscm	8.0 µg/dscm.
Particulate matter	34 mg/dscm (0.015 gr/dscf)	1.6 mg/dscm (0.00070 gr/dscf).
Semivolatile metals	59 µg/dscm	6.5 µg/dscm.
Low volatile metals	84 µg/dscm	8.9 µg/dscm.
Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas [3]	1.5 ppmv or the alternative emission limits under § 63.1215.	0.18 ppmv or the alternative emission limits under § 63.1215.
Hydrocarbons [4,5]	10 ppmv (or 100 ppmv carbon monoxide)	10 ppmv (or 100 ppmv carbon monoxide).
Destruction and removal efficiency	For existing and new sources, 99.99% for each principal organic hazardous constituent (POHC). For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, 99.9999% for each POHC.	

[1] All emission standards are corrected to 7% oxygen dry basis.
[2] A wet air pollution system followed by a dry air pollution control system is not considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this standard. A dry air pollution systems followed a wet air pollution control system is considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this standard.
[3] Combined standard, reported as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent.
[4] Sources that elect to comply with the carbon monoxide standard must demonstrate compliance with the hydrocarbon standard during the comprehensive performance test.
[5] Hourly rolling average. Hydrocarbons reported as propane.

A. What Are the Proposed Standards for Dioxin and Furan?

The proposed standards for dioxin/furan for sources equipped with dry air pollution control devices and/or waste heat boilers are 0.28 ng TEQ/dscm for existing sources and 0.11 ng TEQ/dscm for new sources. For incinerators using either wet air pollution control or no air pollution control devices, the proposed standards for dioxin/furan are 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm while limiting the temperature at the inlet to the particulate matter control device to less than 400 °F for existing sources and 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm for new sources.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Dioxin and furan emissions for existing incinerators are currently limited by § 63.1203(a)(1) to 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm; or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm provided that the combustion gas temperature at the inlet to the initial particulate matter control device is limited to 400 °F or less. (For purposes of compliance, operation of a wet air pollution control system is presumed to meet the 400 °F or lower requirement.) This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6796, February 13, 2002).

Since promulgation of the September 1999 final rule, we have obtained additional dioxin/furan emissions data. We now have dioxin/furan emissions data for over 55 sources. The emissions in our data base range from less than 0.001 to 34 ng TEQ/dscm.

As discussed in Part Two, Section II, we assessed whether incinerators equipped with dry air pollution control devices and/or waste heat boilers have statistically different emissions than sources with either wet air pollution control or no air pollution control equipment.[83] Our statistical analysis indicates dioxin/furan emissions between these types of incinerators are significantly different. (As we explained there, these differences relate to differences in dioxin/furan formation mechanisms, not pollution control device efficiency.) Therefore, we believe subcategorization is warranted for this emission standard and we are proposing separate floor levels.

To identify the floor level for incinerators equipped with dry air pollution control equipment and/or waste heat boilers, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the Emissions Approach described in Part Two, Section VI. The calculated floor is 0.28 ng TEQ/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. The calculated floor level of 0.28 ng TEQ/dscm is based on five best performing sources that achieved this floor level either by the use of temperature control at the inlet to dry air pollution control device and good combustion or by the use of activated carbon injection. The single best performer is equipped with a dry air pollution control system and a waste heat boiler, and uses activated carbon injection, good combustion, and temperature control to control dioxin/furan emissions. The remaining four

[83] A source with a wet air pollution system followed by a dry air pollution control system is not considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this standard, while a source with a dry air pollution system followed a wet air pollution control system is considered to be a dry air pollution control system. In addition, we note that a spray dryer is not considered to be a wet air pollution control system for purposes of subcategorization.

best performers are equipped with dry air pollution systems but do not have waste heat recovery boilers. Two of these sources use activated carbon, good combustion, and temperature control to control dioxin/furan emissions.[84] The other two without waste heat recovery boilers use a combination of good combustion and temperature control to control emissions.

We then judged the relative stringency of the calculated floor level to the interim standard to determine if the proposed floor level needed to be "capped" by the current interim standard to ensure the proposed floor level is not less stringent than an existing federal emission standard. A comparison of the calculated floor level of 0.28 ng TEQ/dscm to the interim standard—0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm provided that the combustion gas temperature at the inlet to the initial particulate matter control device is limited to less than 400 °F—indicates that a floor level of 0.28 ng TEQ/dscm is more stringent than the current interim standard. This judgment is based on our belief that the majority of these incinerators are currently complying with the 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and temperature limitation portion of the interim standard.[85] We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 71% of sources and would reduce dioxin/furan emissions by 0.28 grams per year.

We also considered whether to further subcategorize based on whether the incinerator is equipped with a waste heat recovery boiler or dry air pollution control device. Our analysis determined that the dioxin/furan emissions from incinerators with waste heat recovery boilers are not statistically different from those equipped with dry air pollution control systems. We propose, therefore, that further subcategorization is not necessary given that incinerators using either waste heat recovery boilers or dry air pollution control systems can readily achieve the calculated floor level using control technologies demonstrated by the best performing sources.

For sources with either wet air pollution control systems or no air pollution control equipment, but are not equipped with a heat recovery boiler, we contemplated identifying an emission limit but instead rely on surrogates for control of organic HAP, namely good combustion practices, to be demonstrated by complying with the carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon emissions standard and compliance with the destruction and removal efficiency standard.[86] We believe that it would be inappropriate to establish a numerical dioxin/furan floor level for sources with wet or no air pollution control systems because the floor emission level would not be replicable by the best performing sources nor duplicable by other sources. Dioxin/furan formation mechanisms are complex. Sources with wet or no air pollution control devices may have difficulty complying with a numerical dioxin/furan limit that is based on the lowest emitting dioxin/furan sources within this subcategory because there is not a demonstrated floor control technology that these sources can use to "dial in" to achieve a given emission level. Moreover, dioxin/furan emissions could result from operation under poor combustion conditions and formation on particulate matter surfaces in duct work, on heat recovery boiler tubes, and on particulates entrained in the combustion gas stream. As a result, we would instead identify floor control for these sources to be operating under good combustion practices by complying with the destruction and removal efficiency and carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon standards.

Though MACT floor for these units is operating under good combustion practices, there is a regulatory limit which is relevant in identifying the floor level. Hazardous waste incinerators are complying with an interim standard for dioxin/furan—an emission limit of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or, alternatively, 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm provided that the combustion gas temperature at the inlet to the initial particulate matter control device is limited to 400 °F or less—that fixes a level of performance for the source category. Given that all sources are meeting this interim standard and that the interim standard is judged as more stringent than a MACT floor of "good combustion practices," the dioxin/furan floor level can be no less stringent than the current regulatory limit.[87] Therefore, the proposed floor level for incinerators with either wet air pollution control systems or no air pollution control equipment that are not equipped with a heat recovery boiler is either 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm provided that the combustion gas temperature at the inlet to the initial particulate matter control device is limited to 400 °F or less. This emission level is currently being achieved by all sources because the interim standard is an enforceable standard currently in effect.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated beyond-the-floor standards based on the use of control technology which removes dioxin/furan, namely use of an activated carbon injection system or a carbon bed system as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of dioxin/furan emissions. Activated carbon is currently used at three incinerators to control dioxin/furan. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 0.10 ng TEQ/dscm for all incinerators, which represents a 65–75% reduction in dioxin/furan emissions from the floor level. We selected this level because it represents a level that is considered routinely achievable with activated carbon.[88]

For incinerators equipped with dry air pollution control equipment and/or waste heat boilers, the national incremental annualized compliance cost for these sources to meet the beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $2.2 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the floor level controls of 0.5 grams TEQ per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between activated carbon injection and carbon beds and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste generated by 1,500 tons per year in addition to using an additional 3 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these hazardous waste treatment/disposal and energy impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $4.4 million per

[84] One source uses an activated carbon injection system, and the other uses a carbon bed.

[85] We request comment, however, on whether this judgment is correct. If an incinerator is operated with a dry air pollution control device inlet temperature greater than 400 °F, then it may be appropriate to instead require sources to comply with the more stringent of the two standards, that is, 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm.

[86] Use of "good combustion practices" does not necessarily preclude significant dioxin/furan formation. Our data base suggests, however, that incinerators using wet air pollution control systems achieve dioxin/furan emissions less than 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm. *See* USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 2.

[87] Even though all sources have recently demonstrated compliance with the interim standards, the dioxin/furan data in our data base preceded the compliance demonstration.

[88] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emissions Estimates and Engineering Costs," March 2004, Chapter 4.3.

additional gram of dioxin/furan removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection and carbon bed systems.

For sources with either wet air pollution control systems or no air pollution control equipment that are not equipped with a heat recovery boiler, the national incremental annualized compliance cost for these sources to meet the beyond-the-floor level would be approximately $3.9 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.35 grams TEQ per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste generated by 700 tons per year. The option would also require sources to use an additional 2 million kW-hours per year and 70 million gallons of water beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $11 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection and carbon bed systems.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Dioxin and furan emissions for new incinerators are currently limited by § 63.1203(b)(1) to 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm. This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796, February 13, 2002).

For incinerators equipped with dry air pollution control equipment and/or waste heat boilers, the calculated floor level is 0.11 ng TEQ/dscm, which considers variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified using the Emissions Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 out of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

For sources with either wet air pollution control systems or no air pollution control equipment that are not equipped with a heat recovery boiler, as previously discussed for existing sources, we believe that it would be inappropriate to establish numerical dioxin/furan emission for these sources. We would instead identify floor control for these sources to be operating under good combustion practices by complying with the destruction and removal efficiency and carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon standards.

Though MACT floor for these units is operating under good combustion practices, there is a regulatory limit which is relevant in identifying the floor level. New hazardous waste incinerators are subject to an interim emission standard for dioxin/furan of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm. Given that the interim standard is judged more stringent than a MACT floor of "good combustion practices," the dioxin/furan floor level can be no less stringent than the current regulatory limit. Therefore, the proposed floor level for incinerators with either wet air pollution control systems or no air pollution control equipment that are not equipped with a heat recovery boiler is 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm. Therefore, we are proposing the current interim standard of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm as the floor level for new sources.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated beyond-the-floor standards based on the use of a carbon bed system to achieve additional removal of dioxin/furan. Given the relatively low dioxin/furan levels at the floor, we made a conservative assumption that the use of a carbon bed will provide an additional 50% dioxin/furan control. We applied this removal efficiency to the dioxin/furan floor levels to identify the beyond-the-floor levels.

For a new incinerator with average gas flowrate equipped with dry air pollution control equipment and/or a waste heat boiler, the national incremental annualized compliance cost to meet the beyond-the-floor level of 0.06 ng TEQ/dscm rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.22 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the floor level controls of 0.013 grams TEQ per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $17 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon bed systems.

For a source with either a wet air pollution control system or no air pollution control equipment that is not equipped with a heat recovery boiler, the national incremental annualized compliance cost for a new incinerator with an average gas flowrate to meet a beyond-the-floor level of 0.10 ng TEQ/dscm would be approximately $0.22 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.024 grams TEQ per year. Considering the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects in addition to costs of approximately $9.3 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on a carbon bed system.

B. What Are the Proposed Standards for Mercury?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new incinerators that limit emissions of mercury to 130 µg/dscm and 8 µg/dscm, respectively.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Mercury emissions for existing incinerators are currently limited to 130 µg/dscm by § 63.1203(a)(2). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796).

We have both normal and compliance test emissions data for over 50 sources. For several sources, we have emissions data from more than one test campaign. The mercury stack emissions in our data base range from less than 1 to 35,000 µg/dscm, which are expressed as mass of mercury per unit volume of stack gas.

To identify the floor level, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 610 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. Even though all sources have recently demonstrated compliance with the interim standard of 130 µg/dscm, all the mercury emissions data in our data base precede initial compliance with these interim standards. As a result, the calculated floor level of 610 µg/dscm is less stringent than the interim standard, which is a regulatory limit relevant in identifying the floor level (so as to avoid any backsliding from a current level of performance achieved by all incinerators, and hence, the level of minimal stringency at which EPA could calculate the MACT floor). Therefore, we are proposing the floor level as the current emission standard of 130 µg/dscm. This emission level is currently being achieved by all sources.

We invite comment on an alternative approach to identify the floor level using available normal emissions data instead of the compliance test data. For reasons we discussed above in Part Two, our floor-setting methodology favors compliance test data over normal emissions data. However, there are available more mercury emissions data

characterized as normal—over 40 test conditions—than the eleven compliance test results. Given that the data base includes considerably more normal emissions than compliance test data, we invite comment on whether the floor analysis should be based on the normal emissions data instead of the compliance test data. The floor level considering the normal data using the Emissions Approach is 7.8 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. If we were to adopt such an approach, we would require sources to comply with the limit on an annual basis because the floor analysis is based on normal emissions data. Under this approach, compliance would not be based on the use of a total mercury continuous emissions monitoring system because these monitors have not been adequately demonstrated as a reliable compliance assurance tool at all types of incinerator sources. Instead, a source would maintain compliance with the mercury standard by establishing and complying with short-term limits on operating parameters for pollution control equipment and annual limits on maximum total mercury feedrate in all feedstreams.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of mercury: (1) Activated carbon injection; and (2) control of mercury in the hazardous waste feed.

Use of Activated Carbon Injection. We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of mercury emissions. Activated carbon injection is currently being used at three incinerators and has been demonstrated for controlling mercury and has achieved efficiencies ranging from 80% to greater than 90% depending on various factors such as injection rate, mercury speciation in the flue gas, flue gas temperature, and carbon type. Given the limited experience at hazardous waste combustion systems, we made a conservative assumption that the use of activated carbon will provide 70% mercury control. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 39 µg/dscm.

The national incremental annualized compliance cost for incinerators to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $7.1 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.39 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between activated carbon injection and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste generated by 1,800 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 5.8 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these hazardous waste treatment/disposal and energy impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $18 million per additional ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection.

Feed Control of Mercury in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 100 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level that represents the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of mercury in hazardous waste (beyond feedrate control that may be necessary to achieve the floor level) can be used and still achieve modest emissions reductions.[89] The national incremental annualized compliance cost for incinerators to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $1.8 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.11 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $17 million per additional ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of mercury in the hazardous waste.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose a mercury emissions standard of 130 µg/dscm for existing incinerators.

[89] Ideally, a methodology to estimate costs of feed control should consider lost revenues associated with hazardous wastes not fired and costs to implement feed control of metals and chlorine. We attempted to conduct such an analysis; however, we concluded that there are too many uncertainties to do this analysis. Instead, we developed an alternative approach to cost feed control of metals and chlorine in the hazardous waste based on the assumption that a source would not implement a feed control strategy if the costs exceed the costs to retrofit an existing air pollution control device. Thus, our cost estimates of feed control represent an upper bound estimate on likely costs to control metals or chlorine in hazardous waste. See USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emission Estimates and Engineering Costs," March 2004, Chapter 4.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Mercury emissions from new incinerators are currently limited to 45 µg/dscm by § 63.1203(b)(2). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796).

The MACT floor for new sources for mercury would be 8 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach considering compliance test data could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

As we did for existing sources, we also invite comment on basing the floor analysis on the normal emissions data using the Emissions Approach. The floor level using the normal data is 0.70 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. If we were to adopt such an approach, we would require sources to comply with the limit on an annual basis because it is based on normal emissions data.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of mercury: (1) Use of a carbon bed; and (2) control of mercury in the hazardous waste feed.

Carbon Bed System. We evaluated a carbon bed system as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of mercury emissions. Given the relatively low floor level, we made a conservative assumption that the use of a carbon bed system would provide 50% mercury control. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new incinerator with average gas flow rate to meet a beyond-the-floor level of 4 µg/dscm, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.22 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions of approximately 2.1 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $200 million per additional ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on a carbon bed system.

Feed Control of Mercury in the Hazardous Waste. We also believe that the expense for a reduction in mercury emissions based on further control of mercury concentrations in the

hazardous waste is not warranted. A beyond-the-floor level of 6.4 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level, would result in a small incremental reduction in mercury emissions. For similar reasons discussed above for existing sources, we likewise conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the mercury in the hazardous waste feed would not be justified because of the costs and emission reductions. Therefore, we propose a mercury standard of 8 µg/dscm for new sources.

C. What Are the Proposed Standards for Particulate Matter?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new incinerators that limit emissions of particulate matter to 0.015 and 0.00070 gr/dscf, respectively.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Particulate matter emissions for existing incinerators are currently limited to 0.015 gr/dscf (34 mg/dscm) by § 63.1203(a)(7). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6796). The particulate matter standard is a surrogate control for the hazardous air pollutant metals antimony, cobalt, manganese, nickel, and selenium.

We have compliance test emissions data for most incinerators. For some sources, we have compliance test emissions data from more than one compliance test campaign. Our data base of particulate matter stack emission concentrations range from 0.0002 to 0.078 gr/dscf.

To identify the MACT floor for incinerators, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the Air Pollution Control Technology Approach. The calculated floor is 0.020 gr/dscf (46 mg/dscm), which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. The calculated floor level of 0.020 gr/dscf is less stringent than the interim standard of 0.015 gr/dscf, which is a regulatory limit relevant in identifying the floor level (so as to avoid any backsliding from a current level of performance achieved by all incinerators, and hence, the level of minimal stringency at which EPA could calculate the MACT floor). Therefore, we are proposing the floor level as the current emission standard of 0.015 gr/dscf. This emission level is currently being achieved by all sources.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated improved particulate matter control to achieve a beyond-the-floor standard of 17 mg/dscm (0.0075 gr/dscf). For an existing incinerator that needs a significant reduction in particulate matter emissions, we assumed and costed a new baghouse to achieve the beyond-the-floor level. If little or modest emissions reductions were needed, then improved control was costed as design, operation, and maintenance modifications of the existing particulate matter control equipment.

The national incremental annualized compliance cost for incinerators to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $3.9 million and would provide an incremental reduction in particulate matter emissions beyond the MACT floor of 48 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the nonair quality health and environmental impacts between further improvements to control particulate matter and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste generated by 48 tons per year and would also require sources to use an additional 2.7 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $81,000 per additional ton of particulate matter removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Particulate matter emissions from new incinerators are currently limited to 0.015 gr/dscf (34 mg/dscm) by § 63.1203(b)(7). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6796).

The MACT floor for new sources for particulate matter would be 1.6 mg/dscm (0.00070 gr/dscf), which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the Air Pollution Control Technology Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

As discussed in Part Two, Section II, we considered whether to propose separate standards (subcategorize) for particulate matter for several different potential subcategories such as government-owned versus non-government incinerators and liquid injection versus solid fuel-fired incinerators. We determined that the emission characteristics from these potential subcategories are not statistically different, and, therefore, separate standards for particulate matter are not warranted. We request comment on whether these subcategorization considerations capture the appropriate differences in manufacturing process, emission characteristics, or technical feasibility for particulate matter. We note, for example, the single best performing source, which is the basis of the floor level for new incinerators, is an incinerator used to decontaminate scrap metal. Though we believe these sources are best performers because they use highly efficient baghouses for the capture of particulate matter, and, therefore, appropriate for inclusion in the analysis, we invite comment on whether we have considered the appropriate subcategories for particulate matter. We note that a floor level based on the second best performing incinerator source would be 0.0021 gr/dscf.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated improved emissions control based on a state-of-the-art baghouse using a high quality fabric filter bag material to achieve a beyond-the-floor standard of 1.2 mg/dscm (0.0005 gr/dscf). The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new incinerator to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $80,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in particulate matter emissions of approximately 0.15 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated and are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. We estimate that this option would require a new source to use an additional 0.2 million kW-hours per year. For these reasons and a cost-effectiveness of $0.53 million per ton of particulate matter removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control for new incinerators. Therefore, we propose a particulate

matter standard of 1.6 mg/dscm for new sources.

D. What Are the Proposed Standards for Semivolatile Metals?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new incinerators that limit emissions of semivolatile metals (cadmium and lead) to 59 ug/dscm and 6.5 ug/dscm, respectively.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Semivolatile metals emissions from existing incinerators are currently limited to 240 ug/dscm by § 63.1203(a)(3). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796). Incinerators control emissions of semivolatile metals with air pollution control equipment and/or by controlling the feed concentration of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste.

We have compliance test emissions data for nearly 30 incinerators. Semivolatile metal stack emissions range from approximately 4 to 29,000 ug/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of semivolatile metals per unit volume of stack gas. Lead was usually the most significant contributor to semivolatile emissions during compliance test conditions.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 59 ug/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 52% of sources. The floor level would reduce semivolatile metals emissions by 0.43 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of semivolatile metals: (1) Improved particulate matter control; and (2) control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of semivolatile metals. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 30 µg/dscm, which is a 50% reduction from the floor level, based on additional reductions of particulate matter emissions by operating and maintaining existing control equipment to have improved collection efficiency. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for incinerators to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $3.0 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 190 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between further improvements to control particulate matter and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste generated by 50 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 3.4 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these hazardous waste treatment and energy impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $31 million per additional ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 47 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level that represents the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste can be used and still achieve modest emissions reductions. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for incinerators to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $1.7 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor of 90 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated and are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. For these reasons and costs of approximately $39 million per additional ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for existing incinerators at 59 µg/dscm.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Semivolatile metals emissions from new incinerators are currently limited to 120 µg/dscm by § 63.1203(b)(3). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796).

The MACT floor for new sources for semivolatile metals would be 6.5 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of semivolatile metals: (1) Improved control of particulate matter; and (2) control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. We evaluated a standard of 3.3 µg/dscm, which is a 50% reduction from the floor level, based on a state-of-the-art baghouse using a high quality fabric filter bag material as beyond-the-floor control for further reductions in semivolatile metals emissions. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new incinerator with an average gas flow rate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $80,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions of approximately 2 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. We estimate that this option would require a new source to use an additional 0.2 million kW-hours per year. For these reasons and costs of $94 million per ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control for new sources.

Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also believe that the expense for a reduction in semivolatile metals emissions based on further control of semivolatile metals concentrations in the hazardous waste is not warranted. A beyond-the-floor level of 5.2 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level, would result in little additional semivolatile metals reductions. For similar reasons discussed above for existing sources, we

judge that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed would not be justified because of the costs and expected emission reductions. Therefore, we propose a semivolatile metals standard of 6.5 µg/dscm for new sources.

E. What Are the Proposed Standards for Low Volatile Metals?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new incinerators that limit emissions of low volatile metals (arsenic, beryllium, and chromium) to 84 µg/dscm and 8.9 µg/dscm, respectively.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Low volatile metals emissions from existing incinerators are currently limited to 97 µg/dscm by § 63.1203(a)(4). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796). Incinerators control emissions of low volatile metals with air pollution control equipment and/or by controlling the feed concentration of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste.

We have compliance test emissions data for nearly 30 incinerators. Low volatile metal stack emissions range from approximately 1 to 4,300 µg/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of low volatile metals per unit volume of stack gas.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 84 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 85% of sources and would reduce low volatile metals emissions by 56 pounds per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of low volatile metals: (1) Improved particulate matter control; and (2) control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste feed.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of low volatile metals. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 42 µg/dscm, which is a 50% reduction from the floor level, based on additional reductions of particulate matter emissions by operating and maintaining existing control equipment to have improved collection efficiency. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for incinerators to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.88 million and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 365 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between further improvements to control particulate matter and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste generated by 100 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 0.7 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $4.8 million per additional ton of low volatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 67 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level that represents the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste can be used and still achieve modest emissions reductions. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for incinerators to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.25 million and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.11 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated and are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $2.2 million per additional ton of low volatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for existing incinerators at 84 µg/dscm.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Low volatile metal emissions from new incinerators are currently limited to 97 µg/dscm by § 63.1203(b)(4). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796).

The MACT floor for new sources for low volatile metals would be 8.9 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of low volatile metals: (1) Improved control of particulate matter; and (2) control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste feed.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. We evaluated a standard of 4.5 µg/dscm, which is a 50% reduction from the floor level, based on a state-of-the-art baghouse using a high quality fabric filter bag material as beyond-the-floor control for further reductions in low volatile metals emissions. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new incinerator with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $80,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions of approximately 2.3 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. For these reasons and costs of $69 million per ton of low volatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control for new sources.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also believe that the expense associated with a reduction in low volatile metals emissions based on further control of low volatile metals concentrations in the hazardous waste is not warranted. A beyond-the-floor level of 7.1 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level, would result in little additional low volatile metals reductions. For similar reasons discussed above for existing sources, we

judge that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the low volatile metals in the hazardous waste feed would not be cost-effective or otherwise appropriate. Therefore, we propose a low volatile metals standard of 8.9 µg/dscm for new sources.

F. What Are the Proposed Standards for Hydrogen Chloride and Chlorine Gas?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new incinerators that limit total chlorine emissions (hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, combined, reported as a chloride equivalent) to 1.5 and 0.18 ppmv, respectively. However, we are also proposing to establish alternative risk-based standards, pursuant to CAA section 112(d)(4), which a source could elect to comply with by in lieu of the MACT emission standards for total chlorine. The emission limits would be based on national exposure standards that ensure protection of public health with an ample margin of safety. *See* Part Two, Section XIII for additional details.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Total chlorine emissions from existing incinerators are limited to 77 ppmv by § 63.1203(a)(6). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796). Incinerators control emissions of total chlorine with air pollution control equipment and/or by controlling the feed concentration of chlorine in the hazardous waste.

We have compliance test emissions data for most incinerators. Total chlorine emissions range from less than 1 ppmv to 460 ppmv.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 1.5 ppmv, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the best performing feed control sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 11% of sources and reductions to the floor level would reduce total chlorine emissions by 286 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of total chlorine: (1) Improved control with wet scrubbing; and (2) control of chlorine in the hazardous waste feed.

Use of Wet Scrubbing. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 0.8 ppmv based on improved wet scrubbers that would include increasing the liquid to gas ratio, increasing the liquor pH, and replacing the existing packing material with new more efficient packing material. We made a conservative assumption that an improved wet scrubber will provide 50% total chlorine control beyond the controls needed to achieve the floor level given the low total chlorine levels at the floor. Applying this wet scrubbing removal efficiency to the total chlorine floor level of 1.5 ppmv leads to a beyond-the-floor level 0.8 ppmv. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for incinerators to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $1.7 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 6 tons per year. We also evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects between improved wet scrubbers and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of waste water generated by 270 million gallons per year. The option would also require sources to use an additional 3.2 million kW-hours per year and 270 million gallons of water beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $0.29 million per additional ton of total chlorine removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved wet scrubbing.

Feed Control of Chlorine in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 1.2 ppmv, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level that represents the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of chlorine in hazardous waste can be used and still achieve appreciable emissions reductions. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for incinerators to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.69 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 2.5 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated and are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $0.28 million per additional ton of total chlorine removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of chlorine in the hazardous waste.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for existing incinerators at 1.5 ppmv.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Total chlorine emissions from incinerators are currently limited to 21 ppmv by § 63.1203(b)(6). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796). The MACT floor for new sources for total chlorine would be 0.18 ppmv, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified similar potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of total chlorine for new sources: (1) Use of improved wet scrubbers; and (2) control of chlorine in the hazardous waste feed.

Use of Wet Scrubbing. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 0.1 ppmv using wet scrubbers as beyond-the-floor control for further reductions in total chlorine emissions. We made a conservative assumption that an improved wet scrubber will provide 50% total chlorine reductions beyond the controls needed to achieve the floor level given the low total chlorine levels at the floor. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new incinerator with an average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.2 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions of approximately 35 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. We estimate that this option would increase the amount of wastewater generated by 50 million gallons per year and would require a new source to use an additional 0.5 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. For these reasons and

costs of $12 million per ton of chlorine removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved wet scrubbing control for new sources.

Feed Control of Chlorine in the Hazardous Waste. We also believe that the expense associated with a reduction in chlorine emissions based on further control of chlorine concentrations in the hazardous waste is not warranted. We considered a beyond-the-floor level of 0.14 ppmv, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. For similar reasons discussed above for existing sources, we judge that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the chlorine in the hazardous waste feed would not be cost-effective or otherwise appropriate. Therefore, we propose a chlorine standard of 0.18 ppmv for new sources.

G. What Are the Standards for Hydrocarbons and Carbon Monoxide?

Hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide standards are surrogates to control emissions of organic hazardous air pollutants for existing and new incinerators. The standards limit hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide concentrations to 10 ppmv or 100 ppmv. *See* §§ 63.1203(a)(5) and (b)(5). Existing and new incinerators can elect to comply with either the hydrocarbon limit or the carbon monoxide limit on a continuous basis. Sources that comply with the carbon monoxide limit on a continuous basis must also demonstrate compliance with the hydrocarbon standard during the comprehensive performance test. However, continuous hydrocarbon monitoring following the performance test is not required. The rationale for these decisions are discussed in the September 1999 final rule (64 FR at 52900). We view the standards for hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide as unaffected by the Court's vacature of the challenged regulations in its decision of July 24, 2001. We therefore are not proposing these standards for incinerators, but rather are mentioning them here for the reader's convenience.

H. What Are the Standards for Destruction and Removal Efficiency?

The destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) standard is a surrogate to control emissions of organic hazardous air pollutants other than dioxin/furans. The standard for existing and new incinerators requires 99.99% DRE for each principal organic hazardous constituent, except that 99.9999% DRE is required if specified dioxin-listed hazardous wastes are burned. *See* §§ 63.1203(c). The rationale for these decisions are discussed in the September 1999 final rule (64 FR at 52902). We view the standards for DRE as unaffected by the Court's vacature of the challenged regulations in its decision of July 24, 2001. We therefore are not proposing these standards for incinerators, but rather are mentioning them here for the reader's convenience.

VIII. How Did EPA Determine the Proposed Emission Standards for Hazardous Waste Burning Cement Kilns?

In this section, the basis for the proposed emission standards is discussed. *See* proposed § 63.1220 The proposed emission limits apply to the kiln stack gases, in-line kiln raw mill stack gases if combustion gases pass through the in-line raw mill, and kiln alkali bypass stack gases if discharged through a separate stack.[90] The proposed standards for existing and new cement kilns that burn hazardous waste are summarized in the table below:

PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR EXISTING AND NEW CEMENT KILNS

Hazardous air pollutant or surrogate	Emission standard [1]	
	Existing sources	New sources
Dioxin and furan [1]	0.20 ng TEQ/dscm; or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400°F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device.	
Mercury [2]	64 ug/dscm	35 ug/dscm.
Particulate Matter	65 mg/dscm (0.028 gr/dscf)	13 mg/dscm (0.0058 gr/dscf).
Semivolatile metals [3]	4.0×10^{-4} lb/MMBtu	6.2×10^{-5} lb/MMBtu.
Low volatile metals [3]	1.4×10^{-5} lb/MMBtu	1.4×10^{-5} lb/MMBtu.
Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas [4]	110 ppmv or the alternative emission limits under § 63.1215.	78 ppmv or the alternative emission limits under § 63.1215.
Hydrocarbons: kilns without bypass [5, 6]	20 ppmv (or 100 ppmv carbon monoxide) [5]	Greenfield kilns: 20 ppmv (or 100 ppmv carbon monoxide and 50 ppmv [7] hydrocarbons). All others: 20 ppmv (or 100 ppmv carbon monoxide) [5].
Hydrocarbons: kilns with bypass; main stack [6, 8]	No main stack standard	50 ppmv [7].
Hydrocarbons: kilns with bypass; bypass duct and stack [5, 6, 8].	10 ppmv (or 100 ppmv carbon monoxide)	10 ppmv (or 100 ppmv carbon monoxide).
Destruction and removal efficiency	For existing and new sources, 99.99% for each principal organic hazardous constituent (POHC). For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, 99.9999% for each POHC.	

[1] All emission standards are corrected to 7% oxygen, dry basis. If there is a separate alkali bypass stack, then both the alkali bypass and main stack emissions must be less than the emission standard.

[2] Mercury standard is an annual limit.

[3] Standards are expressed as mass of pollutant stack emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input of the hazardous waste.

[4] Combined standard, reported as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent.

[5] Sources that elect to comply with the carbon monoxide standard must demonstrate compliance with the hydrocarbon standard during the comprehensive performance test.

[6] Hourly rolling average. Hydrocarbons reported as propane.

[90] Currently, we are not aware of any preheater/precalciner kiln that vents its alkali bypass gases through a separate stack.

[7] Applicable only to newly-constructed cement kilns at greenfield sites (*see* 64 FR at 52885). The 50 ppmv standard is a 30-day block average limit.

[8] Measurement made in the bypass sampling system of any kiln (*e.g.*, alkali bypass of a preheater/precalciner kiln; midkiln gas sampling system of a long kiln).

A. What Are the Proposed Standards for Dioxin and Furan?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new cement kilns that limit emissions of dioxin and furans to either 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400°F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Dioxin and furan emissions for existing cement kilns are currently limited by § 63.1204(a)(1) to 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400°F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device. This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796, February 13, 2002).

Since promulgation of the 1999 final rule, we have obtained additional dioxin/furan emissions data. We now have compliance test emissions data for all but one cement kiln that burns hazardous waste. The compliance test dioxin/furan emissions in our data base range from approximately 0.004 to 20 ng TEQ/dscm.[91] Cement kilns control dioxin by quenching kiln gas temperatures so that gas temperatures at the inlet to the particulate matter control device are below the range of optimum dioxin/furan formation.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the Emissions Approach described in Part Two, Section VI.C above. The calculated floor is 0.22 ng TEQ/dscm, which considers emissions variability. These best performing sources controlled inlet temperatures to the particulate matter control device from 380°–475°F. Although some best performing sources had inlet temperatures to the particulate matter control device within the optimum temperature range (*i.e.*, >400°F) for formation of dioxin/furan, their emissions were lower than other non-best performing sources. Our data base shows that these other non-best performing sources, when operating within a temperature range up to 475°F, had emissions of dioxin/furan as high as 1.2 ng TEQ/dscm. We cannot explain why some sources emit dioxin/furan at significantly lower levels than other sources operating at similar control device inlet temperatures. As noted earlier, there are many uncertainties and imperfectly understood complexities relating to dioxin/furan formation.

The data generally support the relationship between inlet temperature to the particulate matter control device and dioxin/furan emissions: When inlet temperatures are below the optimum range of formation, dioxin/furan emissions are lower. However, the converse may not hold: When inlet temperatures are within the optimum range of formation, dioxin/furan emissions may or may not be higher (but in most cases are higher). Moreover, we are concerned that a floor level of 0.22 ng TEQ/dscm is not replicable by all sources using temperature control because we have emissions data from sources operating below the optimum temperature range of dioxin/furan formation that is higher than the calculated floor level of 0.22 ng TEQ/dscm. As a result of this concern, we would identify the floor level as 0.22 ng TEQ/dscm or controlling the inlet temperature to the particulate matter control device.

Allowing a source to comply with a temperature limit alone, however, absent a numerical dioxin/furan emission limit, is less stringent than the current interim standard of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm, or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400°F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device. The current interim standard is a regulatory limit that is relevant in identifying the floor level because it fixes a level of performance for the source category. Given that all sources are achieving this interim standard and that the interim standard is judged as more stringent than the calculated MACT floor, the dioxin/furan floor level can be no less stringent than the current regulatory limit. We are, therefore, proposing the dioxin/furan floor level as 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400°F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device. This emission level is being achieved by all sources because it is the current required interim standard.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of dioxin/furan emissions. Activated carbon has been demonstrated for controlling dioxin/furans in various combustion applications. However, currently no cement kiln that burns hazardous waste uses activated carbon injection. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 0.10 ng TEQ/dscm, which represents a 75% reduction in dioxin/furan emissions from the floor level. We selected this level because it represents a level that is considered routinely achievable with activated carbon injection. In addition, we assumed for costing purposes that cement kilns needing activated carbon injection to achieve the beyond-the-floor level would install the activated carbon injection system after the existing particulate matter control device and add a new, smaller baghouse to remove the injected carbon with the adsorbed dioxin/furan. We chose this costing approach to address potential concerns that injected carbon may interfere with cement kiln dust recycling practices.

The national incremental annualized compliance cost for cement kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $21 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 3.4 grams TEQ per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between activated carbon injection and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste[92] generated by 7,800 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 2.6 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $6.2 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan removed, we are not proposing a

[91] Even though all sources have recently demonstrated compliance with the interim standards, the dioxin/furan data in our data base preceded the compliance demonstration. This explains why we have emissions data that are higher than the interim standard.

[92] Under the exemption from hazardous waste status in § 261.4(b)(8), cement kiln dust is not currently classified as a hazardous waste.

beyond-the-floor standard based on use of activated carbon injection.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Dioxin and furan emissions for new cement kilns are currently limited by § 63.1204(b)(1) to either 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400°F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device. This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796).

The calculated MACT floor for new sources would be 0.21 ng TEQ/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified by the Emissions Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. As discussed for existing sources, we are concerned that a floor level of 0.21 ng TEQ/dscm would not be reproducible by all sources using temperature control because we have emissions data from sources operating below the optimum temperature range of dioxin/furan formation that is higher than the calculated floor level of 0.21 ng TEQ/dscm. As a result of this concern, we would identify the MACT floor as 0.21 ng TEQ/dscm or controlling the inlet temperature to the particulate matter control device.

Allowing a source to comply with a temperature limit alone, however, absent a numerical dioxin/furan emission limit, is less stringent than the current interim standard of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm, or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400°F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device. The current interim standard is a regulatory limit that is relevant in identifying the floor level because it fixes a level of performance for new cement kilns. Given that all sources are achieving this interim standard and that the interim standard is judged as more stringent than the calculated MACT floor, the dioxin/furan floor level can be no less stringent than the current regulatory limit. We are, therefore, proposing the dioxin/furan floor level as 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400°F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of dioxin/furan emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 0.10 ng TEQ/dscm, which represents a 75% reduction in dioxin/furan emissions from the floor level. We selected this level because it represents a level that is considered routinely achievable with activated carbon injection. In addition, we assumed for costing purposes that a new cement kiln will install the activated carbon injection system after the existing particulate matter control device and add a new, smaller baghouse to remove the injected carbon with the adsorbed dioxin/furan. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new cement kiln to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $1.0 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions of approximately 0.17 grams TEQ per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $5.8 million per gram of dioxin/furan removed. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were not significant factors. For these reasons, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection for new cement kilns. Therefore, we are proposing the standard as 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm or control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400°F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device.

B. What Are the Proposed Standards for Mercury?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new cement kilns that limit emissions of mercury to 64 and 35 µg/dscm, respectively. If we were to adopt these standards, then sources would comply with the limit on an annual basis because the standards are based on normal emissions data.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Mercury emissions for existing cement kilns are currently limited to 120 µg/dscm by § 63.1204(a)(2).[93] This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6796). None of the cement kilns burning hazardous waste use a dedicated control device to remove mercury from the gas stream; however, kilns control the feed concentration of mercury in the hazardous waste.

We have emissions data for all sources. All of these data are best classified as from normal operations, although, as explained below, there is a substantial range within these data. For most sources, we have normal emissions data from more than one test campaign. The normal mercury stack emissions in our data base range from less than 2 to 118 µg/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of mercury (from all feedstocks) per unit volume of stack gas.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated all normal emissions data using the SRE/Feed Approach. We considered normal emissions data from all test campaigns.[94] For example, one source in our data base has normal emissions data for three different testing campaigns: 1992, 1995, and 1998. Under this approach we would consider the emissions data from the three separate years or campaigns. We believe this approach better captures the range of average emissions for a source than only considering the most recent normal emissions. Given that no cement kilns burning hazardous waste use a control device which captures mercury from the flue gas stream, for purposes of this analysis we assumed all sources achieved a SRE of zero. The effect of this assumption is that the sources with the lowest mercury concentrations in the hazardous waste were identified as the best performing sources.

The calculated floor is 64 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability, based on a hazardous waste maximum theoretical emissions concentration (MTEC) of 26 µg/dscm. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 59% of sources and would reduce mercury emissions by 0.23 tons per year. If we were to adopt such a floor level, we are proposing that sources comply with the limit on an annual basis because it is based on normal emissions data. Under this approach,

[93] An alternative mercury standard is available for existing cement kilns whereby a source can elect to comply with a hazardous waste maximum theoretical emissions concentration or MTEC of mercury of 120 µg/dscm. MTEC is a term to compare metals and chlorine feedrates across sources of different sizes. MTEC is defined as the metals or chlorine feedrate divided by the gas flow rate and is expressed in units of µg/dscm.

[94] Given that we only have normal feedrate and emissions data for mercury for cement kilns, we do not believe it is appropriate to establish a hazardous waste thermal emissions-based standard. We prefer to establish emission standards under the hazardous waste thermal emissions format using compliance test data because the metals feedrate information from compliance tests that we use to apportion emissions to calculate emissions attributable to hazardous waste are more reliable than feedrate data measured during testing under normal, typical operations.

compliance would not be based on the use of a total mercury continuous emissions monitoring system because these monitors have not been adequately demonstrated as a reliable compliance assurance tool at cement kiln sources. Instead, a source would maintain compliance with the mercury standard by establishing and complying with short-term limits on operating parameters for pollution control equipment and annual limits on maximum total mercury feedrate in all feedstreams.

We did not use the stack emissions data of preheater/precalciner kilns in the floor analysis because we believe the mercury emissions are biased low when the in-line raw mill is on-line and biased high when the in-line raw mill is off-line. (*See* earlier discussion on why we are proposing not to subcategorize hazardous waste burning cement kilns for mercury between wet process kilns and preheater/precalciner kilns with in-line raw mills.) For either case, we believe the normal mercury data are not representative of average emissions and, therefore, not appropriate to include in the floor analysis. We request comment on this data handling decision.

In the September 1999 final rule, we acknowledged that a cement kiln using properly designed and operated MACT control technologies, including controlling the levels of metals in the hazardous waste, may not be capable of achieving a given emission standard because of mineral and process raw material contributions that might cause an exceedance of the emission standard. To address this concern, we promulgated a provision that allows kilns to petition for alternative standards provided they submit site-specific information that shows raw material hazardous air pollutant contributions to the emissions prevent the source from complying with the emission standard even though the kiln is using MACT control. *See* § 63.1206(b)(10).

Today's proposed floor of 64 µg/dscm, which was based on a hazardous waste MTEC of 26 µg/dscm, may likewise necessitate such an alternative because contributions of mercury in the raw materials and fossil fuels at some sources may cause an exceedance of the emission standard. The Agency intends to retain a source's ability to comply with an alternative standard, and we request comment on two approaches to accomplish this. The first approach would be to structure the alternative standard similar to the petitioning process used under § 63.1206(b)(10). In the case of mercury for an existing cement kiln, MACT would be defined as a hazardous waste feedrate corresponding to an MTEC of 26 µg/dscm. If we were to adopt this approach, we would require sources, upon approval of the petition by the Administrator, to comply with this hazardous waste MTEC on an annual basis because it is based on normal emissions data. Under the second approach, we would structure the alternative standard similar to the framework used for the alternative interim standards for mercury under § 63.1206(b)(15). The operating requirement would be an annual MTEC not to exceed 26 µg/dscm. We also request comment on whether there are other approaches that would more appropriately provide relief to sources that cannot achieve a total stack gas concentration standard because of emissions attributable to raw material and nonhazardous waste fuels.

In June 2003, the Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition (CKRC)[95] submitted to EPA information on actual mercury concentrations in the hazardous waste burn tanks of all 14 cement facilities for a three year period covering 1999 to 2001. In general, the information shows the mercury concentration (in parts per million) in the hazardous waste for each burn tank.[96] In total, approximately 20,000 mercury burn tank concentration data points are included in CKRC's submission.[97] The data show that approximately 50% of the individual burn tank measurements are 0.6 ppmw or less, 75% are less than 1.1 ppmw, 88% are less than 2 ppmw, and 97% of all burn tank measurements are less than 5 ppmw. For a hypothetical wet process cement kiln that gets 50% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a hazardous waste with a mercury concentration of 0.6 ppmw equates approximately to an uncontrolled (*i.e.*, a system removal efficiency of zero) stack gas concentration of 24 µg/dscm. This estimated stack gas concentration, of course, does not include contributions to emissions from other mercury-containing feedstocks including raw materials and fossil fuels. Mercury concentrations of 1.1, 2, and 5 ppmw in the hazardous waste equate to uncontrolled stack gas concentrations of approximately 43, 79, and 196 µg/dscm.[98]

We compared the concentration of mercury in the hazardous waste associated with the normal emissions data in our data base to the 3-year historical burn tank concentration data to estimate whether the normal data in our data base—the basis of today's proposed floor of 64 µg/dscm—are likely to represent the high end, low end, or close to average emissions. Mercury feed concentration information is not available for every test condition; however, the mercury concentrations in the hazardous waste burned by the best performing sources during the tests that generated the normal emissions ranged from 0.1 to 0.44 ppmw. For the best performing sources comprising the MACT pool for which we can make a comparison, it appears that the normal concentrations in the hazardous waste during testing represent the low end (15th percentile or less) of average mercury concentrations. We invite comment on whether the normal emissions data in our data base are representative of average emissions in practice and whether evaluating the data to identify a floor level is appropriate.

In addition, we request comment on how to identify a floor level using the 3-year hazardous waste mercury concentration data. One potential approach would be to establish a hazardous waste feed concentration standard expressed in ppmw. To identify a floor level expressed as a hazardous waste feed concentration in ppmw, we identified and evaluated the 3-year historical burn tank concentration data of the five best performing facilities (those sources with the lowest mean concentration considering variability). The calculated alternative floor level is 2.2 ppmw in the hazardous waste. To put this in context for a hypothetical wet process cement kiln that gets 50% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a mercury concentration of 2.2 ppmw in the hazardous waste equates approximately to an uncontrolled stack gas concentration of 86 µg/dscm.[99] This

[95] Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition is a trade organization that represents cement companies that burn hazardous wastes as a fuel. CKRC also represents companies that manage and market hazardous waste fuels used in cement kilns.

[96] For two cement facilities, the mercury concentration data are only available on a monthly-averaged basis.

[97] Data from three of the facilities had a significant number of individual measurements reported as not detectable and also had relatively high analysis detection limits (compared to levels achieved by other cement plants). The detection limit for most cement kilns was typically 0.1 ppm or less. For purposes of today's preamble discussion, the measurements from these three cement plants are excluded from the data characterization conclusions.

[98] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 23.

[99] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume

Continued

estimated stack gas concentration, of course, does not include contributions to emissions from other mercury-containing feedstocks such as raw materials and fossil fuels. If we were to adopt such an approach, we would require sources to comply with the feed concentration standard on a short term basis (*e.g.*, 12 hour average).

We also invite comment on whether we should judge an annual limit of 64 µg/dscm as less stringent than either the current emission standard of 120 µg/dscm or the hazardous waste MTEC of mercury of 120 µg/dscm for cement kilns (so as to avoid any backsliding from a current level of performance achieved by all sources, and hence, the level of minimal stringency at which EPA could calculate the MACT floor). In order to comply with the current emission standard, generally a source must conduct manual stack sampling to demonstrate compliance with the mercury emission standard and then establish a maximum mercury feedrate limit based on operations during the performance test. Following the performance test, the source complies with a limit on the maximum total mercury feedrate in all feedstreams on a 12-hour rolling average (not an annual average). Alternatively, a source can elect to comply with a hazardous waste MTEC of mercury of 120 µg/dscm that would require the source to limit the mercury feedrate in the hazardous waste on a 12-hour rolling average. The floor level of 64 µg/dscm proposed today would allow a source to feed more variable mercury-containing feedstreams (*e.g.*, a hazardous waste with an mercury MTEC greater than 120 µg/dscm) than the current 12-hour rolling average because today's proposed floor level is an annual limit. For example, we estimated a hazardous waste MTEC for each burn tank measurement associated with the 3-year historical concentration data submitted by CKRC. We found that approximately 5% of burn tank measurements would exceed a hazardous waste MTEC of 120 µg/dscm, including sources upon which the proposed floor is based.[100]

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of mercury: (1) Activated carbon injection; (2) control of mercury in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of mercury in the raw materials and auxiliary fuels. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for mercury.

Use of Activated Carbon Injection. We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of mercury emissions. Activated carbon has been demonstrated for controlling mercury in several combustion applications; however, currently no cement kiln that burns hazardous waste uses activated carbon injection. Given this lack of experience using activated carbon injection, we made a conservative assumption that the use of activated carbon injection will provide 70% mercury control and evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 19 µg/dscm. In addition, for costing purposes we assumed that cement kilns needing activated carbon injection to achieve the beyond-the-floor level would install the activated carbon injection system after the existing particulate matter control device and add a new, smaller baghouse to remove the injected carbon with the adsorbed mercury. We chose this costing approach to address potential concerns that injected carbon may interfere with cement kiln dust recycling practices.

The national incremental annualized compliance cost for cement kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $16.8 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.41 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between activated carbon injection and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 4,400 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 21 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $41 million per additional ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection.

Feed Control of Mercury in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 51 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level representing the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of mercury in hazardous waste (beyond feedrate control that may be necessary to achieve the floor level) can be used and still achieve modest emissions reductions.[101] The national incremental annualized compliance cost for cement kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $3.7 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 180 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $42 million per additional ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of mercury in the hazardous waste.

Feed Control of Mercury in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Cement kilns could achieve a reduction in mercury emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of mercury for a primary raw material with a higher level. We believe that this beyond-the-floor option would be even less cost-effective than either of the options discussed above, however. Given that sources are sited near the supply of the primary raw material, transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials is likely to be cost-prohibitive, especially considering the small expected emissions reductions that would result.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of mercury would be an appropriate control option for sources. Given that most cement kilns burning hazardous waste also burn coal as a fuel, we considered switching to natural gas as a potential beyond-the-floor option. We are concerned about the availability of natural gas to all cement kilns because natural gas pipelines are not available in all regions of the United States. See 68 FR 1673. Moreover, even where pipelines provide access to natural gas, supplies of natural gas may not be adequate. For example, it is common practice in cities during winter months (or periods of peak demand) to prioritize natural gas usage for residential areas before industrial usage. Requiring cement kilns to switch to natural gas would place an even greater strain on natural gas resources. Consequently, even where pipelines exist, some sources may not be able to use natural gas during times of limited

III: Selection of MACT Standards", March 2004, Chapter 23.

[100] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards", March 2004, Chapter 23.

[101] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emission Estimates and Engineering Costs", March 2004, Chapter 4.

supplies. Thus, natural gas may not be a viable control option for some sources. Therefore, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on limiting mercury in the raw material feed and auxiliary fuels.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose not to adopt a beyond-the-floor standard for mercury and propose to establish the emission standard for existing cement kilns at 64 µg/dscm. If we were to adopt such a standard, we are proposing that sources comply with the standard on an annual basis because it is based on normal emissions data.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Mercury emissions from new cement kilns are currently limited to 120 µg/dscm by § 63.1204(b)(2). New cement kilns can comply with an alternative mercury standard that limits the hazardous waste maximum theoretical emissions concentration or MTEC of mercury of 120 µg/dscm. This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796).

The MACT floor for new sources for mercury would be 35 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability, based on a hazardous waste MTEC of 5.1 µg/dscm. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. As for existing sources, we assumed all sources equally achieved a SRE of zero. The effect of this assumption is that the single source with the lowest mercury concentration in the hazardous waste was identified as the best performing source. We also invite comment on whether we should judge an annual limit of 35 µg/dscm as less stringent than either the current emission standard of 120 µg/dscm or the hazardous waste MTEC of mercury of 120 µg/dscm for cement kilns (so as to avoid any backsliding from a current level of performance achieved by all sources).

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified the same three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of mercury: (1) Use of activated carbon; (2) control of mercury in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of the mercury in the raw materials and auxiliary fuels.

Use of Activated Carbon Injection. We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of mercury emissions. We made a conservative assumption that the use of activated carbon injection will provide 70% mercury control and evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 11 µg/dscm. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new cement kiln to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $1.0 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions of approximately 88 pounds per year. We also estimate that this option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 400 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 1.9 million kW-hours per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of $23 million per ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection for new cement kilns.

Feed Control of Mercury in the Hazardous Waste. We also believe that the expense for further reduction in mercury emissions based on further control of mercury concentrations in the hazardous waste is not warranted. A beyond-the-floor level of 28 ug/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level, would result in little additional mercury reductions. For similar reasons discussed above for existing sources, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the mercury in the hazardous waste feed would not be justified because of the costs coupled with estimated emission reductions.

Feed Control of Mercury in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Cement kilns could achieve a reduction in mercury emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of mercury for a primary raw material with a higher level. For a new source at an existing cement plant, we believe that this beyond-the-floor option would not be cost-effective due to the costs of transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials to the cement plant. Given that the plant site already exists and sited near the source of raw material, replacing the raw materials at the plant site with lower mercury-containing materials would be the source's only option. For a new cement kiln constructed at a new site—a greenfield site [102]—we are not aware of any information and data from a source that has undertaken or is currently located at a site whose raw materials are low in mercury which would consistently decrease mercury emissions. Further, we are uncertain as to what beyond-the-floor standard would be achievable using a lower, if it exists, mercury-containing raw material. Although we are doubtful that selecting a new plant site based on the content of metals in the raw material is a realistic beyond-the-floor option considering the numerous additional factors that go into such a decision, we solicit comment on whether and what level of a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the level of mercury in the raw materials is appropriate.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of mercury would be an appropriate control option for sources. We considered using natural gas in lieu of a fossil fuel such as coal containing higher concentrations of mercury as a potential beyond-the-floor option. As discussed for existing sources, we are concerned about the availability of the natural gas infrastructure in all regions of the United States and believe that using natural gas would not be a viable control option for all new sources. Therefore, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on limiting mercury in the raw material feed and auxiliary fuels.

Therefore, we propose a mercury standard of 35 ug/dscm for new sources. If we were to adopt such a standard, we are proposing that sources comply with the standard on an annual basis because it is based on normal emissions data.

C. What Are the Proposed Standards for Particulate Matter?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new cement kilns that limit emissions of particulate matter to 65 mg/dscm (0.028 gr/dscf) and 13 mg/dscm (0.0058 gr/dscf), respectively.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Particulate matter emissions for existing cement kilns are currently limited to 0.15 kilograms of particulate matter per megagram dry feed [103] and 20% opacity by § 63.1204(a)(7). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at

[102] A greenfield cement kiln is a kiln constructed at a site where no cement kiln previously existed; however, a newly constructed or reconstructed cement kiln at an existing site would not be considered as a greenfield cement kiln.

[103] This standard equates approximately to a stack gas concentration level of 0.030 gr/dscf for wet process kilns and 0.040 gr/dscf for preheater/precalciner kilns. The conversion varies by process type because the amount of flue gas generated per ton of raw material feed varies by process type.

6796). The particulate matter standard is a surrogate control for the metals antimony, cobalt, manganese, nickel, and selenium in the hazardous waste and all HAP metals in the raw materials and auxiliary fuels which are controllable by particulate matter control. All cement kilns control particulate matter with baghouses and electrostatic precipitators.

We have compliance test emissions data for all cement kiln sources. For most sources, we have compliance test emissions data from more than one compliance test campaign. Our data base of particulate matter stack emission concentrations range from 0.0008 to 0.063 gr/dscf.

To identify the floor level, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the Air Pollution Control Technology Approach. The calculated floor is 65 mg/dscm (0.028 gr/dscf), which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 44% of sources and would reduce particulate matter emissions by 43 tons per year.

We are also proposing to delete the current opacity standard in conjunction with revisions to the compliance assurance requirements for particulate matter for cement kilns. These proposed compliance assurance amendments include requiring a cement kiln source using a baghouse to comply with the same bag leak detection system requirements that are currently applicable to all other hazardous waste combustors (see § 63.1209(m)). A cement kiln source using an ESP has the option either to (1) use a particulate matter emissions detector as a process monitor in lieu of complying with operating parameter limits, as we are proposing for all other hazardous waste combustor sources; or (2) establish site-specific, enforceable operating parameter limits that are linked to the automatic waste feed cutoff system. See Part Three, Section III for a discussion of the proposed changes.

We also request comment on whether the particulate matter standard should be expressed on a concentration basis (as proposed today) or on a production-based format. A concentration-based standard is expressed as mass of particulate matter per dry standard volume of gas (*e.g.*, mg/dscm as proposed today) while a production-based standard is expressed as mass of particulate matter emitted per mass of dry raw material feed to the kiln (*e.g.*, the format of the interim standard). We evaluated the compliance test production-based data associated with the most recent test campaign to determine what the floor level would be under this approach. The calculated floor would be 0.10 kilograms of particulate matter per megagram dry feed. We note that a concentration format can be viewed as penalizing more energy efficient kilns, which burn less fuel and produce less kiln exhaust gas per megagram of dry feed. This is because with a concentration-based standard the more energy-efficient kilns would be restricted to a lower level of particulate matter emitted per unit of production.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated improved particulate matter control to achieve a beyond-the-floor standard of 32 mg/dscm (0.014 gr/dscf), which is a 50% reduction from MACT floor emissions.[104] For an existing source that needs a significant reduction in particulate matter emissions, we assumed and estimated costs for a new baghouse to achieve the beyond-the-floor level. If little or modest emissions reductions were needed, then improved control was costed as design, operation, and maintenance modifications of the existing particulate matter control equipment.

The national incremental annualized compliance cost for cement kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $4.8 million and would provide an incremental reduction in particulate matter emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 385 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between further improvements to control particulate matter and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 385 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 15 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $12,400 per additional ton of particulate matter removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Particulate matter emissions from new cement kilns are currently limited to 0.15 kilograms of particulate matter per megagram dry feed and 20% opacity by § 63.1204(b)(7). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796).

The MACT floor for new sources for particulate matter would be 13 mg/dscm (0.0058 gr/dscf), which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the Air Pollution Control Technology Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We are also proposing to delete the current opacity standard in conjunction with revisions to the compliance assurance requirements for particulate matter for cement kilns. *See* Part Three, Section III for details.

As discussed for existing sources, we also request comment on whether the particulate matter standard should be expressed on a concentration basis or on a production-based format. We evaluated the compliance test production-based data associated with the most recent test campaign to determine what the floor level would be under this approach. The calculated floor would be 0.028 kilograms of particulate matter per megagram dry feed.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated improved emissions control based on a state-of-the-art baghouse using a high quality fabric filter bag material to achieve a beyond-the-floor standard of 6.7 mg/dscm (0.0029 gr/dscf). This reduction represents a 50% reduction in particulate matter emissions from MACT floor levels. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new cement kiln to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.38 million and would provide an incremental reduction in particulate matter emissions of approximately 2.6 tons per year. We estimate that this

[104] We did not evaluate a beyond-the-floor standard based on fuel substitution because particulate matter emissions from cement kilns are primarily entrained raw material, not ash contributed by the hazardous waste fuel. There is, therefore, no correlation between particulate matter emissions and the level of ash in the hazardous waste.

beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by less than 6 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 1.8 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $61,400 per additional ton of particulate matter removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control for new cement kilns. Therefore, we propose a particulate matter standard of 13 mg/dscm for new sources.

D. What Are the Proposed Standards for Semivolatile Metals?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing cement kilns that limit emissions of semivolatile metals (cadmium and lead, combined) to 4.0×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste. The proposed standard for new sources is 6.2×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Semivolatile metals emissions from existing cement kilns are currently limited to 330 µg/dscm by § 63.1204(a)(3). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796). Cement kilns control emissions of semivolatile metals with baghouses or electrostatic precipitators and/or by controlling the feed concentration of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste.

We have compliance test emissions data for all cement kiln sources. For most sources, we have compliance test emissions data from more than one compliance test campaign. Semivolatile metal stack emissions range from approximately 1 to 2,800 µg/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of semivolatile metals (from all feedstocks) per unit volume of stack gas. Hazardous waste thermal emissions range from 3.0×10^{-6} to 3.7×10^{-3} lbs per million Btu. Hazardous waste thermal emissions represent the mass of semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste. Lead was the most significant contributor to semivolatile emissions during compliance test conditions.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 4.0×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 81% of sources and would reduce semivolatile metals emissions by 1 ton per year.

To put the proposed floor level in context for a hypothetical wet process cement kiln that gets 50% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a thermal emissions level of 4.0×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste equates approximately to a stack gas concentration of 180 µg/dscm. This estimated stack gas concentration does not include contributions to emission from other semivolatile metals-containing materials such as raw materials and fossil fuels. The additional contribution to stack emissions of semivolatile metals in an average raw material and coal is estimated to range as high as 20 to 50 µg/dscm. Thus, for the hypothetical wet process cement kiln the thermal emissions floor level of 4.0×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste is estimated to be less than 230 µg/dscm, which is less than the current interim standard of 330 µg/dscm. Given that comparing the proposed floor level to the interim standard requires numerous assumptions (as just illustrated) including hazardous waste fuel replacement rates, heat input requirements per ton of clinker, concentrations of semivolatile metals in the raw material and coal, and system removal efficiency, we have a more detailed analysis in the background document.[105] Our detailed analysis indicates the proposed floor level is at least as stringent as the interim standard (so as to avoid any backsliding from a current level of performance achieved by all cement kilns, and hence, the level of minimal stringency at which EPA could calculate the MACT floor). Thus, we conclude that a dual standard—the semivolatile metals standard as both the calculated floor level, expressed as a hazardous waste thermal emissions level, and the current interim standard—is not needed for this standard.

In the September 1999 final rule, we acknowledged that a cement kiln using properly designed and operated MACT control technologies, including controlling the levels of metals in the hazardous waste, may not be capable of achieving a given emission standard because of mineral and process raw material contributions that might cause an exceedance of the emission standard. To address this concern, we promulgated a provision that allows kilns to petition for alternative standards provided that they submit site-specific information that shows raw material hazardous air pollutant contributions to the emissions prevent the source from complying with the emission standard even though the kiln is using MACT control. *See* § 63.1206(b)(10). If we were to adopt the semivolatile (and low volatile) metals standard using a thermal emissions format, then there would be no need for these alternative standard provisions for semivolatile metals (since, as explained earlier, that standard is based solely on semivolatile metals contributions from hazardous waste fuels). Therefore, we would delete the provisions of § 63.1206(b)(10) as they apply to semivolatile (and low volatile) metals. We invite comment on this approach.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of semivolatile metals: (1) Improved particulate matter control; (2) control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of the semivolatile metals in the raw materials and fuels. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for semivolatile metals.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of semivolatile metals. Our data show that all cement kilns are already achieving greater than 98.6% system removal efficiency for semivolatile metals, with most attaining 99.9% removal. Thus, additional controls of particulate matter are likely to result in only modest additional reductions of semivolatile metals emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 2.0×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which

[105] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 23.

represents a 50% reduction in emissions from MACT floor levels. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for cement kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $2.7 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 1.2 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between further improvements to control particulate matter and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 300 tons per year and would also require sources to use an additional 5.7 million kW-hours of energy per year to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $2.3 million per additional ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 3.2×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level representing the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of semivolatile metals in hazardous waste can be used and still achieve appreciable emissions reductions. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for cement kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.30 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.36 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the national compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $0.84 million per additional ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste.

Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Cement kilns could achieve a reduction in semivolatile metal emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of lead and/or cadmium for a primary raw material with higher levels of these metals. We believe that this beyond-the-floor option would even be less cost-effective than either of the options discussed above, however. Given that cement kilns are sited near the primary raw material supply, acquiring and transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials is likely to be cost-prohibitive. Therefore, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on limiting semivolatile metals in the raw material feed. We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of semivolatile metals would be an appropriate control option for sources. Given that most cement kilns burning hazardous waste also burn coal as a fuel, we considered switching to natural gas as a potential beyond-the-floor option. For the same reasons discussed for mercury, we judge a beyond-the-floor standard based on fuel switching as unwarranted.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for existing cement kilns at 4.0×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Semivolatile metals emissions from new cement kilns are currently limited to 180 µg/dscm by § 63.1204(b)(3). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6796).

The MACT floor for new sources for semivolatile metals would be 6.2×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

To put the proposed floor level in context for a hypothetical wet process cement kiln that gets 50% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a thermal emissions level of 6.2×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste equates approximately to a stack gas concentration of 80 µg/dscm, including contributions from typical raw materials and coal. Thus, for the hypothetical wet process cement kiln the thermal emissions floor level of 6.2×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste is estimated to be less than the current interim standard for new sources of 180 µg/dscm.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified the same three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of semivolatile metals: (1) Improved control of particulate matter; (2) control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of semivolatile metals in the raw materials and fuels.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of semivolatile metals. We evaluated improved control of particulate matter based on a state-of-the-art baghouse using a high quality fabric filter bag material as beyond-the-floor control for further reductions in semivolatile metals emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 2.5×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new cement kiln with an average gas flow rate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than to comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.38 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions of approximately 144 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. For these reasons and costs of $5.3 million per ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control for new cement kilns.

Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also believe that the expense for further reduction in semivolatile metals emissions based on further control of semivolatile metals concentrations in the hazardous waste is not warranted. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 5.0×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the compliance cost estimates. For similar

reasons discussed above for existing sources, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the concentration of semivolatile metals levels in the hazardous waste feed would not be justified because of the costs coupled with estimated emission reductions.

Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Cement kilns could achieve a reduction in semivolatile metals emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of cadmium and lead for a primary raw material with a higher level. For a new source at an existing cement plant, we believe that this beyond-the-floor option would not be cost-effective due to the costs of transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials to the cement plant. Given that the plant site already exists and sited near the source of raw material, replacing the raw materials at the plant site with lower semivolatile metals-containing materials would be the source's only option. For a cement kiln constructed at a new greenfield site, we are not aware of any information and data from a source that has undertaken or is currently located at a site whose raw materials are inherently lower in semivolatile metals that would consistently achieve reduced semivolatile metals emissions. Further, we are uncertain as to what beyond-the-floor standard would be achievable using a lower, if it exists, semivolatile metals-containing raw material. Although we are doubtful that selecting a new plant site based on the content of metals in the raw material is a realistic beyond-the-floor option considering the numerous additional factors that go into such a decision, we solicit comment on whether and what level of a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the level of semivolatile metals in the raw materials is appropriate.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of semivolatile metals would be an appropriate control option for sources. Given that most cement kilns burning hazardous waste also burn coal as a fuel, we considered switching to natural gas as a potential beyond-the-floor option. For the same reasons discussed for mercury, we judge a beyond-the-floor standard based on fuel switching as unwarranted.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for new cement kilns at 6.2×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste.

E. What Are the Proposed Standards for Low Volatile Metals?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new cement kilns that limit emissions of low volatile metals (arsenic, beryllium, and chromium, combined) to 1.4×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Low volatile metals emissions from existing cement kilns are currently limited to 56 µg/dscm by § 63.1204(a)(4). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*see* 67 FR at 6796). Cement kilns control emissions of low volatile metals with baghouses or electrostatic precipitators and/or by controlling the feed concentration of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste.

We have compliance test emissions data for all cement kiln sources. For most sources, we have compliance test emissions data from more than one compliance test campaign. Low volatile metal stack emissions range from approximately 1 to 100 µg/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of low volatile metals (from all feedstocks) per unit volume of stack gas. Hazardous waste thermal emissions range from 9.2×10^{-7} to 1.0×10^{-5} lbs per million Btu. Hazardous waste thermal emissions represent the mass of low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste. For nearly every cement kiln, chromium was the most significant contributor to low volatile emissions.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 1.4×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 52% of sources and would reduce low volatile metals emissions by 0.10 tons per year.

To put the proposed floor level in context for a hypothetical wet process cement kiln that gets 50% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a thermal emissions level of 1.4×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste equates approximately to a stack gas concentration of 7 µg/dscm. This estimated stack gas concentration does not include contributions to emission from other low volatile metals-containing materials such as raw materials and fossil fuels. The additional contribution to stack emissions of low volatile metals in an average raw material and coal is estimated to range from less than 1 to 15 µg/dscm. Thus, for the hypothetical wet process cement kiln the thermal emissions floor level of 1.4×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste is estimated to be less than 22 µg/dscm, which is less than the current interim standard of 56 µg/dscm. Given that comparing the proposed floor level to the interim standard requires numerous assumptions (as just illustrated) including hazardous waste fuel replacement rates, heat input requirements per ton of clinker, concentrations of low volatile metals in the raw material and coal, and system removal efficiency, we have included a more detailed analysis in the background document.[106] Our detailed analysis indicates the proposed floor level is as least as stringent as the interim standard (so as to avoid any backsliding from a current level of performance achieved by all cement kilns, and hence, the level of minimal stringency at which EPA could calculate the MACT floor). Thus, we conclude that a dual standard—the low volatile metals standard as both the calculated floor level, expressed as a hazardous waste thermal emissions level, and the current interim standard—is not needed for this standard.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of low volatile metals: (1) Improved particulate matter control; (2) control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of the low volatile metals in the raw materials. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for low volatile metals.

[106] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 23.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of low volatile metals. Our data show that all cement kilns are already achieving greater than 99.9% system removal efficiency for low volatile metals, with most attaining 99.99% removal. Thus, additional control of particulate matter emissions is likely to result in only a small increment in reduction of low volatile metals emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 7.0×10^{-6} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which represents a 50% reduction in emissions from MACT floor levels. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for cement kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $3.7 million and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 120 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between further improvements to control particulate matter and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 72 tons per year and would also require sources to use an additional 1.2 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $63 million per additional ton of low volatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 1.1×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level representing the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of mercury in hazardous waste can be used and still achieve appreciable emissions reductions. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for cement kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $1.2 million and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 38 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $64 million per additional ton of low volatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Cement kilns could achieve a reduction in low volatile metal emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of arsenic, beryllium, and/or chromium for a primary raw material with higher levels of these metals. We believe that this beyond-the-floor option would even be less cost-effective than either of the options discussed above, however. Given that cement kilns are sited near the primary raw material supply, acquiring and transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials is likely to be cost-prohibitive. Therefore, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on limiting low volatile metals in the raw material feed. We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of low volatile metals would be an appropriate control option for sources. Given that most cement kilns burning hazardous waste also burn coal as a fuel, we considered switching to natural gas as a potential beyond-the-floor option. For the same reasons discussed for mercury, we judge a beyond-the-floor standard based on fuel switching as unwarranted.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for existing cement kilns at 1.4×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Low volatile metals emissions from new cement kilns are currently limited to 54 μg/dscm by § 63.1204(b)(4). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*see* 67 FR at 6796, February 13, 2002).

The floor level for new sources for low volatile metals would be 1.4×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

To put the proposed floor level in context for a hypothetical wet process cement kiln that gets 50% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a thermal emissions level of 1.4×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste equates approximately to a stack gas concentration of 22 μg/dscm, including contributions from typical raw materials and coal. Thus, for the hypothetical wet process cement kiln the thermal emissions floor level of 6.2×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste is estimated to be more stringent than the current interim standard for new sources of 54 μg/dscm.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified the same three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of low volatile metals: (1) Improved control of particulate matter; (2) control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of low volatile metals in the raw materials and fuels.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of low volatile metals. We evaluated improved control of particulate matter based on a state-of-the-art baghouse using a high quality fabric filter bag material as beyond-the-floor control for further reductions in low volatile metals emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 6.0×10^{-6} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new cement kiln to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.38 million and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions of approximately 33 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. For these reasons and costs of $23.5 million per ton of low volatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control for new cement kilns.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 1.1×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We believe that the expense for further reduction in low volatile metals emissions based on further control of low volatile metals concentrations in the hazardous waste is not warranted given the costs, nonair quality health and environmental impacts, and energy effects.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Cement kilns could achieve a reduction in low volatile metals emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of low volatile metals for a primary raw material with a higher level. For a new source at an existing cement plant, we believe that this beyond-the-floor option would not be cost-effective due to the costs of transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials to the cement plant. Given that the plant site already exists and sited near the source of raw material, replacing the raw materials at the plant site with lower low volatile metals-containing materials would be the source's only option. For a cement kiln constructed at a new greenfield site, we are not aware of any information and data from a source that has undertaken or is currently located at a site whose raw materials are inherently lower in low volatile metals that would consistently achieve reduced low volatile metals emissions. Further, we are uncertain as to what beyond-the-floor standard would be achievable using a lower, if it exists, low volatile metals-containing raw material. Although we are doubtful that selecting a new plant site based on the content of metals in the raw material is a realistic beyond-the-floor option considering the numerous additional factors that go into such a decision, we solicit comment on whether and what level of a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the level of low volatile metals in the raw materials is appropriate.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of low volatile metals would be an appropriate control option for sources. Given that most cement kilns burning hazardous waste also burn coal as a fuel, we considered switching to natural gas as a potential beyond-the-floor option. For the same reasons discussed for mercury, we judge a beyond-the-floor standard based on fuel switching as unwarranted.

Therefore, we are proposing a low volatile metals standard of 1.4×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste.

F. What Are the Proposed Standards for Hydrogen Chloride and Chlorine Gas?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new cement kilns that limit total chlorine emissions (hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, combined, reported as a chloride equivalent) to 110 and 83 ppmv, respectively. However, we are also proposing to establish alternative risk-based standards, pursuant to CAA section 112(d)(4), which could be elected by the source in lieu of the MACT emission standards for total chlorine. The emission limits would be based on national exposure standards that ensure protection of public health with an ample margin of safety. See Part Two, Section XIII for additional details.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Total chlorine emissions from existing cement kilns are limited to 130 ppmv by § 63.1204(a)(6). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6796). None of the cement kilns burning hazardous waste use a dedicated control device, such as a wet scrubber, to remove total chlorine from the gas stream. However, the natural alkalinity in some of the raw materials is highly effective at removing chlorine from the gas stream. Our data base shows that the majority of the system removal efficiency (SRE) data of total chlorine—over 80%—indicate a SRE greater than 95%. This scrubbing effect, though quite effective, varies across different sources and also at individual sources over time due to differences in raw materials, operating conditions, cement kiln dust recycle rates, and production requirements. Likewise, our data show that total chlorine emissions from a given source can vary over a considerable range. Based on these data, we conclude that the best (highest) SRE achieved at a given source is not duplicable or replicable.

The majority of the chlorine fed to the cement kiln during a compliance test comes from the hazardous waste.[107] In all but a few cases the hazardous waste contribution to the total amount of chlorine fed to the kiln represented at least 75% of the total chlorine loading to the kiln. As we identified in the September 1999 final rule, the proposed MACT floor control for total chlorine is based on controlling the concentration of chlorine in the hazardous waste. The chlorine concentration in the hazardous waste will affect emissions of total chlorine at a given SRE because emissions increase as the chlorine loading increases.

We have compliance test emissions data for all cement kiln sources. For most sources, we have compliance test emissions data from more than one compliance test campaign. Total chlorine emissions range from less than 1 ppmv to 192 ppmv.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using a variant of the SRE/Feed Approach because of concerns about a cement kiln's ability to replicate a given SRE. To identify the floor level we first evaluated the chlorine feed level in the hazardous waste for all sources. The best performing sources had the lowest maximum theoretical emissions concentration or MTEC, considering variability. We then applied a SRE of 90% to the best performing sources' total MTEC (*i.e.*, includes chlorine contributions to emissions from all feedstreams such as raw material and fossil fuels) to identify the floor level. Given our concerns about the reproducibility of SREs of total chlorine, we selected a SRE of 90% because our data base shows that all sources have demonstrated this SRE at least once (and often several times) during a compliance test. The calculated floor is 110 ppmv, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the best performing feed control sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 93% of sources and would reduce total chlorine emissions by 64 tons per year.

We also invite comment on an alternative approach to establish a floor level expressed as a hazardous waste thermal feed concentration.[108] A hazardous waste thermal feed concentration is expressed as mass of chlorine in the hazardous waste per

[107] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards", March 2004, Chapter 2.

[108] We are also requesting comment on whether the hazardous waste feed concentration floor level should be the standard itself (*i.e.*, no stack emission concentration standard) or as an alternative to the stack emission standard (*e.g.*, sources have the opinion to comply with either the calculated stack emissions concentration or the hazardous waste feed concentration limit).

million Btu heat input contributed by the hazardous waste. The floor would be based on the best five performing sources with the lowest thermal feed concentration of chlorine in the hazardous waste considering each source's most recent compliance test data. One advantage of this approach is that the uncertainty surrounding the capture (SRE) of chlorine in a kiln is removed. The calculated floor level would be 2.4 lbs chlorine in the hazardous waste per million Btu in the hazardous waste, which considers variability. For a hypothetical wet process cement kiln that gets 50% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a hazardous waste with a chlorine concentration of 2.4 lbs chlorine per million Btu and achieving 90% SRE equates approximately to a stack gas concentration of 75 ppmv. This estimated stack gas concentration does not include contributions to emission from other chlorine-containing materials such as raw materials and fossil fuels. The additional contribution to stack emissions of total chlorine in an average raw material and coal is estimated to range from less than 1 to 35 ppmv. Thus, for the hypothetical wet process cement kiln this floor level is estimated to be less than 110 ppmv, which is less than the current interim standard of 130 ppmv.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of total chlorine: (1) Use of wet scrubbers; (2) control of chlorine in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of the chlorine in the raw materials. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for total chlorine.

Use of Wet Scrubbers. We evaluated the use of wet scrubbers as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of mercury emissions. Wet scrubbers are not currently being used at any hazardous waste burning cement kilns to capture hydrogen chloride. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 55 ppmv. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for cement kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $3.4 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 370 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between wet scrubbing and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of water usage and waste water generated by 1.5 billion gallon per year. The option would also require sources to use an additional 12 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $9,300 per additional ton of total chlorine removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on wet scrubbing.

Feed Control of Chlorine in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 88 ppmv, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level that represents the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of chlorine in the hazardous waste can be used and still achieve modest emissions reductions. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for cement kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $1.1 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 100 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated and are included in the compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $11,000 per additional ton of total chlorine, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of chlorine in the hazardous waste.

Feed Control of Chlorine in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Cement kilns could achieve a reduction in total chlorine emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of chlorine for a primary raw material with higher levels of chlorine. We believe that this beyond-the-floor option would even be less cost-effective than either of the options discussed above because most chlorine feed to the kiln is in the hazardous waste. In addition, given that cement kilns are sited near the primary raw material supply, acquiring and transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials is likely to be cost-prohibitive. Therefore, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on limiting chlorine in the raw material feed. We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of chlorine would be an appropriate control option for kilns. Given that most cement kilns burning hazardous waste also burn coal as a fuel, we considered switching to natural gas as a potential beyond-the-floor option. For the same reasons discussed for mercury, we judge a beyond-the-floor standard based on fuel switching as unwarranted.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose not to adopt a beyond-the-floor standard for total chlorine and propose to establish the emission standard for existing cement kilns at 110 ppmv.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Total chlorine emissions from new cement kilns are currently limited to 86 ppmv by § 63.1204(b)(6). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6796). The MACT floor for new sources for total chlorine would be 78 ppmv, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified similar potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of total chlorine for new sources: (1) Use of wet scrubbing; (2) control of chlorine in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of chlorine in the raw materials and fuels.

Use of Wet Scrubbers. We considered wet scrubbing as beyond-the-floor control for further reductions in total chlorine emissions and evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 39 ppmv. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new cement kiln to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $1.2 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions of approximately 22 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. For these reasons and costs of $24,000 per ton of total chlorine removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on wet scrubbing for new cement kilns.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 62 ppmv, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We believe that the expense for further reduction in total chlorine emissions

based on further control of chlorine concentrations in the hazardous waste is not warranted given the costs, nonair quality health and environmental impacts, and energy effects.

Feed Control of Chlorine in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Cement kilns could achieve a reduction in total chlorine emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of chlorine for a primary raw material with a higher level. For a new source at an existing cement plant, we believe that this beyond-the-floor option would not be cost-effective due to the costs of transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials to the cement plant. Given that the plant site already exists and sited near the source of raw material, replacing the raw materials at the plant site with lower chlorine-containing materials would be the source's only option. For a cement kiln constructed at a new greenfield site, we are not aware of any information and data from a source that has undertaken or is currently located at a site whose raw materials are inherently lower in chlorine that would consistently achieve reduced total chlorine emissions. Further, we are uncertain as to what beyond-the-floor standard would be achievable using a lower, if it exists, chlorine-containing raw material. Although we are doubtful that selecting a new plant site based on the content of chlorine in the raw material is a realistic beyond-the-floor option considering the numerous additional factors that go into such a decision, we solicit comment on whether and what level of a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the level of chlorine in the raw materials is appropriate.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of chlorine would be an appropriate control option for sources. Given that most cement kilns burning hazardous waste also burn coal as a fuel, we considered switching to natural gas as a potential beyond-the-floor option. For the same reasons discussed for mercury, we judge a beyond-the-floor standard based on fuel switching as unwarranted.

Therefore, we are proposing a total chlorine standard of 78 ppmv for new cement kilns.

G. What Are the Standards for Hydrocarbons and Carbon Monoxide?

Hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide standards are surrogates to control emissions of organic hazardous air pollutants for existing and new cement kilns. For cement kilns without bypass or midkiln sampling systems, the standard for existing sources limit hydrocarbon or carbon monoxide concentrations to 20 ppmv or 100 ppmv, respectively. The standards for new sources limit (1) hydrocarbons to 20 ppmv; or (2) carbon monoxide to 100 ppmv. New, greenfield kilns[109], that elect to comply with the 100 ppmv carbon monoxide standard, however, must also comply with a 50 ppmv hydrocarbon standard. New and existing sources that elect to comply with the 100 ppmv carbon monoxide standard, including new greenfield kilns that elect to comply with the carbon monoxide standard and 50 ppmv hydrocarbon standard, must also demonstrate compliance with the 20 ppmv hydrocarbon standard during the comprehensive performance test. However, continuous hydrocarbon monitoring following the performance test is not required.

For cement kilns with bypass or midkiln sampling systems, existing cement kilns are required to comply with either a carbon monoxide standard of 100 ppmv or a hydrocarbon standard of 10 ppmv. Both standards apply to combustion gas sampled in the bypass or a midkiln sampling port that samples representative kiln gas. See §§ 63.1204(a)(5) and (b)(5). The rationale for these decisions are discussed in the September 1999 final rule (64 FR at 52885). We view the standards for hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide as unaffected by the Court's vacature of the challenged regulations in its decision of July 24, 2001. We therefore are not proposing these standards for cement kilns, but rather are mentioning them here for the reader's convenience.

H. What Are the Standards for Destruction and Removal Efficiency?

The destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) standard is a surrogate to control emissions of organic hazardous air pollutants other than dioxin/furans. The standard for existing and new lightweight aggregate kilns requires 99.99% DRE for each principal organic hazardous constituent, except that 99.9999% DRE is required if specified dioxin-listed hazardous wastes are burned. See §§ 63.1204(c). The rationale for these decisions are discussed in the September 1999 final rule (64 FR at 52890). We view the standards for DRE as unaffected by the Court's vacature of the challenged regulations in its decision of July 24, 2001. We therefore are not proposing these standards for cement kilns, but rather are mentioning them here for the reader's convenience.

IX. How Did EPA Determine the Proposed Emission Standards for Hazardous Waste Burning Lightweight Aggregate Kilns?

In this section, the basis for the proposed emission standards is discussed. See proposed § 63.1221. The proposed emission limits apply to the stack gases from lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste and are summarized in the table below:

PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR EXISTING AND NEW LIGHTWEIGHT AGGREGATE KILNS

Hazardous air pollutant or surrogate	Emission standard [1]	
	Existing sources	New sources
Dioxin and furan	0.40 ng TEQ/dscm	0.40 ng TEQ/dscm.
Mercury [2]	67 µg/dscm	67 µg/dscm.
Particulate Matter	57 mg/dscm (0.025 gr/dscf)	23 mg/dscm (0.0099 gr/dscf).
Semivolatile metals [3]	3.1×10^{-4} lb/MMBtu and 250 µg/dscm	2.4×10^{-5} lb/MMBtu and 43 µg/dscm.
Low volatile metals [3]	9.5×10^{-5} lb/MMBtu and 110 µg/dscm	3.2×10^{-5} lb/MMBtu and 110 µg/dscm.
Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas [4]	600 ppmv	600 ppmv.
Hydrocarbons [5,6]	20 ppmv (or 100 ppmv carbon monoxide)	20 ppmv (or 100 ppmv carbon monoxide).

[109] A greenfield cement kiln is a kiln that commenced construction or reconstruction after April 19, 1996 at a site where no cement kiln previously existed, irrespective of the class of kiln (*i.e.*, nonhazardous waste or hazardous waste burning). A newly constructed or reconstructed cement kiln at an existing site is not classified as a greenfield cement kiln, and is subject to the same carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon standards as an existing cement kiln.

PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR EXISTING AND NEW LIGHTWEIGHT AGGREGATE KILNS—Continued

Hazardous air pollutant or surrogate	Emission standard [1]	
	Existing sources	New sources
Destruction and removal efficiency	For existing and new sources, 99.99% for each principal organic hazardous constituent (POHC). For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, 99.9999% for each POHC.	

[1] All emission standards are corrected to 7% oxygen, dry basis.
[2] Mercury standard is an annual limit.
[3] Standards are expressed as mass of pollutant emissions contributed by hazardous waste per million British thermal unit contributed by the hazardous waste.
[4] Combined standard, reported as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent.
[5] Sources that elect to comply with the carbon monoxide standard must demonstrate compliance with the hydrocarbon standard during the comprehensive performance test.
[6] Hourly rolling average. Hydrocarbons reported as propane.

A. What Are the Proposed Standards for Dioxin and Furan?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new lightweight aggregate kilns that limit emissions of dioxin and furans to 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Dioxin and furan emissions for existing lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited by § 63.1205(a)(1) to 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or rapid quench of the flue gas at the exit of the kiln to less than 400°F. This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6797).

Since promulgation of the September 1999 final rule, we have obtained additional dioxin/furan emissions data. We now have compliance test emissions data for all lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste. The compliance test dioxin/furan emissions in our database range from approximately 0.9 to 58 ng TEQ/dscm.

Quenching kiln gas temperatures at the exit of the kiln so that gas temperatures at the inlet to the particulate matter control device are below the temperature range of optimum dioxin/furan formation (400–750°F) may be problematic for some of these sources. Some of these sources have extensive (long) duct-work between the kiln exit and the inlet to the control device. For these sources, quenching the gases at the kiln exit to a low enough temperature to limit dioxin/furan formation may conflict with the source's ability to avoid acid gas dew point related problems in the long duct-work and control device. As a result, some sources quench the kiln exit gases to a temperature that is in the optimum temperature range for surface-catalyzed dioxin/furan formation. Available compliance test emissions data indicate that inlet temperatures to the control device range from 435–450°F. This means that temperatures in the duct-work are higher and well within the range of optimum dioxin/furan formation.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the Emissions Approach described in Part Two, Section VI above. The calculated floor is 14 ng TEQ/dscm, which considers emissions variability. However, the current interim emission standard—0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or rapid quench of the flue gas at the exit of the kiln to less than 400°F—is a regulatory limit that is relevant in identifying the floor level because it fixes a level of performance for the source category. We estimate that sources achieving the "rapid quench of the flue gas at the exit of the kiln to less than 400°F" part of the current standard can emit up to 6.1 ng TEQ/dscm. Given that all sources are achieving the interim standard and that the interim standard is judged as more stringent than the calculated MACT floor, the dioxin/furan floor level can be no less stringent than the current regulatory limit.[110] We are, therefore, proposing the dioxin/furan floor level as the current emission standard of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or rapid quench of the flue gas at the exit of the kiln to less than 400°F. This emission level is being achieved by all sources because it is the interim standard. In addition, there are no emissions reductions for existing lightweight aggregate kilns to comply with the floor level.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of dioxin/furan emissions. Activated carbon has been demonstrated for controlling dioxin/furans in various combustion applications; however, no lightweight aggregate kiln that burns hazardous waste uses activated carbon injection. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm, which represents a level that is considered routinely achievable using activated carbon injection. In addition, we assumed for costing purposes that lightweight aggregate kilns needing activated carbon injection to achieve the beyond-the-floor level would install the activated carbon injection system after the existing particulate matter control device and add a new, smaller baghouse to remove the injected carbon with the adsorbed dioxin/furans. We chose this costing approach to address potential concerns that injected carbon may interfere with lightweight aggregate dust use practices.

The national incremental annualized compliance cost for lightweight aggregate kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $1.8 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 1.9 grams TEQ per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the nonair quality health and environmental impacts between activated carbon injection and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 550 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 1 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national compliance cost estimates.

Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $0.95 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan TEQ

[110] Even though all sources have recently demonstrated compliance with the interim standards, the dioxin/furan data in our data base preceded the compliance demonstration. This explains why we have emissions data that are higher than the interim standard.

removed, we are proposing a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm for existing lightweight aggregate kilns. We judge that the cost to achieve this beyond-the-floor level is warranted given our special concern about dioxin/furan. Dioxin/furan are some of the most toxic compounds known due to their bioaccumulation potential and wide range of health effects, including carcinogenesis, at exceedingly low doses. Exposure via indirect pathways is a chief reason that Congress singled our dioxin/furan for priority MACT control in CAA section 112(c)(6). See S. Rep. No. 128, 101st Cong. 1st Sess. at 154–155. In addition, we note that a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm is consistent with historically controlled levels under MACT for hazardous waste incinerators and cement kilns, and Portland cement plants. See §§ 63.1203(a)(1), 63.1204(a)(1), and 63.1343(d)(3). Also, EPA has determined previously in the 1999 Hazardous Waste Combustor MACT final rule that dioxin/furan in the range of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm or less are necessary for the MACT standards to be considered generally protective of human health under RCRA (using the 1985 cancer slope factor), thereby eliminating the need for separate RCRA standards under the authority of RCRA section 3005(c)(3) and 40 CFR 270.10(k). Finally, we note that this decision is not inconsistent with EPA's decision not to promulgate beyond-the-floor standards for dioxin/furan for hazardous waste burning lightweight aggregate kilns, cement kilns, and incinerators at cost-effectiveness values in the range of $530,000 to $827,000 per additional gram of dioxin/furan TEQ removed. See 64 FR at 52892, 52876, and 52961. In those cases, EPA determined that controlling dioxin/furan emissions from a level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm to a beyond-the-floor level of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm was not warranted because dioxin/furan levels below 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm are generally considered to be below the level of health risk concern.

We specifically request comment on whether this beyond-the-floor standard is warranted.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Dioxin and furan emissions for new lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited by § 63.1205(b)(1) to 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or rapid quench of the flue gas at the exit of the kiln to less than 400°F. This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6797).

The calculated MACT floor for new sources would be 1.3 ng TEQ/dscm, which considers emissions variability, or rapid quench of the flue gas at the exit of the kiln to less than 400°F. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified by the Emissions Approach. However, we are concerned that the calculated floor level of 1.3 ng TEQ/dscm is not duplicable by all sources using temperature control because we estimate that sources rapidly quenching the flue gas at the exit of the kiln to less than 400°F can emit up to 6.1 ng TEQ/dscm. Therefore, we are proposing the floor as the current emission standard of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm or rapid quench of the flue gas at the exit of the kiln to less than 400°F.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of dioxin/furan emissions, and considered a beyond-the-floor level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm, which represents a level that is considered routinely achievable with activated carbon injection. In addition, we assumed for costing purposes that a new lightweight aggregate kiln will install the activated carbon injection system after the existing particulate matter control device and add a new, smaller baghouse to remove the injected carbon with the adsorbed dioxin/furan. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new source to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.26 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions of 0.37 grams per year. Nonair quality health, environmental impacts, and energy effects are accounted for in the cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and cost of $0.71 million per gram TEQ removed, we are proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection. We believe that the cost to achieve this beyond-the-floor level is warranted given our special concern about dioxin/furan. Dioxin/furan are some of the most toxic compounds known due to their bioaccumulation potential and wide range of health effects, including carcinogenesis, at exceedingly low doses. In addition, as discussed above, we note that the beyond-the-floor emission level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm is consistent with historically controlled levels under MACT for hazardous waste incinerators and cement kilns, and Portland cement plants. See §§ 63.1203(a)(1), 63.1204(a)(1), and 63.1343(d)(3). EPA has determined previously in the 1999 Hazardous Waste Combustor MACT final rule that dioxin/furan in the range of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm or less are necessary for the MACT standards to be considered generally protective of human health under RCRA, thereby eliminating the need for separate RCRA standards.

We specifically request comment on whether this beyond-the-floor standard is warranted.

B. What Are the Proposed Standards for Mercury?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new lightweight aggregate kilns that limit emissions of mercury to 67 µg/dscm.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Mercury emissions for existing lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited to 120 µg/dscm by § 63.1205(a)(2). Existing lightweight aggregate kilns have the option to comply with an alternative mercury standard that limits the hazardous waste maximum theoretical emissions concentration (MTEC) of mercury to 120 µg/dscm.[111] This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6797). One lightweight aggregate facility with two kilns uses a venturi scrubber to remove mercury from the flue gas stream and the remaining sources limit the feed concentration of mercury in the hazardous waste to control emissions.

We have compliance test emissions data for only one source; however, we have normal emissions data for all sources. For most sources, we have normal emissions data from more than one test campaign. We used these emissions data to represent the average emissions from a source even though we do not know whether the emissions represent the high end, low end, or close to the average emissions. The normal mercury stack emissions range from less than 1 to 47 µg/dscm, while the highest compliance test emissions data is 1,050 µg/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of mercury (from all feedstocks) per unit volume of stack gas.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated all normal emissions data using the SRE/Feed Approach. We considered normal stack emissions data from all test campaigns.[112] For example,

[111] MTEC is a term to compare metals and chlorine feedrates across sources of different sizes. MTEC is defined as the metals or chlorine feedrate divided by the gas flow rate and is expressed in units of µg/dscm.

[112] Given that the majority of feedrate and emissions data for mercury is normal, we do not believe it is appropriate to establish a hazardous

Continued

one source in our data base has normal emissions data for three different testing campaigns: 1992, 1995, and 1999. Under this approach we considered the emissions data from the three separate years or campaigns. As explained earlier, we believe this approach better captures the range of average emissions for a source than only considering the most recent normal emissions. In addition, for sources without control equipment to capture mercury, we assumed the sources achieved a SRE of zero. The effect of this assumption is that the sources (without control equipment for mercury) with the lower mercury concentrations in the hazardous waste were identified as the better performing sources.

The calculated floor is 67 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability, based on a hazardous waste maximum theoretical emissions concentration (MTEC) of 42 µg/dscm. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 57% of sources and would reduce mercury emissions by 8 pounds per year. If we were to adopt such a floor level, we are proposing that sources comply with the limit on an annual basis because it is based on normal emissions data. Under this approach, compliance would not be based on the use of a total mercury continuous emissions monitoring system because these monitors have not been adequately demonstrated as a reliable compliance assurance tool at all types of incinerator sources. Instead, a source would maintain compliance with the mercury standard by establishing and complying with short-term limits on operating parameters for pollution control equipment and annual limits on maximum total mercury feedrate in all feedstreams.

In the September 1999 final rule, we acknowledged that a lightweight aggregate kiln using properly designed and operated MACT control technologies, including controlling the levels of metals in the hazardous waste, may not be capable of achieving a given emission standard because of process raw material contributions that might cause an exceedance of the emission standard. To address this concern, we promulgated a provision that allows sources to petition for alternative standards provided they submit site-specific information that shows raw material hazardous air pollutant contributions to the emissions prevent the source from complying with the emission standard even though the kiln is using MACT control. See § 63.1206(b)(9).

Today's proposed floor of 67 µg/dscm, which was based on a hazardous waste MTEC of 42 µg/dscm, may likewise necessitate such an alternative because contributions of mercury in the raw materials and fossil fuels at some sources may cause an exceedance of the emission standard. The Agency intends to retain a source's ability to comply with an alternative standard, and we request comment on two approaches to accomplish this. The first approach would be to structure the alternative standard similar to the petitioning process used under § 63.1206(b)(9). In the case of mercury for an existing lightweight aggregate kiln, MACT would be defined as a hazardous waste feedrate corresponding to an MTEC of 42 µg/dscm. If we were to adopt this approach, we would require sources, upon approval of the petition by the Administrator, to comply with this hazardous waste MTEC on an annual basis because it is based on normal emissions data. Under the second approach, we would structure the alternative standard similar to the framework used for the alternative interim standards for mercury under § 63.1206(b)(15). The operating requirement would be an annual MTEC not to exceed 42 µg/dscm. We also request comment on whether there are other approaches that would more appropriately provide relief to sources that cannot achieve a total stack gas concentration standard because of emissions attributable to raw material and nonhazardous waste fuels.

In comments submitted to EPA in 1997, Solite Corporation (Solite), owner and operator of five [113] of the seven lightweight aggregate kilns, stated that the normal emissions data in our data base are unrepresentative of average emissions of mercury because the normal range of mercury concentrations in the hazardous waste burned during the compliance and trial burn tests was not captured during the tests. In their 1997 comments, Solite provided information on actual mercury concentrations in the hazardous waste burn tanks over a year and a quarter period. The information showed that 87% of the burn tanks contained mercury at concentrations below the facility's detection limit of 2 ppm. Additional analyses of a limited number of these samples conducted at an off-site lab showed that the majority of samples were actually less than 0.2 ppm.[114]

We examined the test reports of the five best performing sources that are the basis of today's proposed floor level to determine the concentration level of mercury in the hazardous wastes. The hazardous waste burned by the best performing sources during the tests that generated the normal emissions data had mercury concentrations that ranged from 0.02 to 0.2 ppm.[115] Even though the concentrations of mercury in the hazardous waste seem low, we cannot judge how these snap shot concentrations compare to long-term normal concentrations because the majority of the burn tank concentration data submitted by Solite are nondetect measurements at a higher detection limit.

Solite informed us in July 2003 that they are in the process of upgrading the analysis equipment at their on-site laboratory. Once completed, Solite expects to be capable of detecting mercury in the hazardous waste at concentrations of 0.2 ppm. Solite also indicated that they intend to assemble and submit to EPA several months of burn tank concentration data analyzed with the new equipment. We will add these data to the docket of today's proposal once available. As we discussed for cement kilns for mercury, we are requesting comment on approaches to establish a hazardous waste feed concentration standard based on long-term feed concentrations of mercury in the hazardous waste. Likewise, we invite comments on establishing a mercury feed

waste thermal emissions-based standard. We prefer to establish emission standards under the hazardous waste thermal emissions format using compliance test data because the metals feedrate information from compliance tests that we use to apportion emissions to calculate emissions attributable to hazardous waste are more reliable than feedrate data measured during testing under normal, typical operations.

[113] Solite Corporation has four kilns at its Cascade facility and three kilns at its Arvonia facility. However, only three kilns and two kilns, respectively, can be fired with hazardous waste at any one time. For purposes of today's proposal, Solite Corporation is assumed to operate a total of five kilns.

[114] A hazardous waste with a mercury concentration of 2 ppm equates approximately to a mercury emissions level of 200–250 µg/dscm, and a source firing a hazardous waste with a mercury concentration of 0.2 ppm approximately equates to 20–25 µg/dscm. The existing standard of 120 µg/dscm allows a source to burn a hazardous waste with a mercury concentration of approximately 1 ppm.

[115] These mercury concentrations were analyzed by an off-site lab that had equipment capable of detecting mercury at lower concentrations. Sixteen of the 27 measurements of the best performers were reported as non-detects.

concentration standard for lightweight aggregate kilns.

We also invite comment on whether we should judge an annual limit of 67 µg/dscm as less stringent than either the current emission standard of 120 µg/dscm or the hazardous waste MTEC of mercury of 120 µg/dscm for lightweight aggregate kilns (so as to avoid any backsliding from a current level of performance achieved by all sources, and hence, the level of minimal stringency at which EPA could calculate the MACT floor). In order to comply with the current emission standard, generally a source must conduct manual stack sampling to demonstrate compliance with the mercury emission standard and then establish a maximum mercury feedrate limit based on operations during the performance test. Following the performance test, the source complies with a limit on the maximum total mercury feedrate in all feedstreams on a 12-hour rolling average (not an annual average). Alternatively, a source can elect to comply with a hazardous waste MTEC of mercury of 120 µg/dscm that would require the source to limit the mercury feedrate in the hazardous waste on a 12-hour rolling average. The floor level of 67 µg/dscm proposed today would allow a source to feed more variable mercury-containing feedstreams (*e.g.*, a hazardous waste with a mercury MTEC greater than 120 µg/dscm) than the current 12-hour rolling average because today's proposed floor level is an annual limit. For example, the concentration of mercury in the hazardous waste exceeded a hazardous waste MTEC of 120 µg/dscm in a minimum of 13% of the burn tanks based on the data submitted by Solite in their 1997 comments (discussed above). As mentioned above, Solite intends to submit several months of burn tank concentration data using upgraded analysis equipment at their on-site laboratory that we will consider when comparing the relative stringency of an annual limit of 67 µg/dscm and a short-term limit of 120 µg/dscm.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of mercury: (1) Activated carbon injection; (2) control of mercury in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of mercury in the raw materials and auxiliary fuels. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for mercury.

Use of Activated Carbon Injection. We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of mercury emissions. Activated carbon has been demonstrated for controlling mercury in several combustion applications; however, currently no lightweight aggregate kiln that burns hazardous waste uses activated carbon injection. Given this lack of experience using activated carbon injection, we made a conservative assumption that the use of activated carbon injection will provide 70% mercury control and evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 20 µg/dscm. In addition, for costing purposes we assumed that sources needing activated carbon injection to achieve the beyond-the-floor level would install the activated carbon injection system after the existing baghouse and add a new, smaller baghouse to remove the injected carbon with the adsorbed mercury. We chose this costing approach to address potential concerns that injected carbon may interfere with lightweight aggregate kiln dust use practices.

The national incremental annualized compliance cost for lightweight aggregate kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $1.1 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 11 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between activated carbon injection and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 270 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 1.2 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $209 million per additional ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection.

Feed Control of Mercury in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 54 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level representing the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of mercury in hazardous waste (beyond feedrate control that may be necessary to achieve the floor level) can be used and still achieve modest emissions reductions.[116] The national incremental annualized compliance cost for lightweight aggregate kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.3 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 3 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $229 million per additional ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of mercury in the hazardous waste.

Feed Control of Mercury in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Lightweight aggregate kilns could achieve a reduction in mercury emissions by substituting a raw material containing a lower level of mercury for a primary raw material with a higher level. We believe that this beyond-the-floor option would be even less cost-effective than either of the options discussed above, however. Given that sources are sited near the supply of the primary raw material, transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials, even if available, is likely to be cost-prohibitive, especially considering the small expected emissions reductions that would result.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of mercury would be an appropriate control option for sources. Two facilities typically burn hazardous waste at a fuel replacement rate of 100%, while one facility has burned a combination of fuel oil and natural gas in addition to the hazardous waste. We considered switching only to natural gas as the auxiliary fuel as a potential beyond-the-floor option. We do not believe that switching to natural gas is a viable control option for the same reasons discussed above for cement kilns.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for existing lightweight aggregate kilns at 67 µg/dscm. If we were to adopt such a standard, we are proposing that sources comply with the standard on an annual basis because it is based on normal emissions data.

[116] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emission Estimates and Engineering Costs", March 2004, Chapter 4.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Mercury emissions from new lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited to 120 µg/dscm by § 63.1205(b)(2). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*see* 67 FR at 6797).

The MACT floor for new sources for mercury would be 67 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified the same three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of mercury: (1) Use of activated carbon; (2) control of mercury in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of the mercury in the raw materials and auxiliary fuels.

Use of Activated Carbon Injection. We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of mercury emissions. We made a conservative assumption that the use of activated carbon injection will provide 70% mercury control and evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 20 µg/dscm. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new lightweight aggregate kiln with average gas flow rate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.26 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions of approximately 42 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of $12 million per ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection for new sources.

Feed Control of Mercury in the Hazardous Waste. We also believe that the expense for further reduction in mercury emissions based on further control of mercury concentrations in the hazardous waste is not warranted. A beyond-the-floor level of 54 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level, would result in little additional mercury reductions. For similar reasons discussed above for existing sources, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the mercury in the hazardous waste feed would not be justified because of the costs coupled with estimated emission reductions.

Feed Control of Mercury in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Lightweight aggregate kilns could achieve a reduction in mercury emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of mercury for a primary raw material with a higher level. For a new source at an existing lightweight aggregate plant, we believe that this beyond-the-floor option would not be cost-effective due to the costs of transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials to the facility. Given that the plant site already exists and sited near the source of raw material, replacing the raw materials at the plant site with lower mercury-containing materials would be the source's only option. For a new lightweight aggregate kiln constructed at a new site—a greenfield site[117]—we are not aware of any information and data from a source that has undertaken or is currently located at a site whose raw materials are low in mercury which would consistently decrease mercury emissions. Further, we are uncertain as to what beyond-the-floor standard would be achievable using a lower, if it exists, mercury-containing raw material. Although we are doubtful that selecting a new plant site based on the content of metals in the raw material is a realistic beyond-the-floor option considering the numerous additional factors that go into such a decision, we solicit comment on whether and what level of a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the level of mercury in the raw materials is appropriate.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of mercury would be an appropriate control option for sources. We considered using natural gas in lieu of a fuel containing higher concentrations of mercury as a potential beyond-the-floor option. As discussed for existing sources, we are concerned about the availability of the natural gas infrastructure in all regions of the United States and believe that using natural gas would not be a viable control option for all new sources. Therefore, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on limiting mercury in the raw material feed and auxiliary fuels.

[117] A greenfield source is a kiln constructed at a site where no lightweight aggregate kiln previously existed; however, a newly constructed or reconstructed kiln at an existing site would not be considered as a greenfield kiln.

Therefore, we propose a mercury standard of 67 µg/dscm for new sources. If we were to adopt such a standard, we are proposing that sources comply with the standard on an annual basis because it is based on normal emissions data.

C. What Are the Proposed Standards for Particulate Matter?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new lightweight aggregate kilns that limit emissions of particulate matter to 0.025 and 0.0099 gr/dscf, respectively. This standard would control unenumerated HAP metals in hazardous waste, and all non-Hg HAP metals in the raw material and fossil fuel inputs to the kiln.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Particulate matter emissions for existing lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited to 0.025 gr/dscf (57 mg/dscm) by § 63.1205(a)(7). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6797). The particulate matter standard is a surrogate control for the non-mercury metal HAP. All lightweight aggregate kilns control particulate matter with baghouses.

We have compliance test emissions data for all lightweight aggregate kiln sources. For most sources, we have compliance test emissions data from more than one compliance test campaign. Our database of particulate matter stack emissions range from 0.001 to 0.042 gr/dscf.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the APCD Approach. The calculated floor is 0.029 gr/dscf, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. The calculated floor level of 0.029 gr/dscf is less stringent than the interim standard of 0.025 gr/dscf, which is a regulatory limit relevant in identifying the floor level (so as to avoid any backsliding from a current level of performance achieved by all lightweight aggregate kilns, and hence, the level of minimal stringency at which EPA could calculate the MACT floor). Therefore, we are proposing the floor level as the current emission standard of 0.025 gr/dscf. This emission level is currently being achieved by all sources.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated improved particulate matter control to achieve a beyond-the-floor standard of 29 mg/dscm (0.013 gr/dscf). The national incremental annualized compliance cost for lightweight aggregate kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.32 million and would provide an incremental reduction in particulate matter emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 8.6 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between further improvements to control particulate matter and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 9 tons per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $36,600 per additional ton of particulate matter removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Particulate matter emissions from new lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited to 0.025 gr/dscf by § 63.1205(b)(7). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6797, February 13, 2002).

The MACT floor for new sources for particulate matter would be 23 mg/dscm (0.0099 gr/dscf), which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the APCD Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated improved particulate matter control to achieve a beyond-the-floor standard. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 12 mg/dscm (0.005 gr/dscf). The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new lightweight aggregate kiln with an average gas flow rate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $91,400 million and would provide an incremental reduction in particulate matter emissions of approximately 2 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were also evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $45,600 per additional ton of particulate removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control for new lightweight aggregate kilns. Therefore, we propose a particulate matter standard of 2.3 mg/dscm (0.0099 gr/dscf) for new sources.

D. What Are the Proposed Standards for Semivolatile Metals?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing lightweight aggregate kilns that limit emissions of semivolatile metals (cadmium and lead, combined) to 3.1×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste and 250 µg/dscm. The proposed standard for new sources is 2.4×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste and 43 µg/dscm.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Semivolatile metals emissions from existing lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited to 250 µg/dscm by § 63.1205(a)(3). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6797). Lightweight aggregate kilns control emissions of semivolatile metals with baghouses and/or by controlling the feed concentration of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste.

We have compliance test emissions data for all lightweight aggregate kiln sources. For most sources, we have compliance test emissions data from more than one compliance test campaign. Semivolatile metal stack emissions range from approximately 1 to over 1,600 µg/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of semivolatile metals (from all feedstocks) per unit volume of stack gas. Hazardous waste thermal emissions range from 3.0×10^{-6} to 1.1×10^{-3} lbs per million Btu. Hazardous waste thermal emissions represent the mass of semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste. For most lightweight aggregate kilns, lead was the major contributor to semivolatile emissions.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 3.1×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 71% of sources, and would reduce semivolatile metals emissions by 30 pounds per year.

To put the proposed floor level in context for a hypothetical lightweight aggregate kiln that gets 90% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a thermal emissions level of 3.1×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste equates approximately to a stack gas concentration of 300 µg/dscm. This estimated stack gas concentration does not include contributions to emission from other semivolatile metals-containing materials such as raw materials and fossil fuels. The additional contribution to stack emissions of semivolatile metals in an average raw material is estimated to range as high as 20 to 50 µg/dscm. Thus, for the hypothetical lightweight aggregate kiln the thermal emissions floor level of 3.1×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste is estimated to be less than 350 µg/dscm, which is higher than the current interim standard of 250 µg/dscm. Given that comparing the proposed floor level to the interim standard requires numerous assumptions (as just illustrated) including hazardous waste fuel replacement rates, heat input requirements per ton of clinker, concentrations of semivolatile metals in the raw material and fuels, and system removal efficiency, we have included a more detailed analysis in the background document.[118] Our detailed analysis indicates the proposed floor level could be less stringent than the interim standard for some sources. In order to avoid any backsliding from the current level of performance achieved by all lightweight aggregate kilns, we propose a dual standard: the semivolatile metals standard as both the

[118] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 23.

calculated floor level, expressed as a hazardous waste thermal emissions level, and the current interim standard. This would ensure that all sources are complying with a limit that is at least as stringent as the interim standard.

In the September 1999 final rule, we acknowledged that a lightweight aggregate kiln using properly designed and operated MACT control technologies, including controlling the levels of metals in the hazardous waste, may not be capable of achieving a given emission standard because of mineral and process raw material contributions that might cause an exceedance of the emission standard. To address this concern, we promulgated a provision that allows kilns to petition for alternative standards provided that they submit site-specific information that shows raw material hazardous air pollutant contributions to the emissions prevent the source from complying with the emission standard even though the kiln is using MACT control. See § 63.1206(b)(9). If we were to adopt the proposed dual semivolatile (and low volatile) metals standards approach, we propose to retain the alternative standard provisions under § 63.1206(b)(9) for semivolatile metals (and low volatile metals). We invite comment on this approach.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of semivolatile metals: (1) Improved particulate matter control; (2) control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of the semivolatile metals in the raw materials and fuels.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of semivolatile metals. Our data show that all lightweight aggregate kilns are already achieving greater than 99.7% system removal efficiency for semivolatile metals, with many attaining 99.9% removal. Thus, additional control of particulate matter are likely to result in only modest additional reductions of semivolatile metals emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 1.5×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which represents a 50% reduction in emissions from MACT floor levels. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for lightweight aggregate kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than to comply with the floor controls would be approximately $84,200 and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 20 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between further improvements to control particulate matter and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by less than 10 tons per year and would also require sources to use an additional 2,000 kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. The costs associated with these impacts are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $7.6 million per additional ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 2.5×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level representing the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of semivolatile metals in hazardous waste can be used and still achieve appreciable emissions reductions. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for lightweight aggregate kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $6,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of less than one pound per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the national compliance cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $20 million per additional ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste.

Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Lightweight aggregate kilns could achieve a reduction in semivolatile metal emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of cadmium and/or lead for a primary raw material with higher levels of these metals. We believe that this beyond-the-floor option would even be less cost-effective than either of the options discussed above, however. Given that facilities are sited near the primary raw material supply, acquiring and transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials is likely to be cost-prohibitive. Therefore, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on limiting semivolatile metals in the raw material feed.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of semivolatile metals would be an appropriate control option for sources. Two facilities typically burn hazardous waste at a fuel replacement rate of 100%, while one facility has burned a combination of fuel oil and natural gas in addition to the hazardous waste. We considered switching only to natural gas as the auxiliary fuel as a potential beyond-the-floor option. We do not believe that switching to natural gas is a viable control option for similar reasons discussed above for cement kilns.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for existing lightweight aggregate kilns at 3.1×10^{-4} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste and 250 µg/dscm.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Semivolatile metals emissions from new lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited to 43 µg/dscm by § 63.1205(b)(3). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6797).

The MACT floor for new sources for semivolatile metals would be 2.4×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu in the hazardous waste, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

To put the proposed floor level in context for a hypothetical lightweight aggregate kiln that gets 90% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a thermal emissions level of 2.4×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste can equate to a stack gas concentration as high as 60 µg/dscm, including contributions from typical raw materials. Thus, for the

hypothetical lightweight aggregate kiln the thermal emissions floor level of 2.4×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste is estimated to be as high as 60 µg/dscm, which is higher than the current interim standard of 43 µg/dscm. In order to avoid any backsliding from the current level of performance for a new lightweight aggregate kiln source, we propose a dual standard: the semivolatile metals standard as both the calculated floor level, expressed as a hazardous waste thermal emissions level, and the current interim standard. This would ensure that all sources are complying with a limit that is at least as stringent as the interim standard. Thus, the proposed MACT floor for new lightweight aggregate kilns is 2.4×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste and 43 µg/dscm.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified the same three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of semivolatile metals: (1) Improved control of particulate matter; (2) control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of semivolatile metals in the raw materials and fuels.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of semivolatile metals. We evaluated improved control of particulate matter based on a state-of-the-art baghouse using a high quality fabric filter bag material as beyond-the-floor control for further reductions in semivolatile metals emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 1.2×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new lightweight aggregate kiln with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than to comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.11 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions of approximately 13 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 3 tons per year and would also require sources to use an additional 0.3 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $18 million per ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control for new lightweight aggregate kilns.

Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also believe that the expense for further reduction in semivolatile metals emissions based on further control of semivolatile metals concentrations in the hazardous waste is not warranted. We considered a beyond-the-floor level of 1.9×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the compliance cost estimates. For similar reasons discussed above for existing sources, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the concentration of semivolatile metals levels in the hazardous waste feed would not be justified because of the costs and estimated emission reductions.

Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Lightweight aggregate kilns could achieve a reduction in semivolatile metals emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of cadmium and lead for a primary raw material with a higher level. For a new source at an existing facility, we believe that this beyond-the-floor option would not be cost-effective due to the costs of transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw material to the facility. Given that the plant site already exists and is sited near the source of raw material, replacing the raw materials at the plant site with lower semivolatile metals-containing materials would be the source's only option. For a kiln constructed at a new greenfield site, we are not aware of any information and data from a source that has undertaken or is currently located at a site whose raw materials are inherently lower in semivolatile metals that would consistently achieve reduced semivolatile metals emissions. Further, we are uncertain as to what beyond-the-floor standard would be achievable using, if it exists, a lower semivolatile metals-containing raw material. Although we are doubtful that selecting a new plant site based on the content of metals in the raw material is a realistic beyond-the-floor option considering the numerous additional factors that go into such a decision, we solicit comment on whether and what level of a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the level of semivolatile metals in the raw materials is appropriate.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of semivolatile metals would be an appropriate control option for sources. Two facilities typically burn hazardous waste at a fuel replacement rate of 100%, while one facility has burned a combination of fuel oil and natural gas in addition to the hazardous waste. We considered switching only to natural gas as the auxiliary fuel as a potential beyond-the-floor option. We do not believe that switching to natural gas is a viable control option for the same reasons discussed above for cement kilns.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for new lightweight aggregate kilns at 2.4×10^{-5} lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat content in the hazardous waste and 43 µg/dscm.

E. What Are the Proposed Standards for Low Volatile Metals?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing lightweight aggregate kilns that limit emissions of low volatile metals (arsenic, beryllium, and chromium) to 9.5×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste and 110 µg/dscm. The proposed standard for new sources is 3.2×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste and 110 µg/dscm.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Low volatile metals emissions from existing lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited to 110 µg/dscm by § 63.1205(a)(4). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*see* 67 FR at 6797). Lightweight aggregate kilns control emissions of low volatile metals with baghouses and/or by controlling the feed concentration of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste.

We have compliance test emissions data for all lightweight aggregate kiln sources. For most sources, we have compliance test emissions data from more than one compliance test campaign. Low volatile metal stack emissions range from approximately 16 to 200 µg/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of low volatile metals (from all feedstocks) per unit volume of

stack gas. Hazardous waste thermal emissions range from 9.7×10^{-6} to 1.8×10^{-4} lbs per million Btu. Hazardous waste thermal emissions represent the mass of low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste. For most lightweight aggregate kilns, chromium was the major contributor to low volatile emissions.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 9.5×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 57% of sources and would reduce low volatile metals emissions by 30 pounds per year.

To put the proposed floor level in context for a hypothetical lightweight aggregate kiln that gets 90% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a thermal emissions level of 9.5×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste equates approximately to a stack gas concentration of 90 µg/dscm. This estimated stack gas concentration does not include contributions to emission from other low volatile metals-containing materials such as raw materials. The additional contribution to stack emissions of low volatile metals in an average raw material is estimated to be 50 µg/dscm. Thus, for the hypothetical lightweight aggregate kiln the thermal emissions floor level of 9.5×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste is estimated to be 150 µg/dscm, which is higher than the current interim standard of 110 µg/dscm. Given that comparing the proposed floor level to the interim standard requires numerous assumptions including hazardous waste fuel replacement rates, heat input requirements per ton of clinker, concentrations of low volatile metals in the raw material and fuels, and system removal efficiency, we have included a more detailed analysis in the background document.[119] Our detailed analysis indicates the proposed floor level could be less stringent than the interim standard for some sources. In order to avoid any backsliding from the current level of performance achieved by all lightweight aggregate kilns, we propose a dual standard: the low volatile metals standard as both the calculated floor level, expressed as a hazardous waste thermal emissions level, and the current interim standard. This would ensure that all sources are complying with a limit that is at least as stringent as the interim standard.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of low volatile metals: (1) Improved particulate matter control; (2) control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of the low volatile metals in the raw materials and fuels.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of low volatile metals. Our data show that all lightweight aggregate kilns are already achieving greater than 99.8% system removal efficiency for low volatile metals, with many attaining 99.9% or greater removal. Thus, additional control of particulate matter emissions is likely to result in only a small increment in reduction of low volatile metals emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 4.7×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for lightweight aggregate kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.24 million and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 28 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated to estimate the impacts between further improvements to control particulate matter and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by less than 30 tons per year and would also require sources to use an additional 46,000 kW-hours of energy per year. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $17 million per additional ton of low volatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 7.6×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. We chose a 20% reduction as a level representing the practicable extent that additional feedrate control of low volatile metals in hazardous waste (beyond feedrate control that may be necessary to achieve the floor level) can be used and still achieve modest emissions reductions. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for lightweight aggregate kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $150,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 14 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were considered and are included in the cost estimates. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $22 million per additional ton of low volatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Lightweight aggregate kilns could achieve a reduction in low volatile metal emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of arsenic, beryllium, and/or chromium for a primary raw material with higher levels of these metals. We believe that this beyond-the-floor option would even be less cost-effective than either of the options discussed above, however. Given that facilities are sited near the primary raw material supply, acquiring and transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw materials is likely to be cost-prohibitive. Therefore, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on limiting low volatile metals in the raw material feed.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of low volatile metals would be an appropriate control option for sources. Two facilities typically burn hazardous waste at a fuel replacement rate of 100%, while one facility has burned a combination of fuel oil and natural gas in addition to the hazardous waste. We considered switching only to natural gas as the auxiliary fuel as a potential beyond-the-

[119] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 23.

floor option. We do not believe that switching to natural gas is a viable control option for similar reasons discussed above for cement kilns.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for existing lightweight aggregate kilns at 9.5×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste and 110 µg/dscm.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Low volatile metals emissions from new lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited to 110 µg/dscm by § 63.1205(b)(4). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6797).

The MACT floor for new sources for low volatile metals would be 3.2×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions in the hazardous waste per million Btu in the hazardous waste, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

As discussed for existing sources, in order to avoid any backsliding from the current level of performance for a new lightweight aggregate kiln source, we propose a dual standard: the low volatile metals standard as both the calculated floor level, expressed as a hazardous waste thermal emissions level, and the current interim standard. This would ensure that all sources are complying with a limit that is at least as stringent as the interim standard. Thus, the proposed MACT floor for new lightweight aggregate kilns is 3.2×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste and 110 µg/dscm.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We considered three potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of low volatile metals: (1) Improved particulate matter control; (2) control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) control of the low volatile metals in the raw materials and fuels.

Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of low volatile metals. We evaluated improved control of particulate matter based on a state-of-the-art baghouse using a high quality fabric filter bag material as beyond-the-floor control for further reductions in low volatile metals emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 1.6×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new lightweight aggregate kiln with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than to comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.11 million and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions of approximately 16 pounds per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 3 tons per year and would also require sources to use an additional 0.3 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of nearly $14 million per ton of low volatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control for new lightweight aggregate kilns.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also believe that the expense for further reduction in low volatile metals emissions based on further control of low volatile metals concentrations in the hazardous waste is not warranted. We considered a beyond-the-floor level of 2.6×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the compliance cost estimates. For similar reasons discussed above for existing sources, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the concentration of low volatile metals levels in the hazardous waste feed would not be justified because of the costs and estimated emission reductions.

Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Raw Materials and Auxiliary Fuels. Lightweight aggregate kilns could achieve a reduction in low volatile metals emissions by substituting a raw material containing lower levels of arsenic, beryllium, and/or chromium for a primary raw material with a higher level. For a new source at an existing facility, we believe that this beyond-the-floor option would not be cost-effective due to the costs of transporting large quantities of an alternate source of raw material to the facility. Given that the plant site already exists and is sited near the source of raw material, replacing the raw materials at the plant site with lower low volatile metals-containing materials would be the source's only option. For a kiln constructed at a new greenfield site, we are not aware of any information and data from a source that has undertaken or is currently located at a site whose raw materials are inherently lower in low volatile metals that would consistently achieve reduced low volatile metals emissions. Further, we are uncertain as to what beyond-the-floor standard would be achievable using, if it exists, a lower low volatile metals-containing raw material. Although we are doubtful that selecting a new plant site based on the content of metals in the raw material is a realistic beyond-the-floor option considering the numerous additional factors that go into such a decision, we solicit comment on whether and what level of a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the level of low volatile metals in the raw materials is appropriate.

We also considered whether fuel switching to an auxiliary fuel containing a lower concentration of low volatile metals would be an appropriate control option for sources. Two facilities typically burn hazardous waste at a fuel replacement rate of 100%, while one facility has burned a combination of fuel oil and natural gas in addition to the hazardous waste. We considered switching only to natural gas as the auxiliary fuel as a potential beyond-the-floor option. We do not believe that switching to natural gas is a viable control option for the same reasons discussed above for cement kilns.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose to establish the emission standard for new lightweight aggregate kilns at 3.2×10^{-5} lbs low volatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat content in the hazardous waste and 110 µg/dscm.

F. What Are the Proposed Standards for Hydrogen Chloride and Chlorine Gas?

We are proposing to establish standards for existing and new lightweight aggregate kilns that limit total chlorine emissions (hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, combined, reported as a chloride equivalent) to 600 ppmv. Although we are also proposing to invoke CAA section 112(d)(4) to establish alternative risk-based standards in lieu of the MACT emission standards for total chlorine, the risk-based standards would be capped at the

interim standards. Given that we are proposing MACT standards equivalent to the interim standards—600 ppmv, an emission level you are currently achieving—you would not be eligible for the section 112(d)(4) risk-based standards. See Part Two, Section XIII for additional details.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Total chlorine emissions from existing cement kilns are limited to 600 ppmv by § 63.1205(a)(6). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (See 67 FR at 6797). One of the three lightweight aggregate facilities uses a venturi scrubber to remove total chlorine from the gas stream. The system removal efficiency (SRE) achieved by this facility during compliance testing shows removal efficiencies ranging from 96 to 99%. Sources at the other two facilities do not use air pollution control equipment to capture emissions of total chlorine, and, therefore, SREs are negligible.

The majority of the chlorine fed to the lightweight aggregate kiln during a compliance test comes from the hazardous waste. In all but a few cases the hazardous waste contribution to the total amount of chlorine fed to the kiln represented at least 80% of the total loading to the kiln. The proposed MACT floor control for total chlorine is, in part, based on controlling the concentration of chlorine in the hazardous waste. The chlorine concentration in the hazardous waste will affect emissions of total chlorine at a given SRE because emissions will increase as the chlorine loading increases.

We have compliance test emissions data for all lightweight aggregate kiln sources. For most sources, we have compliance test emissions data from more than one compliance test campaign. Total chlorine emissions range from 14 to 116 ppmv for the source using a venturi scrubber and range from 500 to 2,400 ppmv at sources without scrubbing control equipment.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 3.0 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

To put the proposed floor level in context for a hypothetical lightweight aggregate kiln that gets 90% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a thermal emissions level of 3.0 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste equates approximately to a stack gas concentration of 1,970 ppmv. This estimated stack gas concentration does not include contributions to emission from other chlorine-containing materials such as raw materials. Given that the calculated floor level is less stringent than the current interim emission standard of 600 ppmv. In order to avoid any backsliding from the current level of performance achieved by all lightweight aggregate kilns, we are proposing the floor standard as the current emission standard of 600 ppmv. This emission level is currently being achieved by all sources.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We considered a beyond-the-floor standard of 150 ppmv based on the assumption that dry lime scrubbing will provide 75% control of hydrogen chloride.[120] In addition, for costing purposes we assumed that lightweight aggregate kilns needing total chlorine reductions to achieve the beyond-the-floor level would install the dry scrubbing system after the existing particulate matter control device and add a new, smaller baghouse to remove the products of the reaction and any unreacted lime. We chose this conservative costing approach to address potential concerns that unreacted lime and collected chloride and sulfur salts may interfere with lightweight aggregate dust use practices.

The national incremental annualized compliance cost for lightweight aggregate kilns to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $1.9 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 280 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $6,800 per additional ton of total chlorine removed. We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects associated with this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 12,700 tons per year and would also require sources to use an additional 175,000 kW-hours per year and 31 million gallons of water beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level.

We note that a cost of $6,800 per additional ton of total chlorine removed is in the "grey area" between a cost the Agency has concluded is cost-effective and a cost the Agency has concluded is not cost-effective under other MACT rules. EPA concluded that a cost of $1,100 per ton of total chlorine removed for hazardous waste burning lightweight aggregate kilns was cost-effective in the 1999 MACT final rule. See 68 FR at 52900. EPA concluded, however, that a cost of $45,000 per ton of hydrogen chloride removed was not cost-effective for industrial boilers. See 68 FR at 1677. Consequently, we are concerned that a cost of $6,800 per additional ton of total chlorine removed is not warranted. Therefore, after considering cost-effectiveness and nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard.

We specifically request comment on whether a beyond-the-floor standard is warranted.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

Total chlorine emissions from new lightweight aggregate kilns are currently limited to 600 ppmv by § 63.1205(b)(6). This standard was promulgated in the Interim Standards Rule (*See* 67 FR at 6797). The MACT floor for new sources for total chlorine would be 0.93 lbs chlorine in the hazardous waste per million Btu in the hazardous waste, which considers emissions variability.

To put the proposed floor level in context for a hypothetical lightweight aggregate kiln that gets 90% of its required heat input from hazardous waste, a thermal emissions level of 0.93 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste equates approximately to a stack gas concentration of 610 ppmv. This estimated stack gas concentration does not include contributions to emission from other chlorine-containing materials such as raw materials. Given that the calculated floor level is less stringent than the current interim emission standard of 600 ppmv. In order to avoid any backsliding from the current standard for a new lightweight aggregate kilns, we are proposing the floor standard as the current emission standard of 600 ppmv.

[120] We also considered controlling the chlorine levels in the hazardous waste feed and controlling the chlorine levels in the raw materials as potential beyond-the-floor techniques; however, it is our judgment that they are not likely to be as cost-effective as dry lime scrubbing.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

Similar to existing sources, we considered a beyond-the-floor standard of 150 ppmv based on the assumption that dry lime scrubbing will provide 75% control of hydrogen chloride. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new lightweight aggregate kiln with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than to comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.42 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions of approximately 150 tons per year for a cost-effectiveness of approximately $2,800 per additional ton of total chlorine removed. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects were evaluated and are included in the cost estimates. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of solid waste generated by 23 tons per year and would also require sources to use an additional 0.3 million kW-hours per year and 2 million gallons of water beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level.

A cost of $2,800 per additional ton of total chlorine removed is in the "grey area" between a cost the Agency has concluded is cost-effective and a cost the Agency has concluded is not cost-effective under other MACT rules, as discussed above. Therefore, we are concerned that a cost-effectiveness of $2,800 per additional ton of total chlorine removed may not be warranted. After considering cost-effectiveness and nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard.

We specifically request comment on whether a beyond-the-floor standard is warranted.

G. What Are the Standards for Hydrocarbons and Carbon Monoxide?

Hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide standards are surrogates to control emissions of organic hazardous air pollutants for existing and new lightweight aggregate kilns. The standards limit hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide concentrations to 20 ppmv or 100 ppmv. *See* §§ 63.1205(a)(5) and (b)(5). Existing and new lightweight aggregate kilns can elect to comply with either the hydrocarbon limit or the carbon monoxide limit on a continuous basis. Sources that comply with the carbon monoxide limit on a continuous basis must also demonstrate compliance with the hydrocarbon standard during the comprehensive performance test. However, continuous hydrocarbon monitoring following the performance test is not required. The rationale for these decisions are discussed in the September 1999 final rule (64 FR at 52900). We view the standards for hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide as unaffected by the Court's vacature of the challenged regulations in its decision of July 24, 2001. We therefore are not proposing these standards for lightweight aggregate kilns, but rather are mentioning them here for the reader's convenience.

H. What Are the Standards for Destruction and Removal Efficiency?

The destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) standard is a surrogate to control emissions of organic hazardous air pollutants other than dioxin/furans. The standard for existing and new lightweight aggregate kilns requires 99.99% DRE for each principal organic hazardous constituent, except that 99.9999% DRE is required if specified dioxin-listed hazardous wastes are burned. *See* §§ 63.1205(c). The rationale for these decisions are discussed in the September 1999 final rule (64 FR at 52902). We view the standards for DRE as unaffected by the Court's vacature of the challenged regulations in its decision of July 24, 2001. We therefore are not proposing these standards for lightweight aggregate kilns, but rather are mentioning them here for the reader's convenience.

X. How Did EPA Determine the Proposed Emission Standards for Hazardous Waste Burning Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers?

The proposed standards for existing and new solid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste are summarized in the table below. *See* proposed § 63.1216.

PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR EXISTING AND NEW SOLID FUEL-FIRED BOILERS

Hazardous air pollutant or surrogate	Emission standard [1]	
	Existing sources	New sources
Dioxin and furan	100 ppmv carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv hydrocarbons..	100 ppmv carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv hydrocarbons.
Mercury	10 µg/dscm	10 µg/dscm.
Particulate matter	69 mg/dscm (0.030 gr/dscf)	34 mg/dscm (0.015 gr/dscf).
Semivolatile metals	170 µg/dscm	170 µg/dscm.
Low volatile metals	210 µg/dscm	190 µg/dscm.
Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas [2]	440 ppmv or the alternative emission limits under § 63.1215.	73 ppmv or the alternative emission limits under § 63.1215.
Carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons [3]	100 ppmv carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv hydrocarbons.	100 ppmv carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv hydrocarbons.
Destruction and Removal Efficiency	For existing and new sources, 99.99% for each principal organic hazardous constituent (POHC). For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, 99.9999% for each POHC.	

[1] All emission standards are corrected to 7% oxygen, dry basis.
[2] Combined standard, reported as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent.
[3] Hourly rolling average. Hydrocarbons reported as propane.

We considered whether fuel switching could be considered a control technology to achieve MACT floor control. We investigated whether fuel switching would achieve lower HAP emissions and whether it could be technically achieved considering the existing design of solid fuel-fired boilers. We also considered the availability of various types of fuel. After considering these factors, we determined that fuel switching is not an appropriate control technology for purposes of determining the MACT floor level of control. This decision is based on the overall effect of fuel switching on HAP emissions, technical

and design considerations, and concerns about fuel availability.

We determined that while fuel switching from coal to natural gas or oil would decrease particulate matter and some metal HAP emissions, emissions of some organic HAP would increase, resulting in uncertain benefits.[121] We believe that it is inappropriate in a MACT rulemaking to consider as MACT a control option that potentially will decrease emissions of one HAP while increasing emissions of another HAP. In order to adopt such a strategy, we would need to assess the relative risk associated with each HAP emitted, and determine whether requiring the control in question would result in overall lower risk. Such an analysis is not appropriate at this stage in the regulatory process. For example, the term "clean coal" refers to coal that is lower in sulfur content and not necessarily lower in HAP content. Data gathered by EPA also indicates that within specific coal types HAP content can vary significantly. Switching to a low sulfur coal may actually increase emissions of some HAP. Therefore, it is not appropriate for EPA to include fuel switching to a low sulfur coal as part of the MACT standards for boilers that burn hazardous waste.

We also considered the availability of alternative fuel types. Natural gas pipelines are not available in all regions of the U.S., and natural gas is simply not available as a fuel for many solid fuel-fired boilers. Moreover, even where pipelines provide access to natural gas, supplies of natural gas may not be adequate. For example, it is common practice in cities during winter months (or periods of peak demand) to prioritize natural gas usage for residential areas before industrial usage. Requiring EPA regulated combustion units to switch to natural gas would place an even greater strain on natural gas resources. Consequently, even where pipelines exist, some units would not be able to run at normal or full capacity during these times if shortages were to occur. Therefore, under any circumstances, there would be some units that could not comply with a requirement to switch to natural gas.

In addition, we have significant concern that switching fuels would be infeasible for sources designed and operated to burn specific fuel types. Changes in the type of fuel burned by a boiler may require extensive changes to the fuel handling and feeding system (*e.g.*, a stoker-fired boiler using coal as primary fuel would need to be redesigned to handle fuel oil or gaseous fuel as the primary fuel). Additionally, burners and combustion chamber designs are generally not capable of handling different fuel types, and generally cannot accommodate increases or decreases in the fuel volume and shape. Design changes to allow different fuel use, in some cases, may reduce the capacity and efficiency of the boiler. Reduced efficiency may result in less complete combustion and, thus, an increase in organic HAP emissions. For the reasons discussed above, we conclude that fuel switching to cleaner solid fuels or to liquid or gaseous fuels is not an appropriate criteria for identifying the MACT floor level of control for solid fuel-fired boilers.

A. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Dioxin and Furan?

The proposed standard for dioxin/furan for existing and new sources is compliance with the proposed carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon (CO/HC) emission standard and compliance with the proposed destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) standard. The CO/HC and DRE standards control emissions of organic HAPs in general, and are discussed in Sections G and H below. This standard ensures that boilers operate under good combustion practices as a surrogate for dioxin/furan control. Operating under good combustion practices minimizes levels of products of incomplete combustion, including potentially dioxin/furan, and organic compounds that could be precursors for post-combustion formation of dioxin/furan. The rationale for the dioxin/furan standard is discussed below.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

The proposed MACT floor control for existing sources is compliance with the proposed CO/HC emission standard and compliance with the proposed DRE standard.

Solid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste cofire the hazardous waste with coal at firing rates of 6–33% of total heat input. We have dioxin/furan emission data for one source, and those emissions are 0.07 ng TEQ/dscm.

Although dioxin/furan can be formed post-combustion in an electrostatic precipitator or baghouse that is operated at temperatures within the range of 400° to 750°F, the boiler for which we have dioxin/furan emissions data is equipped with an electrostatic precipitator that operated at 500°F during the emissions test. Although this is well within the optimum temperature range for formation of dioxin/furan, dioxin/furan emissions were low. In addition, this boiler fed chlorine at levels four times greater than any other solid fuel boiler.[122] We also have emissions data from 16 nonhazardous waste coal-fired boilers equipped with electrostatic precipitators and baghouses operated at temperatures up to 480°F, all of which have dioxin/furan emissions below 0.3 ng TEQ/dscm.[123] We conclude from these data and the information discussed below that rapid quench of post-combustion gas temperatures to below 400°F—the control technique that is the basis for the MACT standards for hazardous waste burning incinerators, and cement and lightweight aggregate kilns—is not the dominant dioxin/furan control mechanism for coal-fired boilers.

We believe that sulfur contributed by the coal fuel is a dominant control mechanism by inhibiting formation of dioxin/furan. Coal generally contributes from 65% to 95% percent of the boiler's heat input with the remainder provided by hazardous waste fuel. The presence of sulfur in combustor feedstocks has been shown to dramatically inhibit the catalytic formation of dioxin/furan in downstream temperature zones from 400°F to 750°F. High sulfur coals tend to inhibit dioxin/furan formation better than low sulfur coals. *Id.*

Adsorption of any dioxin/furan that may be formed on coal fly ash, and subsequent capture in the electrostatic precipitator or baghouse, also may contribute to the low dioxin/furan emissions despite some boilers operating at relatively high back-end gas temperatures. This effect is similar to that of using activated carbon injection to control dioxin/furan emissions. Adsorption of dioxin/furan on fly ash is related to the carbon content of the fly ash, and, thus, the type of coal burned. *Id.*

Operating under good combustion conditions to minimize emissions of organic compounds such as polychlorinated biphenols, benzene, and phenol that can be precursors to dioxin/furan formation is an important requisite to control dioxin/furan emissions. Although sulfur-induced inhibition may be the dominant mechanism to control dioxin/furan

[121] C. Leatherwood, ERG, to J. Eddinger, OAQPS, EPA, Memorandum: Development of Fuel Switching Costs and Emission Reductions for Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, October 2002.

[122] Uncontrolled hydrogen chloride in combustion gas was approximately 700 ppmv.

[123] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 2.

emissions from coal-fired boilers, minimizing dioxin/furan precursors by operating under good combustion practices certainly plays a part in controlling dioxin/furan emissions.

We propose to use the CO/HC and DRE standards as surrogates to ensure that boilers operate under good combustion conditions because quantified levels of control provided by sulfur in the coal and adsorption onto collected fly ash may not be replicable by the best performing sources nor duplicable by other sources. Although coal sulfur content may be a dominant factor affecting dioxin/furan emissions, we do not know what minimum level of sulfur provides significant control. Moreover, sulfur in coal causes emissions of sulfur oxides, a major criteria pollutant, and particulate sulfates. Similarly, we cannot quantify a minimum carbon content of coal that would form carbonaceous fly ash with superior dioxin/furan adsorptive properties. In addition, restricting coal types that may be burned based on carbon content may have an adverse impact on energy production at sources burning hazardous waste as fuel. (These considerations raise the question of whether boilers operating under these conditions would still be "best" performers when these adverse impacts are taken into account.) For these reasons, and because we have emissions data from only one source, we cannot establish a numerical dioxin/furan emission standard.

Operating under good combustion practices is floor control because all hazardous waste burning boilers are required by existing RCRA regulations to operate under good combustion conditions to minimize emissions of toxic organic compounds. See § 266.104 requiring compliance with DRE and CO/HC emission standards.[124] We also find, as required by CAA section 112(h)(1), that these proposed standards are consistent with section 112(d)'s objective of reducing emissions of these HAPs to the extent achievable.

We request comment on an alternative floor that would be established as the highest dioxin/furan emission level in our data base. Because we have dioxin/furan emission data from only one coal-fired boiler that burns hazardous waste, we would combine that data point with emissions data from coal-fired boilers that do not burn hazardous waste since the factors that affect dioxin/furan emissions from these boilers are not significantly influenced by hazardous waste. These additional data would better represent the range of emissions from coal-fired boilers. Under this approach, the dioxin/furan floor would be an emission level of 0.30 ng TEQ/dscm. We would also use this approach to establish the same floor for new sources.

Finally, we note that we propose to require a one-time dioxin/furan emission test for sources that would not be subject to a numerical dioxin/furan emission standard, such as solid fuel-fired boilers. As discussed in Part Two, Section XIV.B below, the testing would assist in developing both section 112(d)(6) standards and section 112(f) residual risk standards.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

As discussed above, we propose to use the CO/HC and DRE standards as surrogates to ensure good combustion conditions, and thus, control of dioxin/furan emissions. We are not proposing beyond-the-floor standards for CO/HC and DRE, as discussion in Sections G and H below.

We investigated use of activated carbon injection or, for sources equipped with baghouses, catalytically impregnated fabric felt/membrane filter materials to achieve a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.10 ng TEQ/dscm.[125] To estimate the cost-effectiveness of these beyond-the-floor control techniques, we imputed dioxin/furan emissions levels for the six sources for which we don't have measured emissions data. To impute the missing emissions levels, we used the emissions data from the hazardous waste burning boiler as well as the emissions data from nonhazardous waste coal-fired boilers. It may be appropriate to meld these emissions data because hazardous waste burning should not affect dioxin/furan emissions from coal-fired boilers. In fact, the nonhazardous waste coal-fired boilers had somewhat higher emissions than the hazardous waste coal-fired boiler. (The emissions from the nonhazardous waste coal-fired boilers may simply represent the range of emissions that could be expected from hazardous waste coal-fired boilers, as well, given that we have emissions data from only one hazardous waste boiler.)

The national incremental annualized compliance cost for solid fuel-fired boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $3.4 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.26 grams TEQ tons per year. We also evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects between activated carbon injection and controls likely to be used to meet the floor level. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste[126] generated by 3,300 tons per year and would also require sources to use an additional 1.2 million kW-hours per year. Based on these impacts and costs of approximately $13 million per additional grams of dioxin/furan removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection.

For these reasons, we propose a floor standard for dioxin/furan for existing sources of compliance with the proposed CO/HC emission standard and compliance with the proposed DRE standard.[127]

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

As discussed above, we propose to use the CO/HC and DRE standards as surrogates to ensure good combustion conditions, and thus, control of dioxin/furan emissions. Because we are proposing the same DRE and CO/HC standards for existing sources and new sources as discussion in Sections G and H below, we are proposing the same dioxin/furan floor for new and existing sources.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We are not proposing beyond-the-floor standards for CO/HC for dioxin/furan for new solid fuel-fired boilers because we are not proposing beyond-the-floor standards for CO/HC and DRE

[124] Section 266.104 requires compliance with a CO limit of 100 ppmv or a HC limit of 20 ppmv, while we are proposing today a CO limit of 100 ppmv or a HC limit of 10 ppmv (see Section X.H in the text). Although today's proposed HC limit is more stringent than the current limit for boilers, all solid fuel boilers chose to comply with the 100 ppmv CO limit. Moreover, for those liquid-fuel fired boilers that chose to comply with the 20 ppmv HC limit, their HC emissions are below 10 ppmv.

[125] We considered a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm but determined that it may not result in emissions reductions because the majority of sources (the hazardous waste coal-fired boiler and the nonhazardous waste coal-fired boilers) appear to emit dioxin/furan at levels below 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm.

[126] To estimate the cost of a beyond-the-floor standard conservatively, we assumed the solid waste generated would be subject to regulation as hazardous waste. These costs are likely overestimated, however, because these residues are not likely to fail the criteria for retaining the Bevill exclusion under 40 CFR 266.112.

[127] We note that we propose to require solid fuel-fired boilers (and liquid fuel-fired boilers that are not subject to a numerical dioxin/furan standard) to conduct a one-time dioxin/furan emission test to provide data to assist in developing both section 112(d)(6) standards and section 112(f) residual risk standards. See discussion in Section XIV.B of the preamble.

for new sources. See discussion in Sections G and H below.

In addition, we evaluated activated carbon injection or, for sources equipped with baghouses, use of catalytically impregnated fabric felt/membrane filter materials as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of dioxin/furan emissions to achieve a beyond-the-floor level of 0.15 ng TEQ/dscm. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new solid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.28 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions of approximately 0.21 grams TEQ per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $1.3 million per gram of dioxin/furan removed. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste (or solid waste if the source retains the Bevill exclusion under 40 CFR 266.112) generated for a new solid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate by 270 tons per year and would require a source to use an additional 0.1 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. After considering these impacts and a cost of $1.3 million per gram of dioxin/furan removed, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection or catalytically impregnated fabric felt/membrane filter is not warranted for new sources. Consequently, we propose a floor standard for dioxin/furan for new sources: Compliance with the proposed CO/HC and DRE emissions standards.

B. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Mercury?

The proposed standard for mercury for solid fuel-fired boilers is 10 µg/dscm for both existing sources and new sources.[128]

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

The MACT floor for existing sources is 10 µg/dscm based on adsorption of mercury onto coal fly ash and removal of fly ash by the electrostatic precipitator or baghouse.

All solid fuel-fired boilers are equipped with electrostatic precipitators or baghouses. We have compliance test emissions data for three sources equipped with electrostatic precipitators which document maximum mercury emissions ranging from 3 ug/dscm to 11 µg/dscm and system removal efficiencies of 83% to 96%. These three sources represent seven of the 12 solid fuel-fired boilers.[129] The Agency has also determined that coal-fired utility boilers can achieve significant control of mercury by adsorption on fly ash and particulate matter control.[130]

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 10 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 67% of sources and would provide a reduction in mercury emissions of 0.015 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of mercury: (1) Activated carbon injection; and (2) control of mercury in the hazardous waste feed. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for mercury.

a. Use of Activated Carbon Injection. We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of mercury emissions. Activated carbon has been demonstrated for controlling mercury from waste combustion systems and has achieved efficiencies ranging from 80% to greater than 90% depending on factors such as: Activated carbon type/impregnation; injection rate; mercury speciation in the flue gas; and flue gas temperature. We made a conservative assumption that the use of activated carbon will provide 70% mercury control for coal-fired boilers given the low mercury levels at the floor. Applying this activated carbon removal efficiency to the mercury floor level of 10 µg/dscm would provide a beyond-the-floor level of 3.0 µg/dscm.

The national incremental annualized compliance cost for solid fuel boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $1.1 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.03 tons per year. We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects and estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste (or solid waste if the source retains the Bevill exclusion under 40 CFR 266.112) generated by 1,000 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 0.35 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. Based on these factors and costs of approximately $35 million per additional ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection.

b. Feed Control of Mercury in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 8 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for solid fuel boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.11 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.005 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are not significant factors for feedrate control.

We are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of mercury in the hazardous waste because it would not be cost-effective at approximately $23 million per additional ton of mercury removed. Consequently, we propose a floor standard for mercury for existing sources of 10 µg/dscm.

3. What Is the Rationale for MACT Floor for New Sources?

MACT floor for new sources would be 10 µg/dscm, the same as the floor for existing sources. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified by the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We identified the same two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control

[128] As information, EPA proposed MACT standards for mercury for solid fuel-fired industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers that do not burn hazardous waste of 5.3 µg/dscm for existing sources and 3.4 µg/dscm for new sources. See 68 FR 1660 (Jan. 13, 2003). These standards are based on use of fabric filters to control mercury emissions.

[129] Owners and operators have used the emissions data from the three boilers as "data in lieu of testing" emissions from other, identical boilers at the same facility. One of the three boilers as two such sister identical boilers, and the other two boilers each have a sister identical boiler. Thus, emissions from these three boilers represent emissions from seven of the 12 solid fuel-fired boilers.

[130] Memo from Frank Princiotta, USEPA, to John Seitz, USEPA, entitled "Control of Mercury Emissions from Coal-fired Utility Boilers," dated October 25, 2000.

of mercury: (1) Use of activated carbon injection; and (2) control of mercury in the hazardous waste feed.

We evaluated use of carbon injection for new sources to achieve a beyond-the-floor emission level of 5.0 µg/dscm. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new solid fuel boiler with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.28 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions of approximately 0.008 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $37 million per ton of mercury removed. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste (or solid waste if the source retains the Bevill exclusion under 40 CFR 266.112) generated for a new solid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate by 270 tons per year and would require a source to use an additional 0.1 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. After considering these impacts and, primarily, cost-effectiveness, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection for new sources. Consequently, we propose a floor standard for mercury of 10 µg/dscm for new sources.

C. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Particulate Matter?

The proposed standards for particulate matter for solid fuel-fired boilers are 69 mg/dscm (0.030 gr/dscf) for existing sources and 34 mg/dscm (0.015 gr/dscf) for new sources.[131] The particulate matter standard serves as a surrogate for nonmercury HAP metals in emissions from the coal burned in the boiler, and for nonenumerated HAP metal emissions attributable to the hazardous waste fuel burned in the boiler.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

All solid fuel-fired boilers are equipped with electrostatic precipitators or baghouses. We have compliance test emissions data for seven boilers. Emissions from these seven boilers represent emissions from all 12 solid fuel-fired boilers.[132] Particulate emissions range from 0.021 gr/dscf to 0.037 gr/dscf.[133]

To identify the floor level, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the air pollution control device approach. *See* discussion in Part Two, Section VI.A.2.a. The calculated floor is 140 mg/dscm (0.063 gr/dscf), which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 75% of sources. Compliance with the floor level would reduce particulate matter emissions by 33 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated improved design, operation, and maintenance of the existing electrostatic precipitators (*e.g.*, humidification to improve gas conditioning) and baghouses (*e.g.*, improved bags) for these boilers to achieve a beyond-the-floor emission level of 69 mg/dscm (0.030 gr/dscf). We also evaluated a more stringent standard based on adding a polishing fabric filter to achieve a beyond-the-floor emission level of 0.015 gr/dscf. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for solid fuel boilers to meet a beyond-the-floor level of 69 mg/dscm rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $1.3 million and would provide an incremental reduction in particulate matter emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 400 tons per year and an incremental reduction in metal HAP of 6.8 tons per year. We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects and estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste (or solid waste if the source retains its Bevill exclusion under 40 CFR 266.112) generated by 380 tons per year and would require sources to use an additional 3.3 million kW-hours per year and to use an additional 160 million gallons of water beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level.

Notwithstanding these nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects, a beyond-the-floor standard of 69 mg/dscm (0.030 gr/dscf) based on improved particulate matter control is warranted because it is cost-effective at a cost of approximately $3,200 per additional ton of particulate matter removed and a cost of approximately $190,000 per additional ton of metal HAP removed.[134] In addition, the average incremental annualized cost would be only $120,000 per facility. We also note that, although section 112(d) only authorizes control of HAPs, and particulate matter is not itself a HAP but a surrogate for HAP metals, Congress expected the MACT program to result in significant emissions reductions of criteria air pollutants (of which particulate matter is one), and viewed this as an important benefit of the MACT (and residual risk) provisions. *See* 5 *Legislative History* at 8512 (Senate Committee Report). Finally, we note that this beyond-the-floor standard of 0.030 gr/dscf would be comparable to the floor-based standard the Agency recently promulgated for solid fuel-fired boilers that do not burn hazardous waste: 0.07 lb/MM Btu (approximately 0.034 gr/dscf). *See* NESHAP for Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters, signed Feb. 26, 2004. Because hazardous waste does not contribute substantially to particulate matter emissions from coal-fired boilers, MACT standards for solid fuel boilers should be similar irrespective of whether they burn hazardous waste.

A 34 mg/dscm beyond-the-floor standard for existing sources based on use of a polishing fabric filter would remove an additional 570 tons per year of particulate matter beyond the floor level at a cost-effectiveness of $9,800 per ton removed. We conclude that this standard would not be as cost-effective as a 69 mg/dscm standard and would result in greater nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects. For these reasons, we propose a beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard of 0.030 gr/dscf (69 mg/dscm) for existing sources. We specifically request comment on whether this beyond-the-floor standard is warranted.

---

[131] As information, EPA proposed MACT standards for particulate matter for solid fuel-fired industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers that do not burn hazardous waste of 0.035 gr/dscf for existing sources and 0.013 gr/dscf for new sources. *See* 68 FR 1660 (Jan. 13, 2003). These standards are based on control of particulate matter emissions using a fabric filter.

[132] Owners and operators have determined that emissions from these seven boilers represent emissions from five other identical, sister boilers. Owners and operators have used the emissions from these seven boilers as "data in lieu of testing" emissions from the other five identical boilers.

[133] Although particulate matter emissions are predominantly attributable to coal ash rather than ash from hazardous waste fuel, we did not combine emissions data for coal-fired boilers that do not burn hazardous waste with the data for boilers that burn hazardous waste because we have particulate emissions data for all boilers that burn hazardous waste.

[134] Note that we are not proposing beyond-the-floor particulate matter standards for incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and liquid fuel-fired boilers because those standards would have a cost-effectiveness of $12,000 to $80,000 per ton of particulate matter removed, substantially higher than the $3,200 per ton cost-effectiveness of a beyond-the-floor standard for solid fuel-fired boilers.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

MACT floor for new sources would be 90 mg/dscm (0.040 gr/dscf), considering emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified by the APCD Approach (*i.e.*, the source using a fabric filter with the lowest emissions) could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated use of a fabric filter to achieve a beyond-the-floor emission level of 34 mg/dscm (0.015 gr/dscf). The incremental annualized cost for a new solid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $280,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in particulate emissions of approximately 44 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $6,400 per ton of particulate matter removed. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste (or solid waste if the source retains the Bevill exclusion under 40 CFR 266.112) generated for a new solid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate by 44 tons per year and would require a source to use an additional 1.1 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. Notwithstanding these impacts, a standard of 34 mg/dscm (0.015 gr/dscf) is warranted because it would be cost-effective and it would remove additional nonenumerated metal HAP. We also note that this beyond-the-floor standard of 0.015 gr/dscf for new sources would be comparable to the floor-based standard the Agency recently promulgated for new solid fuel-fired boilers that do not burn hazardous waste: 0.025 lb/MM Btu (approximately 0.012 gr/dscf). *See* NESHAP for Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters, signed Feb. 26, 2004.

For these reasons, we propose a beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard of 34 mg/dscm (0.015 gr/dscf) for new sources. We specifically request comment on whether this beyond-the-floor standard is warranted.

D. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Semivolatile Metals?

The proposed standard for semivolatile metals (lead and cadmium, combined) for solid fuel-fired boilers is 170 µg/dscm for both existing and new sources.[135]

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

We have compliance test emissions data for four boilers. Emissions from these four boilers represent emissions from nine of the 12 solid fuel-fired boilers.[136] Semivolatile metal emissions range from 62 µg/dscm to 170 µg/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of semivolatile metals (from all feedstocks) per unit of stack gas.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 170 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this floor level is being achieved by 42% of sources and would reduce semivolatile metals emissions by 0.22 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated three beyond-the-floor approaches for semivolatile metals for existing sources: (1) Improved control of particulate matter; (2) control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) a no-cost standard derived from the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for semivolatile metals.

a. Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of semivolatile metals. Consequently, we evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 85 µg/dscm, a 50 percent reduction in semivolatile metal emissions, that would be achieved by reducing particulate matter emissions. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for solid fuel boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.29 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.29 tons per year. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by approximately 133 tons per year, an additional 61 million gallons per year of water would be used, and an additional 1.3 million kW-hours per year of electricity would be used. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $1 million per additional ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

b. Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 140 µg/dscm based on additional control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed. This represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for solid fuel boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $36,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.046 tons per year. Although nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are not significant factors, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste because it is not cost-effective at approximately $0.78 million per additional ton of semivolatile metals removed.

c. No-cost Standard Derived from the Beyond-the-Floor Particulate Matter Standard. The beyond-the-floor standard for particulate matter would also provide beyond-the-floor control for semivolatile metals if sources were to comply with the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard using improved particulate matter control

---

[135] As information, EPA proposed to control nonmercury metal HAP emissions for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers that do not burn hazardous waste with a particulate matter emission standard only. See 68 FR 1660 (Jan. 13, 2003). For hazardous waste combustors, we propose to control specific, enumerated semivolatile and low volatile metals with separate emission standards because hazardous waste can have a wide range of concentrations of these metals, and, thus, particulate matter may contain a wide range of metal concentrations. Thus, particulate matter may not be an effective surrogate for particular metal HAP. Nonetheless, for practical reasons, we rely on particulate matter to control nonenumerated metal HAP.

[136] Owners and operators have determined that emissions from these four boilers represent emissions from five other identical, sister boilers. Owners and operators have used the emissions from these four boilers as "data in lieu of testing" emissions from the other five identical boilers.

rather than by reducing the feedrate of ash. To identify a beyond-the-floor emission level for semivolatile metals that would derive from the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard, we assumed that emissions of semivolatile metals would be reduced by the same percentage that sources would need to reduce particulate matter emissions. We then developed a revised semivolatile metal emission data base considering these particulate matter standard-derived reductions and reductions needed to meet the semivolatile metal floor level. We analyzed these revised emissions to identify the best performing sources and an emission level that the average of the best performers could achieve 99 out of 100 future tests. This emission level—82 µg/dscm—is a beyond-the-floor semivolatile metal standard that can be achieved at no cost because the costs have been allocated to the particulate matter beyond-the-floor standard.

We are concerned, however, that sources may choose to comply with the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard by controlling the feedrate of ash in the hazardous waste feed, which may or may not reduce the feedrate and emissions of metal HAP. If so, it would be inappropriate to consider the beyond-the-floor standard for semivolatile metals discussed above as a no-cost standard. We specifically request comment on whether sources may comply with beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard by controlling the feedrate of ash.

For these reasons, we propose a floor standard for semivolatile metals of 170 µg/dscm for existing sources.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

MACT floor for new sources would be 170 µg/dscm, considering emissions variability. This is the same as the floor for existing sources. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified by the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated three beyond-the-floor approaches for semivolatile metals for new sources: (1) Improved particulate matter controls; (2) control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) a no-cost standard derived from the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard.

a. Improved Particulate Matter Controls. We evaluated improved control of particulate matter using a fabric filter as beyond-the-floor control for further reductions in semivolatile metals emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 71 µg/dscm. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new solid fuel boiler with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.28 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions of approximately 0.15 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $1.8 million per ton of semivolatile metals removed. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste (or solid waste if the source retains the Bevill exclusion under 40 CFR 266.112) generated for a new solid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate by 44 tons per year and would require the source to use an additional 1.2 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. After considering these impacts and cost-effectiveness, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard for new sources based on use of a fabric filter to improve control of particulate matter is not warranted.

b. Feedrate Control. For similar reasons discussed above for existing sources, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste feed would not be cost-effective.

c. No-cost Standard Derived from the Beyond-the-Floor Particulate Matter Standard. As discussed above in the context of existing sources, the beyond-the-floor standard for particulate matter would also provide beyond-the-floor control for semivolatile metals if sources were to comply with the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard using improved particulate matter control rather than by reducing the feedrate of ash. Under this approach, the no-cost beyond-the-floor standard for semivolatile metals for new sources would be 44 µg/dscm. As discussed above, however, we are concerned that sources may choose to comply with the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard by controlling the feedrate of ash in the hazardous waste feed, which may or may not reduce the feedrate and emissions of metal HAP. If so, it would be inappropriate to consider this beyond-the-floor standard as a no-cost standard. We specifically request comment on whether sources may comply with beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard by controlling the feedrate of ash.

For these reasons, we propose a semivolatile metals standard of 170 µg/dscm for new sources.

E. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Low Volatile Metals?

The proposed standards for low volatile metals (arsenic, beryllium, and chromium) for solid fuel-fired boilers is 210 µg/dscm for existing sources and 190 µg/dscm for new sources.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

We have compliance test emissions data for four boilers. Emissions from these four boilers represent emissions from 10 of the 12 solid fuel-fired boilers.[137] Low volatile metal emissions range from 41 µg/dscm to 230 µg/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of low volatile metals (from all feedstocks) per unit of stack gas.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 210 µg/dscm, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 67% of sources and that it would reduce low volatile metals emissions by 0.45 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated three beyond-the-floor approaches for low volatile metals for existing sources: (1) Improved control of particulate matter; (2) control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) a no-cost standard derived from the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for low volatile metals.

a. Improved Particulate Matter Control. Controlling particulate matter also controls emissions of low volatile metals. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 105 µg/dscm. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for solid fuel boilers to meet this

[137] Owners and operators have determined that emissions from these four boilers represent emissions from five other identical, sister boilers. Owners and operators have used the emissions from these four boilers as "data in lieu of testing" emissions from the other five identical boilers.

beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.32 million and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.37 tons per year. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by approximately 83 tons per year, an additional 54 million gallons of water per year would be used, and electricity consumption would increase by 1.2 million kW-hours per year. Considering these impacts and a cost of approximately $0.87 million per additional ton of low volatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

b. Feed Control of Low Volatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 170 µg/dscm, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for solid fuel boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $98,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.13 tons per year. Although nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are not significant factors, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feedrate control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste because it would not be cost-effective at approximately $0.78 million per additional ton of low volatile metals removed.

c. No-cost Standard Derived from the Beyond-the-Floor Particulate Matter Standard. As discussed above in the context of semivolatile metals, the beyond-the-floor standard for particulate matter would also provide beyond-the-floor control for low volatile metals if sources were to comply with the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard using improved particulate matter control rather than by reducing the feedrate of ash. To identify a beyond-the-floor emission level for low volatile metals that would derive from the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard, we assumed that emissions of low volatile metals would be reduced by the same percentage that sources would need to reduce particulate matter emissions. We then developed a revised low volatile metal emission data base considering these particulate matter standard-derived reductions and reductions needed to meet the low volatile metal floor level. We analyzed these revised emissions to identify the best performing sources and an emission level that the average of the best performers could achieve 99 out of 100 future tests. This emission level—110 µg/dscm—is a beyond-the-floor low volatile metal standard that can be achieved at no cost because the costs have been allocated to the particulate matter beyond-the-floor standard.

We are concerned, however, that sources may choose to comply with the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard by controlling the feedrate of ash in the hazardous waste feed, which may or may not reduce the feedrate and emissions of metal HAP. If so, it would be inappropriate to consider the beyond-the-floor standard for low volatile metals discussed above as a no-cost standard. We specifically request comment on whether sources may comply with beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard by controlling the feedrate of ash.

For these reasons, we propose a floor standard for low volatile metals of 210 µg/dscm for existing sources.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

MACT floor for low volatile metals for new sources would be 190 µg/dscm, considering emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified by the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated three beyond-the-floor approaches for low volatile metals for new sources: (1) Improved particulate matter control; (2) control of low volatile metals in the hazardous waste feed; and (3) a no-cost standard derived from the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard.

a. Improved Particulate Matter Control. We evaluated improved control of particulate matter using a fabric filter to achieve an emission level of 79 µg/dscm as beyond-the-floor control for low volatile metals emissions. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new solid fuel boiler to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.28 million and would provide an incremental reduction in low volatile metals emissions of approximately 0.17 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $1.7 million per ton of low volatile metals removed. We estimate that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste (or solid waste if the source retains the Bevill exclusion under 40 CFR 266.112) generated for a new solid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate by 44 tons per year and would require the source to use an additional 1.2 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. After considering these impacts and cost-effectiveness, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control using a fabric filter for new sources is not warranted.

b. Feedrate Control. For similar reasons discussed above for existing sources, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on controlling the low volatile metals in the hazardous waste feed would not be cost-effective.

c. No-cost Standard Derived from the Beyond-the-Floor Particulate Matter Standard. As discussed above in the context of existing sources, the beyond-the-floor standard for particulate matter would also provide beyond-the-floor control for low volatile metals if sources were to comply with the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard using improved particulate matter control rather than by reducing the feedrate of ash. Under this approach, the no-cost beyond-the-floor standard for low volatile metals for new sources would be 34 µg/dscm. As discussed above, however, we are concerned that sources may choose to comply with the beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard by controlling the feedrate of ash in the hazardous waste feed, which may or may not reduce the feedrate and emissions of metal HAP. If so, it would be inappropriate to consider this beyond-the-floor standard as a no-cost standard. We specifically request comment on whether sources may comply with beyond-the-floor particulate matter standard by controlling the feedrate of ash.

For these reasons, we propose a low volatile metals standard of 190 µg/dscm for new sources.

F. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Total Chlorine?

The proposed standards for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas (*i.e.*, total chlorine, reported as a hydrogen chloride equivalents) for solid fuel-fired boilers are 440 ppmv for existing sources and 73 ppmv for new sources.[138]

[138] As information, EPA proposed MACT standards for hydrogen chloride for solid fuel-fired industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Solid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste are equipped with electrostatic precipitators or baghouses and do not have back-end controls for total chlorine. Total chlorine emissions are controlled by controlling the feedrate of chlorine in the hazardous waste feed. We have compliance test emissions data for five boilers. Emissions from these five boilers represent emissions from 10 of the 12 solid fuel-fired boilers.[139] Total chlorine emissions range from 60 ppmv to 700 ppmv.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated the compliance test emissions data associated with the most recent test campaign using the SRE/Feed Approach. The calculated floor is 440 ppmv, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the best performing feed control sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by 83% of sources and that it would reduce total chlorine emissions by 420 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated dry scrubbing to achieve a beyond-the-floor emission level of 110 ppmv for total chlorine for existing sources, assuming conservatively a 75% removal efficiency. The national annualized incremental compliance cost for solid fuel-fired boilers to comply with this beyond-the-floor level rather than the floor level would be $3.7 million, and emissions of total chlorine would be reduced by an additional 790 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $4,700 per ton of total chlorine removed. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor level and estimate that the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 18,000 tons per year, an additional 27 million gallons of water per year would be used, and electricity consumption would increase by 0.11 million kW-hours per year.

We note that a cost of $4,700 per additional ton of total chlorine removed is in the "grey area" between a cost the Agency has concluded is cost-effective and a cost the Agency has concluded is not cost-effective under other MACT rules. EPA concluded that a cost of $1,100 per ton of total chlorine removed for hazardous waste burning lightweight aggregate kilns was cost-effective in the 1999 MACT final rule. See 68 FR at 52900. EPA concluded, however, that a cost of $45,000 per ton of hydrogen chloride removed was not cost-effective for industrial boilers. See 68 FR at 1677.

Although a beyond-the-floor standard of 110 ppmv for solid fuel boilers under today's rule would provide health benefits from collateral reductions in SO_2 emissions,[140] we are concerned that a cost of $4,700 per additional ton of total chlorine removed is not warranted. Therefore, after considering cost-effectiveness and nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on dry scrubbing. We specifically request comment on whether a beyond-the-floor standard is warranted.

We also evaluated use of feedrate control of chlorine in hazardous waste to achieve a beyond-the-floor level of 350 ppmv, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. The national annualized incremental compliance cost for solid fuel-fired boilers to comply with this beyond-the-floor level rather than the floor level would be $0.08 million, and emissions of total chlorine would be reduced by an additional 40 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $2,000 per ton of total chlorine removed. Although nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are not significant factors for feedrate control, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on hazardous waste feedrate control because we are concerned about the practicability of achieving these emissions reductions, and our estimate of the associated cost, using feedrate control. We specifically request comment on use of feedrate control of chlorine in hazardous waste as a beyond-the-floor control technique, the emission reductions that could be achieved, and the costs of achieving those reductions.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

MACT floor for new sources would be 73 ppmv. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified by the Emissions Approach (*i.e.*, the source with the lowest emissions) could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated dry lime scrubbing to achieve a beyond-the-floor emission level of 37 ppmv for total chlorine for new sources, assuming conservatively a 50% removal efficiency.[141] The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new solid fuel boiler with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $610,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions of approximately 42 tons per year. Although nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are not significant factors, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard of 37 ppmv is not warranted because it would not be cost-effective at approximately $14,000 per additional ton of total chlorine removed.

For these reasons, we propose a floor standard for total chlorine of 73 ppmv for new sources.

G. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Carbon Monoxide or Hydrocarbons?

To control emissions of organic HAP, existing and new sources would be required to comply with either a carbon monoxide standard of 100 ppmv or a hydrocarbon standard of 10 ppmv.[142]

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Solid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste are currently subject to RCRA standards that require

that do not burn hazardous waste of 68 ppmv for existing sources and 15 ppmv for new sources. See 68 FR 1660 (Jan. 13, 2003). These standards are based on use of wet scrubbers to control hydrogen chloride.

[139] Owners and operators have determined that emissions from these five boilers represent emissions from five other identical, sister boilers. Owners and operators have used the emissions from these five boilers as "data in lieu of testing" emissions from the other five identical boilers.

[140] See U.S. EPA, "Addendum to the Assessment of the Potential Costs, Benefits, and Other Impacts of the Hazardous Waste Combustion MACT Replacement Standards—Proposed Rule," March 2004.

[141] Although we assumed dry scrubbing can readily achieve 75% removal of total chlorine for beyond-the-floor control for existing sources, assuming 50% removal for beyond-the-floor control for new sources is appropriate. This is because the floor for new sources—73 ppmv—is substantially lower than the floor for existing sources—440 ppmv—and dry scrubbing is less efficient at lower uncontrolled emission levels.

[142] As information, EPA proposed MACT standards for carbon monoxide for new solid fuel-fired industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers that do not burn hazardous waste of 400 ppmv corrected to 3% oxygen. See 68 FR 1660 (Jan. 13, 2003).

compliance with either a carbon monoxide standard of 100 ppmv, or a hydrocarbon standard of 20 ppmv. Compliance is based on an hourly rolling average as measured with a CEMS. See § 266.104(a). We are proposing today floor standards of 100 ppmv for carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv for hydrocarbons.

Floor control for existing sources is operating under good combustion practices including: (1) Providing adequate excess air with use of oxygen CEMS and feedback air input control; (2) providing adequate fuel/air mixing; (3) homogenizing hazardous waste fuels (such as by blending or size reduction) to control combustion upsets due to very high or very low volatile content wastes; (4) regulating waste and air feedrates to ensure proper combustion temperature and residence time; (5) characterizing waste prior to burning for combustion-related composition (including parameters such as heating value, volatile content, liquid waste viscosity, *etc.*); (6) ensuring the source is operated by qualified, experienced operators; and (7) periodic inspection and maintenance of combustion system components such as burners, fuel and air supply lines, injection nozzles, etc. Given that there are many interdependent parameters that affect combustion efficiency and thus carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions. we are not able to quantify "good combustion practices."

Ten of 12 solid fuel-fired boilers are currently complying with the RCRA carbon monoxide limit of 100 ppmv on an hourly rolling average. The remaining two boilers are complying with the RCRA hydrocarbon limit of 20 ppmv on an hourly rolling average. Those boilers have hydrocarbon levels below 5 ppmv, however, indicative of operating under good combustion practices.

We propose a floor level for carbon monoxide level of 100 ppmv because it is a currently enforceable Federal standard. Although the best performing sources are achieving carbon monoxide levels below 100 ppmv, it is not appropriate to establish a lower floor level because carbon monoxide is a surrogate for nondioxin/furan organic HAP. As such, lowering the carbon monoxide floor may not significantly reduce organic HAP emissions. In addition, it would be inappropriate to apply a MACT methodology to the carbon monoxide emissions from the best performing sources because those sources may not be able to replicate their emission levels. This is because there are myriad factors that affect combustion efficiency and, subsequently, carbon monoxide emissions. Extremely low carbon monoxide emissions cannot be assured by controlling only one or two operating parameters We note also that we used this rationale to establish a carbon monoxide standard of 100 ppmv for Phase I sources in the September 1999 Final Rule.

We propose a floor level for hydrocarbons of 10 ppmv even though the currently enforceable standard is 20 ppmv because: (1) The two sources that comply with the RCRA hydrocarbon standard can readily achieve 10 ppmv; and (2) reducing hydrocarbon emissions within the range of 20 ppmv to 10 ppmv should reduce emissions of nondioxin/furan organic HAP. We do not apply a prescriptive MACT methodology to establish a hydrocarbon floor below 10 ppmv, however, because we have data from only two sources. In addition, we note that the hydrocarbon emission standard for Phase I sources established in the September 1999 Final Rule is 10 ppmv also.

There would be no incremental emission reductions associated with these floors because all sources are currently achieving the floor levels.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We considered beyond-the-floor levels for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons based on use of better combustion practices but conclude that they may not be replicable by the best performing sources nor duplicable by other sources given that we cannot quantify good combustion practices. Moreover, we cannot ensure that carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon levels lower than the floors would significantly reduce emissions of nondioxin/furan organic HAP. This is because the portion of hydrocarbons that is comprised of nondioxin/furan organic HAP is likely to become lower as combustion efficiency improves and hydrocarbon levels decrease. Thus, at beyond-the-floor hydrocarbon levels, we would expect a larger portion of residual hydrocarbons to be compounds that are not organic HAP.

Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements are not significant factors for use of better combustion practices as beyond-the-floor control.

For these reasons, we conclude that beyond-the-floor standards for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons are not warranted for existing sources.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

MACT floor for new sources would be the same as the floor for existing sources—100 ppmv for carbon monoxide and 10 ppmv for hydrocarbons—and based on the same rationale.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

As discussed in the context of beyond-the-floor considerations for existing sources, we considered beyond-the-floor standards for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons for new sources based on use of better combustion practices. But, we conclude that beyond the floor standards may not be replicable by the best performing sources nor duplicable by other sources given that we cannot quantify good combustion practices. Moreover, we cannot ensure that carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon levels lower than the floors would significantly reduce emissions of nondioxin/furan organic HAP.

Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements are not significant factors for use of better combustion practices as beyond-the-floor control.

For these reasons, we conclude that beyond-the-floor standards for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons are not warranted for new sources.

H. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standard for Destruction and Removal Efficiency?

To control emissions of organic HAP, existing and new sources would be required to comply with a destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) of 99.99% for organic HAP. For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, the DRE standard is 99.9999% for organic HAP.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Solid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste are currently subject to RCRA DRE standards that require 99.99% destruction of designated principal organic hazardous constituents (POHCs). For sources that burn hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, the DRE standard is 99.9999% destruction of designated POHCs. See § 266.104(a).

The DRE standard helps ensure that a combustor is operating under good combustion practices and thus minimizing emissions of organic HAP. Under the MACT compliance regime, sources would designate POHCs that are organic HAP or that are surrogates for organic HAP.

We propose to establish the RCRA DRE standard as the floor for existing sources because it is a currently enforceable Federal standard. There would be no incremental emission reductions associated with this floor because sources are currently complying with the standard.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We considered a beyond-the-floor level for DRE based on use of better combustion practices but conclude that it may not be replicable by the best performing sources nor duplicable by other sources given that we cannot quantify better combustion practices. Moreover, we cannot ensure that a higher DRE standard would significantly reduce emissions of organic HAP given that DRE measures the destruction of organic HAP present in the boiler feed rather than gross emissions of organic HAP. Although a source's combustion practices may be adequate to destroy particular organic HAP in the feed, other organic HAP that may be emitted as products of incomplete combustion may not be controlled by the DRE standard.[143]

For these reasons, and after considering non-air quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor DRE standard for existing sources.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

We propose to establish the RCRA DRE standard as the floor for new sources because it is a currently enforceable Federal standard.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

Using the same rationale as we used to consider a beyond-the-floor DRE standard for existing sources, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor DRE standard for new sources is not warranted. Consequently, after considering non-air quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements, we are proposing the floor DRE standard for new sources.

XI. How Did EPA Determine the Proposed Emission Standards for Hazardous Waste Burning Liquid Fuel-Fired Boilers?

The proposed standards for existing and new liquid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste are summarized in the table below. *See* proposed § 63.1217.

PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR EXISTING AND NEW LIQUID FUEL-FIRED BOILERS

Hazardous air pollutant or surrogate	Emission standard [1]	
	Existing sources	New sources
Dioxin and furan: sources equipped with dry air pollution control system [2].	0.40 ng TEQ/dscm	0.015 ng TEQ/dscm or control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400°F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device.
Dioxin and furan: sources equipped with wet or with no air pollution control systems [2].	100 ppmv carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv hydrocarbons.	100 ppmv carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv hydrocarbons
Mercury [3]	3.7E–6 lbs/MM Btu	3.8E–7 lbs/MM BTU
Particulate matter	72 mg/dscm (0.032 gr/dscf)	17 mg/dscm (0.0076 gr/dscf)
Semivolatile metals [3]	1.1E–5 lbs/MM BTU	4.3E–6 lbs/MM BTU
Low volatile metals: chromium only [3, 4]	1.1E–4 lbs/MM BTU	3.6E–5 lbs/MM BTU
Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas [3, 5]	2.5E–2 lbs/MM BTU or the alternative emission limits under § 63.1215.	7.2E–4 lbs/MM BTU or the chlorine alternative emission limits under § 63.1215
Carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons [6]	100 ppmv carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv hydrocarbons..	100 ppmv carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv hydrocarbons.
Destruction and Removal Efficiency	For existing and new sources, 99.99% for each principal organic hazardous constituent (POHC). For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, 99.9999% for each POHC.	

[1] All emission standards are corrected to 7% oxygen, dry basis.
[2] A wet air pollution system followed by a dry air pollution control system is not considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this standard. A dry air pollution systems followed a wet air pollution control system is considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this standard.
[3] Standards are expressed as mass of pollutant emissions contributed by hazardous waste per million Btu contributed by the hazardous waste.
[4] Standard is for chromium only and does not include arsenic and beryllium.
[5] Combined standard, reported as a chloride (Cl(-)) equivalent.
[6] Hourly rolling average. Hydrocarbons reported as propane.

We considered whether fuel switching could be considered a MACT floor control technology for liquid fuel-fired boilers to achieve lower HAP emissions. We conclude that HAP emissions from liquid fuel-fired boilers are attributable primarily to the hazardous waste fuels rather than the natural gas or fuel oil that these boilers burn. Consequently, we conclude that fuel switching is not an effective MACT floor control technology to reduce HAP emissions for liquid fuel-fired boilers.

A. What Are the Proposed Standards for Dioxin and Furan?

We propose to establish a dioxin/furan standard for existing liquid fuel-fired boilers equipped with dry air pollution control devices of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm. The standard for new sources would be 0.015 ng TEQ/dscm or control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400 °F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device. For liquid fuel-fired boilers equipped either with wet air pollution control systems or with no air pollution systems, we propose a standard for both existing and new sources as compliance with the proposed standards for carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon and destruction and removal efficiency. In addition, we note that we propose to require a one-time dioxin/furan emission test for

[143] The carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon emission standard would control organic HAP that are products of incomplete combustion by also ensuring use of good combustion practices.

sources that would not be subject to a numerical dioxin/furan emission standard, including liquid fuel-fired boilers with wet or no emission control device, and new liquid fuel-fired boilers equipped with a dry air pollution control device. As discussed in Part Two, Section XIV.B below, the testing would assist in developing both section 112(d)(6) standards and section 112(f) residual risk standards.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

As discussed in Part Two, Section I.B.5, we used a statistical analysis to conclude that liquid boilers equipped with dry air pollution control devices have different dioxin/furan emission characteristics compared to sources with either wet air pollution control or no air pollution control devices.[144] Note that we consider the type of emission control device as a basis for subcategorization because the type of control device affects formation of dioxin/furan: dioxin/furan can form in dry particulate matter control devices while it cannot form in wet (or no) control devices. We therefore believe subcategorization is warranted and we propose to identify separate floor levels for sources equipped with dry particulate matter control devices versus sources with wet or no emission control device.

a. MACT Floor for Boilers Equipped with Dry Control Systems. To identify the floor level for liquid fuel boilers equipped with dry air pollution control systems, we considered whether dioxin/furan can be controlled by controlling the temperature at the inlet to the particulate matter control device. We conclude that this control mechanism may not be the predominant factor that affects dioxin/furan emissions from these sources. We have emissions data for three boilers equipped with electrostatic precipitators or fabric filters. Emissions from two of the boilers are below 0.03 ng TEQ/dscm. We do not have data on the gas temperature at the inlet to the emission control device for these sources. The third boiler, however, has dioxin/furan emissions of 2.4 ng TEQ/dscm when the flue gas temperature at the inlet to the fabric filter is 410 °F. We conclude from this information that this boiler is not likely to be able to achieve dioxin/furan emissions below 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm if the gas temperature is reduced to below 400 °F. This is contrary to the finding we made for cement kilns and incinerators without heat recovery boilers and equipped with dry particulate matter control devices. In those cases, we conclude that gas temperature control at the dry particulate matter control device is the predominant factor affecting dioxin/furan emissions. See discussions in Sections VII and VIII above. Consequently, other factors are likely contributing to high dioxin/furan emissions from the liquid fuel-fired boiler equipped with a fabric filter operated at a gas temperature of 410 °F, such as metals in the waste feed or soot on boiler tubes that may catalyze dioxin/furan formation reactions.

We evaluated the compliance test emissions data using the Emissions Approach and calculated a numerical dioxin/furan floor level of 3.0 ng TEQ/dscm, which considers emissions variability. As discussed above, however, one of the three sources for which we have emissions data is not likely to be able to achieve this emission level using gas temperature control at the inlet to the dry particulate matter control device. Consequently, we propose to identify the floor level as 3.0 ng TEQ/dscm or control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400 °F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device. This floor level is duplicable by all sources, and would minimize dioxin/furan emissions for sources where flue gas temperature at the control device substantially affects dioxin/furan emissions. We estimate that this emission level is being achieved by all sources and, thus, would not reduce dioxin/furan emissions.

b. MACT Floor for Boilers Equipped with Wet or No Control Systems. We have dioxin/furan emissions data for 33 liquid fuel-fired boilers equipped with a wet or no particulate matter control device. Emissions levels are below 0.1 ng TEQ/dscm for 30 of the sources. Emission levels for the other three sources are 0.19, 0.36, and 0.44 ng TEQ/dscm.

As previously discussed in Part Two, Section VII.A, we believe that it would be inappropriate to establish a numerical dioxin/furan emission floor level for sources using wet or no air pollution control systems based on the emissions achieved by the best performing sources because a numerical floor level would not be replicable by the best performing sources nor duplicable by other sources. As a result, we propose to define the MACT floor for sources with wet or no emission control devices as operating under good combustion practices by complying with the destruction and removal efficiency and carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon standards.[145] There would be no emissions reductions for these existing boilers to comply with the floor level because they are currently complying with the carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon standard and destruction and removal efficiency standard pursuant to RCRA requirements.

We also request comment on an alternative MACT floor expressed as a dioxin/furan emission concentration for liquid fuel boilers with wet or no emission control devices.[146] Although it would be inappropriate to identify a floor concentration based on the average emissions of the best performing sources as discussed above, we possibly could identify the floor as the highest emission concentration from any source in our data base, after considering emissions variability.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated use of activated carbon injection systems or carbon beds as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of dioxin/furan emissions. Activated carbon has been demonstrated for controlling dioxin/furans in various combustion applications.

a. Beyond-the-Floor Considerations for Boilers Equipped with Dry Control Systems. For liquid fuel-fired boilers using dry air pollution control equipment, we evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm based on activated carbon injection or control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400 °F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for sources to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $80,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the MACT floor

[144] Sources with a wet air pollution system followed by a dry air pollution control system is not considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this standard. Sources with a dry air pollution systems followed a wet air pollution control system is considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this standard.

[145] The fact that we determined floor control for existing sources as good combustion practices does not mean that all sources using floor control will have low dioxin/furan emissions. As discussed in Part Two, Section XIV.B., we are proposing to require liquid fuel-fired boilers that would not be subject to a numerical dioxin/furan emission standard to perform a one-time dioxin/furan emissions test to quantify the effectiveness of today's proposed surrogate for dioxin/furan emission control.

[146] Although the floor for liquid fuel boilers equipped with a dry emission control device would not be a numerical standard (*i.e.*, 3.0 ng TEQ/dscm or control of temperature of flue gas at the inlet to the control device to 400 °F), we propose a numerical beyond-the-floor standard for those boilers, as discussed below in the text.

controls of 0.06 grams TEQ per year for a cost-effectiveness of $1.3 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan removed. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 100 tons per year, an additional 25 trillion Btu per year of natural gas would be consumed, and electricity consumption would increase by 0.50 million kW-hours per year.

We judge that the cost to achieve this beyond-the-floor level is warranted given our special concern about dioxin/furan. Dioxin/furan are some of the most toxic compounds known due to their bioaccumulation potential and wide range of health effects, including carcinogenesis, at exceedingly low doses. Exposure via indirect pathways is a chief reason that Congress singled our dioxin/furan for priority MACT control in CAA section 112(c)(6). *See* S. Rep. No. 128, 101st Cong. 1st Sess. at 154–155. In addition, we note that the beyond-the-floor emission level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm is consistent with historically controlled levels under MACT for hazardous waste incinerators and cement kilns, and Portland cement plants. *See* §§ 63.1203(a)(1), 63.1204(a)(1), and 63.1343(d)(3). Also, EPA has determined previously in the 1999 Hazardous Waste Combustor MACT final rule that dioxin/furan in the range of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm or less are necessary for the MACT standards to be considered generally protective of human health under RCRA (using the 1985 cancer slope factor), thereby eliminating the need for separate RCRA standards under the authority of RCRA section 3005(c)(3) and 40 CFR 270.10(k). Finally, we note that this decision is not inconsistent with EPA's decision not to promulgate beyond-the-floor standards for dioxin/furan for hazardous waste burning lightweight aggregate kilns, cement kilns, and incinerators at cost-effectiveness values in the range of $530,000 to $827,000 per additional gram of dioxin/furan TEQ removed. *See* 64 FR at 52892, 52876, and 52961. In those cases, EPA determined that controlling dioxin/furan emissions from a level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm to a beyond-the-floor level of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm was not warranted because dioxin/furan levels below 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm are generally considered to be below the level of health risk concern.

For these reasons, we believe that proposing a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm is warranted notwithstanding the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects identified above and costs of approximately $1.3 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan TEQ removed. We specifically request comment on our decision to propose this beyond-the-floor standard.

b. Beyond-the-Floor Considerations for Boilers Equipped with Wet or No Control Systems. For liquid fuel-fired boilers equipped with wet or no air pollution control systems, we evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm based on activated carbon. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for these sources to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $550,000 and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.12 grams TEQ per year. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 100 tons per year, an additional 25 trillion Btu per year of natural gas would be consumed, an additional 4 million gallons per year of water would be used, and electricity consumption would increase by 0.50 million kW-hours per year. We are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm for liquid boilers that use a wet or no air pollution control system because it would not be cost-effective at $4.6 million per gram of TEQ removed.

We are also considering an alternative beyond-the-floor standard for existing liquid fuel boilers with wet or no particulate matter control devices of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm. Although all but one source for which we have data are currently achieving this emission level, boilers for which we do not have dioxin/furan emissions data may have emissions higher than 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm. In addition, dioxin/furan emissions from a given boiler may vary over time. Other factors that may contribute substantially to dioxin/furan formation, such as the level and type of soot on boiler tubes, or feeding metals that catalyze dioxin/furan formation reactions, differ across boilers and may change over time at a given boiler. Thus, dioxin/furan levels for these sources may be higher than 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm. For example, we recently obtained dioxin/furan emissions data for a liquid fuel-fired boiler equipped with a wet emission control system documenting emissions of 1.4 ng TEQ/dscm.[147] To control dioxin/furan emissions to a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm, you would use activated carbon. We specifically request comment on this beyond-the-floor option, including how we should estimate compliance costs and emissions reductions.

[147] These data were recently obtained and are not in the MACT data base. *See* "Region 4 Boiler Dioxin Data," Excel spreadsheet, March 10, 2004.

3..What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

The calculated floor level for new liquid fuel boilers equipped with dry air pollution control systems is 0.015 ng TEQ/dscm, which we identified using the Emissions Approach. If dioxin/furan emissions could be controlled predominantly by controlling the gas temperature at the inlet to the dry particulate matter control device, this would be the emission level that the single best performing source could be expected to achieve in 99 out of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. This emission level may not be replicable by this source and duplicable by other (new) sources, however, because factors other than flue gas temperature control at the control device may affect dioxin/furan emissions. *See* discussion of this issue in the context of the floor level for existing sources. Therefore, we propose to establish the floor level as 0.015 ng TEQ/dscm or control of flue gas temperature not to exceed 400 °F at the inlet to the particulate matter control device.

As previously discussed, we believe that it would be inappropriate to establish a numerical dioxin/furan emission floor level for liquid boilers with wet or with no air pollution control systems. Therefore, we propose floor control for these units as good combustion practices provided by complying with the proposed destruction and removal efficiency and carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon standards.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated use of activated carbon as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of dioxin/furan emissions. Activated carbon has been demonstrated for controlling dioxin/furan in various combustion applications.

a. Beyond-the-Floor Considerations for Boilers Equipped with Dry Control Systems. For liquid fuel-fired boilers using dry air pollution control equipment, we evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 0.01 ng TEQ/dscm using activated carbon injection. The national incremental annualized compliance cost

for a source with an average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.15 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.005 grams TEQ per year. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that, for a new liquid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate, the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 120 tons per year and electricity consumption would increase by 0.1 million kW-hours per year. After considering these impacts and costs of approximately $32 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.01 ng TEQ/dscm for liquid fuel-fired boilers using dry air pollution control systems.

We are also considering an alternative beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm for new liquid fuel boilers equipped with a dry particulate matter control device. A new source that achieves the floor level by controlling the gas temperature at the inlet to the dry particulate matter control device to 400 °F may have dioxin/furan emissions at levels far exceeding 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm. See discussion above regarding factors other than gas temperature at the control device that can affect dioxin/furan emissions from liquid fuel-fired boilers (and discussion of emissions of 2.4 ng TEQ/dscm for a boiler operating a fabric filter at 410 °F). Therefore, it may be appropriate to establish a beyond-the-floor standard to limit emissions to 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm based on use of activated carbon injection. We also note that this beyond-the-floor standard may be appropriate to ensure that emission levels from new sources do not exceed the proposed 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm beyond-the-floor standard for existing sources. Because standards for new sources are based on the single best performing source while standards for existing sources are based on the average of the best 12% (or best 5) performing sources, standards for new sources should not be less stringent than standards for existing sources. We specifically request comment on this beyond-the-floor option, including how we should estimate compliance costs and emissions reductions.

b. Beyond-the-Floor Considerations for Boilers Equipped with Wet or No Control Systems. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm for liquid fuel-fired boilers equipped with wet or with no air pollution control systems based on use of activated carbon. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for a source with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $0.15 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.06 grams TEQ per year. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that, for a source with average gas flowrate, the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 120 tons per year and electricity consumption would increase by 0.1 million kW-hours per year. After considering these impacts and costs of approximately $2.4 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for liquid fuel-fired boilers using a wet or no air pollution control system.

We are also considering an alternative beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm for new liquid fuel boilers equipped with wet or with no air pollution control systems. A new source that achieves the floor level—compliance with the standards for carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon and destruction and removal efficiency—may have high dioxin/furan emissions at levels far exceeding 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm. See discussion above regarding factors other than gas temperature at the control device that can affect dioxin/furan emissions from liquid fuel-fired boilers. Therefore, it may be appropriate to establish a beyond-the-floor standard to limit emissions to 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm based on use of activated carbon. We specifically request comment on this beyond-the-floor option, including how we should estimate compliance costs and emissions reductions.

B. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Mercury?

We propose to establish standards for existing liquid fuel-fired boilers that limit emissions of mercury to 3.7E–6 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. The proposed standards for new sources would be 3.8E–7 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste.[148] These standards are expressed as hazardous waste thermal emission concentrations because liquid fuel-fired boilers burn hazardous waste for energy recovery. *See* discussion in Part Two, Section IV.B of the preamble.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

MACT floor for existing sources is 3.7E–6 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste, which is based primarily by controlling the feed concentration of mercury in the hazardous waste. Approximately 11% of liquid boilers also use wet scrubbers that can control emissions of mercury.

We have normal emissions data within the range of normal emissions for 32% of the sources.[149] The normal mercury stack emissions in our data base are all less than 7 µg/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of mercury (from all feedstocks) per unit of stack gas. Hazardous waste thermal emissions, available for 12% of sources, range from 1.0E–7 to 1.0E–5 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. Hazardous waste thermal emissions represent the mass of mercury contributed by the hazardous waste per million Btu contributed by the hazardous waste.

To identify the MACT floor, we evaluated all normal emissions data using the Emissions Approach. The calculated floor is 3.7E–6 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this floor level is being achieved by 40% of sources and would reduce mercury emissions by 0.68 tons per year.

Because the floor level is based on normal emissions data, compliance would be documented by complying with a hazardous waste mercury thermal feed concentration on an annual rolling average. See discussion in Part Two, Section XIV.F below.

We did not use the SRE/Feed Approach to identify the floor level because the vast majority of mercury feed levels in the hazardous waste and

[148] As information, EPA did not propose MACT emission standards for mercury for liquid fuel-fired boilers that do not burn hazardous waste. *See* 68 FR 1660 (Jan. 13, 2003). Note that, in today's rule, we propose to control mercury only in hazardous waste fuels, an option obviously not available to boilers that do not burn hazardous waste.

[149] Several owners and operators have used the emissions data as "data in lieu of testing" emissions from other, identical boilers at the same facility. For purposes of identifying the number of boilers represented in this paragraph, the percentage includes the data-in-lieu sources.

the emissions measurements did not have detectable concentrations of mercury. Given that a system removal efficiency, or SRE, is the percentage of mercury emitted compared to the amount fed, we concluded that it would be inappropriate to base this analysis on SREs that were derived from measurements below detectable levels.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of mercury: (1) Activated carbon injection; and (2) control of mercury in the hazardous waste feed. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for mercury.

a. Use of Activated Carbon Injection. We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of mercury emissions. Activated carbon has been demonstrated for controlling mercury in several combustion applications; however, currently no liquid fuel boilers burning hazardous waste uses activated carbon injection. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 1.1E–6 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for liquid fuel-fired boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $12 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.097 tons per year. We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of using activated carbon injection to meet this beyond-the-floor emission level and estimate that the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 4,800 tons per year and that sources would consume an additional 44 trillion Btu per year of natural gas and use an additional 9.6 million kW-hours per year beyond the requirements to achieve the floor level. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $124 million per additional ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection.[150]

b. Feed Control of Mercury in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 3.0E–6 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for liquid fuel-fired boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $4.2 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.036 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are not significant factors for feedrate control. Therefore, based on these factors and costs of approximately $115 million per additional ton of mercury removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of mercury in the hazardous waste.

For the reasons discussed above, we do not propose a beyond-the-floor standard for mercury for existing sources. We propose a standard based on the floor level: 3.7E–6 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

The MACT floor for new sources for mercury would be 3.8E–7 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste and would be implemented as an annual average because it is based on normal emissions data. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the Emissions Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated activated carbon injection as beyond-the-floor control to achieve an emission level of 2.0E–7 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new liquid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.15 million and would provide an incremental reduction in mercury emissions of less than 0.0002 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $1 billion per ton of mercury removed. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that, for a new liquid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate, the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 120 tons per year and electricity consumption would increase by 0.1 million kW-hours per year. Although nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are not significant factors, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on activated carbon injection for new sources because it would not be cost-effective. Therefore, we propose a mercury standard based on the floor level: 3.8E–7 lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste.

C. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Particulate Matter?

The proposed standards for particulate matter for liquid fuel-fired boilers are 59 mg/dscm (0.026 gr/dscf) for existing sources and 17 mg/dscm (0.0076 gr/dscf) for new sources.[151] The particulate matter standard serves as a surrogate for nonenumerated HAP metal emissions attributable to the hazardous waste fuel burned in the boiler. Although the particulate matter standard would also control nonmercury HAP metal from nonhazardous waste fuels, the natural gas or fuel oil these boilers burn as primary or auxiliary fuel do not contain significant levels of metal HAP.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Few liquid fuel-fired boilers are equipped particulate matter control equipment such as electrostatic precipitators and baghouses, and, therefore, many sources control particulate matter emissions by limiting the ash content of the hazardous waste. We have compliance test emissions data from nearly all liquid boilers representing maximum allowable emissions. Particulate emissions range from 0.0008 to 0.078 gr/dscf.

To identify the floor level, we evaluated the compliance test emissions

[150] We note that the beyond-the-floor dioxin/furan standard we propose for liquid fuel-fired boilers equipped with dry particulate matter control devices would also provide no-cost beyond-the-floor mercury control for sources that use activated carbon injection to control dioxin/furan. If such sources achieve the beyond-the-floor dioxin/furan standard by other means (control of temperature at the inlet to the control device; control of feedrate of metals that may catalyze formation of dioxin/furan), however, collateral reductions in mercury emissions would not be realized.

[151] As information, EPA proposed MACT standards for particulate matter for solid fuel-fired industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers that do not burn hazardous waste of 0.035 gr/dscf for existing sources and 0.013 gr/dscf for new sources.

data associated with the most recent test campaign using the APCD Approach. The calculated floor is 72 mg/dscm (0.032 gr/dscf), which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this floor level is being achieved by 44% of sources and would reduce particulate matter emissions by 1,200 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated use of fabric filters to improve particulate matter control to achieve a beyond-the-floor standard of 36 mg/dscm (0.016 gr/dscf). The national incremental annualized compliance cost for liquid fuel-fired boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $16 million and would provide an incremental reduction in particulate matter emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 520 tons per year. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 520 tons per year and electricity consumption would increase by 13 million kW-hours per year. After considering these factors and costs of approximately $30,000 per additional ton of particulate matter removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose a standard for particulate matter for existing liquid fuel-fired boilers based on the floor level: 72 mg/dscm (0.032 gr/dscf).

3. What Is the Rational for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

MACT floor for new sources would be 17 mg/dscm (0.0076 gr/dscf), considering emissions variability. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified by the APCD Approach (*i.e.*, the source using a fabric filter [152] with the lowest emissions) could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

[152] The source also is equipped with a high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filter.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated use of an advanced fabric filter using high efficiency membrane bag material and a low air to cloth ratio to achieve a beyond-the-floor emission level of 9 mg/dscm (0.0040 gr/dscf). The incremental annualized cost for a new liquid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.15 million and would provide an incremental reduction in particulate emissions of approximately 2.9 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $53,000 per ton of particulate matter removed. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that, for a new liquid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate, the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 3 tons per year and electricity consumption would increase by 0.54 million kW-hours per year. Considering these factors and cost-effectiveness, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard of 9 mg/dscm is not warranted.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose a floor-based standard for particulate matter for new liquid fuel-fired boilers: 9.8 mg/dscm (0.0043 gr/dscf)

D. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Semivolatile Metals?

We propose a standard for existing liquid fuel-fired boilers that limits emissions of semivolatile metals (cadmium and lead, combined) to 1.1E–5 lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. The proposed standard for new sources is 4.3E–6 lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

MACT floor for existing sources is 1.1E–5 lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste, which is based on particulate matter control (for those few sources using a control device) and controlling the feedrate of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste.

We have emissions data within the range of normal emissions for nearly 40% of the sources.[153] The normal semivolatile stack emissions in our database range from less than 1 to 46 ug/dscm. These emissions are expressed conventionally as mass of semivolatile metals (from all feedstocks) per unit of stack gas. Hazardous waste thermal emissions, available for 25% of sources, range from 1.2E–6 to 4.8E–5 lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input of the hazardous waste.

We identified a MACT floor of 1.1E–5 expressed as a hazardous waste thermal emission by applying the Emissions Approach to the normal hazardous waste thermal emissions data.[154] This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this floor level is being achieved by 33% of sources and would reduce semivolatile metals emissions by 1.7 tons per year.

Because the floor level is based on normal emissions data, compliance would be documented by complying with a hazardous waste mercury thermal feed concentration on an annual rolling average. See discussion in Part Two, Section XIV.F below.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of semivolatile metals: (1) Improved particulate matter control; and (2) control of mercury in the hazardous waste feed. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for semivolatile metals.

a. Improved Particulate Matter Control. We evaluated installation of a new fabric filter or improved design, operation, and maintenance of the existing electrostatic precipitator and fabric filter as beyond-the-floor control

[153] Several owners and operators have used the emissions data as "data in lieu of testing" emissions from other, identical boilers at the same facility. For purposes of identifying the number of boilers represented in this paragraph, the percentages include the data-in-lieu sources.

[154] We propose to use the Emissions Approach rather than the SRE/Feed approach because our data base is comprised of emissions obtained during normal rather than compliance test operations. Because of the relatively low semivolatile metal feedrates during normal operations, we are concerned that the system removal efficiencies that we would calculate may be inaccurate (*e.g.*, sampling and analysis imprecision at low feed rates can have a substantial impact on calculated system removal efficiencies).

for further reduction of semivolatile metals emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 5.5E–6 lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for liquid fuel-fired boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $6.5 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.06 tons per year. We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects and determined that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste generated by approximately 45 tons per year and would increase electricity usage by 0.8 million kW-hours per year. After considering these factors and costs of approximately $100 million per additional ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

b. Feed Control of Semivolatile Metals in the Hazardous Waste. We also evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 8.8E–6 lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste, which represents a 20% reduction from the floor level. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for liquid fuel-fired boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $4.8 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.06 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are not significant factors for feedrate control. Therefore, considering these factors and costs of approximately $81 million per additional ton of semivolatile metals removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on feed control of semivolatile metals in the hazardous waste.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose a floor standard for semivolatile metals for existing liquid fuel-fired boilers of 1.1E–5 lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

The MACT floor for new sources for semivolatile metals would be 4.3E–6 lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the Emissions Approach [155] could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

Because the floor level is based on normal emissions data, compliance would be documented by complying with a hazardous waste mercury thermal feed concentration on an annual rolling average. See discussion in Part Two, Section XIV.F below.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 2.1E–6 lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste based on an advanced fabric filter using high efficiency membrane bag material and a low air to cloth ratio. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new liquid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.15 million and would provide an incremental reduction in semivolatile metals emissions of less than 0.002 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $87 million per ton of semivolatile metals removed. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that, for a new liquid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate, the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 2 tons per year and electricity consumption would increase by 0.54 million kW-hours per year. Considering these factors and cost-effectiveness, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard is not warranted. Therefore, we propose a semivolatile metals standard based on the floor level: 4.3E–6 lbs semivolatile metals emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste for new sources.

E. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Chromium?

We propose to establish standards for existing and new liquid fuel-fired boilers that limit emissions of chromium to 1.1E–4 lbs and 3.6E–5 lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste, respectively.

We propose to establish emission standards on chromium-only because our data base has very limited compliance test data on emissions of total low volatile metals: arsenic, beryllium, and chromium. We have compliance test data on only two sources for total low volatile metals emissions while we have compliance test data for 12 sources for chromium-only. Although we have total low volatile metals emissions for 12 sources when operating under normal operations, we prefer to use compliance test data to establish the floor because they better address emissions variability.

By establishing a low volatile metal floor based on chromium emissions only we are relying on the particulate matter standard to control the other enumerated low volatile metals—arsenic and beryllium—as well as nonenumerated metal HAP. We request comment on this approach and note that, as discussed below, an alternative approach would be to establish a MACT floor based on normal emissions data for all three enumerated low volatile metals.

We request comment on whether the compliance test data for chromium-only are appropriate for establishing a MACT floor for chromium. We are concerned that some sources in our data base may have used chromium as a surrogate for arsenic and beryllium during RCRA compliance testing such that their chromium emissions may be more representative of their total low volatile metals emissions than only chromium. If we determine this to be the case, we could apply the floor we calculate using chromium emissions to total low volatile metal emissions. Alternatively, we could use the normal emissions data we have on 12 sources and our MACT methodology to establish a total low volatile metals floor.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

MACT floor for existing sources is 1.1E–4 lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste, which is based on particulate matter control (for those few sources using a control device) and controlling the feed concentration of chromium in the hazardous waste.

We have compliance test emissions data for approximately 17% of the

[155] We use the Emissions Approach rather than the SRE/Feed Approach when we use normal rather than compliance test data to establish the standard, as discussed previously.

sources.[156] The compliance test chromium stack emissions in our database range from 2 to 900 ug/dscm. These emissions are expressed as mass of chromium (from all feedstocks) per unit of stack gas. Hazardous waste thermal emissions, available for 13% of sources, range from 3.2E–6 to 8.8E–4 lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste.

To identify the floor level, we evaluated all compliance test thermal emissions data using the SRE/Feed Approach (see discussion in Section VI.C above). The calculated floor is 1.1E–4 lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste feed, which considers emissions variability. This is an emission level that the average of the best performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this floor level is being achieved by 36% of sources and would reduce chromium emissions by 9.4 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of chromium emissions: (1) Use of a fabric filter to improve particulate matter control; and (2) control of chromium in the hazardous waste feed. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for chromium.

a. Use of a Fabric Filter to Improve Particulate Matter Control. We evaluated use of a fabric filter as beyond-the-floor control for further reduction of chromium emissions. We evaluated a beyond-the-floor level of 5.5E–5 lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for liquid fuel-fired boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $5.9 million and would provide an incremental reduction in chromium emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 0.50 tons per year. We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects and determined that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous waste generated by approximately 160 tons per year and would increase electricity usage by 3.0 million kW-hours per year. Based on these impacts and a cost of approximately $12 million per additional ton of chromium removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on improved particulate matter control.

b. Feed Control of Chromium in the Hazardous Waste. We evaluated additional feed control of chromium in the hazardous waste as a beyond-the-floor control technique to reduce floor emission levels by 25% to achieve a standard of 8.8E–5 lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. This beyond-the-floor level of control would reduce chromium by an additional 0.20 tons per year at a cost-effectiveness of $22 million per ton of chromium removed. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are not significant factors for feedrate control. We conclude that use of additional hazardous waste chromium feedrate control would not be cost-effective and are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on this control technique.

For the reasons discussed above, we do not propose a beyond-the-floor standard for chromium. Consequently, we propose to establish the emission standard for existing liquid fuel-fired boilers at the floor level: a hazardous waste thermal emission standard of 1.1E–4 lbs chromium emissions attributable to hazardous waste per million Btu of hazardous waste feed.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

The MACT floor for new sources for chromium would be 3.6E–5 lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste feed. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated use of an advanced fabric filter using high efficiency membrane bag material and a low air to cloth ratio as beyond-the-floor control to reduce chromium emissions to a beyond-the-floor level of 1.8E–5 lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new liquid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.15 million and would provide an incremental reduction in chromium emissions of 0.014 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $11 million per ton of chromium removed. We evaluated the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects of this beyond-the-floor standard and estimate that, for a new liquid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate, the amount of hazardous waste generated would increase by 2 tons per year and electricity consumption would increase by 0.54 million kW-hours per year. Considering these factors and cost-effectiveness, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard is not warranted. Therefore, we propose a chromium emission standard for new sources based on the floor level: 3.6E–5 lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste feed.

F. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Total Chlorine?

We are proposing to establish a standard for existing liquid fuel-fired boilers that limit emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas (*i.e.*, total chlorine) to 2.5E–2 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. The proposed standard for new sources would be 7.2E–4 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Most liquid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste do not have back-end controls such as wet scrubbers for total chlorine control. For these sources, total chlorine emissions are controlled by most sources by controlling the feedrate of chlorine in the hazardous waste feed. Approximately 15% of sources use wet scrubbing systems to control total chlorine emissions.

We have compliance test data representing maximum emissions for 40% of the boilers. Total chlorine emissions range from less than 1 to 900 ppmv. Hazardous waste thermal emissions, available for 27% of boilers, range from 1.00E–4 to 1.4 lbs total

[156] Several owners and operators have used the emissions data as "data in lieu of testing" emissions from other, identical boilers at the same facility. For purposes of identifying the number of boilers represented in this paragraph, the percentages include the data-in-lieu sources.

chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste.

The calculated floor is 2.5E–2 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste using the SRE/Feed Approach to identify the best performing sources (*see* discussion in section VI.C above). This is an emission level that the average of the performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this floor level is being achieved by 70% of sources and would reduce total chlorine emissions by 660 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We identified two potential beyond-the-floor techniques for control of total chlorine emissions: (1) Use of a wet scrubber; and (2) control of chlorine in the hazardous waste feed. For reasons discussed below, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for total chlorine.

a. Use of Wet Scrubbing. We considered a beyond-the-floor standard of 1.3E–2 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste based on wet scrubbing to reduce emissions beyond the floor level by 50 percent. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for liquid fuel-fired boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $7.8 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 430 tons per year. We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects and determined that this beyond-the-floor option would increase both the amount of hazardous wastewater generated and water usage by approximately 3.2 billion gallons per year and would increase electricity usage by 30 million kW-hours per year. Considering these impacts and a cost-effectiveness of approximately $18,000 per additional ton of total chlorine removed, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on wet scrubbing.

b. Feed Control of Chlorine in the Hazardous Waste. We evaluated additional feed control of chlorine in the hazardous waste as a beyond-the-floor control technique to reduce floor emission levels by 20% to achieve a standard of 2.0E–2 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. The national incremental annualized compliance cost for liquid fuel-fired boilers to meet this beyond-the-floor level rather than comply with the floor controls would be approximately $3.9 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions beyond the MACT floor controls of 170 tons per year. Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects are not significant factors for feedrate control. We conclude that use of additional hazardous waste chlorine feedrate control would not be cost-effective at $23,000 per ton of total chlorine removed and are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard based on this control technique.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose a total chlorine standard for existing liquid fuel-fired boilers based on the floor level: 2.5E–2 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

The MACT floor for new sources for total chlorine would be 7.2E–4 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. This is an emission level that the single best performing source identified with the SRE/Feed Approach could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under operating conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated wet scrubbing as beyond-the-floor control for further reductions in total chlorine emissions to achieve a beyond-the-floor level of 3.6E–4 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste. The incremental annualized compliance cost for a new liquid fuel-fired boiler with an average gas flowrate to meet this beyond-the-floor level, rather than comply with the floor level, would be approximately $0.44 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions of approximately 0.13 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $3.3 million per ton of total chlorine removed. We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects and determined that, for a new source with average an average gas flowrate, this beyond-the-floor option would increase both the amount of hazardous wastewater generated and water usage by approximately 140 million gallons per year and would increase electricity usage by 1.3 million kW-hours per year. After considering these impacts and cost-effectiveness, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard based on wet scrubbing for new liquid fuel-fired boilers is not warranted.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose a total chlorine standard for new sources based on the floor level: 7.2E–4 lbs total chlorine emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input from the hazardous waste.

G. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Carbon Monoxide or Hydrocarbons?

To control emissions of organic HAP, existing and new sources would be required to comply with either a carbon monoxide standard of 100 ppmv or a hydrocarbon standard of 10 ppmv.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Liquid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste are currently subject to RCRA standards that require compliance with either a carbon monoxide standard of 100 ppmv, or a hydrocarbon standard of 20 ppmv. Compliance is based on an hourly rolling average as measured with a CEMS. See § 266.104(a). We are proposing today floor standards of 100 ppmv for carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv for hydrocarbons.

Floor control for existing sources is operating under good combustion practices including: (1) Providing adequate excess air with use of oxygen CEMS and feedback air input control; (2) providing adequate fuel/air mixing; (3) homogenizing hazardous waste fuels (such as by blending or size reduction) to control combustion upsets due to very high or very low volatile content wastes; (4) regulating waste and air feedrates to ensure proper combustion temperature and residence time; (5) characterizing waste prior to burning for combustion-related composition (including parameters such as heating value, volatile content, liquid waste viscosity, *etc.*); (6) ensuring the source is operated by qualified, experienced operators; and (7) periodic inspection and maintenance of combustion system components such as burners, fuel and air supply lines, injection nozzles, *etc.* Given that there are many interdependent parameters that affect combustion efficiency and thus carbon

monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions, we are not able to quantify "good combustion practices."

All liquid fuel-fired boilers are currently complying with the RCRA carbon monoxide limit of 100 ppmv on an hourly rolling average. No boilers are complying with the RCRA hydrocarbon limit of 20 ppmv on an hourly rolling average.

We propose a floor level for carbon monoxide level of 100 ppmv because it is a currently enforceable Federal standard. Although the best performing sources are achieving carbon monoxide levels below 100 ppmv, it is not appropriate to establish a lower floor level because carbon monoxide is a surrogate for nondioxin/furan organic HAP. As such, lowering the carbon monoxide floor may not significantly reduce organic HAP emissions. In addition, it would be inappropriate to apply a MACT methodology to the carbon monoxide emissions from the best performing sources because those sources may not be able to replicate their emission levels. This is because there are myriad factors that affect combustion efficiency and, subsequently, carbon monoxide emissions. Extremely low carbon monoxide emissions cannot be assured by controlling only one or two operating parameters We note also that we used this rationale to establish a carbon monoxide standard of 100 ppmv for Phase I sources in the September 1999 Final Rule.

We propose a floor level for hydrocarbons of 10 ppmv even though the currently enforceable standard is 20 ppmv because: (1) The two sources that comply with the RCRA hydrocarbon standard can readily achieve 10 ppmv; and (2) reducing hydrocarbon emissions within the range of 20 ppmv to 10 ppmv should reduce emissions of nondioxin/furan organic HAP. We do not apply a prescriptive MACT methodology to establish a hydrocarbon floor below 10 ppmv, however, because we have data from only two sources. In addition, we note that the hydrocarbon emission standard for Phase I sources established in the September 1999 Final Rule is 10 ppmv also.

There would be no incremental emission reductions associated with these floors because all sources are currently achieving the floor levels.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We considered beyond-the-floor levels for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons based on use of better combustion practices but conclude that they may not be replicable by the best performing sources nor duplicable by other sources given that we cannot quantify good combustion practices. Moreover, as discussed above, we cannot ensure that lower carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon levels would significantly reduce emissions of nondioxin/furan organic HAP.

Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements are not significant factors for use of better combustion practices as beyond-the-floor control.

For these reasons, we conclude that beyond-the-floor standards for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons are not warranted for existing sources.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

MACT floor for new sources would be the same as the floor for existing sources—100 ppmv for carbon monoxide and 10 ppmv for hydrocarbons—and based on the same rationale.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

As discussed in the context of beyond-the-floor considerations for existing sources, we considered beyond-the-floor standards for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons for new sources based on use of better combustion practices. But we conclude that beyond the floor standards may not be replicable by the best performing sources nor duplicable by other sources given that we cannot quantify good combustion practices. Moreover, we cannot ensure that lower carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon levels would significantly reduce emissions of nondioxin/furan organic HAP.

Nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements are not significant factors for use of better combustion practices as beyond-the-floor control.

For these reasons, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor standard for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons.

H. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standard for Destruction and Removal Efficiency?

To control emissions of organic HAP, existing and new sources would be required to comply with a destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) of 99.99% for organic HAP. For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, the DRE standard is 99.9999% for organic HAP.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Liquid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste are currently subject to RCRA DRE standards that require 99.99% destruction of designated principal organic hazardous constituents (POHCs). For sources that burn hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, the DRE standard is 99.9999% destruction of designated POHCs. See § 266.104(a).

The DRE standard helps ensure that a combustor is operating under good combustion practices and thus minimizing emissions of organic HAP. Under the MACT compliance regime, sources would designate POHCs that are organic HAP or that are surrogates for organic HAP.

We propose to establish the RCRA DRE standard as the floor for existing sources because it is a currently enforceable Federal standard. There would be no incremental costs or emission reductions associated with this floor because sources are currently complying with the standard.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We considered a beyond-the-floor level for DRE based on use of better combustion practices but conclude that it may not be replicable by the best performing sources nor duplicable by other sources given that we cannot quantify better combustion practices. Moreover, we cannot ensure that a higher DRE standard would significantly reduce emissions of organic HAP given that DRE measures the destruction of organic HAP present in the boiler feed rather than gross emissions of organic HAP. Although a source's combustion practices may be adequate to destroy particular organic HAP in the feed, other organic HAP that may be emitted as products of incomplete combustion may not be controlled by the DRE standard.[157]

For these reasons, and after considering nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor DRE standard for existing sources.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

We propose to establish the RCRA DRE standard as the floor for new sources because it is a currently enforceable Federal standard.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

Using the same rationale as we used to consider a beyond-the-floor DRE

[157] The carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon emission standard would control organic HAP that are products of incomplete combustion by also ensuring use of good combustion practices.

standard for existing sources, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor DRE standard for new sources is not warranted. Consequently, after considering nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements, we are proposing the floor DRE standard for new sources.

XII. How Did EPA Determine the Proposed Emission Standards for Hazardous Waste Burning Hydrochloric Acid Production Furnaces?

The proposed standards for existing and new hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste are summarized in the table below. See proposed § 63.1218.

PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR EXISTING AND NEW HYDROCHLORIC ACID PRODUCTION FURNACES

Hazardous air pollutant or surrogate	Emission standard[1]	
	Existing sources	New sources
Dioxin and furan	0.40 ng TEQ/dscm	0.40 ng TEQ/dscm.
Hydrochloric acid and chlorine gas[2]	14 ppmv or 99.9927% System Removal Efficiency.	1.2 ppmv or 99.99937% System Removal Efficiency.
Carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons[3]	100 ppmv carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv hydrocarbons.	100 ppmv carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv hydrocarbons.
Destruction and Removal Efficiency	For existing and new sources, 99.99% for each principal organic hazardous constituent (POHC). For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, 99.9999% for each POHC.	

[1] All emission standards are corrected to 7% oxygen, dry basis.
[2] Combined standard, reported as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent.
[3] Hourly rolling average. Hydrocarbons reported as propane.

A. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Dioxin and Furan?

The proposed standard for dioxin/furan for existing and new sources is 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

The proposed MACT floor for existing sources is compliance with the proposed CO/HC emission standard and compliance with the proposed DRE standard.

Hydrochloric acid production furnaces use wet scrubbers to remove hydrochloric acid from combustion gases to produce the hydrochloric acid product and to minimize residual emissions of hydrochloric acid and chlorine gas. Thus, dioxin/furan cannot be formed on particulate surfaces in the emission control device as can happen with electrostatic precipitators and fabric filters. Nonetheless, dioxin/furan emissions from hydrochloric acid production furnaces can be very high. We have dioxin/furan emissions data for 18 test conditions representing 14 of the 17 sources. Dioxin/furan emissions range from 0.02 ng TEQ/dscm to 6.8 ng TEQ/dscm.

We investigated whether it would be appropriate to establish separate dioxin/furan standards for furnaces equipped with waste heat recovery boilers versus those without boilers. Ten of the 17 hydrochloric acid production furnaces are equipped with boilers. We considered whether waste heat recovery boilers may be causing the elevated dioxin/furan emissions, as appeared to be the case for incinerators equipped with boilers. See 62 FR at 24220 (May 2, 1997) where we explain that heat recovery boilers preclude rapid temperature quench of combustion gases, thus allowing particle-catalyzed formation of dioxin/furan. The dioxin/furan data for hydrochloric acid production furnaces indicate, however, that furnaces with boilers have dioxin/furan emissions ranging from 0.05 to 6.8 ng TEQ/dscm, while furnaces without boilers have dioxin/furan emissions ranging from 0.02 to 1.7 ng TEQ/dscm. Based on a statistical analysis of the data sets (see discussion in Part Two, Section II.E), we conclude that the dioxin/furan emissions for furnaces equipped with boilers are not significantly different from dioxin/furan emissions for furnaces without boilers. Thus. we conclude that separate dioxin/furan emission standards are not warranted.

We cannot identify or quantify a dioxin/furan control mechanism for these furnaces. Consequently, we conclude that establishing a floor emission level based on emissions from the best performing sources would not be appropriate because the best performing sources may not be able to replicate their emission levels, and other sources may not be able to duplicate those emission levels.

We note, however, that dioxin/furan emissions can be affected by the furnace's combustion efficiency. Operating under poor combustion conditions can generate dioxin/furan and organic precursors that may contribute to post-combustion dioxin/furan formation. Because we cannot quantify a dioxin/furan floor level and because hydrochloric acid production furnaces are currently required to operate under good combustion practices by RCRA standards for carbon monoxide/hydrocarbons and destruction and removal efficiency, we identify those RCRA standards as the proposed MACT floor. See § 266.104 requiring compliance with destruction and removal efficiency and carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon emission standards.[158] We also find, as required by CAA section 112(h)(1), that these proposed standards are consistent with section 112(d)'s objective of reducing emissions of these HAP to the extent achievable.

We also request comment on an alternative MACT floor expressed as a dioxin/furan emission concentration. Although it would be inappropriate to identify a floor concentration based on the average emissions of the best performing sources as discussed above, we could identify the floor as the highest emission concentration from any source in our data base, after considering emissions variability. Under this approach, the highest emitting source could be expected to achieve the floor 99 out of 100 future tests when

[158] Section 266.104 requires compliance with a carbon monoxide limit of 100 ppmv or a hydrocarbon limit of 20 ppmv, while we are proposing today a carbon monoxide limit of 100 ppmv or a hydrocarbon limit of 10 ppmv (see Section XII.H in the text). Although today's proposed hydrocarbon limit is more stringent than the current limit for hydrochloric acid production furnaces, all sources chose to comply with the 100 ppmv carbon monoxide limit.

operating under the same conditions as it did when the emissions data were obtained. A floor that is expressed as a dioxin/furan emission level would prevent sources from emitting at levels higher than the (currently) worst-case source (actually, the worst-case performance test result) currently emits. We specifically request comment on this alternative MACT floor.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated use of an activated carbon bed (preceded by gas reheating to above the dewpoint) as beyond-the-floor control for dioxin/furan. Carbon beds can achieve greater than 99% reduction in dioxin/furan emissions.[159] We considered alternative beyond-the-floor levels of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm and 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm.

The incremental annualized cost of a beyond-the-floor emission level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm would be $1.9 million and would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions of 2.3 grams TEQ per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $0.83 million per gram TEQ removed.[160] A beyond-the-floor emission level of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm would provide very little incremental emissions reduction—0.1 grams TEQ per year—at additional costs. We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects and determined that this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous wastewater generated by 210 tons per year, and would increase electricity usage by 1.8 million kW-hours per year and natural gas consumption by 96 trillion Btu per year.

We judge that the cost to achieve a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm is warranted given our special concern about dioxin/furan. Dioxin/furan are some of the most toxic compounds known due to their bioaccumulation potential and wide range of health effects, including carcinogenesis, at exceedingly low doses. Exposure via indirect pathways is a chief reason that Congress singled out dioxin/furan for priority MACT control in CAA section 112(c)(6). See S. Rep. No. 128, 101st Cong. 1st Sess. at 154–155. In addition, we note that the beyond-the-floor emission level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm is consistent with historically controlled levels under MACT for hazardous waste incinerators and cement kilns, and Portland cement plants. See §§ 63.1203(a)(1), 63.1204(a)(1), and 63.1343(d)(3). Also, EPA has determined previously in the 1999 Hazardous Waste Combustor MACT final rule that dioxin/furan in the range of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm or less are necessary for the MACT standards to be considered generally protective of human health under RCRA (using the 1985 cancer slope factor), thereby eliminating the need for separate RCRA standards under the authority of RCRA section 3005(c)(3) and 40 CFR 270.10(k). Finally, we note that this decision is not inconsistent with EPA's decision not to promulgate beyond-the-floor standards for dioxin/furan for hazardous waste burning lightweight aggregate kilns, cement kilns, and incinerators at cost-effectiveness values in the range of $530,000 to $827,000 per additional gram of dioxin/furan TEQ removed. See 64 FR at 52892, 52876, and 52961. In those cases, EPA determined that controlling dioxin/furan emissions from a level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm to a beyond-the-floor level of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm was not warranted because dioxin/furan levels below 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm are generally considered to be below the level of health risk concern.

For these reasons, we believe that proposing a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm is warranted notwithstanding the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects identified above and costs of approximately $0.83 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan TEQ removed. We specifically request comment on our decision to propose this beyond-the-floor standard.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

MACT floor for new sources is the same as for existing sources under the same rationale: compliance with the carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon emission standard and compliance with the destruction and removal efficiency standard.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

As for existing sources, we evaluated use of an activated carbon bed as beyond-the-floor control for new sources to achieve an emission level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm. We estimate that the incremental annualized cost for a new hydrochloric acid production furnace with average gas flowrate to reduce dioxin/furan emissions at the floor of 0.68 ng TEQ/dscm[161] to achieve a beyond-the-floor emission level of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm would be $0.15 million. These controls would provide an incremental reduction in dioxin/furan emissions of 0.66 grams TEQ per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $230,000 per gram TEQ removed. We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects and determined that, for a new source with an average gas flowrate, this beyond-the-floor option would increase the amount of hazardous wastewater generated by 9 tons per year, and would increase electricity usage by 0.14 million kW-hours per year and natural gas consumption by 9.2 trillion Btu per year.

We judge that the cost to achieve a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm is warranted given our special concern about dioxin/furan. Dioxin/furan are some of the most toxic compounds known due to their bioaccumulation potential and wide range of health effects, including carcinogenesis, at exceedingly low doses. Exposure via indirect pathways is a chief reason that Congress singled our dioxin/furan for priority MACT control in CAA section 112(c)(6). See S. Rep. No. 128, 101st Cong. 1st Sess. at 154–155. In addition, we note that the beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm is consistent with historically controlled levels under MACT for hazardous waste incinerators and cement kilns, and Portland cement plants. See §§ 63.1203(a)(1), 63.1204(a)(1), and 63.1343(d)(3). Also, EPA has determined previously in the 1999 Hazardous Waste Combustor MACT final rule that dioxin/furan in the range of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm or less are necessary for the MACT standards to be considered generally protective of human health under RCRA (using the 1985 cancer slope factor), thereby eliminating the need for separate RCRA standards under the authority of RCRA section 3005(c)(3) and 40 CFR 270.10(k).

For these reasons, we believe that proposing a beyond-the-floor standard of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm is warranted notwithstanding the nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects identified above and costs of approximately $0.23 million per additional gram of dioxin/furan TEQ removed. We specifically request comment on our decision to propose this beyond-the-floor standard.

[159] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emissions Estimates and Engineering Costs," March 2004, Chapter 4.

[160] Please note that, under the proposed floor level, sources would not incur retrofit costs or achieve dioxin/furan emissions reductions because they currently comply with the floor controls under current RCRA regulations at 40 CFR 266.104.

[161] We estimate beyond-the-floor control costs assuming a new source emits the highest levels likely under floor control based on compliance with the carbon monoxide and destruction and removal efficiency standards.

B. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Mercury, Semivolatile Metals, and Low Volatile Metals?

We propose to require compliance with the total chlorine standard as a surrogate for the mercury, semivolatile metals, and low volatile metals standards.

As discussed above, hydrochloric acid production furnaces use wet scrubbers to remove hydrochloric acid from combustion gases to produce the hydrochloric acid product and to minimize residual emissions of hydrochloric acid and chlorine gas. Wet scrubbers also remove metal HAP, including mercury, from combustion gases. To minimize contamination of hydrochloric acid product with metals, hydrochloric acid production furnaces generally feed hazardous waste with low levels of metal HAP. Moreover, the wet scrubbers used to recover the hydrochloric acid product and minimize residual emissions of hydrochloric acid and chlorine gas also control emissions of metal HAP to very low levels. Based on emissions testing within the range of normal emissions (*i.e.*, not compliance test, maximum allowed emissions), hydrochloric acid production furnaces emit mercury at levels from 0.1 to 0.4 µg/dscm, semivolatile metals at levels from 0.1 to 4.1 µg/dscm, and low volatile metals at levels from 0.1 to 43 µg/dscm.[162, 163]

We also note that these sources emit low levels of particulate matter. Compliance test, maximum allowable emissions of particulate matter range from 0.001 to 0.013 gr/dscf.

Because wet scrubbers designed to recover the hydrochloric acid product and control residual emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas also control emissions of mercury, and semivolatile and low volatile metals (including nonenumerated metals), use of MACT wet scrubbers to comply with the proposed total chlorine standard discussed below will also ensure MACT control of metal HAP. Accordingly, we propose to use the total chlorine standard as a surrogate for the mercury, semivolatile metals, and low volatile metals standards.

C. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Total Chlorine?

The proposed standards for total chlorine are 14 ppmv or 99.9927 percent total chlorine system removal efficiency (SRE) for existing sources and 1.2 ppmv or 99.99937 percent total chlorine SRE for new sources. A source may elect to comply with either standard.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

The proposed MACT floor for existing sources is compliance with either a total chlorine emission level of 14 ppmv or a total chlorine SRE of 99.9927 percent.

Hydrochloric acid production furnaces use wet scrubbers to remove hydrochloric acid from combustion gases to produce the hydrochloric acid product and to minimize residual emissions of hydrochloric acid and chlorine gas. We have compliance test, maximum allowable total chlorine emissions data for all 17 hydrochloric acid production furnaces. Total chlorine emissions range from 0.4 to 500 ppmv, and total chlorine system removal efficiencies (SRE) range from 98.967 to 99.9995 percent.

As discussed in Section VI.C above, control of the feedrate of chlorine in hazardous waste fed to the furnace is not an appropriate MACT emission control technique because hydrochloric acid production furnaces are designed to produce hydrochloric acid from chlorinated feedstocks. Consequently, the approaches we normally use to identify the best performing sources—SRE/Feed Approach or Emissions Approach—are not appropriate because they directly or indirectly consider chlorine feedrate. More simply, limiting feedrate means not producing the intended product, a result inconsistent with MACT. See 2 *Legislative History* at 3352 (House Report) ("MACT is not intended to * * * drive sources to the brink of shutdown"). To avoid this concern, we identify a floor SRE, and provide an alternative floor as a total chlorine emission limit based on floor SRE and the highest chlorine feedrate for any source in the data base. By using the highest chlorine feedrate to calculate the alternative total chlorine emission limit, we ensure that feedrate control (*i.e.*, nonproduction of product) is not a factor in identifying the proposed MACT floor. The alternative total chlorine emission limit would require a source that may not be achieving floor SRE to achieve total chlorine emission levels no greater than the level that would be emitted by any source achieving floor SRE.

The floor SRE is 99.9927 percent. It is calculated from the five best SREs, and considers emissions variability. Floor SRE is an SRE that the average of the performing sources could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. We estimate that this SRE is being achieved by 29% of sources.

The alternative floor emission limit is 14 ppmv, and is the emission level that the source with the highest chlorine feedrate—2.9E+8 µg/dscm—would achieve when achieving 99.9927 percent SRE.

Approximately 24% of sources are achieving the alternative floor levels, and these floor levels would reduce total chlorine emissions by 145 tons per year.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We evaluated improved design, operation, and maintenance of existing scrubbers to achieve a beyond-the-floor emission level of 7 ppmv for total chlorine for existing sources, assuming a 50% reduction in emissions from the floor level.

The national annualized compliance cost for hydrochloric acid production furnaces to comply with this beyond-the-floor standard would be $0.25 million, and emissions of total chlorine would be reduced by 3 tons per year. The cost-effectiveness of this beyond-the-floor standard would be $76,000 per ton of total chlorine removed.

We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects and determined that this beyond-the-floor option would increase both the amount of hazardous wastewater generated and water usage by approximately 82 million gallons per year and would increase electricity usage by 0.34 million kW-hours per year. Generation of nonwastewater hazardous waste would decrease by 7 tons per year. Considering these impacts and cost-effectiveness as well, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard for existing sources would not be warranted.

For these reasons, we propose a floor total chlorine standard of 14 ppmv or 99.9927% SRE for existing sources.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

The proposed MACT floor for new sources is compliance with either a total chlorine emission level of 1.2 ppmv or

[162] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 2.

[163] Except that one source emitted 330 µg/dscm low volatile metals and 0.043 gr/dscf particulate matter during compliance testing. This source apparently detuned the acid gas absorber and other acid gas control equipment given that it achieved less than 99% system removal efficiency for total chlorine and had total chlorine emissions of 500 ppmv. This source would not be allowed to operate under these conditions under today's proposed rule: 14 ppmv total chlorine emission limit, or 99.9927 system removal efficiency. Thus, under the proposed rule, emissions of low volatile metals and particulate matter would be substantially lower.

a total chlorine SRE of 99.99937 percent. We use the same rationale for identifying alternative floors for new sources as discussed above in the context of existing sources.

The new source floor SRE is the SRE that the single best performing source (*i.e,* source with the best SRE) could be expected to achieve in 99 of 100 future tests when operating under conditions identical to the compliance test conditions during which the emissions data were obtained. The new source floor alternative emission limit is an emission level that the source with the highest chlorine feedrate—2.9E+8 µg/dscm—would achieve when achieving 99.99937 percent SRE.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

We evaluated a beyond-the-floor standard for new sources of 0.60 ppmv based on achieving a 50 percent reduction in emissions by improving the design/operation/maintenance of the wet scrubber. The incremental annualized cost for a new solid fuel-fired boiler with average gas flowrate to meet a beyond-the-floor level of 0.60 ppmv would be approximately $0.15 million and would provide an incremental reduction in total chlorine emissions of 0.07 tons per year, for a cost-effectiveness of $2.1 million per ton of total chlorine removed.

We evaluated nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy effects and determined that, for a new source with average gas flowrate, this beyond-the-floor option would increase both the amount of hazardous wastewater generated and water usage by approximately 26 million gallons per year and would increase electricity usage by 0.25 million kW-hours per year. Considering these impacts and cost-effectiveness as well, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor standard for new sources would not be warranted.

For the reasons discussed above, we propose a total chlorine standard of 1.2 ppmv or a total chlorine SRE of 99.99937 percent for new sources.

D. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standards for Carbon Monoxide or Hydrocarbons?

To control emissions of organic HAP, existing and new sources would be required to comply with either a carbon monoxide standard of 100 ppmv or a hydrocarbon standard of 10 ppmv.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste are currently subject to RCRA standards that require compliance with either a carbon monoxide standard of 100 ppmv, or a hydrocarbon standard of 20 ppmv. Compliance is based on an hourly rolling average as measured with a CEMS. See § 266.104(a). All hydrochloric acid production furnaces have elected to comply with the 100 ppmv carbon monoxide standard. We propose floor standards of 100 ppmv for carbon monoxide or 10 ppmv for hydrocarbons for the same reasons discussed above in the context of liquid fuel-fired boilers.

There would be no incremental emission reductions associated with these floors because sources are currently achieving the carbon monoxide standard.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

Our considerations for beyond-the-floor standards for existing hydrochloric acid production furnaces are identical to those discussed above for existing liquid fuel-fired boilers. For the reasons discussed above in the context of liquid fuel-fired boilers, we conclude that beyond-the-floor standards for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons for existing hydrochloric acid production furnaces are not warranted.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

MACT floor for new sources would be the same as the floor for existing sources—100 ppmv for carbon monoxide and 10 ppmv for hydrocarbons—and based on the same rationale.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

Our considerations for beyond-the-floor standards for new hydrochloric acid production furnaces are identical to those discussed above for new liquid fuel-fired boilers. For the reasons discussed above in the context of liquid fuel-fired boilers, we conclude that beyond-the-floor standards for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons for new hydrochloric acid production furnaces are not warranted.

E. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Standard for Destruction and Removal Efficiency?

To control emissions of organic HAP, existing and new sources would be required to comply with a destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) of 99.99% for organic HAP. For sources burning hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, the DRE standard is 99.9999% for organic HAP.

1. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for Existing Sources?

Hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste are currently subject to RCRA DRE standards that require 99.99% destruction of designated principal organic hazardous constituents (POHCs). For sources that burn hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027, however, the DRE standard is 99.9999% destruction of designated POHCs. See § 266.104(a).

The DRE standard helps ensure that a combustor is operating under good combustion practices and thus minimizing emissions of organic HAP. Under the MACT compliance regime, sources would designate POHCs that are organic HAPs or that are surrogates for organic HAPs.

We propose to establish the RCRA DRE standard as the floor for existing sources because it is a currently enforceable Federal standard. There would be no incremental emission reductions associated with this floor because sources are currently complying with the standard.

2. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for Existing Sources

We considered a beyond-the-floor level for DRE based on use of better combustion practices but conclude that it may not be replicable by the best performing sources nor duplicable by other sources given that we cannot quantify better combustion practices. Moreover, we cannot ensure that a higher DRE standard would significantly reduce emissions of organic HAP given that DRE measures the destruction of organic HAP present in the boiler feed rather than gross emissions of organic HAP. Although a source's combustion practices may be adequate to destroy particular organic HAP in the feed, other organic HAP may be emitted as products of incomplete combustion.

For these reasons, and after considering nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements, we are not proposing a beyond-the-floor DRE standard for existing sources.

3. What Is the Rationale for the MACT Floor for New Sources?

We propose to establish the RCRA DRE standard as the floor for new sources because it is a currently enforceable Federal standard.

4. EPA's Evaluation of Beyond-the-Floor Standards for New Sources

Using the same rationale as we used to consider a beyond-the-floor DRE

standard for existing sources, we conclude that a beyond-the-floor DRE standard for new sources is not warranted. Consequently, after considering nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements, we are proposing the floor DRE standard for new sources.

XIII. What Is the Rationale for Proposing an Alternative Risk-Based Standard for Total Chlorine in Lieu of the MACT Standard?

Under authority of CAA section 112(d)(4), we propose standard procedures to allow you to establish a risk-based emission limit for total chlorine in lieu of compliance with the section 112(d)(2) MACT emission standard. See proposed § 63.1215. The risk-based approach would be applicable to all hazardous waste combustors except hydrochloric acid production furnaces. Because we are proposing to use the MACT standard for total chlorine as a surrogate to control metal HAP for the hydrogen chloride production furnace source category, we cannot allow any variance from the standard. For the other hazardous waste combustor source categories, we are proposing the section 112(d)(4) standard as an alternative to the MACT standard. Sources could choose which of these two standards they would prefer to apply.

The alternative risk-based emission limit for total chlorine would be based on national exposure standards established by EPA that ensure protection of public health with an ample margin of safety. The standard would consist of a nationally-applicable, uniform algorithm that would be used to establish site-specific emission limitations based on site-specific input from each source choosing to use this approach. Thus, these standards would provide a uniform level of risk reduction, consistent with the requirement of section 112(d)(4) that EPA establish "emission standards", *i.e.*, a requirement established by EPA which limits quantity, rate or concentration of air emissions (see CAA section 302(k)).

We also request comment on an alternative approach to implement section 112(d)(4) for cement kilns in which we establish a national risk-based emission standard for total chlorine that would be applicable to all cement kilns. Under this approach, EPA would issue a single total chlorine emission standard using an emission level that meets our national exposure standards if each cement kiln were to emit at that level.

We believe that most hazardous waste combustors are likely to consider establishing risk-based standards for total chlorine because the MACT standards proposed today are more stringent, and in some cases substantially more stringent, than currently applicable standards (*e.g.*, the total chlorine standard for incinerators is currently 77 ppmv while we propose today a MACT standard of 1.4 ppmv).

A. What Is the Legal Authority To Establish Risk-Based Standards?

Under the authority of section 112(d)(4), the Administrator may establish emission standards based on risk, in lieu of the technology-based MACT standards, when regulating HAP for which health threshold levels have been established. Under section 112(d)(4), Congress gave EPA the discretion to consider the health threshold of any HAP and to use that health threshold, with an ample margin of safety, to set emission standards for the source category or subcategory. In the legislative history accompanying this provision, the Senate Report stated,

> "To avoid expenditures by regulated entities that secure no public health or environmental benefit, the Administrator is given discretionary authority to consider the evidence for a health threshold higher than MACT at the time the standard is under review. The Administrator is not required to take such factors into account; that would jeopardize the standard-setting schedule imposed under this section with the kind of lengthy study and debate that has crippled the current program. But where health thresholds are well established, for instance in the case of ammonia, and the pollutant presents no risk of other adverse health effects, the Administrator may use the threshold with an ample margin of safety (and not considering cost) to set emissions limitations for sources in the category or subcategory." (S. Rep. No. 228, 101st Cong. 1st Sess. at 171 (1989); see also *id.* at 175–176 (1989).)

EPA has previously used section 112(d)(4) authority in the Industrial Boiler and Process Heater MACT Final Rule signed Feb. 26, 2004, the Pulp and Paper MACT Phase II (66 FR 3180, January 12, 2001) and the Lime Manufacturing MACT (69 FR 394, January 5, 2004), and has proposed to use it in a different manner in several other MACT rulemakings (*e.g.*, the Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engine MACT (67 FR 77830, December 19, 2002).[164] The approach we propose today is nearly identical to the approach EPA recently adopted for the Industrial Boiler and Process Heater MACT source category, which allows a source to establish a site-specific risk-based emission limit for threshold HAP using prescribed procedures. This approach differs from the previous MACT rules where EPA simply determined, on a national basis, what level of exposure from each source in the category would be protective of public health with an ample margin of safety, and did not pose significant adverse environmental impacts. This previous approach resulted in a determination that no standard was necessary because no source in the category could exceed such a risk-based standard. Today's proposal varies in that the level of protection afforded by the standard is uniform, but the limits for individual sources differ due to site-specific factors. As explained later in this section of the preamble, EPA is, however, also considering for cement kilns applying the single national standard approach adopted in earlier rules.

B. What Is the Rationale for the National Exposure Standards?

We identify as national exposure standards threshold levels that are protective of human health from both chronic and acute exposure. In addition, because EPA has discretion whether or not to promulgate risk-based standards pursuant to section 112(d)(4), we would not allow an alternative standard where emission levels may result in adverse environmental effects that would otherwise be reduced or eliminated. We would not issue the alternative standard even though it may be shown that emissions do not approach or exceed levels requisite to protect public health with an ample margin of safety because we believe the statute requires that we consider effects on terrestrial animals, plants, and aquatic ecosystems in addition to public health in establishing a standard pursuant to section 112(d)(4). See S. Rep. 228 at 176: "Employing a health threshold or safety level rather than the MACT criteria to set standards shall not result in adverse environmental effects which would otherwise be reduced or eliminated."

1. What Are the Human Health Threshold Levels?

a. Chronic Exposure. Hydrogen chloride is corrosive to the eyes, skin, and mucous membranes. Chronic exposure may cause gastritis, bronchitis, dermatitis, and dental discoloration and erosion. Chronic exposure to chlorine gas can cause respiratory effects

[164] The Agency also proposed to use Section 112(d)(4) authority in two other MACT rulemakings—the Combustion Turbine MACT (68 FR 1888, January 14, 2003), and the Chlorine Production MACT (67 FR 44671)—but determined that MACT standards for those source categories are not warranted and delisted the source categories from the section 112(c) list of major sources pursuant to the authority in section 112(c)(9).

including eye and throat irritation and airflow obstruction. *See* discussion in Part One, Section I.E of this preamble.

Given that neither hydrogen chloride nor chlorine gas is known to produce a carcinogenic response,[165] we use reference air concentrations (RfC) to assess the likelihood of non-cancer health effects in humans. The RfC is an estimate of a continuous inhalation exposure to the human population, including sensitive subgroups, that is likely to be without an appreciable risk of deleterious effects over a lifetime. We use an RfC for hydrogen chloride of 20 $\mu g/m^3$, as presented in EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS). We propose to use an RfC for chlorine gas of 0.2 $\mu g/m^3$ based on a provisional assessment prepared by EPA on inhalation hazards from chlorine.[166] This is the same as the value for chlorine used by the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, which they refer to as a chronic "Reference Exposure Level" (REL). Because RfCs can change over time based on new information, the rule would require you to use the current RfC value found at *http://epa.gov/ttn/atw/toxsource/summary.html.*

We considered how to account for the fact that chlorine gas photolyzes in the atmosphere in bright sunlight to chlorine ions and then quickly reacts with hydrogen or methane to form hydrogen chloride. The half-life of chlorine due to photolysis in bright sunlight is estimated to be 10 minutes.[167] Nonetheless, this is generally sufficient time for the plume to reach nearby ground-level receptors without significant transformation. In addition, such transformation is possible only a portion of the time. Photolysis does not occur at night and is reduced on overcast or cloudy days. Generally speaking, the rate of photolysis depends on the particular wavelength and intensity of solar radiation reaching the earth's surface which varies greatly depending on the solar angle which changes with the time of day, the season of the year, and the latitude at a given location. While the ideal approach would be explicit modeling of photolysis rates as a function of solar insolation, sky conditions, absorption cross-section, quantum yield, and subsequent transformation to hydrogen chloride, to our knowledge no such regulatory air dispersion model currently exists.

Because it is reasonable to believe that receptors will be exposed to chlorine gas before appreciable transformation occurs due to the variability and complexity of the transformation and the fact that chlorine gas is considerably more toxic than hydrogen chloride, we conclude that, for the purpose of protection of public health, it is prudent to assume that chlorine gas is not transformed to hydrogen chloride.

b. Acute Threshold Levels. Short-term exposure to hydrogen chloride may cause eye, nose, and respiratory tract irritation and inflamation and pulmonary edema. Short-term exposure to high levels of chlorine gas can result in chest pain, vomiting, toxic pneumonitis, and pulmonary edema. At lower levels, chlorine gas is a potent irritant to the eyes, the upper respiratory tract, and lungs. *See* Part One, Section I.E. Please note that, although we discuss here how we would consider acute exposure, we conclude below that you need not assess acute exposure to establish an emission limit for total chlorine. *See* discussion in Section B.2.e.

To assess effects from acute exposure, we would use the acute exposure guideline level (AEGL). AEGL toxicity values are estimates of adverse health effects due to a single exposure lasting 8 hours or less. Consensus toxicity values for effects of acute exposures have been developed by several different organizations. EPA, in conjunction with the National Research Council and National Academy of Sciences, is in the process of setting acute exposure guideline levels. A national advisory committee organized by EPA has developed AEGLs for priority chemicals for 10-minute, 30-minute, 1-hour, 4-hour, and 8-hour airborne exposures. They have also determined for each exposure duration the levels of these chemicals that will protect against notable discomfort (AEGL–1), serious effects (AEGL–2), and life-threatening effects or death (AEGL–3).[168] To be protective of public health, we propose to use the AEGL–1 values to assess acute exposure: 2.7 mg/m^3 (1.8 ppm) for hydrogen chloride, and 1.4 mg/m^3 (0.5 ppm) for chlorine gas.[169] Airborne concentrations of a substance above the AEGL–1 could cause notable discomfort, irritation, or certain asymptomatic nonsensory effects in the general population, including susceptible individuals. Please note, however, that airborne concentrations below the AEGL–1 could produce mild odor, taste, or other sensory irritations. Effects above the AEGL–1 (but below the AEGL–2) are not disabling and are transient and reversible upon cessation of exposure.

2. What Exposures Would You Be Required to Assess?

We discuss below the following issues: (1) Use of the Hazard Index to assess exposure to both hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas; (2) exposure to emissions of respiratory irritant HAP other than hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas; (3) exposure to emissions of respiratory irritant HAP from collocated sources; (4) exposure to ambient background levels of respiratory irritant HAP; and (5) our conclusion that acute exposure need not be assessed to establish emission limits because the Hazard Index for chronic exposure is expected to be higher in all situations.

a. Hazard Index. Noncancer risk assessments typically use a metric called the Hazard Quotient (HQ) to assess risks of exposures to noncarcinogens. The HQ is the ratio of a receptor's potential exposure (or modeled concentration) to the health reference value or threshold level (*e.g.*, RfC or AEGL) for an individual pollutant. HQ values less than 1.0 indicate that exposures are below the

[165] EPA conducted an assessment of the carcinogenicity of chlorine gas and concluded that it is not likely to be a human carcinogen (*see* EPA's June 22, 1999 Risk Assessment Issue Paper for Derivation of a Provisional Chronic Inhalation RfC for Chlorine, p.12). The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) concluded that hydrochloric acid is not classifiable as to its carcinogenicity to humans (*see* IARC Monographs, Vol. 54: Occupational Exposures to Mists and Vapours from Strong Inorganic Acids; and Other Industrial Chemicals (1992) p.189).

[166] *See* EPA's externally peer-reviewed "Risk Assessment Issue Paper for Derivation of a Provisional Chronic Inhalation RfC for Chlorine" (June 22, 1999) that can be found in the docket for today's proposal.

[167] As determined by a modeling analysis done by the Air Pollution Research Center at the University of California at Riverside, as reported in a California Air Resources Board fact sheet, "Toxic Air Contaminant Identification List Summaries—ARB/SSD/SES," p. 231, September 1997. *See also http://www.arb.ca.gov/toxics/tac/factshts/chlorine.pdf.*

[168] The full definitions of the AEGL values are more nuanced. AEGL 1: The airborne concentration of a substance above which it is predicted that the general population, including susceptible individuals, could experience notable discomfort, irritation, or certain asymptomatic nonsensory effects. However, the effects are not disabling and are transient and reversible upon cessation of exposure. AEGL 2: The airborne concentration of a substance above which it is predicted that the general population, including susceptible individuals, could experience irreversible or other serious, long-lasting adverse health effects or an impaired ability to escape. AEGL 3: The airborne concentration of a substance above which it is predicted that the general population, including susceptible individuals, could experience life-threatening health effects or death.

[169] For hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas (individually), the AEGL–1 values for 10-minute, 30-minute, 1-hour, and 8-hour exposures are the same. Therefore, when comparing predicted ambient levels of exposure to the AEGL–1 value, we believe it is reasonable to evaluate maximum 1-hour ground level concentrations.

health reference value or threshold level and, therefore, that such exposures are without appreciable risk of adverse effects in the exposed population. HQ values above 1 do not necessarily imply that adverse effects will occur, but that the likelihood of such effects in a given population increases as HQ values exceed 1.0.[170]

When the risk of noncancer effects from exposure to more than one pollutant to the same target organ must be assessed, the effects are generally considered to be additive and the HQ values for each pollutant are summed to form an analogous metric called the Hazard Index (HI). Assuming additivity, HI values less than 1.0 indicate that exposures to the mixtures are likely to be without appreciable risk of adverse effects in the exposed population. HI values above 1.0 do not necessarily imply that adverse effects from exposure to the mixture will occur, but that the likelihood of such effects in a given population increases as HI values exceed 1.0.

For purposes of establishing risk-based emission limits for total chlorine, we propose to allow a maximum HI value of not greater than 1.0.

b. Exposure to Emissions of HAP other than Hydrogen Chloride and Chlorine Gas that Have a Common Mechanism of Action. We have identified in the table below 40 HAP that are respiratory irritants, including hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas. Because these HAP have a common mechanism of action, we must determine whether exposure to these HAP must be considered when determining that the HI is less than or equal to 1.0.

Respiratory Irritant HAP

1,2-Epoxybutane
1,3-dichloropropene
2,4-Toluene diisocyanate
2-Chloroacetophenone
Acetaldehyde
Acrolein
Acrylic acid
Acrylonitrile
Antimony
Beryllium
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate
Chlorine
Chloroprene
Chromium
Cobalt
Diethanolamine
Epichlorohydrin
Ethylene glycol
Formaldehyde
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene
Hexamethylene 1,6-diisocyanate
Hydrochloric acid
Maleic anhydride
Methyl bromide
Methyl isocyanate
Methyl methacrylate
Methylene diphenyl diisocyanate
N-hexane
Naphthalene
Nickel
Nitrobenzene
Phosgene
Phthalic anhydride
Propylene dichloride
Propylene oxide
Styrene oxide
Titanium tetrachloride
Toluene
Triethylamine
Vinyl acetate

In making this determination, we would consider only those respiratory irritants that are HAP (as opposed to also considering respiratory irritants that are criteria pollutants) not only because section 112 deals with control of emissions of HAP, but also because ambient levels of criteria pollutants that have a common mechanism of action with hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas (*e.g.*, SO_X, NO_X, PM, ozone) are controlled through the applicable State Implementation Plans demonstrating compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for these pollutants.

In addition to hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, several of the respiratory irritant HAP listed in the table above may be emitted by hazardous waste combustors, including the metals antimony trioxide, beryllium, chromium (VI), cobalt, and nickel, and the organic compounds Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, formaldehyde, napthalene, and toluene.[171] We do not believe, however, that these respiratory irritant HAP would be emitted by hazardous waste combustors at levels that would result in significant Hazard Quotient values. Beryllium and chromium would be controlled by emission standards for low volatile metals and the remaining metal HAP would be controlled by a particulate matter standard. Emissions of the respiratory irritant organic HAP would be controlled to trace levels by the MACT standards for carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons and destruction and removal efficiency (DRE). Accordingly, we propose to require you to quantify and assess emissions from the hazardous waste combustor of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas only; you would not be required to account for these other respiratory irritant HAP because they would not contribute substantially to the Hazard Index.

c. Exposure to Emissions of Respiratory Irritant HAP from Collocated Sources. You would be required to account for exposure to emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas from all on-site hazardous waste combustors subject to subpart EEE, part 63. EPA will address exposure to emissions of respiratory irritant HAP from other sources that may be collocated with a hazardous waste combustor—for example, process vents and fossil fuel boilers—under the residual risk requirements of section 112(f) for both hazardous waste combustors and (potentially) other MACT source categories. *See A Legislative History of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990* (Senate Print 103–38, 103d Cong. 1st sess.) vol. 1 at 868–69 (floor statement of Sen. Durenberger (Senate floor manager for section 112) during debate on the Conference Report, indicating that EPA is obligated to consider "combined risks of all sources that are collocated with such sources within the same major source" but going on to state that the determination of ample margin of safety from emissions from all collocated sources need not occur at the same time, but rather can be spread out over the course of the residual risk determination process for all major sources.

d. Exposure to Ambient Background Levels of Respiratory Irritant HAP. Background levels of respiratory irritant HAP attributable to emissions from off-site sources would not be considered when establishing risk-based limits for total chlorine under section 112(d)(4). Rather, these background levels will be addressed (as may be necessary) through other CAA programs such as the urban air toxics program.

e. Acute Exposure Need Not Be Assessed. We have determined that you need not assess acute exposure to establish an emission limit for total chlorine. You would not be required to model maximum 1-hour average off-site ground level concentrations to calculate a Hazard Index (HI) based on acute exposure for purposes of establishing an emission limit for total chlorine. We conclude that the chronic exposure Hazard Index (HI) for the hazardous waste combustor(s) would always exceed the acute exposure HI. Thus, the emission limit for total chlorine based on chronic exposure would always be more stringent than the limit based on

[170] See US EPA Glossary of Key Terms for National Air Toxics Assessment, at *http://www.epa.gov//ttn/atw/nata/gloss1.html.*

[171] Betty Willis, et al., Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "Public Health Reviews of Hazardous Waste Thermal Treatment Technologies: A Guidance Manual for Public Health Assessors," March 2002, Table 4.

acute exposure. As an example, the Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition evaluated both chronic and acute exposure to hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas for the 14 cement facilities that burn hazardous waste.[172] In all cases, the chronic HI exceeded the acute HI. In addition, we determined that the Hazard Quotient (HQ) for chronic exposure was always higher than the HQ for acute exposure for the HAP we evaluated in the risk assessment we used to support the 1999 Final MACT Rule for hazardous waste combustors.[173]

Not requiring an acute exposure analysis reduces the burden on both the regulated community and regulatory officials to develop and review an analysis that would be superseded by the chronic exposure analysis when establishing an emission limit for total chlorine.

Please note that this discussion relates to evaluating acute exposure in establishing an emission limit for total chlorine. Although we conclude that the chronic exposure Hazard Index would always be higher than the acute exposure Hazard Index, and thus would be the basis for the total chlorine emission rate limit, this relates to acute versus chronic exposure to a constant, maximum average (*e.g.*, a maximum annual average) emission rate of total chlorine from a hazardous waste combustor. Acute exposure must be considered, however, when establishing operating requirements (*e.g.*, feedrate limit for total chlorine and chloride) to ensure that short-term emissions do not result in an acute exposure Hazard Index of 1.0 or greater even though long-term (*e.g.*, annual average) emissions do not exceed the limit. *See* discussion in Section G.1 below.

3. Does the Proposed Approach Ensure an Ample Margin of Safety?

Section 112(d)(4) allows EPA to develop risk-based standards for HAP "for which a health threshold has been established", and the resulting standard is to provide an "ample margin of safety." The "ample margin of safety" standard, at least as applied to nonthreshold pollutants, typically connotes a two-step process (based on the standard first announced in the so-called *Vinyl Chloride* decision (*NRDC* v. *EPA*, 824 F. 2d at 1146 (D.C. Cir. 1987)), whereby EPA "first [determines] * * * a 'safe' or 'acceptable' level of risk considering only health factors, followed by a second step to set a standard that provides an 'ample margin of safety', in which costs, feasibility, and other relevant factors in addition to health may be considered." 54 FR at 38045. It is not clear that Congress intended this analysis to apply to section 112(d)(4) standards, since the principal legislative history to the provision indicates that costs are not to be considered in setting standards under section 112(d)(4) (S. Rep. 228 at 173), whereas cost normally is a relevant consideration in the second part of the ample margin of safety process, as described above. Further, if issues of feasibility, cost, and other non-health factors are to be taken into account in establishing section 112(d)(4) standards, it would be exceedingly difficult, if not practically impossible, to do so on a site-specific basis, undermining the approach we are proposing here. Nor is it clear that the two-step approach is necessarily warranted when considering threshold pollutants, since there is greater certainty regarding levels at which adverse health effects occur. See *Vinyl Chloride*, 824 F. 2d at 1165 n. 11.[174]

We specifically request comment on how to ensure that the emission limits calculated using the health threshold values (*e.g.*, RfCs and AEGL–1 values), and after considering emissions of respiratory irritant HAP from collocated hazardous waste combustors, achieve an ample margin of safety.

4. How Are Effects on Terrestrial Animals Addressed?

We believe the RfC values for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas should be generally protective for chronic effects in most, if not all, fauna. We note that the RfC values are based on animal studies. Although the AEGL–1 values for acute exposure are based on human data, we nonetheless expect that they too would be generally protective of most fauna, absent information to the contrary.

5. How Are Effects on Plants Addressed?

EPA has not established ecotoxicity values that are protective of vegetation. Nonetheless, for the reasons discussed below we do not believe that ambient concentrations of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas that meet the human health threshold values discussed above will pose adverse effects on plants.

As discussed in the preamble to the Lime Manufacturing NESHAP proposed rule (67 FR 78056),[175] chronic exposure to about 600 $\mu g/m^3$ can be expected to result in discernible effects, depending on the plant species. Effects of acute, 20-minute exposures of 6,500 to 27,000 $\mu g/m^3$ include leaf injury and decrease in chlorophyll levels in various species. The hydrogen chloride RfC of 20 $\mu g/m^3$ is well below the 600 $\mu g/m^3$ effect level, and the AEGL–1 value for hydrogen chloride of 2,700 $\mu g/m^3$ is far below the 6500 $\mu g/m^3$ acute effect level. Therefore, no adverse exposure effects are anticipated.

We specifically request additional information on ecotoxicity for both acute and chronic exposure of vegetation to hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas.

C. How Would You Determine if Your Total Chlorine Emission Rate Meets the Eligibility Requirements Defined by the National Exposure Standards?

Under the risk-based approach to establish an alternative to the MACT standard for your total chlorine emission limit, you would have to demonstrate that emissions of total chlorine from on-site hazardous waste combustors result in exposure to the actual most-exposed individual residing off site of a Hazard Index of less than or equal to 1.0. (Put another way, we are proposing to establish this level of risk as the national emission limitation, with the rule further establishing the mechanisms by which this demonstration can be made, such demonstrations yielding a site-specific limit for total chlorine.)[176] The rule would also establish two ways by which you could make this demonstration: by a look-up table analysis or by a site-specific compliance demonstration (as explained below). The look-up table is much simpler to use, but establishes emission rates that are quite conservative because there are few site-specific parameters considered and

[172] See Trinity Consultants, "Analysis of HCl/Cl2 Emissions from Cement Kilns for 112(d)(4) Consideration in the HWC MACT Replacement Standards," September 17, 2003.

[173] See USEPA, "Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Support to the Development of Technical Standards for Emissions from Combustion Units Burning Hazardous Wastes: Background Document," July 1999.

[174] Indeed, using the classic two-step approach to "ample margin of safety" could result in the same standards we are proposing as MACT for HCl and Cl2 for all of the affected source categories (if one assumes that all of the standards would be below protective risk-based levels for all sources), since we believe that the proposed technology-based standards would be justifiable based on considerations of technical feasibility and cost, and so would provide a reasonable margin of safety beyond the risk-based level considered protective.

[175] EPA published the final rule at 69 FR 394, January 5, 2004.

[176] Rather than establishing emission rate limits for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, or for total chlorine, for each combustor, you would actually establish an HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for each combustor, as discussed below in the text.

therefore the model's default assumptions are conservative. If you elect not to comply with those conservative emission rates, you may perform a site-specific compliance demonstration.

The look-up table identifies the total chlorine emission limit in terms of a toxicity-weighted HCl-equivalent emission rate. Under the site-specific compliance demonstration alternative, the total chlorine limit would also be expressed as a toxicity weighted HCl-equivalent emission rate even though you would model emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas from each on-site hazardous waste combustor. We define the toxicity-weighted HCl-equivalent emission rate below.

1. Toxicity-Weighted HCl-Equivalent Emission Rates

Although the MACT emission standards for total chlorine are expressed as a stack gas emission concentration—ppmv—we must use an emission rate (*e.g.*, lb/hr) format for risk-based standards. This is because health and environmental risk is related to the mass rate of emissions over time.

In addition, we propose to use a toxicity-weighted HCl-equivalent emission rate (HCl-equivalents) as the metric for the combined emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas. The HCl-equivalent emission rate considers the RfCs of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas when calculating the combined emission rate according to this equation:

$$ER_{dtw} = \Sigma(ER_i \times (RfC_{HCl}/RfC_i))$$

where:

ER_{tw} is the HC1-equivalent emission rate, lb/hr

ER_i is the emission rate of HAP i in lbs/hr

RfC_i is the reference concentration of HAP i

RfC_{HCl} is the reference concentration of HCl

Expressing the risk-based emission limit as HCl-equivalents enables you to use the equation to apportion the emission rate limit between hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas as you choose. Thus, you need to be concerned with ensuring compliance with the HCl-equivalent emission rate only, rather than with emission rates for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas individually.

Under the look-up table analysis discussed below, you would use the hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emission rates you choose for each on-site hazardous waste combustor to calculate the HCl-equivalent emission rate for the combustor. You would sum the HCl-equivalent emission rates for your hazardous waste combustors. If you elect to use the site-specific compliance demonstration to document eligibility, you would model emission rates of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas that you choose for each on-site hazardous waste combustor to document that the facility Hazard Index is less than or equal to 1.0. You would then use the hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emission rates you model to establish an HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for each combustor.

2. How Would You Conduct a Look-Up Table Analysis?

You would sum the HCl-equivalent rates for all combustors, and compare the sum to the appropriate allowable emission rate in Table 1 of proposed § 63.1215. Emission rates are provided as a function of stack height and distance to the nearest property boundary. If you have more than one hazardous waste combustor at your facility, you would use the average value for stack height (*i.e.*, the averaged stack heights of the different hazardous waste combustors at your facility), and the minimum distance between any hazardous waste combustor stack and the property boundary.[177]

If one or both of these values for stack height and distance to nearest property boundary do not match the exact values in the look-up table, you would use the next lowest table value. This would ensure that the HCl-equivalent emission rate limits are protective.

You would not be eligible for the look-up table analysis if your facility is located in complex terrain because the plume dispersion models used to calculate the emission rates are not applicable to sources in complex terrain.

You would be eligible to comply with the risk-based alternative HCl-equivalent emission rate limits you calculate for each combustor if the facility HCl-equivalent emission rate limit (*i.e.*, the sum of the HCl-equivalent emission rates for all hazardous waste combustors) does not exceed the appropriate value specified in the look-up table. Please note, however, that we also propose to cap the HCl-equivalent emission rate limits for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns at a level that ensures that the current total chlorine emission standards are not exceeded. See discussion below in Section D.

Please note that the emission rates provided in Table 1 are different from those provided for industrial boilers in the Industrial Boiler and Process Heater MACT rule recently promulgated. This is because the key parameters used by the SCREEN3 atmospheric dispersion model to predict the normalized air concentrations that EPA used to establish HCl-equivalent emission rates as a function of stack height and distance to property boundary for industrial boilers—stack diameter, stack exit gas velocity, and stack exit gas temperature—are substantially different for hazardous waste burning incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. Thus, the maximum HCl-equivalent emission rates for hazardous waste combustors would generally be lower than those EPA established for industrial boilers.

To ensure that the HCl-equivalent emission rate limits in a look-up table analysis for hazardous waste combustors would not result in a Hazard Index of more than 1.0, we propose to establish limits based on the maximum annual average normalized air concentrations in U.S. EPA, "A Tiered Modeling Approach for Assessing the Risk Due to Sources of Hazardous Air Pollutants," March 1992, Table 1. Those normalized air concentrations are based on conservative simulations of toxic pollutant sources with Gaussian plume dispersion models. The simulations are conservative regarding factors such as meteorology, building downwash, plume rise, *etc.*

We specifically request comment on whether the HCl-equivalent emission rates in Table 1 are too conservative and thus have limited utility because they apply to all hazardous waste combustors generically. Alternatively, we could establish less conservative emission rates in look-up tables specific to various classes of hazardous waste combustors (*e.g.*, cement kilns, incinerators) that have similar stack properties that affect predicted emissions. We request comment on whether industry stakeholders would be likely to use the proposed look-up table eligibility demonstration or revised

[177] HCl production furnaces are not eligible for the risk-based total chlorine emission limits because we are proposing that the MACT standard for total chlorine would be used as a surrogate to control metal HAP. Nonetheless, if you operate an HCl production furnace at a facility where you would establish risk-based emission limits for total chlorine for other hazardous waste combustors, you would account for total chlorine emissions from the HCl production furnace in your risk-based eligibility demonstration for the other combustors. If, for example, you use the look-up table to demonstrate eligibility, you would include the stack height of the HCl production furnace in the calculation of average stack height for your combustors, and you would consider whether the HCl production furnace stack is the closest hazardous waste combustor stack to the property boundary.

look-up tables tailored to specific classes of hazardous waste combustors, in lieu of the site-specific compliance eligibility demonstration.

3. How Would You Conduct a Site-Specific Compliance Demonstration?

If you fail to demonstrate that your facility is able to comply with the alternative risk-based emission limit using the look-up table approach, you may choose to perform a site-specific compliance demonstration. We are proposing that you may use any scientifically-accepted peer-reviewed risk assessment methodology for your site-specific compliance demonstration. An example of one approach for performing the demonstration for air toxics can be found in the EPA's "Air Toxics Risk Assessment Reference Library, Volume 2, Site-Specific Risk Assessment Technical Resource Document,", which may be obtained through the EPA's Air Toxics Web site at *http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw*.

Your facility would be eligible for the alternative risk-based total chlorine emission limit if your site-specific compliance demonstration shows that the maximum Hazard Index for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions from all on-site hazardous waste combustors at a location where people live (*i.e.*, the maximum *actual* most exposed individual) is less than or equal to 1.0, rounded to the nearest tenths decimal place (0.1).[178] You would estimate long-term inhalation exposures for this individual most exposed to the facility's emissions through the estimation of annual or multi-year average ambient concentrations. You would use site-specific, quality-assured data wherever possible, and health-protective default assumptions wherever site-specific data are not available. You would document the data and methods used for the assessment so that it is transparent and can be reproduced by an experienced risk assessor and emissions measurement expert.

Your site-specific compliance demonstration need not assume any attenuation of exposure concentrations due to the penetration of outdoor pollutants into indoor exposure areas. In addition, we are proposing that the demonstration need not assume any reaction or deposition of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas from the emission point to the point of exposure. In particular, you would assume that chlorine gas is not photolyzed to hydrogen chloride, as discussed in Section B.1 above.

If your site-specific compliance demonstration documents that the maximum Hazard Index from your hazardous waste combustors is less than or equal to 1.0, you would establish a maximum HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for each combustor using the hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emission rates you modeled in the site-specific compliance demonstration. Please note, however, that we also propose to cap the HCl-equivalent emission rate limits for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns at a level that ensures that the current total chlorine emission standards are not exceeded. See discussion below in Section D.

D. What Is the Rationale for Caps on the Risk-Based Emission Limits?

The HCl-equivalent emission rate limits would be capped for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns at a level that ensures total chlorine emissions do not exceed the interim standards provided by §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205. These caps on the risk-based emission limits would ensure that emission levels do not increase above the emission levels that sources are currently required to achieve, thus precluding "back-sliding." Given the discretionary nature of section 112(d)(4), and the general purpose of the section 112(d) standard-setting process to lock-in performance of current emission control technology, we think it appropriate to invoke the provision in a manner that does not result in emission increases over current regulatory levels.

We considered whether to propose emission caps for boilers at the levels allowed by the RCRA emission standards under § 266.107 but conclude that this would be inappropriate. This is because the RCRA emission standards are also risk-based standards but are based on risk criteria that we considered appropriate in 1987 when we proposed those rules. The risk criteria we propose today are substantially different from those used to implement § 266.107. For example, the RfC for hydrogen chloride is higher now while the RfC for chlorine gas is lower. In addition, we considered a Hazard Index of 0.25 acceptable under the RCRA rule, while we propose today a Hazard Index limit of less than or equal to 1.0. Because the risk criteria for the current RCRA rules are substantially different from the risk criteria we propose today for invoking Section 112(d)(4), we do not believe it is appropriate to use the RCRA standards as a cap for establishing risk-based standards under Section 112(d)(4).

Capping risk-based emission limits for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns at an HCl-equivalent emission rate corresponding to the MACT interim standards would not increase compliance costs (by definition). Thus, the cap would help ensure that emissions are protective of public health with an ample margin of safety, and that there are no significant adverse environmental impacts.

To implement the cap, you would ensure that the hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emission rates you use to calculate the HCl-equivalent emission rate for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns would not result in total chlorine emission concentrations exceeding the standards provided by §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205.

E. What Would Your Risk-Based Eligibility Demonstration Contain?

To enable regulatory officials to review and approve the results of your risk-based demonstration, you would include the following information, at a minimum: (1) Identification of each hazardous waste combustor combustion gas emission point (*e.g.*, generally, the flue gas stack); (2) the maximum capacity at which each combustor will operate, and the maximum rated capacity for each combustor, using the metric of stack gas volume emitted per unit of time, as well as any other metric that is appropriate for the combustor (*e.g.*, million Btu/hr heat input for boilers; tons of dry raw material feed/hour for cement kilns); (3) stack parameters for each combustor, including, but not limited to stack height, stack area, stack gas temperature, and stack gas exit velocity; (4) plot plan showing all stack emission points, nearby residences, and property boundary line; (5) identification of any stack gas control devices used to reduce emissions from each combustor; (6) identification of the RfC values used to calculate the HCl-equivalent emissions rate; (7) calculations used to determine the HCl-equivalent emission rate as prescribed above; (8) for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, calculations used to determine that the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for each combustor does not exceed the standards for total chlorine at §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205; and (9) the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for each hazardous waste

[178] When calculating Hazard Index values, the final HI value should be rounded to one decimal place given the uncertainties in the analyses. For example, an HI calculated to be 0.94 would be presented as 0.9, while an HI calculated to be 0.96 would be presented as 1.0 (which would pass the eligibility demonstration). Intermediate calculations should use as many significant figures as appropriate.

combustor that you will certify in the Documentation of Compliance required under § 63.1211(d) that you will not exceed, and the limits on the operating parameters specified under § 63.1209(o) that you will establish in the Documentation of Compliance.

If you use the look-up table analysis to demonstrate that your facility is eligible for the risk-based alternative for the total chlorine emission limit, your eligibility demonstration would also contain, at a minimum, the following: (1) Calculations used to determine the average stack height of on-site hazardous waste combustors; (2) identification of the combustor stack with the minimum distance to the property boundary of the facility; (3) comparison of the values in the look-up table to your maximum HCl-equivalent emission rate.

If you use a site-specific compliance demonstration to demonstrate that your facility is eligible for the risk-based alternative for the total chlorine emission limit, your eligibility demonstration would also contain, at a minimum, the following: (1) Identification of the risk assessment methodology used; (2) documentation of the fate and transport model used; and (3) documentation of the fate and transport model inputs, including the stack parameters listed above converted to the dimensions required for the model. In addition, you would include all of the following that apply: (1) Meteorological data; (2) building, land use, and terrain data; (3) receptor locations and population data; and (4) other facility-specific parameters input into the model. Your demonstration would also include: (1) Documentation of the fate and transport model outputs; (2) documentation of any exposure assessment and risk characterization calculations; and (3) documentation of the predicted Hazard Index for HCl-equivalents and comparison to the limit of less than or equal to 1.0.

F. When Would You Complete and Submit Your Eligibility Demonstration?

You would be required to submit your eligibility demonstration to the permitting authority for review and approval.[179] In addition you would submit an electronic copy of the demonstration to *reag@epa.gov* (preferably) or a hard copy to: U.S. EPA, Risk and Exposure Assessment Group, Emission Standards Division (C404–01), Attn: Group Leader, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711.

Requiring prior approval of these eligibility demonstrations is warranted because hazardous waste combustor may feed chlorine at high feedrates which may result in emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas that approach or exceed the RfCs (*i.e.*, absent compliance with either the MACT standards or the section 112(d)(4) risk-based standards). Thus, prior approval of alternative HCl-equivalent emission rate limits is warranted to ensure that emissions are protective with an ample margin of safety.

1. Existing Sources

If you operate an existing source, you must be in compliance with the emission standards on the compliance date. Consequently, if you elect to comply with the alternative risk-based emission rate limit for total chlorine, you must have completed the eligibility demonstration and received approval from your delegated permitting authority by the compliance date.

You would submit documentation supporting your eligibility demonstration not later than 12 months prior to the compliance date.

Your permitting officials will notify you of approval or intent to disapprove your eligibility demonstration within 6 months after receipt of the original demonstration, and within 3 months after receipt of any supplemental information that you submit. A notice of intent to disapprove your eligibility demonstration will identify incomplete or inaccurate information or noncompliance with prescribed procedures and specify how much time you will have to submit additional information. If your permitting authority has not approved your eligibility demonstration to comply with a risk-based HCl-equivalent emission rate(s) by the compliance date, you must comply with the MACT emission standards for total chlorine gas under §§ 63.1216, 63.1217, 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221.[180]

2. New Sources

If you operate a source that is not an existing source and that becomes subject to Subpart EEE, you must comply with the MACT emission standards for total chlorine unless and until your eligibility demonstration has been approved by the permitting authority.

If you operate a new or reconstructed source that starts up before the effective date of the emission standards proposed today, or a solid fuel-fired boiler or liquid fuel-fired boiler that is an area source that increases its emissions or its potential to emit such that it becomes a major source of HAP before the effective date of the emission standards proposed today (and thus becomes subject to emission standards applicable to major sources, including the standard for total chlorine), you would be required to comply with the emission standards under §§ 63.1216 and 63.1217 until your eligibility demonstration is completed, submitted, and approved by your permitting authority.

If you operate a new or reconstructed source that starts up after the effective date of the emission standards proposed today, or a solid fuel-fired boiler or liquid fuel-fired boiler that is an area source that increases its emissions or its potential to emit such that it becomes a major source of HAP after the effective date of the emission standards proposed today (and thus becomes subject to emission standards applicable to major sources including the standard for total chlorine), you would be required to comply with the emission standards under §§ 63.1216 and 63.1217 until your eligibility demonstration is completed, submitted, and approved by your permitting authority.

G. How Would the Risk-Based HCl-Equivalent Emission Rate Limit Be Implemented?

Upon approval by the permitting authority of your eligibility demonstration, the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit established in the demonstration for your hazardous waste combustor(s) becomes the applicable emission limit for total chlorine in lieu of the MACT standard for total chlorine.

1. What Are the Testing and Monitoring Requirements?

To ensure compliance with the alternative HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for your combustor(s), you would conduct performance testing as required for the MACT standards and establish limits on the same operating parameters that apply to sources complying with the MACT standards for total chlorine under § 63.1209(o). You would establish and comply with these operating parameter limits just as you would establish and comply with the limits for the MACT emission standard for total chlorine, with the exception of the

[179] Since the Title V permitting authority is delegated to States in virtually all instances, the permit limit would thus be issued as a matter of State authority (generally in parallel with a delegation of section 112 authority pursuant to CAA section 112(l)), and be reviewable only in State courts.

[180] Please note that, if your eligibility demonstration is not approved prior to the compliance date, a request to extend the compliance date to enable you to undertake measures to comply with the MACT standards for total chlorine will not be approved unless you made a good faith effort to submit a complete, accurate, and timely eligibility demonstration and to respond to concerns raised by the permitting authority or U.S. EPA.

chlorine feedrate limit, as discussed below. For example, existing sources would establish these limits in the Documentation of Compliance required under § 63.1211(c) and begin complying with them not later than the compliance date. Existing sources would also revise the operating limits as necessary based on the initial comprehensive performance test and begin complying with the revised operating limits not later than when the Notification of Compliance is postmarked, as required under §§ 63.1207(j) and 63.1210(b).

The limit on chlorine feedrate required under § 63.1209(o)(1) would be established differently to ensure compliance with the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit rather than the total chlorine emission standard. To ensure that facility-wide hazardous waste combustor emissions of HCl-equivalents result in exposures equivalent to a Hazard Index of less than or equal to 1.0, the feedrate limit for chlorine would be established as the average of the test run averages and the averaging period for compliance would be one year. A yearly rolling average is appropriate for risk-based emission limits rather than the 12-hour rolling average applicable to the MACT standards because the risk-based emission limit is based on chronic exposure.

As discussed in Section B.2.e above, although we conclude that the chronic exposure Hazard Index would always be higher and thus be the basis for the total chlorine emission rate limit, we still must be concerned about acute exposure attributable to short-term emission rates higher than the maximum average emission rate limit. For example, the annual average limit on chlorine (*i.e.*, total chlorine and chloride) feedrate would allow a source to feed very high levels of chlorine for short periods of time, potentially resulting in exceedances of the acute exposure Hazard Index based the AEGL–1 values for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas. We specifically request comment on how a short-term limit on chlorine feedrate could be established for each hazardous waste combustor to ensure that the acute exposure Hazard Index is less than or equal to 1.0. One approach would be for you to extrapolate from the chlorine feedrate during the comprehensive performance test to the feedrate projected to achieve emission rates of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas that result in an acute exposure Hazard Index of 1.0.[181] This feedrate would be a 1-hour average feedrate limit. This approach uses the reasonable assumption that there is a proportional relationship between chlorine feedrate and the emission rate of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas. To extrapolate feedrates, you would consider the system removal efficiency achieved during the performance test for sources equipped with wet or dry acid gas scrubbers and for cement kilns.[182] Other sources would assume a zero system removal efficiency because any removal efficiency that may be measured would be incidental and not reproducible.

The approach discussed above would be applicable if you use the site-specific compliance eligibility demonstration. If you use the look-up table for your eligibility demonstration, an alternative approach would be needed to establish a short-term chlorine feedrate limit. One approach would be to establish a look-up table for maximum 1-hour average HCl-equivalents based on acute exposure. Acute exposure HCl-equivalents would be calculated using the AEGL–1 values for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, and the look-up table of acute exposure maximum emission rate limits would be based on normalized air concentrations for maximum 1-hour average ground level concentrations.[183] You would extrapolate the chlorine feedrate from the level achieved during the comprehensive performance test to a level that would not exceed the acute exposure HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for each combustor provided in the look-up table. This feedrate would be a 1-hour average feedrate limit.

We specifically request comment on these approaches to establish a short-term limit on the feedrate of total chlorine and chloride to ensure that the acute exposure Hazard Index for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas is less than or equal to 1.0.

2. What Test Methods Would You Use?

Although you would comply with the MACT standard for total chlorine using stack Method 26/26A, certain sources would not be allowed to use that method to demonstrate compliance with the risk-based HCl-equivalent emission rate limit.[184] Cement kilns and sources equipped with a dry acid gas scrubber should use EPA Method 320/321 or ASTM D 6735–01 to measure hydrogen chloride, and the back-half (caustic impingers) of Method 26/26A to measure chlorine gas. Incinerators, boilers, and lightweight aggregate kilns should use EPA Method 320/321 or ASTM D 6735–01 to measure hydrogen chloride, and Method 26/26A to measure total chlorine, and calculate chlorine gas by difference if: (1) the bromine/chlorine ratio in feedstreams is greater than 5 percent; or (2) the sulfur/chlorine ratio in feedstreams is greater than 50 percent.

a. Method 26/26A Has a Low Bias for Hydrogen Chloride in Certain Situations. Method 26/26A has a low bias for hydrogen chloride for sources that emit particulate matter than can adsorb hydrogen chloride: cement kilns and sources equipped with a dry acid gas scrubber. Particulate matter caught by the Method 26/26A filter scrubs hydrogen chloride from the sample gas, and can result in measurements that are biased low by 2 to 30 times.[185] Chlorine gas is not adsorbed so that chlorine gas emissions are not biased by this mechanism.

b. Method 26/26A Can Have a Low Bias for Chlorine Gas and a High Bias for Hydrogen Chloride, but Has No Bias for Total Chlorine. Method 26/26A also has a low bias for chlorine and a high bias for hydrogen chloride when bromine is present at significant levels. Bromine has a strong effect on the bias. Although the various interhalogen reactions are extremely complex and may depend on a variety of system parameters, it appears that each bromine molecule can react with a chlorine molecule in the acidic impingers of Method 26/26A where hydrogen chloride is captured, converting the chlorine to chloride ions which are

[181] We also request comment on whether extrapolation of the chlorine feedrate should be allowed to 100% of the Hazard Index limit of 1.0, or whether a more conservative approach of limited extrapolation to a fraction of the Hazard Index (*e.g.*, 0.8) would be warranted, given the uncertainties inherent in projecting emissions from extrapolated feedrates.

[182] We request comment on whether the system removal efficiency a cement kiln demonstrates during a performance test because of the alkalinity of the raw material is reasonably indicative of the system removal efficiency it routinely achieves (*i.e.*, is the system removal efficiency reasonably reproducible).

[183] We would use the normalized maximum 1-hour average concentrations in U.S. EPA, "A Tiered Modeling Approach for Assessing the Risk Due to Sources of Hazardous Air Pollutants," March 1992, Table 2.

[184] Even though Method 26/26A may bias total chlorine emission measurements low for cement kilns for reasons discussed in the text, it is appropriate to allow compliance with the technology-based MACT emission standards for total chlorine using that method. Because the MACT standards are developed using data obtained using Method 26/26A, allowing that method for compliance will achieve reductions in total chlorine emissions. For the same reason, it would be inappropriate to require compliance with unbiased methods because the average of the best performing sources might not be able to achieve the standard.

[185] USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume III: Selection of MACT Standards and Technologies," March 2004.

reported as hydrogen chloride. Total chlorine measurements (*i.e.*, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, combined, reported as Cl-equivalents), however, are not affected. To minimize this bias, we propose to require sources that have a bromine/chlorine feedrate exceeding 5 percent to use alternative methods discussed below. Given the strong bias that bromine can have on M26/26A measurements, we believe a 5 percent limit on the ratio is within the range of reasonable values that we could select. We specifically request comment on this or other approaches to minimize the bromine bias.

Method 26/26A also has a low bias for chlorine and a high bias for hydrogen chloride when sulfur is present at substantial levels relative to the levels of chlorine. The capture of chlorine in the acidic impingers that collect hydrogen chloride has been shown to rapidly increase when the ratio of SO2/HCl (both expressed in ppmv) exceeds 0.5. Again, total chlorine measurements are not biased. To minimize this bias, we believe that a 50 percent limit on the ratio of the sulfur/chlorine feedrate is within the range of reasonable values that we could select. We specifically request comment on this or other approaches to minimize the sulfur dioxide bias.

c. Unbiased Methods Are Available. The Agency recently developed three methods for hydrogen chloride in the context of the Portland Cement MACT rule for purposes of area source determinations: Methods 320, 321, and 322. Although M322 (GFCIR, Gas Filter Correlation Infra-Red) is easier to use and less expensive than M320/M321 (FTIR, Fourier Transform Infra-Red), the Agency did not promulgated M322 in the final Portland Cement MACT rule because of accuracy concerns resulting from emissions sampling of lime manufacturing kilns in the context of developing the Lime Manufacturing MACT rule.

The Agency has also adopted an American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) standard for measuring hydrogen chloride emissions: ASTM D 6735–01. This method (and M321) is allowed for area source determinations under the Lime Manufacturing MACT rule. 69 FR 394 (Jan. 5, 2004). The method is an impinger method, like M26/26A, but with several improvements. For example, the method uses a rejection probe (*i.e.*, the probe is directed counter to the gas flow), the filter is heated to minimize adsorption of hydrogen chloride on particulate matter that may catch on the filter, glassware must be conditioned, and improved quality assurance/quality control procedures are prescribed.

H. How Would You Ensure That Your Facility Remains Eligible for the Risk-Based Emission Limit?

1. Changes Over Which You Have Control

Changes in design, operation, or maintenance of a hazardous waste combustor that may affect the rate of emissions of HCl-equivalents from the combustor are subject to the requirements of § 63.1206(b)(5).

If you change the information documented in the demonstration of eligibility for the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit which is used to establish the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit, you would be subject to the following procedures.

a. Changes that Would Decrease the Allowable HCl-Equivalent Emission Rate Limit. If you plan to make a change that would decrease the allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit documented in your eligibility demonstration, you would comply with § 63.1206(b)(5)(i)(A–C) regarding notifying the permitting authority of the change, submitting a comprehensive performance test schedule and test plan, comprehensive performance testing, and restriction on burning hazardous waste prior to submitting a revised Notification of Compliance. An example of a change that would decrease the allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit is location of the property boundary closer to the nearest hazardous waste combustor stack when using the look-up table to make the eligibility demonstration.

b. Changes that Would Not Decrease the Allowable HCl-Equivalent Emission Rate Limit. If you determine that a change would not decrease the allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit documented in your eligibility demonstration, you would document the change in the operating record upon making such change. If the change would increase your allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit and you elect to establish a higher HCl-equivalent limit, you must submit a revised eligibility demonstration for review and approval. Upon approval of the revised eligibility demonstration, you must comply with § 63.1206(b)(5)(i)(A)(2), (B), and (C) regarding submitting a comprehensive performance test schedule and test plan, comprehensive performance testing, and restriction on burning hazardous waste prior to submitting a revised Notification of Compliance.

2. Changes Over Which You Do Not Have Control

Over time, factors and information over which you do not have control and which you use to make your eligibility demonstration may change. For example, if you use a site-specific compliance demonstration, individuals may locate within the area impacted by emissions such that the most exposed individual may be exposed to higher ground level concentrations than previously estimated. This could lower your allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit. Consequently, you would be required to review the documentation you use in your eligibility demonstration every five years on the anniversary of the comprehensive performance test and submit for review with the test plan either a certification that the information used in your eligibility demonstration has not changed in a manner that would decrease the allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit, or a revised eligibility demonstration for a revised HCl-equivalent emission rate limit.

If you determine that you cannot demonstrate compliance with a lower allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit during the (subsequent) comprehensive performance test because you cannot complete changes to the design or operation of the source prior to the test, you may request that the permitting authority grant you additional time as necessary to make those changes, not to exceed three years.

I. Request for Comment on an Alternative Approach: Risk-Based National Emission Standards

As noted earlier, another approach to implement section 112(d)(4)—and one EPA has used in past MACT rules—would be to establish national emission standards for each source category to ensure that the emissions from each source within the category are protective of public health with an ample margin of safety (and do not pose adverse environmental impacts). Under this approach, dispersion modeling of representative worst-case sources (or all sources) within a category would be used to identify an emission level that meets the section 112(d)(4) criteria for all sources within the category. Thus, the same risk-based national emission standard would be established for each source in each source category under this approach, rather than the approach we discuss above of establishing a national exposure standard based on a uniform level of protection that you would use to establish a site-specific emission limit.

The approach of establishing a risk-based national emission standard for a source category has the advantage of being less burdensome to implement both for the regulated community and regulatory authorities. It has the disadvantage, however, of requiring documentation "up front" to support the proposed emission standards. EPA does not have the time, data, or resources to conduct the analyses required to support this approach.

The Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition (CKRC), however, has submitted documentation supporting a national risk-based emission standard for total chlorine for cement kilns.[186] CKRC uses normalized air concentrations from ISC–PRIME and ISCST3 to estimate maximum annual average and maximum 1-hour average off-site ground level concentrations of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas for each source. CKRC assumes that each kiln emits total chlorine at 130 ppmv, the current Interim Standard, and that emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas partition at the same ratio as measured during the most recent compliance test. The analysis indicates that the facility Hazard Index for 1-hour exposures was below 0.2 for the kilns at all facilities, and the facility Hazard Index for long-term exposures was below 0.2 for the kilns at 8 of 14 facilities. Emissions from kilns at the remaining 6 facilities can potentially result in facility Hazard Index values up to 0.7.

Notwithstanding that CKRC followed the guidance we suggested to identify a section 112(d)(4) risk-based emission standard for a source category, we conclude that establishing a stack gas concentration-based total chlorine standard of 130 ppmv may not be protective with an ample margin of safety. Even though the highest Hazard Index for any facility in the category is below the maximum HI of less than 1.0, the Hazard Index value for a facility could increase even though sources do not exceed an emission standard of 130 ppmv. This is because the Hazard Index is affected by the mass emission rate (*e.g.*, lb/hr) of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas individually. Thus the Hazard Index could increase from the values CKRC has calculated even though each source complies with a 130 ppmv total chlorine emission standard given that: (1) The RfC for chlorine gas is 100 times lower than the RfC for hydrogen chloride; (2) the partitioning of total chlorine between hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas could change so that a greater portion is emitted as chlorine; and (3) the mass emission rate of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas would increase if the stack gas flowrate increases.

Because of these concerns, the more appropriate metric for a risk-based standard for total chlorine would be the toxicity-weighted HCl-equivalent emission rate discussed above in Section C.1.

To achieve our dual objective of establishing a protective risk-based emission standard expressed as a toxicity-weighted HCl-equivalent emission rate (lb/hr) and ensuring that the standard does not allow total chlorine emission concentrations (ppmv) higher than the current interim standard of 130 ppmv, we propose that an HCl-equivalent emission rate limit be established that is achievable by all cement facilities. This would be an HCl-equivalent emission rate for which on-site cement kiln emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas do not exceed a Hazard Index of 1.0. To make this determination, facilities would assume that emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas partition at the same ratio as measured during the most recent compliance test. Finally, the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit would be capped, if necessary, at a limit that ensures that total chlorine concentrations for each kiln do not exceed 130 ppmv.

If this information and supporting documentation is provided to us, we would promulgate a toxicity-weighted HCl-equivalent emission rate that would be applicable to cement kilns.

On a related matter, we evaluated whether using hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions data obtained with stack sampling Method 26/26A to project hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions in CKRC's analysis compromised the results. Method 26/26A is known to underestimate hydrogen chloride emissions from cement kilns.[187] We discuss above in Section F.2 concerns about Method 26/26A and the rationale for proposing to require sources to use methods other than Method 26/26A to measure emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas for compliance with risk-based standards. Briefly, Method 26/26A results for hydrogen chloride are biased low for cement kilns, although results for chlorine gas are unaffected. Even though CKRC used Method 26A results to apportion the 130 ppmv total chlorine assumed emissions between hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas for each source, the calculated Hazard Index values are not compromised. Given that the hydrogen chloride emission levels are biased low, the chlorine gas/hydrogen chloride ratio that CKRC used to apportion the 130 ppmv total chlorine emissions between chlorine gas and hydrogen chloride emissions for each source is biased high. Thus, CKRC projected chlorine gas emissions that are biased high and hydrogen chloride emissions that are biased low. These biases result in calculating conservative (*i.e.*, higher than actual) Hazard Index values because the health threshold values are lower for chlorine gas than for hydrogen chloride.[188] Thus, actual Hazard Index values at an emission level of 130 ppmv total chlorine would be lower than those that CKRC calculated.

XIV. How Did EPA Determine Testing and Monitoring Requirements for the Proposed Rule?

The CAA requires us to develop regulations that include monitoring and testing requirements. CAA section 114 (a) (3). The purpose of these requirements is to allow us to determine whether an affected source is operating in compliance with the rule.

We propose testing and monitoring requirements for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that are identical to those applicable to incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns under §§ 63.1207, 63.1208, and 63.1209.[189] Please note, however, that we discuss below a proposed requirement for boilers that would not be subject to a numerical dioxin/furan emission standard to conduct a one-time test for dioxin/furan emissions. In addition, in Part Three of today's preamble, we request comment on, or propose revisions to, several compliance requirements. Any amendments to the compliance requirements that we promulgate would be applicable to all hazardous waste combustors. In addition, we discuss below in this

[186] Trinity Consultants, "Analysis of HCl/Cl2 Emissions from Cement Kilns for 112(d)(4) Consideration in the HWC MACT Replacement Standards," September 17, 2003.

[187] *See* 63 FR at 14196 (March 24, 1998).

[188] For the same reasons, HCl-equivalent emission rates that CKRC may use in an eligibility demonstration for the source category would be biased conservatively high.

[189] Please note that we also propose to revise the existing schedule for the initial comprehensive performance test for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. Under the proposed revised schedule, owners and operators of incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns would be required to conduct the initial comprehensive performance test to document compliance with the replacement standards proposed today (§§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221) within 12 months of the compliance date. *See* discussion in Part Three, Section I.F.

section proposed compliance procedures for emission standards that would be based on normal rather than compliance test data and that would be applicable to all hazardous waste combustors subject to such a standard. Finally, we discuss below in this section proposed compliance procedures for emission standards based on hazardous waste thermal emissions that would be applicable to all hazardous waste combustors.

The rationale for the testing and monitoring requirements, and implementation of the requirements, is the same as discussed in the rulemakings promulgating those requirements for hazardous waste-burning incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, and as discussed in Part Three of today's preamble. *See* 61 FR 43501 (August 23, 1996), 62 FR 24212 (May 2, 1997), 67 FR 6791 (February 13, 2002), and 67 FR 6967 (February 14, 2002). For this reason, we only summarize those identical requirements and our rationale for them in today's notice.[190]

A. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Testing Requirements?

The proposed rule requires solid fuel-fired boilers and liquid fuel-fired boilers to perform an initial comprehensive performance test for dioxin/furan,[191] mercury, particulate matter, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, and total chloride to demonstrate compliance with emission standards. Hydrochloric acid production furnaces would be required to perform an initial comprehensive performance test for dioxin/furan and total chloride to demonstrate compliance with emission standards. All three source categories are also subject to the destruction and removal efficiency standard. Compliance with the destruction and removal efficiency standard, however, is based on a one-time emissions test, and previous destruction and removal efficiency testing under RCRA requirements may be used for that demonstration if design, operation, or maintenance of the source has not changed in a manner that could adversely affect combustion efficiency and, thus, destruction and removal efficiency. Finally, all three source categories would be required to demonstrate compliance with the carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon emission standard during the comprehensive performance test (and at all other times).

The comprehensive performance test would be conducted every five years to ensure that the performance of the air pollution control device has not deteriorated and that other factors that may affect emissions have not caused an increase in emissions above the standards.

The proposed rule also requires confirmatory testing to ensure compliance with the dioxin/furan emission standards, the test to be conducted mid-way between comprehensive performance tests when operating under typical conditions rather than at performance test conditions. More frequent confirmatory testing for dioxin/furan is needed because dioxin/furan emissions can be affected by various and interrelated factors, some of which are not fully understood, and because of the particular health hazard posed by emissions of dioxin/furan.

To ensure continuous compliance with the emissions standards, you would be required to establish limits on key operating parameters susceptible to continuous monitoring. The limits would be based on operating values achieved during the comprehensive performance test when the source successfully demonstrates compliance.[192] Because operating limits are calibrated based on operations during the comprehensive performance test, sources generally operate at the upper end of the range of normal operations during these tests. These proposed requirements are discussed below in Section XII.C.

B. What Are the Dioxin/Furan Testing Requirements for Boilers That Would Not Be Subject to a Numerical Dioxin/Furan Emission Standard?

As explained earlier, we are not proposing numerical dioxin/furan emission standards for solid fuel-fired boilers and for those liquid fuel-fired boilers that are equipped with wet scrubbers or no particulate control device. Rather, those boilers would be subject to the carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon emission standard and the destruction and removal efficiency standard to help minimize dioxin/furan emissions. *See* discussion in Part Two, Sections X.A and XI.A.

We propose that solid fuel-fired boilers and those liquid fuel-fired boilers that would not be subject to a numerical dioxin/furan emission standard conduct a one-time dioxin/furan emission test to quantify the effectiveness of today's proposed surrogate dioxin/furan emission controls. This test would be performed no later than the initial comprehensive performance test required under the proposed standards. The results of this one-time test would be reported with the test results for the first comprehensive performance test. *See* proposed § 3.1207(b)(3).

1. What Is the Rationale for Requiring the Test?

We are adopting this provision pursuant to our authority in CAA section 114 (a)(1)(D), which allows EPA to require "any person * * * who is subject to any requirement of this chapter" (which includes section 112) on a one-time, periodic or continuous basis, to "sample such emissions (in accordance with such procedures or methods, at such locations, at such intervals, during such periods and in such manner as the Administrator shall prescribe)". The purpose of such monitoring is "developing or assisting in the development of" standards under various provisions of the Act, including section 112. In this case, monitoring will assist in making determinations under both section 112(d)(6) and section 112(f), which could lead to development of standards under either or both of these provisions.

Section 112(d)(6) of the Act requires us to "review, and revise as necessary emission standards promulgated under this section no less than every eight years." We believe testing that results from compliance with today's proposed standards will, in nearly all cases, establish an adequate database for us to perform this review. However, we would not have sufficient dioxin/furan emissions data for those boilers that are subject to the carbon monoxide/hydrocarbon standard and destruction and removal efficiency standard in lieu of a numerical dioxin/furan standard. We have data from approximately one-third of the boilers that are not subject to a numerical dioxin/furan standard. Although those data indicate that these sources emit low concentrations of dioxin/furan despite the absence of any dioxin/furan control equipment, we are concerned about extrapolating this performance to the entire universe of

[190] For this reason, in the technical support documents for today's proposed rule we also refer extensively to the technical support documents for the Phase I rule.

[191] Those boilers that would be subject to a numerical dioxin/furan standard (*i.e.*, liquid fuel-fired boilers equipped with an electrostatic precipitator or fabric filter) would be required to conduct periodic comprehensive and confirmatory testing. Other boilers would be required to conduct a one-time test for dioxin/furan emissions under the conditions discussed below in the text.

[192] Because the dioxin/furan confirmatory test is conducted under operating conditions that are within the range of normal operations rather than at the upper end of the range of normal operations as during a comprehensive performance test, you would not reestablish operating conditions for dioxin/furan based on the confirmatory performance test.

the subject boilers because our data set may not be statistically random and the potential hazard posed by dioxin/furan is high. In fact, the design of these sources would seem to have the potential for formation of significant dioxin/furan concentrations.[193] We think this proposed testing would add a one-time cost of approximately $10,000 for each source for which dioxin/furan test data are not already available, and the cost appears reasonable to enable us to meet our section 112(d)(6) and 112(f) mandates. Section 112(d)(6) requires EPA, at specified times, to determine if further technology-based emission reductions are warranted. Quantified dioxin/furan emission information from these sources will assist in this determination. Section 112(f) requires EPA (among other things) to determine if emissions from all sources subject to section 112(d) standards must be further reduced in order to assure an ample margin of safety to protect public health. Having actual emission data from these sources obviously will assist in making the required section 112(f) determinations for these sources.

2. What Are the Operating Requirements for the Test?

You must perform the dioxin/furan test under feed and operating conditions that are most likely to maximize dioxin/furan emissions, similar to a dioxin/furan comprehensive performance test. Based on currently available research, the following factors should be considered for the testing: (1) Dioxin/furan testing should be conducted at the point in the maintenance cycle for the boiler when the boiler tubes are more fouled and soot-laden, and not after maintenance involving soot or ash removal from the tubes; (2) dioxin/furan testing should be performed following (or during) a period of feeding normal or greater quantities of metals; (3) dioxin/furan testing should be performed while feeding normal or greater quantities of chlorine; (4) the flue gas temperature in some portion of the heat recovery section of the boiler should be within the dioxin formation temperature window of 750 to 400°F during the testing; (5) the testing should not be conducted under optimal combustion conditions; (6) for units equipped with wet air pollution control systems, the testing should be conducted after a high solids loading has developed in the scrubber system; and (7) for solid fuel-fired boilers, the sulfur content of the coal should be equivalent to or lower than normal coal sulfur levels, and the gas temperature at the inlet to the electrostatic precipitator or fabric filter should be close to the operating limit. In addition, unless sulfur compounds are routinely fed to the unit, dioxin/furan testing should not be performed after a period of firing high sulfur fuel or injection of sulfur additives.

The majority of these recommendations are based on research demonstrating that soot deposits can enhance dioxin/furan formation in the presence of chlorine and catalytic metal contaminants, with formation continuing even after cessation of those contaminant feeds to the system.[194, 195] The boiler tube deposits serve as a sink and source for dioxin/furan reactants (catalytic metals and chlorine), and combined soot-copper deposits have been shown to cause more dioxin/furan formation than a deposit of soot or copper alone. From analysis of soot deposits taken from different sections of a firetube boiler, the highest measured dioxin/furan concentrations were found in those deposits containing the highest concentrations of copper and chloride. Those same deposits were removed from the boiler passages where flue gas temperatures ranged from 600–300°C, which is within the often-cited optimal temperature region for dioxin/furan formation. Tube deposits have also been shown to have a negative effect on dioxin emissions when those deposits have been affected by sulfur dioxide, which is why dioxin/furan testing is not recommended following a period of feeding higher-than-normal levels of sulfur to the boiler.

The recommendation not to test under optimal combustion conditions has been explained previously in the September 1999 Final Rule preamble discussion. *See* 64 FR at 52937. Good combustion practices minimize dioxin/furan emissions by: (1) Destroying trace dioxins/furans that may be present in feed streams; (2) minimizing gas-phase formation of dioxins/furans; and (3) minimizing dioxin/furan precursors that may enhance post-combustion formation.

For units equipped with wet air pollution control systems, it is also recommended that testing be conducted after a high solids loading has developed in the scrubber system. Research conducted to explore the phenomenon of increased dioxin/furan flue gas concentrations across some wet scrubber systems has shown differing flue gas outlet dioxin/furan homologue profiles than flue gas inlet profiles to the scrubber, but similar flue gas outlet homologue profiles to scrubber suspended solids and sludge profiles.[196] This result suggests that some type of memory effect may be associated with suspended solids in a scrubber system which can cause higher dioxin/furans emissions.

You may use data-in-lieu of testing to document dioxin/furan emissions for similar on-site boilers. In addition, dioxin/furan emission data from previous testing would be acceptable, provided the test was performed in a manner likely to maximize dioxin/furan emissions.

C. What Are the Proposed Test Methods?

The proposed emission standards are method-based standards, meaning that the stack test methods used for compliance must be the same as those used to generate the emissions data we used to calculate the standards. Because alternative stack methods may report lower emissions, it is appropriate to require use of the same methods for compliance as sources used to generate the emissions data in our data base.

For this reason, you would be required to use the following stack test methods for compliance: (1) Method 29 for mercury, semivolatile metals, and low volatile metals; and (2) Method 26/26A for total chlorine.[197] For dioxin/furan, the rule would require use of Method 0023A unless you receive approval to use Method 23. We discuss the rationale for allowing site-specific approvals to use Method 23 in Part Three, Section II.D of today's preamble. In addition, for particulate matter, you would be required to use either Method 5, the method used to generate the data in our data base or Method 5i. We allow use of Method 5i because it is more

[193] Incinerators equipped with waste heat recovery boilers are known to emit high levels of dioxin/furan, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces with waste heat recovery boilers can also emit high levels of dioxin/furan. Because the mechanisms that affect formation and control of dioxin/furan are complex and not fully understood, we are concerned that some of the factors that cause high dioxin/furan emissions from incinerators and hydrochloric acid production furnaces equipped with waste heat recovery boilers may also affect dioxin/furan emissions from boilers.

[194] Lee, C.W.; Kilgroe, J.D.; Raghunathan, K. *Environ. Eng. Sci.* 1998, 15(1), 71–84.

[195] Gullett, B.K.; Touati, A.; Lee, C.W. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2000, 34, 2069–2074.

[196] Takaoka, M.; Liao, P.; Takeda, N.; Fujiwara, T.; Oshita, K. *Chemosphere* 2003, 53, 153–161.

[197] Please note that we discuss in Section XIII of the preamble above concerns with the accuracy of M26/26A for measuring emissions of total chlorine for cement kilns. As we explain there, although M26/26A is appropriate for demonstrating compliance with the MACT standards for cement kilns, it is not acceptable for demonstrating compliance with risk-based standards developed under authority of section 112(d)(4) of the Act.

precise than Method 5 at lower particulate matter loadings.

These test methods are codified in 40 CFR part 60, appendix A.[198]

D. What Is the Rationale for the Proposed Continuous Monitoring Requirements?

The most direct means of ensuring compliance with emissions limits is the use of continuous emission monitoring systems (CEMS). We consider other options when CEMS are not available or when we consider the impacts of including such requirements unreasonable. When monitoring options other than CEMS are considered, it is often necessary for us to balance more reasonable costs against the quality or accuracy of the emissions monitoring data. Although monitoring operating parameters cannot provide a direct measurement of emissions, it is often a suitable substitute for CEMS. The information provided can be used to ensure that air pollution control equipment is operating properly. Because most parameter requirements are calibrated during comprehensive performance testing,[199] they provide a reasonable surrogate for direct monitoring of emissions. This information reasonably assures the public that the reductions envisioned by the proposed rule are being achieved.

1. What CEMS Requirements Did EPA Consider?

To comply with the carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon emission limits, you would be required to use a carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon CEMS as well as an oxygen CEMS to correct the carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon values to 7% oxygen. *See* § 63.1209(a). Because boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces are currently required to use these CEMS to comply with existing RCRA emission standards for carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons, there would be a minimal incremental compliance cost.[200]

We also evaluated the cost of applying hydrogen chloride CEMS to boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces. We estimate the capital costs for hydrogen chloride CEMS to be $88,000 per unit and annualized costs to be $33,000 per unit. We determined these costs would be unreasonably high considering: (1) The CEMS detects hydrogen chloride but not chlorine gas, so that compliance with the total chlorine emission standard could not be monitored; (2) the effectiveness of operating parameter limits to ensure compliance with the emission standard for total chlorine; and (3) the relatively low level of hazard posed by emissions of total chlorine.

Finally, we conclude that the use of CEMS to document compliance with particulate matter or metal HAP emission standards has not been demonstrated on hazardous waste combustors in the United States.

2. What Operating Parameter Limits Would Be Required?

To ensure continuous compliance with the proposed emission limits, you would be required to establish limits on key operating parameters and continuously monitor the parameters including: feedrate of metals, chlorine, and, for some source categories, ash; key combustor operating parameters; and key operating parameters of the control device. *See* § 63.1209(j–o). You would also be required to document monitoring by recordkeeping and reporting. We selected the following requirements based on reasonable cost, ease of execution, and usefulness of the resulting data to both owners and operators and EPA for ensuring continuous compliance with the emission limits.

To ensure continuous compliance with the dioxin/furan emission limit, you would be required to establish: (1) A limit on maximum gas temperature at the inlet to a dry particulate matter control device; (2) a limit on minimum combustion chamber temperature; (3) a limit on maximum flue gas flowrate or production rate; (4) a limit on maximum waste feedrate; (5) if your combustor is equipped with an activated carbon injection system: limits on the particulate matter control device, as discussed below; a limit on minimum carbon injection rate; a limit on minimum carrier fluid flowrate or pressure drop; and you must specify and use the brand (*i.e.*, manufacturer) and type of carbon used during the comprehensive performance test, unless you document key parameters that affect adsorption and establish limits on those parameters based on the carbon used in the comprehensive performance test; (6) if your combustor is equipped with a carbon bed: you must monitor the bed life to ensure that it has not reached the end of its useful life to minimize dioxin/furan (and mercury) emissions at least to the levels required by the emission standards; you must replace the bed or bed segment before it has reached the end of its useful life; you must specify and use the brand (*i.e.*, manufacturer) and type of carbon used during the comprehensive performance test, unless you document key parameters that affect adsorption and establish limits on those parameters based on the carbon used in the comprehensive performance test; and you must establish a limit on maximum gas temperature either at the bed inlet or outlet; (7) if your combustor is equipped with a catalytic oxidizer: limits on minimum and maximum gas temperature at the inlet to the catalyst; you must replace the oxidizer when it has reached the maximum service time specified by the manufacturer; and when replacing the catalyst, the new catalyst must be equivalent to or better than the one used during the previous comprehensive performance test as measured by catalytic metal loading for each metal, space time, and substrate construction; (8) if you feed a dioxin/furan inhibitor into the combustion system: a limit on minimum inhibitor feedrate; and you must specify and use the brand (*i.e.*, manufacturer) and type of inhibitor used during the comprehensive performance test, unless you document key parameters that affect the effectiveness of the inhibitor and establish limits on those parameters based on the inhibitor used in the comprehensive performance test. *See* § 63.1209(k).

To ensure continuous compliance with the mercury emission limit, owners and operators of boilers would be required to establish: (1) A limit on the total feedrate of mercury in all feedstreams for solid fuel-fired boilers, and a limit on mercury in hazardous waste feedstreams per million Btu of hazardous waste fired for liquid-fuel-fired boilers;[201, 202] (2) if your boiler is equipped with a wet scrubber, limits prescribed for control of total chlorine with a wet scrubber, except for a limit on minimum pH of the scrubber water; (3) if your boiler is equipped with an activated carbon injection system, limits on the particulate matter control device as discussed below, and limits on the activated carbon injection system as

[198] Method 0023A, however, is included in "Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods," EPA Publication SW–846 Third Edition (November 1986), as amended.

[199] Except that some parameters are limited based on the recommendations/specifications of the manufacturer of the control device.

[200] If you elect to comply with the carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard, you would be required to document that hydrocarbon emissions during the comprehensive performance test meet the standard.

[201] This is because the mercury emission standard for liquid fuel-fired boilers is a hazardous waste thermal emission concentration. Liquid fuel-fired boilers would also be required to monitor the heating value of hazardous waste feeds to ensure compliance with the hazardous waste thermal emission concentration.

[202] The mercury feedrate limit would be based on levels fed during the comprehensive performance test unless the regulatory authority approves a request for you to extrapolate to a higher allowable feedrate (and emission rate) limit.

discussed above for dioxin/furan; and (4) if your boiler is equipped with an activated carbon bed, limits on the carbon bed as discussed above for dioxin/furan.

You may comply with mercury feedrate limits only, however, if you elect to assume that all mercury in the feed is emitted. For solid fuel-fired boilers, you would assume that all mercury in all feedstreams is emitted under this alternative approach. You would also establish a limit on minimum flue gas flowrate to ensure compliance with the mercury emission standard. For liquid fuel-fired boilers where the mercury emission standard is expressed as hazardous waste thermal emissions, you would assume that all mercury in all hazardous waste feedstreams is emitted. You would have to comply with a hazardous waste thermal feed concentration that would be expressed as the mass of mercury in the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input contributed by the hazardous waste. Also, please note that these compliance requirements would not apply to hydrochloric acid production furnaces because (as explained earlier) we propose to use the total chlorine standard as a surrogate for the mercury, particulate matter, semivolatile metal, and low volatile metal standards for these sources. *See* § 63.1209(l).

To ensure continuous compliance with the particulate matter emission limit, you would be required to establish: (1) Limits on the control device operating parameters; (2) a limit on maximum flue gas flowrate or production rate; and a limit on maximum ash feedrate. If your boiler is equipped with a wet scrubber, you would establish limits on: (1) For high energy scrubbers only, minimum pressure drop across the scrubber and either minimum liquid to gas ratio or minimum scrubber water flowrate and maximum flue gas flowrate; and (2) for all scrubbers, the solids content of the scrubber liquid or a minimum blowdown rate. If your boiler is equipped with an electrostatic precipitator, ionizing wet scrubber, or fabric filter, please note that we discuss in Part Three, Section II.I. below proposed compliance parameters for these control devices. Briefly, if your boiler is equipped with a fabric filter, you must comply with bag leak detection system requirements. If your boiler is equipped with an electrostatic precipitator or ionizing wet scrubber, you must either: (1) Install and operate a particulate matter loading detector as a process monitor to indicate when you must take corrective measures; or (2) establish limits on key operating parameters, on a site-specific basis, that are representative and reliable indicators that the control device is operating within the same range of conditions as during the comprehensive performance test, and link those operating limits to the automatic waste feed cutoff system. Please note that the particulate matter compliance requirements would not apply to hydrochloric acid production furnaces, as discussed above. *See* § 63.1209(m).

To ensure continuous compliance with the semivolatile and low volatile metal emission limits, you would be required to establish: (1) A limit on the maximum inlet temperature to the primary dry particulate matter control device; (2) a limit on maximum feedrate of semivolatile and low volatile metals from all feedstreams for solid fuel-fired boilers, and a limit on semivolatile metals and low volatile metals in hazardous waste feedstreams per million Btu of hazardous waste fired for liquid-fuel-fired boilers;[203, 204] (3) limits (or process monitors) on the particulate matter control device as discussed above; (4) a limit on maximum feedrate of total chlorine or chloride in all feedstreams; and (5) a limit on maximum flue gas flowrate or production rate. You may comply with semivolatile and low volatile metal feedrate limits only, however, if you elect to assume that all semivolatile and low volatile metals in the feed is emitted. For solid fuel-fired boilers, you would assume that all semivolatile and low volatile metals in all feedstreams are emitted under this alternative approach. You would also establish a limit on minimum flue gas flowrate to ensure compliance with the semi- and low volatile metals emission standard. For liquid fuel-fired boilers where the semivolatile and low volatile metals emission standards are expressed as hazardous waste thermal emissions, you would assume that all semivolatile and low volatile metals in all hazardous waste feedstreams are emitted. You would have to comply with a hazardous waste thermal feed concentration that would be expressed as the mass of semivolatile (or low volatile) metals in the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input contributed by the hazardous waste. Also, please note that the semivolatile metal and low volatile metal compliance requirements would not apply to hydrochloric acid production furnaces, as discussed above. *See* § 63.1209(n).

To ensure continuous compliance with the total chlorine emission limit, you would be required to establish: (1) A limit on maximum feedrate of total chlorine and chloride from all feedstreams for solid fuel-fired boilers, and a limit on total chlorine and chloride in hazardous waste feedstreams per million Btu of hazardous waste fired for liquid-fuel-fired boilers;[205] (2) a limit on maximum flue gas flowrate or production rate; (3) if your combustor is equipped with a high or low energy wet scrubber: a limit on minimum pH of the scrubber water; a limit on either the minimum liquid to gas ratio or the minimum scrubber water flowrate and maximum flue gas flowrate; (4) if your combustor is equipped with a high energy wet scrubber, a limit on minimum pressure drop across the scrubber; (5) if your combustor is equipped with a low energy wet scrubber: a limit on minimum pressure drop across the scrubber; and a limit on minimum liquid feed pressure to the scrubber; and (6) if your combustor is equipped with a dry scrubber: a limit on minimum sorbent feedrate; a limit on minimum carrier fluid flowrate or nozzle pressure drop; and you must specify and use the brand (*i.e.*, manufacturer) and type of sorbent used during the comprehensive performance test, unless you document key parameters that affect the effectiveness of the sorbent and establish limits on those parameters based on the sorbent used in the comprehensive performance test. If your combustor is equipped with an ionizing wet scrubber, please note that we discuss in Part Three, Section II.I. below proposed compliance parameters for this control device. Briefly, if your combustor is equipped with an ionizing wet scrubber, you must either: (1) Install and operate a particulate matter loading detector as a process monitor to indicate when you must take corrective measures; or (2)

[203] This is because the semivolatile metal and low volatile metal emission standards for liquid fuel-fired boilers are hazardous waste thermal emission concentrations. You would also be required to monitor the heating value of hazardous waste feedstreams to ensure compliance with the hazardous waste thermal emission concentration.

[204] The semivolatile and low volatile metal feedrate limits would be based on levels fed during the comprehensive performance test unless the regulatory authority approves a request for you to extrapolate to higher allowable feedrate (and emission rate) limits. Please note that the semivolatile and low volatile metal feed limits for liquid fuel-fired boilers are hazardous waste thermal concentration limits (pounds of metal per million Btu), not mass feedrate limits, given that the emission standards are expressed as hazardous waste thermal emissions.

[205] This is because the total chlorine emission standard for liquid fuel-fired boilers is a hazardous waste thermal emission concentration. You would also be required to monitor the heating value of hazardous waste feedstreams to ensure compliance with the hazardous waste thermal emission standard.

establish limits on key operating parameters, on a site-specific basis, that are representative and reliable indicators that the control device is operating within the same range of conditions as during the comprehensive performance test, and link those operating limits to the automatic waste feed cutoff system.

You may comply with a total chlorine and chloride feedrate limit only, however, if you elect to assume that all chlorine in the feed is emitted. For solid fuel-fired boilers, you would assume that all chlorine in all feedstreams is emitted under this alternative approach. You would also establish a limit on minimum flue gas flowrate to ensure compliance with the total chlorine standard. For liquid fuel-fired boilers where the total chlorine emission standard is expressed as hazardous waste thermal emissions, you would assume that all chlorine in all hazardous waste feedstreams is emitted. You would have to comply with a hazardous waste thermal feed concentration that would be expressed as the mass of chlorine in the hazardous waste per million Btu heat input contributed by the hazardous waste. *See* § 63.1209(o).

To ensure continuous compliance with the destruction and removal efficiency standard, you would be required to: (1) Establish a limit on minimum combustion chamber temperature; (2) establish a limit on maximum flue gas flowrate or production rate; (3) establish a limit on maximum hazardous waste feedrate; and (4) specify operating parameters and limits to ensure that good operation of each hazardous waste firing system is maintained. *See* § 63.1209(j).

E. What Are the Averaging Periods for the Operating Parameter Limits, and How Are Performance Test Data Averaged To Calculate the Limits?

Except as discussed in Section XIV.F below, we propose that owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces establish averaging periods for the operating parameter limits and calculate the limits from comprehensive performance test data under the same approaches required currently for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. A detailed discussion of how those approaches work, and the rationale for them, are provided at 64 FR at 52919–22 (September 30, 1999). That discussion is summarized below.

We propose the following averaging periods: (1) No averaging period (*i.e.*, instantaneous monitoring) for maximum combustion chamber pressure to control combustion system leaks;[206] (2) 12-hour rolling averages for maximum feedrate of mercury, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, total chlorine and chloride, and ash; and (3) one-hour rolling averages for all other operating parameters. We propose a 12-hour rolling average for metal, total chlorine and chloride, and ash feedrate limits to correspond to the potential duration of three runs of a comprehensive performance test, considering that feedrate and emissions, are, for the most part, linearly related. We propose an hourly rolling average limit for all parameters that are based on operating data from the comprehensive performance test, except combustion chamber pressure and metal, chlorine, and ash feedrate limits. Hourly rolling averages are appropriate for these parameters rather than averaging periods based on the duration of the performance test because we are concerned that there may be a nonlinear relationship between operating parameter levels and emission levels of HAP or HAP surrogates.

We propose two approaches to calculate limits for operating parameters: (1) Calculate the limit as the average of the maximum (or minimum, as specified) rolling averages for each run of the test; or (2) calculate the limit as the average of the test run averages for each run of the test. Hourly rolling averages for two parameters—combustion gas flowrate or production rate and hazardous waste feedrate—would be based on the average of the maximum hourly rolling averages for each run. Hourly rolling average and 12-hour rolling average limits for all other parameters, however, would be based on the average level occurring during the comprehensive performance test. We conclude that this more conservative approach is appropriate for these parameters because they can have a greater effect on emissions, and because it is consistent with how manual emissions results are determined.[207] We also conclude that limits based on the average level occurring during the comprehensive performance are readily achievable. This is because sources generally conduct performance testing at the extreme upper end of the range of normal operations to provide the operating flexibility needed after establishing operating parameter limits. Because sources can readily control (during the performance test and thereafter) the parameters for which limits are established, the operating limits based on the average of the performance test runs should be readily achievable under routine operations.

F. How Would Sources Comply With Emissions Standards Based on Normal Emissions?

Several proposed emission standards would be based on emissions that are within the normal range of operations for the source rather than on compliance test emissions that represent the extreme upper end of the range of normal emissions:[208] mercury standards for cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and liquid fuel-fired boilers, and semivolatile metal emissions for liquid fuel-fired boilers. To ensure compliance with emission standards based on normal emissions data, you would document during the comprehensive performance test a system removal efficiency for the metals and back-calculate from the emission standard a maximum metal feedrate limit that must not be exceeded on an *annual* rolling average. If your source is not equipped with an emission control system (such as activated carbon to control mercury) for the metals in question, however, you must assume zero system removal efficiency. This is because a source that is not equipped with an emission control system may be able to document a positive system removal efficiency, but it is not likely to be reproducible. It is likely to be an artifact of the calculation of emissions and feeds rather than a removal efficiency that is reliable and reproducible.

To ensure that you can calculate a valid, reproducible system removal efficiency for sources equipped with a control system that effectively controls the metal in question, you may need to spike metals in the feed during the comprehensive performance test at levels that may result in emissions that are higher than the standard. This would be acceptable because compliance with an emission standard derived from normal emissions data is based on compliance with an annual average feedrate limit calculated as prescribed here, rather than compliance with the emission standard during the comprehensive performance test.

We propose a one-year averaging period for the metal feedrate limit

[206] Please note, however, that we request comment on the appropriateness of these combustion system leak requirements in Part Three of today's preamble.

[207] Manual method emission test results for each run represent average emissions over the entire run.

[208] Compliance test emissions represent the upper range of emissions from a source because operating parameter limits for the HAP or HAP surrogate are established based on this compliance test.

because the emission standard represents normal, average emissions. Although the averaging period could be substantially shorter or longer, a one-year averaging period is within the range of reasonable averaging periods and would be readily achievable for a standard based on normal emissions. The annual rolling average metal feedrate would be updated each hour based on the average of the 60 previous 1-minute averages.

We propose to retain the hourly rolling average requirement for the other operating parameter limits, however, for the reasons discussed above (*i.e.*, to be conservative given the nonlinear relationship between the operating parameter and emissions, and because the limits would be readily achievable).

G. How Would Sources Comply With Emission Standards Expressed as Hazardous Waste Thermal Emissions?

Several proposed emission standards would be expressed as hazardous waste thermal emissions: mass of pollutant emissions attributable to the hazardous waste feed per million Btu of hazardous waste fed to the combustor.

To demonstrate compliance with a hazardous waste thermal emissions-based standard during a comprehensive performance test, you would calculate the hazardous waste thermal emissions by apportioning mass emissions of mercury, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, or total chlorine according to the ratio of the mass feedrate of mercury, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, or total chlorine and chloride from hazardous waste feedstreams to the feedrate for all feedstreams and dividing by the heat input rate (*i.e.*, million Btu/hr) attributable to the hazardous waste.

To ensure continuous compliance with the hazardous waste thermal emissions-based standard, you would calculate an operating limit based on the hazardous waste thermal feed concentration during the performance test.[209] The hazardous waste thermal feed concentration limit would be calculated as the mass feedrate (lb/hr) of mercury, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, or total chlorine and chloride from hazardous waste feedstreams divided by the heat input rate (million Btu/hr) from hazardous waste feedstreams. For compliance, you would continuously monitor the feedrate of hazardous waste on a 12-hour rolling average updated each minute or, for standards based on normal emissions, on an annual rolling average updated each hour. You must know the concentration of mercury, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, or total chlorine and chloride in the hazardous waste at all times, and the heating value of the hazardous waste at all times. Using this information, you would calculate and record the hazardous waste thermal feed concentration on a 12-hour rolling average, or for standards based on normal emissions, on an annual rolling average updated each hour.

[209] If the hazardous waste thermal emission standard is derived from normal rather than compliance test emissions data, however, the hazardous waste thermal feed concentration would be calculated as discussed above in Section F of the preamble.

H. What Happens if My Thermal Emissions Standard Limits Emissions to Below the Detection Limit of the Stack Test Methods?

Under today's proposed thermal emissions standards, the standard may limit emissions to levels that are below the analytical detection limit of the stack test method. For example, this may occur with the semi-volatile metals standard for liquid fuel boilers when allowable emission levels are below the analytical detection capabilities of Method 29 when the hazardous waste firing rate or heating value is low. To address this issue, we are requesting comment on an approach that would allow you to be in compliance with today's proposed thermal emission standards if certain sampling and analytical criteria are met.

The first criterion would ensure that the test crew accumulates enough of the analyte (*e.g.*, metal HAP) in the sample train to ensure that it is measurable by the laboratory. For example, the amount of HAP accumulated in a one hour sample may not be sufficient for the laboratory to quantify. On the other hand, a three hour test would be more likely to accumulate enough sample, since three times the amount of that HAP would be collected. Most Method 29 results that comprise our emissions database are from two to three hour samples. The first criterion would be met if the facility samples the flue gas for at least three hours for each run.

The second criterion would ensure that the laboratory uses adequate quality assurance procedures to measure the HAP in the sample. Section 13.2 of Method 29 provides the analytical detection limits for the various laboratory methods used to determine the amount of HAP accumulated in the sample. The second criterion would be met if the laboratory reports analytical detection limits that are less than or equal to those reported in section 13.2.

The final criterion is that no HAP represented by the standard can be present above the analytical detection limit. For the semi-volatile metals standard, this means that neither lead nor cadmium could be present above the analytical detection limits for any run of the test. You would assume that the HAP is present at the full detection limit, if lead or cadmium are present above the analytical detection limit during any run of the test.

If you wish to use this provision to demonstrate compliance with the standard, you would be required to show that all three criteria have been met in the Notification of Compliance sent to the appropriate permitting agency. You would not be required to provide advance notice or obtain prior approval from the permitting authority.

I. Are We Concerned About Possible Negative Biases Associated With Making Hydrogen Chloride Measurements in High Moisture Conditions?

Several industry stakeholders have brought several scientific papers to our attention that indicate that Method 26A, used for compliance with the hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas standards, may have a significant low bias at wet stacks with low hydrogen chloride concentrations. These stakeholders have asked us not to establish standards for hydrogen chloride and chlorine standard below 20 ppmv to address this substantial negative bias.

We agree that there was a concern early in the development and deployment of Method 26A that water droplets would not evaporate in the sampling train and would therefore dissolve hydrogen chloride in the sample train, before the hydrogen chloride can be caught by the impingers. EPA determined that this potential problem can be precluded by providing enough heat to the sample train to evaporate all water droplets that might collect in the sample probe or filter. Once the water is evaporated, the hydrogen chloride reenters the sample gas stream and is collected by the impingers.

EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD) performed laboratory studies to document and fully understand this problem. We also monitored the application of Method 26A and it's SW–846 equivalent to determine how these concerns may impact hydrogen chloride measurements made on wet stacks. Our conclusion is that the situations encountered in ORD's laboratory studies are not encountered when making stack test measurements.

The Coalition for Responsible Waste Incineration, CRWI, provided a paper authored by Joette Steger, et al., which

illustrates this point. (See memorandum to docket for today's proposed rule from H. Scott Rauenzahn, U.S. EPA, entitled "Method 26A and CRWI's Concerns," dated March 25, 2004.) Steger found that Method 26A has a significant negative bias when 40 to 50 percent of the water in the sample is in the form of water droplets. Under similar sample conditions, with 60 percent of the water in the form of droplets, Steger found that providing more heat to the sample train corrected the negative bias concern.

We also checked our hydrogen chloride emissions data for hazardous waste combustors to see if water droplets could be present in the sample line. We found that water droplets could be present in three of our incinerator test conditions: 327C10 at 5 percent water droplets; 808C1 at 12.5 percent water droplets; and 3024C1 at 8 percent water droplets. None of these stack conditions approach the 40 to 50 percent water droplets observed to be a problem by Steger. These stack gas conditions most closely resemble Steger's run B–5, with 10% water droplets. No negative bias was observed for Steger's run B–5. We conclude that this negative bias, while conceptually possible, is not encountered at hazardous waste combustors with wet stacks.

We request comments on our analysis of these trade association's concerns, and request more data regarding this issue.

J. What Are the Other Proposed Compliance Requirements?

We propose other compliance requirements for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that are the same as those currently in place at § 63.1206 for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. The rationale for the requirements is the same as discussed in previous rulemakings for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, and compliance procedures would be the same as currently required for those sources.

The other compliance requirements include provisions for: startup, shutdown, and malfunction plans; operation and maintenance plans including a requirement for bag leak detector systems for fabric filters; automatic hazardous waste feed cutoff systems, including a requirement for exceedance reporting; combustion system leak requirements; changes in design, operation, or maintenance that could adversely affect compliance with emission standards; operator training and certification requirements; and requirements for sources that elect to comply with the carbon monoxide standard to document one-time that hydrocarbons also meet the hydrocarbon standard; and provisions allowing a one-time demonstration of compliance with the destruction and removal efficiency standard.

Please note that we propose revisions to, or request comment on, some of these compliance requirements in Part Three of the preamble. Any revisions to these requirements that we might make in the final rule would be applicable to all hazardous waste combustors.

XV. How Did EPA Determine Compliance Times for this Proposed Rule?

Section 112 of the CAA specifies the dates by which affected sources must comply with the emission standards. New or reconstructed units must be in compliance with the proposed rule immediately upon startup or [DATE THE FINAL RULE IS PUBLISHED IN THE **Federal Register**], whichever is later. A new or reconstructed unit for purposes of complying with this proposed rule is one that begins construction after April 20, 2004.[210]

Existing sources are allowed up to three years to comply with the final rule. See proposed § 63.1206(a)(1)(ii) and (a)(2). This is the maximum period allowed by the CAA. We believe that three years for compliance is necessary to allow adequate time to design, install, and test control systems that will be retrofitted onto existing units.

XVI. How Did EPA Determine the Required Records and Reports for the Proposed Rule?

We propose notification, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that are identical to those already in place at §§ 63.1210 and 63.1211 and applicable to incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns. Please note, however, that we are proposing a new requirement applicable to all hazardous waste combustors that would require you to submit a Notification of Intent to Comply and a Compliance Progress Report.

[210] Please note that a new or reconstructed unit for purposes of complying with the Interim Standards applicable to incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns is a unit that began operation after September 30, 1999.

A. Summary of Requirements Currently Applicable to Incinerators, Cement Kilns, and Lightweight Aggregate Kilns and That Would Be Applicable to Boilers and Hydrochloric Acid Production Furnaces

Owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces would be required to submit the following notifications to the Administrator in addition to those required by the NESHAP General Provisions, subpart A of 40 CFR part 63: (1) Notification of changes in design, operation, or maintenance (§ 63.1206(b)(5)(i)); (2) notification of performance test and continuous monitoring system evaluation, including the performance test plan and continuous monitoring system performance evaluation plan (§§ 63.1207(e)); and (3) notification of compliance, including results of performance tests and continuous monitoring system evaluations (§§ 63.1210(b), 63.1207(j); 63.1207(k), and 63.1207(l)). You would also be required to submit notifications to the Administrator if you request or elect to comply with various alternative requirements. Those notifications are listed at § 63.1210(a)(2).

Owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces would be required to submit the following reports to the Administrator in addition to those required by the NESHAP General Provisions, subpart A of 40 CFR part 63: (1) Startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan (if electing to comply with § 63.1206(c)(2)(ii)(B)); (2) excessive exceedances report (§ 63.1206(c)(3)(vi)); and (3) emergency safety vent opening reports (§ 63.1206(c)(4)(iv)).

Owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces would be required to keep records documenting compliance with the requirements of Subpart EEE. Recordkeeping requirements are prescribed in § 63.1211(b), and include requirements under the NESHAP General Provisions, subpart A of 40 CFR part 63.

B. Why Is EPA Proposing Notification of Intent to Comply and Compliance Progress Report Requirements?

1. What Is the Notification of Intent to Comply?

In the June 1998 "fast track" rule (63 FR 33782), we required that sources subject to the Phase I subpart EEE standards complete a Notification of

Intent to Comply (NIC) no later than October 2, 2000 and conduct a NIC public meeting no later than July 31, 2000. The NIC and its associated public meeting served four primary purposes during the early implementation and compliance phases of the Phase I subpart EEE requirements which we believe were of benefit to regulators, sources and the public alike.

First, the NIC served as a compliance planning tool for Phase I sources because it required you to develop an outline of the key activities that needed to be completed in order to meet the subpart EEE standards by the compliance date. It also required that you include the estimated dates for each of those key activities. Because the NIC was required to be completed within the first year of implementing the Phase I requirements, it also may have had the added and important benefit of encouraging sources to reduce their HAP emissions early. By focusing a source's attention on the means by which it would achieve compliance well before the actual compliance date, the NIC may have prompted some sources to upgrade their combustion design and operations earlier, thereby yielding an early reduction in HAP emissions. The NIC also may have prompted earlier waste minimization efforts for the same reason.

Second, the NIC also served as a planning tool for regulatory authorities. Based on the information provided in the NIC, regulators could determine what activities were likely to occur and when over the course of the three-year compliance period. For example, they could estimate how many sources needed to modify their combustion units and existing RCRA permits prior to performance testing, how many sources intended to stop burning hazardous waste, and how many sources intended to apply for the comparable fuels exclusion. Using this information, regulators could plan how to most efficiently allocate their resources in response to the forthcoming compliance activities of the sources.

Third, the NIC promoted early public involvement by fostering an open dialogue between sources and the public regarding compliance strategies for meeting the Phase I subpart EEE standards. Experience has shown that members of the public are interested in being kept adequately informed of and having input into the compliance and permitting activities of hazardous waste combustion facilities. The NIC and its associated public meeting provided an opportunity for the public to share their views, thereby allowing the source to develop a final compliance strategy that met the goals of both the source and the surrounding community.

Fourth, the public involvement aspect of the NIC also offset any public participation opportunities that may have been "lost" if sources chose to take advantage of the RCRA streamlined permit modification process. Many Phase I sources had to modify their combustion systems' design and/or operations in order to comply with the MACT standards. Sources that were already operating under RCRA combustion permits needed to first modify those permits before initiating any MACT compliance related changes. Normally, a Class 2 or 3 modification would be necessary to incorporate into a RCRA permit the types of changes we expected would be necessary for sources complying with Phase I standards. Given that Class 2 and 3 modifications could have consumed a year or more of a source's three-year subpart EEE compliance period, we developed a streamlined permit modification process solely for the purpose of implementing subpart EEE upgrades. Under the streamlined process, you could request a Class 1 modification with prior Agency approval to address and incorporate any necessary MACT upgrades into your RCRA permit. To be eligible to use the streamlined permit modification, however, you first must have complied with the NIC requirements, including those related to public involvement.

2. What Happened to the NIC Provisions?

We promulgated the NIC on June 19, 1998 (63 FR 33782) along with several other requirements related to the Phase I NESHAP. On May 14, 2001, we removed the NIC and two other provisions from the federal regulations in response to a court mandate to vacate. See 66 FR 24270. In *Chemical Manufacturers Ass'n* v *EPA*, 217 F. 3d 861 (D.C. Cir. 2000), the court vacated three provisions of the Phase I rule: the Early Cessation requirement, the NIC and the Compliance Progress Report.[211] While the panel majority held that we possessed the legal authority to impose an Early Cessation requirement, the panel also held that we had claimed the authority to do so without making a showing of a health and environmental benefit (such as reduced HAP emissions or less hazardous waste generated) and that this was an impermissible statutory interpretation. See 217 F. 3d at 865–67. The panel majority further held that because it could not determine whether we would have promulgated the NIC and Progress Report requirements absent the Early Cessation provision, both the NIC and Progress Report requirements should be vacated as well. However, the panel did agree to issue a stay of its mandate for a long enough period of time to allow sources to submit their NICs so that they would be eligible for the RCRA streamlined permit modification.

As discussed above, the NIC was intended to serve as a compliance planning and communication tool. We did not intend the NIC to serve as the basis for requiring a source to cease burning hazardous waste. However, as a planning and communication tool we expected sources that did not intend to comply with the standards to state this in their NIC and include a schedule of activities that the source would need to complete in order to stop burning hazardous waste within the two-year Early Cessation time frame. We believe that the court recognized this interpretation as our original intent in their agreement to stay their issuance of the mandate until after sources had submitted their final NICs on October 1, 2000. By allowing the Phase I sources to complete the NIC process, the court provided sources with the opportunity to effectively plan their compliance strategies and take advantage of the RCRA streamlined permit modification. It also provided the public with the opportunity for a level of participation that they may not have had otherwise.

3. Why Is EPA Proposing To Re-Institute the NIC for Phase I Sources?

As stated above, we believe that the NIC was a valuable planning and communication tool for sources, regulators, and the public during the early implementation and compliance stages of the 1999 Phase I subpart EEE requirements. The NIC also provided an additional benefit to sources upgrading their combustion systems by compensating for any "lost" public participation opportunities when using the RCRA streamlined permit modification process. As discussed in Part One, I. B and D, we are proposing in today's notice to supplant the existing Phase I standards with final Replacement standards. We anticipate that a significant number of Phase I sources may need to conduct additional upgrades, or in some cases upgrade for the first time, to comply with the Replacements standards. See

[211] Under the Early Cessation provision, we required sources that did not intend to comply with the Phase I standards to stop burning hazardous waste within two years of the effective date of the Phase I rule. Under the Compliance Progress Report provision, we required sources to report to their regulatory agencies the status of their progress toward compliance with the standards.

§§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221. Re-instituting the NIC for these sources could provide the same planning and communication benefits during the initial Replacement standards compliance period that it did for the original Phase I standards.

Specifically, we expect that by focusing attention early on the necessary tasks and strategies for achieving compliance, Phase I sources will be in a better position to meet the Replacement standards by the compliance date. Regulators will gain insight from the information provided in the NIC to effectively allocate their resources to accommodate future regulatory activities. And, the NIC will provide the public with the opportunity and mechanism to keep abreast of any significant changes an existing source might need to make as a result of the Replacement standards. We do not believe that the same planning and communication opportunities gained from completing the NIC process are available from other portions of the air regulatory program. For example, although the public will be notified of a source's obligation to comply with the Replacement standards during the reopening or renewal of the source's title V, this notification, in most cases, will not occur as early in the three-year subpart EEE compliance period, nor is it likely to include the specific information regarding the source's compliance strategy.[212]

In addition, while we believe that there will be fewer Phase I sources in the position of having RCRA combustion permit conditions after demonstrating compliance with the Interim standards, for those that do and wish to use the streamlined permit modification process to allow any necessary Replacement standards upgrades, a second NIC would provide the same public participation benefits as did the first NIC.[213] 40 CFR 270.42(j) currently allows a source to use the RCRA streamlined modification process provided that the source first complied with the NIC requirements that were in place prior to October 11, 2000. Since many sources complied with those NIC requirements in 1999 and 2000, the existing regulatory language would allow those same sources to further modify their RCRA permits for Replacement standards upgrades. The regulatory language does not make any distinction regarding when the upgrades are to take place in relation to when the NIC requirements were to have been fulfilled. We do not believe that it is appropriate for a source to rely on previous informational and public participation activities carried out to comply with the earlier NIC requirements and emission standards to address upgrades occurring years later in response to a different set of standards any more than it would be appropriate to allow the public participation activities of a previous RCRA modification to suffice for a later modification. By requiring sources that choose to use the RCRA streamlined permit modification process for Replacement standards upgrades to first complete a NIC, including its associated public meeting, that specifically addresses those Replacement standards upgrades, the community will be kept better informed of additional changes to the combustion system and the impact on the RCRA permit.

4. Why Is EPA Proposing To Require the NIC for Phase II Sources?

We believe that the NIC would provide the same benefits with respect to communication and compliance strategy planning for the Phase II sources that it has for Phase I sources. In addition, without completing the NIC process, Phase II sources will not be eligible to take advantage of the RCRA streamlined permit modification when upgrading their combustion systems. We are proposing that Phase II sources comply with the same NIC requirements as their Phase I counterparts.

5. How Will the NIC Process Work?

We are proposing to apply a similar NIC process to that which we promulgated in the June 19, 1998 "fast track" rule (63 FR 33782). The following is a general description of that process. Within nine months of the promulgation of the final Phase I Replacement standards and Phase II standards, you would develop and make publicly available a draft NIC. The draft NIC would contain general information such as whether you are a major or an area source and what waste minimization, emission control techniques, and emission monitoring techniques you might be considering. At the same time, you would also provide a notice to the public of at least one informal NIC public meeting. Within ten months, you would hold this public meeting to discuss the activities you described in the draft NIC for achieving compliance with the subpart EEE standards. The meeting provides an opportunity for a mutual understanding between you and the public regarding compliance options, including consideration of both technical (*e.g.*, equipment changes to upgrade air pollution control devices) and operational (*e.g.*, process changes to minimize waste generation) alternatives. We expect the exchange between you and the community at the meeting to be similar to that which would occur at RCRA pre-application meetings. That is, we intend for the meeting to provide an open, flexible and informal occasion for you and the public to discuss various aspects of your compliance strategy, provide an opportunity for sharing ideas and provide an opportunity for building a framework for a solid and positive working relationship. Lastly, you would submit a final NIC to your regulatory authority that would include the information provided in the draft NIC (revised as necessary after the public meeting) as well as a summary of the public meeting. This final NIC would be submitted to your regulatory authority within one year of the promulgation of the final Phase I Replacement standards and Phase II standards.

In summary, we believe that the NIC would provide important planning and communication opportunities for both Phase I and Phase II sources. It also would allow all Phase I, as needed, and Phase II sources to take advantage of the RCRA streamlined permit modification procedure. Thus, we are proposing NIC requirements for both Phase I and Phase II sources.

[212] If a major title V source has a remaining permit term of three or more years on the date the Replacement standards are promulgated, the title V permitting authority must complete a reopening of the source's title V permit to incorporate the requirements of these standards not later than 18 months after promulgation. Major sources having remaining permit terms of less than three years on the date the Replacement standards are promulgated may wait until permit renewal to incorporate the new standards. Area sources with title V permits likewise may wait until permit renewal. Permitting authorities must follow the same public notice procedures for title V permit reopenings and renewals as is required for initial permit issuance under title V, including providing public notice of the action, providing a public comment period of at least 30 days, and providing an opportunity for a public hearing. See 40 CFR 70.7 and 71.7.

[213] Once a source conducts its CPT and submits an Notification of compliance documenting compliance with the Subpart EEE standards, the source may request that its RCRA permit be modified to remove any duplicative limits or conditions. Only those risk-based provisions that are more stringent than the MACT requirements as specified in the Notification of compliance or that address other emission hazards will remain in the RCRA permit. We expect that many sources will document compliance with the Phase I Interim standards between 2003 and 2004 and will request the removal of any duplicative, less stringent provisions from their RCRA permits shortly thereafter.

6. What Is the Compliance Progress Report?

In addition to the NIC, we also promulgated Compliance Progress Report requirements in the 1998 "fast track" rule. See 63 FR 33782. The purpose of the Progress Report was to help regulatory agencies determine if sources were making reasonable headway in their efforts to come into compliance. The Progress Report was required to be submitted at the midpoint of the three-year compliance period and contain information that essentially built on the information you previously provided in the NIC. For example, if you indicated in the NIC that you needed to make specific physical modifications to your combustion system in order to comply with the standards, you would be expected to describe your progress in making those modifications in your Compliance Progress Report. Although the Progress Report was primarily intended as a tool for the regulatory agencies, we believe it also may have been beneficial to sources as well. For example, the Progress Report could have been used by sources as a mechanism to review and make any necessary changes to their original strategy for achieving compliance.

As discussed in the previous section, the Court vacated the early cessation, NIC and Compliance Progress Report provisions of the Phase I rule in *Chemical Manufacturers Ass'n* v *EPA*, 217 F. 3d 861 (D.C. Cir. 2000). Although the Court's primary focus was the early cessation provision, it also vacated the Progress Report requirements because it could not determine whether we would have promulgated those requirements absent the early cessation provision.

7. Why Is EPA Requesting Comment on Requiring the Compliance Progress Report for Phase I and Phase II Sources?

We believe that the Progress Report would be a useful tool for both regulators and sources in measuring progress toward achieving compliance with the Subpart EEE standards and determining if any revisions to a source's compliance strategy are necessary. Unlike the NIC, however, we do not have practical experience with the application of the Compliance Progress Report, because the Court vacated its requirements prior to their implementation. As a result, we are requesting comment on whether or not the Compliance Progress Report should be required for Phase I or Phase II sources.

8. How Would the Compliance Progress Report Requirement Work?

The Compliance Progress Report requirements would be similar to those promulgated for Phase I sources in the June 19, 1998 "fast track" rule (63 FR 33782). Within two years of the promulgation of the final standards, you would develop and submit to your regulatory authority a Compliance Progress Report. The Report would include information which demonstrates your progress toward compliance. This could include, for example, completed engineering designs for any physical modifications to the combustion unit that are needed to comply with the standards; copies of construction applications; and binding contractual commitments to purchase, fabricate, and install any necessary equipment, devices, and ancillary structures. In addition, you would be expected to include a detailed schedule that lists the dates for all remaining key activities and projects that will bring you into compliance with the standards. For example, you would include bid and award dates for construction contracts, milestones for groundbreaking, and dates for the approval of permits and licenses. We would also expect you to include in your report any updates or changes to the information you previously provided in your NIC, including if you have changed your compliance plan based on engineering studies or evaluations that you have conducted since your NIC submittal.[214] Sources that intend to cease burning hazardous waste prior to or on the compliance date would still be expected to submit a report describing key activities and projected dates for initiating RCRA closure and discontinuing hazardous waste activities at the combustion unit.

XVII. What Are the Title V and RCRA Permitting Requirements for Phase I and Phase II Sources?

In today's notice of proposed rulemaking, we are maintaining the same general approach we took in the 1999 rule with respect to title V and RCRA permitting requirements and the Phase I sources. We feel that this approach, to place the MACT air emissions and related operating requirements in the title V permit and to continue to require RCRA permits for all other aspects of the combustion unit and the facility that are governed by RCRA, is still the most appropriate method to meet our obligations under both statutes. In 1999, our goal in developing a permitting scheme to accommodate both statutes with respect to air emission limitations and standards, was to avoid duplication to the extent practicable and to streamline requirements. We remain committed to that goal, as we revise and refine the permitting approach we finalized in 1999.

A. What Is the General Approach To Permitting Hazardous Waste Combustion Sources?

In the September 1999 rule, we finalized a permitting approach that places the MACT air emissions and related operating requirements in the title V permit and retains all other RCRA related requirements (*e.g.*, corrective action, general facility standards, other combustor specific concerns such as material handling, risk-based emission limits and operating requirements, and other hazardous waste management units) in the RCRA permit. See 64 FR 52828, 52833–52834 (September 30, 2000). Under this approach, sources comply with their RCRA emission limits and operating requirements until they demonstrate compliance with the MACT standards by conducting a comprehensive performance test and submitting a Notification of Compliance (NOC) to the Administrator (or authorized State) that documents compliance.[215] Upon documenting compliance through the NOC, sources may begin the transition from RCRA permitting to title V permitting.

We believe that this approach still makes the most sense in terms of providing flexibility and minimizing duplication between the two permitting programs, while ensuring that there is no break in regulatory coverage. It is also appropriate given where sources will be in the transition process of complying with the MACT Interim Standards upon promulgation of the Phase I Replacement standards and the Phase II standards. The majority of Phase I sources will have initiated a

[214] For example, if you reported in your NIC that you intended to upgrade your existing unit, but later determined that it was more appropriate to replace the unit with a new unit, we would expect you to inform your regulatory agency of this change in your compliance plan in your Compliance Progress Report.

[215] There is no change to our decision to subject Phase I area sources to the same MACT standards and title V permitting requirements as the major sources. For Phase II sources, area sources are required to meet the same MACT standards as major sources, but only for: dioxin/furan, mercury, carbon monoxide/hydrocarbons, and destruction and removal efficiency. See Part Two, Section I.A. for more information on regulation of area sources. Therefore, Phase II area sources will be required to obtain a title V permit only for those MACT standards as discussed later in Paragraph C.4. of this section.

significant modification of their title V permits to include the operating requirements of their NOC and a modification of their RCRA permits to remove duplicative conditions. By this time, permitting authorities and sources are familiar with the current permitting approach and have worked through many issues to make compliance with the Interim Standards and the ensuing transition successful. We feel that permitting authorities and sources would prefer to draw upon their experiences and utilize the expertise they have developed, rather than exploring ways to implement a new permitting scheme. Therefore, we are retaining the same general approach to permitting for Phase I sources and are proposing to apply this same general approach to Phase II sources in today's Notice of proposed rulemaking: to place the MACT emission standards only in the CAA regulation at 40 CFR part 63 subpart EEE, and rely on implementation through the air program and operating permit programs developed under title V.

1. What Is the Authority for the Proposals Discussed in This Section?

EPA is issuing these proposals to modify RCRA permits under the authority of sections 1006(b), 2002, 3004, 3005 and 7004(b) of RCRA. With regard to the regulatory framework that would result from today's proposal, we are proposing to eliminate the existing RCRA stack emissions national standards for hazardous air pollutants for hazardous waste combustors. That is, after submittal of the NOC established by today's rule and, where applicable, RCRA permit modifications at individual facilities, RCRA national stack emission standards will no longer apply to these hazardous waste combustors. We originally issued emission standards under the authority of section 3004(a) and (q) of RCRA, which calls for EPA to promulgate standards "as may be necessary to protect human health and the environment." We believe that the proposed MACT standards are generally protective of human health and the environment, and that separate RCRA emission standards are not needed to protect human health and the environment. Refer to Part Four, Section IX. *How Does the Proposed Rule Meet the RCRA Protectiveness Mandate?* for a discussion on this topic.

In addition, RCRA section 1006(b) directs EPA to integrate the provisions of RCRA for purposes of administration and enforcement and to avoid duplication, to the maximum extent practicable, with the appropriate provisions of the Clean Air Act (and other federal statutes). This integration must be done in a way that is consistent with the goals and policies of these statutes. Therefore, section 1006(b) provides further authority for EPA to eliminate the existing RCRA stack emissions standards to avoid duplication with the new MACT standards.

We are not proposing, however, that RCRA permit conditions to control emissions from these sources will never be necessary, only that the national RCRA standards appear to be unnecessary. Under the authority of RCRA's "omnibus" clause section 3005(c)(3); see 40 CFR 270.32(b)(2)), RCRA permit writers may impose additional terms and conditions on a site-specific basis as may be necessary to protect human health and the environment. Thus, if MACT standards are not protective of human health and the environment in an individual instance, RCRA permit writers will establish permit limits that are protective.

In RCRA, Congress gave EPA broad authority to provide for public participation in the RCRA permitting process. Section 7004(b) of RCRA requires EPA to provide for, encourage, and assist public participation in the development, revision, implementation, and enforcement of any regulation, guideline, information, or program under the Act.

2. Is EPA Proposing a Different Permitting Approach for New Sources?

As discussed above, we are maintaining the same general permitting approach as before. However, we are proposing to eliminate the unintended result of the previous regulatory construct, which caused new sources to initially be subject to the RCRA air emission and operating requirements. In particular, we want to specify that any hazardous waste burning incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces newly entering the RCRA permitting process (*e.g.*, sources that are seeking an initial RCRA permit or permit modification to include a new hazardous waste combustion unit) after promulgation of the Phase I Replacement standards and Phase II standards are not subject to certain specified RCRA permit requirements or performance standards. The approach we are proposing today is similar to the one we proposed in the July 3, 2001. proposed amendment rule (see 66 FR 35146), but was not finalized. The amendment was not finalized due to several unresolved issues and thus, it was agreed (during litigation settlement discussions), that we would revisit and address the issues in the Phase I Replacement standards and Phase II standards rulemaking.

a. Why Is EPA Proposing a Different Permitting Approach for New Sources? In the September 1999 rule, we had amended language in 40 CFR 264.340, 265.340, 266.100, 270.19, 270.22, 270.62, and 270.66 to accommodate the permit transition from RCRA to the CAA. To summarize, the amended language in these sections says that once a source demonstrates compliance with the standards in 40 CFR part 63 subpart EEE, the requirements in specified part 264, 265, 266, and part 270 sections would no longer apply. However, the amended language neglected to specifically address if, how, or when new sources would make the transition from RCRA permitting requirements to CAA MACT requirements.

As we discussed in the preamble to the July 3, 2001, proposed amendments, under RCRA, new sources must obtain a permit or a permit modification before they may start construction of a new source/unit. The way the current part 270 language reads, new sources subject to the 1999 rule and the Interim Standards rule are not able to demonstrate compliance with the part 63 standards until after a RCRA permit is issued, the source is built, and they conduct performance testing. This means they would have to submit a trial burn plan with their RCRA permit application and also submit suggested conditions for the various phases of operation—start-up/shake-down, trial burn, and post-trial burn. Likewise, RCRA permitted facilities that are adding a new combustion source would have to provide the same information with their permit modification request. Whether the source is new or adding a new combustion source, the permit writer would have to review this information and write conditions into the RCRA permit governing all phases of combustor operations. This expenditure of resources, on the part of the source and the permitting agency, is unnecessary given that the conditions will become inactive or be removed from the RCRA permit upon compliance with the MACT standards. For new sources, compliance with the MACT standards is upon start-up. Therefore, today we are proposing that new sources (whether a new source or a new source at an existing permitted source) who will be subject to the Phase I Replacement standards and Phase II standards upon start-up, not follow the RCRA permitting process for establishing combustor emissions and

operating requirements (*i.e.*, submission of a trial burn plan with the RCRA permit application, submission of suggested conditions for the various phases of operation—start-up/shake-down, trial burn, and post-trial burn, and ultimately obtaining a permit with operating and emission standards).

b. How Is EPA Proposing to Change the Current Requirements for New Sources? In the July 3, 2001 proposal, we developed regulatory language to clarify our intent not to require new sources to obtain a RCRA permit with respect to combustor operations and emissions. In response to that proposal, we received comments from the Sierra Club expressing concerns that the increased opportunities for public participation established in the *RCRA Expanded Public Participation Rule* (60 FR 63417, December 11, 1995) would be lost. This rule involves communities earlier in the permitting process, provides more opportunities for participation, expands public access to information, and offers guidance on how facilities can improve public participation. In a follow-up discussion with the Sierra Club, they specifically expressed interest in being able to influence decisions on the construction of hazardous waste combustors. Upon consideration, we agree with the Sierra Club that in our previous effort to streamline the RCRA permitting process for new sources, we did not fully consider that important opportunities for public participation may be lost. Although we still believe that new sources, whether a new source or an existing source adding a new source, should not be required to follow the RCRA permitting process, we also believe that the Sierra Club's concerns have merit. It makes sense to afford the public the same (or as close as possible) public participation opportunities for new units under the HWC MACT/CAA framework that they had under the RCRA regulations. Therefore we are modifying our earlier proposal as discussed in the paragraphs below, to consider several options that will attempt to address these concerns, as well as provide a means to improve the existing regulatory requirements for new sources.

The RCRA Expanded Public Participation Rule implemented four new requirements for facilities and permitting agencies that enable communities to become more active participants throughout the permitting process. They are: (1) Permit applicants must hold an informal public meeting before applying for a permit; (2) permitting agencies must announce the submission of a permit application which will tell community members where they can view the application while the agency reviews it; (3) permitting agencies may require a facility to set up an information repository at any point during the permitting process if warranted; and (4) permitting agencies must notify the public *prior* to a trial (or test) burn. Consequently, we will focus on each of these and propose mechanisms that mirror or fulfill the RCRA public participation requirements.

We stated earlier in this section that under RCRA, new sources must obtain a permit (or a permit modification at an existing source) before they may start construction of a new source. This holds true regardless of whether we finalize an approach that does not require new sources to obtain a RCRA permit that contains the combustor operating and emissions standards (*i.e.*, a RCRA permit will still be required to address all other activities at the facility including corrective action, general facility standards, other combustor specific concerns such as material handling, risk-based emission limits and operating requirements, and other hazardous waste management units). So, in applying for a RCRA permit, new hazardous waste facilities/sources will still be required to meet the public participation requirements. However, the problem arises if new sources are not required to provide information relative to the combustor (*i.e.*, sources were formerly, at this point in the process, required to submit a trial burn plan), but only for the other proposed hazardous waste management activities at the source. Thus, the source would not be required to discuss the proposed combustor-specific operations and emissions at the informal public meeting, nor would the permit application that is made available to the public to review, contain information regarding the combustor operations or emissions.

In an effort to provide an opportunity for public participation equivalent to RCRA, we believe that the Notification of Intent to Comply (NIC) requirements, as proposed in Part Two, Section XVI.B., serve in place of the first two RCRA public participation requirements. The primary functions of the NIC are to serve as a compliance planning tool and to promote early public involvement in the permitting process. In terms of compliance planning, the draft NIC must contain general information including the waste minimization, emission control, and emission monitoring techniques that are being considered and how the source intends to comply with the emission standards. With regard to early public involvement, a draft of the NIC must be made available to the public for review within 9 months of the effective date of the final Replacement Standards and Phase II Standards rule. One month later, the source must hold an informal public meeting to discuss the activities described in the NIC. The NIC requirements apply to new sources as well (see § 63.1212(b)(1) in today's Notice), but the timing will vary according to the date a new source begins burning hazardous waste. For example, if a new source begins burning 3 months after the rule's effective date, then it will have only 6 months before it must prepare and make a draft NIC available for public review.[216] More significantly, according to 40 CFR 63.1212(b)(2), as proposed in today's Notice, new sources that are to begin burning more than 9 months after the effective date of the final rule will be required to meet all of the NIC and Compliance progress report requirements in §§ 63.1210(b) and (c), 63.1211(c), and 63.1212(a) prior to burning hazardous waste.

We feel that the NIC requirements are commensurate with the public participation requirements to hold an informal public meeting to inform the community of the proposed combustor operations and to make the compliance information available for public review and comment. On the other hand, we also recognize that there are a few gaps. For instance, the NIC requirements are not associated with a permit action and the regulatory agency is not required to be present at the NIC public meeting. We would, however, expect the source to consider any comments raised during the NIC process as it develops its final compliance strategy and final NIC.[217] Also, if a new source begins burning after the effective date of today's rule, but prior to 9 months after the effective date, the NIC is not required to be made available for public review before a new source begins burning. In other words, the public is not provided information relative to the combustor's operations, emissions, and compliance schedule prior to it beginning operations. Given these gaps, we are proposing a scenario in which the NIC requirements for new sources under MACT, could be crafted

[216] Note that new sources must have prepared and included their documentation of compliance in the operating record upon start-up. New sources then have 6 months from the date of start-up to begin their comprehensive performance test.

[217] If necessary, concerns raised regarding the regulation of the combustor can be addressed through application of RCRA's omnibus provision (RCRA section 3005(c)(3)).

to achieve a comparable level of public participation as under RCRA.

We are proposing to require that all new sources prepare a draft NIC and make it available to the public at the same time as their RCRA pre-application meeting notice. We also propose that new sources submit their comprehensive performance test plan at this time. By submitting the NIC and CPT plan together, the public would be provided with compliance-related information relevant to the combustor as well as the proposed combustor operations and emissions (*i.e.*, the public is provided testing information through the CPT that they would have received via the trial burn plan). Lastly, as part of this option we propose that the NIC public meeting coincide with the informal public meeting for the RCRA permit. By holding a simultaneous meeting, the public is given the opportunity to inquire and comment on both the source's proposed activities and the combustor's proposed operations with regulatory officials from both the Air and RCRA programs present. We request comment on this discussion.[218]

With respect to the information repository regulations at 40 CFR 124.33, the purpose of the information repository is to make information (*i.e.*, documents, reports, data, and information deemed necessary) available to the public during the permit issuance process and during the life of a permit. While the Title V permit procedures specify that information relevant to the permitting decision be made available to the public,[219] this information would not be accessible prior to construction or operation of the combustor. Under RCRA, the information repository would be established some time after submission of the permit application, but before construction and operation of the combustor. Even though an information repository is not a required component of the RCRA permit process, the regulations provide a permitting agency with the discretion to evaluate the need for and require a source to establish and maintain one. Therefore, so that the public is afforded the same opportunities to view and copy information such as the NIC, test plans, draft Title V permit and application, reports and so forth under MACT, we are considering two options. We could include a provision similar to § 124.33 in the NIC regulations for new sources. It would allow a regulatory agency, on a case-by-case basis, to require a source to establish an information repository specific to the combustor. We believe the NIC regulations are a suitable location to place such a provision, since the NIC is the first opportunity for the public to discuss the combustor operations and emissions. Alternatively, rather than incorporate provisions for an information repository in the NIC regulations, the applicability language in § 124.33 could be amended to include new combustion sources that will comply with Part 63, subpart EEE upon start-up. We request comment on this discussion.

The last RCRA public participation requirement requires the permitting agency to notify the public prior to a trial burn or test burn at a combustion facility. If new sources are not required to follow the RCRA permitting process with respect to combustor emissions and operations, they also would not be required to submit a trial burn plan with their permit application or conduct a trial burn. However, under MACT, new (and existing) combustion sources are required to submit performance test and continuous monitoring system (CMS) performance evaluation test plans for approval. The MACT performance test serves the same purpose as the RCRA trial burn test: To demonstrate compliance with the relevant emission standards and to collect data to determine at what levels the corresponding operating conditions should be set. Similar, but not identical to the RCRA requirements at 40 CFR 270.62 and 270.66 requiring the permitting agency to notify the public prior to a trial/test burn, the MACT performance test regulations (see § 63.1207(e)(2)), specify that a source must issue a public notice announcing the approval of the test plans and provide a location where the public may view them. Although the timing of the public notices are slightly different, the regulations both provide notice to the public about testing. Under RCRA, notice is given to the public prior (usually 30 days) to commencement of the trial burn, whereas under MACT, notice is given when the test plans are approved. The newly amended regulations of § 63.1207(e)(2) proposed in this Notice, specify that sources must make the test plans available for review at least 60 days prior to commencement of the test and must provide the expected time period for commencing (and completing) the test. Thus, the public is informed of the test and provided estimates of test dates through public notice of the approved test plan.

Thus far, the approach we have proposed is intended to ensure that the public will have the same opportunities for participation and access to information as they would if new sources continued to be subject to the RCRA permit process to include the combustor emission and operating requirements. By proposing that new sources not be required to obtain a RCRA permit with combustor emission and operating requirements, it provides for the smoothest and most practical transition from RCRA requirements to MACT requirements.[220]

Aside from the approach we have focused on, there are others that may be worthy of consideration. We can also look at the option of a transition point for new sources that would specify how far a new source would proceed down the RCRA permit path before it could "transition" over to compliance with the MACT standards and CAA permitting. There are three additional options we can consider relative to a transition point: (1) After the RCRA Part B application is submitted; (2) after the RCRA permit is issued; and (3) after the source places its Documentation of Compliance (DOC) in the operating record.

Beginning with the first option, each successive one moves in the direction toward the way new sources currently make the transition from RCRA to MACT and includes modifications to the RCRA information requirements. We envision each of these options to be a variation of the current RCRA permit process. Under the first option, the transition point would occur after the source submits its RCRA Part B application. The key to this option is that the source would be subject to the public participation requirements of 40 CFR 124.31 and 124.32, to hold an informal public meeting and to have the submission of the permit application noticed. However, new sources would

[218] Since the public participation requirements of 40 CFR 124.31 and 124.32 only apply to initial RCRA permits and renewals with significant changes, a corresponding regulatory amendment would need to be made to the applicability paragraphs to include modifications to RCRA permits only for new combustion sources that will comply with Part 63, subpart EEE upon start-up. Also, 63.1212(b) would need to be amended to reference §§ 124.31 and 124.32.

[219] 40 CFR § 70.7(h)(2) requires that information including the draft Title V permit, the application, all relevant supporting materials, and other materials available to the permitting authority that are relevant to the permit decision, be made available to interested persons.

[220] This approach does not eliminate the possibility that some combustor-specific requirements may be retained in the RCRA permit such as: Risk-based conditions, compliance with an alternative MACT standard, compliance with startup, shutdown and malfunction events under RCRA rather than the CAA, *etc.* See section XVII, D.2. for a more complete discussion. Consequently, sources would be expected to include the applicable RCRA conditions in their RCRA permit application.

not be required to include the combustor's operation and emission information in the Part B application. Rather, the source would only be required to discuss the compliance-related activities related to the combustor as part of the informal public meeting. For the second option, the transition point would be after the permitting agency issues the RCRA permit. The source would not only discuss the combustor's compliance-related activities as part of the RCRA informal public meeting as in the first option, but it would also address the operations and emissions through development of a trial burn plan, or a CPT plan in lieu of the trial burn plan, or even a coordinated CPT/RCRA trial burn plan, if it is likely that the source will require some RCRA permit conditions (*i.e.*, risk-based conditions). With this option, even though all activities pre-permit issuance must address the source and the combustor's operations and emissions, the approved permit would not contain the operating and emission requirements (with the exception of risk-based or alternative standards). For the third option, the transition point would be after the source places its DOC in the operating record, which indicates the source's compliance with the MACT standards. Basically, the source would proceed down the RCRA permit path as in option two by complying with the public participation requirements, submitting a trial burn plan/CPT plan/coordinated plan, suggesting conditions for the various phases of operation, and receiving a RCRA permit. However, in this option, the permit would need to address combustor operations and emissions to the extent that it would cover the construction and start-up/shakedown periods.

With respect to the public participation requirements, all three options automatically factor in the first two RCRA public participation requirements (by virtue of where the transition would be made). However, we did not discuss how we would account for the remaining two public participation requirements. We believe that the information repository and the notification of a trial burn requirements can be addressed in the same manner as we discussed in our proposed approach. So, for these options, we would incorporate an appropriate requirement, either through the NIC regulations or the public participation regulations, that would allow for an information repository to be established. Regarding the notice of a trial burn, we believe that the notice of the performance test is equivalent.

In summary, our proposed approach involves modifying the NIC provisions to include RCRA public participation requirements. The second group of options consider a range of transition points that are also worthy of consideration. We invite comment on this discussion.

3. What Are the Proposed Changes to the RCRA Permitting Requirements That Will Facilitate the Transition to MACT?

To alleviate potential conflicts between the RCRA permit requirements and MACT, we are proposing an additional streamlined permit modification provision, requiring prior Agency approval, which would allow an existing RCRA permit to be better aligned with specific provisions contained in the Subpart EEE requirements. The intent of this provision is to reduce potential burdens associated with compliance with overlapping RCRA and MACT requirements, while still maintaining the overall integrity of the RCRA permit.

a. How Will the Overlap During Performance Testing Be Addressed? When we finalized the performance test requirements and the changes to the RCRA permitting requirements in the September 30, 1999, rule, we did not consider how sources would conduct their performance tests while at the same time, maintain compliance with their RCRA permit requirements. For instance, during the performance test, a source will likely want to conduct testing at the edge of the operating envelope or the worst case for certain parameters to ensure operating flexibility. This could conflict with established operating and emissions limits required in the source's RCRA permit and consequently, prevent the source from optimizing its testing range.

Currently, sources have three options that would allow them to resolve any potential conflicts between their performance test and their RCRA permit requirements. One option would be for a source to submit a RCRA Class 2 or 3 permit modification request to temporarily change or waive specific RCRA permit requirements during the MACT performance test (see § 270.42, appendix I, L.5). Another option would be for a source to request approval for such changes through its RCRA trial burn plan or coordinated MACT / RCRA test plan (see § 270.42, appendix I, L.7.a. or d.). In this case, a source could include proposed test conditions in its plan to temporarily waive specific RCRA permit requirements during the test. The last option would be for a source to request a temporary authorization that would allow specific RCRA permit requirements to be waived for a period of 180 days (see § 270.42(e)).

We do not believe that any of the options discussed above provide an optimal solution to resolving conflicts between a source's performance test protocol and its RCRA permit operating and emissions limits. A Class 2 or 3 RCRA permit modification may not be an option for many sources due to the time typically involved in processing these requests. Sources that choose to modify their permits would need to do so well in advance of conducting their performance test to ensure that the modification would be processed in time to conduct the test on schedule. This may result in sources submitting modification requests prior to approval of their performance test plans. We believe that RCRA permit writers are unlikely to approve any modifications to RCRA permit requirements without the assurance that the source will be operating under an approved test plan. Resolving conflicts using a trial burn or coordinated test plan is not a viable option for a source that has already completed its trial burn/risk burn testing. Lastly, while a temporary authorization is relatively streamlined, it is meant to be used in unique cases affecting an individual facility. We believe that it is most logical and easily implemented to propose a modification that can be used consistently to remedy a common problem affecting an entire group of facilities with similar operations (*e.g.*, hazardous waste burning combustors facing barriers to testing due to RCRA permit requirements). Therefore, in today's Notice, we are proposing to allow sources to waive specific RCRA permit operating and emissions limits during pretesting, initial, and subsequent performance testing through a new streamlined permit modification procedure.[221]

We believe that a process for waiving specific RCRA permit requirements during performance testing is consistent with our objectives to streamline requirements and minimize conflicts between the RCRA and CAA programs without sacrificing the protections afforded by RCRA. Moreover, we view this new permit modification to be complementary to the provisions of § 63.1207(h) for waiving operating parameter limits (OPLs) during

[221] For subsequent performance tests, we anticipate that this modificaiton would be useful for sources that may have risk-based or alternative requirements in their RCRA permits.

performance testing. In the February 14, 2002 final amendments rule, we reiterated that OPLs in the Documentation of Compliance (DOC) may be revised at any time to reflect testing parameters for the initial performance test prior to submission of the NOC and so, in effect, are automatically waived. Also, we revised the language in § 63.1207(h)(1) and (2) to not require that subsequent performance test plans be approved in order to waive OPLs, but rather that sources only record the emission test results of the pretesting.

b. Are There Other Instances Where the New Streamlined Permit Modification Can Be Used? In addition to our efforts today to minimize overlapping permit requirements during performance testing, we are also proposing to allow the new streamlined permit modification to address other potential conflicts. In implementing the 1999 rule, it has become clear that there are several other instances when conflicts may arise where RCRA permit requirements overlap with MACT requirements. For example, the required averaging period for an operating parameter might be slightly different between MACT and the RCRA permit, requiring two different data acquisition schemes during the interim period between submittal of the Documentation of Compliance (DOC) and the final modification of the RCRA permit after receipt of the NOC. Or, if a RCRA permit requires periodic emissions testing, the specified test schedule in the permit might not be aligned with the required test schedule for MACT, causing a facility to perform duplicate testing instead of allowing a single coordinated RCRA/MACT test event. Conflicts in operating limitations, monitoring and recordkeeping requirements, and scheduling provisions can be especially prevalent during this interim period. Consequently, we believe the new streamlined permit modification procedure would be appropriate to address these probable overlaps.

c. Why Is a New Streamlined Permit Modification Procedure Being Proposed? This new streamlined modification differs from the one we finalized in the June 1998 "fast track" rule (63 FR 33782). In 1998, we provided for a streamlined RCRA permit modification process whereby you could request a Class 1 modification with prior Agency approval to address and incorporate any necessary MACT upgrades into your RCRA permit (see 40 CFR 270.42, appendix I, L(9)). The streamlined permit modification provision, which was intended solely for the purpose of implementing physical or operating upgrades, allowed sources that were already operating under RCRA combustion permits to modify their combustion systems' design and/or operations in order to comply with the MACT standards without having to obtain a Class 2 or 3 RCRA permit modification. Thus, L(9) was not intended to account for overlapping requirements. Further, to be eligible to use L(9), you first must have complied with the NIC requirements, including those related to public involvement. Refer to Part Two, Section XVI for a discussion of the NIC.

However, similar to the streamlined modification we finalized as L(9), we feel that this new streamlined modification warrants a Class 1 modification with prior Agency approval. We feel that a Class 1 is appropriate considering that: we do not expect that there would be significant changes when requesting certain RCRA permit requirements to be waived; it would be applicable for a relatively short period of time; regulatory oversight is incorporated via approval of the modification request and; the intended goal of the modification is to achieve environmental improvement ultimately through implementation of more protective standards.

d. How Will the New Streamlined Permit Modification Work? Our proposed approach allows for a waiver of specific RCRA permit requirements provided that you: (1) Submit a Class 1 permit modification request specifying the requested changes to the RCRA permit, with an accompanying explanation of why the changes are necessary and how the revised provisions will be sufficiently protective, and (2) obtain Agency approval prior to implementing the changes.[222] When utilized to waive permit requirements during the performance test, you also must have an approved performance test plan prior to submitting your modification request. (We believe that the Class 1 modification with prior Agency approval will ensure that your proposed test conditions are reasonable with respect to your existing permit limits (*i.e.* that they are sufficiently protective); and that an approved performance test plan confirms that you have met the regulatory requirements for performance test plans.)

We propose that you submit your streamlined modification request in sufficient time to allow the Director a minimum of 30 days (with the option to extend the deadline for another 30 days) to review and approve your request. For purposes of performance testing, we propose that you submit your request at the time you receive approval of your performance test plan, which is 90 days in advance of the test and coincides with the time limitations imposed on the Director for approval. Additionally, we are requiring that the waiver of permit limits only be relevant during the actual testing events and during pretesting for an aggregate period of up to 720 hours of operation. In other words, it would not apply for the duration of time allotted to begin and complete the test (*i.e.*, the entire 60 days).

As a side note, we realize that some sources may not have an approved performance test plan by the date their test is scheduled to begin because the Administrator failed to approve (or deny) it within the specified time period, which could render this new streamlined modification impractical. However, we expect that sources would petition the Administrator to waive their performance test date for up to 6 months, with an additional 6 months possible, rather than to proceed with the performance test without the surety of an approved test plan.[223]

B. How Will the Replacement Standards Affect Permitting for Phase I Sources?

1. Where Will Phase I Sources Be in Their Transition to MACT With Respect to Their RCRA Permits?

We discussed earlier that by the time the Phase I Replacement standards and Phase II standards are finalized, most Phase I sources will have completed their initial comprehensive performance test and submitted their NOC documenting compliance with the MACT Interim Standards.[224] This marks the point at which sources will begin to transition from RCRA permitting requirements to CAA requirements and title V permitting. For sources with RCRA permits, they must continue to comply with the operating standards and emission limits in their permits until any duplicative requirements are either removed through a permit modification, expire, or are automatically inactivated via a sunset clause contained in the permit. For sources operating under interim status,

[222] Refer to the new section in the RCRA permit modification table in 40 CFR 270.42, appendix I, L(10) and new regulatory language in 270.42(k), that must be used to waive specified permit requirements.

[223] *See* 40 CFR 63.1207(e)(3) for performance test time extension requirements.

[224] Some sources will receive extensions of up to one year to conduct their initial comprehensive performance test (see 40 CFR 63.1207(e)(3)). Therefore, their transition point will occur at a later time designated by the extension.

they must comply with the RCRA interim status requirements until they demonstrate and document compliance with the MACT Interim Standards. We anticipate that sources who are in the process of renewing their RCRA permits would work with their permit writers to include sunset clauses to inactivate duplicative requirements upon compliance with the MACT Interim Standards. Given the permit actions taken during the transition period leading up to compliance with the Interim Standards, we believe that many sources will have had duplicative requirements removed from their permits by the time the Replacement Standards are promulgated. For sources that have not had their RCRA permits modified, we expect that they will proceed with a modification to remove duplicative requirements.[225]

2. Where Will Phase I Sources Be in Their Transition to MACT With Respect to Their Title V Permits?

With regard to title V permits, Phase I major and area sources were required to submit a title V permit application 12 months after the effective date of the 1999 rule—or were required to reopen existing title V permits with 3 or more years remaining in the permit term, 18 months after the effective date—to include the MACT standards. Sources with less than 3 years remaining could wait until renewal to incorporate the 1999 standards.[226] Upon promulgation of the Interim Standards on February 13, 2002, major sources were required to reopen their permits or could wait until renewal to include the revised standards according to the same time frames mentioned above. Therefore, we expect that all Phase I sources would have title V permits containing the MACT Interim Standards and potentially, operating standards in accordance with their DOC, at the time the Replacement Standards rule is promulgated. Furthermore, most sources will have initiated a significant modification to their permits to include the revised operating requirements of their NOC. Regardless of these required compliance activities leading up to the promulgation date of the Replacement Standards rule, Phase I sources will again need to reopen within 18 months or wait until renewal to incorporate the MACT Replacement standards.

3. What Is Different With Respect To Permitting in Today's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking?

Based upon our decision to utilize the same general permitting approach as in the 1999 and Interim Standards rules, we expect sources to follow the same transition scheme as it relates to RCRA permit requirements and the CAA requirements and title V permitting for the Replacement Standards rule. One aspect, however, that was not addressed in those rules was how the permitting of new sources would be affected. Hence, we discuss approaches in this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (see Section A.1. above) that would require them to obtain RCRA permits only for corrective action, general facility standards, other combustor specific concerns such as material handling, risk-based emission limits and operating requirements, and other hazardous waste management units at the source. Should the approach we are proposing be finalized, there may not be any operating requirements and emission standards to remove from their RCRA permits.

We also discussed a new streamline permit modification procedure in section A.2. "What Are the Proposed Changes to the RCRA Permitting Requirements that Will Facilitate the Transition to MACT?". This new procedure allows sources to waive specific RCRA permit operating and emission limits during pretesting, performance testing, and other instances where there may be conflicts during the interim period between submission of the Documentation of Compliance and final RCRA permit modification.

Another important difference is our proposal to codify the authority for permit writers to evaluate the need for and, where appropriate, require Site-Specific Risk Assessments (SSRA). We are also proposing to codify the authority for permit writers to add conditions to RCRA permits that they determine, based on the results of an SSRA, are necessary to protect human health and the environment. In doing so, our intent is to change the regulatory mechanism that is the basis for SSRAs, while retaining the same SSRA policy from a substantive standpoint. Under this approach, permitting authorities continue to have the responsibility to ensure the protectiveness of RCRA permits.

Next, we have proposed to re-institute the NIC (see Part Two, Section XVI for a discussion of the NIC) for Phase I sources and to require the NIC for Phase II sources. While the NIC serves as a compliance planning tool and to promote early public involvement, it is also a requirement before the streamlined permit modification procedure in 40 CFR 270.42(j) and 270.42, appendix I, section L.9, can be utilized to make changes to either the combustor design or operations, in order to comply with the final Replacement Standards. Thus, sources who have not yet made the transition from their RCRA permits to title V permits must comply with the NIC requirements to take advantage of the streamlined permit modification.

Last, a subtle difference pertaining to the transition scheme stems from the time span between compliance with the Interim Standards and the effective date of the Replacement Standards relative to RCRA permits. Sources who received extensions to the date for commencing their initial comprehensive performance test, whether a 6 month or 12 month extension, will not be required to submit an NOC until either a few months before or just after the effective date of the final Replacement Standards rule. Therefore, these sources would be modifying their RCRA permits just before or after the effective date of the final rule. Nevertheless, we anticipate that sources will proceed with modification of their RCRA permits to remove duplicative requirements.

C. What Permitting Requirements Is EPA Proposing for Phase II Sources?

Phase II sources are presently subject to the RCRA permitting requirements for hazardous waste combustors provided in 40 CFR 270.22 and 270.66. We are proposing in today's notice to apply the same approach to permitting Phase II sources that we did for Phase I sources in the September 1999 rule. Specifically, we propose to:

(1) Place the new Phase II emission standards only in the CAA regulations at 40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE, and rely on their implementation through the air program,

(2) Specify that, with few exceptions, the analogous standards in the RCRA regulations no longer apply once a facility demonstrates compliance with the MACT standards in subpart EEE, and

(3) Require that the new standards be incorporated into operating permits issued under title V of the CAA rather than be incorporated into RCRA permits.

Our goal with regard to permitting Phase II sources remains the same as the goal that we had for Phase I sources—to accommodate the requirements of

[225] A streamlined permit modification was developed in the 1999 rule to allow the removal of duplicative conditions from RCRA permits (*see* § 270.42, appendix I, section A.8).

[226] Only major sources are required to reopen their title V permits when 3 or more years remain in the permit term. Even though area sources were subject to the same standards and title V permit requirements, they can wait until renewal regardless of the time remaining to incorporate new or revised standards. The reopening provisions of 40 CFR 70.7(f) and 71.7(f) only apply to major sources.

both the RCRA and CAA statutes, while at the same time avoiding duplication between the two programs to the extent practicable. The permitting approach we developed for Phase I sources in the September 1999 rule enables us to achieve this goal. In that rule, we amended the applicability of 40 CFR 270.19, 270.22, 270.62, and 270.66 so that once a source demonstrates compliance with the MACT standards, it is no longer subject to the full array of RCRA combustion permitting activities, unless the Director of the permitting agency decides to apply specific RCRA regulatory provisions, on a case-by-case basis, for purposes of information collection in accordance with §§ 270.10(k) and 270.32(b)(2). We are proposing to make a similar change to 40 CFR 270.22 and 270.66 for Phase II sources. In addition, we are proposing for Phase II sources, as we are for Phase I sources, that new sources not follow the RCRA permitting process for establishing combustor emissions and operating requirements. Of course, as for Phase I sources, Phase II sources would remain subject to the RCRA permitting requirements for all other aspects of their combustion unit and facility operations, including general facility standards, corrective action, other combustor-specific concerns such as materials handling, risk-based emission limits and operating requirements, as appropriate, and other hazardous waste management units at the site.[227] Also, some sources will retain specific RCRA permitting requirements if they choose to comply with an alternative MACT standard; address startup, shutdown and malfunction events under RCRA rather than the CAA; or, if an area source, comply with the RCRA metals, particulate matter, or chlorine standards and associated requirements. It is also important to note that if you later decide to add a new combustion unit to your facility, you must first modify your RCRA permit to include the new unit. This is because your RCRA permit must reflect all hazardous waste management units at the facility. Although the emissions from the new unit will be regulated under the CAA MACT standards, as noted above, your RCRA permit must address any other related requirements for the new unit.

[227] Even though the RCRA air emission standards for combustors will no longer apply once compliance is demonstrated with MACT (except in certain cases), other RCRA air emission standards will continue to apply to other hazardous waste management units at the facility. For example, part 264, subpart CC, still applies to air emissions from tanks, surface impoundments, and containers.

1. What Other Permitting Requirements Are We Proposing To Apply To Phase II Sources?

As part of the Phase I rule, we promulgated additional specific changes to the RCRA permitting requirements in 40 CFR part 270 to facilitate implementation of the new standards and permit transition from RCRA to the CAA. First, we added a streamlined RCRA permit modification process to allow sources to make changes to either their combustor design or operations, as necessary, in order to comply with the Phase I standards. This modification process, a Class 1 with prior Agency approval, was promulgated in the June 19, 1998 "Fast Track" rule and is provided in 40 CFR 270.42(j) and 270.42, appendix I, section L.9. See 63 FR 33785. Second, we further amended the § 270.42, appendix I permit modification table to add a new line item that streamlines modification procedures for removing conditions from a permit that are no longer applicable (*e.g.*, because the standards upon which they are based are no longer applicable to the source). This new line item is a Class 1 modification requiring prior Agency approval and is provided in section A.8 of appendix I.[228] Third, we added a new section, 40 CFR 270.235, to the RCRA permitting requirements that address startup, shutdown, and malfunction events and the integration of those requirements between the RCRA program and the CAA program. Fourth, we amended the requirements in 40 CFR 270.72 governing changes that facilities can make while they are operating under interim status.[229] We believe that each of the above changes that we made to the RCRA permitting regulations for Phase I sources are also appropriate for Phase II sources and thus, are proposing that these same features apply to Phase II sources. They will serve to ease implementation of the new standards and transition combustion sources from RCRA to the CAA.

We did not amend any title V regulations in 40 CFR parts 70 or 71 for Phase I sources. It was our intent during the Phase I rulemaking, and continues to be our intent for Phase II, to rely on the existing air program to implement the new MACT requirements, including their incorporation into a title V operating permit. Thus, we are proposing that all current CAA title V requirements governing permit applications, permit content, permit issuance, renewal, reopenings and revisions will apply to air emissions from Phase II sources. In addition, the requirements of other CAA permitting programs, such as air construction permits, likewise will continue to apply, as appropriate. We also included provisions in the subpart EEE requirements that address the relationship between the standards and title V permits. Specifically, we stated in 40 CFR 63.1206(c)(1)(iv) and (v) that the operating requirements in the Notification of Compliance are applicable requirements for purposes of parts 70 and 71, and that these operating requirements will be incorporated into title V permits. We are proposing the same approach for the interface between the Phase II standards and title V permits.

2. What Other Permitting Requirements Are We Proposing in Today's Notice That Would Also Be Applicable to Phase II Sources?

In today's notice, we are proposing three changes to the general permitting approach for all sources subject to part 63, subpart EEE, including Phase II sources. First, we are proposing to allow sources to waive specific RCRA permit operating and emission limits using a streamlined permit modification procedure. This would apply for pretesting, performance testing, and other instances where there may be conflicts during the interim period between submittal of the DOC and final RCRA permit modification. Second, we are proposing that new units not be required to obtain a RCRA permit that includes emission limits or conditions, with certain exceptions (*e.g.*, more stringent risk-based limits). Third, we are proposing to codify the authority for permit writers to evaluate the need for and, where appropriate, require SSRAs. We are also proposing to codify the authority for permit writers to add conditions to RCRA permits that they determine, based on the results of an SSRA, are necessary to protect human health and the environment. We believe

[228] It is important to note that you only may request the removal of duplicative combustion limits and conditions from your RCRA permit. Any risk-based conditions that are more stringent than the MACT requirements would be retained.

[229] Section 270.72(b) imposes a limit on the extent of the changes, stating that they cannot amount to "reconstruction" (defined in the regulation as "when the capital investment in the changes to the facility exceeds 50 percent of the capital cost of a comparable entirely new hazardous waste management facility"). Although we did not expect the individual costs to perform changes required to comply with the MACT standards to exceed this 50 percent limit, the limit is cumulative for all changes at an interim status facility. Thus, conceivably there could be situations where MACT-related changes would cause a source to exceed the limit. To ensure that the limit would not be a hindrance to MACT compliance, we added an exemption to paragraph (b) of that section for changes necessary to comply with standards under 40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE.

that each of the above proposals are appropriate for Phase II as well as Phase I sources and, therefore, are applying them to all hazardous waste combustors subject to part 63, subpart EEE. See the discussions provided in A.1 and A.2 of this section.

3. How Will the Permitting Approach Work for Phase II Sources?

In the preamble to the September 1999 rule, we discussed at length how to implement the new permitting approach, including aspects such as when and how to transition sources from RCRA permitting to title V. See 64 FR 52981. We have also provided a fact sheet on permit transition in our Hazardous Waste Combustion NESHAP Toolkit, which is available at the following Internet address: *http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/combust/toolkit/index.htm*. The information provided in the above-mentioned preamble and the fact sheet is appropriate for Phase II as well as Phase I sources. Below is a summary of this information for sources that already have RCRA permits and for sources that are currently operating under RCRA Interim Status. The permitting approach for new sources is discussed earlier in A.1 of this section.

a. Implementing the New Permitting Approach for Phase II Sources that Already Have RCRA Permits. If you already have a RCRA permit, you must continue to comply with the conditions in your permit until either they expire or your permitting authority modifies your permit to remove them. You can request a permit modification, using line item A.8 provide in appendix I of § 270.42, to request that your permitting authority remove any duplicative conditions once you have conducted your comprehensive performance test and submitted a Notification of Compliance documenting compliance to your CAA regulatory agency. The appropriate CAA regulatory agency in most cases will be the state environmental agency.

When you submit your RCRA permit modification request you should identify the conditions in your RCRA permit that you believe should be removed. We recommend that you also attach a copy of your Notification of Compliance. This information will help the RCRA permit writer determine whether there are any risk-based conditions that need to remain in your RCRA permit. For example, any conditions imposed under RCRA omnibus authority, or similar state authority, based on the results of a site-specific risk assessment that are *more stringent* than the corresponding MACT standard or limitation documented in the Notification of Compliance would have to remain in the RCRA permit. You should also inform your RCRA permit writer if you intend to comply with any specific RCRA requirements in lieu of those provided in part 63, subpart EEE, such as the RCRA startup, shutdown, and malfunction requirements. Providing this information to the RCRA permit writer likely will expedite review of your permit modification request.

We expect that in some situations RCRA permit writers may not approve a request to remove conditions until they know that their counterparts in the Air program have reviewed the Notification of Compliance and verified that the facility has successfully demonstrated compliance with the MACT standards. This may happen, for example, with facilities that have historically generated a lot of interest or concern from the community or that have had previous problems in maintaining compliance with performance standards. If you have received confirmation that the regulatory agency has made a Finding of Compliance based on your Notification of Compliance, we recommend you include that with your RCRA permit modification request as well. Once people in the Air program responsible for reviewing the Notification of Compliance have completed their evaluation of the documentation and test results, we encourage them to inform their RCRA counterparts. This courtesy will help RCRA permit writers complete their review of the RCRA permit modification requests, thereby facilitating the permit transition.

b. Implementing the New Permitting Approach for Sources that Are Operating under RCRA Interim Status. If you are currently operating under RCRA interim status, you must continue to meet RCRA performance standards governing emissions of hazardous air pollutants in 40 CFR part 266 until you conduct your comprehensive performance test and submit your Notification of Compliance documenting compliance with the MACT standards to the regulatory agency. The RCRA combustion permitting procedures in 40 CFR part 270 also continue to apply until you demonstrate compliance.

There is not a "one size fits all" answer to how facilities operating under RCRA interim status should make the transition. RCRA permit writers, in coordination with facility owners or operators, should map out the most appropriate route to follow in each case. In mapping out site-specific approaches to transition, both the regulators and the facility owners or operators should keep in mind the goal we mentioned earlier of minimizing the amount of time a facility might be subject to duplicative requirements under the two programs. Factors they should take into consideration include, but are not limited to the following. (1) The status of the facility in the RCRA permitting process at the time the final MACT rule is promulgated. For example—If a facility is on the verge of conducting a RCRA trial burn, it should proceed with the trial burn and continue through the RCRA permitting process. (2) The facility's anticipated schedule for demonstrating compliance with the MACT standards. For example—If the facility plans to come into compliance with the standards early, it may make sense to transition before completing the RCRA permitting process. (3) The priorities and schedule of the regulatory agency. For example—A state agency may have made certain commitments (*e.g.*, to the public or to its state legislature) regarding their RCRA or CAA programs that might impact its decisions regarding the transition. (4) The level of environmental concern at a given site. For example—To make sure that the facility is being operated in a manner protective of human health and the environment, the regulatory agency may decide to proceed with RCRA permitting, including the site-specific risk assessment, rather than delay the RCRA process to coordinate with testing under MACT.

If after evaluating all the relevant factors a decision is made to proceed with a RCRA permit in advance of a source's MACT compliance demonstration, we suggest including language to facilitate the eventual transition. Regulators can attach "sunset" provisions to those conditions that will no longer apply once a source demonstrates compliance with the part 63 subpart EEE standards.

In making the transition from one program to the other, testing under one program should not be unnecessarily delayed in order to coordinate with testing required under the other. As proposed for Phase II, sources would be conducting periodic performance testing (every five years) anyway, just as the Phase I sources are required to do. In both our Hazardous Waste Minimization and Combustion Strategy and in the September 1999 Phase I rule, we emphasized the importance of bringing hazardous waste combustion units under enforceable controls that have been demonstrated to achieve compliance with performance standards. Stack testing is essentially

the way to make this demonstration, whether it is performed under the RCRA or CAA regulatory schemes, and so should be performed as expeditiously as possible.

4. How Do We Propose Regulating Phase II Area Sources?

In today's Notice, we are not making a positive area source finding as we have with the Phase I area sources. However, we are using the "specific pollutants" authority in section 112(c)(6) of the CAA to propose that area sources be subject to MACT standards only for certain hazardous air pollutants. Thus, area sources will be subject to title V permitting requirements for those pollutants specified per CAA section 112(c)(6).

Under 40 CFR 63.1(c)(2), area sources subject to MACT standards are also subject to title V permitting, unless the standards for the source category specifies that: (1) states will have the option to exclude area sources from title V permit requirements; or (2) states will have the option to defer permitting of area sources. We did not allow the states these options in the September 1999 rule for Phase I sources, and we are not proposing to offer them for Phase II sources either. Since the RCRA program does not make a distinction between regulating major and area sources and would no longer be able to address the pollutants covered by MACT (because the underlying RCRA standards in 40 CFR parts 264, 265, and 266 would no longer be applicable once the source demonstrates compliance with subpart EEE), we believe that area sources should not be exempt from the title V permitting requirements. It is important that there not be a gap in permitting coverage as we implement the deferral from regulation under RCRA to regulation under the CAA. In addition, section 502(a) of the CAA requires that any area source exemptions from the title V permitting requirements be predicated on a finding that compliance with the requirements is impracticable, infeasible, or unnecessarily burdensome. We do not believe that the title V permitting requirements will be impracticable, infeasible, or unnecessarily burdensome for Phase II area sources, because these sources are already complying with RCRA permitting requirements.

As explained above, we are using the "specific pollutants" authority to propose that area sources be subject to MACT standards only for certain hazardous air pollutants: dioxin/furans, mercury, DRE and carbon monoxide/hydrocarbons. (See Part Two, Section II.C.) For particulate matter, chlorine and HAP metals other than mercury, we are proposing that area sources have the option of complying with the MACT standards for Phase II major sources or continuing to comply with the RCRA emission standards and requirements. Those Phase II area sources that choose to comply with the RCRA standards and requirements will be subject to title V permits for some of their emissions and RCRA permits for others. In summary, regardless of whether an area source elects to comply with all or only the pollutants pursuant to CAA section 112(c)(6), a title V permit will be required.

D. How Would this Proposal Affect the RCRA Site-Specific Risk Assessment Policy?

1. What Is the Site-Specific Risk Assessment Policy?

In the September 30, 1999 Phase I rule, we articulated a revised Site-Specific Risk Assessment (SSRA) policy recommendation for hazardous waste burning incinerators, cement kilns and light-weight aggregate kilns. Specifically, we recommended that for hazardous waste combustors subject to the Phase I MACT standards, permitting authorities should evaluate the need for an SSRA on a case-by-case basis. We further stated that while SSRAs are not anticipated to be necessary for every facility, they should be conducted where there is some reason to believe that operation in accordance with the MACT standards alone may not be protective of human health and the environment. If the permitting authority concludes that a risk assessment is necessary for a particular combustor, the permitting authority must provide the factual and technical basis for its decision in the facility's administrative record. Should the SSRA demonstrate that supplemental requirements are needed to protect human health and the environment, additional conditions and limitations should be included in the facility's RCRA permit pursuant to the omnibus authority. The basis and supporting information for those supplemental requirements also must be documented in the facility's administrative record. For hazardous waste combustors not subject to the Phase I standards, we continued to recommend that SSRAs be conducted as part of the RCRA permitting process. See 64 FR 52841.[230]

2. Are SSRAs Likely To Be Necessary After Sources Comply With the Phase I Replacement Standards and Phase II Standards?

As explained earlier, all Phase I replacement standards must be equivalent to or more stringent than the negotiated interim standards. Many of the replacement standards proposed in today's notice would be more stringent than the interim standards (*e.g.*, 64 µg/dscm as opposed to 120 µg/dscm for the existing source cement kiln mercury standard). And, with the exception of the mercury standard for both new and existing LWAKs and the total chlorine standard for new LWAKs, they are also equivalent to or more stringent than the 1999-promulgated standards, which EPA determined to be generally protective in a national risk assessment conducted for that rulemaking.[231, 232] For today's proposed action, we conducted a comparative risk analysis of the Phase I replacement standards to the 1999-promulgated Phase I standards. Specifically, we compared certain characteristics of the Phase I source universe as it exists today to the 1999 Phase I source universe to determine if there were any significant differences that might influence or impact the potential risk. We focused on the following four key characteristics: emission rates, stack gas characteristics, meteorological conditions, and exposed populations. Based on the results of our comparative analysis, we believe that the risk to human health and the environment from Phase I sources complying with the proposed replacement standards will be, for the most part, the same or less than the estimated risk from sources complying with the 1999-promulgated standards. See Part Four, Section IX, *How Does the Proposed Rule Meet the RCRA Protectiveness Mandate?*.

Policy and Guidance for Hazardous Waste Combustion Facilities. This document is available in the docket (Docket # RCRA–2003–0016) established for today's proposed action.

[231] The 1999-promulgated total chlorine standard for new LWAKs was 41 ppmv. The proposed replacement standard is 150 ppmv. We do not view the total chlorine replacement standard as a concern because the 1999-promulgated total chlorine standard for existing sources was higher (230 ppmv) and found to be generally protective in the national risk assessment conducted for that rulemaking. With respect to risk from mercury for LWAKs, see "Inferential Risk Analysis in Support of Standards for Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Hazardous Waste Combustors," prepared under contract to EPA by Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC.

[232] See *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Support to the Development of Technical Standards for Emissions from Combustion Units Burning Hazardous Wastes: Background Document*, July 1999.

[230] We provided further clarification of the appropriate use of the SSRA policy and technical guidance in an April 10, 2003 memorandum from Marianne Lamont Horinko, Assistant Administrator for OSWER, to the EPA Regional Administrators titled *Use of the Site-Specific Risk Assessment*

Although the replacement standards are generally equivalent to or more stringent than both the interim and 1999-promulgated standards, we cannot assess to what extent this may change the frequency with which SSRAs are determined to be necessary. In the end, the MACT standards are technology-based and so, risk analysis notwithstanding, cannot assure that emissions from each affected source will be protective of human health and the environment. For example, a particular source could emit types and concentrations of non-dioxin PICs different from those we modeled, and so could continue to pose risk not accounted for in our analysis. Sources' emissions of criteria pollutants, which are non-HAPs and so are beyond the direct scope of MACT, also could possibly pose risk which could necessitate site specific risk assessment.[233] Another potential example involves emissions of nonmercury metal HAP by cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns. The semivolatile and low volatile metal thermal emission standards directly address emissions attributable to the hazardous waste, as opposed to a source's total HAP metal emissions. Thus, although these proposed limits reflect MACT, by normalizing the standards to thermal firing rate (for the appropriate reasons explained earlier), they do not create a HAP metal "emissions cap." HAP metal emission contributions from nonhazardous waste fuels and raw materials are not directly regulated by this type of emission standard, but are rather controlled appropriately with the particulate matter standard.[234]

In contrast, RCRA permits can address the total emissions from the combustion unit, assuming an appropriate nexus with hazardous waste combustion. Thus, for those combustors that must comply with a thermal emission standard and that feed materials other than hazardous waste, the permitting authority may decide that an SSRA is appropriate to determine if additional limits (*i.e.*, a total emissions cap) are necessary to ensure that all metal HAP emissions from the combustion unit remain at a level that is protective of human health and the environment.

With respect to Phase II sources, the standards we are proposing in today's notice are significantly more stringent than the existing technical standards required under RCRA (40 CFR part 266, subpart H). To evaluate the protectiveness of the proposed Phase II standards, we conducted the same comparative risk analysis for Phase II sources that we conducted for Phase I sources. Specifically, we evaluated the differences between the 1999 Phase I source universe and the existing Phase II source universe with respect to the four key source characteristics mentioned above to determine if there were any significant differences that might influence or impact the potential risk. As discussed in the background document, ("Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emissions Estimates and Engineering Costs") we estimated emissions for each facility based on site-specific stack gas concentrations and flow rates measured during trial burn or compliance tests. We then assumed that sources would design their systems to meet an emission level below the proposed standard. For today's proposed standards, the design level is generally the lower of: (1) 70% of the standard; or (2) the arithmetic average of the emissions data of the best performing sources.[235] We believe the comparative analysis lends support to our view that the standards for Phase II sources are generally protective. For a detailed discussion of the comparative risk analysis methodology and results, see the background document entitled "Inferential Risk Analysis in Support of Standards for Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Hazardous Waste Combustors," prepared under contract to EPA by Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC.

As with the Phase I sources, we cannot reliably predict to what extent SSRAs will continue to be necessary for Phase II sources once they have complied with the MACT standards. In view of the standards alone there are at least three possible scenarios for which SSRAs may continue to be needed. First, we are proposing thermal emission standards for liquid fuel-fired boilers. Thus, similar to cement kilns and LWAKs, permitting authorities may determine that an SSRA is necessary to ensure that all emissions from liquid fuel-fired boilers are protective of human health and the environment. Second, we are proposing that liquid fuel-fired boilers with wet APCD or no APCD and solid fuel-fired boilers comply with a CO or total hydrocarbon limit as a surrogate for the dioxin/furan emission standard. Permitting authorities may determine that an SSRA is necessary for these sources if there is some concern that the CO or total hydrocarbon limit alone may not be adequately protective. Third, we are not proposing standards for all HAPs emitted by Phase II area sources. Instead, consistent with CAA section 112(c)(6), we are proposing MACT standards only for dioxin/furans, mercury, carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, and DRE. For the remaining metals, particulate matter and TCl, we are providing area sources with the option of complying with the MACT standards for major sources or continuing to comply with the existing RCRA technical standards. Sources that choose to comply with the RCRA standards may need to consider an SSRA, because the RCRA standards alone may not be sufficiently protective (*i.e.*, since they do not address the potential risk from indirect exposures to long-term deposition of metals onto soils and surface waters). To date, we have identified only three area sources in the Phase II universe. Thus, the number of sources that could decide to continue complying with the above-mentioned RCRA standards is expected to be very limited.

It is useful to note that there are other site-specific factors or circumstances beyond the standards themselves that can be important to the SSRA decision making process for an individual combustor. For example, a source's proximity to a water body or an endangered species habitat, repeated occurrences of contaminant advisories for nearby water bodies, the number of hazardous air pollutant emission sources within a facility and the surrounding community, whether or not the waste feed to the combustor is comprised of persistent, bioaccumulative or toxic contaminants, and sensitive receptors with potentially significantly different exposure pathways, such as Native Americans, will likely influence a permitting authority's decision of whether or not an SSRA is necessary. In addition, uncertainties inherent in our comparative risk analysis and the national risk assessment conducted in support of the 1999-promulgated

[233] See 56 FR at 7145 (Feb. 21, 1991) explaining why there can be circumstances where a risk-based standard for particulate matter (a criteria pollutant) for hazardous waste combustion sources may be needed, and how such a standard could be integrated into the National Ambient Air Quality Standard implementation process.

[234] Particulate matter is an appropriate surrogate to control metal emissions in nonhazardous waste fuels and raw material in lieu of a numerical metal emission limit because a numerical metal emission standard may inappropriately control feedrate of HAP metals in the raw materials and fossil fuels (since such control would be neither replicable nor duplicable, and is not justified as a beyond-the-floor standard).

[235] If available test data in our data base indicate that the source was emitting below the design level, we assumed that the source would continue to emit at the levels measured in test.

standards also may influence a permitting authority's decision. For example, the 1999 national risk assessment contained some uncertainties regarding the fate and transport of mercury in the environment and the biological significance of mercury exposures in fish. Another example relates to nondioxin products of incomplete combustion. Due to insufficient emissions data and parameter values, the 1999 national risk assessment did not include an evaluation of risk posed by nondioxin products of incomplete combustion. See 64 FR 52840 and 52841 for additional discussion of uncertainties regarding the national risk assessment. Also, the comparative risk analysis conducted in support of today's action did not account for cumulative emissions at a source or background exposures from other sources.

3. What Changes Are EPA Proposing With Respect To the Site-Specific Risk Assessment Policy?

As stated earlier in this section, we recommended in the preamble to the 1999 rulemaking that permitting authorities evaluate the need for an SSRA on a case-by-case basis for hazardous waste combustors subject to the Phase I MACT standards. For hazardous waste combustors not subject to the Phase I standards, we continued to recommend that SSRAs be conducted as part of the RCRA permitting process if necessary to protect human health and the environment. We indicated that the RCRA omnibus provision authorized permit writers to require applicants to submit SSRA results where an SSRA was determined to be necessary. Today, we are proposing to codify the authority for permit writers to evaluate the need for and, where appropriate, require SSRAs. We are also proposing to codify the authority for permit writers to add conditions to RCRA permits that they determine, based on the results of an SSRA, are necessary to protect human health and the environment. In doing so, our intent is to change the regulatory mechanism that is the basis for SSRAs, while retaining the same SSRA policy from a substantive standpoint. Under this approach, permitting authorities continue to have the responsibility to ensure the protectiveness of RCRA permits. We are requesting comment on this proposal.

RCRA sections 3004(a) and (q) require that we promulgate standards for hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities and hazardous waste energy recovery facilities as may be necessary to protect human health and the environment. RCRA section 1006(b) directs us to integrate the provisions of RCRA with the appropriate provisions of the CAA and other federal statutes to the maximum extent practicable. Thus, to the extent that the RCRA emission standards and associated requirements promulgated under section 3004(a) or (q) are duplicative of the CAA MACT standards, section 1006(b) provides us with the authority to eliminate duplicative RCRA standards and associated requirements. For this reason, we have provided that most RCRA emission standards and associated requirements no longer apply to incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns once these sources demonstrate compliance with MACT requirements. As explained earlier, we are proposing to do the same in today's notice for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and HCl production furnaces.

Although the Phase I replacement and Phase II standards provide a high level of protection to human health and the environment, thereby allowing us to nationally defer the RCRA emission requirements to MACT, additional controls may be necessary on an individual source basis to ensure that adequate protection is achieved in accordance with RCRA. We believe that this will continue to be the case even after the Phase I replacement and Phase II standards are promulgated as discussed earlier in this section. Up to this point in time, we have relied exclusively on RCRA section 3005(c)(3) and its associated regulations (*e.g.*, 40 CFR 270.10(k)) when conducting or requiring a risk assessment on a site-specific basis. Because risk assessments are likely to continue to be necessary at some facilities, we are proposing to explicitly codify the authority to require them on a case-by-case basis and add conditions to RCRA permits based on SSRA results under the authority of sections 3004(a) and (q) and 3005 of RCRA. We continue to believe that section 3005(c)(3) and its associated regulations provide the authority to require and perform SSRAs and to write permit conditions based on SSRA results. Indeed, as explained below, EPA will likely continue to include permit conditions based on the omnibus authority in some circumstances when conducting these activities, and state agencies in states with authorized programs will continue to rely on their own authorized equivalents, at least for some period of time. However, since we foresee that SSRAs will likely continue to be necessary at some hazardous waste combustion facilities, we are proposing to expressly codify these authorities for the convenience of both regulators and the regulated community.

We are not proposing that SSRAs automatically be conducted for hazardous waste combustion units, because we continue to believe that the decision of whether or not a risk assessment is necessary must be made based upon relevant site-specific factors associated with an individual combustion unit and that there are combustion units for which an SSRA will not be necessary. We further believe that it is the permitting authority, with information provided by hazardous waste combustion facilities, that is best equipped to make this decision.

4. How Would the New SSRA Regulatory Provisions Work?

The SSRA regulatory provisions are proposed under both base program authority (sections 3004(a) and 3005(b)) and HSWA authority (section 3004(q)). Thus, where EPA or a state regulator has determined that a risk assessment is necessary, the applicability of the new provisions will vary according to the nature of the combustion unit in question (whether it is regulated under 3004(q), or only 3004(a) and 3005(b)), and the authorization status of the state. Depending on the facts, the new authority would be applicable, or the omnibus provision would remain the principal authority for requiring site-specific risk assessments and imposing risk-based conditions where appropriate.

As explained in the state authorization section of this preamble (see Part Two, Section XIX.C), EPA does not consider these provisions to be either more or less stringent than the pre-existing federal program, since they simply make explicit an authority that has been and remains available under the omnibus authority and its implementing regulations. Thus, states with authorized equivalents to the federal omnibus authority will not be required to adopt these provisions, so long as they interpret their omnibus authority broadly enough to require risk assessments where necessary. Nonetheless, we encourage states to adopt these provisions to promote regulatory transparency.

We are proposing to add a paragraph to the general permit application requirements of 40 CFR 270.10 to specifically allow a permit writer to require that a permittee or an applicant submit an SSRA or the information necessary for the regulatory agency to conduct an SSRA, if one is determined to be necessary. The permit writer may decide that an SSRA is needed if there

is some reason to believe that additional controls beyond those required pursuant to 40 CFR parts 63, 264 or 266 may be needed to ensure protection of human health and the environment under RCRA. We are also proposing to allow the permit writer to require that the applicant provide information, if needed, to make the decision of whether a risk assessment should be required. In addition, we are proposing to amend the applicability language of 40 CFR 270.19, 270.22, 270.62, and 270.66 to allow a permit writer that has determined that an SSRA is necessary for a specific combustion unit to continue to apply the relevant requirements of these sections on a case-by-case basis and as they relate to the performance of the SSRA after the source has demonstrated compliance with the MACT standards.

The basis for the decision to conduct the risk assessment must be included in the administrative record for the facility and made available to the public during the comment period for the draft permit. If the facility, or any other party, files comments on a draft permit decision objecting to the permitting authority's conclusions regarding the need for a risk assessment, the authority must respond fully to the comments. In addition, the risk assessment itself also must be included in the administrative record and made available to the public during the comment period for the permit. Any resulting permit conditions from the SSRA also must be documented and supported in the administrative record. We are proposing to add a paragraph to 40 CFR 270.32 to address the inclusion of conditions and limitations in RCRA permits as a result of the findings of an SSRA.

5. Why Is EPA Not Providing National Criteria for Determining When an SSRA Is or Is Not Necessary?

We are not proposing national criteria for determining when an SSRA is necessary. In the preamble to the April 1996 Phase I NPRM, we provided a list of guiding factors which we later updated and modified in the preamble to the September 1999 final rulemaking. See 61 FR 17372 and 64 FR 52842. We view these guiding factors as items that, because they may be relevant to the potential risk from a hazardous waste combustion unit, could be considered by a permitting authority when deciding if an SSRA is necessary. We did not, and do not, intend for them to be definitive criteria from which permitting authorities would make their decision. As we stated in 1999, we believed that the complexity of multi-pathway risk assessments precluded the conversion of these qualitative guiding factors into more definitive criteria. Since that time, we have reaffirmed our belief that the decision process regarding SSRAs does not lend itself to the application of required national criteria. Most combustors may be characterized using one or more of the qualitative guiding factors we provided in 1999, but not all. These factors were not intended to be an exclusive list of considerations, nor do we believe that this decision is necessarily susceptible to an exclusive list of factors. The decision whether to require a risk assessment is inherently site specific, and permitting authorities need to have the flexibility to evaluate a range of factors that can vary from facility to facility. In addition, it is useful to recognize that as risk assessment science continues to mature, the factors may change in terms of relative importance and it may not be prudent to obligate permitting authorities to an exclusive list that could not be easily adjusted to keep pace with scientific advancements.

In a study conducted by U.S. EPA Region 4, the guiding factors were used to rank 13 hazardous waste combustion facilities into high, medium and low risk potential groupings to ascertain if the factors could be used as a prioritization tool for determining whether or not an SSRA was necessary. The region found that all facilities evaluated exhibited a "high" level of concern with respect to at least one or more site-specific characteristics relating to the guiding factors and that further analysis was required before the region could be assured that the source would operate in a manner that is adequately protective under RCRA. As a result, the region concluded that the guiding factors alone could not be used to make a protectiveness finding. The region's study, which is entitled *Technical Support Assistance of MACT Implementation Qualitative Risk Check* is available in the docket (Docket #RCRA–2003–0016) established for today's notice.

Moreover, simply determining whether a combustor fits a particular guiding factor does not address the complex interplay that may exist between the guiding factors. Nor, does it measure the level of relative importance of one factor over another. For example, is the proximity of potentially sensitive receptors more important than multiple on-site emission points? For all of these reasons, we believe that codification of a list of factors would not be appropriate here.

6. What Is the Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition's SSRA Rulemaking Petition?

On February 28, 2002, the Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition (CKRC) submitted a petition for rulemaking "Petition Under RCRA § 7004(a) For (1) Repeal of Regulations Issued Without Proper Legal Process and (2) Promulgation of Regulations If Necessary With Proper Legal Process" to the Administrator containing two independent requests with respect to SSRAs. First, CKRC requested that we repeal the existing SSRA policy and technical guidance because it believes that the policy and guidance "are regulations issued without appropriate notice and comment rulemaking procedures." Second, CKRC requested that after we repeal the policy and guidance, "should EPA believe it can establish the need to require SSRAs in certain situations, CKRC urges EPA to undertake an appropriate notice and comment rulemaking process seeking to promulgate regulations establishing such requirements."

As stated in the petition, "CKRC does not believe that these SSRA requirements are in any event necessary or appropriate." In addition, CKRC disagrees with our use of the RCRA omnibus provision as the authority to conduct SSRAs or to collect the information and data necessary to conduct SSRAs and further contends that the regulations associated with the omnibus provision are insufficient in detail. CKRC asserts that we have chosen to establish SSRA requirements through guidance documents. CKRC also raised the following three general concerns: (1) Whether an SSRA is needed for hazardous waste combustors that will be receiving a RCRA permit when the combustor is in full compliance with the RCRA boiler and industrial furnace regulations and/or with the MACT regulations; (2) How an SSRA should be conducted; and (3) What is the threshold level for a "yes" or "no" decision that additional risk-based permit conditions are necessary. In support of its petition, CKRC refers to *Appalachian Power Co.* v. *EPA*, 208 F.3d 1015 (D.C. Cir. 2000), *GE* v. *EPA*, 290 F.3d 377 (D.C. Cir. 2002), and *Ethyl Corporation* v. *EPA*, 306 F.3d 1144 (D.C. Cir. 2002). The petition is available in the docket established for today's proposed action.

CKRC filed the petition filed under RCRA section 7004(a), which provides that: "Any person may petition the Administrator for the promulgation, amendment, or repeal of any regulation under this Act. Within a reasonable time following receipt of such a petition, the

Administrator shall take action with respect to the petition and shall publish notice of such action in the **Federal Register**, together with the reasons therefor." .

Shortly after receiving the petition, we conducted a preliminary evaluation of CKRC's concerns as stated in the petition.[236] We determined that any decision regarding the petition should be made in coordination with our development of the proposed Replacement MACT standards for Phase I sources and the proposed new MACT standards for Phase II sources. Thus, we decided that today's notice was the most appropriate vehicle to announce and request comment on our tentative decision concerning the petition.

In the meantime, we believed that it was important to take certain measures to ensure that the SSRA policy and guidance were being used in the manner that we had intended. In an April 10, 2003 memorandum from Marianne Lamont Horinko, Assistant Administrator of the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, to the U.S. EPA Regional Administrators, we took two of these measures. First, we requested that the regions review certain documents (*e.g.*, regional memoranda, policy and guidance documents, Memoranda of Agreement of Grant Workplans with the states) to determine if any contained misleading or incorrect information concerning the SSRA policy and technical guidance. If any were found to contain misleading or incorrect information, we requested that the region take immediate measures to clarify or correct the information. Second, we reiterated, in detail, the appropriate use of the SSRA policy and guidance for hazardous waste combustors, as well as the appropriate use of the RCRA omnibus authority as it relates to SSRAs. In a May 15, 2002, memoranda from Robert Springer, Director of the Office of Solid Waste, to the RCRA Senior Policy Advisors, we took the third measure to ensure proper application of the SSRA policy by our regional permit writers. In this memorandum, we instituted an EPA headquarters review process of future regional decisions concerning the need for an SSRA for hazardous waste combustion units seeking a RCRA permit determination. Specifically, we requested that the regions provide us with a written summary of the basis for any future decisions to conduct or not conduct an SSRA. It is our intention that the review process focus on whether or not permit writers have adequately supported their decisions. It is important to point out that because many of the decisions regarding SSRAs are now being made at the state level, we do not yet know how many regional SSRA decision summaries will be submitted for our review. Both the April 10, 2003, and May 15, 2003, memoranda are provided in the docket established for today's proposed action.

EPA is in the process of an additional effort to ensure proper use of the guidance: we are reviewing the guidance documents themselves, and, to the extent we find language that could be construed as limiting discretion, we intend to revise the documents to make clear that they are non-binding. CKRC indicated in its petition that, in its view, the documents contain language that could be construed as mandatory. While EPA does not necessarily agree, and believes that, in context, it is clear that the guidance in the documents is discretionary, EPA is nonetheless reviewing the documents to ensure that they are carefully drafted.

After consideration of the petition, we have made a tentative decision to partially grant and partially deny CKRC's requests. Specifically, we are proposing to deny CKRC's request that we repeal the SSRA policy and guidance and we are proposing to grant CKRC's request in part by promulgating an explicit authority to require SSRAs on a site-specific basis using notice and comment rulemaking procedures. We are requesting comment on our tentative decision.

With respect to CKRC's first request that we repeal the SSRA policy and guidance, and in response to their specific concern of whether an SSRA is necessary for combustors that are in full compliance with the RCRA and/or MACT regulations, we believe that SSRAs do serve a useful purpose and can be necessary even if a facility is in full compliance with the existing RCRA and/or MACT technical standards. RCRA requires that all hazardous waste permits be protective of human health and the environment. As discussed in the preamble to the 1999 Phase I rulemaking, the existing RCRA incinerator and Boiler and Industrial Furnace (BIF) regulations do not address the potential risk that may be posed from indirect exposures to combustor emissions. See 64 FR 52828, 52839–52842 (September 30, 1999). Further, the technical requirements associated with the RCRA standards have not been updated to reflect changes in technology or science for a decade or more and, thus, may not be sufficiently protective with respect to the potential risk from direct exposures either. For example, our knowledge regarding the formation, control and toxicity of dioxin/furans has vastly improved since the promulgation of the RCRA standards. Therefore, until such time that hazardous waste combustors comply with the MACT standards, SSRAs can serve a useful function in ensuring that RCRA combustor permits will be protective of human health and the environment.

Moreover, even once the MACT standards are fully implemented for incinerators and BIFs, we believe that there may continue to be instances in which the permitting authority determines that additional protections are necessary (*e.g.*, where site-specific conditions indicate that there may be a potential risk to a sensitive ecosystem or population), as was explained above in Section 2, *Are SSRAs Likely to be Necessary After Sources Comply with the Phase I Replacement Standards and Phase II Standards?* See also, the explanations at 64 FR 52840–52841. Because there may continue to be a need for SSRAs at some level, we agree with CKRC that it would be appropriate to explicitly codify the authority to require SSRAs and SSRA-based permit conditions, for the sake of regulatory clarity and transparency (although we continue to believe that the RCRA omnibus provision provides sufficient authority to conduct SSRAs). EPA requests comment on the variety of site-specific circumstances that might give rise to the need for an SSRA, and whether other mechanisms might exist to address those circumstances.

As stated earlier, CKRC raised three general concerns, the first of which we discussed in the preceding paragraphs. The second concern relates to the technical recommendations that EPA has offered for conducting an SSRA. CKRC disagrees with our use of guidance, instead arguing that EPA's recommendations should have been issued through the notice and comment rulemaking process.

We disagree that the Agency's technical recommendations either must or should be issued as a regulation. Risk assessment—especially multi-pathway, indirect exposure assessment—is a highly technical and evolving field. Any regulatory approach EPA might codify in this area is likely to become outdated, or at least artificially constraining, shortly after promulgation in ways that

[236] EPA does not consider the request to repeal EPA's guidance documents to be a valid petition under this section, since the documents are guidance documents, not regulations. Nonetheless, because CKRC has also petitioned the Agency to issue regulations, and to be responsive to issues raised by the regulated community, EPA has decided to use the procedure established in 40 CFR 260.20 for section 7004 petitions to respond to both of CKRC's requests. EPA does not concede by relying on the section 7004(a) procedure that its guidance documents are regulations.

EPA cannot anticipate now. In EPA's view, this is an area that is uniquely fitted for a guidance approach, rather than regulation. In fact, across Agency programs, EPA has generally adopted a guidance approach to risk assessment for exactly this reason. See, *e.g.*, Guidelines for Reproductive Toxicity Risk Assessment, 61 FR 56274 (October 31, 1996). EPA's Superfund program has not promulgated regulations specifying risk assessment methods. Instead, the program uses site-specific approaches for determining risk, employing methods offered in EPA guidance as appropriate. The same is true for the RCRA corrective action program. Although we have attempted to provide our guidance recommendations in a form that responds to or encompasses many of the issues that can arise when conducting an SSRA, we recognize that the flexibility to apply other methodologies, assumptions, or recommendations has been important to both regulators and the regulated community in terms of developing an appropriate site-specific protocol.[237] For example, some of EPA's technical recommendations may not be appropriate for the combustion device in question, and risk assessors must have the flexibility to make adjustments for the specific conditions present at the source, and the state of risk assessment science at the time that the SSRA is being performed. As an obvious example, sources that are located in a dry, desert climate with no nearby permanent or temporary water bodies of concern should not be required to include a fisher exposure scenario in an SSRA. In addition, risk assessors should be free to use the most recent air modeling tools and toxicity values available rather than be limited to those that may be out-of-date because a regulation has not been revised following the development of the new tools or values. Guidance allows for this flexibility.

CKRC points out the EPA codified certain parameters for BIF risk assessments, to show that it is possible to do so. While EPA agrees it is possible, the codification in the BIF area is the exception, not the rule. It has been our experience in implementing the BIF regulations that codification of certain risk parameters has proven to be overly constraining because risk science is a continually changing field. For example, by codifying the toxicity values, risk managers were not able to utilize more recent values available through EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS)[238] and other resources. Also, shortly after we codified the air modeling guidelines in support of the risk parameters and procedures, the Air program revised their air modeling guidelines, rendering some of the BIF air modeling guidelines inconsistent and so, they were removed. Further, it is important to note that at the time of codification, BIF risk assessments were not intended to address indirect routes of exposure, thus making the parameters easier to implement. Today, however, risk assessments are more complex due to the necessary inclusion of multi-pathway and indirect exposure routes. Given the complexity of multi-pathway and indirect exposure assessments and the fact that risk science is continuously evolving, it would be difficult and again, overly constraining, to codify risk parameters today.

We also believe that a guidance approach is consistent with the fact that permit writers must make site-specific decisions whether to do risk assessments at all. We expect that permit writers will reach their decisions based on different factors and concerns—in some cases, factors and concerns that we may not have identified at this time. We think that it makes little sense to allow this kind of flexibility regarding whether to do a risk assessment and for what purposes, while prescribing how one must be conducted if one is required.

CKRC further contends that the guidance is overly conservative and constitutes "a confusing pattern of drafts over a number of years in a seemingly endless fashion" that has resulted in their members incurring significant costs. Because of the variability in the many factors that influence the risk from hazardous waste combustors, the guidance contains some conservative recommendations and assumptions in order to address this wide range. However, based on input from users of the guidance, we have attempted to correct the recommendations and assumptions that we consider to be overly conservative and, as stated previously, because they are guidance recommendations and not requirements, the risk assessor may choose not to follow them. More recently, we have solicited public and peer review comments on the 1998 guidance,[239] and are in the process of revising it based on the comments received. This includes comments CKRC submitted related to the components of the guidance they contended were overly conservative.[240]

With respect to CKRC's assertion that the guidance is "a confusing pattern of drafts over a number of years", we acknowledge that we have issued a number of guidance documents since 1990. However, we disagree that this has resulted in a confusing pattern of drafts. The development and release of the guidance documents correspond to three specific regulatory time periods in the area of hazardous waste combustion. In addition, the issuance of subsequent versions relates to the fact that the Agency has repeatedly solicited public and peer review comments on its technical guidance, and has built upon the experience of regulators and facilities in using earlier guidance.

In 1990, EPA developed its initial guidance document during the same time period as the RCRA BIF emission standards. In 1993, we released an addendum to the 1990 guidance in response to the draft Hazardous Waste Minimization and Combustion Strategy and our increasing concerns about the potential impacts from indirect routes of exposure, and solicited comments from the public and the Science Advisory Board. A revised document taking into account these comments was issued one year later.[241]

At the time that we were developing the Phase 1 MACT standards, we again updated our combustion risk assessment guidance by releasing a document specifically addressing human health risk in 1998 and one addressing ecological risk in 1999, again soliciting public input and peer review on these

[237] Permitting authorities, in some cases, have developed their own guidance methodologies responsive to the specific needs associated with their facilities. For example, North Carolina, Texas, and New York have each developed their own risk assessment methodologies. We think this flexibility employed in the field supports our judgment that risk assessment methodologies should not be codified.

[238] IRIS is a collection of continuously updated chemical files which contain descriptive and quantitative information with respect to: oral reference doses and inhalation reference concentrations (RfDs and RfCs, respectively) for chronic noncarcinogenic health effects; and hazard identification, oral slope factors, and oral and inhalation unit risks for carcinogenic effects. For more information, see *http://www.epa.gov/iris/index.html*.

[239] USEPA. "Human Health Risk Assessment Protocol for Hazardous Waste Combustion Facilities" EPA–520–D–98–001A, B&C. External Peer Review Draft, 1998. (*http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/combust/risk.htm*)

[240] We are not responding to the specific comments here, but will respond to them as part of the public process for developing the final guidance documents.

[241] USEPA. "Guidance for Performing Screening Level Risk Analyses at Combustion Facilities Burning Hazardous Wastes" Draft, April 1994. USEPA. "Implementation of Exposure Assessment Guidance for RCRA Hazardous Waste Combustion Facilities" Draft, 1994. (These documents are available as part of the "Exposure Assessment Guidance for RCRA Hazardous Waste Combustion Facilities" EPA530–R–R–94–021. Copies may be ordered through the National Service Center for Environmental Publications' Web site at *http://www.epa.gov/ncepihom/*)

documents.[242] For purposes of clarity, both of these documents refer to all earlier guidance where appropriate and discuss briefly the progression of the guidance. Although the 1998 human health guidance and the 1999 ecological guidance provide our current thinking regarding SSRA methodology for hazardous waste combustors, we noted to our permit writers that we recommended that they should continue to use the 1994 guidance for those SSRAs that were in progress.

Although CKRC claims to find these guidance documents confusing, EPA's judgment is that most interested parties—both regulators and the regulated community—have found the guidance to be useful, and that the documents have substantially reduced the uncertainty and confusion that surrounded multi-pathway risk assessments a decade ago. As stated above, no one is obligated to follow this guidance, and regulators often depart from it; but EPA believes it has been extremely helpful on the whole, rather than confusing.

CKRC has alleged that SSRA's typically cost between $200,000 and $1,000,000 for an individual facility. We are aware that prior to the release of the 1998 guidance, combustion risk assessments were more costly than we understand them to be today. For an individual facility, we do not know to what extent these costs are attributed to the act of conducting a risk assessment, to recommendations provided in our guidance, to changes that the facility chose to make during the risk assessment, or the facility's desire to develop its own site-specific protocol. Not including the collection and analysis of emission risk data, we have been advised that the cost of an average SSRA today is approximately $84,000. (*See* document entitled *Hazardous Waste Combustion MACT—Replacement Standards: Proposed Rule. Preliminary Cost Assessment for Site Specific Risk Assessment*, November, 2003, as provided in the docket for today's action.) The emission risk data is projected to add on average between $57,000 (if the facility collects its emission risk data at the same time as its emission standards performance data) and $285,000 (if the facility must conduct a separate emission test solely for the purpose of collecting data for the SSRA). Therefore, including emission data collection, the average cost of an SSRA is between $141,000 and $370,000. This is considerably less than the cost range provided by CKRC of $200,000 to $1,000,000. Additionally, EPA's upper bound cost of $370,000 is significantly less than the upper bound cost of $1,300,000, as reported by CKRC in their petition (and the attached affidavit).[243] We believe that the cost of SSRAs has decreased over time, particularly since the release of the 1998 guidance. This may be in large part because the 1998 guidance is much more comprehensive than previous guidance documents and because private software companies have developed computer programs based on the guidance, which can further decrease costs associated with the risk calculations for each exposure scenario.

CKRC also expressed specific concern that it and its members have been denied an opportunity to comment on the combustion risk assessment guidance documents. We strongly disagree with this assertion. We have repeatedly sought public comment on the guidance documents. For the 1998 human health guidance we not only requested public comment, but also submitted the document for an external peer review and held a peer review meeting which was open to the public. Since the peer review meeting, we have been incorporating both the public and peer review comments into the human health guidance. While we have not yet completed this task and released a final document, any member of the public may at any time discuss any concerns that they have with our recommendations. In addition, regardless of whether a risk assessor uses the recommendations provided in our guidance or not, we have encouraged the permit writer and facility representatives to meet prior to any analysis to discuss the appropriate risk methodology and data input needs for an SSRA. Such a meeting allows both the permitting authority and the facility the opportunity to raise questions and objections concerning the appropriateness of different methodologies, assumptions, or default values and their application to the hazardous waste combustor. Facility representatives and any member of the public also may comment on the risk assessment methodology as part of the public comment process associated with the RCRA permit.

The third general concern raised by CKRC in its petition was that we had not provided a threshold level for a "yes" or "no" decision to trigger the need for additional risk-based permit conditions. EPA agrees that its guidance does not establish a bright-line threshold level for determining whether to impose additional permit conditions; such a binding requirement would only be appropriately established through rulemaking. However, EPA has provided recommendations about the overall targets for acceptable risk levels. See USEPA. *Implementation of Exposure Assessment Guidance for RCRA Hazardous Waste Combustion Facilities*, Draft, 1994. Moreover, we do not intend to codify our recommended target levels for some of the same reasons that we are not proposing to codify the risk assessment technical guidance. Our recommended target levels provide risk managers with a starting point from which to determine if a combustor's potential risk may or may not be acceptable. However, we believe that it is important, and indeed essential, that risk managers be afforded sufficient flexibility to apply different target levels as dictated by the circumstances surrounding the combustor. For example, a risk manager may wish to apply a more stringent carcinogenic target level for a combustor that is located in a densely populated area with a high concentration of industrial emission sources.

In summary, we have made a tentative decision to deny CKRC's request that we repeal the SSRA policy and guidance and to grant CKRC's request in part by proposing to codify the authority to require SSRAs. We are not proposing to codify the SSRA guidance or our recommended risk methodology for hazardous waste combustors. We are requesting comment on our tentative decision.

XVIII. What Alternatives to the Particulate Matter Standard Is EPA Proposing or Requesting Comment On?

As discussed in Part Two, Section IV.C, we are proposing particulate matter standards as surrogates to control metal HAP.[244] We are not proposing numerical metal HAP emission standards that would have accounted for all metal HAP because we generally do not have as much compliance test

[242] We noted earlier that the 1998 guidance is currently being revised in consideration of public and peer review comments received. With respect to the 1999 guidance (USEPA. "Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment Protocol for Hazardous Waste Combustion Facilities" EPA–530–D–99–001A, B&C. Peer Review Draft, 1999), we solicited public comment and plan to conduct a peer review. (*http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/combust/ecorisk.htm*)

[243] The cost ranges for CKRC include both the cost of risk assessments and emission data collection. In its petition, CKRC provided a range of costs ($100,000 to $500,000 for risk assessments and $100,000 to $500,000 for emission data collection), but also provided an upper bound cost ($728,297 for a risk assessment and $588,790 for emission data collection, plus additional permit costs to equate to $1.3M).

[244] Particulate matter is not a listed HAP pursuant to CAA 112(b).

emissions information in our database for the nonenumerated metal HAP compared to the enumerated metal HAP,[245] and because we believe that a particulate matter standard, in lieu of emission standards that directly regulate all the metals in all feedstreams, simplifies compliance activities.

Nonetheless, we are today proposing an alternative to the particulate matter standard for incinerators, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and solid fuel-fired boilers that is conceptually similar to the alternative metal emission control requirements that were previously promulgated for incinerators. We are also requesting comment on another alternative to the particulate matter standard that would apply to all source categories that would be subject to particulate matter standards (*i.e.*, all source categories except hydrochloric acid production furnaces).

We discuss these two different alternatives below.

A. What Alternative to the Particulate Matter Standard Is EPA Proposing For Incinerators, Liquid Fuel-Fired Boilers, and Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers?

We promulgated an alternative to the particulate matter standard for incinerators feeding low levels of metals in the July 3, 2001, direct final rule. See 66 FR at 35093. Today we propose a simplified alternative to the particulate matter standard for incinerators, and we propose to expand the provision to also apply to liquid and solid fuel-fired boilers. Below, we first describe the alternative that was originally promulgated for incinerators, after which we describe the simplified approach and our rationale for proposing it.

The July 3, 2001, final rule allows incinerators to operate under alternative metal emission control requirements reflecting MACT in lieu of complying with the 0.015 gr/dscf particulate emission standard. Under the alternative, no particulate matter emission standard applies to incinerators under subpart EEE; however, the incinerator remains subject to the RCRA particulate matter standard of 0.08 gr/dscf pursuant to § 264.343(c). This is because Clean Air Act standards can supplant RCRA standards only when the CAA standard is sufficiently protective of human health and the environment to make the RCRA standard duplicative (within the meaning of RCRA section 1006 (b)(3)).[246] *See* Part Two, Section XVII.D.

This previously promulgated alternative to the particulate matter standard has three components. The first component is simply to meet metal emission limitations for semivolatile and low volatile metals. The emission limitations apply to both enumerated *and* non-enumerated metal HAP, excluding mercury. Enumerated semivolatile metals are those metals that are directly controlled with the numerical semivolatile emission standard, *i.e.*, cadmium and lead. Enumerated low volatile metals are those metals that are directly controlled with the numerical low volatile metals emission standard, *i.e.*, arsenic, beryllium and chromium. Non-enumerated metals are those remaining metal HAP: antimony, cobalt, manganese, nickel, and selenium that are not controlled directly with an emission standard, but are rather controlled through the surrogate particulate matter standard.[247] For purposes of these alternative requirements, the non-enumerated metals are classified as either a semivolatile or a low volatile metal, and included in the calculation of compliance with the corresponding emissions limit. The level of the standard is the same as that which applies to other incinerators, but the standard would apply to all metal HAP, not just those enumerated in the present low volatile metal and semivolatile metal standards.

The second component is a requirement for the incinerator to demonstrate that it is using reasonable hazardous waste metal feed control, *i.e.*, a defined metal feedrate that is better than the MACT-defining metal feed floor control level. The third component is a requirement for the incinerator to demonstrate that its air pollution control system achieves, at a minimum, a 90 percent system removal efficiency for semivolatile metals.

Today we propose a simplified version of the above described alternative in that we propose to require you to comply only with the first component described above, which is to achieve metal emission standards for semivolatile and low volatile metals. As discussed above, the level of the proposed standard is the same as that which applies to other sources, but the standard would apply to all metal HAP, not just those enumerated in the present semivolatile and low volatile metal standards. As with the previously promulgated alternative, no particulate matter emission standard would apply to these sources under subpart EEE; however, sources would remain subject to the RCRA particulate matter standard of 0.08 gr/dscf pursuant to §§ 264.343(c) or 266.105.

We propose to eliminate the requirements for you to demonstrate that: (1) You are using reasonable hazardous waste metal feed control, *i.e.*, a defined metal feed control that is better than the MACT-defining feed control level; and (2) your source is equipped with an air pollution control system that achieves at least a 90 percent system removal efficiency for semivolatile metals. We believe these two requirements are not necessary to ensure you are in fact controlling metals below MACT levels given that all sources electing to comply with this alternative must limit both the enumerated metals and non-enumerated metals to levels below the proposed levels that apply only to enumerated metals. Today's proposed approach, in effect, lowers the existing semivolatile and low volatile metal emissions limits because the contribution of nonenumerated metals must be accounted for when achieving the same numerical semivolatile and low volatile emission limits. We believe this is appropriate because this effectively lower emissions limit for enumerated metals compensates for the lower emission levels that would have been achieved if the source used a particulate matter control device capable of achieving the particulate matter standard. Put another way, we regard this emission limitation as an equivalent means of meeting the standard for HAP metals (except mercury) already established in the rule.

As discussed above, the approach we promulgated on July 3, 2001 required you, in practice, to feed low levels of metals on a continuous basis in order to qualify for the alternative. The rule required that the source's feed control level must be equivalent to or lower than 25% of the MACT-defining hazardous waste feed control level. We considered whether it would be appropriate to also apply such a

[245] "Enumerated" metals are those HAP metals that are directly controlled with an emission limit, *i.e.*, lead, cadmium, arsenic, beryllium, and chromium. The remaining nonmercury metal HAP are controlled using particulate matter as a surrogate.

[246] Sources electing to comply with these alternative requirements thus remain subject to the RCRA PM standard in their RCRA permit. The RCRA permit must include applicable operating limits that ensure compliance with the RCRA PM limit.

[247] Please note that the particulate matter standard is not redundant to the semivolatile and low volatile metal standards. Although controlling particulate matter also controls semivolatile and low volatile metals in combustion gas, these metals can also be controlled by feedrate control. Thus, sources can achieve the emission standard for semivolatile and low volatile metals primarily by feedrate control. In such cases, the particulate matter standard would be controlling nonenumerated metals primarily.

qualification requirement to today's proposed alternative. Unfortunately, the methodology used to calculate today's proposed emission standards does not base the standards on a specific MACT-defining feed control level. Thus, we do not have a MACT feed control level that we can readily use to define an appropriate low feed control level. We request comment on whether it is appropriate and/or necessary to establish a minimum feed control level, and if so, how it could be determined.

1. What Emission Limitation Must Incinerators Comply With Under This Alternative?

For existing incinerators, the emissions limits under this alternative would be: (1) A semivolatile metal emission limit of 59 µg/dscm for the combined emissions of lead, cadmium, and selenium; and (2) a low volatile metal emission limit of 84 µg/dscm for combined emissions of arsenic, beryllium, chromium, antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel (all emissions corrected to 7% oxygen).

For new sources, the emissions limits would be: (1) a semivolatile emission limit of 7 µg/dscm for combined emissions of lead, cadmium, and selenium; and (2) a low volatile emission limit of 9 µg/dscm for emissions of arsenic, beryllium, chromium, antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel (all emissions corrected to 7% oxygen).

2. What Emission Limitation Must Liquid Fuel-Fired Boilers Comply With Under This Alternative?

For existing liquid fuel-fired boilers, the emissions limits under this alternative would be: (1) A semivolatile metal emission limit of 1.1E–5 lb/MM BTU for the combined emissions of lead, cadmium, and selenium; and (2) a low volatile metal emission limit of 7.7E–5 lb/MM BTU for combined emissions of arsenic, beryllium, chromium, antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel (all emissions corrected to 7% oxygen).

For new sources, the emissions limits would be: (1) A semivolatile metal emission limit of 4.3E–6 lb/MM BTU for combined emissions of lead, cadmium, and selenium; and (2) a low volatile metal emission limit of 3.6E–5 lb/MM BTU for emissions of arsenic, beryllium, chromium, antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel (all emissions corrected to 7% oxygen).

3. What Emission Limitation Must Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers Comply With Under This Alternative?

For existing solid fuel-fired boilers, the emissions limits under this alternative would be: (1) A semivolatile metal emission limit of 170 µg/dscm for the combined emissions of lead, cadmium, and selenium; and (2) a low volatile metal emission limit of 210 µg/dscm for combined emissions of arsenic, beryllium, chromium, antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel (all emissions corrected to 7% oxygen).

For new sources, the emissions limits would be: (1) A semivolatile metal emission limit of 170 µg/dscm for combined emissions of lead, cadmium, and selenium; and (2) a low volatile metal emission limit of 190 µg/dscm for emissions of arsenic, beryllium, chromium, antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel (all emissions corrected to 7% oxygen).

4. Why Don't We Offer This Alternative to Lightweight Aggregate Kilns and Cement Kilns?

This alternative is intended to apply to sources that feed *de minimis* levels of metal HAP. We do not believe hazardous waste burning lightweight aggregate kilns and cement kilns feed these metals at *de minimis* levels primarily because raw materials and coal that is co-fired may contain these metal HAP, and because hazardous waste that is combusted by sources that receive off-site hazardous waste shipments (*i.e.*, commercial hazardous waste combustors) typically contain these metal HAP. Thus, we think that allowing this alternative would not be of practical significance because we do not believe these sources could meet the standard. As a result, we are not proposing this alternative for these source categories.

B. What Alternative to the Particulate Matter Standard Is EPA Requesting Comment On?

As previously discussed, we do not have sufficient metal HAP compliance data to calculate MACT floors that would account for all the nonmercury metal HAP in all feedstreams. We discuss below, however, an alternative approach to the particulate matter standard that could be implemented if sources monitor and collect nonmercury metal HAP feed concentration data prior to the compliance date. Such an approach, if promulgated, would result in site-specific metal HAP emission limits that would be dependent, in part, on each source's average feed concentration levels of metal HAP in their hazardous and nonhazardous waste feedstreams, and, for energy recovery units, each source's hazardous waste firing rate. We discuss this alternative below, and we request comment as to whether this approach is appropriate given the complexities associated with its implementation. Also see USEPA, "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume IV: Compliance With MACT Standards," March 2004, Chapter 23.9, for more discussion.

1. What Are the Components of the Total Metal Emissions Limitations?

This total metal emission limitation would regulate all nonmercury metal HAP with separate semivolatile HAP metal and low volatile HAP metal emission limits. Each semivolatile and low volatile metal limit would have separate MACT components that would control and limit enumerated and nonenumerated metal HAP emissions that are attributable to: (1) Hazardous waste feedstreams; (2) nonhazardous waste, non-fuel feedstreams (*e.g.*, cement kiln raw material); and (3) nonhazardous waste fuels (*e.g.*, coal). Some of these components may or may not apply depending on the source category. Each semivolatile and low volatile metal component is converted to a mass emission limitation, and each source's resultant total metal emissions would be limited to the summation of each of the applicable components. We describe these MACT components below.

a. Energy Recovery Units: Allowable Enumerated Semivolatile and Low Volatile Metal Emissions Attributable to the Hazardous Waste. This first component limits enumerated metal emissions attributable to hazardous waste feedstreams from energy recovery units, *i.e.*, liquid boilers, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, and is equivalent to the enumerated semivolatile and low volatile metal mass emission rate that would be allowed by today's proposed standards. Each source's allowable mass emission rate limit for this component would be equivalent to its associated hazardous waste thermal feed rate (expressed as million Btu hazardous waste per hour) multiplied by the proposed semivolatile and low volatile metal thermal emission standard.

b. Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers and Incinerators: Allowable Enumerated Semivolatile and Low Volatile Metal Emissions Attributable to All Feedstreams. This second component applies only to solid fuel-fired boilers and incinerators, and limits enumerated

metal mass emissions attributable to all feedstreams, *i.e.*, hazardous waste, nonhazardous waste, and nonhazardous waste fuels. This component limit is equivalent to the enumerated semivolatile and low volatile metal mass emission rate that would be allowed by today's proposed standards. Today's proposed standards for incinerators and solid-fuel-fired boilers limits total emissions from all feedstreams, and are expressed as stack gas concentration limits. Each source's allowable mass emission rate limit for this component would be equivalent to its gas flowrate multiplied by the proposed standard.

c. All Source Categories: Allowable Nonenumerated Semivolatile and Low Volatile Metal Emissions Attributable to the Hazardous Waste. This third component limits nonenumerated semivolatile and low volatile metal emissions attributable to hazardous waste feedstreams, and is applicable to all source categories. We currently do not have sufficient data to calculate a MACT emission limitation for nonenumerated metals in the hazardous waste. As a result, sources complying with this alternative would be required to collect three years of nonenumerated semivolatile and low volatile metal hazardous waste feed control concentrations.[248] Incinerators and solid fuel-fired boilers would be required to collect hazardous waste maximum theoretical emissions concentrations, and energy recovery units would be required to collect three years of hazardous waste thermal feed concentration data for these metal groups.[249] Each incinerator and solid fuel-fired boiler's allowable semivolatile and low volatile metal mass emission rate for this component would be equivalent to its associated three year average hazardous waste maximum theoretical emissions concentrations for each metal group multiplied by: (1) One minus the MACT system removal efficiency; and (2) its associated volumetric gas flow rate. Each energy recovery unit's allowable mass emission rate for this component would be equivalent to its associated three year average hazardous waste thermal feed concentration for each metal group multiplied by: (1) One minus the MACT system removal efficiency; and (2) its associated hazardous waste thermal feedrate (expressed as million Btu hazardous waste per hour). The MACT system removal efficiency that would be applied separately for semivolatile metals and low volatile metals would be determined as described in Part Two, Section VI.G.5 for each source category.

d. Energy Recovery Units: Enumerated and Nonenumerated Metal HAP Emissions Attributable to Nonhazardous Waste Fuels. The fourth component limits enumerated and nonenumerated semivolatile and low volatile metal mass emissions attributable to nonhazardous waste fuels (*e.g.*, coal) and is applicable to energy recovery units, *i.e.*, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and liquid fuel-fired boilers. Energy recovery units complying with this alternative would be required to collect three years of enumerated and nonenumerated semivolatile and low volatile metal nonhazardous waste fuel thermal feed concentration levels.[250] Each source's allowable mass emission rate for this component would be equivalent to its associated three year average metal nonhazardous waste fuel thermal feed concentration for each metal group[251] multiplied by: (1) One minus the MACT system removal efficiency for the specified metal group; and (2) its associated nonhazardous waste thermal feedrate.[252] As discussed above, the MACT system removal efficiency that would be applied separately for semivolatile metals and low volatile metals would be determined as described in Part Two, Section VI.G.5 for each source category.

e. Incinerators and Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers: Nonenumerated Metal HAP Emissions Attributable to Nonhazardous Waste Fuels. The fifth component limits nonenumerated semivolatile and low volatile metal mass emissions attributable to nonhazardous waste fuels (*e.g.*, coal, fuel oil) and is applicable to incinerators and solid fuel-fired boilers. Sources complying with this alternative would be required to collect three years of nonenumerated semivolatile and low volatile metal nonhazardous waste fuel thermal feed concentrations. Each source's allowable mass emission rate for this component would be equivalent to its associated three year average metal nonhazardous waste fuel thermal feed concentration for each metal group[253] multiplied by: (1) One minus the MACT system removal efficiency for the specified metal group; and (2) its associated nonhazardous waste fuel thermal feedrate (expressed as million btu per hour). As discussed above, the MACT system removal efficiency that would be applied separately for semivolatile metals and low volatile metals would be determined as described in Part Two, Section VI.G.5 for each source category.

f. Incinerators and Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers: Nonenumerated Metal HAP Emissions Attributable to Nonfuel Nonhazardous Waste. The sixth component limits nonenumerated metal HAP emissions attributable to nonfuel nonhazardous waste feedstreams from incinerators and solid fuel-fired boilers. Sources complying with this alternative would be required to collect three years of nonenumerated semivolatile and low volatile metal nonfuel nonhazardous waste feedstream concentration data, expressed as mass of metal fed in its nonfuel nonhazardous waste feedstream per total thermal input into the combustor. Each source's allowable mass emission rate for this component would be equivalent to its associated three year average metal nonfuel nonhazardous waste thermal feed concentration for each metal group[254] multiplied by: (1) One minus the MACT system removal efficiency for the specified metal group; and (2) its associated total thermal feedrate (expressed as million Btus per hour). As discussed above, the MACT system removal efficiency that would be applied separately for semivolatile metals and low volatile metals would be determined as described in Part Two, Section VI.G.5 for each source category.

g. Cement Kilns and Lightweight Aggregate Kilns: Enumerated and Nonenumerated Metal HAP Emissions Attributable to Raw Materials. The

[248] We request comment on how such an approach would work for new sources, given that new sources may not have historical feed concentration data at the time they begin operations.

[249] Each source would be required to calculate its associated three year average nonenumerated metal hazardous waste concentrations for both semivolatile metals (selenium) and low volatile metals (antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel) expressed in either hazardous waste thermal concentrations, *i.e.*, pounds per million Btus (for energy recovery units) or maximum theoretical emissions concentrations, *i.e.*, pounds per dry standard cubic feet (for incinerators and solid fuel-fired boilers).

[250] Sources would not be required to collect three years of data if the nonhazardous waste fuels such as natural gas do not contain metal HAP.

[251] Each source would be required to calculate its associated three year average metal concentrations in their coal for both semivolatile metals (lead, cadmium, and selenium) and low volatile metals (arsenic, beryllium, chromium, antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel) expressed in pounds per million Btu of coal.

[252] This would be equivalent to a kiln's coal feedrate expressed in million Btus per hour.

[253] Each source would be required to calculate its associated three year average nonenumerated metal concentrations in their nonhazardous waste fuel for both semivolatile metals (selenium) and low volatile metals (antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel) expressed in pounds per million Btu.

[254] Each source would be required to calculate its associated three year average nonenumerated metal thermal feed concentrations in their nonfuel nonhazardous waste feedstreams for both semivolatile metals (selenium) and low volatile metals (antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel) expressed in pounds per million Btu.

seventh component limits enumerated and nonenumerated metal HAP emissions attributable to raw material from cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns. Cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns complying with this alternative would be required to collect three years of enumerated and nonenumerated semivolatile and low volatile metal raw material feed concentration data, expressed as mass of metal fed in raw material per total thermal input into the kiln.[255] Each cement kiln and lightweight aggregate kiln's allowable mass emission rate for this component would be equivalent to its associated three year average metal raw material thermal feed concentration for each metal group[256] multiplied by: (1) one minus the MACT system removal efficiency for the specified metal group; and (2) its associated total thermal feedrate. As discussed above, the MACT system removal efficiency that would be applied separately for semivolatile metals and low volatile metals would be determined as described in Part Two, Section VI.G.5 for each source category.

2. Would Sources Still Be Required To Comply With a Particulate Matter Standard if They Comply With This Alternative?

As previously discussed in Part Two, Section VI.F, we conclude that today's proposed floor levels can be no higher than the interim standards because all sources, not just the best performing sources, are achieving the interim standards. It is not clear whether this alternative total metal emission limitation is less stringent than the current interim particulate matter standard for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns.[257] As a result, incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns complying with this alternative would also be required to comply with the interim standard for particulate matter. Liquid and solid fuel-fired boilers complying with this alternative would remain subject to the RCRA particulate matter standard of 0.08 gr/dscf pursuant to § 264.343(c).[258]

3. How Would Sources Demonstrate Compliance With This Alternative?

Sources complying with this alternative would be required to calculate its site-specific semivolatile and low volatile metal mass emission rate limitation as described above. Each source's emission limitation would not only be a function of its average three years of metal concentration data collected, but also would be a function of either its gas flowrate (for incinerators and solid fuel fired boilers), hazardous waste thermal firing rate (for cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and liquid fuel-fired boilers), and total thermal input rate (for all sources). As a result each source's mass emission limitation would vary over time as the dependent variables change (*e.g.*, a cement kiln's allowable mass emission limitation would increase if its hazardous waste thermal firing rate increases).

Sources would demonstrate compliance with these site-specific metal emission rate limitations during its comprehensive performance test and would establish operating parameter limits on its air pollution control device to ensure that the source achieves the metal system removal efficiency that was demonstrated during the test during normal day-to-day operations. Sources would then establish total metal feedrate limits that would assure compliance with this site-specific metal emission limitation. Given that these metal emission limitations may vary over time, we request comment as to whether these emission limitations (and associated feedrate operating limits) should be instantaneous limits based on each source's current operating levels (*e.g.*, hazardous waste thermal input rate for energy recovery units, or gas flowrate for incinerators), or rather 12 hour rolling average limits that would be updated each minute.

XIX. What Are the Proposed RCRA State Authorization and CAA Delegation Requirements?

A. What Is the Authority for This Rule?

Today's rule amends the promulgated standards located at 40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE. It amends the standards for the Phase I source categories—incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste, and it also amends subpart EEE to establish MACT standards for the Phase II source categories—boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste. Additionally, this rule amends several RCRA regulations located in 40 CFR part 270 to reflect changes in applicability, addition of a new permit modification procedure and additions related site-specific risk assessments and permitting.

1. How Is This Rule Delegated Under the CAA?

Consistent with the September 1999 rule, we recommend that state, local, and tribal (S/L/T) air pollution control agencies apply for delegation of this subpart (and all NESHAP) under section 112(l) of the CAA, if they have not done so already, so that they can exercise delegable authorities for the final Phase I Replacement standards and Phase II standards. Delegable authorities are the discretionary activities, such as approving changes to the reporting schedule, that are part of each NESHAP. EPA retains some of those authorities, but allows most to be implemented by those S/L/T agencies who accept straight delegation of the NESHAP; in this case, subpart EEE. The delegable authorities, those that can and cannot be delegated, are described in section 63.1214 of this subpart. (For more information on delegation of part 63 provisions, see 65 FR 55810–55846.) All major sources of air pollutants, such as all sources subject to this subpart, must have a title V operating permit which would contain all applicable requirements, including those for this subpart. (For more information, please see 40 CFR part 70.) While S/L/T agencies can implement and enforce MACT standards through their approved title V programs, approval of title V programs alone do not allow S/L/T authorities to be the primary enforcement authority and they cannot exercise delegable provisions' authorities. An approved title V program means that S/L/T agencies commit to incorporating all MACT standards into title V permits as permit conditions and to enforcing all the terms and conditions of the permit.[259] Having an approved title V program, for

[255] Total thermal input to kiln would include both hazardous and nonhazardous fuel thermal input.

[256] Each source would be required to calculate its associated three year average metal thermal feed concentrations in their raw material for both semivolatile metals (lead, cadmium, and selenium) and low volatile metals (arsenic, beryllium, chromium, antimony, cobalt, manganese, and nickel) expressed in pounds per million Btus.

[257] There is not a direct correlation between particulate matter emissions and metal emissions given that metal emission levels are both a function of feed control and particulate matter control.

[258] As previously discussed, this is because Clean Air Act standards can supplant RCRA standards only when the CAA standard is sufficiently protective of human health and the environment to make the RCRA standard duplicative (within the meaning of RCRA section 1006 (b) (3)).

[259] Accordingly, S/L/T agencies are required to reopen existing title V permits that have 3 or more years remaining in the permit term to include the promulgated standards. If there are less than 3 years remaining, S/L/T agencies may wait until renewal to incorporate the standards. Provided that a source is not required to reopen its title V permit, it must still fully comply with the promulgated standards (40 CFR 70.7(f)(1)(i)).

instance, does not automatically allow S/L/T agencies to approve test plans, requests for (minor and intermediate) changes to monitoring, performance test waivers, document notifications, or other Category I Authorities (*see* 40 CFR 63.91(g)(1)(i)). For those S/L/T agencies who have been previously delegated authority for the MACT standards under 40 CFR part 63 subpart EEE, we encourage you to request approval of the revisions to emission standards and various other compliance requirements of today's proposal when promulgated.

B. Are There Any Changes to the CAA Delegation Requirements for Phase I Sources?

With regard to CAA delegation requirements for Phase I sources, we intend to clarify which provisions in 40 CFR part 63 subpart EEE are delegable and those that are not in today's Notice of proposed rulemaking. We recently published a final rule, *Clarifications to Existing National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Delegations' Provisions* on June 23, 2003 (see 68 FR 37334), that clarifies and streamlines delegable provisions for each existing NESHAP. Prior to finalization of this rule, many permitting authorities and sources alike were left to interpret which Category I authorities were delegable according to provisions specific to one NESHAP versus another. In light of this final rule, which outlines the non-delegable provisions for subpart EEE, some confusion remains today as to which actions can be taken by a delegated S/L/T agency. Therefore, we intend to clarify specific actions in subpart EEE that can or cannot be taken by permitting agencies who have received delegation under 112(l) of the CAA for subpart EEE.

Sections 63.91(g)(1)(i) and (g)(2)(i) list authorities that are generally delegable to S/L/T agencies and those that are not, respectively. These apply to all NESHAP. Similar information contained in § 63.1214 explains that some of the discretionary authorities, such as approval of alternative reporting schedules, under subpart EEE, can be implemented and enforced by a delegated authority. It also lists the authorities that are retained by EPA and are not delegable to S/L/T agencies even if they have received delegation for subpart EEE. These non-delegable authorities are: (1) Approval of alternatives to requirements in §§ 63.1200, 63.1203 through 63.1205, and 63.1206(a); (2) approval of major alternatives to test methods under § 63.7(e)(2)(ii) and (f); (3) approval of major alternatives to monitoring under § 63.8(f) and; (4) approval of major alternatives to recordkeeping and reporting under § 63.10(f). It is important to note that if the alternatives mentioned in items (2) through (4) are determined to be minor or intermediate according to the definitions in § 63.90(a), then they are considered delegable and can be approved by a S/L/T agency who has been granted authority for subpart EEE.[260] To aid in the determination of whether a request is major, intermediate, or minor, we recommend that you consult the September 14, 2000 final rule, *Hazardous Air Pollutants: Amendments to the Approval of State Programs and Delegation of Federal Authorities* (65 FR 55810). The preamble to this rule provides examples, as well as the regulatory definitions as they exist today in 40 CFR 63.90(a). Additionally, you may consult a guidance document entitled, *How to Review and Issue Clean Air Act Applicability Determinations and Alternative Monitoring* (EPA 305-B-99-004, February 1999).

While § 63.1214(c) and § 63.90(a) provide which authorities are not delegable for subpart EEE sources and define degrees of changes, they may not be clear in certain applications. We will address specific sections in subpart EEE, through the following preamble discussion and through regulatory amendments, where we believe there is a need for clarity based upon our experiences with the implementation of the Phase I standards thus far. Also, there are some alternatives in subpart EEE that were inadvertently left out of § 63.1214(c) which we are adding through this Notice of proposed rulemaking.

- Beginning with test methods, major alternatives are not delegable. (See 40 CFR 63.90(a) for definitions of major, intermediate, and minor changes to test methods.) We noted in § 63.1214(c)(2) that major alternatives to the test methods as addressed in the general provisions at § 63.7(e)(2)(ii) and (f) were not delegable, however, we did not specifically include test methods relevant to subpart EEE. Section 63.1208(b) specifies the test methods sources must use to determine compliance with emission standards in subpart EEE. This section is delegable in its entirety to S/L/T agencies who have been delegated authority for subpart EEE, as long as the request is not a major change. Additionally, the CEMS required in § 63.1209(a)(1), although a monitoring requirement, is considered to be a test method since it serves as the benchmark measurement method for demonstrating compliance with emission standards. The authority to approve changes to the CEMS-related requirements is also delegable to S/L/T agencies as long as the request is not a major change. To summarize, if a source proposes a major change to a test method specified in §§ 63.1208(b) and 63.1209(a)(1), it must send the request to the appropriate EPA Region and EPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards,[261] since major changes to test methods are not delegable. We are adding §§ 63.1208(b) and 63.1209(a)(1), to the authorities in § 63.1214(c)(2) that are not delegable for major changes.

Consistent with the major alternatives to test methods, major alternatives to monitoring are not delegable. (See 40 CFR 63.90(a) for definitions of major, intermediate, and minor changes to test methods.) We noted in § 63.1214(c)(2) that major alternatives to monitoring as addressed in the general provisions in § 63.8(f) were not delegable, but we did not specifically address the relevant monitoring requirements in subpart EEE. Section 63.1209 specifies the monitoring requirements sources must use to determine compliance with emission standards in EEE. Depending upon the pollutant to be monitored, either a CEMS or COMS is required.

Before discussing whether changes to monitoring in subpart EEE are delegable, it is important first to review how requests for changes to monitoring are handled under the general provisions of § 63.8(f). In general, requests for alternative monitoring follow the same approach, with respect to delegation authority, as requests for alternative test methods discussed above; requests that are defined as major should be sent to the appropriate EPA Region and requests that are intermediate or minor should be sent to the delegated S/L/T agency. A request to use other monitoring in lieu of a CEMS is always considered a major change. However, if a source proposes to use a CEMS in lieu of an operating parameter, the request may be considered an intermediate change, so long as the CEMS to be used is regarded as a "proven technology" and could be submitted to a S/L/T agency for approval. The rationale for this is that the use of a CEMS, rather than monitoring via an operating parameter, provides a better measure of compliance

[260] EPA Regions may choose whether they will or will not delegate authority to S/L/T agencies to approve minor and intermediate changes.

[261] Send requests to: Conniesue B. Oldham, Ph.D., Group Leader, Source Measurement Technology Group (D205-02), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711.

and thus, we want to encourage the use of CEMS when possible. While we want to encourage the use of CEMS, we recognize that S/L/T agencies may not always have the technical resources to review these applications, particularly when there are no federally promulgated performance specifications for the CEMS. In such cases, we expect that the S/L/T agency will rely on EPA Regions for approval.

In subpart EEE, § 63.1209, there are two alternative approaches to monitoring that sources may use. One is located at § 63.1209(a)(5), *Petitions to use CEMS for other standards,* and the other is at § 63.1209(g)(1), *Alternative monitoring requirements other than continuous emissions monitoring systems.* Section 63.1209(a)(5) allows sources to request to use CEMS to monitor particulate matter, mercury, semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, and/or hydrochloric acid/chlorine gas in lieu of compliance with operating parameter limits. In these cases, a source would be monitoring the pollutant of concern and comparing the emissions measurements directly against an emission limitation rather than comparing the measurements to an operating parameter. We consider a request under § 63.1209(a)(5) to be a major change to monitoring and consequently, it is not delegable. We classify § 63.1209(a)(5) to be a major change (rather than an intermediate change which can be delegable) mainly because we have not yet promulgated Performance Specifications for the CEMS that may be used. In other words, it could be argued that these CEMS do not yet qualify as fully "proven technology". We understand that it could be argued either way, but for the reasons discussed in the previous paragraph and as an added measure of consistency, requests to use CEMS in lieu of operating parameters should be submitted to the EPA Region for approval. Therefore, we are adding § 63.1209(a)(5) to the authorities in § 63.1214(c)(2) that are not delegable for major changes.

The other alternative monitoring provision, § 63.1209(g)(1), allows sources to use alternative monitoring methods, with the exception of the standards that must be monitored with a CEMS, and to request a waiver of an operating parameter limit. Section 63.1209(g)(1) applies to requests for alternative parameter monitoring that involve the use of a different detector (*i.e.*, thermocouple, pressure transducer, or flow meter), a different monitoring location, a different method as recommended by the manufacturer, or a different averaging period that is more stringent than the applicable standard. For example, sources equipped with wet scrubbers are required to establish a minimum pressure drop limit to assure adequate contact between the gas and liquid. A source may petition to have this monitoring requirement waived if the manufacturer does not recommend pressure drop as a critical control parameter that affects the unit's operating efficiency. Depending upon the type of wet scrubber, an appropriate minimum limit may be specified for steam injection rate, disk spin rate, or a maximum temperature limit on liquid and flue gas, rather than pressure drop. Also, sources could request more stringent averaging periods in order to "mirror" the averaging periods required under RCRA. This may facilitate an easier transition from RCRA to MACT during the time period sources may need to comply with both sets of requirements. Since we do not consider these changes to be major, requests under § 63.1209(g)(1) should be sent to the delegated S/L/T agency for approval. Accordingly, we are amending the language in § 63.1209(g)(1) to specify that a source may submit an application to the Administrator or a State with an approved Title V program. Also, we are revising the title under § 63.1209(g)(1) so that it is more specific regarding its intended use.

Lastly, major alternatives to recordkeeping and reporting also are not delegable. (See 40 CFR 63.90(a) for definitions of major, intermediate, and minor changes to test methods.) We noted in § 63.1214(c)(2) that major alternatives to the general provisions of § 63.10(f) were not delegable, but we did not specifically address any relevant recordkeeping and reporting requirements in subpart EEE. Section 63.1211 specifies the recordkeeping and reporting requirements sources must comply with in subpart EEE. This section is delegable in its entirety to S/L/T agencies who have been delegated authority to implement and enforce subpart EEE, as long as the request is not a major change. It is worthwhile to note that paragraph (e), *Data compression,* may be incorrectly interpreted as a major change itself to the recordkeeping and reporting requirements, because it appears as though there are no criteria to define fluctuation or data compression limits. However, this is not the case. In the preamble to the September 1999 final rule (see 64 FR 52961 and 52962), we provided guidance for preparing a request to use data compression techniques and recommended fluctuation and data compression limits. This guidance was not affected by the court's vacatur of portions of this rule, so it remains in effect. Consequently, this allows permitting authorities to be consistent in their evaluation of requests. We view paragraph (e) to be a minor change itself and so a written request to use data compression techniques can be submitted to a delegated S/L/T agency. We are adding § 63.1211(a)—(d) to the authorities in § 63.1214(c)(2) that are not delegable for major changes.

In addition to the clarifications and amendments addressed above, there are two important delegation issues we would like to emphasize. The first is simply to remind sources and permitting authorities alike that, if a provision in this subpart specifies that you may petition or request that the "Administrator or State with an approved Title V program * * *," then a state that has not been delegated for that requirement, but has an approved Title V program, does have the authority to approve or disapprove the request. For instance, § 63.6(i)(1) and § 63.1213(a) both specify that the "Administrator (or a State with an approved permit program)" can grant a compliance extension request. The second is that EPA Regions can decide whether or not to delegate the authority to approve intermediate changes to state and local agencies. In some cases, a state may have received delegation to approve only minor changes. Where there is uncertainty, we recommend that sources try to determine if a request is major, intermediate, or minor based on the definitions in 40 CFR 63.90(a), and then consult with their S/L/T agency and/or EPA Region to determine where to submit the request. Or, sources may submit requests to the S/L/T agency or EPA Region who will then determine where it should go for approval.

C. What Are the Proposed CAA Delegation Requirements for Phase II Sources?

With respect to CAA delegation requirements for Phase II sources, they are the same as those for Phase I sources. Since both Phase I and Phase II MACT standards are located in the same subpart, EEE, the same delegation provisions apply to both. Generally speaking, authority to approve alternatives to standards or major changes to test methods, monitoring, and recordkeeping and reporting are not delegated to S/L/T agencies. Authority to approve intermediate and minor changes to test methods, monitoring, and recordkeeping and reporting are delegated to S/L/T agencies who have been delegated authority to implement

subpart EEE. All other subpart EEE implementation requirements may be handled by the delegated S/L/T agency. For specific information, please refer to the previous section, A.1. *What are the clarifications and changes to CAA delegable authorities for this rule?*

How Would States Become Authorized under RCRA for this Rule? Under section 3006 of RCRA, EPA may authorize 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 hazardous waste program entirely in lieu of EPA administering the federal program in that state. The federal requirements no longer applied 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 were promulgated, the state was obligated to enact equivalent authorities within specified time frames. However, the new federal requirements did not take effect in an authorized state until the state adopted the federal requirements as state law.

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, including the issuance of permits, until the state is granted authorization to do so. While states must still adopt 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 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.

The amendments to the RCRA regulations proposed today in sections 40 CFR 270.10, 270.22, 270.32, 270.42, 270.66, and 270.235 are considered to be either less stringent or equivalent to the existing Federal program. Thus, states are not required to modify their programs to adopt and seek authorization for these provisions, although we strongly encourage them to do so to facilitate the transition from the RCRA program to the CAA program and to promote national consistency. Additionally, EPA will not implement those provisions promulgated under HSWA authority that are not more stringent than the previous federal regulations in States that have been authorized for those previous federal provisions.

The amendments in sections 40 CFR 270.22 and 270.66 in today's notice are proposed under the HSWA amendments to RCRA. Further, today's proposed amendment in 40 CFR 270.235 to apply this provision to solid and liquid fuel-fired boilers and HCL production furnaces, is proposed under HSWA statutory authority. The amendments to the RCRA regulations proposed today in sections 40 CFR 270.10 and 270.32 are proposed under both non-HSWA and HSWA authority, depending on the type of unit to which these amendments are applied (under HSWA authority if applied to BIFs or non-HSWA authority if applied to incinerators). Refer to Part Two, Section XVII.D.4 for a more detailed discussion of the implementing authorities for proposed regulations in 40 CFR 270.10 and 270.32. The following RCRA sections, enacted as part of HSWA, apply to today's rule: 3004(o), 3004(q), and 3005(c)(3). As a part of HSWA, these RCRA provisions are federally enforceable in an authorized State until the necessary changes to a State's authorization are approved by us. See RCRA section 3006, 42 U.S.C. 6926. The Agency is adding these requirements to Table 1 in 271.1(j), which identifies rulemakings that are promulgated pursuant to HSWA.

Part Three: Proposed Revisions to Compliance Requirements

In this section, we discuss proposed revisions to compliance requirements that may affect all hazardous waste combustors. We also request comment on whether we should make revisions to other compliance requirements, and explain why we conclude not to make revisions to other compliance requirements that we proposed (or requested comment on) previously.

I. Why Is EPA Proposing To Allow Phase I Sources To Conduct the Initial Performance Test To Comply With the Replacement Rules 12 Months After the Compliance Date?

We propose to allow owners and operators of incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns to commence the initial comprehensive performance test to comply with the replacement standards proposed at §§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221 within 12 months of the compliance date rather than within six months of the compliance date. See proposed § 63.1207(c)(3). Owners and operators of solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces, however, must commence the initial comprehensive performance test within six months of the compliance date.

During development of the joint motion by petitioners to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit that resulted in the Agency promulgating the Interim Standards Rule on February 13, 2002,[262] stakeholders representing owners and operators of incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns requested that we propose to allow them 12 months after the compliance date to commence the initial comprehensive performance test. These stakeholders request a 12 month window rather than the six month window currently required under § 63.1207(c) to give them longer to amortize the cost of the comprehensive performance test demonstrating compliance with the Interim Standards before having to retest to demonstrate compliance with the replacement standards proposed today.[263] We believe this request has merit and so are proposing to allow them to commence the initial comprehensive performance test within 12 months after the compliance date.[264]

[262] See discussion in Part One, Section I.B.1.

[263] These stakeholders assumed, correctly, that today's proposed replacement emission standards would be substantially more stringent than the current (September 1999 Final Rule) standards.

[264] Please note that this does not affect the compliance date. You must be in compliance with the replacement standards on the compliance date, and certify in the Documentation of Compliance that you have established operating parameter limits that you believe will ensure compliance with the standards. You must record the Documentation of Compliance in the operating record by the compliance date.

II. Why Is EPA Requesting Comment on Requirements Promulgated as Interim Standards or as Final Amendments?

As discussed in Part One, Section I.B., EPA promulgated interim standards (called the Interim Standards Rule) on February 13, 2002 that amended compliance and implementation provisions of the September 1999 Final Rule. The amended provisions were specified in a joint motion by petitioners to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (the Court). Although petitioners agreed that the amendments should be promulgated (see 67 FR at 6794), petitioners requested that EPA reopen certain amended provisions for public comment.

Also as discussed in Part One, Section I.B, EPA promulgated amendments (called Final Amendments) to the September 1999 Final Rule on February 14, 2002 that revised certain implementation and compliance requirements. These amendments were also specified in the joint motion to the Court, and petitioners requested that EPA reopen specific amended provisions for public comment.

We discuss these provisions in this section, and reopen them for public comment. (We note, however, that we are *not* reopening for comment any RCRA rules, and are not soliciting comment on any aspect of those rules, or otherwise reconsidering or reexaming any such rules. Any references to RCRA rules in the discussion which follows is solely as an aid to readers.) Although we are not proposing additional revisions to these provisions, we may determine after review of public comments on the issues we raise that revisions are appropriate. If so, we would promulgate those amendments in the Replacement Rule.

Although these provisions currently apply only to incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, we are proposing today to apply them to boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces as well. (*See* Part Two, Sections XIII–XV.) Accordingly, any amendments to these requirements that we may promulgate would also apply to boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces.

A. Interim Standards Amendments to the Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Plan Requirements

The September 1999 Final Rule required compliance with the emission standards and operating requirements at all times that hazardous waste is in the combustion system, including during startup, shutdown, and malfunctions. Industry stakeholders noted that requiring compliance with emission standards and operating requirements during startup, shutdown, and malfunctions is inconsistent with the General Provisions of subpart A, part 63, that apply to MACT sources (unless alternative requirements are prescribed for a source category). Stakeholders stated that it is inappropriate to penalize a source for exceeding emission standards and operating requirements during malfunctions because some exceedances are unavoidable and sources are already required to take corrective measures prescribed in the startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan (SSMP) to minimize emissions.

In response to industry stakeholder concerns, the Interim Standards Rule amended the SSMP requirements to: (1) Exempt sources from the Subpart EEE emission standards and operating requirements during startup, shutdown, and malfunctions; (2) continue to subject sources to RCRA requirements during malfunctions, unless they comply with alternative MACT requirements including expanding the SSMP to minimize the frequency and severity of malfunctions, and submit the plan to the delegated CAA authority for review and approval [265]; (3) continue to subject sources that burn hazardous waste during startup and shutdown to RCRA requirements for startup and shutdown, unless they comply with alternative MACT requirements, and require sources to include waste feed restrictions and operating conditions and limits in the startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan; (4) require sources to include in the SSMP a requirement to comply with the automatic hazardous waste feed cutoff system during startup, shutdown, and malfunctions; and (5) make conforming revisions to the emergency safety vent opening requirements. *See* 67 FR at 6798–6802.

In response to Sierra Club's request during development of the joint motion to the Court, we specifically request comment on the following issues. Notwithstanding the rationale for revising the September 1999 Final Rule to exempt sources from the subpart EEE emission standards and operating requirements during malfunctions, would it be appropriate to require compliance with those standards and operating requirements during malfunctions to ensure that owners and operators have an incentive to minimize the frequency and duration of malfunctions that result in exceedances of the standards or operating requirements. Given that most excess emissions would occur during startup, shutdown, and malfunctions, should the SSMP be submitted for review by the delegated regulatory authority and made available for public review under all options for controlling emissions during startup, shutdown, and malfunctions? Providing a mechanism for public review may help ensure that the SSMP is complete, proactive, and provides appropriate corrective measures.[266] And finally, should the final rule clarify the definitions of startup, shutdown, and malfunctions to preclude, for example, an owner or operator incorrectly classifying an exceedance of an operating limit while hazardous waste remains in the combustion chamber as a malfunction when, in fact, the exceedance occurred because of a not infrequent event that could have been prevented by proper operation and maintenance of equipment?

B. Interim Standards Amendments to the Compliance Requirements for Ionizing Wet Scrubbers

The September 1999 Final Rule required sources to establish a limit on minimum total power to an ionizing wet scrubber. The Interim Standards Rule deleted that requirement to conform with the requirements for electrostatic precipitators given that an ionizing wet scrubber is essentially an ESP integrated with a packed bed scrubber. *See* 67 FR at 6802–03.[267] In lieu of establishing a limit on the minimum total power requirement to an ionizing wet scrubber, sources and delegated CAA authorities will use the alternative monitoring provisions of § 63.1209(g) to identify appropriate controls for an ionizing wet scrubber on a site-specific basis. This is

[265] These requirements are needed to minimize emissions of HAP during startup, shutdown, and malfunctions and, thus, help meet our RCRA mandate to ensure that emissions from hazardous waste combustors do not pose a hazard to human health and the environment. Sources may elect either to remain under RCRA control during these events or to comply under MACT with requirements to develop and implement a comprehensive and proactive startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan that is reviewed and approved by the delegated regulatory authority.

[266] We also request comment on whether the startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan should be expanded beyond the scope required under § 63.6(e)(3) (requiring appropriate corrective measures in reaction to a malfunction) to address specific, proactive measures that the owner and operator have considered and are taking to minimize the frequency and severity of malfunctions.

[267] EPA voluntarily vacated operating parameter limits for electrostatic precipitators (and fabric filters) on May 14, 2001. *See* 66 FR at 24272. Until new operating parameter limits are promulgated, sources and delegated CAA authorities will use § 63.1209(g) to establish operating parameter limits for electrostatic precipitators (and fabric filters) on a site-specific basis.

the same approach that is used for electrostatic precipitators.

Please note that we are requesting comment today on compliance requirements for electrostatic precipitators and fabric filters. In that discussion (*see* Section III.I below), we explain that we are proposing to apply the same compliance requirements to both electrostatic precipitators and ionizing wet scrubbers.

C. Why Is EPA Requesting Comment on the Fugitive Emission Requirements?

The September 1999 Final Rule required sources to control combustion system leaks by either: (1) Keeping the combustion zone sealed; (2) maintaining the maximum combustion zone pressure lower than ambient pressure using an instantaneous monitor; or (3) using an alternative means to provide control of system leaks equivalent to maintaining the maximum combustion zone pressure lower than ambient. After publication of the September 1999 Final Rule, stakeholders expressed concern that the option to maintain combustion zone pressure lower than ambient pressure (option 2 above) could result in overly prescriptive requirements. Stakeholders believed that this regulatory language could be interpreted to require sources to monitor and record combustion zone pressure at a frequency of every 50 milliseconds. Stakeholders also requested that we clarify that combustion system leaks refers to fugitive emissions resulting from the combustion of hazardous waste, and not fugitive emissions that originate from nonhazardous process streams.

In response to these concerns, we proposed amendments to the combustion system leak provisions on July 3, 2001. *See* 66 FR at 35132. We promulgated several revisions in the Final Amendments Rule after considering stakeholder comments. *See* 67 FR at 6973.

The amended provisions that we are reopening for public comment today are discussed below. First, we amended the definition of an instantaneous pressure monitor to better clarify that the intent of the combustion system leak requirements is to prevent fugitive emissions from the combustion of hazardous waste rather than from nonhazardous feedstreams. The revised definition also clarifies that instantaneous pressure monitors must detect and record pressure at a frequency adequate to detect combustion system leak events, as determined on a site-specific basis. *See* § 63.1201(a) and § 63.1209(p). Second, we added a provision that requires sources to specify the method used to control combustion system leaks in the performance test workplan and Notification of Compliance. *See* § 63.1206(c)(5)(ii). Finally, in response to numerous comments, we added a provision that will allow sources, upon prior written approval of the Administrator, to use other techniques that can be demonstrated to prevent fugitive emissions without the use of instantaneous pressure limits. *See* § 63.1206(c)(5)(i)(D).

The provision allowing sources, upon prior written approval, to use other techniques that are demonstrated to prevent fugitive emissions without the use of instantaneous pressure limits was the most controversial. Specifically, some stakeholders believe this revised regulatory language is inappropriate because it suggests sources can sustain a positive pressure event and still prevent fugitive emissions. We believe that all positive pressure events do not necessarily result in fugitive emissions. As discussed in detail in the Final Amendments Rule, there are state-of-the-art rotary kiln seal designs (such as shrouded and pressurized seals) which are capable of handling positive pressures without fugitive releases. However, we believe these kilns are highly unusual, and that other conventional rotary kilns used in the hazardous waste combustion industry may not have seals which are designed for such positive pressure operation. In fact, we believe that, for most rotary kilns in use today, positive pressure events can result in fugitive releases. The level of such fugitive releases will be dependent on factors including the magnitude and duration of the pressure excursion and the design and operation of the kiln.

Furthermore, one commenter recommends that sources should be allowed to petition the regulatory official to use an alternative approach, *i.e.*, an approach that does not require instantaneous pressure limits, only if they meet specific combustor design criteria. For example, it may be appropriate to apply this provision only to sources that we know are designed in manner that would not necessitate use of instantaneous pressure limits to prevent fugitive emissions (*e.g.*, kilns with multiple graphite seals with pressurized chambers between the seals to prevent out-leakage, or overlapping spring plate seals to form an air seal). We request comment on whether this specificity is necessary, or whether it is more appropriate to determine this on a site-specific basis (as is currently required). We also request comment on whether all the previously discussed combustion system leak regulatory revisions are appropriate.

D. Why Is EPA Requesting Comment on Bag Leak Detector Sensitivity?

The September 1999 Final Rule required sources equipped with fabric filters to install a bag leak detection system where the detector has the capability to detect PM emissions at concentrations of 1.0 milligrams per actual cubic meter, or less. In response to industry stakeholder concerns that a detector need not be able to detect levels as low as 1.0 mg/acfm to detect subtle changes in baseline, normal emissions of PM, we proposed in the July 3, 2001, proposed rule (66 FR at 35134–35) to allow sources to use detectors with less sensitivity provided that the detector could detect subtle increases in normal emissions (*e.g.*, caused by pinhole leaks in the bags). The stakeholders noted that sources equipped with well designed and operated fabric filters can have normal, baseline emissions well above 1.0 mg/acfm and be in compliance with the particulate matter emission standards. Stakeholders recommended that we revise the bag leak detection requirements to explicitly allow detectors with lower sensitivity in lieu of source's having to petition the delegated regulatory authority under the alternative monitoring provisions of § 63.1209(g)(1) to receive case-by-case approval. All commenters on the proposed amendment supported the revision, and we finalized the amendment in the February 14, 2002, Final Amendments. See 67 FR at 6981.

In response to a petitioner's request during development of the joint motion to the Court, however, we specifically request additional comment on whether allowing detectors that have a level of detection that is higher than 1.0 mg/acfm will enable the detector to detect subtle increases in normal emissions. The petitioner is concerned that a detector with a level of detection higher than 1.0 mg/acfm may not have the same sensitivity as a detector that can detect PM at 1.0 mg/acfm. Thus, petitioner is concerned that the less sensitive detector may not be able to detect subtle increases in PM emissions due to bag degredation as readily as a detector that can detect at 1.0 mg/acfm. We specifically request comment on this issue.

We reopen this issue for comment without prejudice to the existing regulations which allow for less sensitive bag leak detectors. You may use less sensitive bag leak detectors until the compliance date for any change we may make in the final rule.

E. Final Amendments Waiving Operating Parameter Limits During Testing Without an Approved Test Plan

The September 1999 Final Rule waived operating parameter limits during subsequent performance testing under an approved performance test plan. In response to stakeholder concerns, we addressed two issues in the Final Amendments: (1) Applicability of operating parameter limits, established in the Documentation of Compliance, during an initial performance test conducted without an approved test plan; and (2) applicability of operating parameter limits, established in the Notification of Compliance, during subsequent performance tests conducted without an approved test plan. See 67 FR at 6978.

Regarding the initial performance test, we explained that a source can revise the operating parameter limits specified in the Documentation of Compliance at any time based on supporting information. This information would also be included in the performance test plan to support deviating from the operating limits established in the previous Documentation of Compliance. Given that sources operate after the compliance date until the Notification of Compliance is submitted under operating limits established in the Documentation of Compliance, and that the technical support for the operating limits established in the Documentation of Compliance is the same as would be included in the test plan, it is appropriate to allow initial performance testing and associated pretesting without an approved test plan.

Regarding subsequent performance testing, we amended the rule to waive the operating parameter limits during performance testing and associated pretesting even when testing without an approved test plan. We reasoned that stack emissions data obtained during the testing would document whether the source maintained compliance with the emission standards. (Please note that during testing, including pretesting, stack emissions must be documented for any emissions standard for which the source waives an operating parameter limit.) Absent approval of the test plan, documentation of potential violation of an emission standard is nonetheless an ample incentive to operate within the emission standards.

In response to a petitioner's request during development of the joint motion to the Court, however, we request comment on whether documentation of stack emissions during subsequent performance testing and associated pretesting is adequate to ensure compliance with the emission standards absent an approved test plan.

III. Why Is EPA Requesting Comment on Issues and Amendments That Were Previously Proposed?

In a July 3, 2001, proposed rule, EPA proposed several revisions to implementation and compliance requirements, and discussed other implementation and compliance issues. See 66 FR 35126. We promulgated several of those amendments in the February 14, 2002, Final Amendments Rule, and we stated in that rule that we would address the remaining proposed amendments and other issues in a future rulemaking. See 67 FR at 6970–71. We discuss below those remaining proposed amendments and issues.

Although these issues and proposed amendments originally pertained only to incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, any amendments that we may promulgate subsequent to this notice would also apply to boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces.

A. Definition of Research, Development, and Demonstration Source.

In response to industry stakeholder concerns, EPA requested comment in the July 3, 2001, proposed rule on approaches to preclude inappropriate use of the exemption for research, development, and demonstration sources. See 66 FR at 35128. We indicated we were considering two approaches: (1) Clearly distinguishing between research and development sources, and limiting the exemption for demonstration sources to one year or less; or (2) requiring documentation of how a source's demonstration of an innovative or experimental hazardous waste treatment technology or process is different from the waste management services provided by a commercial hazardous waste combustor.

Two stakeholders provided comments, and both recommended that EPA not revise the definition of research, development, and demonstration source. One commenter suggested that EPA should be able to determine if a source is inappropriately claiming the exemption for research, development, and demonstration source without amending the regulation. The other commenter suggested that, rather than amend the regulation, EPA should reiterate that RCRA regulations continue to apply to exempt research, development, and demonstration sources.[268]

We concur with the commenters and are not proposing to amend the definition of research, development, and demonstration source.

B. Identification of an Organics Residence Time That Is Independent of, and Shorter Than, the Hazardous Waste Residence Time

In response to industry stakeholder recommendations, EPA requested comment in the July 3, 2001, proposed rule on whether it is practicable to calculate a hazardous waste organics residence time that defines when organic constituents in solid materials have been destroyed. See 66 FR at 35128–30. Under stakeholders' recommendation, after the hazardous waste organics residence time expires, sources could comply with standards the Agency has promulgated under sections 112 or 129 of the Clean Air Act to control organic emissions for source categories that do not burn hazardous waste in lieu of the hazardous waste combustor standards and associated compliance requirements under subpart EEE, part 63, for dioxin/furan, destruction and removal efficiency, and carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon emissions.[269]

In the July 3, 2001, proposed rule, we raised several concerns regarding the approach recommended by stakeholders to calculate an organics residence time, and specifically requested comment on how these concerns could be addressed. See 66 FR at 35130. Although several stakeholders provided comment on the discussion we presented in the July 3, 2001, proposed rule, commenters did not address the concerns we raised. Rather, commenters generally note that calculation of an organics residence time for solid waste streams would be difficult to characterize generically. Accordingly, commenters suggest that the rule be amended to specifically allow calculation of an organics residence time on a site-specific basis.

We are reluctant to encourage site-specific petitions to calculate an

[268] Hazardous waste research, development, and demonstration sources remain subject to RCRA permit requirements under § 270.65, which direct the Administrator to establish permit terms and conditions that will assure protection of human health and the environment.

[269] Stakeholders also wanted the hazardous waste residence time (for organics) to expire as soon as possible to avoid violations associated with exceedances of an organics emission standard or associated operating requirement during malfunctions when hazardous waste remained in the combustion chamber. The rule has been amended, however, to state that an exceedance of an emission standard or operating requirement during a malfuncation is not a violation provided that the source has developed an appropriate startup, shutdown, and malfuncation plan, and follows the corrective measures provided by the plan. See 67 FR at 6798–6801.

organics residence time, however, given that the concerns we raised in the July 3, 2001, proposal have not been addressed.[270] Moreover, we believe that stakeholders' primary motive for identifying an organics residence time has been eliminated by the February 13, 2002, amendment to the rule stating that an exceedance of an emission standard or operating requirement during a malfunction when hazardous waste remains in the combustion chamber is not a violation provided that the source follows the corrective measures provided by an appropriate startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan.

For these reasons, we are not proposing an organics residence time or explicitly encouraging sources to petition the delegated CAA authority on a site-specific basis to identify an organics residence time.

C. Why Is EPA Not Proposing To Extend APCD Controls After the Residence Time Has Expired When Sources Operate Under Alternative Section 112 or 129 Standards?

In the July 3, 2001, proposed rule, we proposed to extend applicability of operating requirements for dry particulate matter emission control devices before you could switch modes of operation and become subject to Section 112 or 129 standards for sources that do not burn hazardous waste. *See* 66 FR at 35130–32. We proposed to require you to maintain compliance with applicable emission standards for semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, and particulate matter, including the operating parameter limits for dry control systems, after the hazardous waste residence time has expired until the control device undergoes a complete cleaning cycle. We were concerned that dry particulate matter control devices such as electrostatic precipitators and baghouses retain collected particulate matter contaminated with waste-derived metals; and dioxin/furan when activated carbon injection is used. In such cases, we were concerned that waste-derived metals and dioxin/furan may be emitted at levels exceeding the hazardous waste combustor emission standards if you were to switch modes of operation and comply with potentially less stringent alternative MACT standards for sources that do not burn hazardous waste (*e.g.*, subpart LLL for cement kilns, section 129 standards the Agency is developing for commercial and industrial solid waste incinerators, and MACT standards the Agency is developing for boilers).[271]

Commenters raised several concerns about the practicability of maintaining compliance with the semivolatile metals, low volatile metals, and particulate matter standards after the hazardous waste residence time has expired until the particulate matter device undergoes a complete cleaning cycle. Commenters explained that it is difficult to determine when a cleaning cycle has been completed for multi-field electrostatic precipitators and multi-compartment fabric filters because fabric filter cleaning is typically a continuous process, and electrostatic precipitator plate cleaning frequency varies significantly depending on the plate position within the electrostatic precipitator. Commenters also stated that the proposed requirement would encourage more frequent cleaning of electrostatic precipitators and fabric filters than normal, which could increase emissions of HAP and adversely affect bag life.

After review of comments and further consideration, we conclude that it is not necessary to revise the standards to extend applicability of the operating requirements for dry particulate matter control devices before you could switch modes of operation and become subject to MACT standards for sources that do not burn hazardous waste. We now believe that it is highly unlikely that entrained particulate matter contaminated with hazardous waste derived metals would be released from the electrostatic precipitator or fabric filter at rates higher than when feeding hazardous waste when the source begins operating under the alternative MACT (or section 129) standards for sources that do not burn hazardous waste. In addition, incinerators, cement kilns, and solid-fuel-fired boilers would be subject to alternative standards and operating limits for particulate matter. Although lightweight aggregate kilns would not be subject to alternative standards for particulate matter,[272] lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste are equipped with fabric filters where their performance is not highly sensitive to operating conditions. And, although liquid fuel-fired boilers would not be subject to alternative Section 129 standards for particulate matter,[273] over 80% of liquid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste are not equipped with a control device, and only about one third of those with a control device are equipped with an electrostatic precipitator or fabric filter. Thus, the absence of particulate matter controls under the alternative section 129 standards is not a significant concern.

For these reasons, we are not proposing to extend applicability of the operating requirements for dry particulate matter control devices before you could switch modes of operation and become subject to MACT standards for sources that do not burn hazardous waste.

D. Why Is EPA Proposing To Allow Use of Method 23 as an Alternative to Method 0023A for Dioxin/Furan?

The September 1999 Final Rule requires use of Method 0023A for stack sampling of dioxin/furan emissions. In response to industry stakeholder requests, we proposed in the July 3, 2001, proposed rule to allow you to petition the delegated regulatory authority to use Method 23 found in 40 CFR part 60, appendix A, instead of Method 0023A. *See* 66 FR at 35137. We are revising the proposal today to allow you to use Method 23 in lieu of Method 0023A after justifying use of Method 23 as part of your performance test plan that must be reviewed and approved by the delegated regulatory authority. See proposed § 63.1208(b)(1)(i)(B). This approach would achieve the same objectives as a petition, but would be simpler to implement because it would not require a separate petition/document.

In the July 3, 2001, proposed rule, we explain that Method 0023A is an improved version of Method 23 in that it can improve the quality assurance of the method. By analyzing the sampling train front half catch (filter and probe rinse) separately from the back half catch (sorbent and rinses), Method 0023A provides quality assurance of recovery of dioxin/furan contained in solid phase particulate and collected on the filter and probe. Under Method 23, poor recovery of dioxin/furan contained in solid phase particulate may go unnoticed because the front half catch and back half catch are combined before analysis. This may be of particular

[270] We questioned whether available information on low oxygen destruction would adequately model destruction under the pyrolytic conditions that occur within solid matrices and whether it is practicable to perform valid engineering calculations for multiple waste streams that are not homogeneous and that contain multiple organic constituents of concern.

[271] Please note that you are subject to the standards under subpart EEE at all times, including after the hazardous waste residence time has expired, unless you have established an alternative mode of operation under § 63.1209(q)(1).

[272] The Agency determined that lightweight aggregate kilns that do not burn hazardous waste are not a significant source of HAP emissions and, thus, that MACT standards are not necessary for that source category.

[273] The Agency did not propose PM standards for existing liquid fuel-fired industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers and process heaters. *See* 68 FR 1660.

importance for sources that use activated carbon injection or sources that have carbonaceous material in particulate matter.

Although Method 0023A can improve quality assurance, it is slightly more expensive than Method 23 and, in many situations, quality assurance may not be improved. For example, Method 0023A may not be warranted in the future if Method 0023A analyses document that dioxin/furan are not detected, are detected at low levels in the front half of Method 0023A, or are detected at levels well below the emission standard, and the design and operation of the combustor has not changed in a manner that could increase dioxin/furan emissions.

Environmental stakeholders comment that use of Method 23 would allow sources to emit dioxin/furan in excess of the standards without being detected. We disagree. Owners and operators seeking to use Method 0023A would be required to document using data or information that Method 23 would provide front half recoveries comparable to Method 0023A.

Industry stakeholders comment that we should simply revise the rule to allow use of either method, rather than requiring a petitioning process to use Method 23. As discussed above (and in the July 3, 2001, proposal), we believe that there are situations where the quality assurance and added cost of Method 0023A may be warranted, and, so, are not proposing to allow use of Method 23 without justification and prior approval. We agree, however, that the formal petitioning process that we proposed is not necessary. Rather, we propose today to require you to justify use of Method 23 as part of the performance test plan that you submit to the delegated regulatory authority for review and approval. See proposed § 63.1207(f)(1)(xxv).

In the interim, you may request to use Method 23 in lieu of Method 0023A under § 63.7(e)(2)(i) which allows use of a test method with minor changes in methodology. You should submit your request and the supporting justification to the delegated regulatory authority.

E. Why Is EPA Not Proposing the "Matching the Profile" Alternative Approach To Establish Operating Parameter Limits?

In response to stakeholder concerns about the stringency of calculating most operating parameter limits as the average of the test run averages of the comprehensive performance test, EPA requested comment in the July 3, 2001, proposed rule on an alternative approach to establish operating parameter limits. See 66 FR at 35138–39.

The alternative approach, called "matching the profile", was intended to allow sources to identify limits for operating parameters that would allow the operating parameters to have the same average variability as experienced during the comprehensive performance test. The parameter could exceed the average achieved during the performance test for a period of time, provided that it was equivalently lower than the average for the same duration of time.

Commenters generally note that the matching the profile approach has a significant disadvantage in that multiple limits would be established for each parameter. Accordingly, commenters recommend that we not include this approach in the regulation, but rather continue to offer it as guidance. Moreover, commenters note that sources can request approval of alternative monitoring approaches under § 63.1209(g)(1), and they are concerned that codification of only one approach, and particularly an approach with potentially limited utility, could lead the delegated CAA authority to conclude incorrectly that other approaches may not be appropriate.

We believe that this matter is best dealt with on a site-specific basis, but note that by specifying one approach in the rule, we do not mean to preclude use of a different approach pursuant to § 63.1209(g)(1). Sources thus may request approval of the profiling approach, or another approach, to establish operating limits on a site-specific basis under § 63.1209(g)(1).

F. Why Is EPA Not Proposing To Allow Extrapolation of OPLs?

In response to industry stakeholder concerns, we requested comment in the July 3, 2001, proposed rule on whether the rule should allow extrapolation of an operating parameter limit to a higher limit using a site-specific, empirically-derived relationship between the parameter and emissions of the pollutant in question.[274] *See* 66 FR at 35139–40. We also requested comment on whether the rule should allow use of established engineering principles that define the relationship between operating parameter and emissions to extrapolate operating limits and emissions in lieu of a site-specific, empirically-derived relationship.

Industry stakeholders are concerned that the rule inappropriately penalizes sources that achieve comprehensive performance test emission levels well below the standard by requiring them to establish operating limits based on performance test operations at those low emission levels. They note that operating under conditions to artificially increase emissions during testing (*e.g.*, by detuning emission control equipment) may not be feasible or desirable from a worker/public health and cost perspective.

Although stakeholders acknowledge that they may request such extrapolation as an alternative monitoring approach under § 63.1209(g)(1), they note that explicitly defining an extrapolation approach in the rule may better facilitate their efforts to obtain approval from the delegated regulatory authority.

Several industry stakeholders agreed with the principle of extrapolation as we discussed it in the July 3, 2001, notice, but disagreed with the requirements for, and limits on, extrapolation that we recommended. Several other stakeholders oppose the use of extrapolation generally because of concern that it is difficult to define completely and accurately the relationship between an operating parameter and emissions.

Given the extent of the issues associated with explicitly providing for extrapolation of operating parameter limits, particularly on a categorical rather than a site-specific level, and given that you already have the ability to request approval of extrapolation procedures under § 63.1209(g)(1), we are not proposing to revise the rule to explicitly allow extrapolation. We believe that extrapolation must be justified by a site-specific analysis.

G. Why Is EPA Proposing To Delete the Limit on Minimum Combustion Chamber Temperature for Dioxin/Furan for Cement Kilns?

In response to stakeholder concerns that it is technically impracticable for cement kilns to establish a minimum combustion chamber temperature based on the average of the test run averages for each run of the comprehensive performance test, EPA requested comment in the July 3, 2001, proposed rule on whether the rule should continue to require cement kilns to establish and comply with a minimum combustion chamber temperature limit. See 66 FR at 35140.

We received a total of five comments to the July 3, 2001, proposed rule. Three commenters opposed deleting the requirement for cement kilns to establish and comply with a minimum combustion chamber temperature.

[274] Please note that the rule already allows extrapolation of mercury feedrates (§ 63.1209(l)(1)(i)) and semivolatile and low volatile metal feedrates (§ 63.1209(n)(2)(ii)).

Currently, cement kilns are required to establish a minimum combustion chamber temperature as an operating parameter limit to ensure compliance with the destruction and removal efficiency and dioxin/furan standards. See §§ 63.1209(j)(1) and (k)(2). These commenters generally cited the need for monitoring combustion chamber temperature by noting that combustion chamber temperature is a principal factor in ensuring combustion efficiency and destruction of toxic organic compounds.

Two commenters support deleting the minimum combustion chamber temperature requirements. Commenters state that a cement kiln inherently controls the kiln temperature to produce clinker because the required material temperatures must exceed approximately 2,500°F with combustion gas temperatures higher still. These commenters note that a cement kiln operates well above minimum temperatures required to destroy the organic compounds in the hazardous waste, and, therefore, a minimum combustion chamber temperature limit is not necessary to control organic hazardous air pollutant emissions.

Commenters also state that combustion chamber temperatures cannot be maintained at low enough levels for the duration of the comprehensive performance test to establish workable operating limits that would allow them to burn hazardous waste fuels economically without frequent waste feed cutoffs because of potential exceedances of the limit. Commenters indicate that combustion chamber temperature levels are fairly constant within a narrow range and note that there is a very narrow range of temperatures and feed composition in which a cement kiln must operate in order to produce quality clinker and a marketable product. Moreover, commenters state that cement kiln operators must take extreme actions, including potentially equipment-damaging steps, to lower kiln temperatures to establish an economically viable minimum combustion chamber limit. Finally, commenters indicate that these problems are compounded by the requirement in the MACT rule to establish the hourly rolling limit based on the average of the test run averages (§§ 63.1209(j)(1)(ii) and (k)(2)(ii)).

We are not proposing to delete the requirement for cement kilns to establish and comply with a minimum combustion chamber temperature to help ensure compliance with the destruction and removal efficiency standard. Even though we remain reluctant to delete this requirement, commenters may, if they choose, provide additional comments on whether the rule should continue to require cement kilns to establish a minimum combustion chamber temperature limit as specified in § 63.1209(j)(1).

We are, however, proposing to delete the requirement to establish a minimum combustion chamber temperature limit for dioxin/furan under § 63.1209(k)(2). As mentioned above, sources are currently required to establish a minimum combustion chamber temperature as an operating parameter limit for both the destruction and removal efficiency and dioxin/furan standards. This proposed amendment would not affect the requirement for cement kilns to establish a minimum combustion chamber temperature under § 63.1209(j)(1) during the destruction and removal efficiency demonstration. Currently, the destruction and removal efficiency demonstration need be made only once during the operational life of a source provided that the design, operation, and maintenance features do not change in a manner that could reasonably be expected to affect the ability to meet the destruction and removal efficiency standard. See § 63.1206(b)(7). If a facility wishes to operate under new operating parameter limits that could be expected to affect the ability to meet the destruction and removal efficiency standard, then the source will need to conduct another destruction and removal efficiency test. In addition, if a source feeds hazardous waste at locations other than the flame zone, the destruction and removal efficiency demonstration must be verified during each comprehensive performance test and new operating parameter limits must be established.

Sources that fire hazardous waste only at the flame zone (*i.e.*, the kiln end where clinker product is normally discharged) are required to make only one destruction and removal efficiency demonstration test during the operational life of the kiln. During this destruction and removal efficiency demonstration test, the source would set a minimum combustion chamber temperature limit under § 63.1209(j)(1) that would be the limit for the operational life of the kiln. However, as the rule is currently written, such sources would need to establish a minimum combustion chamber temperature limit during subsequent comprehensive performance tests for the dioxin/furan test under § 63.1209(k)(2). The source would be required to comply with the more stringent (higher) of two minimum combustion chamber temperature limits, which could lead to a situation where the controlling minimum combustion chamber temperature limit is based on the dioxin/furan test rather than the destruction and removal efficiency demonstration.

We believe that this may be an inappropriate outcome given that the operating limit for minimum combustion chamber temperature is a more important parameter to ensure compliance with the destruction and removal efficiency standard than to ensure compliance with the dioxin/furan standard. Our data indicate that limiting the gas temperature at the inlet to the particulate matter control device, an operating parameter limit established during each comprehensive performance test (§ 63.1209(k)(1)), is a critical dioxin/furan control parameter. We are, therefore, inviting comment on deleting the requirement to establish a minimum combustion chamber temperature limit when complying with the dioxin/furans standard. This proposed amendment does not affect the other operating parameter limits under § 63.1209(k) that must be established for dioxin/furan such as establishing a limit on the gas temperature at the inlet to the particulate matter control device.

For cement kilns that fire hazardous wastes at locations other than the flame zone, the current requirements would effectively remain the same. Given that a source conducts the destruction and removal efficiency demonstration and dioxin/furan test simultaneously and that a source is also required to establish a minimum combustion chamber temperature limit when demonstrating compliance with and establishing operating parameter limits for the destruction and removal efficiency standard, the minimum combustion chamber temperature limits is effectively retained.

H. Why Is EPA Requesting Additional Comment on Whether To Add a Maximum pH Limit for Wet Scrubbers To Control Mercury Emissions?

We requested comment in the July 3, 2001, proposed rule as to whether it is appropriate to establish a limit on maximum pH to control mercury. See 66 FR at 35142–43. We are requesting additional comment today on this issue given the results of a recent study indicating that increasing the pH of scrubber liquid can increase mercury emissions.

1. What Were the Major Comments on the Discussion in the July 3, 2001, Proposed Rule?

One commenter supports placing limits on the maximum pH of wet scrubber liquids for mercury control, but did not provide any additional rationale on the technical validity of the limit. Other commenters oppose the imposition of a maximum pH limit. One commenter wants to see stronger evidence that pH has an impact, and suggests a reproposal is needed. Another suggests that EPA conduct source testing to confirm that pH has an impact. Others suggest that if EPA continues to believe that wet scrubber operating parameter limits are important for mercury control, then the wet scrubber mercury operating parameter limits should be determined on a case-by-case basis because the relationship between mercury control and wet scrubber pH is not well established and there are numerous other factors that affect mercury control in wet scrubbers, especially for facilities that burn waste with various chemical compositions.

2. What Is the Rationale for Considering a Maximum pH Limit To Control Mercury?

The use of a low pH liquid scrubber solution has been suggested to be beneficial for mercury control because it helps prevent the re-release of captured mercury. Ionic mercury (Hg^{+2}) is highly soluble in wet scrubber liquid; as opposed to Hg^0, which has a very low solubility in a typical water/alkali scrubber solution. Once absorbed, Hg^{+2} can be reduced to Hg^0 by compounds in the liquid scrubber solution such as SO_2 and HSO_3. Hg^0 may then be revolatilized back into the stack gas. This is supported by numerous observations of Hg^0 at the wet scrubber outlet which are higher than Hg^0 at the scrubber inlet[275, 276, 277]. These studies suggest that the low scrubber liquid pH prevents captured mercury from revolatilizing from the scrubber liquid by: (1) limiting the capture of reducing agents; and (2) favoring the formation of stable mercury-chlorine compounds such as $HgCl_2$ due to available Cl^-. In contrast, other studies postulate that a high scrubber liquid pH might actually be beneficial for the control of mercury, particularly elemental Hg[278]. Basic, high pH solutions have the increased ability to absorb chlorine gas. Dissolved chlorine gas is suggested to enhance the scrubber's ability to oxidize and capture Hg^0 (specifically, dissolved chlorine gas dissociates in basic solutions to produce OCl^- ions which oxidize Hg^0 to soluble Hg^{+2}). In contrast, the presence of hydrogen chloride or sulfur as SO_2 or $H2SO_3$ in the scrubber solution reduces the liquid scrubber pH, reduces OCl^-, and reduces the Hg^0 oxidative potential of the scrubber liquid.

Although limited test data from full-scale coal fired boiler evaluations indicate an inconsistent impact of scrubber liquid pH on mercury control,[279] a recent study[280] confirms that ionic mercury (*e.g.*, $HgCl_2$) that is initially captured in the scrubber can be reduced in the liquid to elemental Hg (*i.e.*, H^0) and then revolatilized to the stack gas. The study concludes that the reduction of ionic mercury in the liquid is likely due to dissolved sulfur compounds and that decreasing the pH of the liquid will decrease the reduction process and subsequently decrease mercury emissions. This new work is additional evidence that a maximum pH limit might be appropriate, especially if sulfur is present in feeds.

Other recent work indicates that there are numerous factors that influence the control of mercury in wet scrubbers. Mercury speciation in the flue gas is vitally important to the ability to control mercury in wet scrubbers. In hazardous waste combustor flue gases, mercury tends to be predominately in two forms: (1) elemental (Hg^0); and (2) ionic (Hg^{+2}, typically as $HgCl_2$). Speciation depends on numerous factors including the presence of chlorine or sulfur, both of which are reactive with mercury. For example, increased levels of chlorine may increase the amount of $HgCl_2$ and reduce the amount of Hg^0. This might suggest that a *minimum* chlorine feedrate limit is needed to ensure Hg scrubber efficiency is maintained, which is counter to the maximum chlorine feedrate limit used to control emissions of total chlorine and semivolatile and low volatile metals. Speciation is also affected by the flue gas temperature cooling profile, which can impact mercury reaction kinetics. For example, rapid cooling may limit the equilibrium formation of $HgCl_2$ (*i.e.*, super equilibrium levels of Hg^0 can survive from rapid cooling). This might suggest that a *maximum* flue gas cooling limit is needed, which is counter to that for controlling dioxin/furan.

Control of mercury in wet scrubbers is also affected by the scrubber liquid chemical composition. As discussed above, scrubber liquid composition has a dramatic impact on the control of mercury. Specifically, the presence of reducing compounds such as SO_2 and HSO_3 can lead to increased mercury emission by reducing soluble $HgCl_2$ to insoluble Hg^0 which can be desorbed while oxidative compounds such as chlorine gas and special oxidation additives such as $NaClO_2$, acidified $KMnO_3$, Na_2S, and TMT (tri-mercapto-triazine) would generally help control mercury emissions by inhibiting reduction of $HgCl_2$ to Hg^0 and/or enhancing the capture of Hg^0.

Finally, control of mercury in wet scrubbers is affected by the scrubber liquid to gas ratio.

Given the recent study discussed above indicating that increasing the pH of scrubber liquid can increase mercury emissions, we request additional comment on whether it would be appropriate to establish a limit on the maximum pH of scrubber liquid to ensure compliance with the mercury emission standard. We also request comment on issues relative to establishing and complying with both a maximum limit on pH to control mercury emissions and a minimum limit on pH to control total chlorine. For example, you would establish the maximum and minimum pH limits under separate performance tests. You would establish the minimum pH limit during a performance test to demonstrate compliance with the total chlorine standard while you would establish the maximum pH limit during a performance test to demonstrate compliance with the mercury standard. In addition, we request comment on the anticipated range of pH levels between the maximum and minimum limits and whether the range could potentially be small enough to inhibit operations substantially. For example, if the pH

[275] B. Siret and S. Eagleson, "A New Wet Scrubbing Technology for Control of Elemental (Metallic) and Ionic Mercury Emissions," Proceedings of 1997 Conference on Incineration and Thermal Treatment Technology, pp. 821–824, 1997.

[276] G. T. Amrhein, G. Kudlac, D. Madden, "Full-Scale Testing of Mercury Control for Wet FGD Systems," Presented at the 27th International Technical Conference on Coal Utilization and Fuel Systems, Clearwater, Fl, March 4–7, 2002.

[277] C.S. Krivanek, "Mercury Control Technologies for MWCs: The Unanswered Questions," 1993 Air and Waste Management Sponsored Municipal Solid Waste Combustor Specialty Conference, 1993.

[278] W. Linak, J. Ryan, B. Ghorishi, and J. Wendt, "Issues Related to Solution Chemistry in Mercury Sampling Impingers," Journal or Air and Waste Management Association, Vol. 51, pp. 688–698, May 2001.

[279] For example, McDermott Technology (McDermott Technology, Internet Web page at *http://www.mtiresearch.com* on "Mercury Emission Results," date unknown) report no impact, while DeVito and Rosenhoover (M. DeVito and W Rosenhoover, CONSOL Coal Inc., "Flue Gas Hg Measurements from Coal-fired Boilers Equipped with Wet Scrubbers," date unknown) observe that mercury control efficiency appears to increase with increasing pH.

[280] J. Chang and S. Ghorishi, "Simulation and Evaluation of Elemental Mercury Concentration Increase in Flue Gas Across a Wet Scrubber," Environmental Science and Technology, Vol 37, No. 24, 2003, pp. 5763–5766

required to achieve your desired scrubber control efficiency for total chlorine (*i.e.*, the minimum pH limit) is just below the pH level required to achieve your desired control efficiency for mercury (*i.e.*, the maximum pH limit), you may have limited operating flexibility.

Finally, we note that, in the interim until we determine whether to promulgate a maximum pH limit to control mercury emissions, site-specific or other information may lead the delegated regulatory authority to conclude under § 63.1209(g)(2) that a limit on the maximum pH of wet scrubber liquid may be warranted to ensure compliance with the mercury emission standard.

I. How Is EPA Proposing to Ensure Performance of Electrostatic Precipitators, Ionizing Wet Scrubbers, and Fabric Filters?

If your combustor is equipped with a fabric filter, you would be required to use the bag leak detection system under § 63.1206(c)(7)(ii) to ensure performance of the fabric filter is maintained in lieu of operating parameter limits.[281] In addition, we propose to revise the bag leak requirements under § 63.1206(c)(7)(ii) to require you to operate and maintain the fabric filter such that the bag leak detection system alarm does not sound more than 5 percent of the operating time during a 6-month period.

If your combustor is equipped with an electrostatic precipitator or ionizing wet scrubber, we propose to give you the option of: (1) Using a particulate matter continuous emissions detector for process monitoring to signal when you must take corrective measures to address maintenance or other factors causing relative or absolute mass particulate matter loadings to be higher than the levels achieved during the performance test; or (2) establishing site-specific operating parameter limits. If you choose to use a continuous emissions detector, you must not exceed the alarm set-point you establish based on the performance test more than 5 percent of the operating time during a 6-month period. If you choose to establish site-specific operating parameter limits, you must link each limit to the automatic waste feed cutoff system.

1. What Is the Background of this Issue?

The current regulations require you to establish site-specific operating parameter limits to ensure performance of electrostatic precipitators, ionizing wet scrubbers, and fabric filters. *See* § 63.1209(m)(1)(iv).[282] Regulatory officials review and approve those operating parameter limits and may require additional or alternative limits under § 63.1209(g)(2).

In the July 3, 2001 proposed rule, we requested comment on how to establish prescriptive requirements to ensure performance of these control devices. *See* 66 FR at 35143–45. We requested comment on four approaches to ensure performance of electrostatic precipitators: (1) Requiring an increasing kVA pattern across the electrostatic precipitator; (2) limiting kVA on only the back ⅓ of fields; (3) use of a CMS that measures relative particulate matter loadings; and (4) use of predictive emission monitoring systems. These approaches would also be applicable to ionizing wet scrubbers. We also requested comment on whether and how cell pressure drop should be used to ensure performance of fabric filters.

We received comments in favor of and opposing most of these approaches.[283] Some stakeholders also recommend other approaches. One commenter favors use of specific power as an operating parameter for electrostatic precipitator performance. Specific power is the secondary power/gas flow rate. Another commenter suggests continuing with establishing site-specific operating parameter limits.

2. What Is the Rationale for Proposing to Revise the Compliance Requirements for Fabric Filters?

After reviewing comments and further investigation, we conclude that controls in addition to a bag leak detection system are not needed to ensure performance of fabric filters. Use of pressure drop to ensure performance is problematic for reasons we discussed in the July 3, 2001 proposed rule. Moreover, the bag leak detection system provides a direct measure of small (and greater) increases in particulate matter loading that enable you to take immediate corrective measures.

We conclude, however, that the bag leak detection system requirements under § 63.1206(c)(7)(ii) are not prescriptive enough to ensure proper operation and maintenance of the fabric filter. Current provisions require you to take immediate corrective measures when the bag leak detection system alarm sounds, indicating that particulate loadings exceed the set-point. There is no limit on the duration of time, however, that the bag house may be operating under these conditions. To ensure that you take both corrective and proactive measures to minimize the frequency and duration of bag leak detection system alarms, you must operate and maintain the fabric filter to ensure that the bag leak detection system alarm does not sound more than 5 percent of the operating time during a 6-month period.[284] We note that the Agency also proposed this requirement for boilers and process heaters that do not burn hazardous waste. *See* 68 FR at 1708 (January 13, 2003). If you exceed the alarm set-point more than 5 percent of the time during a 6-month period, you would be required to notify the delegated regulatory authority within 5 days. In the notification, you must describe the causes of the excessive exceedances and the revisions to the design, operation, or maintenance of the combustor or baghouse you are taking to minimize exceedances. This notification would alert the regulatory authority of the excessive exceedances so that they may review and confirm the corrective measures you are undertaking. *See* proposed § 63.1206(c)(7)(ii)(C).

We also conclude that the current exemption from the bag leak detection system requirements for cement kilns should be eliminated. We did not require bag leak detection systems for cement kilns in the September 1999 Final Rule because cement kilns are subject to an opacity standard and must monitor opacity with a continuous monitor. As a practical matter, however, the opacity levels achieved during the comprehensive performance test will be lower, often substantially lower, than the opacity standard. Thus, absent effective operating parameter limits on the fabric filter based on performance test operations, we cannot ensure that performance is maintained at the level achieved during the performance test (and that you remain in compliance with the particulate matter and other

[281] As discussed below in the text, we propose to revise the current rules to delete the exemption for cement kilns from the bag leak detection system requirements.

[282] Please note that § 63.1209(m)(1)(iv) inadvertently indicates that the requirement to establish site-specific operating limits applies to control devices other than ionizing wet scrubbers, baghouses, and electrostatic precipitators. We should have revised that paragraph to require site-specific operating parameter limits for those control devices when we revised paragraph (m)(1) to delete the operating parameter limits for those devices. The delegated regulatory authority can use § 63.1209(g)(2) to require you to establish site-specific operating parameter limits for those control devices prior to the effective date of the final rule based on today's proposed rule.

[283] USEPA, "Response to Comments on July 2001 Proposed Rule," March 2004.

[284] Periods of time when the combustor is operating but the bag leak detection system is malfunctioning must be considered exceedances of the set-point.

standards [285]). Consequently, we propose to require that cement kilns comply with the bag leak detection requirements (as proposed to be revised) under § 63.1206(c)(7)(ii).[286] We note that, although triboelectric detectors are generally used as bag leak detectors given their ability to detect very low loadings of particulate matter, cement kilns may use the transmissometers they currently use for opacity monitoring provided that the transmissometer is sensitive enough to detect subtle increases in particulate matter loading over normal (not performance test) loadings.

Finally, we request comment on whether it is practicable to establish the alarm set-point for the back leak detection system based on the detector response achieved during the performance test rather than as recommended in the Agency's guidance document.[287] The guidance document recommends that you establish the alarm set-point at a level that is twice the detector response achieved during bag cleaning. Although establishing the set-point at this level would avoid frequent exceedances due to normal bag cleaning, we are concerned that it may not be low enough to detect gradual degradation in fabric filter performance that, for example, can be caused by pinholes in the bags. Moreover, establishing the set-point at a detector response that is twice the response achieved during bag cleaning may not be low enough to require you to take corrective measures if particulate matter loadings increase above the levels achieved during the performance test, and thus at loadings that may indicate an exceedance of the particulate matter emission standard. To avoid alarms caused by bag cleaning cycles, the alarm set-point would be established as the average detector response of the test run averages during the particulate matter performance test, and would be established as a 6-hour rolling average updated each hour with a one-hour block average. This is the time that could be required to conduct three runs of a particulate matter performance test. The one-hour block average would be the average of the detector responses over each 15-minute block.

3. What Is the Rationale for Proposing to Revise the Compliance Requirements for Electrostatic Precipitators and Ionizing Wet Scrubbers?

We propose a two-tiered approach to ensure performance of electrostatic precipitators and ionizing wet scrubbers: (1) Use of a particulate matter continuous emissions detector for process monitoring to signal when you must take corrective measures to address maintenance or other factors causing relative or absolute mass particulate matter loadings to be higher than the levels achieved during the performance test; or (2) use of site-specific operating parameter limits. You could choose to comply with either tier.

a. How Would Tier I Work? Under Tier I, you would use a particulate matter continuous emissions detector for process monitoring to signal when you must take corrective measures to address maintenance or other factors causing relative or absolute mass particulate matter loadings to be higher than the levels achieved during the performance test. You would establish an alarm set-point as the average detector response achieved during the particulate matter emissions performance test. The limit would be applied as a 6-hour rolling average updated each hour with a one-hour block average to correspond to the time it could take to conduct three runs of a performance test. The one-hour block average would be the average of the detector responses over each 15-minute block.

If you exceed the alarm set-point, you must immediately take the corrective measures you specify in your operation and maintenance plan to bring the response below the set-point. To ensure that you take both corrective and proactive measures to minimize the frequency and duration of exceedances, you would be required to operate and maintain the electrostatic precipitator and ionizing wet scrubber to ensure that the alarm set-point is not exceeded more than 5 percent of the operating time during a 6-month period.[288] This is consistent with the proposed requirement to limit the period of time that a fabric filter may be operating under conditions of poor performance. If you exceed the alarm set-point more than 5 percent of the time during a 6-month period, you would be required to notify the delegated regulatory. This notification would alert the regulatory authority of the excessive exceedances so that they may take corrective measures, such as requiring you to revise the operation and maintenance plan.

You may use any detector as a particulate matter continuous monitor provided that the detector response correlates with relative or absolute particulate matter mass emissions and that it can detect small changes in particulate matter loadings.[289] You would include in the performance test plan a description of the particulate matter detector you select and information documenting that the detector response correlates with relative or absolute particulate matter loadings and that the detector can detect small changes in particulate matter loadings above the levels anticipated during the comprehensive performance test. For example, if you anticipate to achieve a particulate matter emission level of 0.010 gr/dscf during the comprehensive performance test, your detector should be able to distinguish between particulate matter loadings of 0.010 gr/dscf and 0.011 gr/dscf.

b. How Would Tier II Work? Under Tier II, you would comply with site-specific operating parameter limits you establish under § 63.1209(m)(1)(iv). As currently required, the operating limits would be linked to the automatic waste feed cutoff system. Exceedance of an operating limit would be a violation and is evidence of failure to ensure compliance with the particulate matter, semivolatile metal, and low volatile metal emission standards.

IV. Other Proposed Compliance Revisions

A. What Is the Proposed Clarification to the Public Notice Requirement for Approved Test Plans?

We are proposing in today's notice to add clarifying language to the section 1207(e)(2) public notification requirement for approved performance test and CMS performance evaluation test plans. The Agency believes that adequate public involvement is an essential element to the continuing and successful management of hazardous waste. Providing opportunities for timely and adequate public notice is necessary to fully inform nearby communities of a source's plans to initiate important waste management

[285] Because controlling particulate matter also controls semivolatile and low volatile metals (and dioxin/furan if you use activated carbon injection), exceeding the particulate matter loadings achieved during the performance test is also evidence of failure to ensure compliance with the emission standards for those pollutants.

[286] Because the proposed bag leak detection requirements are more stringent than the opacity standard, exempting cement kilns from the New Source Performance Standards for particulate matter and opacity under § 60.60 continues to be appropriate. *See* §§ 63.1204(h) and 63.1220(h).

[287] USEPA, "Fabric Filter Bag Leak Detection Guidance," September 1997.

[288] Periods of time when the combustor is operating but the bag leak detection system is malfunctioning must be considered exceedances of the set-point.

[289] Please note that, for the purpose of process monitoring proposed here, you need not correlate the particulate matter detector to particulate matter emission concentrations.

activities. In 1995, we expanded the RCRA public participation requirements for hazardous waste combustion sources to require that the State Director issue a public notice prior to a source conducting a RCRA trial burn emission test. *See* 60 FR 63417, 40 CFR 270.62(b)(6) and 40 CFR 270.66(d)(3). The purpose of this notification requirement was to inform the public of an upcoming trial burn should an individual be interested in reviewing the results of the test. When we promulgated the Phase I hazardous waste combustion NESHAP in 1999, we included a similar requirement in subpart EEE for the same general purpose. Section 1207(e)(2) of subpart EEE requires that sources issue a public notice announcing the approval of site-specific performance test plans and CMS performance evaluation test plans and provide the location where the plans will be made available to the public for review. We neglected, however, to include direction regarding how and when sources should notify the public, what the notification should contain, or where and for how long the test plans should be made available. As a result, we are proposing to add clarifying language to the section 1207(e)(2) public notification requirement. We are using the RCRA trial burn notification requirements as a foundation for the proposed clarifications.

1. How Should Sources Notify the Public?

The source must make a reasonable effort to provide adequate notification of the approval of their site-specific performance test and CMS performance evaluation test plans. Because this notification is intended for informational purposes only, we are proposing that sources use their facility/public mailing list. We expect that by the time a source receives approval of its subpart EEE test plans, a facility/public mailing list already would have been developed in response to the source's RCRA and CAA permitting activities. As such, we are proposing that sources use the facility/public mailing list developed under 40 CFR 70.7(h)(1), 71.11(d)(3)(i)(E) and 124.10(c)(1)(ix), for purposes of this notification. Sources may voluntarily choose to use other mechanisms in addition to a distribution to the facility/public mailing list, if previous experience has shown that such additional mechanisms are necessary to reach all interested segments of the community. For example, sources may consider using press releases, advertisements, visible signs, and outreach to local community, professional, and interest groups in addition to the required distribution to the facility/public mailing list.

2. When Should Sources Notify the Public of Approved Test Plans?

The existing regulations require that sources issue a public notice after the Administrator has approved the site-specific performance test and CMS performance evaluation test plans. It is important to remember that the purpose of this notification is similar to that required under RCRA for trial burn tests. *See* 60 FR 63417, 40 CFR 270.62(b)(6) and 40 CFR 270.66(d)(3). The notification is intended to provide information to the public regarding the upcoming performance test. It is not intended to solicit comment on the performance test plan. We considered proposing that the notification occur within 30 days of the source's receipt of test plan approval. However, we chose not to proceed with this option because we were concerned that the notification would not be as meaningful to the public if too much time elapses between the test plan approval notification and the actual initiation of the performance test. In order to provide the public with adequate notice of the upcoming test and a reasonable period of time to review the approved plans prior to the test, we are proposing that the source issue its notice after test plan approval, but no later than 60 days prior to conducting the test. We believe that this also will allow the source sufficient time to prepare its public notice and corresponds to the 40 CFR 63.1207(e)(1)(i)(B) requirement for a source to notify the Administrator of its intention to initiate the test.

3. What Should the Notification Include?

Similar to the public involvement requirements for RCRA trial burn tests, we are proposing that the notification contain the following information:

(1) The name and telephone number of the source's contact person;

(2) The name and telephone number of the regulatory agency's contact person;

(3) The location where the approved performance test and CMS performance evaluation test plans and any necessary supporting documentation can be reviewed and copied;

(4) The time period for which the test plans will be available for public review, and;

(5) An expected time period for commencement and completion of the performance test and CMS performance evaluation test.

4. Where Should the Plans Be Made Available and for How Long?

The site-specific performance test and CMS performance evaluation test plans must be made available at an unrestricted location which is accessible to the public during reasonable hours and provides a means for the public to obtain copies of the plans if needed. To provide for adequate time for the public to review the test plans, we are proposing that the plans be made available for a total of 60 days, beginning on the date that the source issues its public notice.

B. What Is the Proposed Clarification to the Public Notice Requirement for the Petition To Waive a Performance Test?

Sources that petition the Administrator for an extension of time to conduct a performance test (in other words, obtain a performance test waiver), are required under section 1207(e)(3)(iv) to notify the public of their petition. Although the regulatory language does provide some direction regarding how the source may notify the public (*e.g.*, using a public mailing list), it does not provide any direction regarding when this notice must be issued or what it must contain. As a result, we are proposing in today's notice to add clarifying language to the Section 1207(e)(3)(iv) public notice requirement.

1. When Should Sources Notify the Public of a Petition To Waive a Performance Test?

We are proposing that a source notify the public of a petition to waive a performance test at the same time that the source submits its petition to the Administrator. Although not explicitly stated in section 1207(e)(3)(iv), this was our original intent. In the July 3, 2001, preamble to the subpart EEE proposed technical amendments, we provided a time line of the waiver petitioning process for an initial Comprehensive Performance Test.[290] In that time line, we indicated that the submittal of the petition and the public notification should occur at the same time.

2. What Should the Notification Include?

The notification of a petition to waive a performance test is an informational notification. As such, we are proposing that it include the same level of information as that provided by a source for the notification of an approved test plan:

[290] It should be noted that the petition for waiver of a performance test applies to both the initial test and all subsequent tests. *See* 40 CFR 1207(e)(3).

(1) The name and telephone number of the source's contact person;

(2) The name and telephone number of the regulatory agency's contact person;

(3) The date the source submitted its site-specific performance test plan and CMS performance evaluation test plans; and

(4) The length of time requested for the waiver.

Part Four: Impacts of the Proposed Rule

I. What Are the Air Impacts?

Table 1 of this preamble shows the emissions reductions achieved by the proposed rule for all existing hazardous waste combustor sources. For Phase I sources—incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns—the emission reductions represent the difference in emissions between sources controlled to the proposed standards and estimated emissions when complying with the interim MACT standards promulgated on February 13, 2002. For Phase II sources—industrial/commercial/institutional boilers and process heaters and hydrochloric acid production facilities—the reductions represent the difference in emissions between the proposed standards and the current baseline of control provided by 40 CFR part 266, subpart H.

Nationwide baseline HAP emissions from hazardous waste combustors are estimated to be approximately 13,000 tons per year at the current level of control. Today's proposed standards would reduce emissions of hazardous air pollutants and particulate matter by approximately 3,300 tons per year.

Nationwide emissions of dioxin/furans from all hazardous waste combustors will be reduced by 4.7 grams TEQ per year. Emissions of HAP metals from all hazardous waste combustors will be reduced by 23 tons per year, including one ton per year of mercury. We estimate that particulate matter itself, a surrogate for HAP metals will be reduced by over 1,700 tons per year. Finally, emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas from all hazardous waste combustors will reduced by nearly 1,500 tons and over 100 tons per year, respectfully.[291] A discussion of the emission estimates methodology and results is presented in "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emission Estimates and Engineering Costs" (Chapter 3) in the docket for today's proposal.

TABLE 1.—NATIONWIDE ANNUAL EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS OF HAPS AND OTHER POLLUTANTS

Pollutant	Estimated emission reductions (tons per year) [1]
Dioxin/furans	0.3
Mercury	0.93
Cadmium	0.50
Lead	3.30
Arsenic	1.27
Beryllium	0.31
Chromium	8.97
Antimony	1.18
Cobalt	0.42
Nickel	1.57
Selenium	0.28
Manganese	4.50
Hydrogen Chloride	1470
Chlorine Gas	107
Particulate Matter	1727

[1] Dioxin/furan emissions reductions and reductions expressed as grams TEQ.

II. What Are the Water and Solid Waste Impacts?

We estimate that water usage would increase by 4.8 billion gallons per year if the proposed MACT standards were adopted. In addition to the increased water usage, an additional 4.6 billion gallons per year of wastewater would be produced. We estimate the additional solid waste that would need to be treated as a result of the proposed standards to be 10,400 tons per year. The costs associated with these hazardous waste treatment/disposal and water requirements are accounted for in the national annualized compliance cost estimates. A discussion of the methodology used to estimate impacts is presented in "Draft Technical Support Document for HWC MACT Replacement Standards, Volume V: Emission Estimates and Engineering Costs' (Chapters 4 and 5) that is available in the docket.

III. What Are the Energy Impacts?

We estimate an increase of approximately 133 million kilowatt hours (kWh) in national annual energy usage as a result of the proposed standards. The increase results from the electricity required to operate air pollution control devices installed to meet the proposed standards, such as baghouses and wet scrubbers.

IV. What Are the Control Costs?

Control costs, as presented in this section, refer only to engineering, operation, and maintenance costs associated with unit/system upgrades necessary to meet the proposed replacement standards. These costs do not incorporate any market-based adjustments. All costs presented in this section are annualized estimates in 2002 dollars.

We estimate there are a total of 276 sources [292] that may be subject to requirements of the proposed rule. Liquid and solid fuel boilers represent approximately 43 percent of this total, followed by on-site incinerators at 33 percent, and cement and lightweight aggregate kilns at 12 percent. Commercial incinerators and hydrochloric acid production furnaces make up the remaining 12 percent of the total.

Total national engineering costs for the proposed standards are estimated to range from $57.7 million to $77.9 million per year. The low end of this range reflects total upgrade costs excluding controls to meet the total chlorine standard.[293] All Phase II sources combined represent about 66 percent or 80 percent of this total, depending upon section 112(d)(4) scenario. The average cost per source is expected to be highest for lightweight aggregate kilns and solid fuel boilers, ranging from $329,000 to $400,000 and $217,000 to $283,000, respectively. Average liquid fuel boiler costs range from $378,000 to $419,000 per system. Hydrochloric acid production furnaces were found to have average system costs of about $200,000 under both section 112(d)(4) scenarios. On-site incinerators and commercial incinerators were found to generally have the lowest average cost ranges. Average annualized engineering costs for on-site incinerators are estimated to range from $16,300 to $139,000 per source, while average annual per source engineering costs for commercial incinerators are estimated to range from $67,000 to $247,000. For all Phase I sources (140 sources; commercial incinerators, on-site incinerators, cement kilns, and

[291] We are, however, proposing to establish alternative risk-based standards, pursuant to CAA section 112(d)(4), which could be elected by the source in lieu of the MACT emission standards for total chlorine. The emission limits would be based on national exposure standards that ensure protection of public health with an ample margin of safety. See Part Two, Section XIII for additional details.If we were to adopt alternative risk-based standards, then the national annual emissions reductions for total chlorine are overstated.

[292] For purposes of this discussion, a source is defined as the air pollution control system associated with the hazardous waste combustion unit(s). A source may contain one or more combustion units, and a facility may operate one or more sources.

[293] We are proposing using section 112(d)(4) of the Clean Air Act to establish risk-based standards for total chlorine for hazardous waste combustors (except for hydrochloric acid production furnaces). The low-end of this cost range assumes all facilities emit total chlorine levels below risk-based levels of concern. Under this scenario, no total chlorine controls are assumed to necessary.

lightweight aggregate kilns), average annualized engineering costs are estimated to range from $76,000 to $184,000 per source. The combined Phase II sources (136 sources; solid and liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces) had average annualized engineering costs ranging from $341,000 to $380,000 per source. Across all sectors covered by today's proposal (Phase I and Phase II sources), average annualized costs were found to range from $209,000 to $282,000 per source.

Engineering compliance (control) costs have also been assessed on a per ton of waste burned basis. Captive energy recovery sources (includes solid and liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces), burning a total of 1,001,500 tons of hazardous waste per year, are projected to experience the highest average incremental costs, ranging from $46 to $52 per ton. Commercial energy recovery sources (cement kilns and LWAKs), burning approximately 1,093,800 tons per year, may see incremental control costs ranging from $7.50 to $8.50 per ton. Captive (on-site) and commercial incinerators burn an estimated 1,010,600 tons and 452,200 tons per year, respectively. These sources are estimated to experience average incremental engineering costs ranging from $1.50 to $12.70 per ton for captive and $2.20 to $8.20 per ton for commercial sources.

The aggregate control costs presented in this section do not reflect the anticipated real world cost burden on the economy. Any market disruption, such as the implementation of hazardous waste MACT or risk-based standards will cause a short-tem disequilibrium in the hazardous waste burning market. Following the implementation of the replacement standards, market adjustments will occur in a natural economic process designed to reach a new market equilibrium. Actual cost impacts to society are more accurately measured by taking into account market adjustments. These costs are commonly termed Social Costs, and are generally less than total engineering costs due to cost efficiencies implemented during the market adjustment process. Social Costs theoretically represent the total real world costs of all goods and services society must give up in order to gain the added protection to human health and the environment. Social Costs are presented in Part VIII of this Section.

V. Can We Achieve the Goals of the Proposed Rule in a Less Costly Manner?

Section 1(b)(3) of Executive Order 12866 instructs Executive Branch Agencies to consider and assess available alternatives to direct regulation prior to making a determination for regulation. This regulatory determination assessment should be considered, "to the extent permitted by law, and where applicable." The ultimate purpose of the regulatory determination assessment is to ensure that the most efficient tool, regulation, or other type of action is applied in meeting the targeted objective(s). Requirements for MACT standards under the Clean Air Act, as mandated by Congress, have compelled us to select today's regulatory approach. Furthermore, we are under legal obligation to meet the targeted objectives of today's proposal through a regulatory action. As a result, alternatives to direct regulatory action were not evaluated.

In addition to the statutory and legal mandates necessitating today's proposed rulemaking, we believe that federal regulation is the most efficient approach for helping to correct market failures leading to the negative environmental externalities resulting from the combustion of hazardous waste. The complex nature of the pollutants, waste feeds, waste generators, and the diverse nature of the combustion market would limit the effectiveness of a non-regulatory approach such as taxes, fees, or an educational-outreach program.

The hazardous waste combustion industry operates in a dynamic market. Several combustion facilities and systems have closed or consolidated over the past several years and this trend is likely to continue. These closures and consolidations may lead to reduced air pollution, in the aggregate, from hazardous waste facilities. However, the ongoing demand for hazardous waste combustion services will ultimately result in a steady equilibrium as the market adjusts over the long-term. We therefore expect that air pollution problems from these facilities, and the corresponding threats to human health and ecological receptors, will continue if a regulatory action was not implemented.

We believe that the market has generally failed to correct the air pollution problems resulting from the combustion of hazardous wastes for several reasons. First, there exists no natural market incentive for hazardous waste combustion facilities to incur additional costs implementing control measures. This occurs because the individuals and entities who bear the negative human health and ecological impacts associated with these actions have no direct control over waste burning decisions. This environmental externality occurs because the private industry costs of combustion do not fully reflect the human health and environmental costs of hazardous waste combustion. Second, the parties injured by the combusted pollutants are not likely to have the resources or technological expertise to seek compensation from the damaging entity (combustion source) through legal or other means.[294] Finally, emissions from hazardous waste combustion facilities directly affect a "public good," the air. Improved air quality benefits human health and the environment. The absence of government intervention, therefore, will perpetuate a market that fails to fully internalize key negative externalities, resulting in a sub-optimal quantity and quality of public goods, such as air.

We have assessed several regulatory options designed to mitigate the unacceptable levels of risk to human health and the environment resulting from the combustion of hazardous waste in the targeted units. We believe, based on available data, that our preferred regulatory approach,[295] as presented in today's proposed rule, is the most cost-efficient method for reducing the level of several hazardous air pollutants. These include: dioxin and furan, mercury, semivolatile and low volatile metals, and total chlorine emissions (*i.e.*, hydrogen chloride and chlorine). Carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and particulate matter will also be reduced.

We evaluated seven alternative methodologies in the development of today's proposed approach. These were: system removal efficiency plus feed control, straight emission-based, modified emission-based, exclusive technology approach, simultaneous achievability, using the CAA section 112(d)(4) to establish risk-based standards for total chlorine, and beyond-the-floor. Numerous different combinations of these methodologies were assessed. Selection of the Agency preferred approach was based, in part on methodological clarity, implementation simplicity, cost and economic impacts, stakeholder input, and necessary protectiveness to human health and the environment.

[294] Some economists consider this a failure of full and proper enforcement of property rights.

[295] Including our proposal to apply section 112(d)(4) to establish risk-based standards for total chlorine for all sources, except hydrochloric acid production furnaces.

VI. What Are the Economic Impacts?

Various market adjustments (*i.e.*, economic impacts) are expected in response to the changes in hazardous waste combustion costs anticipated as a result of the replacement standards, as proposed. Economic impacts may be measured through several factors. This section presents estimated economic impacts relative to market exits, waste reallocations, and employment impacts. Economic impacts presented in this section are distinct from social costs, which correspond only to the estimated monetary value of market disturbances.

A. Market Exit Estimates

The hazardous waste combustion industry operates in a dynamic market, with systems entering and exiting the market on a routine basis. Our analysis defines "market exit" as ceasing to burn hazardous waste. We have projected post-rule hazardous waste combustion system market exits based on economic feasibility only. Market exit estimates are derived from a breakeven analysis designed to determine system viability. This analysis is subject to several assumptions, including: engineering cost data on the baseline costs of waste burning, cost estimates for pollution control devices, prices for combustion services, and assumptions about the waste quantities burned at these facilities. It is important to note that, for most sectors, exiting the hazardous waste combustion market is not equivalent to closing a plant. (Actual plant closure would only be expected in the case of an exit from the hazardous waste combustion market of a commercial incinerator closing all its systems.)

Under the Agency's proposed approach, we estimate there may be anywhere from 51 to 58 systems (sources) that stop burning hazardous waste. This represents anywhere from 18 percent to 21 percent of the total number of systems affected by the rule. The range is based on the inclusion or exclusion of total chlorine controls.[296] At the high-end of this range, onsite incinerators represent about 55 percent of the total number of market exits. Liquid and solid fuel boilers (includes process heaters) account for 41 percent, and commercial incinerators account for the remaining. No cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, or hydrochloric acid production furnaces are projected to exit the market as a result of the rule. Market exits are estimated to change only slightly under the alternative regulatory options.

B. Quantity of Waste Reallocated

Some combustion systems (sources) may no longer be able to cover their hazardous waste burning costs as a result of rule requirements, as proposed. These sources are expected to divert or reroute their wastes to alternative burners.[297] For multiple system facilities, this diversion may include on-site (non-commercial) waste consolidation among fewer systems at the same facility. A certain portion of this waste may also be reallocated to waste management alternatives (*e.g.*, solvent reclamation). Combustion, however, is likely to remain the lowest cost option. Thus, we expect that the vast majority of reallocated waste will continue to be managed at combustion facilities.

Our economic model indicates that, in response to today's rule, approximately 87,500 to 120,900 tons of hazardous waste may be reallocated, representing up to 3.4 percent of the total 1999 estimated quantity of hazardous waste burned at all sources. This estimate includes on-site consolidations and off-site diversions. Off-site diversions alone represent no more than 1.5 percent of the total waste burned. About 56 percent to 65 percent of the total reallocated waste quantity is expected to be consolidated among fewer systems at the same non-commercial facility. Commercial incinerators and commercial energy recovery (cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns) facilities are projected to receive all hazardous waste that is rerouted off-site. Onsite incinerators and boilers are the primary source of all off-site diverted waste. Based on the high estimate for total waste reallocated (120,900 tons), commercial incinerators and cement kilns are projected to receive 37 percent and 7 percent, respectively. The remainder, as mentioned above, is projected to be consolidated on-site. Currently, there is more than adequate capacity to accommodate all off-site waste diversions.

C. Employment Impacts

Today's rule is likely to cause employment shifts across all of the hazardous waste combustion sectors. These shifts may occur as specific combustion facilities find it no longer economically feasible to keep all of their systems running, or to stay in the hazardous waste market at all. When this occurs, workers at these locations may lose their jobs or experience forced relocations. At the same time, the rule may result in employment gains, as new purchases of pollution control equipment stimulate additional hiring in the pollution control manufacturing sector, and as additional staff are required at selected combustion facilities to accommodate reallocated waste and/or various compliance activities.

1. Employment Impacts—Dislocations (losses)

Primary employment dislocations (losses) in the combustion industry are likely to occur when combustion systems consolidate the waste they are burning into fewer systems or when a facility exits the hazardous waste combustion market altogether. Operation and maintenance labor hours are expected to be reduced for each *system* that stops burning hazardous waste. For each *facility* that completely exits the market, employment losses will likely also include supervisory and administrative labor.

Total incremental employment dislocations potentially resulting from the proposed replacement standards are estimated to range from 308 to 387 full-time-equivalent (FTE) jobs. Depending upon the scenario, on-site incinerators and boilers are responsible for anywhere from about 85 to 100 percent all potential job dislocations. Their significant share of the losses is a function of both the large number of systems affected, and the number of expected exits within these sectors.

2. Employment Impacts—Gains

In addition to employment dislocations, today's rule is also expected to result in job gains. These gains are projected to occur to both the air pollution control industry and to combustion firms as they hire personnel to accommodate reallocated waste and/or comply with the various requirements of the rule. Hazardous waste combustion sources are projected to need additional operation and maintenance personnel for the new pollution control equipment and other compliance activities, such as new reporting and record keeping requirements.

The total annual employment gains associated with the proposed standards are estimated to range from 407 to 525 FTEs. Job gains to the air pollution

[296] Even though we are proposing to allow sources (except hydrochloric acid production furnaces) to invoke section 112(d)(4) in lieu of MACT chlorine control requirements, we have not attempted to estimate the following: (1) The total number of sources that may elect to implement this provision, and, (2) what level of control may be necessary following a section 112(d)(4) risk-based determination, since this would vary on a site-by-site basis.

[297] This analysis includes the cost of waste transport to alternative combustion sources, burning fees, and purchase of alternative fuels (if appropriate).

control industry[298] represent about 31 percent of this total. Among all combustors, boilers are projected to experience the greatest number of job gains, followed by cement and lightweight aggregate kilns. Job gains in these sectors alone represent about 55 percent to 61 percent of total projected gains, depending upon regulatory scenario.

While it may appear that this analysis suggests overall net job creation, such a conclusion would be inappropriate. Because the gains and losses occur in different sectors of the economy, they should not be added together. Doing so would mask important distributional effects of the rule. In addition, the employment gain estimates reflect within sector impacts only and therefore do not account for potential job displacement across sectors. This may occur if investment funds are diverted from other areas of the larger economy.

VII. What Are the Benefits of Reductions in Particulate Matter Emissions?

For the 1999 rule, we estimated the avoided incidence of mortality and morbidity associated with reductions in particulate matter (PM) emissions.[299] Estimates of cases of mortality and morbidity avoided were made for children and the elderly, as well as the general population, using concentration-response functions derived from human epidemiological studies. Morbidity effects included respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses requiring hospitalization, as well as other illnesses not requiring hospitalization, such as acute and chronic bronchitis and acute upper and lower respiratory symptoms. Decreases in particulate matter-related minor restricted activity days (MRADs) and work loss days (WLDs) were also estimated. Rates of avoided incidence, work days lost, and days of restricted activity were estimated for each of 16 sectors surrounding a facility using the concentration-response functions and sector-specific estimates of the corresponding population and model-derived ambient air concentration, either annual mean PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations or distributions of daily PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations, depending on the concentration-response function. The sectors were defined by 4 concentric rings out to a distance of 20 kilometers (about 12 miles), each of which was divided into 4 quadrants. The sector-specific rates were weighted by facility-specific sampling weights and then summed to give the total incidence rates for a given source category.[300]

Since performing the risk assessment for the 1999 *Assessment*, the Agency has updated its benefits methodology to reflect recent advances in air quality modeling and human health benefits modeling. To estimate PM exposure for the 1999 risk assessment, the Agency used the Industrial Source Complex Model-Short Term Version 3 (ISCST3). More recent EPA benefits analyses have used more advanced air-quality models. For example, the Agency's assessment of the industrial boilers and process heaters NESHAP used the Climatological Regional Dispersion Model (CRDM), which uses a national source-receptor matrix to estimate exposure associated with PM emissions.[301] Similarly, the Agency's analysis of the proposed Inter-state Air Quality Rule used the Regional Modeling System for Aerosols and Deposition (REMSAD), which also accounts for the long-range transport of particles.[302] In contrast, ISCST3 modeled exposure within a 20-kilometer radius of each emissions source for the 1999 risk assessment.[303] To the extent that PM is transported further than 20 km from each emissions source, the 1999 risk assessment may underestimate PM exposure. In addition, to estimate exposure in the 1999 risk assessment, EPA used block-group-level data from the 1990 Census. More recent studies use data from the 2000 Census.

More recent EPA benefits analyses also apply a different concentration-response function for PM mortality than that used for the 1999 risk assessment. In 1999, EPA used the concentration-response function published by Pope, *et al.* in 1995.[304] Since that time, health scientists have refined estimates of the concentration-response relationship, and EPA has updated its methodology for estimating benefits to reflect these more recent estimates. In the regulatory impact analysis of the non-hazardous boiler MACT standards, EPA used the Krewski, *et al.* re-analysis of the 1995 Pope study to estimate avoided premature mortality.[305] Since the relative risk estimated in the Krewski study (1.18) is nearly the same as that presented in Pope *et al.* (1.17), the Agency assumes that updating the 1999 risk assessment to reflect the results of the 2000 Krewski study would have minimal impact on the estimated benefits associated with the proposed HWC MACT replacement standards.

For the current proposal, we took the avoided incidence estimates from the September 1999 final rule and adjusted them to reflect the particulate matter emission reductions projected to occur under the proposed standards and the reduction in the numbers of facilities burning hazardous wastes since the analysis for the final rule was completed. For cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and incinerators, the estimates were made by adjusting the respective estimates at the source category level by the ratio of emission reductions (for today's proposed rule vs. the 1999 final rule) and the ratio of the number of facilities affected by the rules (facilities currently burning hazardous wastes vs. facilities burning hazardous wastes in the analysis for the September 1999 final rule).[306] For liquid and solid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces, we extrapolated the avoided incidence from the incinerator source category using a similar approach except that the ratios of the exposed populations were used (corresponding to the concentration-

[298] Manufacturers and distributers of air pollution control devices are expected to increase sales as a result of this action.

[299] See "Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Support to the Development of Technical Standards for Emissions from Combustion Units Burning Hazardous Wastes: Background Document," July 1999.

[300] It should be noted that the avoided incidence estimates were based entirely on the incremental decrease in ambient air concentrations associated with emission controls on the hazardous waste sources subject to the 1999 rule. Background levels of particulate matter were assumed to be sufficiently high to exceed any possible threshold of effect but ambient background levels of particulate matter were not otherwise considered in the analysis.

[301] U.S. EPA, *Regulatory Impact Analysis of The Final Industrial Boilers and Process Heaters NESHAP: Final Report*, February 2004.

[302] U.S. EPA, *Benefits of the Proposed Inter-State Air Quality Rule*, January 2004.

[303] Research Triangle Institute, *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Support to The Development of Technical Standards for Emissions from Combustion Units Burning Hazardous Wastes: Background Document*, prepared for U.S. EPA, Office of Solid Waste, July 1999.

[304] Pope, C.A., III, M.J. Thun, M.M. Namboodiri, D.W. Dockery, J.S. Evans, F.E. Speizer, and C.W. Heath, Jr. 1995. Particulate air pollution as a predictor of mortality in a prospective study of U.S. adults. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine151:669–674, as cited in Research Triangle Institute, *op. cit.*

[305] Krewski D, Burnett RT, Goldbert MS, Hoover K, Siemiatycki J, Jerrett M, Abrahamowicz M, White WH. 2000. Reanalysis of the Harvard Six Cities Study and the American Cancer Society Study of Particulate Air Pollution and Mortality. Special Report to the Health Effects Institute, Cambridge, MA, July 2000.

[306] To account for the increase in population since the 1990 census was taken, for the Phase I sources we also adjusted the avoided incidence estimates by the ratio of the population at the national level (corresponding to the concentration-response function) for the year 2000 census vs. the 1990 census. For Phase II source, we used the year 2000 census to develop source category-specific population estimates for use in the extrapolations.

response functions from the 1999 analysis), instead of the number of facilities. We estimated the exposed populations for hazardous waste-burning boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces using the same GIS methods as the September 1999 final rule (*i.e.*, a 16 sector overlay). Nonetheless, the extrapolated estimates are subject to some uncertainty. The estimates of avoided incidence of mortality and morbidity are shown in Table 2. The estimates of days of restricted activity and days of work lost are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 2.—PM-RELATED AVOIDED INCIDENCE OF MORTALITY AND MORBIDITY

Source category	Hospital admissions			Respiratory		Illnesses	
	Mortality	Respiratory illness	Cardiovascular	Chronic bronchitis	Acute bronchitis	Lower respiratory	Upper respiratory
Cement Kilns	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Lightweight Aggregate Kilns	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Incinerators	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Solid Fuel Boilers	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.1
HCl Production Furnaces	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Liquid Fuel Boilers	0.3	0.9	0.4	5.5	4.2	37.2	4.3
Total	0.3	0.9	0.4	5.6	4.3	38.0	4.4

TABLE 3.—PM-RELATED RESTRICTED ACTIVITY AND WORK LOSS DAYS

Source category	Minor restricted	Restricted activity days	Work loss days
Cement Kilns	3.1	1.0	0.4
Lightweight Aggregate Kilns	0.0	0.0	0.0
Incinerators	0.0	0.0	0.0
Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers	59.0	19.4	7.1
HCl Production Furnaces	0.0	0.0	0.0
Liquid Fuel-Fired Boilers	3692.2	1215.9	443.2
Total	3754.4	1236.4	450.7

We also conducted an analysis of key factors that influence the PM-related health benefits by statistically comparing attributes of the sources subject to today's proposed rule versus the sources subject to the 1999 rule. The greater the similarities between the sources covered by today's proposal and the sources subject to the 1999 rule, the more confidence we have in the extrapolated incidence estimates. The more the dissimilarities, the greater is the uncertainty in the estimates. The comparative analysis is discussed in a separate background document for today's rule.[307]

VIII. What are the Social Costs and Benefits of the Proposed Rule?

The value of any regulatory action is traditionally measured by the net change in social welfare that it generates. Our economic assessment for today's rule evaluates compliance costs, social costs, benefits, economic impacts, selected other impacts (*e.g.*, children's health, unfunded mandates), and small entity impacts. To conduct this analysis, we examined the current combustion market and practices, developed and implemented a methodology for examining compliance and social costs, applied an economic model to analyze industry economic impacts (results discussed above), examined benefits, and followed appropriate guidelines and procedures for examining equity considerations, children's health, and other impacts. The data we used in this analysis were the most recently available at the time of the analysis. Because our data were limited, the findings from these analyses are more accurately viewed as national estimates.

A. Combustion Market Overview

The hazardous waste industry consists of three key segments: hazardous waste generators, fuel blenders/intermediaries, and hazardous waste burners. Hazardous waste is combusted at four main types of facilities: commercial incinerators, on-site incinerators, waste burning kilns (cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns), and industrial boilers. Commercial incinerators are generally larger in size and designed to manage virtually all types of solids, as well as liquid wastes. On-site incinerators are more often designed as liquid-injection systems that handle liquids and pumpable solids. Waste burning kilns and boilers generally burn hazardous wastes to generate heat and power for their manufacturing processes.

As discussed above, we have identified a total of 276 sources (systems) permitted to burn hazardous waste in the United States. Liquid fuel-fired boilers account for 107 sources, followed by on-site incinerators at 92 sources. Cement kilns, hydrochloric acid production furnaces, and commercial incinerators account for 26, 17, and 15 sources, respectively. Solid fuel-fired boilers and lightweight aggregate kilns make up the remaining, at 12 and seven systems, respectively. These 276 sources are operated by a total of 150 different facilities. On-site incinerators account for 69 facilities, or 46 percent of this total, followed by all boiler facilities at 45 percent (67 facilities). There are 14 cement kilns, 10 commercial incineration facilities and three lightweight aggregate kilns. A single facility may have one or more combustion systems. Facilities with multiple systems may have the same or different types. Thus, the numbers presented above will not sum to 150 facilities.

[307] See "Inferential Risk Analysis in Support of Standards for Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Hazardous Waste Combustors," prepared under contract to EPA by Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC.

The number of sources per facility in the combustion universe ranges from one to 12. On average, boilers, hydrochloric acid production furnaces, and lightweight aggregate kilns, with an average of 2.0 sources per facility, contain more waste burning combustion systems per facility than do incinerators and cement kilns, with an average of 1.4 sources per facility. On-site incinerators, with 1.3 sources per facility, have the lowest average among all types of combustion devices in the universe.

Combustion systems operating at chemical and allied product facilities represent 72 percent (199 sources) of the total number of hazardous waste burning systems. Stone, clay, and glass production accounts for 12 percent (34 sources), followed by electric, gas, and sanitation services at 8 percent (22 sources).

The EPA Biennial Reporting System (BRS) reports a total demand for all combusted hazardous waste, across all facilities, at 3.56 million tons (U.S. ton) in 1999. Commercial energy recovery (cement kilns and lightweight aggregate kilns) burned about 31 percent of this total, followed by on-site incinerators at just over 28 percent, captive energy recovery (all boilers) at 28 percent, and commercial incineration at nearly 13 percent. About 62 percent of all waste burned in 1999 was organic liquids. This is followed by inorganic liquids (15 percent), sludges (13 percent), and solids (9 percent). Hazardous gases represent about 0.1 percent of the total annual quantity burned. In terms of waste source, the industrial organic chemicals sector generates approximately a third of all hazardous waste burned, followed by pesticides and agricultural chemicals, business services, organic fibers, medicinal chemicals, pharmaceuticals, plastics materials and resins, petroleum, and miscellaneous.

Companies that generate large quantities of uniform hazardous wastes generally find it more economical and efficient to combust these wastes on-site using their own noncommercial systems. Commercial incineration facilities manage a wide range of waste streams generated in small to medium quantities by diverse industries. Cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, and boilers derive heat and energy by combining clean burning (solvents and organics) high-Btu liquid hazardous wastes [308] with conventional fuels.

Regulatory requirements, liability concerns, and economics influence the demand for combustion services. Regulatory forces influence the demand for combustion by mandating certain hazardous waste treatment standards (land disposal restriction requirements, etc.). Liability concerns of waste generators affect combustion demand because combustion, by destroying organic wastes, greatly reduces the risk of future environmental problems. Finally, if alternative waste management options are more expensive, hazardous waste generators will likely choose to send their wastes to combustion facilities in order to increase their overall profitability.

Throughout much of the 1980s, hazardous waste combustors enjoyed a strong competitive position and generally maintained a high level of profitability. During this period, EPA regulations requiring combustion greatly expanded the waste tonnage for this market. In addition, federal permitting requirements, as well as powerful local opposition to siting of new incinerators, constrained the entry of new combustion systems. As a result, combustion prices rose steadily, ultimately reaching record levels in 1987. The high profits of the late 1980s induced many firms to enter the market, in spite of the difficulties and delays anticipated in the permitting and siting process. Hazardous waste markets have changed significantly since the late 1980s. In the early 1990s, substantial overcapacity resulted in fierce competition, declining prices, poor financial performance, numerous project cancellations, system consolidations, and facility closures. Since the mid 1990s, several additional combustion facilities have closed, while many of those that have remained open have consolidated, or further consolidated their operations. Available excess capacity is currently estimated at about 20 percent of the total 1999 quantity combusted.

B. Baseline Specification

Proper and consistent baseline specification is vital to the accurate assessment of incremental costs, benefits, and other economic impacts associated with today's proposed rule. The baseline essentially describes the world absent the proposed rule. The incremental impacts of today's rule are evaluated by predicting post MACT compliance responses with respect to the baseline. The baseline, as applied in this analysis, is the point at which today's rule is promulgated. Thus, incremental cost and economic impacts are projected beyond the standards established in the February 13, 2002, Interim Standards Final Rule.

C. Analytical Methodology and Findings—Social Cost Analysis

Total social costs include the value of resources used to comply with the standards by the private sector, the value of resources used to administer the regulation by the government, and the value of output lost due to shifts of resources away from the current market equilibrium. To evaluate these shifts in resources and changes in output requires predicting changes in behavior by all affected parties in response to the regulation, including responses of directly-affected entities, as well as indirectly-affected private parties.

For this analysis, social costs are grouped into two categories: economic welfare (changes in consumer and producer surplus), and government administrative costs. The economic welfare analysis conducted for today's rule uses a simplified partial equilibrium approach to estimate social costs. In this analysis, changes in economic welfare are measured by summing the changes in consumer and producer surplus. This simplified approach bounds potential economic welfare losses associated with the rule by considering two scenarios: compliance costs assuming no market adjustments, and market adjusted compliance costs. The private sector compliance costs of $57.7 million to $77.9 million per year, as presented in Section IV, assume no market adjustments. These costs may be considered to represent the high-end of total social costs. Our best estimate of social costs assume rational market adjustments. Under this scenario, increased compliance costs are examined in the context of likely incentives combustion facilities would have to continue burning hazardous wastes, and the competitive balance in different combustion sectors.

For all sectors to meet the proposed replacement standards, total annualized market-adjusted costs are estimated to range from $41 to $50 million. The low end of this range assumes no chlorine control costs.[309] The Phase II sources represent about 83 percent of the high-end total. Our economic model indicates that two sectors as a whole, commercial incinerators and cement kilns, would experience net gains following all market adjustments. This occurs due to marginally higher prices,

[308] Many cement kilns are also able to burn a certain level of solid waste.

[309] We are proposing using section 112(d)(4) of the Clean Air Act to establish risk-based standards for total chlorine for hazardous waste combustors (except for hydrochloric acid production furnaces). The low-end of this cost range assumes all facilities emit total chlorine levels below risk-based levels of concern. Under this scenario, no total chlorine controls are assumed to be necessary.

increased waste receipts, and relatively low upgrade costs. Total annual government costs are approximately one-half million dollars for the proposed approach.

D. Analytical Methodology and Findings—Benefits Assessment

This section discusses the monetized and non-monetized benefits to human health and the environment potentially associated with today's rule. Monetized human health benefits are derived from reductions in PM and dioxin/furan exposure and are based on a Value of Statistical Life (VSL) estimate of $5.5 million.[10] Monetized environmental benefits are estimated from visibility improvements expected in response to reduced air pollution. Non-monetized benefits are associated with human health, ecological, and waste minimization factors.

1. Monetized Benefits

Particulate Matter—We developed monetized estimates of human health benefits associated with reduced emissions of particulate matter (PM). We also estimated the value of improved visibility associated with reduced PM emissions.

Results from our risk assessment extrapolation procedure, as discussed under Section VII above, are used to evaluate incremental human health benefits potentially associated with particulate matter emission reductions at hazardous waste combustion facilities. This analysis used avoided cost factors from the July 1999 *Assessment* document, combined with the updated estimates of avoided adverse health effects related only to particulate matter emissions.

Under the Agency preferred approach, reduced PM emissions are estimated to result in monetized human health benefits of approximately $4.18 million per year. This is an undiscounted figure. Avoided PM morbidity cases account for $2.34 million of this total and include: respiratory illness, cardiovascular disease, chronic bronchitis, work loss days, and minor restricted activity. Chronic bronchitis accounts for approximately 90 percent of the total morbidity cases. All morbidity cases are assumed to be avoided within the first year following reduced PM emissions and are not discounted under any scenario.

Avoided premature deaths (mortality) account for the remaining $1.84 million per year. Assuming a discount rate of three and seven percent, PM mortality benefits would be $1.70 million and $1.54 million, respectively. Our discounted analysis of PM mortality benefits assumes that 25 percent of premature mortalities occur during the first year, 25 percent occur during the second year, and 16.7 percent occur in each of the three subsequent years after exposure. This methodology is consistent with the Agency's analysis of the proposed Clear Skies Act of 2003. Total monetized PM benefits, therefore, are estimated to range from $4.24 million/year to $4.52 million per year. These findings appear to indicate that particulate matter reductions from the interim baseline to the replacement standards are small relative to the reductions achieved in going to the interim standards. This assessment does not consider corresponding health benefits associated with the reduction of metals carried by the PM.

Dioxin/furan—Dioxin/furan emissions are projected to be reduced by a total of 4.68 grams per year under the Agency Preferred Approach. Of this total, 0.42 grams/year are derived in going from the interim standards baseline to the floor levels. The remaining 4.26 grams/year are derived by going from the floor to beyond-the-floor (BTF) standards. In the July 23, 1999 *Addendum* to the *Assessment,* cancer risk reductions linked to consumption of dioxin-contaminated agricultural products accounted for the vast majority of the 0.36 cancer cases per year that were expected to be avoided due to the 1999 standards. Cancer risk reductions associated with the replacement standards are expected to be less than 0.36 cases per year, but greater than zero.

Assuming that the proportional relationship between dioxin/furans emissions and premature cancer deaths is constant, we estimate that approximately 0.058 premature cancer deaths will be avoided on an annual basis under the Agency Preferred Approach because of reduced dioxin/furans emissions. This estimate reflects a cancer risk slope factor of 1.56×10^5 $[mg/kg/day]^{-1}$. This cancer slope factor is derived from the Agency's 1985 health assessment document for polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins[11] and represents an upper bound 95th percentile confidence limit of the excess cancer risk from a lifetime exposure.

For the past 12 years the Agency has been conducting a reassessment of the human health risks associated with dioxin and dioxin-like compounds. This reassessment[12] will soon be under review at the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), as specified by Congress in the Conference Report accompanying EPA's fiscal year 2003 appropriation (Title IV of Division K of the Conference Report for the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution of 2003). Evidence compiled from this draft reassessment indicates that the carcinogenic effects of dioxin/furans may be six times as great as believed in 1985, reflecting an upper bound cancer risk slope factor of 1×106 $[mg/kg/day]^{-1}$ for some individuals. Agency scientists' more likely (central tendency) estimates (derived from the ED_{01} rather than the LED_{01}) result in slope factors and risk estimates that are within 2–3 times of the upper bound estimates (*i.e.*, between 3×10^5 $[mg/kg/day]^{-1}$ and 5×10^5 $[mg/kg/day]^{-1}$) based on the available epidemiological and animal cancer data. Risks could be as low as zero for some individuals. Use of the alternative upper bound cancer risk slope factor would result in up to 0.35 premature cancer deaths avoided in response to the proposed replacement standards for dioxin/furans. The assessment of upper bound cancer risk using this alternative slope factor should not be considered Agency policy. The proposed standards for dioxin in today's rule were not based on this draft reassessment.

Total non-discounted human health benefits associated with projected dioxin reductions are estimated at $0.32 million/year. Total benefits are estimated to range from $0.12 million/year to $0.17 million/year at a 3 percent discount rate, and $0.03 million/year to $0.08 million/year at a 7 percent rate. The two figures under each discount scenario reflect an assumed latency period of 21 or 34 years.

Visibility Benefits—In addition to the human health benefits discussed above, we also assessed visibility improvements. Particulate matter emissions are a primary cause of reduced visibility. Changes in the level of ambient particulate matter caused by the reduction in emissions associated with the Agency preferred approach are expected to increase the level of visibility in some parts of the United States. We derived upper and lower bound benefits estimates associated with particulate matter emissions

[10] Office of Management and Budget. *Circular A–4.* September 17, 2003.

[11] USEPA, 1985. Health Assessment Document for Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins. EPA/600/8–84/014F. Final Report. Office of Health and Environmental Assessment. Washington, DC. September, 1985.

[12] U.S.EPA, *Exposure and Human Health Reassessment of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin (TCDD) and Related Compounds,* September 2000. Note: Toxicity risk factors presented in this document should not be considered EPA's official estimate of dioxin toxicity, but rather reflect EPA's ongoing effort to reevaluate dioxin toxicity.

reductions using two different methodologies, each comparing reductions to those associated with the Clean Air Act. The first approach assumes a linear relationship between particulate matter reductions and visibility improvements. Under this approach, the Agency preferred replacement standards may result in a visibility benefit of approximately $5.78 million per year. Our second approach is to assume a linear relationship between health benefits and visibility benefits associated with reduction in particulate matter emissions. Under this approach, the proposed replacement standards could result in a visibility benefit of approximately $0.11 million/year. This method represents our lower bound estimate of visibility benefits.

2. Non-Monetized Benefits

We examined, but did not monetize human health benefits potentially associated with reduced exposure to lead, mercury, and total chlorine. Non monetized ecological benefits potentially associated with reductions in dioxin/furan, selected metals, total chlorine, and particulate matter were also examined. Finally, waste minimization is examined as a non-monetized benefit.

Lead—The proposed replacement standards are expected to reduce lead emissions by approximately five tons per year. In comparison, the 1999 standards were expected to reduce lead emissions by 89 tons per year, and were expected to reduce cumulative lead exposures for two children age 0–5 to less than 10 µg/dL. The lead benefits associated with the proposed replacement standards are therefore expected to be modest, reducing the cumulative lead exposures for less than two children age 0–5, less than 10 µg/dL annually. The proposed replacement standards will also result in reduced lead levels for children of sub-populations with especially high levels of exposure. Children of subsistence fishermen, commercial beef farmers, and commercial dairy farmers who face the greatest levels of cumulative lead exposure will also experience comparable reductions in overall exposure as a result of the MACT standards.

Mercury—Mercury emitted from hazardous waste burning incinerators, kilns, boilers, and other natural and man-made sources is carried by winds through the air and eventually is deposited to water and land. Recent estimates (which are highly uncertain) of annual total global mercury emissions from all sources (natural and anthropogenic) are about 5,000 to 5,500 tons per year (tpy). Of this total, about 1,000 tpy are estimated to be natural emissions and about 2,000 tpy are estimated to be contributions through the natural global cycle of re-emissions of mercury associated with past anthropogenic activity. Current anthropogenic emissions account for the remaining 2,000 tpy. Point sources such as fuel combustion; waste incineration; industrial processes; and metal ore roasting, refining, and processing are the largest point source categories on a world-wide basis. Given the global estimates noted above, U.S. anthropogenic mercury emissions are estimated to account for roughly 3 percent of the global total, and U.S. hazardous waste burning incinerators, kilns, and boilers are estimated to account for about 0.0045 percent of total global emissions.

Mercury exists in three forms: elemental mercury, inorganic mercury compounds (primarily mercuric chloride), and organic mercury compounds (primarily methylmercury). Mercury is usually released in an elemental form and later converted into methylmercury by bacteria. Methylmercury may be more toxic to humans than other forms of mercury, in part because it is more easily absorbed in the body.[313] If the deposition is directly to a water body, then the processes of aqueous fate, transport, and transformation begin. If deposition is to land, then terrestrial fate and transport processes occur first and then aqueous fate and transport processes occur once the mercury has cycled into a water body. In both cases, mercury may be returned to the atmosphere through resuspension. In water, mercury is transformed to methylmercury through biological processes and for exposures affected by this rulemaking. Methylmercury is considered to be the form of greatest concern. Once mercury has been transformed into methylmercury, it can be ingested by the lower trophic level organisms where it can bioaccumulate in fish tissue (*i.e.*, concentrations of mercury remain in the fish's system for a long period of time and accumulates in the fish tissue as predatory fish consume other species in the food chain). Fish and wildlife at the top of the food chain can, therefore, have mercury concentrations that are higher than the lower species, and they can have concentrations of mercury that are higher than the concentration found in the water body itself. In addition, when humans consume fish containing methylmercury, the ingested methylmercury is almost completely absorbed into the blood and distributed to all tissues (including the brain); it also readily passes through the placenta to the fetus and fetal brain.[314]

Based on the findings of the National Research Council, EPA has concluded that benefits of Hg reductions would be most apparent at the human consumption stage, as consumption of fish is the major source of exposure to methylmercury. At lower levels, documented Hg exposure effects may include more subtle, yet potentially important, neurodevelopmental effects.

Some subpopulations in the U.S., such as: Native Americans, Southeast Asian Americans, and lower income subsistence fishers, may rely on fish as a primary source of nutrition and/or for cultural practices. Therefore, they consume larger amounts of fish than the general population and may be at a greater risk to the adverse health effects from Hg due to increased exposure. In pregnant women, methylmercury can be passed on to the developing fetus, and at sufficient exposure may lead to a number of neurological disorders in children. Thus, children who are exposed to low concentrations of methylmercury prenatally may be at increased risk of poor performance on neurobehavioral tests, such as those measuring attention, fine motor function, language skills, visual-spatial abilities (like drawing), and verbal memory. The effects from prenatal exposure can occur even at doses that do not result in effects in the mother. Mercury may also affect young children who consume fish containing mercury. Consumption by children may lead to neurological disorders and developmental problems, which may lead to later economic consequences.

In response to potential risks of mercury-containing fish consumption, EPA and FDA have issued fish consumption advisories which provide recommended limits on consumption of certain fish species for different populations. EPA and FDA have developed a new joint advisory that was released in March 2004. This new FDA-EPA fish advisory recommends that women and young children reduce the risks of Hg consumption in their diet by moderating their fish consumption, diversifying the types of fish they consume, and by checking any local advisories that may exist for local rivers and streams. This collaborative FDA-EPA effort will greatly assist in

[313] *Regulatory Impact Analysis of the Final Industrial Boilers and Process Heaters NESHAP: Final Report*, February 2004.

[314] *Regulatory Impact Analysis of the Final Industrial Boilers and Process Heaters NESHAP: Final Report*, February 2004.

educating the most susceptible populations. Additionally, the reductions of Hg from this regulation may potentially lead to fewer fish consumption advisories (both from federal or state agencies), which will benefit the fishing community. Currently 44 states have issued fish consumption advisories for non-commercial fish for some or all of their waters due to contamination of mercury. The scope of FCA issued by states varies considerably, with some warnings applying to all water bodies in a state and others applying only to individual lakes and streams. Note that the absence of a state advisory does not necessarily indicate that there is no risk of exposure to unsafe levels of mercury in recreationally caught fish. Likewise, the presence of a state advisory does not indicate that there is a risk of exposure to unsafe levels of mercury in recreationally caught fish, unless people consume these fish at levels greater than those recommended by the fish advisory.

Reductions in methylmercury concentrations in fish should reduce exposure, subsequently reducing the risks of mercury-related health effects in the general population, to children, and to certain subpopulations. Fish consumption advisories (FCA) issued by the States may also help to reduce exposures to potential harmful levels of methylmercury in fish. To the extent that reductions in mercury emissions reduces the probability that a water body will have a FCA issued, there are a number of benefits that will result from fewer advisories, including increased fish consumption, increased fishing choices for recreational fishers, increased producer and consumer surplus for the commercial fish market, and increased welfare for subsistence fishing populations.

There is a great deal of variability among individuals in fish consumption rates; however, critical elements in estimating methylmercury exposure and risk from fish consumption include the species of fish consumed, the concentrations of methylmercury in the fish, the quantity of fish consumed, and how frequently the fish is consumed. The typical U.S. consumer eating a wide variety of fish from restaurants and grocery stores is not in danger of consuming harmful levels of methylmercury from fish and is not advised to limit fish consumption. Those who regularly and frequently consume large amounts of fish, either marine or freshwater, are more exposed. Because the developing fetus may be the most sensitive to the effects from methylmercury, women of child-bearing age are regarded as the population of greatest interest. The EPA, Food and Drug Administration, and many States have issued fish consumption advisories to inform this population of protective consumption levels.

The EPA's 1997 Mercury Study RTC supports a plausible link between anthropogenic releases of Hg from industrial and combustion sources in the U.S. and methylmercury in fish. However, these fish methylmercury concentrations also result from existing background concentrations of Hg (which may consist of Hg from natural sources, as well as Hg which has been re-emitted from the oceans or soils) and deposition from the global reservoir (which includes Hg emitted by other countries). Given the current scientific understanding of the environmental fate and transport of this element, it is not possible to quantify how much of the methylmercury in locally-caught fish consumed by the U.S. population is contributed by U.S. emissions relative to other sources of Hg (such as natural sources and re-emissions from the global pool). As a result, the relationship between Hg emission reductions from Phase I and Phase II sources assessed in this rule, and methylmercury concentrations in fish cannot be calculated in a quantitative manner with confidence. In addition, there is uncertainty regarding over what time period these changes would occur.

Given the present understanding of the Hg cycle, the flux of Hg from the atmosphere to land or water at one location is comprised of contributions from: the natural global cycle; the cycle perturbed by human activities; regional sources; and local sources. Recent advances allow for a general understanding of the global Hg cycle and the impact of the anthropogenic sources. It is more difficult to make accurate generalizations of the fluxes on a regional or local scale due to the site-specific nature of emission and deposition processes. Similarly, it is difficult to quantify how the water deposition of Hg leads to an increase in fish tissue levels. This will vary based on the specific characteristics of the individual lake, stream, or ocean.

Total Chlorine—We were not able to quantify the benefits associated with reductions in total chlorine emissions. Total chlorine is a combination of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas. The replacement standards proposed today are expected to reduce total chlorine emissions by 2,638 tons. Hydrogen chloride is corrosive to the eyes, skin, and mucous membranes. Acute inhalation can cause eye, nose, and respiratory tract irritation and inflamation, and pulmonary edema. Chronic occupational inhalation has been reported to cause gastritis, bronchitis, and dermatitis in workers. Long term exposure can also cause dental discoloration and erosion. No information is available on the reproductive or developmental effects in humans. Chlorine gas inhalation can cause bronchitis, asthma and swelling of the lungs, headaches, heart disease, and meningitis. Acute exposure causes more severe respiratory and lung effects, and can result in fatalities in extreme cases. No information is available on the reproductive or developmental effects in humans. The proposed replacement standards are expected to reduce chlorine exposure for people in close proximity to hazardous waste combustion facilities, and are therefore likely to reduce the risk of all associated health effects.

Ecological Benefits—We examined ecological benefits through a comparison of the 1999 *Assessment* and the proposed replacement standards. Ecological benefits in the 1999 *Assessment* were based on reductions of approximately 100 tons per year in dioxin/furans and selected metals. Lead was the only pollutant of concern for aquatic ecosystems, while mercury appeared to be of greatest concern for terrestrial ecosystems. Dioxin/furan and lead emission reductions also provided some potential benefits for terrestrial ecosystems. The proposed replacement standards are expected to reduce dioxin/furan and selected metal emissions by about 15 to 20 percent of the 1999 estimate. The proposed replacement standards will produce fewer incremental benefits than those estimated for the 1999 *Assessment* (and later, for the 2002 Interim Standards). However, the 1999 *Assessment* did not estimate the ecological benefits of MACT standards for industrial boilers and industrial furnaces. These systems were excluded from the universe in 1999 but are part of the universe addressed by the proposed replacement standards. As a result, while the total ecological benefits of the proposed rule are likely to be modest, areas near facilities with boilers may enjoy more significant ecological benefits under the proposed replacement standards than areas near facilities that have already complied with the 2002 Interim standards.

Mercury, lead, and chlorides are among the HAPs that can cause damage to the health and visual appearance of

plants.[315] While the total value of forest health is difficult to estimate, visible deterioration in the health of forests and plants can cause a measurable change in recreation behavior. Several studies that measure the change in outdoor recreation behavior according to forest health are available to place a value on aesthetic degradation of forests.[316] Although these studies are available, additional research is needed to fully understand the effects of these HAPs on the forest ecosystem. Thus, these benefits are not quantified in this analysis.

Emissions that are sufficient to cause structural and aesthetic damage to vegetation are likely to affect growth as well. Little research has been done on the effects of compounds such as chlorine, heavy metals (as air pollutants), and PM on agricultural productivity.[317] Even though the potential for visible damage and production decline from metals and other pollutants suggests the proposed replacement standards could increase agricultural productivity, these changes cannot be quantified.

3. Waste Minimization Benefits

Facilities that burn hazardous waste and remain in operation following implementation of the replacement standards are expected to experience marginally increased costs as a result of the MACT standards. This will result in an incentive to pass these increased costs on to their customers in the form of higher combustion prices. In the 1999 Assessment we conducted a waste minimization analysis to inform the expected price change. The analysis concluded that the demand for combustion is relatively inelastic. While a variety of waste minimization alternatives are available for managing hazardous waste streams that are currently combusted, the costs of these alternatives generally exceed the cost of combustion. When the additional costs of compliance with the MACT standards are taken into account, waste minimization alternatives still tend to exceed the higher combustion costs. This inelasticity suggests that, in the short term, large reductions in waste quantities are not likely. However, over the longer term (*i.e.*, as production systems are updated), companies may continue to seek alternatives to expensive waste-management (*i.e.*, source reduction). To the extent that increases in combustion prices provide additional incentive to adopt more efficient processes, the proposed replacement standards may contribute to the longer term process based waste minimization efforts.

No waste minimization impacts are captured in our quantitative analysis of costs and benefits. A quantitative assessment of the benefits associated with waste minimization may result in double-counting of some of the benefits described earlier. For example, waste minimization may reduce emissions of hazardous air pollutants and therefore have a positive effect on public health. Furthermore, emission reductions beyond those necessary for compliance with the replacement standards are not addressed in the benefits assessment. In addition, waste minimization is likely to result in specific types of benefits not captured in this Assessment. For example, waste generators that engage in waste minimization may experience a reduction in their waste handling costs and could also reduce the risk related to waste spills and waste management. Finally, waste minimization procedures potentially stimulated by today's action, as proposed, may result in additional costs to facilities that implement these technologies. These have not been assessed in our analysis but are likely to at least partially offset corresponding benefits.

4. Conclusion

Total non-discounted monetized benefits are estimated to range from $$4.6 million/year to $10.3 million/year. It is important to emphasize that monetized benefits represent only a portion of the total benefits associated with this rule. A significant portion of the benefits are not monetized. Specifically, ecological benefits, and human health benefits associated with reductions in chlorine, mercury, and lead are not quantified or monetized. In some locations these benefits may be significant. In addition, specific sub-populations near combustion facilities, including children and minority populations, may be disproportionately affected by environmental risks and may therefore enjoy more significant benefits. For a complete discussion of the methodology, data, findings, and limitations associated with our benefits analysis the reader is encouraged to review the *Assessment* and *Addendum* documents, as identified under Part Five, Section I.

IX. How Does the Proposed Rule Meet the RCRA Protectiveness Mandate?

As discussed in more detail below, we believe today's proposed standards, based on evaluating estimated emissions from sources, are generally protective. We therefore propose that these standards apply in lieu of RCRA air emission standards in most instances.

A. Background

Section 3004(a) of RCRA requires the Agency to promulgate standards for hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities as necessary to protect human health and the environment. The standards for hazardous waste incinerators generally rest on this authority. In addition, section 3004(q) requires the Agency to promulgate standards for emissions from facilities that burn hazardous waste fuels (*e.g.*, cement and lightweight aggregate kilns, boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces) as necessary to protect human health and the environment. Using RCRA authority, the Agency has historically established emission (and other) standards for hazardous waste combustors that are either entirely risk-based (*e.g.*, site-specific standards for metals under the Boiler and Industrial Furnace rule), or are technology-based but determined by a generic risk assessment to be protective (*e.g.*, the DRE standard for incinerators and BIFs).

The MACT standards proposed today implement the technology-based regime of CAA section 112. There is, however, a residual risk component to air toxics standards. Section 112(f) of the Clean Air Act requires the Agency to impose, within eight years after promulgation of the technology-based standards promulgated under section 112(d) (*i.e.*, the authority for today's proposed standards), additional controls if needed to protect public health with an ample

[315] Although the primary pollutants which are detrimental to vegetation aesthetics and growth are tropospheric ozone, sulfur dioxide, and hydrogen fluoride, three pollutants which are not regulated in the MACT standards, some literature exists on the relationship between metal deposition and vegetation health. (Mercury Study Report to Congress Volume VI, 1997) (Several studies are cited in this report.)

[316] See, for example, Brown, T.C. *et al.* 1989, *Scenic Beauty and Recreation Value: Assessing the Relationship*, In J. Vining, ed., *Social Science and Natural Resources Recreation Management*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado; this work studies the relationship between forest characteristics and the value of recreational participation. Also see Peterson, D.G. *et al.* 1987, *Improving Accuracy and Reducing Cost of Environmental Benefit Assessments*. Draft Report to the U.S. EPA, by Energy and Resource Consultants, Boulder, Colorado; Walsh *et al.* 1990, Estimating the public benefits of protecting forest quality, *Journal of Forest Management*, 30:175–189., and Homes *et al.* 1992, *Economic Valuation of Spruce-Fir Decline in the Southern Appalachian Mountains: A comparison of Value Elicitation Methods*. Presented at the *Forestry and the Environment: Economic Perspectives Conference*, March 9–11, 1992 Jasper, Alberta, Canada for estimates of the WTP of visitors and residents to avoid forest damage.

[317] MacKenzie, James J., and Mohamed T. El-Ashry, *Air Pollution's Toll on Forests and Crops* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1989).

margin of safety or to prevent adverse environmental effect.

RCRA section 1006 directs that EPA "integrate all provisions of [RCRA] for purposes of administration and enforcement and . . . avoid duplication, to the maximum extent possible, with the appropriate provisions of the Clean Air Act. . . ." Thus, although considerations of risk are not ordinarily part of the MACT process, in order to avoid duplicative standards where possible, we have evaluated the protectiveness of the standards proposed today.

As noted above, under RCRA, EPA must promulgate standards "as may be necessary to protect human health and the environment." RCRA section 3004(a) and (q). Technology-based standards developed under CAA section 112 do not automatically satisfy this requirement, but may do so in fact. *See* 59 FR at 29776 (June 6, 1994) and 60 FR at 32593 (June 23, 1995) (RCRA regulation of secondary lead smelter emissions unnecessary at this time given stringency of technology-based standard and pendency of section 112(f) determination). If the MACT standards, as a factual matter, are sufficiently protective to also satisfy the RCRA mandate, then no independent RCRA standards are required. Conversely, if MACT standards are inadequate, the RCRA authorities would have to be used to fill the gap.

B. Assessment of Risks

The Agency has conducted an evaluation, for the purposes of satisfying the RCRA statutory mandates, of the degree of protection afforded by the MACT standards being proposed today. We have not conducted a comprehensive risk assessment for this proposal; however, a comprehensive risk assessment for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns was conducted for the 1999 MACT rule. For this proposed rule, we are instead comparing characteristics of the sources covered by the 1999 rule to the sources covered by the replacement rule that are related to risk (*e.g.*, emissions[318], stack characteristics, meteorology, and population). In the 1999 rule we concluded that the promulgated standards were sufficiently protective and the existing RCRA standards for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns need not be retained. Based on the results of statistical comparisons, we infer whether risks for incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces will be about the same, less than, or greater than the risks estimated for the 1999 rule. We think the comparative analysis lends additional support to our view regarding the protectiveness of the proposed standards.[319]

We believe today's proposed standards provide a substantial degree of protection to human health and the environment. We therefore do not believe that we need to retain the existing RCRA standards for boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces (just as we found that existing RCRA standards for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns were no longer needed after the 1999 rule). However, as previously discussed in more detail in Part Two, Section XVII.D, site-specific risk assessments may be warranted on an individual source basis to ensure that the MACT standards provide adequate protection in accordance with RCRA.

Part Five: Administrative Requirements

I. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review

Under Executive Order 12866 [58 FR 51735 (October 4, 1993)], the Agency must determine whether a regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to OMB review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines "significant regulatory action" as one that is likely to result in a rule that may:

(1) Have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities;

(2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;

(3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or

(4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.

Pursuant to the terms of Executive Order 12866, it has been determined that this rule is a "significant regulatory action" because this action may raise novel legal or policy issues due to the standards development methodology applied in development of the proposed replacement standards. As such, this action was submitted to OMB for review. Changes made in response to OMB suggestions or recommendations will be documented in the public record.

The aggregate annualized social costs for this rule are under $100 million (ranging from $41 to $50 million/yr). We have prepared an economic assessment in support of today's action. This document is entitled: *Assessment of the Potential Costs, Benefits, and Other Impacts of the Hazardous Waste Combustion MACT Replacement Standards—Proposed Rule,* March 2004. This *Assessment* is designed to adhere to analytical requirements established under Executive Order 12866, and corresponding Agency and OMB guidance; subject to data, analytical, and resource limitations. An Addendum entitled: *Addendum to the Assessment of the Potential Costs, Benefits, and Other Impacts of the Hazardous Waste Combustion MACT Replacement Standards—Proposed Rule,* March 2004, has also been prepared. This *Addendum* addresses belated changes made to the final proposed standards that were not captured in the *Assessment.* The RCRA docket established for today's rulemaking maintains a copy of the *Assessment* and *Addendum* documents for public review. Interested persons are encouraged to read both documents for a full understanding of the analytical methodology, findings, and limitations associated with this report. Comments and supporting data are encouraged and welcomed.

II. Paperwork Reduction Act

The information collection requirements in this proposed rule have been submitted for approval to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction

[318] We estimated emissions for each facility based on site-specific stack gas concentrations and flow rates measured during trial burn or compliance tests. For sources where stack gas measurements were unavailable, data were imputed by random selection from a pool of measurements for similar units. We assumed that sources would design their systems to meet an emission level below the proposed standard. (In the case of dioxin/furan for sources that would not be subject to a numerical emission standard, we assumed liquid boilers without dry air pollution control systems and solid fuel-fired boilers were emitting at their baseline emissions level as portrayed in the data base.) We called this the "design level." If available test data in our data base indicate that the source was emitting below the design level, we assumed that the source would continue to emit at the levels measured in test. For sources emitting above the design level of a standard, we assumed they would need to reduce emissions to the design level. In the 1999 rule, the design level was taken as 70% of the standard. For today's proposed standards, the design level is generally the lower of: (1) 70% of the standard; or (2) the arithmetic average of the emissions data of the best performing sources.

[319] See "Inferential Risk Analysis in Support of Standards for Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Hazardous Waste Combustors," prepared under contract to EPA by Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC.

Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* The Information Collection Request (ICR) document prepared by EPA has been assigned EPA ICR number 1773.07.

EPA is proposing today's regulations under section 112 of the CAA, to protect and enhance the quality of our nation's air resources, and to promote public health and welfare and the productive capacity of the population. *See* CAA section 101(b)(1). To this end, CAA sections 112(a) and (d) direct EPA to set standards for stationary sources emitting the hazardous air pollutants. The records and reports required by the information collection under this proposal will be used to show compliance with the requirements of the rule. EPA believes that if these minimum requirements specified under the regulations are not met, EPA will not fulfill its Congressional mandate to protect public health and the environment.

The information collection required under this ICR is mandatory for the regulated sources as it is essential to properly enforce the emission limitation requirements of the rule and will be used to further the proper performance of the functions of EPA. EPA has made extensive efforts to integrate the monitoring, compliance testing and recordkeeping requirements of the CAA and RCRA, so that the burden on the sources is kept to a minimum, and the facilities are able to avoid duplicate and unnecessary submissions. We also ensure, to the fullest extent of the law, the confidentiality of the submitted information.

The projected annual burden under today's proposal is estimated at 70,199 hours at a total cost of $5.1 millions. For the hour burden, we estimate a total of 2,612 responses from 243 respondents, or an average of 27 hours per response, or 289 hours per respondent. The cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information includes a total capital and start-up cost component, a total operation and maintenance component and a purchase of services component. The capital and start-up cost component is estimated at $36,184 annualized over its expected useful life, and the operation and maintenance component is estimated at $488,947 annualized over its expected useful life. The frequency of different responses varies and is monthly or annually for some and on occasion for others.

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

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for 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, including the use of automated collection techniques, EPA has established a public docket for this rule, which includes this ICR, under Docket ID number RCRA–2003–0016. Submit any comments related to the ICR for this proposed rule 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 April 20, 2004, a comment to OMB is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it by May 20, 2004. The final rule will respond to any OMB or public comments on the information collection requirements contained in this proposal.

III. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.* 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. This analysis must be completed unless the agency is able to certify that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions.

We have determined that hazardous waste combustion facilities are not owned by small entities (local governments, tribes, *etc.*) other than businesses. Therefore, only businesses were analyzed for small entity impacts. For the purposes of the impact analyses, small entity is defined either by the number of employees or by the dollar amount of sales. The level at which a business is considered small is determined for each North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) code by the Small Business Administration.

Affected individual waste combustors (incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, solid and liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces) will bear the impacts of today's rule. These units will incur direct economic impacts as a result of today's rule. Few of the hazardous waste combustion facilities affected by this proposed rule were found to be owned by small businesses, as defined by the Small Business Administration (SBA). From our universe of 150 facilities, we identified six facilities that are currently owned by small businesses. Three of these are liquid boilers, one is an on-site incinerator, one is a cement kiln, and one is an LWAK. Annualized economic impacts of the proposed replacement standards were found to range from 0.01 percent to 2.23 percent of gross annual corporate revenues. Economic impacts to five of the companies were found to be less than one percent, while the sixth company was found to experience potential impacts between one and 3 percent (2.23 percent). These findings reflect worst-case cost estimates under the Agency Preferred Approach. Actual economic impacts are likely to be less as market adjustments take effect (see appendix H of the Assessment and Assessment of Small Entity Impacts in the *Addendum*).

Based on the above findings we believe that one small company with potential impacts between one and 3 percent of gross revenues does not reflect a significant economic impact on a substantial number of potentially affected small entities. Therefore, after considering the economic impacts of today's proposed rule on small entities, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The reader is encouraged to review and comment on our regulatory flexibility screening analysis prepared in support of this determination: *Regulatory Flexibility Screening Analysis for the Proposed Hazardous Waste Combustion MACT Replacement Standards.* This

document is incorporated as Appendix H of the *Assessment* document.

IV. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Signed into law on March 22, 1995, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) calls on all federal agencies to provide a statement supporting the need to issue any regulation containing an unfunded federal mandate and describing prior consultation with representatives of affected state, local, and tribal governments.

Today's proposed rule is not subject to the requirements of sections 202, 204 and 205 of UMRA. In general, a rule is subject to the requirements of these sections if it contains "Federal mandates" that may result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more in any one year. Today's final rule does not result in $100 million or more in expenditures. The aggregate annualized social cost for today's rule is estimated to range from $41 to $50 million.

V. 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" is 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.

This proposed rule does not have federalism implications. It will not 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, as specified in the Order. The proposed rule focuses on requirements for facilities burning hazardous waste, without affecting the relationships between Federal and State governments. Thus, Executive Order 13132 does not apply to this rule. Although section 6 of Executive Order 13132 does not apply to this rule, EPA did include three State representatives on our Agency workgroup. These representatives participated in the development of this proposed rule. State officials were contacted concerning the methodology used in standards development.

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 proposed rule from State and local officials.

VI. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

Executive Order 13175 [320]: Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications." Our Agency workgroup for this rulemaking includes Tribal representation. We have determined that this rule, as proposed, does not have tribal implications, as specified in the Order. No Tribal governments are known to own or operate hazardous waste combustors subject to the requirements of this proposed rule.. Furthermore, this proposed rule focuses on requirements for all regulated sources without affecting the relationships between tribal governments in its implementation, and applies to all regulated sources, without distinction of the surrounding populations affected. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule. EPA specifically solicits additional comment on this proposed rule from tribal officials.

VII. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks

Executive Order 13045: "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR. 19885, April 23, 1997) applies to any rule that: (1) Is determined to be "economically significant" as defined under E.O. 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency. Today's final rule is not subject to the Executive Order because it is not economically significant as defined under point one of the Order, and because the Agency does not have reason to believe the environmental health or safety risks addressed by this action present a disproportionate risk to children.

[320] Executive Order 13084 is revoked by this Executive Order.

VIII. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355 (May 22, 2001)). This rule, as proposed will not seriously disrupt energy supply, distribution patterns, prices, imports or exports. Furthermore, this rule is not an economically significant action under Executive Order 12866.

IX. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 ("NTTAA"), Public Law 104–113, 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (*e.g.*, materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies. The NTTAA directs EPA to provide Congress, through OMB, explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

This proposed rulemaking involves environmental monitoring or measurement. Consistent with the Agency's Performance Based Measurement System ("PBMS"), EPA proposes not to require the use of specific, prescribed analytic methods. Rather, the Agency plans to allow the use of any method that meets the prescribed performance criteria. The PBMS approach is intended to be more flexible and cost-effective for the regulated community; it is also intended to encourage innovation in analytical technology and improved data quality. EPA is not precluding the use of any method, whether it constitutes a

voluntary consensus standard or not, as long as it meets the performance criteria specified.

EPA welcomes comments on this aspect of the proposed rulemaking and, specifically, invites the public to identify potentially-applicable voluntary consensus standards and to explain why such standards should be used in this regulation.

X. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations" (February 11, 1994) requires us to complete an analysis of today's rule with regard to equity considerations. The Order is designed to address the environmental and human health conditions of minority and low-income populations. This section briefly discusses potential impacts (direct or disproportional) today's rule may have in the area of environmental justice.

To comply with the Executive Order, we have assessed whether today's rule may have negative or disproportionate effects on minority or low-income populations. We have recently analyzed demographic data from the U.S. Census. Previously we examined data from two other reports: "Race, Ethnicity, and Poverty Status of the Populations Living Near Cement Plants in the United States" (EPA, August 1994) and "Race, Ethnicity, and Poverty Status of the Populations Living Near Hazardous Waste Incinerators in the United States" (EPA, October 1994). These reports examine the number of low-income and minority individuals living near a relatively large sample of cement kilns and hazardous waste incinerators and provide county, state, and national population percentages for various sub-populations. The demographic data in these reports provide several important findings when examined in conjunction with the risk reductions projected from today's rule.

We find that combustion facilities, in general, are not located in areas with disproportionately high minority and low-income populations. However, there is evidence that hazardous waste burning cement kilns are somewhat more likely to be located in areas that have relatively higher low-income populations. Furthermore, there are a small number of commercial hazardous waste incinerators located in highly urbanized areas where there is a disproportionately high concentration of minorities and low-income populations within one and five mile radii. The reduced emissions at these facilities due to today's rule could represent meaningful environmental and health improvements for these populations. Overall, today's rule should not result in any adverse or disproportional health or safety effects on minority or low-income populations. Any impacts on these populations are likely to be positive due to the reduction in emissions from combustion facilities near minority and low-income population groups. The *Assessment* document available in the RCRA docket established for today's rule presents the full Environmental Justice Analysis.

XI. Congressional Review

The Congressional Review Act (CRA), 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. Prior to publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**, we will submit all necessary information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States. Under the CRA, a major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. As proposed, this action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects

40 CFR Part 63

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hazardous substances, Incorporation by reference, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

40 CFR Part 264

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hazardous waste, Insurance, Packaging and containers, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Surety bonds.

40 CFR Part 265

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hazardous waste, Insurance, Packaging and containers, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

40 CFR Part 266

Environmental protection, Energy, Hazardous waste, Recycling, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

40 CFR Part 270

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Confidential business information, Hazardous materials transportation, Hazardous waste, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

40 CFR Part 271

Administrative practice and procedure, Hazardous materials transportation, Hazardous waste, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: March 31, 2004.

Michael O. Leavitt,

Administrator.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, title 40, chapter I, of the Code of Federal Regulations is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 63—NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS FOR SOURCE CATEGORIES

1. The authority citation for part 63 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

2. Section 63.1200 is amended by revising the introductory text and paragraph (a)(2) to read as follows:

§ 63.1200 Who is subject to these regulations?

The provisions of this subpart apply to all hazardous waste combustors: incinerators that burn hazardous waste, cement kilns that burn hazardous waste, lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste, solid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste, liquid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste. Hazardous waste combustors are also subject to applicable requirements under parts 260–270 of this chapter.

(a) * * *

(2) Both area sources and major sources subject to this subpart, but not previously subject to title V, are immediately subject to the requirement to apply for and obtain a title V permit in all States, and in areas covered by part 71 of this chapter.

* * * * *

3. Section 63.1201 is amended in paragraph (a) by revising the definition of "New source", and adding definitions for "Hydrochloric acid production furnace", "Liquid fuel-fired boiler", and "Solid fuel-fired boiler" in alphabetical order to read as follows:

§ 63.1201 Definitions and acronyms used in this subpart.

(a) * * *

Hydrochloric acid production furnace and *HCl production furnace* mean a halogen acid furnace defined in § 260.10 of this chapter that produces aqueous hydrochloric acid (HCl) product and that burns hazardous waste at any time.

* * * * *

Liquid fuel-fired boiler and *liquid boiler* mean a boiler defined in § 260.10 of this chapter that does not burn solid fuels and that burns hazardous waste at any time. Liquid fuel-fired boiler includes boilers that only burn gaseous fuels.

* * * * *

New source means any affected source the construction or reconstruction of which is commenced after the dates specified under §§ 63.1206(a)(1)(i)(B), (a)(1)(ii)(B), and (a)(2)(ii).

* * * * *

Solid fuel-fired boiler and *solid boiler* mean a boiler defined in § 260.10 of this chapter that burns a solid fuel and that burns hazardous waste at any time.

* * * * *

4. Section 63.1206 is amended by:

a. Revising paragraph (a).

b. Revising paragraphs (b)(1)(ii), (b)(6) introductory text, (b)(7)(i)(A), (b)(9)(i) introductory text, (b)(10)(i) introductory text, (b)(11), (b)(13)(i) introductory text, and (b)(3)(ii).

c. Revising paragraphs (c)(1)(i) introductory text and (c)(7)(ii) introductory text.

d. Adding paragraphs (c)(7)(ii)(C) and (c)(7)(iii).

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 63.1206 When and how must you comply with the standards and operating requirements?

(a) *Compliance dates.* (1) *Compliance dates for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns that burn hazardous waste*—(i) *Compliance date for standards under §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205*—(A) *Compliance dates for existing sources.* You must comply with the emission standards under §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205 and the other requirements of this subpart no later than the compliance date, September 30, 2003, unless the Administrator grants you an extension of time under § 63.6(i) or § 63.1213.

(B) *New or reconstructed sources.* (*1*) If you commenced construction or reconstruction of your hazardous waste combustor after April 19, 1996, you must comply with the emission standards under §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205 and the other requirements of this subpart by the later of September 30, 1999 or the date the source starts operations, except as provided by paragraph (a)(1)(i)(B)(*2*) of this section. The costs of retrofitting and replacement of equipment that is installed specifically to comply with this subpart, between April 19, 1996 and a source's compliance date, are not considered to be reconstruction costs.

(*2*) For a standard under §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205 that is more stringent than the standard proposed on April 19, 1996, you may achieve compliance no later than September 30, 2003 if you comply with the standard proposed on April 19, 1996 after September 30, 1999. This exception does not apply, however, to new or reconstructed area source hazardous waste combustors that become major sources after September 30, 1999. As provided by § 63.6(b)(7), such sources must comply with the standards under §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205 at startup.

(ii) *Compliance date for standards under §§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221*—(A) *Compliance dates for existing sources.* You must comply with the emission standards under §§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221 and the other requirements of this subpart no later than the compliance date, [date three years after date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**], unless the Administrator grants you an extension of time under § 63.6(i) or § 63.1213.

(B) *New or reconstructed sources.* (*1*) If you commenced construction or reconstruction of your hazardous waste combustor after April 20, 2004, you must comply with the emission standards under §§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221 and the other requirements of this subpart by the later of [date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**] or the date the source starts operations, except as provided by paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(B)(*2*) of this section. The costs of retrofitting and replacement of equipment that is installed specifically to comply with this subpart, between April 20, 2004, and a source's compliance date, are not considered to be reconstruction costs.

(*2*) For a standard under §§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221 that is more stringent than the standard proposed on April 20, 2004, you may achieve compliance no later than [date three years after date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**] if you comply with the standard proposed on April 20, 2004, after [date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**]. This exception does not apply, however, to new or reconstructed area source hazardous waste combustors that become major sources after [date three years after date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**]. As provided by § 63.6(b)(7), such sources must comply with the standards under §§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221 at startup.

(2) *Compliance dates for solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrogen chloride production furnaces that burn hazardous waste for standards under §§ 63.1216, 63.1217, and 63.1218.*—(i) *Compliance date for existing sources.* You must comply with the standards of this subpart no later than the compliance date, [date three years after date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**], unless the Administrator grants you an extension of time under § 63.6(i) or § 63.1213.

(ii) *New or reconstructed sources.* (A) If you commenced construction or reconstruction of your hazardous waste combustor after April 20, 2004, you must comply with this subpart by the later of [date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**] or the date the source starts operations, except as provided by paragraph (a)(2)(ii)(B) of this section. The costs of retrofitting and replacement of equipment that is installed specifically to comply with this subpart, between April 20, 2004, and a source's compliance date, are not considered to be reconstruction costs.

(B) For a standard in the subpart that is more stringent than the standard proposed on April 20, 2004, you may achieve compliance no later than [date three years after date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**] if you comply with the standard proposed on April 20, 2004, after [date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**]. This exception does not apply, however, to new or reconstructed area source hazardous waste combustors that become major sources after [date three years after date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**]. As provided by § 63.6(b)(7), such sources must comply with this subpart at startup.

(3) *Early compliance.* If you choose to comply with the emission standards of this subpart prior to the dates specified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(*2*) of this section, your compliance date is the earlier of the date you postmark the Notification of Compliance under § 63.1207(j)(1) or the dates specified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(*2*) of this section.

(b) * * *

(1) * * *

(ii) When hazardous waste is not in the combustion chamber (*i.e.*, the hazardous waste feed to the combustor has been cut off for a period of time not less than the hazardous waste residence

time) and you have documented in the operating record that you are complying with all otherwise applicable requirements and standards promulgated under authority of sections 112 (*e.g.*, subparts LLL, NNNNN, DDDDD) or 129 of the Clean Air Act in lieu of the emission standards under §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, 63.1205, 63.1215, 63.1216, 63.1217, 63.1218, 63.1219, and 63.1220; the monitoring and compliance standards of this section and §§ 63.1207 through 63.1209, except the modes of operation requirements of § 63.1209(q); and the notification, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements of §§ 63.1210 through 63.1212.

* * * * *

(6) *Compliance with the carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emission standards.* This paragraph applies to sources that elect to comply with the carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions standards of this subpart by documenting continuous compliance with the carbon monoxide standard using a continuous emissions monitoring system and documenting compliance with the hydrocarbon standard during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) performance test or its equivalent.

* * * * *

(7) * * * (i) * * *

(A) You must document compliance with the Destruction and Removal Efficiency (DRE) standard under this subpart only once provided that you do not modify the source after the DRE test in a manner that could affect the ability of the source to achieve the DRE standard.

* * * * *

(9) * * * (i) You may petition the Administrator to recommend alternative semivolatile metal, low volatile metal, mercury, or hydrogen chloride/chlorine gas emission standards under § 63.1205 if:

* * * * *

(10) * * * (i) You may petition the Administrator to recommend alternative semivolatile metal, low volatile metal, mercury, or hydrogen chloride/chlorine gas emission standards under § 63.1204 if:

* * * * *

(11) *Calculation of hazardous waste residence time.* You must calculate the hazardous waste residence time and include the calculation in the performance test plan under § 63.1207(f) and the operating record. You must also provide the hazardous waste residence time in the Documentation of Compliance under § 63.1211(d) and the Notification of Compliance under §§ 63.1207(j) and 63.1210(d).

* * * * *

(13) * * *

(i) Cement kilns that feed hazardous waste at a location other than the end where products are normally discharged and where fuels are normally fired must comply with the carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon standards of this subpart as follows:

* * * * *

(ii) Lightweight aggregate kilns that feed hazardous waste at a location other than the end where products are normally discharged and where fuels are normally fired must comply with the hydrocarbon standards of this subpart as follows:

(A) Existing sources must comply with the 20 parts per million by volume hydrocarbon standard of this subpart;

(B) New sources must comply with the 20 parts per million by volume hydrocarbon standard of this subpart.

* * * * *

(c) * * * (1) * * * (i) You must operate only under the operating requirements specified in the Documentation of Compliance under § 63.1211(d) or the Notification of Compliance under §§ 63.1207(j) and 63.1210(d), except:

* * * * *

(7) * * *

(ii) *Bag leak detection system requirements.* If your combustor is equipped with a baghouse (fabric filter), you must continuously operate a bag leak detection system that meets the specifications and requirements of paragraph (c)(7)(ii)(A) of this section and you must comply with the corrective measures requirements of paragraph (c)(7)(ii)(B) of this section.

* * * * *

(C) *Excessive exceedances notification.* If you operate the combustor when the detector response exceeds the alarm set-point more than 5 percent of the time during any 6-month block time period, you must submit a notification to the Administrator within 5 days that describes the causes of the exceedances and the revisions to the design, operation, or maintenance of the combustor or baghouse you are taking to minimize exceedances.

(iii) *Particulate matter detection system requirements for electrostatic precipitators and ionizing wet scrubbers.* If your combustor is equipped with an electrostatic precipitator or ionizing wet scrubber, and you elect not to establish under § 63.1209(m)(1)(iv) site-specific operating parameter limits that are linked to the automatic waste feed cutoff system under paragraph (c)(3) of this section, you must continuously operate a particulate matter detection system that meets the specifications and requirements of paragraph (c)(7)(iii)(A) of this section and you must comply with the corrective measures requirements of paragraph (c)(7)(iii)(B) of this section.

(A) *Particulate matter detection system requirements.*—(*1*) The particulate matter detection system must be certified by the manufacturer to be capable of continuously detecting and recording particulate matter emissions at the loadings you expect to achieve during the comprehensive performance test;

(*2*) The particulate matter detector shall provide output of relative or absolute particulate matter loadings;

(*3*) The particulate matter detection system shall be equipped with an alarm system that will sound an audible alarm when an increase in relative or absolute particulate loadings is detected over the set-point

(*4*) You must install and operate the particulate matter detection system in a manner consistent with available written guidance from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or, in the absence of such written guidance, the manufacturer's written specifications and recommendations for installation, operation, and adjustment of the system;

(*5*) You must establish the alarm set-point as the average detector response of the test run averages achieved during the comprehensive performance test demonstrating compliance with the particulate matter emission standard. You must comply with the alarm set-point on a 6-hour rolling average, updated each hour with a one-hour block average that is the average of the detector responses over each 15-minute block.

(*6*) Where multiple detectors are required to monitor multiple control devices, the system's instrumentation and alarm system may be shared among the detectors.

(B) *Particulate matter detection system corrective measures requirements.* The operating and maintenance plan required by paragraph (c)(7)(i) of this section must include a corrective measures plan that specifies the procedures you will follow in the case of a particulate matter detection system alarm. The corrective measures plan must include, at a minimum, the procedures used to determine and record the time and cause of the alarm as well as the corrective measures taken to correct the control device malfunction or minimize emissions as

specified below. Failure to initiate the corrective measures required by this paragraph is failure to ensure compliance with the emission standards in this subpart.

(*1*) You must initiate the procedures used to determine the cause of the alarm within 30 minutes of the time the alarm first sounds; and

(*2*) You must alleviate the cause of the alarm by taking the necessary corrective measure(s) which may include shutting down the combustor.

(C) *Excessive exceedances notification.* If you operate the combustor when the detector response exceeds the alarm set-point more than 5 percent of the time during any 6-month block time period, you must submit a notification to the Administrator within 5 days that describes the causes of the exceedances and the revisions to the design, operation, or maintenance of the combustor or electrostatic precipitator or ionizing wet scrubber you are taking to minimize exceedances.

5. Section 63.1207 is amended by:

a. Revising paragraph (b)(1).

b. Adding paragraph (b)(3).

c. Revising paragraph (c)(1).

d. Adding paragraph (c)(3).

e. Revising paragraphs (e)(2) and (e)(3)(iv).

f. Revising paragraphs (f)(1)(ii)(D), (f)(1)(xiii), and (f)(1)(xiv).

g. Adding paragraph (f)(1)(xv).

h. Revising paragraphs (j)(1)(ii) and (j)(3).

i. Revising paragraph (l)(1) introductory text.

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 63.1207 What are the performance testing requirements?

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) *Comprehensive performance test.* You must conduct comprehensive performance tests to demonstrate compliance with the emission standards provided by the subpart, establish limits for the operating parameters provided by § 63.1209, and demonstrate compliance with the performance specifications for continuous monitoring systems.

* * * * *

(3) *One-Time Dioxin/Furan Test for Boilers Not Subject to a Numerical Dioxin/Furan Standard.* For boilers that are not subject to a numerical dioxin/furan emission standard under §§ 63.1216 and 63.1217—solid fuel-fired boilers, and those liquid fuel-fired boilers that are not equipped with a dry particulate matter control device—you must conduct a one-time emission test for dioxin/furan under feed and operating conditions that are most likely to maximize dioxin/furan emissions, similar to a dioxin/furan compliance test.

(i) You must conduct the dioxin/furan emissions test no later than the deadline for conducting the initial comprehensive performance test.

(ii) You may use dioxin/furan emissions data from previous testing to meet this requirement, provided that:

(A) The testing was conducted under feed and operating conditions that are most likely to maximize dioxin/furan emissions, similar to a dioxin/furan compliance test;

(B) You have not changed the design or operation of the boiler in a manner that could significantly affect stack gas dioxin/furan emission concentrations; and

(C) The data meet quality assurance objectives that may be determined on a site-specific basis.

(iii) You may use dioxin/furan emissions data from a boiler to represent emissions from another on-site boiler in lieu of testing (*i.e.*, data in lieu of testing) if the design and operation, including fuels and hazardous waste feed, of the boilers are identical.

(iv) You must include the results of the one-time dioxin/furan emissions test with the results of the initial comprehensive performance test in the Notification of Compliance.

(v) You must repeat the dioxin/furan emissions test if you change the design or operation of the source in a manner that may increase dioxin/furan emissions.

(c) * * * (1) *Test date.* Except as provided by paragraphs (c)(2) and (c)(3) of this section, you must commence the initial comprehensive performance test not later than six months after the compliance date.

* * * * *

(3) For incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, you must commence the initial comprehensive performance test to demonstrate compliance with the standards under §§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221 not later than 12 months after the compliance date.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

(2) After the Administrator has approved the site-specific test plan and CMS performance evaluation test plan, but no later than 60 calendar days before initiation of the test, you must make the test plans available to the public for review. You must issue a public notice to all persons on your facility/public mailing list (developed pursuant to 40 CFR 70.7(h), 71.11(d)(3)(i)(E) and 124.10(c)(1)(ix)) announcing the approval of the test plans and the location where the test plans are available for review. The test plans must be accessible to the public for 60 calendar days, beginning on the date that you issue your public notice. The location must be unrestricted and provide access to the public during reasonable hours and provide a means for the public to obtain copies. The notification must include the following information at a minimum:

(i) The name and telephone number of the source's contact person;

(ii) The name and telephone number of the regulatory agency's contact person;

(iii) The location where the approved test plans and any necessary supporting documentation can be reviewed and copied;

(iv) The time period for which the test plans will be available for public review; and

(v) An expected time period for commencement and completion of the performance test and CMS performance evaluation test.

(3) * * *

(iv) *Public notice.* At the same time that you submit your petition to the Administrator, you must notify the public (*e.g.*, distribute a notice to the facility/public mailing list developed pursuant to 40 CFR 70.7(h), 71.11(d)(3)(i)(E) and 124.10(c)(1)(ix)) of your petition to waive a performance test. The notification must include all of the following information at a minimum:

(A) The name and telephone number of the source's contact person;

(B) The name and telephone number of the regulatory agency's contact person;

(C) The date the source submitted its site-specific performance test plan and CMS performance evaluation test plans; and

(D) The length of time requested for the waiver.

(f) * * *

(1) * * *

(ii) * * *

(D) The Administrator may approve on a case-by-case basis a hazardous waste feedstream analysis for organic hazardous air pollutants in lieu of the analysis required under paragraph (f)(1)(ii)(A) of this section if the reduced analysis is sufficient to ensure that the POHCs used to demonstrate compliance with the applicable DRE standards of this subpart continue to be representative of the organic hazardous air pollutants in your hazardous waste feedstreams;

* * * * *

(xiii) For cement kilns with in-line raw mills, if you elect to use the emissions averaging provision of this subpart, you must notify the Administrator of your intent in the initial (and subsequent) comprehensive performance test plan, and provide the information required by the emission averaging provision;

(xiv) For preheater or preheater/precalciner cement kilns with dual stacks, if you elect to use the emissions averaging provision of this subpart, you must notify the Administrator of your intent in the initial (and subsequent) comprehensive performance test plan, and provide the information required by the emission averaging provision;

(xv) If you request to use Method 23 for dioxin/furan you must provide the information required under § 63.1208(b)(1)(i)(B);

* * * * *

(j) * * * (1) * * *

(ii) Upon postmark of the Notification of Compliance, you must comply with all operating requirements specified in the Notification of Compliance in lieu of the limits specified in the Documentation of Compliance required under § 63.1211(d).

* * * * *

(3) See §§ 63.7(g), 63.9(h), and 63.1210(d) for additional requirements pertaining to the Notification of Compliance (*e.g.*, you must include results of performance tests in the Notification of Compliance).

* * * * *

(l) *Failure of performance test*—(1) *Comprehensive performance test.* The provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the initial comprehensive performance test if you conduct the test prior to your compliance date.

* * * * *

6. Section 63.1208 is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(1)(i) and (b)(5) to read as follows:

§ 63.1208 What are the test methods?

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) * * * (i) To determine compliance with the emission standard for dioxins and furans, you must use:

(A) Method 0023A, Sampling Method for Polychlorinated Dibenzp-p-Dioxins and Polychlorinated Dibenzofurans emissions from Stationary Sources, EPA Publication SW–846, as incorporated by reference in paragraph (a) of this section; or

(B) Method 23, provided in appendix A, part 60 of this chapter, except that for coal-fired boilers, sources equipped with an activated carbon injection system, and other sources that the Administrator determines may emit carbonaceous particulate matter that may bias Method 23 results, you may use Method 23 only upon the Administrator's approval. In determining whether to grant approval to use Method 23, the Administrator may consider factors including whether dioxin/furan are detected at levels substantially below the emission standard, and whether previous Method 0023 analyses detected low levels of dioxin/furan in the front half.

* * * * *

(5) *Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas*—(i) *Compliance with MACT standards.* To determine compliance with the emission standard for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas (combined), you must use:

(A) Method 26/26A as provided in appendix A, part 60 of this chapter; or

(B) Methods 320 or 321 as provided in appendix A, part 60 of this chapter, or ASTM D 6735–01, Test Method for Measurement of Gaseous Chlorides and Fluorides from Mineral Calcining Exhaust Sources—Impinger Method to measure emissions of hydrogen chloride, and Method 26/26A to measure emissions of chlorine gas.

(ii) *Compliance with risk-based limits under § 63.1215.* To demonstrate compliance with emission limits established under § 63.1215, you must use Methods 26/26A, 320,or 321, or ASTM D 6735–01, Test Method for Measurement of Gaseous Chlorides and Fluorides from Mineral Calcining Exhaust Sources—Impinger Method, except:

(A) For cement kilns and sources equipped with a dry acid gas scrubber, you must use Methods 320 or 321, or ASTM D 6735–01 to measure hydrogen chloride, and the back-half, caustic impingers of Method 26/26A to measure chlorine gas; and

(B) For incinerators, boilers, and lightweight aggregate kilns, you must use Methods 320 or 321, or ASTM D 6735–01 to measure hydrogen chloride, and Method 26/26A to measure total chlorine, and calculate chlorine gas by difference if:

(1) The bromine/chlorine ratio in feedstreams is greater than 5 percent; or

(2) The sulfur/chlorine ratio in feedstreams is greater than 50 percent.

* * * * *

7. Section 63.1209 is amended by:

a. Revising paragraphs (a)(1)(ii)(A), (a)(1)(iv)(D), and (a)(1)(v)(D).

b. Revising paragraph (f)(1).

c. Revising the heading of paragraph (g)(1) introductory text and paragraph (g)(1)(i).

d. Revising paragraphs (k)(1)(i) and (k)(2)(i).

e. Revising paragraph (l)(1).

f. Revising paragraph (m)(1)(iv) introductory text.

g. Revising paragraph (n)(2).

h. Revising paragraph (o)(1).

i. Revising paragraph (q)(1)(ii).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 63.1209 What are the monitoring requirements?

(a) * * * (1) * * *

(ii) * * *

(A) You must maintain and operate each COMS in accordance with the requirements of § 63.8(c) except for the requirements under § 63.8(c)(3). The requirements of § 63.1211(d) shall be complied with instead of § 63.8(c)(3); and

* * * * *

(iv) * * *

(D) To remain in compliance, all six-minute block averages must not exceed the opacity standard.

(v) * * *

(D) To remain in compliance, all six-minute block averages must not exceed the opacity standard.

* * * * *

(f) * * *

(1) *Section 63.8(c)(3).* The requirements of § 63.1211(d), that requires CMSs to be installed, calibrated, and operational on the compliance date, shall be complied with instead of § 63.8(c)(3).

* * * * *

(g) * * *

(1) *Requests to use alternatives to operating parameter monitoring requirements.* (i) You may submit an application to the Administrator or State with an approved Title V program under this paragraph for approval of alternative operating parameter monitoring requirements to document compliance with the emission standards of this subpart. For requests to use additional CEMS, however, you must use paragraph (a)(5) of this section and § 63.8(f).

* * * * *

(k) * * *

(1) * * * (i) For sources other than a lightweight aggregate kiln, if the combustor is equipped with an electrostatic precipitator, baghouse (fabric filter), or other dry emissions control device where particulate matter is suspended in contact with combustion gas, you must establish a limit on the maximum temperature of the gas at the inlet to the device on an hourly rolling average. You must establish the hourly rolling average limit as the average of the test run averages.

* * * * *

(2) * * * (i) For sources other than cement kilns, you must measure the

temperature of each combustion chamber at a location that best represents, as practicable, the bulk gas temperature in the combustion zone. You must document the temperature measurement location in the test plan you submit under §§ 63.1207(e) and (f);

* * * * *

(l) * * *

(1) *Feedrate of mercury.* (i) For incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, when complying with the mercury emission standards under §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205, and for solid fuel-fired boilers, you must establish a 12-hour rolling average limit for the total feedrate of mercury in all feedstreams as the average of the test run averages.

(ii) For incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, when complying with the mercury emission standards under §§ 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221, you must establish an annual rolling average limit for the total feedrate of mercury in all feedstreams as follows:

(A) You must calculate a mercury system removal efficiency for each test run as [1—mercury emission rate (g/s) / mercury feedrate (g/s)], and calculate the average system removal efficiency of the test run averages, except if your source is not equipped with a control system that consistently and reproducibly controls mercury emissions, you must assume zero system removal efficiency. If emissions exceed the mercury emission standard, it is not a violation because compliance with these mercury emission standards, which are derived from normal emissions data, is based on compliance with the mercury feedrate limit on an annual rolling average.

(B) You must calculate the annual average mercury feedrate limit as the mercury emission standard ($\mu g/m^3$) divided by the system removal efficiency. The feedrate limit is expressed as an emission concentration, μg mercury/m^3 of stack gas.

(C) You must comply with the emission concentration-based annual average mercury feedrate limit by measuring the mercury feedrate (g/s) and the stack gas flowrate (m^3/s) at least once a minute to calculate a 60-minute average emission concentration-based feedrate as [mercury feedrate (g/s) / gas flowrate (m^3/s)].

(D) You must calculate an annual rolling average mercury feedrate that is updated each hour.

(iii) For liquid fuel-fired boilers, you must establish an annual rolling average hazardous waste mercury thermal concentration limit, as follows:

(A) You must calculate a mercury system removal efficiency for each test run as [1—mercury emission rate (g/s) / mercury feedrate (g/s)], and calculate the average system removal efficiency of the test run averages, except if your source is not equipped with a control system that consistently and reproducibly controls mercury emissions, you must assume zero system removal efficiency. If emissions exceed the mercury emission standard, it is not a violation because compliance with the mercury emission standard, which is derived from normal emissions data, is based on compliance with the hazardous waste mercury thermal concentration limit on an annual rolling average.

(B) You must calculate the annual average hazardous waste mercury thermal concentration limit as the mercury emission standard (lb/MM Btu) divided by the system removal efficiency. The hazardous waste thermal concentration limit is expressed as: lb mercury in hazardous waste feedstreams per million Btu of hazardous waste.

(C) You must comply with the annual average hazardous waste mercury thermal concentration limit by measuring the feedrate of mercury in all hazardous waste feedstreams (lb/s) and the hazardous waste thermal feedrate (MM Btu/s) at least once a minute to calculate a 60-minute average thermal emission concentration as [hazardous waste mercury feedrate (g/s) / hazardous waste thermal feedrate (MM Btu/s)].

(D) You must calculate an annual rolling average hazardous waste mercury thermal concentration that is updated each hour.

(iv) *Extrapolation of feedrate levels.* (A) In lieu of establishing mercury feedrate limits as specified in paragraphs (l)(1)(i) through (iii) of this section, you may request as part of the performance test plan under §§ 63.6(b) and (c) and §§ 63.1207 (e) and (f) to use the mercury feedrates and associated emission rates during the comprehensive performance test to extrapolate to higher allowable feedrate limits and emission rates. The extrapolation methodology will be reviewed and approved, as warranted, by the Administrator. The review will consider in particular whether:

(*1*) Performance test metal feedrates are appropriate (*i.e.*, whether feedrates are at least at normal levels; depending on the heterogeneity of the waste, whether some level of spiking would be appropriate; and whether the physical form and species of spiked material is appropriate); and

(*2*) Whether the extrapolated feedrates you request are warranted considering historical metal feedrate data.

(B) The Administrator will review the performance test results in making a finding of compliance required by §§ 63.6(f)(3) and 63.1206(b)(3) to ensure that you have interpreted the performance test results properly and the extrapolation procedure is appropriate for your source.

* * * * *

(m) * * *

(1) * * *

(iv) *Other particulate matter control devices.* For each particulate matter control device that is not a fabric filter or high energy wet scrubber, or is not an electrostatic precipitator or ionizing wet scrubber for which you elect to monitor particulate matter loadings under § 63.1206(c)(7)(iii) of this chapter for process control, you must ensure that the control device is properly operated and maintained as required by § 63.1206(c)(7) and by monitoring the operation of the control device as follows:

* * * * *

(n) * * *

(2) *Maximum feedrate of semivolatile and low volatile metals*—(i) *General.* You must establish feedrate limits for semivolatile metals (cadmium and lead) and low volatile metals (arsenic, beryllium, and chromium) as follows, except as provided by paragraph (n)(2)(vii) of this section.

(ii) For incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, when complying with the emission standards under §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, 63.1205, and 63.1219 and for solid fuel-fired boilers, you must establish 12-hour rolling average limits for the total feedrate of semivolatile and low volatile metals in all feedstreams as the average of the test run averages and as specified in paragraph (n)(2)(iv) of this section.

(iii) For cement kilns, when complying with the emission standards under § 63.1220, you must establish 12-hour rolling average feedrate limits for semivolatile and low volatile metals as the thermal concentration of semivolatile metals or low volatile metals in all hazardous waste feedstreams. You must calculate hazardous waste thermal concentrations for semivolatile metals and low volatile metals for each run as the total mass feedrate of semivolatile metals or low volatile metals for all hazardous waste feedstreams divided by the total heat input rate for all hazardous waste feedstreams. The 12-hour rolling average feedrate limits for semivolatile metals and low volatile metals are the

average of the hazardous waste thermal concentrations for the runs.

(iv) *Lightweight aggregate kilns under § 63.1221*—(A) *Existing sources.* When complying with the emission standards under § 63.1221, you must establish semivolatile metal and low volatile metal feedrate limits as 12-hour rolling average feedrate limits and 12-hour rolling average hazardous waste thermal concentrations as specified in paragraphs (n)(2)(ii) and (iii). You must comply with both feedrate limits for semivolatile metals and low volatile metals.

(B) *New sources.* When complying with the emission standards under § 63.1221, you must establish semivolatile metal and low volatile metal feedrate limits as 12-hour rolling average hazardous waste thermal concentrations as specified in paragraphs (n)(2)(ii) and (iii).

(v) *Liquid fuel-fired boilers.* (A) For semivolatile metals, you must establish an annual rolling average hazardous waste thermal concentration limit, as follows:

(*1*) You must calculate a semivolatile metals system removal efficiency for each test run as [1—semivolatile metals emission rate (g/s) / semivolatile metals feedrate (g/s)], and calculate the average system removal efficiency of the test run averages, except if your source is not equipped with a control system that consistently and reproducibly controls semivolatile metals emissions, you must assume zero system removal efficiency. If emissions exceed the semivolatile metals emission standard, it is not a violation because compliance with the semivolatile metals emission standard, which is derived from normal emissions data, is based on compliance with the semivolatile metals hazardous waste thermal concentration limit on an annual rolling average.

(*2*) You must calculate the annual average hazardous waste semivolatile metals thermal concentration limit as the semivolatile metals emission standard (lb/MM Btu) divided by the system removal efficiency. The hazardous waste thermal concentration limit is expressed as: pounds semivolatile metals in hazardous waste feedstreams per million Btu of hazardous waste.

(*3*) You must comply with the annual average hazardous waste semivolatile metals thermal concentration limit by measuring the feedrate of semivolatile metals in all hazardous waste feedstreams (lb/s) and the hazardous waste thermal feedrate (MM Btu/s) at least once a minute to calculate a 60-minute average thermal emission concentration as [hazardous waste semivolatile metals feedrate (g/s) / hazardous waste thermal feedrate (MM Btu/s)].

(*4*) You must calculate an annual rolling average hazardous waste semivolatile metals thermal concentration that is updated each hour.

(B) For low volatile metals, you must establish 12-hour rolling average feedrate limits for chromium as the thermal concentration of chromium in all hazardous waste feedstreams. You must calculate a hazardous waste thermal concentration for chromium for each run as the total mass feedrate of chromium for all hazardous waste feedstreams divided by the total heat input rate for all hazardous waste feedstreams. The 12-hour rolling average feedrate limit for chromium is the average of the hazardous waste thermal concentrations for the runs.

(vi) *LVM limits for pumpable wastes.* You must establish separate feedrate limits for low volatile metals in pumpable feedstreams using the procedures prescribed above for total low volatile metals. Dual feedrate limits for both pumpable and total feedstreams are not required, however, if you base the total feedrate limit solely on the feedrate of pumpable feedstreams.

(vii) *Extrapolation of feedrate levels.* In lieu of establishing feedrate limits as specified in paragraphs (l)(1)(i) through (iii) of this section, you may request as part of the performance test plan under §§ 63.6(b) and (c) and 63.1207(e) and (f) to use the semivolatile metal and low volatile metal feedrates and associated emission rates during the comprehensive performance test to extrapolate to higher allowable feedrate limits and emission rates. The extrapolation methodology will be reviewed and approved, as warranted, by the Administrator. The review will consider in particular whether:

(A) Performance test metal feedrates are appropriate (*i.e.*, whether feedrates are at least at normal levels; depending on the heterogeneity of the waste, whether some level of spiking would be appropriate; and whether the physical form and species of spiked material is appropriate);

(B) Whether the extrapolated feedrates you request are warranted considering historical metal feedrate data; and

(C) Whether you have interpreted the performance test results properly and the extrapolation procedure is appropriate for your source.

* * * * *

(o) * * *

(1) *Feedrate of total chlorine and chloride*—(i) *Incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, solid fuel-fired boilers, and hydrochloric acid production furnaces.* You must establish 12-hour rolling average limit for the total feedrate of chlorine (organic and inorganic) in all feedstreams as the average of the test run averages.

(ii) *Liquid fuel-fired boilers.* You must establish a 12-hour rolling average limit for the feedrate of chlorine (organic and inorganic) as the thermal concentration of chlorine in all hazardous waste feedstreams. You must calculate a hazardous waste thermal concentration for chlorine for each run as the total mass feedrate of chlorine for all hazardous waste feedstreams divided by the total heat input rate for all hazardous waste feedstreams. The 12-hour rolling average feedrate limit chlorine is the average of the hazardous waste thermal concentrations for the runs.

* * * * *

(q) * * *

(1) * * *

(ii) You must specify (*e.g.*, by reference) the otherwise applicable requirements as a mode of operation in your Documentation of Compliance under § 63.1211(d), your Notification of Compliance under § 63.1207(j), and your title V permit application. These requirements include the otherwise applicable requirements governing emission standards, monitoring and compliance, and notification, reporting, and recordkeeping.

* * * * *

8. Section 63.1210 is amended by:

a. Revising the table in paragraph (a)(1) and the table in paragraph (a)(2).

b. Redesignating paragraph (b) as (d).

c. Adding new paragraph (b).

d. Adding new paragraph (c).

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 63.1210 What are the notification requirements?

(a) * * *

(1) * * *

Reference	Notification
63.9(b)	Initial notifications that you are subject to subpart EEE of this part.
63.9(d)	Notification that you are subject to special compliance requirements.

Reference	Notification
63.9(j)	Notification and documentation of any change in information already provided under § 63.9.
63.1206(b)(5)(i)	Notification of changes in design, operation, or maintenance.
63.1206(c)(7)(ii)(C)	Notification of excessive bag leak detection system exceedances.
63.1207(e), 63.9(e), 63.9(g)(1) and (3).	Notification of performance test and continuous monitoring system evaluation, including the performance test plan and CMS performance evaluation plan.[1]
63.1210(d), 63.1207(j), 63.1207(k), 63.1207(l), 63.9(h), 63.10(d)(2), 63.10(e)(2).	Notification of compliance, including results of performance tests and continuous monitoring system performance evaluations.

[1] You may also be required on a case-by-case basis to submit a feedstream analysis plan under § 63.1209(c)(3).

(2) * * *

Reference	Notification, request, petition, or application
63.9(i)	You may request an adjustment to time periods or postmark deadlines for submittal and review of required information.
63.10(e)(3)(ii)	You may request to reduce the frequency of excess emissions and CMS performance reports.
63.10(f)	You may request to waive recordkeeping or reporting requirements.
63.1204(d)(2)(iii), 63.1220(d)(2)(iii)	Notification that you elect to comply with the emission averaging requirements for cement kilns with in-line raw mills.
63.1204(e)(2)(iii), 63.1220(e)(2)(iii)	Notification that you elect to comply with the emission averaging requirements for preheater or preheater/precalciner kilns with dual stacks.
63.1206(b)(4), 63.1213, 63.6(i), 63.9(c).	You may request an extension of the compliance date for up to one year.
63.1206(b)(5)(i)(C)	You may request to burn hazardous waste for more than 720 hours and for purposes other than testing or pretesting after a making a change in the design or operation that could affect compliance with emission standards and prior to submitting a revised Notification of Compliance.
63.1206(b)(8)(iii)(B)	If you elect to conduct particulate matter CEMS correlation testing and wish to have federal particulate matter and opacity standards and associated operating limits waived during the testing, you must notify the Administrator by submitting the correlation test plan for review and approval.
63.1206(b)(8)(v)	You may request approval to have the particulate matter and opacity standards and associated operating limits and conditions waived for more than 96 hours for a correlation test.
63.1206(b)(9)	Owners and operators of lightweight aggregate kilns may request approval of alternative emission standards for mercury, semivolatile metal, low volatile metal, and hydrochloric acid/chlorine gas under certain conditions.
63.1206(b)(10)	Owners and operators of cement kilns may request approval of alternative emission standards for mercury, semivolatile metal, low volatile metal, and hydrochloric acid/chlorine gas under certain conditions.
63.1206(b)(14)	Owners and operators of incinerators may elect to comply with an alternative to the particulate matter standard.
63.1206(b)(15)	Owners and operators of cement and lightweight aggregate kilns may request to comply with the alternative to the interim standards for mercury.
63.1206(c)(2)(ii)(C)	You may request to make changes to the startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan.
63.1206(c)(5)(i)(C)	You may request an alternative means of control to provide control of combustion system leaks.
63.1206(c)(5)(i)(D)	You may request other techniques to prevent fugitive emissions without use of instantaneous pressure limits.
63.1207(c)(2)	You may request to base initial compliance on data in lieu of a comprehensive performance test.
63.1207(d)(3)	You may request more than 60 days to complete a performance test if additional time is needed for reasons beyond your control.
63.1207(e)(3), 63.7(h)	You may request a time extension if the Administrator fails to approve or deny your test plan.
63.1207(h)(2)	You may request to waive current operating parameter limits during pretesting for more than 720 hours.
63.1207(f)(1)(ii)(D)	You may request a reduced hazardous waste feedstream analysis for organic hazardous air pollutants if the reduced analysis continues to be representative of organic hazardous air pollutants in your hazardous waste feedstreams.
63.1207(g)(2)(v)	You may request to operate under a wider operating range for a parameter during confirmatory performance testing.
63.1207(i)	You may request up to a one-year time extension for conducting a performance test (other than the initial comprehensive performance test) to consolidate testing with other state or federally-required testing.
63.1207(j)(4)	You may request more than 90 days to submit a Notification of Compliance after completing a performance test if additional time is needed for reasons beyond your control.
63.1207(l)(3)	After failure of a performance test, you may request to burn hazardous waste for more than 720 hours and for purposes other than testing or pretesting.
63.1209(a)(5), 63.8(f)	You may request: (1) Approval of alternative monitoring methods for compliance with standards that are monitored with a CEMS; and (2) approval to use a CEMS in lieu of operating parameter limits.
63.1209(g)(1)	You may request approval of: (1) Alternatives to operating parameter monitoring requirements, except for standards that you must monitor with a continuous emission monitoring system (CEMS) and except for requests to use a CEMS in lieu of operating parameter limits; or (2) a waiver of an operating parameter limit.
63.1209(l)(1)	You may request to extrapolate mercury feedrate limits.
63.1209(n)(2)	You may request to extrapolate semivolatile and low volatile metal feedrate limits.
63.1211(e)	You may request to use data compression techniques to record data on a less frequent basis than required by § 63.1209.

(b) *Notification of intent to comply (NIC).* (1) You must prepare a Notification of Intent to Comply that includes all of the following information:

(i) General information:

(A) The name and address of the owner/operator and the source;

(B) Whether the source is a major or an area source;

(C) Waste minimization and emission control technique(s) being considered;

(D) Emission monitoring technique(s) you are considering;

(E) Waste minimization and emission control technique(s) effectiveness;

(F) A description of the evaluation criteria used or to be used to select waste minimization and/or emission control technique(s); and

(G) A general description of how you intend to comply with the emission standards of this subpart.

(ii) As applicable to each source, information on key activities and estimated dates for these activities that will bring the source into compliance with emission control requirements of this subpart. You must include all of the following key activities and dates in your NIC:

(A) The dates by which you will develop engineering designs for emission control systems or process changes for emissions;

(B) The date by which you will commit internal or external resources for installing emission control systems or making process changes for emission control, or the date by which you will issue orders for the purchase of component parts to accomplish emission control or process changes.

(C) The date by which you will submit construction applications;

(D) The date by which you will initiate on-site construction, installation of emission control equipment, or process change;

(E) The date by which you will complete on-site construction, installation of emission control equipment, or process change; and

(F) The date by which you will achieve final compliance. The individual dates and milestones listed in paragraphs (b)(1)(ii)(A) through (F) of this section as part of the NIC are not requirements and therefore are not enforceable deadlines; the requirements of paragraphs (b)(1)(ii)(A) through (F) of this section must be included as part of the NIC only to inform the public of your how you intend to comply with the emission standards of this subpart.

(iii) A summary of the public meeting required under paragraph (c) of this section;

(iv) If you intend to cease burning hazardous waste prior to or on the compliance date, you must include in your NIC a schedule of key dates for the steps to be taken to stop hazardous waste activity at your combustion unit. Key dates include the date for submittal of RCRA closure documents required under subpart G, part 264 of this chapter.

(2) You must make a draft of the NIC available for public review no later than 30 days prior to the public meeting required under paragraph (c)(1) of this section.

(3) You must submit the final NIC to the Administrator no later than one year following the effective date of the emission standards of this subpart.

(c) *NIC public meeting and notice.* (1) Prior to the submission of the NIC to the permitting agency, and no later than 10 months after the effective date of the emission standards of this subpart, you must hold at least one informal meeting with the public to discuss anticipated activities described in the draft NIC for achieving compliance with the emission standards of this subpart. You must post a sign-in sheet or otherwise provide a voluntary opportunity for attendees to provide their names and addresses;

(2) You must submit a summary of the meeting, along with the list of attendees and their addresses developed under paragraph (b)(1) of this section, and copies of any written comments or materials submitted at the meeting, to the Administrator as part of the final NIC, in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(iii) of this section;

(3) You must provide public notice of the NIC meeting at least 30 days prior to the meeting. You must provide public notice in all of the following forms:

(i) *Newspaper advertisement.* You must publish a notice in a newspaper of general circulation in the county or equivalent jurisdiction of your facility. In addition, you must publish the notice in newspapers of general circulation in adjacent counties or equivalent jurisdiction where such publication would be necessary to inform the affected public. You must publish the notice as a display advertisement.

(ii) *Visible and accessible sign.* You must post a notice on a clearly marked sign at or near the source. If you place the sign on the site of the hazardous waste combustor, the sign must be large enough to be readable from the nearest spot where the public would pass by the site.

(iii) *Broadcast media announcement.* You must broadcast a notice at least once on at least one local radio station or television station.

(iv) *Notice to the facility mailing list.* You must provide a copy of the notice to the facility mailing list in accordance with § 124.10(c)(1)(ix) of this chapter.

(4) You must include all of the following in the notices required under paragraph (c)(3) of this section:

(i) The date, time, and location of the meeting;

(ii) A brief description of the purpose of the meeting;

(iii) A brief description of the source and proposed operations, including the address or a map (*e.g.*, a sketched or copied street map) of the source location;

(iv) A statement encouraging people to contact the source at least 72 hours before the meeting if they need special access to participate in the meeting;

(v) A statement describing how the draft NIC (and final NIC, if requested) can be obtained; and

(vi) The name, address, and telephone number of a contact person for the NIC.

9. Section 63.1211 is amended by:

a. Revising the table in paragraph (b).

b. Redesignating paragraphs (c) and (d) as (d) and (e).

c. Adding new paragraph (c).

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 63.1211 What are the recordkeeping and reporting requirements?

* * * * *

(b) * * *

Reference	Document, data, or information
63.1200, 53.10 (b) and (c)	General. Information required to document and maintain compliance with the regulations of subpart EEE, including data recorded by continuous monitoring systems (CMS), and copies of all notifications, reports, plans, and other documents submitted to the Administrator.
63.1204(d)(1)(ii), 63.1220(d)(1)(ii) ..	Documentation of mode of operation changes for cement kilns with in-line raw mills.
63.1204(d)(2)(ii), 63.1220(d)(2)(ii) ..	Documentation of compliance with the emission averaging requirements for cement kilns with in-line raw mills.
63.1204(e)(2)(ii), 63.1220(e)(2)(ii) ..	Documentation of compliance with the emission averaging requirements for preheater or preheater/precalciner kilns with dual stacks.

Reference	Document, data, or information
63.1206(b)(1)(ii)	If you elect to comply with all applicable requirements and standards promulgated under authority of the Clean Air Act, including sections 112 and 129, in lieu of the requirements of subpart EEE when not burning hazardous waste, you must document in the operating record that you are in compliance with those requirements.
63.1206(b)(5)(ii)	Documentation that a change will not adversely affect compliance with the emission standards or operating requirements.
63.1206(b)(11)	Calculation of hazardous waste residence time.
63.1206(c)(2)	Startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan.
63.1206(c)(2)(v)(A)	Documentation of your investigation and evaluation of excessive exceedances during malfunctions.
63.1206(c)(3)(v)	Corrective measures for any automatic waste feed cutoff that results in an exceedance of an emission standard or operating parameter limit.
63.1206(c)(3)(vii)	Documentation and results of the automatic waste feed cutoff operability testing.
63.1206(c)(4)(ii)	Emergency safety vent operating plan.
63.1206(c)(4)(iii)	Corrective measures for any emergency safety vent opening.
63.1206(c)(5)(ii)	Method used for control of combustion system leaks.
63.1206(c)(6)	Operator training and certification program.
63.1206(c)(7)(i)(D)	Operation and maintenance plan.
63.1209(c)(2)	Feedstream analysis plan.
63.1209(k)(6)(iii), 63.1209(k)(7)(ii), 63.1209(k)(9)(ii), 63.1209(o)(4)(iii).	Documentation that a substitute activated carbon, dioxin/furan formation reaction inhibitor, or dry scrubber sorbent will provide the same level of control as the original material.
63.1209(k)(7)(i)(C)	Results of carbon bed performance monitoring.
63.1209(q)	Documentation of changes in modes of operation.
63.1211(d)	Documentation of compliance.

(c) *Compliance progress reports associated with the notification of intent to comply*—(1) *General.* Not later than two years following the effective date of the emission standards of this subpart, you must comply with the following, unless you comply with paragraph (c)(2)(ii) of this section:

(i) Develop engineering design for any physical modifications to the source needed to comply with the emission standards of this subpart;

(ii) Submit applicable construction applications to the Administrator; and

(iii) Document an internal or external commitment of resources, *i.e.*, funds or personnel, to purchase, fabricate, and install any equipment, devices, and ancillary structures needed to comply with the emission standards and operating requirements of this subpart.

(2) *Progress report.* (i) You must submit to the Administrator a progress report not later than two years following the effective date of the emission standards of this subpart, which contains information documenting that you have met the requirements of paragraph (c)(1) of this section and updates the information you previously provided in your NIC. This information will be used by the Administrator to determine if you have made adequate progress towards compliance with the emission standards of this subpart. In any evaluation of adequate progress, the Administrator may consider any delays in a source's progress caused by the time required to obtain necessary permits (*e.g.*, operating and construction permits or licenses) from governmental regulatory agencies when the sources have submitted timely and complete permit applications.

(ii) If you can comply with the emission standards and operating requirements of this subpart, without undertaking any of the activities described in paragraph (c)(1) of this section, you must submit a progress report documenting either:

(A) That you, at the time of the progress report, are in compliance with the emission standards and operating requirements; or

(B) The steps you will take to comply, without undertaking any of the activities listed in paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(iii) of this section.

(3) *Schedule.* (i) You must include in the progress report a detailed schedule that lists key dates for all projects that will bring the source into compliance with the emission standards and operating requirements of this subpart for the time period between submission of the progress report and the compliance date of the emission standards and operating requirements of this subpart.

(ii) The schedule must contain anticipated or actual dates for all of the following:

(A) Bid and award dates, as necessary, for construction contracts and equipment supply contractors;

(B) Milestones such as ground breaking, completion of drawings and specifications, equipment deliveries, intermediate construction completions, and testing;

(C) The dates on which applications will be submitted for operating and construction permits or licenses;

(D) The dates by which approvals of any operating and construction permits or licenses are anticipated; and

(E) The projected date by which you expect to comply with the emission standards and operating requirements of this subpart.

(4) *Sources that intend to cease burning hazardous waste prior to or on the compliance date.* (i) If you indicated in your NIC your intent to cease burning hazardous waste and do so prior to submitting a progress report, you are exempt from the requirements of paragraphs (c)(1) through (c)(3) of this section. However, you must submit and include in your progress report the date on which you stopped burning hazardous waste and the date(s) you submitted, or plan to submit RCRA closure documents.

(ii) If you signify in the progress report, submitted not later than two years following the effective date of the emission standards of this subpart, your intention to cease burning hazardous waste, you must stop burning hazardous waste on or before the compliance date of the emission standards of this subpart.

* * * * *

10. Section 63.1212 is added to subpart EEE to read as follows:

§ 63.1212 What are the other requirements pertaining to the NIC and associated progress report?

(a) *Certification of intent to comply.* (1) The Notice of Intent to Comply (NIC) and Progress Report must contain the following certification signed and dated by an authorized representative of the source: "I certify under penalty of law that I have personally examined and am

familiar with the information submitted in this document and all attachments and that, based on my inquiry of those individuals immediately responsible for obtaining the information, I believe that the information is true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment".

(2) An authorized representative should be a responsible corporate officer (for a corporation), a general partner (for a partnership), the proprietor (of a sole proprietorship), or a principal executive officer or ranking elected official (for a municipality, State, Federal, or other public agency).

(b) *Sources that begin burning hazardous waste after the effective date of the emission standards of this subpart.* (1) If you begin to burn hazardous waste after the effective date of the emission standards of this subpart, but prior to nine months after the effective date of the emission standards of this subpart, you must comply with the requirements of §§ 63.1206(a)(2), 63.1210(b) and (c), 63.1211(c), and paragraph (a) of this section, and associated time frames for public meetings and document submittals.

(2) If you intend to begin burning hazardous waste more than nine months after the effective date of the emission standards of this subpart, you must comply with the requirements of §§ 63.1206(a)(2), 63.1210(b) and (c), 63.1211(c), and paragraph (a) of this section prior to burning hazardous waste. In addition:

(i) You must make a draft NIC available to the public, notice the public meeting, conduct a public meeting, and submit a final NIC prior to burning hazardous waste; and

(ii) You must submit your progress report at the time you submit your final NIC.

11. Section 63.1214 is amended by revising paragraphs (c)(1), (c)(2), (c)(3), and (c)(4) to read as follows:

§ 63.1214 Implementation and enforcement.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(1) Approval of alternatives to requirements in §§ 63.1200, 63.1203, 63.1204, 63.1205, 63.1206(a), 63.1215, 63.1216, 63.1217, 63.1218, 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221.

(2) Approval of major alternatives to test methods under §§ 63.7(e)(2)(ii) and (f), 63.1208(b), and 63.1209(a)(1), as defined in § 63.90, and as required in this subpart.

(3) Approval of major alternatives to monitoring under §§ 63.8(f) and 63.1209(a)(5), as defined in § 63.90, and as required in this subpart.

(4) Approval of major alternatives to recordkeeping and reporting under §§ 63.10(f) and 63.1211(a) through (d), as defined in § 63.90, and as required in this subpart.

12. Section § 63.1215 is added to subpart EEE to read as follows:

§ 63.1215 What are the alternative risk-based standards for total chlorine?

(a) *General.* You may establish and comply with site-specific, risk-based emission limits for total chlorine under the procedures prescribed in this section. You may comply with these risk-based emission limits in lieu of the emission standards for total chlorine provided under §§ 63.1216, 63.1217, 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221 of this chapter after review and approval by the permitting authority. To identify and comply with the limits, you must:

(1) Identify hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emission rates for each on-site hazardous waste combustor. You may select hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emission rates as you choose to demonstrate eligibility for the total chlorine standards under this section, except as provided by paragraph (b)(4) of this section;

(2) Perform an eligibility demonstration to determine if your HCl-equivalent emission rate limits meet the national exposure standards, as prescribed by paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section;

(3) Submit your eligibility demonstration for review and approval, as prescribed by paragraph (d) of this section;

(4) Demonstrate compliance with the HCl-equivalent emission rate limits, as prescribed by the testing and monitoring requirements under paragraph (e) of this section; and

(5) Comply with the requirements for changes, as prescribed by paragraph (f) of this section.

(b) *HCl-equivalent emission rates.* (1) You must establish a total chlorine limit for each hazardous waste combustor as an HCl-equivalent emission rate.

(2) You must calculate the toxicity-weighted HCl-equivalent emission rate for each combustor as follows:

$$ER_{tw} = \Sigma(ER_i \times (RfC_{HCl}/RfC_i))$$

Where:

ER_{tw} is the HCl-equivalent emission rate, lb/hr

ER_i is the emission rate of HAP i in lbs/hr

RfC_i is the reference concentration of HAP i

RfC_{HCl} is the reference concentration of HCl

(3) You must use the RfC values for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas found at *http://epa.gov/ttn/atw/toxsource/sumnmary.html.*

(4) The hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emission rates you use to calculate the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns must not result in total chlorine emission concentrations exceeding the standards provided by §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205.

(c) *Eligibility demonstration*—(1) *General.* You must perform an eligibility demonstration to determine whether your selected hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emission rates meet the national exposure standards using either a look-up table analysis prescribed by paragraph (c)(3) of this section, or a site-specific compliance demonstration prescribed by paragraph (c)(4) of this section.

(2) *Definition of eligibility.* Your facility is eligible for the alternative risk-based standards for total chlorine if either:

(i) The sum of the calculated HCl-equivalent emission rates for all on-site hazardous waste combustors is below the appropriate value in the look-up table; or

(ii) Your site-specific compliance demonstration indicates that your maximum Hazard Index for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions from all on-site hazardous waste combustors at a location where people live is less than or equal to 1.0, rounded to the nearest tenths decimal place (0.1).

(3) *Look-up table analysis.* (i) The look-up table is provided as Table 1 to this section.

(ii) To determine the correct HCl-equivalent emission rate value from the look-up table, you must use the average stack height for your hazardous waste combustors (*i.e.*, the mean of the stack height of all on-site hazardous waste combustors) and the minimum distance between any hazardous waste combustor stack and the property boundary.

(iii) If one or both of these values for stack height and distance to nearest property boundary do not match the exact values in the look-up table, you would use the next lowest table value.

(iv) You are not eligible for the look-up table analysis if your facility is located in complex terrain.

(v) If the sum of the calculated HCl-equivalent emission rates for all on-site hazardous waste combustors is below the appropriate value in the look-up

table, the emission limit for total chlorine for each combustor is the HCl-equivalent emission rate you calculated.

(4) *Site-specific compliance demonstration.* (i) You may use any scientifically-accepted peer-reviewed risk assessment methodology for your site-specific compliance demonstration. An example of one approach for performing the demonstration for air toxics can be found in the EPA's "Air Toxics Risk Assessment Reference Library, Volume 2, Site-Specific Risk Assessment Technical Resource Document," which may be obtained through the EPA's Air Toxics Web site at *http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw.*

(ii) Your facility is eligible for the alternative risk-based total chlorine emission limit if your site-specific compliance demonstration shows that the maximum Hazard Index for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions from each on-site hazardous waste combustor is less than or equal to 1.0 rounded to the nearest tenths decimal place (0.1).

(iii) At a minimum, your site-specific compliance demonstration must:

(A) Estimate long-term inhalation exposures through the estimation of annual or multi-year average ambient concentrations;

(B) Estimate the inhalation exposure for the actual individual most exposed to the facility's emissions from hazardous waste combustors;

(C) Use site-specific, quality-assured data wherever possible;

(D) Use health-protective default assumptions wherever site-specific data are not available, and;

(E) Contain adequate documentation of the data and methods used for the assessment so that it is transparent and can be reproduced by an experienced risk assessor and emissions measurement expert.

(iv) Your site-specific compliance demonstration need not:

(A) Assume any attenuation of exposure concentrations due to the penetration of outdoor pollutants into indoor exposure areas;

(B) Assume any reaction or deposition of the emitted pollutants during transport from the emission point to the point of exposure.

(v) If your site-specific compliance demonstration documents that the maximum Hazard Index for hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions from your hazardous waste combustors is less than or equal to 1.0, you would establish a maximum HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for each combustor based on the hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emission rates used in this site-specific compliance demonstration.

(d) *Review and approval of eligibility demonstrations*—(1) *Content of the eligibility demonstration*—(i) *General.* The eligibility demonstration must include the following information, at a minimum:

(A) Identification of each hazardous waste combustor combustion gas emission point (*e.g.*, generally, the flue gas stack);

(B) The maximum capacity at which each combustor will operate, and the maximum rated capacity for each combustor, using the metric of stack gas volume emitted per unit of time, as well as any other metric that is appropriate for the combustor (*e.g.*, million Btu/hr heat input for boilers; tons of dry raw material feed/hour for cement kilns);

(C) Stack parameters for each combustor, including, but not limited to stack height, stack area, stack gas temperature, and stack gas exit velocity;

(D) Plot plan showing all stack emission points, nearby residences, and property boundary line;

(E) Identification of any stack gas control devices used to reduce emissions from each combustor;

(F) Identification of the RfC values used to calculate the HCl-equivalent emissions rate;

(G) Calculations used to determine the HCl-equivalent emission rate;

(H) For incinerators, cement kilns, and lightweight aggregate kilns, calculations used to determine that the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for each combustor does not exceed the standards for total chlorine at §§ 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205; and

(I) The HCl-equivalent emission rate limit for each hazardous waste combustor that you will certify in the Documentation of Compliance required under § 63.1211(d) that you will not exceed, and the limits on the operating parameters specified under § 63.1209(o) that you will establish in the Documentation of Compliance.

(ii) *Additional content of look-up table demonstration.* If you use the look-up table analysis, your eligibility demonstration must also contain, at a minimum, the following:

(A) Calculations used to determine the average stack height of on-site hazardous waste combustors;

(B) Identification of the combustor stack with the minimum distance to the property boundary of the facility; and

(C) Comparison of the values in the look-up table to your maximum HCl-equivalent emission rate.

(iii) *Additional content of a site-specific compliance demonstration.* If you use a site-specific compliance demonstration, your eligibility demonstration must also contain, at a minimum, the following:

(A) Identification of the risk assessment methodology used;

(B) Documentation of the fate and transport model used;

(C) Documentation of the fate and transport model inputs, including the stack parameters listed in paragraph (d)(1)(i)(C) of this section converted to the dimensions required for the model;

(D) As applicable:

(*1*) Meteorological data;

(*2*) Building, land use, and terrain data;

(*3*) Receptor locations and population data; and

(*4*) Other facility-specific parameters input into the model;

(E) Documentation of the fate and transport model outputs;

(F) Documentation of any exposure assessment and risk characterization calculations; and,

(G) Documentation of the predicted Hazard Index for HCl-equivalents and comparison to the limit of less than 1.0.

(2) *Review and approval*—(i) *Existing sources.* (A) If you operate an existing source, you must be in compliance with the emission standards on the compliance date. If you elect to comply with the alternative risk-based emission rate limit for total chlorine, you must have completed the eligibility demonstration and received approval from your delegated permitting authority by the compliance date.

(B) You must submit the eligibility demonstration to your permitting authority for review and approval not later than 12 months prior to the compliance date. You must submit a separate copy of the eligibility demonstration to: U.S. EPA, Risk and Exposure Assessment Group, Emission Standards Division (C404–01), Attn: Group Leader, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711.

(C) Your permitting authority will notify you of approval or intent to disapprove your eligibility demonstration within 6 months after receipt of the original demonstration, and within 3 months after receipt of any supplemental information that you submit. A notice of intent to disapprove your eligibility demonstration will identify incomplete or inaccurate information or noncompliance with prescribed procedures and specify how much time you will have to submit additional information.

(D) If your permitting authority has not approved your eligibility demonstration to comply with a risk-based HCl-equivalent emission rate(s) by the compliance date, you must comply with the MACT emission

standards for total chlorine gas under §§ 63.1216, 63.1217, 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221 of this chapter.

(ii) *New sources. General.* (A) If you operate a source that is not an existing source and that becomes subject to subpart EEE, you must comply with the MACT emission standards for total chlorine unless and until your eligibility demonstration has been approved by the permitting authority.

(B) If you operate a new or reconstructed source that starts up before the effective date of the emission standards proposed today, or a solid fuel-fired boiler or liquid fuel-fired boiler that is an area source that increases its emissions or its potential to emit such that it becomes a major source of HAP before the effective date of §§ 63.1216 and 63.1217, you would be required to comply with the emission standards under §§ 63.1216 and 63.1217 until your eligibility demonstration is approved by your permitting authority.

(C) If you operate a new or reconstructed source that starts up after the effective date of the emission standards proposed today, or a solid fuel-fired boiler or liquid fuel-fired boiler that is an area source that increases its emissions or its potential to emit such that it becomes a major source of HAP after the effective date of §§ 63.1216 and 63.1217, you would be required to comply with the emission standards under §§ 63.1216 and 63.1217 until your eligibility demonstration is approved by your permitting authority.

(e) *Testing and monitoring requirements*—(1) *General.* You must document compliance during the comprehensive performance test under § 63.1207 with the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit established in an approved eligibility demonstration for each hazardous waste combustor.

(2) *Test methods.* (i) If you operate a cement kiln or a combustor equipped with a dry acid gas scrubber, you must should use EPA Method 320/321 or ASTM D 6735–01, or an equivalent method, to measure hydrogen chloride, and the back-half (caustic impingers) of Method 26/26A, or an equivalent method, to measure chlorine gas.

(ii) If you operate an incinerator, boiler, or lightweight aggregate kiln, you must use EPA Method 320/321 or ASTM D 6735–01, or an equivalent method, to measure hydrogen chloride, and Method 26/26A, or an equivalent method, to measure total chlorine, and calculate chlorine gas by difference if:

(A) The bromine/chlorine ratio in feedstreams is greater than 5 percent; or

(B) The sulfur/chlorine ratio in feedstreams is greater than 50 percent.

(3) *Operating parameter limits.* (i) You must establish limits on the same operating parameters that apply to sources complying with the MACT standard for total chlorine under § 63.1209(o), except that feedrate limits on total chlorine and chloride must be established as specified under paragraph (e)(3)(ii) of this section.

(ii) *Annual rolling average feedrate.* You must establish an annual rolling average feedrate limit for total chlorine and chloride as the average of the test run averages during the comprehensive performance test.

(A) To document compliance with the feedrate limit, you must know the total chlorine and chloride concentration of feedstreams at all times and continuously monitor the flowrate of all feedstreams.

(B) You must measure the flowrate of each feedstream at least once each minute and update the annual rolling average hourly based on the average of the 60 previous 1-minute measurements.

(f) *Changes*—(1) *Changes over which you have control.* (i) Changes in design, operation, or maintenance of a hazardous waste combustor that may affect the rate of emissions of HCl-equivalents from the combustor are subject to the requirements of § 63.1206(b)(5).

(ii) If you change the information documented in the demonstration of eligibility for the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit and which is used to establish the HCl-equivalent emission rate limit, you are subject to the following requirements:

(A) *Changes that would decrease the allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit.* If you plan to make a change that would decrease the allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit documented in your eligibility demonstration, you must comply with § 63.1206(b)(5)(i)(A)–(C);

(B) *Changes that would not decrease the allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit.* (1) If you determine that a change would not decrease the allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit documented in your eligibility demonstration, you must document the change in the operating record upon making such change.

(*2*) If the change would increase your allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit and you elect to establish a higher HCl-equivalent limit, you must submit a revised eligibility demonstration for review and approval. Upon approval of the revised eligibility demonstration, you must comply with § 63.1206(b)(5)(i)(A)(*2*), (B), and (C).

(2) *Changes over which you do not have control.* (i) You must review the documentation you use in your eligibility demonstration every five years on the anniversary of the comprehensive performance test and submit for review and approval with the comprehensive performance test plan either a certification that the information used in your eligibility demonstration has not changed in a manner that would decrease the allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit, or a revised eligibility demonstration for a revised HCl-equivalent emission rate limit.

(ii) If you determine that you cannot demonstrate compliance with a lower allowable HCl-equivalent emission rate limit during the comprehensive performance test because you cannot complete changes to the design or operation of the source prior to the test, you may request that the permitting authority grant you additional time as necessary to make those changes, not to exceed three years.

TABLE 1. TO § 63.1215.—ALLOWABLE TOXICITY-WEIGHTED EMISSION RATE EXPRESSED IN HCL EQUIVALENTS (LB/HR)

Stack ht (m)	Distance to property boundary (m)					
	10	30	50	100	200	500
2	0.0244	0.0322	0.0338	0.0627	0.173	0.766
5	0.0475	0.0612	0.0881	0.168	0.309	0.881
10	0.165	0.187	0.216	0.336	0.637	1.59
20	0.661	1.01	1.01	1.2	1.87	4.31
35	2.02	2.02	4.04	4.11	5.08	10.4
50	4.11	4.11	4.11	9.74	10.8	18.0

13. Section 63.1216 and an undesignated center heading are added to subpart EEE to read as follows:

Emissions Standards and Operating Limits for Solid Fuel-Fired Boilers, Liquid Fuel-Fired Boilers, and Hydrochloric Acid Production Furnaces

§ 63.1216 What are the standards for solid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste?

(a) *Emission limits for existing sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1) For dioxin and furan, either carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon emissions in excess of the limits provided by paragraph (a)(5) of this section;

(2) Mercury in excess of 10 ug/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(3) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, cadmium and lead in excess of 170 ug/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(4) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, arsenic, beryllium, and chromium in excess of 210 ug/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(5) For carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, either:

(i) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (a)(5)(ii) of this section, you must also document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 10 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(ii) Hydrocarbons in excess of 10 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(6) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas in excess of 440 parts per million by volume, combined emissions, expressed as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent, dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and

(7) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, particulate matter in excess of 68 mg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(b) *Emission limits for new sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1) For dioxin and furan, either carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon emissions in excess of the limits provided by paragraph (b)(5) of this section;

(2) Mercury in excess of 10 µg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(3) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, cadmium and lead in excess of 170 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(4) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, arsenic, beryllium, and chromium in excess of 190 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(5) For carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, either:

(i) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (b)(5)(ii) of this section, you must also document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by §§ 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 10 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(ii) Hydrocarbons in excess of 10 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(6) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas in excess of 73 parts per million by volume, combined emissions, expressed as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent, dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and

(7) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, particulate matter in excess of 34 mg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(c) *Destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) standard*—(1) *99.99% DRE.* Except as provided in paragraph (c)(2) of this section, you must achieve a DRE of 99.99% for each principle organic hazardous constituent (POHC) designated under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must calculate DRE for each POHC from the following equation:

$$DRE = [1 - (Wout / Win)] \times 100\%$$

Where:

Win = mass feedrate of one POHC in a waste feedstream; and

Wout = mass emission rate of the same POHC present in exhaust emissions prior to release to the atmosphere.

(2) *99.9999% DRE.* If you burn the dioxin-listed hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027 (see § 261.31 of this chapter), you must achieve a DRE of 99.9999% for each POHC that you designate under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must demonstrate this DRE performance on POHCs that are more difficult to incinerate than tetra-, penta-, and hexachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins and dibenzofurans. You must use the equation in paragraph (c)(1) of this section to calculate DRE for each POHC. In addition, you must notify the Administrator of your intent to incinerate hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027.

(3) *Principal organic hazardous constituents (POHCs).* (i) You must treat the POHCs in the waste feed that you specify under paragraph (c)(3)(ii) of this section to the extent required by paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of this section.

(ii) You must specify one or more POHCs from the list of hazardous air pollutants established by 42 U.S.C. 7412(b)(1), excluding caprolactam (CAS number 105602) as provided by § 63.60, for each waste to be burned. You must base this specification on the degree of difficulty of incineration of the organic constituents in the waste and on their concentration or mass in the waste feed, considering the results of waste analyses or other data and information.

(d) *Significant figures.* The emission limits provided by paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section are presented with two significant figures. Although you must perform intermediate calculations using at least three significant figures, you may round the resultant emission levels to two significant figures to document compliance.

14. Section 63.1217 is added to subpart EEE to read as follows:

§ 63.1217 What are the standards for liquid fuel-fired boilers that burn hazardous waste?

(a) *Emission limits for existing sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1)(i) Dioxin and furan in excess of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen for incinerators equipped with either a waste heat boiler or dry air pollution control system; or

(ii) Either carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon emissions in excess of the limits provided by paragraph (a)(5) of this section for sources not equipped with either a waste heat boiler or dry air pollution control system;

(iii) A source equipped a wet air pollution control system followed by a dry air pollution control system is not considered to be a dry air pollution control system, and a source equipped with a dry air pollution control system followed a wet air pollution control system is considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this emission limit;

(2) Mercury in excess of 3.7×10^{-6} lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste;

(3) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, in excess of 1.1×10^{-5} lbs combined emissions of cadmium and lead attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste;

(4) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, in excess of 1.1×10^{-4} lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste;

(5) For carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, either:

(i) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (a)(5)(ii) of this section, you must also document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 10 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(ii) Hydrocarbons in excess of 10 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(6) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, in excess of 2.5×0^{-2} lbs combined emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste; and

(7) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2 or as provided by paragraph (e)(2) of this section, particulate matter in excess of 59 mg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(b) *Emission limits for new sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1)(i) Dioxin and furan in excess of 0.015 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen for incinerators equipped with either a waste heat boiler or dry air pollution control system; or

(ii) Either carbon monoxide or hydrocarbon emissions in excess of the limits provided by paragraph (a)(5) of this section for sources not equipped with either a waste heat boiler or dry air pollution control system;

(iii) A source equipped a wet air pollution control system followed by a dry air pollution control system is not considered to be a dry air pollution control system, and a source equipped with a dry air pollution control system followed a wet air pollution control system is considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this emission limit;

(2) In excess of 3.8×10^{-7} lbs mercury emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste;

(3) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, in excess of 4.3×10^{-6} lbs combined emissions of cadmium and lead attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste;

(4) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, in excess of 3.6×10^{-5} lbs chromium emissions attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste;

(5) For carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, either:

(i) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (a)(5)(ii) of this section, you must also document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 10 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(ii) Hydrocarbons in excess of 10 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(6) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2, in excess of 7.2×10^{-4} lbs combined emissions of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste; and

(7) Except for an area source as defined in § 63.2 or as provided in paragraph (e)(3) of this section, particulate matter in excess of 9.8 mg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(c) *Destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) standard*—(1) *99.99% DRE.* Except as provided in paragraph (c)(2) of this section, you must achieve a DRE of 99.99% for each principle organic hazardous constituent (POHC) designated under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must calculate DRE for each POHC from the following equation:

$$DRE = [1 - (Wout / Win)] \times 100\%$$

Where:

Win = mass feedrate of one POHC in a waste feedstream; and

Wout = mass emission rate of the same POHC present in exhaust emissions prior to release to the atmosphere.

(2) *99.9999% DRE.* If you burn the dioxin-listed hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027 (see § 261.31 of this chapter), you must achieve a DRE of 99.9999% for each POHC that you designate under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must demonstrate this DRE performance on POHCs that are more difficult to incinerate than tetra-, penta-, and hexachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins and dibenzofurans. You must use the equation in paragraph (c)(1) of this section to calculate DRE for each POHC. In addition, you must notify the Administrator of your intent to incinerate hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027.

(3) *Principal organic hazardous constituents (POHCs).* (i) You must treat the POHCs in the waste feed that you specify under paragraph (c)(3)(ii) of this section to the extent required by paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of this section.

(ii) You must specify one or more POHCs from the list of hazardous air

pollutants established by 42 U.S.C. 7412(b)(1), excluding caprolactam (CAS number 105602) as provided by § 63.60, for each waste to be burned. You must base this specification on the degree of difficulty of incineration of the organic constituents in the waste and on their concentration or mass in the waste feed, considering the results of waste analyses or other data and information.

(d) *Significant figures.* The emission limits provided by paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section are presented with two significant figures. Although you must perform intermediate calculations using at least three significant figures, you may round the resultant emission levels to two significant figures to document compliance.

(e) *Alternative to the particulate matter standard for liquid fuel-fired boilers.* (1) *General.* In lieu of complying with the applicable particulate matter standards of paragraphs (a)(7) and (b)(7) of this section, you may elect to comply with the following alternative metal emission control requirements:

(2) *Alternative metal emission control requirements for existing sources.* (i) You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain in excess of 1.1×10^{-5} lbs combined emissions of cadmium, lead, and selenium attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste, corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and,

(ii) You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain in excess of 7.7×10^{-5} lbs combined emissions of antimony, arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, manganese, and nickel attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste, corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(3) *Alternative metal emission control requirements for new sources.* (i) You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain in excess of 4.3×10^{-6} lbs combined emissions of cadmium, lead, and selenium attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste, corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and,

(ii) You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain in excess of 3.6×10^{-5} lbs combined emissions of antimony, arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, manganese, and nickel attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste, corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

15. Section 63.1218 is added to subpart EEE to read as follows:

§ 63.1218 What are the standards for hydrochloric acid production furnaces that burn hazardous waste?

(a) *Emission limits for existing sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1) Dioxin and furan emissions in excess of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(2) For mercury, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions in excess of the levels provided by paragraph (a)(6) of this section;

(3) For lead and cadmium, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions in excess of the levels provided by paragraph (a)(6) of this section;

(4) For arsenic, beryllium, and chromium, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions in excess of the levels provided by paragraph (a)(6) of this section;

(5) For carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, either:

(i) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (a)(5)(ii) of this section, you must also document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 10 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(ii) Hydrocarbons in excess of 10 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(6) For hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, either:

(i) Emission in excess of 14 parts per million by volume, combined emissions, expressed as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$ equivalent, dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen; or

(ii) Emissions greater than the levels that would be emitted if the source is achieving a system removal efficiency (SRE) of less than 99.9927 percent for total chlorine and chloride fed to the combustor. You must calculate SRE from the following equation:

$$SRE = [1 - (Cl_{out} / Cl_{in})] \times 100\%$$

Where:

Cl_{in} = mass feedrate of total chlorine or chloride in all feedstreams, reported as chloride; and

Cl_{out} = mass emission rate of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, reported as chloride, in exhaust emissions prior to release to the atmosphere.

(7) For particulate matter, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions in excess of the levels provided by paragraph (a)(6) of this section.

(b) *Emission limits for new sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1) Dioxin and furan emissions in excess of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(2) For mercury, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions in excess of the levels provided by paragraph (a)(6) of this section;

(3) For lead and cadmium, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions in excess of the levels provided by paragraph (a)(6) of this section;

(4) For arsenic, beryllium, and chromium, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions in excess of the levels provided by paragraph (a)(6) of this section;

(5) For carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, either:

(i) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (b)(5)(ii) of this section, you must also document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 10 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(ii) Hydrocarbons in excess of 10 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(6) For hydrochloric acid and chlorine gas, either:

(i) Emission in excess of 1.2 parts per million by volume, combined emissions, expressed as a chloride

($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent, dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen; or

(ii) Emissions greater than the levels that would be emitted if the source is achieving a system removal efficiency (SRE) of less than 99.99937 percent for total chlorine and chloride fed to the combustor. You must calculate SRE from the following equation:

$$SRE = [1 - (Cl_{out} / Cl_{in})] \times 100\%$$

Where:

Cl_{in} = mass feedrate of total chlorine or chloride in all feedstreams, reported as chloride; and

Cl_{out} = mass emission rate of hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, reported as chloride, in exhaust emissions prior to release to the atmosphere.

(7) For particulate matter, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas emissions in excess of the levels provided by paragraph (a)(6) of this section.

(c) *Destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) standard*—(1) *99.99% DRE.* Except as provided in paragraph (c)(2) of this section, you must achieve a DRE of 99.99% for each principle organic hazardous constituent (POHC) designated under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must calculate DRE for each POHC from the following equation:

$$DRE = [1 - (W_{out} / W_{in})] \times 100\%$$

Where:

W_{in} = mass feedrate of one POHC in a waste feedstream; and

W_{out} = mass emission rate of the same POHC present in exhaust emissions prior to release to the atmosphere.

(2) *99.9999% DRE.* If you burn the dioxin-listed hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027 (see § 261.31 of this chapter), you must achieve a DRE of 99.9999% for each POHC that you designate under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must demonstrate this DRE performance on POHCs that are more difficult to incinerate than tetra-, penta-, and hexachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins and dibenzofurans. You must use the equation in paragraph (c)(1) of this section to calculate DRE for each POHC. In addition, you must notify the Administrator of your intent to incinerate hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027.

(3) *Principal organic hazardous constituents (POHCs).* (i) You must treat the POHCs in the waste feed that you specify under paragraph (c)(3)(ii) of this section to the extent required by paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of this section.

(ii) You must specify one or more POHCs from the list of hazardous air pollutants established by 42 U.S.C. 7412(b)(1), excluding caprolactam (CAS number 105602) as provided by § 63.60, for each waste to be burned. You must base this specification on the degree of difficulty of incineration of the organic constituents in the waste and on their concentration or mass in the waste feed, considering the results of waste analyses or other data and information.

(d) *Significant figures.* The emission limits provided by paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section are presented with two significant figures. Although you must perform intermediate calculations using at least three significant figures, you may round the resultant emission levels to two significant figures to document compliance.

16. Section 63.1219 and a new undesignated center heading are added to subpart EEE to read as follows:

Replacement Emissions Standards and Operating Limits for Incinerators, Cement Kilns, and Lightweight Aggregate Kilns

§ 63.1219 What are the replacement standards for hazardous waste incinerators?

(a) *Emission limits for existing sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1)(i) Dioxin and furan in excess of 0.28 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen for incinerators equipped with either a waste heat boiler or dry air pollution control system; or

(ii) Dioxin and furan in excess of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen for sources not equipped with either a waste heat boiler or dry air pollution control system;

(iii) A source equipped a wet air pollution control system followed by a dry air pollution control system is not considered to be a dry air pollution control system, and a source equipped with a dry air pollution control system followed a wet air pollution control system is considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this emission limit;

(2) Mercury in excess of 130 µg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(3) Cadmium and lead in excess of 59 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(4) Arsenic, beryllium, and chromium in excess of 84 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(5) For carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, either:

(i) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (a)(5)(ii) of this section, you must also document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 10 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(ii) Hydrocarbons in excess of 10 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(6) Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas (total chlorine) in excess of 1.5 parts per million by volume, combined emissions, expressed as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent, dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and

(7) Except as provided by paragraph (e)(2) of this section, particulate matter in excess of 34 mg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(b) *Emission limits for new sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1)(i) Dioxin and furans in excess of 0.11 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen for incinerators equipped with either a waste heat boiler or dry air pollution control system; or

(ii) Dioxin and furans in excess of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen for sources not equipped with either a waste heat boiler or dry air pollution control system;

(iii) A source equipped a wet air pollution control system followed by a dry air pollution control system is not considered to be a dry air pollution control system, and a source equipped with a dry air pollution control system followed a wet air pollution control system is considered to be a dry air pollution control system for purposes of this standard;

(2) Mercury in excess of 8 µg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(3) Cadmium and lead in excess of 6.5 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(4) Arsenic, beryllium, and chromium in excess of 8.9 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(5) For carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, either:

(i) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an

hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (b)(5)(ii) of this section, you must also document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 10 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(ii) Hydrocarbons in excess of 10 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(6) Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas in excess of 0.18 parts per million by volume, combined emissions, expressed as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent, dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and

(7) Except as provided by paragraph (e)(3) of this section, particulate matter in excess of 1.6 mg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(c) *Destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) standard*—(1) *99.99% DRE.* Except as provided in paragraph (c)(2) of this section, you must achieve a destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) of 99.99% for each principle organic hazardous constituent (POHC) designated under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must calculate DRE for each POHC from the following equation:

$$DRE = [1 - (W_{out} / W_{in})] \times 100\%$$

Where:

W_{in} = mass feedrate of one POHC in a waste feedstream; and

W_{out} = mass emission rate of the same POHC present in exhaust emissions prior to release to the atmosphere.

(2) *99.9999% DRE.* If you burn the dioxin-listed hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027 (see § 261.31 of this chapter), you must achieve a DRE of 99.9999% for each POHC that you designate under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must demonstrate this DRE performance on POHCs that are more difficult to incinerate than tetra-, penta-, and hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans. You must use the equation in paragraph (c)(1) of this section to calculate DRE for each POHC. In addition, you must notify the Administrator of your intent to incinerate hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027.

(3) *Principal organic hazardous constituent (POHC).* (i) You must treat each POHC in the waste feed that you specify under paragraph (c)(3)(ii) of this section to the extent required by paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of this section.

(ii) You must specify one or more POHCs from the list of hazardous air pollutants established by 42 U.S.C. 7412(b)(1), excluding caprolactam (CAS number 105602) as provided by § 63.60, for each waste to be burned. You must base this specification on the degree of difficulty of incineration of the organic constituents in the waste and on their concentration or mass in the waste feed, considering the results of waste analyses or other data and information.

(d) *Significant figures.* The emission limits provided by paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section are presented with two significant figures. Although you must perform intermediate calculations using at least three significant figures, you may round the resultant emission levels to two significant figures to document compliance.

(e) *Alternative to the particulate matter standard for incinerators*—(1) *General.* In lieu of complying with the applicable particulate matter standards of paragraphs (a)(7) and (b)(7) of this section, you may elect to comply with the following alternative metal emission control requirements:

(2) *Alternative metal emission control requirements for existing sources.* (i) You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain cadmium, lead, and selenium in excess of 59 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and,

(ii) You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain antimony, arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, manganese, and nickel in excess of 84 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(3) *Alternative metal emission control requirements for new sources.* (i) You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain cadmium, lead, and selenium in excess of 6.5/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and,

(ii) You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain antimony, arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, manganese, and nickel in excess of 8.9 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

17. Section 63.1220 is added to subpart EEE to read as follows:

§ 63.1220 What are the replacement standards for hazardous waste burning cement kilns?

(a) *Emission limits for existing sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1)(i) Dioxin and furan in excess of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen; or

(ii) Dioxin and furan in excess of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen provided that the combustion gas temperature at the inlet to the initial dry particulate matter control device is 400°F or lower based on the average of the test run average temperatures;

(2) Mercury in excess of 64 µg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(3) In excess of 4.0×10^{-4} lbs combined emissions of cadmium and lead attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste;

(4) In excess of 1.4×10^{-5} lbs combined emissions of arsenic, beryllium, and chromium attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste;

(5) *Carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons.* (i) For kilns equipped with a by-pass duct or midkiln gas sampling system, either:

(A) Carbon monoxide in the by-pass duct or mid-kiln gas sampling system in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (a)(5)(i)(B) of this section, you must also document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons in the by-pass duct or mid-kiln gas sampling system do not exceed 10 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(B) Hydrocarbons in the by-pass duct or midkiln gas sampling system in excess of 10 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7

percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(ii) For kilns not equipped with a by-pass duct or midkiln gas sampling system, either:

(A) Hydrocarbons in the main stack in excess of 20 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(B) Carbon monoxide in the main stack in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (a)(5)(ii)(A) of this section, you also must document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons in the main stack do not exceed 20 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane.

(6) Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas in excess of 110 parts per million by volume, combined emissions, expressed as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent, dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and

(7) Particulate matter in excess of 65 mg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(b) *Emission limits for new sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1)(i) Dioxin and furan in excess of 0.20 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen; or

(ii) Dioxin and furan in excess of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen provided that the combustion gas temperature at the inlet to the initial dry particulate matter control device is 400°F or lower based on the average of the test run average temperatures;

(2) Mercury in excess of 35 µg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(3) In excess of 6.2×10^{-5} lbs combined emissions of cadmium and lead attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste;

(4) In excess of 1.4×10^{-5} lbs combined emissions of arsenic, beryllium, and chromium attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste;

(5) *Carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons.* (i) For kilns equipped with a by-pass duct or midkiln gas sampling system, carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons emissions are limited in both the bypass duct or midkiln gas sampling system and the main stack as follows:

(A) Emissions in the by-pass or midkiln gas sampling system are limited to either:

(*1*) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (b)(5)(i)(A)(*2*) of this section, you also must document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 10 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(*2*) Hydrocarbons in the by-pass duct or midkiln gas sampling system in excess of 10 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; and

(B) Hydrocarbons in the main stack are limited, if construction of the kiln commenced after April 19, 1996 at a plant site where a cement kiln (whether burning hazardous waste or not) did not previously exist, to 50 parts per million by volume, over a 30-day block average (monitored continuously with a continuous monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane.

(ii) For kilns not equipped with a by-pass duct or midkiln gas sampling system, hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide are limited in the main stack to either:

(A) Hydrocarbons not exceeding 20 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(B)(*1*) Carbon monoxide not exceeding 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and

(*2*) Hydrocarbons not exceeding 20 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane at any time during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7); and

(*3*) If construction of the kiln commenced after April 19, 1996 at a plant site where a cement kiln (whether burning hazardous waste or not) did not previously exist, hydrocarbons are limited to 50 parts per million by volume, over a 30-day block average (monitored continuously with a continuous monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane.

(6) Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas in excess of 78 parts per million, combined emissions, expressed as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent, dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and

(7) Particulate matter in excess of 13 mg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(c) *Destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) standard*—(1) *99.99% DRE.* Except as provided in paragraph (c)(2) of this section, you must achieve a destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) of 99.99% for each principle organic hazardous constituent (POHC) designated under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must calculate DRE for each POHC from the following equation:

$$DRE = [1 - (W_{out} / W_{in})] \times 100\%$$

Where:

W_{in} = mass feedrate of one POHC in a waste feedstream; and

W_{out} = mass emission rate of the same POHC present in exhaust emissions prior to release to the atmosphere.

(2) *99.9999% DRE.* If you burn the dioxin-listed hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027 (see § 261.31 of this chapter), you must achieve a DRE of 99.9999% for each POHC that you designate under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must demonstrate this DRE performance on POHCs that are more difficult to incinerate than tetra-, penta-, and hexachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins and dibenzofurans. You must use the equation in paragraph (c)(1) of this section to calculate DRE for each POHC. In addition, you must notify the Administrator of your intent to incinerate hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027.

(3) *Principal organic hazardous constituent (POHC).* (i) You must treat each POHC in the waste feed that you specify under paragraph (c)(3)(ii) of this section to the extent required by paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of this section.

(ii) You must specify one or more POHCs from the list of hazardous air pollutants established by 42 U.S.C. 7412(b)(1), excluding caprolactam (CAS number 105602) as provided by § 63.60, for each waste to be burned. You must base this specification on the degree of difficulty of incineration of the organic constituents in the waste and on their concentration or mass in the waste feed, considering the results of waste analyses or other data and information.

(d) *Cement kilns with in-line kiln raw mills.* The provisions of § 63.1204(d) apply.

(1) *General.* (i) You must conduct performance testing when the raw mill is on-line and when the mill is off-line to demonstrate compliance with the emission standards, and you must establish separate operating parameter limits under § 63.1209 for each mode of operation, except as provided by paragraph (d)(1)(iv) of this section.

(ii) You must document in the operating record each time you change from one mode of operation to the alternate mode and begin complying with the operating parameter limits for that alternate mode of operation.

(iii) You must establish rolling averages for the operating parameter limits anew (*i.e.*, without considering previous recordings) when you begin complying with the operating limits for the alternate mode of operation.

(iv) If your in-line kiln raw mill has dual stacks, you may assume that the dioxin/furan emission levels in the by-pass stack and the operating parameter limits determined during performance testing of the by-pass stack when the raw mill is off-line are the same as when the mill is on-line.

(2) *Emissions averaging.* You may comply with the mercury, semivolatile metal, low volatile metal, and hydrochloric acid/chlorine gas emission standards on a time-weighted average basis under the following procedures:

(i) *Averaging methodology.* You must calculate the time-weighted average emission concentration with the following equation:

$$C_{total} = \{C_{mill\text{-}off} \times (T_{mill\text{-}off}/(T_{mill\text{-}off} + T_{mill\text{-}on}))\} + \{C_{mill\text{-}on} \times (T_{mill\text{-}on}/(T_{mill\text{-}off} + T_{mill\text{-}on}))\}$$

Where:

C_{total} = time-weighted average concentration of a regulated constituent considering both raw mill on time and off time;

$C_{mill\text{-}off}$ = average performance test concentration of regulated constituent with the raw mill off-line;

$C_{mill\text{-}on}$ = average performance test concentration of regulated constituent with the raw mill on-line;

$T_{mill\text{-}off}$ = time when kiln gases are not routed through the raw mill; and

$T_{mill\text{-}on}$ = time when kiln gases are routed through the raw mill.

(ii) *Compliance.* (A) If you use this emission averaging provision, you must document in the operating record compliance with the emission standards on an annual basis by using the equation provided by paragraph (d)(2) of this section.

(B) Compliance is based on one-year block averages beginning on the day you submit the initial notification of compliance.

(iii) *Notification.* (A) If you elect to document compliance with one or more emission standards using this emission averaging provision, you must notify the Administrator in the initial comprehensive performance test plan submitted under § 63.1207(e).

(B) You must include historical raw mill operation data in the performance test plan to estimate future raw mill down-time and document in the performance test plan that estimated emissions and estimated raw mill down-time will not result in an exceedance of an emission standard on an annual basis.

(C) You must document in the notification of compliance submitted under § 63.1207(j) that an emission standard will not be exceeded based on the documented emissions from the performance test and predicted raw mill down-time.

(e) *Preheater or preheater/precalciner kilns with dual stacks*—(1) *General.* You must conduct performance testing on each stack to demonstrate compliance with the emission standards, and you must establish operating parameter limits under § 63.1209 for each stack, except as provided by paragraph (d)(1)(iv) of this section for dioxin/furan emissions testing and operating parameter limits for the by-pass stack of in-line raw mills.

(2) *Emissions averaging.* You may comply with the mercury, semivolatile metal, low volatile metal, and hydrochloric acid/chlorine gas emission standards specified in this section on a gas flowrate-weighted average basis under the following procedures:

(i) *Averaging methodology.* You must calculate the gas flowrate-weighted average emission concentration using the following equation:

$$C_{tot} = \{C_{main} \times (Q_{main}/(Q_{main} + Q_{bypass}))\} + \{C_{bypass} \times (Q_{bypass}/(Q_{main} + Q_{bypass}))\}$$

Where:

C_{tot} = gas flowrate-weighted average concentration of the regulated constituent;

C_{main} = average performance test concentration demonstrated in the main stack;

C_{bypass} = average performance test concentration demonstrated in the bypass stack;

Q_{main} = volumetric flowrate of main stack effluent gas; and

Q_{bypass} = volumetric flowrate of bypass effluent gas.

(ii) *Compliance.* (A) You must demonstrate compliance with the emission standard(s) using the emission concentrations determined from the performance tests and the equation provided by paragraph (e)(1) of this section; and

(B) You must develop operating parameter limits for bypass stack and main stack flowrates that ensure the emission concentrations calculated with the equation in paragraph (e)(1) of this section do not exceed the emission standards on a 12-hour rolling average basis. You must include these flowrate limits in the Notification of Compliance.

(iii) *Notification.* If you elect to document compliance under this emissions averaging provision, you must:

(A) Notify the Administrator in the initial comprehensive performance test plan submitted under § 63.1207(e). The performance test plan must include, at a minimum, information describing the flowrate limits established under paragraph (e)(2)(ii)(B) of this section; and

(B) Document in the Notification of Compliance submitted under § 63.1207(j) the demonstrated gas flowrate-weighted average emissions that you calculate with the equation provided by paragraph (e)(2) of this section.

(f) *Significant figures.* The emission limits provided by paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section are presented with two significant figures. Although you must perform intermediate calculations using at least three significant figures, you may round the resultant emission levels to two significant figures to document compliance.

(g) [Reserved].

(h) When you comply with the particulate matter requirements of paragraphs (a)(7) or (b)(7) of this section, you are exempt from the New Source Performance Standard for particulate matter and opacity under § 60.60 of this chapter.

18. Section 63.1221 is added to subpart EEE to read as follows:

§ 63.1221 What are the replacement standards for hazardous waste burning lightweight aggregate kilns?

(a) *Emission limits for existing sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1) Dioxins and furans in excess of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(2) Mercury in excess of 67 µg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(3)(i) In excess of 3.1×10^{-4} lbs combined emissions of cadmium and lead attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste; and

(ii) Lead and cadmium in excess of 250 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(4)(ii) In excess of 9.5×10^{-5} lbs combined emissions of arsenic, beryllium, and chromium attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste; and

(ii) Arsenic, beryllium, and chromium in excess of 110 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(5) *Carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons.* (i) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (a)(5)(ii) of this section, you also must document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 20 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(ii) Hydrocarbons in excess of 20 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average, dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(6) Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas in excess of 600 parts per million by volume, combined emissions, expressed as a chloride ($Cl^{(-)}$) equivalent, dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and

(7) Particulate matter in excess of 57 mg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(b) *Emission limits for new sources.* You must not discharge or cause combustion gases to be emitted into the atmosphere that contain:

(1) Dioxins and furans in excess of 0.40 ng TEQ/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(2) Mercury in excess of 67 µg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(3)(i) In excess of 2.4×10^{-5} lbs combined emissions of cadmium and lead attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste; and

(ii) Lead and cadmium in excess of 43 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(4)(i) In excess of 3.2×10^{-5} lbs combined emissions of arsenic, beryllium, and chromium attributable to the hazardous waste per million British thermal unit heat input from the hazardous waste; and

(ii) Arsenic, beryllium, and chromium in excess of 110 µg/dscm, combined emissions, corrected to 7 percent oxygen;

(5) *Carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons.* (i) Carbon monoxide in excess of 100 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen. If you elect to comply with this carbon monoxide standard rather than the hydrocarbon standard under paragraph (b)(5)(ii) of this section, you also must document that, during the destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) test runs or their equivalent as provided by § 63.1206(b)(7), hydrocarbons do not exceed 20 parts per million by volume during those runs, over an hourly rolling average (monitored continuously with a continuous emissions monitoring system), dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane; or

(ii) Hydrocarbons in excess of 20 parts per million by volume, over an hourly rolling average, dry basis, corrected to 7 percent oxygen, and reported as propane;

(6) Hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas in excess of 600 parts per million by volume, combined emissions, expressed as a chloride (Cl^{-}) equivalent, dry basis and corrected to 7 percent oxygen; and

(7) Particulate matter in excess of 23 mg/dscm corrected to 7 percent oxygen.

(c) *Destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) standard*—(1) *99.99% DRE.* Except as provided in paragraph (c)(2) of this section, you must achieve a destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) of 99.99% for each principal organic hazardous constituent (POHC) designated under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must calculate DRE for each POHC from the following equation:

$$DRE = [1 - (W_{out} / W_{in})] \times 100\%$$

Where:

W_{in} = mass feedrate of one POHC in a waste feedstream; and

W_{out} = mass emission rate of the same POHC present in exhaust emissions prior to release to the atmosphere.

(2) *99.9999% DRE.* If you burn the dioxin-listed hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027 (see § 261.31 of this chapter), you must achieve a destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) of 99.9999% for each POHC that you designate under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must demonstrate this DRE performance on POHCs that are more difficult to incinerate than tetra-, penta-, and hexachlorodibenzo-dioxins and dibenzofurans. You must use the equation in paragraph (c)(1) of this section to calculate DRE for each POHC. In addition, you must notify the Administrator of your intent to burn hazardous wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, or F027.

(3) *Principal organic hazardous constituents (POHCs).* (i) You must treat each POHC in the waste feed that you specify under paragraph (c)(3)(ii) of this section to the extent required by paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of this section.

(ii) You must specify one or more POHCs from the list of hazardous air pollutants established by 42 U.S.C. 7412(b)(1), excluding caprolactam (CAS number 105602) as provided by § 63.60, for each waste to be burned. You must base this specification on the degree of difficulty of incineration of the organic constituents in the waste and on their concentration or mass in the waste feed, considering the results of waste analyses or other data and information.

(d) *Significant figures.* The emission limits provided by paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section are presented with two significant figures. Although you must perform intermediate calculations using at least three significant figures, you may round the resultant emission levels to two significant figures to document compliance.

PART 264—STANDARDS FOR OWNERS AND OPERATORS OF HAZARDOUS WASTE TREATMENT, STORAGE, AND DISPOSAL FACILITIES

1. The authority citation for part 264 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 6905, 6912(a), 6924, 6925, 6927, 6928(h), and 6974.

2. Section 264.340 is amended by revising the first sentence of paragraph (b)(1) and adding paragraph (b)(5) to read as follows:

§ 264.340 Applicability.

* * * * *

(b) * * * (1) Except as provided by paragraphs (b)(2) through (b)(5) of this section, the standards of this part no longer apply when an owner or operator demonstrates compliance with the maximum achievable control technology (MACT) requirements of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter by conducting a comprehensive performance test and submitting to the Administrator a Notification of Compliance under §§ 63.1207(j) and 63.1210(d) of this chapter documenting compliance with the requirements of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter.

* * *

* * * * *

(5) The particulate matter standard of § 264.343(c) remains in effect for incinerators that elect to comply with the alternative to the particulate matter standard of § 63.1219(e) of this chapter.

* * * * *

PART 265—INTERIM STATUS STANDARDS FOR OWNERS AND OPERATORS OF HAZARDOUS WASTE TREATMENT, STORAGE, AND DISPOSAL FACILITIES

1. The authority citation for part 265 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 6905, 6906, 6912, 6922, 6923, 6924, 6925, 6935, 6936, and 6937.

2. Section 265.340 is amended by revising paragraph (b)(1) to read as follows:

§ 265.340 Applicability.

* * * * *

(b) * * * (1) Except as provided by paragraphs (b)(2) and (b)(3) of this section, the standards of this part no longer apply when an owner or operator demonstrates compliance with the maximum achievable control technology (MACT) requirements of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter by conducting a comprehensive performance test and submitting to the Administrator a Notification of Compliance under §§ 63.1207(j) and 63.1210(d) of this chapter documenting compliance with the requirements of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter.

* * * * *

PART 266—STANDARDS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF SPECIFIC HAZARDOUS WASTES AND SPECIFIC TYPES OF HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

1. The authority citation for part 266 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 1006, 2002(a), 3001–3009, 3014, 6905, 6906, 6912, 6921, 6922, 6924–6927, 6934, and 6937.

2. Section 266.100 is amended by revising the first sentence of paragraph (b)(1) and adding paragraph (b)(3) to read as follows:

§ 266.100 Applicability.

* * * * *

(b) * * * (1) Except as provided by paragraphs (b)(2) and (b)(3) of this section, the standards of this part no longer apply when an owner or operator demonstrates compliance with the maximum achievable control technology (MACT) requirements of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter by conducting a comprehensive performance test and submitting to the Administrator a Notification of Compliance under §§ 63.1207(j) and 63.1210(d) of this chapter documenting compliance with the requirements of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter.

* * *

* * * * *

(3) If you own or operate a boiler or hydrochloric acid furnace that is an area source under § 63.2 of this chapter and you elect not to comply with the emission standards under §§ 63.1216, 63.1217, and 63.1218 of this chapter for particulate matter, semivolatile and low volatile metals, and total chlorine, you also remain subject to:

(i) Section 266.105—Standards to control particulate matter;

(ii) Section 266.106—Standards to control metals emissions, except for mercury; and

(iii) Section 266.107—Standards to control hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas.

* * * * *

PART 270—EPA ADMINISTERED PERMIT PROGRAMS: THE HAZARDOUS WASTE PERMIT PROGRAM

1. The authority citation for part 270 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 6905, 6912, 6924, 6925, 6927, 6939, and 6974.

2. Section 270.10 is amended by adding paragraph (l) to read as follows:

§ 270.10 General application requirements.

* * * * *

(l) If the Director concludes that there is reason to believe that compliance with the standards in 40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE alone may not be protective of human health or the environment, the Director shall require additional information or assessment(s) that the Director determines are necessary to ensure protection of human health and the environment. The Director also may require a permittee or an applicant to provide information necessary to determine whether such an assessment(s) should be required.

3. Section 270.19 is amended by revising paragraph (e) to read as follows:

§ 270.19 Specific part B information requirements for incinerators.

* * * * *

(e) When an owner or operator demonstrates compliance with the air emission standards and limitations in part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter (*i.e.*, by conducting a comprehensive performance test and submitting a Notification of Compliance under §§ 63.1207(j) and 63.1210(d) of this chapter documenting compliance with all applicable requirements of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter), the requirements of this section do not apply, except those provisions the Director determines are necessary to ensure compliance with §§ 264.345(a) and 264.345(c) of this chapter if you elect to comply with § 270.235(a)(1)(i) to minimize emissions of toxic compounds from startup, shutdown, and malfunction events. Nevertheless, the Director may apply the provisions of this section, on a case-by-case basis, for purposes of information collection in accordance with §§ 270.10(k), 270.10(l), 270.32(b)(2), and 270.32(b)(3) of this chapter.

3. Section 270.22 is amended by revising the introductory text to read as follows:

§ 270.22 Specific part B information requirements for boilers and industrial furnaces burning hazardous waste.

When an owner or operator of a cement kiln, lightweight aggregate kiln, solid fuel-fired boiler, liquid fuel-fired boiler, or hydrochloric acid production furnace demonstrates compliance with the air emission standards and limitations in part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter (*i.e.*, by conducting a comprehensive performance test and submitting a Notification of Compliance under §§ 63.1207(j) and 63.1210(d) of this chapter documenting compliance with all applicable requirements of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter), the requirements of this section do not apply. The requirements of this section

do apply, however, if the Director determines certain provisions are necessary to ensure compliance with §§ 266.102(e)(1) and 266.102(e)(2)(iii) of this chapter if you elect to comply with § 270.235(a)(1)(i) to minimize emissions of toxic compounds from startup, shutdown, and malfunction events; or if you are an area source and elect to comply with the §§ 266.105, 266.106, and 266.107 standards and associated requirements for particulate matter, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, and non-mercury metals; or the Director determines certain provisions apply, on a case-by-case basis, for purposes of information collection in accordance with §§ 270.10(k), 270.10(l), 270.32(b)(2), and 270.32(b)(3).

* * * * *

4. Section 270.32 is amended by adding paragraph (b)(3) to read as follows:

§ 270.32 Establishing permit conditions.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(3) If, as the result of an assessment(s) or other information, the Administrator or Director determines that conditions are necessary in addition to those required under 40 CFR parts 63, subpart EEE, 264 or 266 to ensure protection of human health and the environment, he shall include those terms and conditions in a RCRA permit for a hazardous waste combustion unit.

* * * * *

5. Section 270.42 is amended by:

a. Revising paragraph (j)(1).

b. Redesignating paragraph (j)(2) as (j)(3).

c. Adding new paragraph (j)(2).

d. Adding new paragraph (k); and

e. Adding a new entry 10 in numerical order in the table under section L of Appendix I.

The revisions and additions reads as follows:

§ 270.42 Permit modification at the request of the permittee.

* * * * *

(j) * * *

(1) Facility owners or operators must have complied with the Notification of Intent to Comply (NIC) requirements of 40 CFR 63.1210 that were in effect prior to October 11, 2000, (See 40 CFR part 63 §§ 63.1200–63.1499 revised as of July 1, 2000) in order to request a permit modification under this section for the purpose of technology changes needed to meet the 40 CFR 63.1203, 63.1204, and 63.1205 standards.

(2) Facility owners or operators must comply with the Notification of Intent to Comply (NIC) requirements of 40 CFR 63.1210(b) and 63.1212 before a permit modification can be requested under this section for the purpose of technology changes needed to meet the 40 CFR 63.1215, 63.1216, 63.1217, 63.1218, 63.1219, 63.1220, and 63.1221 standards promulgated on [date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**].

* * * * *

(k) *Waiver of RCRA permitting requirements in support of transition to the part 63 MACT standards.* (1) You may request to have specific RCRA operating and emissions limits waived by submitting a Class 1 permit modification request under Appendix I of this section, section L(10). You must:

(i) Identify the specific RCRA permit operating and emissions limits which you are requesting to waive;

(ii) Provide an explanation of why the changes are necessary in order to minimize or eliminate conflicts between the RCRA permit and MACT compliance; and

(iii) Discuss how the revised provisions will be sufficiently protective.

(2) To request this modification in conjunction with MACT performance testing where permit limits may only be waived during actual test events and pretesting, as defined under 40 CFR 63.1207(h)(2)(i) and (ii), for an aggregate time not to exceed 720 hours of operation (renewable at the discretion of the Administrator) you must:

(i) Demonstrate that your site-specific emissions test plan and continuous monitoring system performance evaluation test plan have been submitted and approved by the Administrator as required in 40 CFR 63.1207(e), and

(ii) Submit your modification request upon approval of your test plan.

(3) The Director shall approve or deny the request within 30 days of receipt of the request. The Director may, at his or her discretion, extend this 30 day deadline one time for up to 30 days by notifying the facility owner or operator.

* * * * *

APPENDIX I TO § 270.42—CLASSIFICATION OF PERMIT MODIFICATION

Modifications	Class
* * * * *	
10. Changes to RCRA permit provisions needed to support transition to 40 CFR part 63 (Subpart EEE—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Hazardous Waste Combustors), provided the procedures of § 270.42(k) are followed	[1] 1

APPENDIX I TO § 270.42—CLASSIFICATION OF PERMIT MODIFICATION—Continued

Modifications	Class
* * * * *	

[1] Class 1 modifications requiring prior Agency approval.

6. Section 270.62 is amended by revising the introductory text to read as follows:

§ 270.62 Hazardous waste incinerator permits.

When an owner or operator demonstrates compliance with the air emission standards and limitations in part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter (*i.e.*, by conducting a comprehensive performance test and submitting a Notification of Compliance under §§ 63.1207(j) and 63.1210(d) of this chapter documenting compliance with all applicable requirements of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter), the requirements of this section do not apply, except those provisions the Director determines are necessary to ensure compliance with §§ 264.345(a) and 264.345(c) of this chapter if you elect to comply with § 270.235(a)(1)(i) to minimize emissions of toxic compounds from startup, shutdown, and malfunction events. Nevertheless, the Director may apply the provisions of this section, on a case-by-case basis, for purposes of information collection in accordance with §§ 270.10(k), 270.10(l), 270.32(b)(2), and 270.32(b)(3) of this chapter.

* * * * *

7. Section 270.66 is amended by revising the introductory text to read as follows:

§ 270.66 Permits for boilers and industrial furnaces burning hazardous waste.

When an owner or operator of a cement kiln, lightweight aggregate kiln, solid fuel-fired boiler, liquid fuel-fired boiler, or hydrochloric acid production furnace demonstrates compliance with the air emission standards and limitations in part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter (*i.e.*, by conducting a comprehensive performance test and submitting a Notification of Compliance under §§ 63.1207(j) and 63.1210(d) of this chapter documenting compliance with all applicable requirements of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter), the requirements of this section do not apply. The requirements of this section do apply, however, if the Director determines certain provisions are necessary to ensure compliance with §§ 266.102(e)(1) and 266.102(e)(2)(iii) of

this chapter if you elect to comply with § 270.235(a)(1)(i) to minimize emissions of toxic compounds from startup, shutdown, and malfunction events; or if you are an area source and elect to comply with the §§ 266.105, 266.106, and 266.107 standards and associated requirements for particulate matter, hydrogen chloride and chlorine gas, and non-mercury metals; or the Director determines certain provisions apply, on a case-by-case basis, for purposes of information collection in accordance with §§ 270.10(k), 270.10(l), 270.32(b)(2), and 270.32(b)(3).

* * * * *

8. Section 270.235 is amended by:

a. Revising paragraphs (a)(1) introductory text and (a)(2) introductory text.

b. Revising paragraphs (b)(1) introductory text and (b)(2).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 270.235 Options for incinerators, cement kilns, lightweight aggregate kilns, solid fuel-fired boilers, liquid fuel-fired boilers and hydrochloric acid production furnaces to minimize emissions from startup, shutdown, and malfunction events.

(a) * * * (1) *Revisions to permit conditions after documenting compliance with MACT.* The owner or operator of a RCRA-permitted incinerator, cement kiln, lightweight aggregate kiln, solid fuel-fired boiler, liquid fuel-fired boiler, or hydrochloric acid production furnace may request that the Director address permit conditions that minimize emissions from startup, shutdown, and malfunction events under any of the following options when requesting removal of permit conditions that are no longer applicable according to §§ 264.340(b) and 266.100(b) of this chapter:

* * * * *

(2) *Addressing permit conditions upon permit reissuance.* The owner or operator of an incinerator, cement kiln, lightweight aggregate kiln, solid fuel-fired boiler, liquid fuel-fired boiler, or hydrochloric acid production furnace that has conducted a comprehensive performance test and submitted to the Administrator a Notification of Compliance documenting compliance with the standards of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter may request in the application to reissue the permit for the combustion unit that the Director control emissions from startup, shutdown, and malfunction events under any of the following options:

* * * * *

(b) * * * (1) *Interim status operations.* In compliance with §§ 265.340 and 266.100(b), the owner or operator of an incinerator, cement kiln, lightweight aggregate kiln, solid fuel-fired boiler, liquid fuel-fired boiler, or hydrochloric acid production furnace that is operating under the interim status standards of part 265 or 266 of this chapter may control emissions of toxic compounds during startup, shutdown, and malfunction events under either of the following options after conducting a comprehensive performance test and submitting to the Administrator a Notification of Compliance documenting compliance with the standards of part 63, subpart EEE, of this chapter.

* * * * *

(2) *Operations under a subsequent RCRA permit.* When an owner or operator of an incinerator, cement kiln, lightweight aggregate kiln, solid fuel-fired boiler, liquid fuel-fired boiler, or hydrochloric acid production furnace that is operating under the interim status standards of parts 265 or 266 of this chapter submits a RCRA permit application, the owner or operator may request that the Director control emissions from startup, shutdown, and malfunction events under any of the options provided by paragraphs (a)(2)(i), (a)(2)(ii), or (a)(2)(iii) of this section.

* * * * *

PART 271—REQUIREMENTS FOR AUTHORIZATION OF STATE HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAMS

1. The authority citation for part 271 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 6905, 6912(a), and 6926.

2. Section 271.1(j) is amended by adding the following entry to Table 1 in chronological order by date of publication in the **Federal Register**, to read as follows:

§ 271.1 Purpose and scope.

* * * * *

(j) * * *

TABLE 1.—REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING THE HAZARDOUS AND SOLID WASTE AMENDMENTS OF 1984

Promulgation date	Title of regulation	Federal Register reference	Effective date
*	*	*	*
Insert date of publication of final rule in the **Federal Register** (FR)].	Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Hazardous Waste Combustors.	[Insert FR page numbers of final rule].	[Insert date of publication of final rule].

[FR Doc. 04–7858 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

Federal Register

Tuesday,
April 20, 2004

Part III

Federal Trade Commission

16 CFR Part 682
Disposal of Consumer Report Information and Records; Proposed Rule

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 682

RIN 3084–AA94

Disposal of Consumer Report Information and Records

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission (FTC)

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission ("FTC" or "Commission") is proposing a rule regarding the proper disposal of consumer report information and records. The Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003 ("FACT Act" or "Act") requires the Federal Reserve Board, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Office of Thrift Supervision (collectively, the "Federal banking agencies"), National Credit Union Administration, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Federal Trade Commission, in coordination with one another, to adopt consistent and comparable rules regarding such disposal.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before June 15, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties are invited to submit written comments. Comments should refer to "The FACT Act Disposal Rule, R–411007" to facilitate the organization of comments. A comment filed in paper form should include this reference both in the text and on the envelope, and should be mailed or delivered to the following address: Federal Trade Commission/ Office of the Secretary, Room 159–H (Annex H), 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580. Comments containing confidential material must be filed in paper form. The FTC is requesting that any comment filed in paper form be sent by courier or overnight service, if possible, because U.S. postal mail in the Washington area and at the Commission is subject to delay due to heightened security precautions.

An electronic comment can be filed by (1) clicking on *http://www.regulations.gov;* (2) selecting "Federal Trade Commission" at "Search for Open Regulations;" (3) locating the summary of this Notice; (4) clicking on "Submit a Comment on this Regulation;" and (5) completing the form. For a given electronic comment, any information placed in the following fields—"Title," "First Name," "Last Name," "Organization Name," "State," "Comment," and "Attachment"—will be publicly available on the FTC Web site. The fields marked with an asterisk on the form are required in order for the FTC to fully consider a particular comment. Commenters may choose not to fill in one or more of those fields, but if they do so, their comments may not be considered.

Comments on any proposed filing, recordkeeping, or disclosure requirements that are subject to paperwork burden review under the Paperwork Reduction Act should additionally be submitted to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for the Federal Trade Commission. Comments should be submitted via facsimile to (202) 395–6974 because U.S. postal mail at the Office of Management and Budget is subject to lengthy delays due to heightened security precautions. Such comments should also be sent to the following address: Federal Trade Commission/Office of the Secretary, Room 159–H (Annex H), 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580.

The FTC Act and other laws the Commission administers permit the collection of public comments to consider and use in this proceeding as appropriate. All timely and responsive public comments, whether filed in paper or electronic form, will be considered by the Commission, and will be available to the public on the FTC Web site, to the extent practicable, at *http://www.ftc.gov*. As a matter of discretion, the FTC makes every effort to remove home contact information for individuals from the public comments it receives before placing those comments on the FTC Web site. More information, including routine uses permitted by the Privacy Act, may be found in the FTC's privacy policy, at *http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/privacy.htm*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Finn or Susan McDonald, Attorneys, (202) 326–3224, Division of Financial Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice contains the following sections:

I. Introduction

The FACT Act was signed into law on December 4, 2003. Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003, Pub. L. No. 108–159 (2003). In general, the Act amends the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA") to enhance the accuracy of consumer reports and to allow consumers to exercise greater control regarding the type and amount of marketing solicitations they receive. To promote increasingly efficient national credit markets, the FACT Act also establishes uniform national standards in key areas of regulation regarding consumer report information. Finally, the Act contains a number of provisions intended to combat consumer fraud and related crimes, including identity theft, and to assist its victims.

Section 216 of the FACT Act requires the Commission, Federal banking agencies, National Credit Union Administration, and Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Agencies"), to issue regulations requiring "any person that maintains or otherwise possesses consumer information, or any compilation of consumer information, derived from consumer reports for a business purpose to properly dispose of any such information or compilation." The purpose of this section is to prevent unauthorized disclosure of consumer information and to reduce the risk of fraud or related crimes, including identity theft, by ensuring that records containing sensitive financial or personal information are appropriately redacted or destroyed before being discarded. The Agencies are required to consult and coordinate with each other so that, to the extent possible, regulations implementing this section are consistent and comparable. In addition, the Agencies' regulations must be consistent with the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act ("GLBA") and other provisions of Federal law. The Commission has conferred with the Agencies and now offers for public comment this proposed rule regarding the disposal of consumer report information and records ("Disposal Rule" or "Rule").[1]

II. Summary of Proposed Rule

The following is a section-by-section summary of the Commission's proposed Rule.

[1] The Federal banking agencies, SEC, and NCUA propose to implement section 216 of the FACT Act by amending their existing guidelines and rules on information security previously issued to implement section 501(b) of the GLBA. However, because the entities subject to the FTC's jurisdiction under the FACT Act and the GLBA are overlapping but not coextensive, the Commission is proposing a separate rule to implement section 216 of the FACT Act.

Proposed Section 682.1: Definitions

This section defines terms for purposes of the proposed Disposal Rule. Proposed section 682.1(a) makes clear that, unless otherwise stated, terms used in the Disposal Rule have the same meaning as set forth in the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. 1681 *et seq.* Thus, for example, the term "consumer report" as used in the Disposal Rule has the same meaning as the term "consumer report" elsewhere in the FCRA. *See* 15 U.S.C. 1681a(d) (defining "consumer report"). The proposed Disposal Rule also defines two new terms: "consumer information" and "disposal."

Proposed section 682.1(b) defines "consumer information" as any record about an individual, whether in paper, electronic, or other form, that is a consumer report or is derived from a consumer report. The Commission believes a broad definition of the term, which includes all types of records that are consumer reports, or contain consumer information derived from consumer reports, will best effectuate the purpose of the Act. However, under this definition, information that is derived from consumer reports but does not identify any particular consumers would not be covered under the proposed Rule. The Commission believes that limiting "consumer information" to information that identifies particular consumers is consistent with current law relating to the scope of the term "consumer report" under the FCRA and the purposes of section 216.

Proposed section 682.1(c) defines "disposing" or "disposal" to include the discarding or abandonment of consumer information, as well as the sale, donation, or transfer of any medium, including computer equipment, upon which consumer information is stored. By itself, the sale, donation, or transfer of consumer information would not be considered "disposal" under the proposed Rule.

The Commission requests comment on both of these proposed definitions.

Proposed Section 682.2: Purpose and Scope

Proposed section 682.2(a) sets forth the purpose of the proposed Disposal Rule, which is to reduce the risk of consumer fraud and related harms, including identity theft, created by improper disposal of consumer information. *See* Cong. Rec. S13889 (Nov. 4, 2003) (Statement of Sen. Nelson).

Proposed section 682.2(b) sets forth the scope of the proposed Disposal Rule, which applies to "any person over which the Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction, that, for a business purpose, maintains or otherwise possesses consumer information, or any compilation of consumer information."[2] This section, which tracks the language of section 216 of the FACT Act, creates two criteria for determining whether a person would be required to comply with the Disposal Rule. First, does the person maintain or otherwise possess the consumer information for a business purpose? Second, does the record being disposed of contain consumer information, or any compilation of consumer information?

As to the first criterion, the Commission reads "for a business purpose" broadly to include all business reasons for which a person may possess or maintain consumer information. Thus, the Rule would likely cover any person that possesses or maintains consumer information other than an individual consumer who has obtained his or her own consumer report. Among the entities that possess or maintain consumer information for a business purpose are consumer reporting agencies, including resellers of consumer reports, that are in the business of selling consumer information, as well as lenders, insurers, employers, landlords, government agencies, mortgage brokers, automobile dealers, and other users of consumer reports.[3] Companies that possess consumer information in connection with the provision of services to another entity are also directly covered by the proposed Rule to the extent that they dispose of the consumer information.[4]

As to the second criterion, the FACT Act and proposed Rule make clear that the disposal requirements apply not only to consumer reports, but also to records containing "consumer information, or any compilation of consumer information, derived from consumer reports." FACT Act, section 628(a)(1). The Commission believes that the phrase "derived from consumer reports" covers all of the information about a consumer that is taken from a consumer report, including information that results in whole or in part from manipulation of information from a consumer report or information from a consumer report that has been combined with other types of information.[5] Thus, any person that possesses such information, including an affiliate that has received it pursuant to section 603(d)(2)(A)(iii) of the FCRA, would be obligated to properly dispose of it.

The Commission requests comment on the scope of the proposed Rule and the costs and benefits of covering the entities and information proposed. The Commission also seeks comment on whether the definition of covered "consumer information" should be further clarified, by example or otherwise. Finally, the Commission requests comment on whether there are any persons or classes of persons covered by the proposed Rule that it should consider exempting from the Rule's application pursuant to section 216(a)(3) of the FACTA.

Proposed Section 682.3: Proper Disposal of Consumer Information

Regarding the standard for disposal, the proposed Rule would require that any person that maintains or otherwise possesses consumer information "take reasonable measures to protect against unauthorized access to or use of the information in connection with its disposal." The Commission recognizes that there are few foolproof methods of record destruction. Accordingly, the proposed Rule does not require covered persons to ensure perfect destruction of consumer information in every instance; rather, it requires covered entities to take reasonable measures to protect against unauthorized access to or use of the information in connection with its disposal.

In determining what measures are "reasonable" under the Rule, the Commission expects that entities covered by the proposed Rule would consider the sensitivity of the consumer information, the nature and size of the entity's operations, the costs and benefits of different disposal methods, and relevant technological changes. "Reasonable measures" are very likely to require elements such as the establishment of policies and procedures governing disposal, as well as appropriate employee training.

[2] "Person" is defined in the FCRA, 15 U.S.C. 1681a(b), as "any individual, partnership, corporation, trust, estate, cooperative, association, government or governmental subdivision or agency, or other entity."

[3] As these examples illustrate, the Commission views a "business purpose" as broader than a "permissible purpose" as defined in section 604 of the FCRA. *See* 15 U.S.C. 1681b (outlining permissible uses of consumer reports). Although "permissible purposes" are generally "business purposes," there are a variety of business purposes for which persons maintain or possess "consumer information" beyond those listed as "permissible" for users of consumer reports.

[4] Examples of such companies could include records management or waste disposal companies.

[5] Information that does not identify particular consumers would not be covered, even if the information was originally "derived from consumer reports," since that information would no longer be "about a consumer."

The flexible standard for disposal in the proposed Rule would allow covered persons to make decisions appropriate to their particular circumstances and should minimize the disruption of existing practices to the extent that they already provide appropriate protections for consumers. It is also intended to minimize the burden of compliance for smaller entities. In addition, a "reasonable measures" standard would harmonize the Disposal Rule with the Commission's Safeguards Rule, 16 CFR part 314, implementing section 501(b) of the GLBA, so that entities subject to both rules will not face conflicting requirements.[6] An entity subject to the Safeguards Rule is required to address the disposal of customer information as one part of a larger, written information security program reasonable and appropriate for that entity. An entity that incorporates proper disposal measures for consumer information, as defined in the FACT Act Disposal Rule, into the broader information security program required by the Safeguards Rule would easily be able to comply with both rules.[7]

Despite the many benefits of a flexible "reasonableness" standard, the Commission recognizes that such a standard can leave covered persons with some uncertainty about compliance. Accordingly, the proposed Rule includes examples intended to provide guidance on disposal measures that would be deemed reasonable under the Rule. These examples are illustrative only, not exhaustive, and because they cannot take into account a particular entity's unique circumstances, they are intended merely to provide general guidance.

The Commission invites comment on the proposed standard for record disposal. In particular, the Commission invites comment on: (1) The costs and benefits of the proposed standard; (2) the costs and benefits of any alternative standards; (3) the appropriateness and usefulness of providing examples in the Rule of reasonable record disposal measures; (4) the merits of the examples included in this notice, as well as any other standards or examples that the Commission might consider to provide guidance on appropriate record disposal.

Proposed Section 682.4: Relation to Other Laws

The proposal makes clear that nothing in the proposed Rule is intended to create a requirement that a person maintain or destroy any record pertaining to a consumer. Nor is the Rule intended to affect any requirement imposed under any other provision of law to maintain or destroy such records.

Proposed Section 682.5: Effective Date

The Commission proposes to make the Disposal Rule effective 3 months after the publication of the final Rule.

III. Invitation To Comment

The Commission invites interested members of the public to submit written data, views, facts, and arguments addressing the issues raised by this Notice. Written comments must be received on or before June 15, 2004. Comments should refer to "The FACT Act Disposal Rule, R–411007" to facilitate the organization of comments. A comment filed in paper form should include this reference both in the text and on the envelope, and should be mailed or delivered to the following address: Federal Trade Commission/ Office of the Secretary, Room 159–H (Annex H), 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580. If the comment contains any material for which confidential treatment is requested, it must be filed in paper (rather than electronic) form, and the first page of the document must be clearly labeled "Confidential."[8] The FTC is requesting that any comment filed in paper form be sent by courier or overnight service, if possible, because U.S. postal mail in the Washington area and at the Commission is subject to delay due to heightened security precautions.

An electronic comment can be filed by (1) clicking on *http://www.regulations.gov;* (2) selecting "Federal Trade Commission" at "Search for Open Regulations;" (3) locating the summary of this Notice; (4) clicking on "Submit a Comment on this Regulation;" and (5) completing the form. For a given electronic comment, any information placed in the following fields—"Title," "First Name," "Last Name," "Organization Name," "State," "Comment," and "Attachment"—will be publicly available on the FTC Web site. The fields marked with an asterisk on the form are required in order for the FTC to fully consider a particular comment. Commenters may choose not to fill in one or more of those fields, but if they do so, their comments may not be considered.

Comments on any proposed filing, recordkeeping, or disclosure requirements that are subject to paperwork burden review under the Paperwork Reduction Act should additionally be submitted to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for the Federal Trade Commission. Comments should be submitted via facsimile to (202) 395–6974 because U.S. postal mail at the Office of Management and Budget is subject to lengthy delays due to heightened security precautions. Such comments should also be sent to the following address: Federal Trade Commission/Office of the Secretary, Room 159–H (Annex H), 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580.

The FTC Act and other laws the Commission administers permit the collection of public comments to consider and use in this proceeding as appropriate. All timely and responsive public comments, whether filed in paper or electronic form, will be considered by the Commission, and will be available to the public on the FTC Web site, to the extent practicable, at *http://www.ftc.gov*. As a matter of discretion, the FTC makes every effort to remove home contact information for individuals from the public comments it receives before placing those comments on the FTC Web site. More information, including routine uses permitted by the Privacy Act, may be found in the FTC's privacy policy, at *http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/privacy.htm*.

[6] The coverage of the proposed Disposal Rule is different from that of the Commission's Safeguards Rule. Although some entities may be subject to both rules, there are a variety of entities subject to the proposed Disposal Rule that are not subject to the Safeguards Rule because they are not "financial institutions" under GLBA. This differential coverage was specifically intended by Congress. See Cong. Rec. S13889 (Nov. 4, 2003) (Statement of Sen. Nelson). In addition, the proposed Disposal Rule and the Safeguards Rule apply to different sets of information. See 16 CFR 314.1(b) (describing scope of "customer information" covered by Safeguards Rule); Proposed Disposal Rule §§ 682.1(b) & 682.2(b) (defining scope of "consumer information" subject to proposed Disposal rule).

[7] As noted above, in addition to the entities that own consumer information, waste disposal companies and other companies that obtain consumer information in connection with the provision of services would be directly covered by the Disposal Rule. By contrast, such entities are generally deemed "service providers" under the Safeguards Rule. To the extent that such entities undertake disposal measures that comply with the Disposal Rule, such measures would also be appropriate disposal measures under the service provider provisions of the Safeguards Rule. See 16 CFR 314.4(d). However, such disposal measures would only be one part of the broader security program required of both financial institutions and, indirectly, their service providers under the Safeguards Rule.

[8] Commission Rule 4.2(d), 16 CFR 4.2(d). The comment must be accompanied by an explicit request for confidential treatment, including the factual and legal basis for the request, and must identify the specific portions of the comment to be withheld from the public record. The request will be granted or denied by the Commission's General Counsel, consistent with applicable law and the public interest. See Commission Rule 4.9(c), 16 CFR 4.9(c).

IV. Communications by Outside Parties to Commissioners or Their Advisors

Written communications and summaries or transcripts of oral communications respecting the merits of this proceeding from any outside party to any Commissioner or Commissioner's advisor will be placed on the public record. *See* 16 CFR 1.26(b)(5).

V. Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506) (PRA), the Commission has reviewed the proposed rule. The proposed rule explicitly provides that it is not intended "(1) to require a person to maintain or destroy any record pertaining to a consumer that is not imposed under other law; or (2) to alter or affect any requirement imposed under any other provision of law to maintain or destroy such a record." As such, the proposed rule does not impose any recordkeeping requirement or otherwise constitute a "collection of information" as it is defined in the regulations implementing the PRA. *See* 5 CFR 1320.3(c).

VI. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act ("RFA"), 5 U.S.C. 601–612, requires an agency to provide an lnitial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis ("IRFA") with a proposed rule and a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis ("FRFA") with the final rule, if any, unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. *See* 5 U.S.C. 603–605. The Commission has determined that it is appropriate to publish an IRFA in order to inquire into the impact of the proposed Rule on small entities. Therefore, the Commission has prepared the following analysis.

A. Reasons for the Proposed Rule

Section 216 of the FACT Act requires the Commission to issue regulations regarding the proper disposal of consumer information in order to prevent sensitive financial and personal information from falling into the hands of identity thieves or others who might use the information to victimize consumers. The requirements of the proposed Rule are intended to fulfill the obligations imposed by section 216.

B. Statement of Objectives and Legal Basis

The objectives of the proposed Rule are discussed above. The legal basis for the proposed Rule is section 216 of the FACT Act.

C. Description of Small Entities to Which the Proposed Rule Will Apply

The proposed Disposal Rule, which tracks the language of section 216 of the FACT Act, applies to "any person that, for a business purpose, maintains or otherwise possesses consumer information, or any compilation of consumer information." As discussed above, the entities covered by the Rule would include consumer reporting agencies, resellers of consumer reports, lenders, insurers, employers, landlords, government agencies, mortgage brokers, automobile dealers, waste disposal companies, and any other business that possesses or maintains consumer information. Although it is not readily feasible to determine a precise number of small entities that will be subject to the proposed Rule, it is clear that numerous small entities across almost every industry could potentially be subject to the Rule.

For example, any employer, regardless of industry or size, that obtains a consumer report (whether a full credit report or a pre-employment background check of public records) would be subject to the proposed Rule. Indeed, any company, regardless of industry or size, that obtains consumer reports for a business purpose would be subject to the proposed Rule. In addition, a variety of consumer reporting agencies and resellers of consumer reports may qualify as small businesses, as could a number of waste disposal companies, all of which would be subject to the proposed Rule.

Given the diversity of the entities potentially subject to the Rule, determining a precise estimate of the number of small entities that will be subject to the proposed Rule, or describing those entities, is not possible. The Commission invites comment and information on this issue.

D. Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping and Other Compliance Requirements

The proposed Rule would not impose any reporting or any specific recordkeeping requirements within the meaning of the Paperwork Reduction Act, discussed above. The proposed Rule would require covered entities, when disposing of consumer information, to take reasonable measures to protect against unauthorized access to or use of the information in connection with its disposal. What is considered "reasonable" will vary according to an entity's nature and size, the costs and benefits of available disposal methods, and the sensitivity of the information involved. This flexibility is intended to reduce the burden that might otherwise be imposed on small entities by a more rigid, prescriptive rule. Nonetheless, the Commission is concerned about the potential impact of the proposed Rule on small entities, and invites comment on the costs of compliance for such parties.

E. Identification of Other Duplicative, Overlapping, or Conflicting Federal Rules

The FTC has not identified any other Federal statutes, rules, or policies that would conflict with the proposed Rule's requirement that covered persons take reasonable measures to protect against unauthorized access to or use of the information in connection with its disposal. However, the Commission is requesting comment on the extent to which other federal standards involving privacy or security of information may duplicate, satisfy, or inform the proposed Rule's requirements. In addition, the FTC seeks comment and information about any statutes or rules that may conflict with the proposed requirements, as well as any other state, local, or industry rules or policies that require covered entities to implement practices that comport with the requirements of the proposed Rule.

F. Discussion of Significant Alternatives

Section 216 of the FACT Act requires the Commission to issue regulations regarding the proper disposal of consumer information. The Act also requires that the regulations cover "any person who possesses or maintains" consumer report information. This broad coverage is consistent with the section's purpose of preventing identity theft because the risks created by improper disposal of consumer information are the same regardless of the nature of the entity disposing of the records. However, the standards in the proposed Rule are flexible, and take account of a covered entity's size and sophistication, as well as the costs and benefits of alternative disposal methods. The FTC welcomes comment on any significant alternatives, consistent with the purposes of the FACT Act, that would minimize the impact on small entities.

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 682

Consumer reports, Consumer reporting agencies, Credit, Fair Credit Reporting Act, Trade practices.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to add part 682 of title 16 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 682—DISPOSAL OF CONSUMER REPORT INFORMATION AND RECORDS

Sec.
682.1 Definitions.
682.2 Purpose and scope.
682.3 Proper disposal of consumer information.
682.4 Relation to other laws.
682.5 Effective date.

Authority: Pub. L. 108–159, sec. 216.

§ 682.1 Definitions.

(a) *In general.* Except as modified by this part or unless the context otherwise requires, the terms used in this part have the same meaning as set forth in the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. 1681 *et seq.*

(b) As used in this part, "*consumer information*" means any record about an individual, whether in paper, electronic, or other form, that is a consumer report or is derived from a consumer report.

(c) As used in this part, "*disposing*" or "*disposal*" includes:

(1) the discarding or abandonment of consumer information, and

(2) the sale, donation, or transfer of any medium, including computer equipment, upon which consumer information is stored.

§ 682.2 Purpose and scope.

(a) *Purpose.* This part ("rule") implements section 216 of the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003, which is designed to reduce the risk of consumer fraud and related harms, including identity theft, created by improper disposal of consumer information.

(b) *Scope.* This rule applies to any person over which the Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction, that, for a business purpose, maintains or otherwise possesses consumer information or any compilation of consumer information.

§ 682.3 Proper disposal of consumer information.

(a) *Standard.* Any person who maintains or otherwise possesses consumer information, or any compilation of consumer information, for a business purpose must properly dispose of such information by taking reasonable measures to protect against unauthorized access to or use of the information in connection with its disposal.

(b) *Examples.* Reasonable measures to protect against unauthorized access to or use of consumer information in connection with its disposal would include:

(1) Implementing and monitoring compliance with policies and procedures that require the burning, pulverizing, or shredding of papers containing consumer information so that the information cannot practicably be read or reconstructed.

(2) Implementing and monitoring compliance with policies and procedures that require the destruction or erasure of electronic media containing consumer information so that the information cannot practicably be read or reconstructed.

(3) After due diligence, entering into and monitoring compliance with a written contract with another party engaged in the business of record destruction to dispose of consumer information in a manner consistent with this rule. In this context, due diligence could include reviewing an independent audit of the disposal company's operations and/or its compliance with this rule, obtaining information about the disposal company from several references or other reliable sources, requiring that the disposal company be certified by a recognized trade association or similar third party, reviewing and evaluating the disposal company's information security policies or procedures, or taking other appropriate measures to determine the competency and integrity of the potential disposal company.

(4) (a) For disposal companies explicitly hired to dispose of consumer information: implementing and monitoring compliance with policies and procedures that protect against unauthorized access to or use of consumer information during collection and transportation, and disposing of such information in accordance with examples (1) and (2) above.

(b) For traditional garbage collectors engaged in the normal course of business: disposing of garbage in accordance with standard procedures.

§ 682.4 Relation to other laws.

Nothing in this rule shall be construed—

(a) to require a person to maintain or destroy any record pertaining to a consumer that is not imposed under other law; or

(b) to alter or affect any requirement imposed under any other provision of law to maintain or destroy such a record.

§ 682.5 Effective date.

This rule is effective 3 months from the date on which a final rule is published in the **Federal Register**.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–8904 Filed 4–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–P

Reader Aids

Federal Register

Vol. 69, No. 76

Tuesday, April 20, 2004

CUSTOMER SERVICE AND INFORMATION

Federal Register/Code of Federal Regulations	
General Information, indexes and other finding aids	202–741–6000
Laws	741–6000
Presidential Documents	
Executive orders and proclamations	741–6000
The United States Government Manual	741–6000
Other Services	
Electronic and on-line services (voice)	741–6020
Privacy Act Compilation	741–6064
Public Laws Update Service (numbers, dates, etc.)	741–6043
TTY for the deaf-and-hard-of-hearing	741–6086

ELECTRONIC RESEARCH
World Wide Web

Full text of the daily Federal Register, CFR and other publications is located at: **http://www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html**

Federal Register information and research tools, including Public Inspection List, indexes, and links to GPO Access are located at: **http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/**

E-mail

FEDREGTOC-L (Federal Register Table of Contents LISTSERV) is an open e-mail service that provides subscribers with a digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents. The digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents includes HTML and PDF links to the full text of each document.

To join or leave, go to **http://listserv.access.gpo.gov** and select *Online mailing list archives, FEDREGTOC-L, Join or leave the list (orchange settings);* then follow the instructions.

PENS (Public Law Electronic Notification Service) is an e-mail service that notifies subscribers of recently enacted laws.

To subscribe, go to **http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html** and select *Join or leave the list* (or change settings); then follow the instructions.

FEDREGTOC-L and **PENS** are mailing lists only. We cannot respond to specific inquiries.

Reference questions. Send questions and comments about the Federal Register system to: **fedreg.info@nara.gov**

The Federal Register staff cannot interpret specific documents or regulations.

FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATE, APRIL

17033–17282	1
17283–17584	2
17585–17898	5
17899–18244	6
18245–18470	7
18471–18800	8
18801–19076	9
19077–19310	12
19311–19752	13
19753–19920	14
19921–20536	15
20537–20804	16
20805–21038	19
21039–21392	20

CFR PARTS AFFECTED DURING APRIL

At the end of each month, the Office of the Federal Register publishes separately a List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA), which lists parts and sections affected by documents published since the revision date of each title.

1 CFR

51 18801

3 CFR

Proclamations:

7765 18465
7766 18467
7767 18469
7768 19077
7769 19307
7770 19751
7771 20537

Executive Orders:

13334 19917

5 CFR

537 21039

Proposed Rules:

1650 18294
1653 18294
1655 18294
1690 18294

7 CFR

301 21039
772 18471
905 19079
916 19753
917 19753
929 18803
982 19082
983 17844
984 17899

Proposed Rules:

272 20724
273 20724
301 19950
330 17984
761 20834
762 20834
763 20834
764 20834
765 20834
766 20834
767 20834
768 20834
769 20834
926 19118
1033 19292
1124 18834

8 CFR

103 20528

Proposed Rules:

103 18296

9 CFR

1 17899
2 17899
3 17899
77 20805
93 21040
94 21042
98 21042
301 18245
309 18245
310 18245
311 18245
313 18245
318 18245
319 18245
320 ..... 18245, 21047
381 21047

11 CFR

Proposed Rules:

110 ..... 18301, 18841

12 CFR

229 19921
335 19085
1700 18808

Proposed Rules:

222 19123
303 20558
1710 19126

14 CFR

25 ..... 18246, 19311
39 ..... 17033, 17034, 17901, 17903, 17905, 17906, 17909, 17911, 17913, 17914, 17915, 17917, 17918, 17919, 17921, 17924, 17925, 18250, 19313, 19618, 19756, 19758, 19759, 20539, 20809, 20811, 20815, 20817, 20818, 21049
71 ..... 17283, 19314, 19315, 19316, 19317, 19318, 19319, 19922, 19923, 20820, 20821, 20822, 20823
73 ..... 18471, 21053
97 17284
121 19761
135 18472

Proposed Rules:

39 ..... 17072, 17073, 17076, 17077, 17080, 17082, 17084, 17086, 17088, 17091, 17095, 17097, 17101, 17103, 17105, 17107, 17109, 17111, 17113, 17115, 17610, 17984, 17987, 17989, 17991, 17993, 17996, 18304, 18306, 18843, 18845, 18848, 19132, 19135, 19777, 19950, 19952, 19954, 19956, 20566
61 21073
71 ..... 18308, 18309, 18508, 19359, 19360, 19958, 19960, 19961, 19962, 19963, 20834, 20835, 20837
91 21073
119 21073
121 21073

135.....21073
136.....21073

15 CFR

738.....21055
740.....21055
774.....17926

16 CFR

316.....21024
1210.....19762

Proposed Rules:

316.....18851
682.....21388
801.....18686
802.....18686
803.....18686

17 CFR

200.....21057

Proposed Rules:

30.....17998
232.....17864
240.....17864
249.....17864

19 CFR

Proposed Rules:

24.....18296

20 CFR

404.....19924
641.....19014

Proposed Rules:

404.....18310

21 CFR

Ch. 1.....17285
1.....19763, 19765, 19766
20.....19766
173.....17297
201.....18255
206.....18728
250.....18728
312.....17927
314.....18728
522.....17585
573.....19320
600.....18728
601.....18728
606.....18255
610.....18255
807.....18472
1308.....17034

Proposed Rules:

Ch. 1.....17615
101.....20838

22 CFR

126.....18810

24 CFR

Proposed Rules:

30.....19906
200.....21036
203.....19906
320.....19746

25 CFR

Proposed Rules:

30.....20839
37.....20839
39.....20839
42.....20839
44.....20839
47.....20839

26 CFR

1.....17586

Proposed Rules:

1.....17117, 17477, 18314
20.....20840
301.....17117, 20840

27 CFR

9.....20823

28 CFR

803.....21058
804.....21059

29 CFR

35.....17570
1952.....20826, 20828
1981.....17587
4022.....19925
4044.....19925

Proposed Rules:

1910.....17774
1917.....19361
1918.....19361
1926.....20840

30 CFR

75.....17480
925.....19927
931.....19321

Proposed Rules:

200.....19137
917.....21075

31 CFR

1.....17298
103.....19093, 19098
240.....17272

32 CFR

199.....17035
719.....20540
725.....20540
727.....20541
752.....20542
1602.....20542
1605.....20542
1609.....20542
1656.....20542
2001.....17052

Proposed Rules:

519.....18314

33 CFR

101.....17927
104.....17927
117.....17055, 17057, 17595, 17597, 18473, 19103, 19325, 20544, 21061, 21062, 21064
147.....19933, 21065
165.....18473, 19326, 21067
167.....18476
334.....20545, 20546, 20547
402.....18811

Proposed Rules:

100.....18002
110.....17119, 20568
117.....17122, 17616, 17618, 18004
165.....18794, 18797
334.....20570

36 CFR

223.....18813
400.....17928

Proposed Rules:

13.....17355
242.....19964

37 CFR

401.....17299

38 CFR

20.....19935, 21068

Proposed Rules:

17.....21075

39 CFR

111.....17059

Proposed Rules:

111.....19363, 20841

40 CFR

9.....19105
52.....17302, 17929, 18815, 19937, 19939, 20548
63.....19106, 19734, 19943, 20968
68.....18819
80.....17932
81.....20550
147.....18478
166.....17303
180.....17304, 18255, 18263, 18275, 18480, 19767
257.....17308
745.....18489

Proposed Rules:

52.....17368, 17374, 18006, 18319, 18323, 18853, 19968
63.....18327, 18338, 19139, 19743, 19968, 21198
81.....17374, 18853
86.....17532
122.....18166
136.....18166
141.....18166
143.....18166
257.....17380
264.....21198
265.....21198
266.....21198
270.....21198
271.....21077, 21198
300.....19363
403.....18166
430.....18166
455.....18166
465.....18166

42 CFR

411.....17933
414.....17935
424.....17933

Proposed Rules:

50.....20778
93.....20778

44 CFR

64.....17310
65.....17597, 17600
67.....17312, 17606, 17608

Proposed Rules:

67.....17381, 17619, 17620

45 CFR

1206.....19110
2551.....20829
2552.....19774
2553.....20830

46 CFR

515.....19774

47 CFR

1.....17946
2.....18275, 18832
22.....17063
24.....17063
25.....18275
27.....17946
73.....17070, 17071, 19328, 20554, 20555, 20556
74.....17946
80.....19947
90.....17946, 17959
101.....17946

Proposed Rules:

0.....17124
1.....17124, 18006, 19779
11.....18857
13.....18007
54.....18508
61.....17124, 18006
64.....20845
69.....17124, 18006
73.....17124, 17125, 18860, 19363, 19364, 20571
80.....18007
87.....19140

48 CFR

Ch. 1.....17740, 17770
1.....17741
2.....17741, 17764
4.....17768
8.....17741
15.....17768
29.....17769
31.....17764
45.....17741
49.....17741
52.....17741, 17770
53.....17741
601.....19329
602.....19329
603.....19329
604.....19329
605.....19329
606.....19329
609.....19329
611.....19329
612.....19329
613.....19329
616.....19329
617.....19329
619.....19329
622.....19329
623.....19329
625.....19329
626.....19329
628.....19329
630.....19329
632.....19329
636.....19329
637.....19329
642.....19329
651.....19329
652.....19329
653.....19329

Proposed Rules:

19.....18244
45.....17584
52.....17584

49 CFR

172.....20831
192.....18228
219.....19270
375.....17313
541.....17960
542.....17960
543.....17960
571.....18496
579.....20556
595.....21069
1104.....18498
1572.....17969

Proposed Rules:

541.....18010
544.....18861
571.....17622, 18015
572.....17622

50 CFR

17.....18279, 18499
92.....17318
216.....17973
223.....18444
224.....18444
229.....21070
622.....19346
648.....17980, 18291
660.....17329, 18444, 19347
679.....17982, 19116, 19358, 19776, 20833

Proposed Rules:

17.....17383, 17627, 17634, 18016, 18018, 18035, 18515, 18516, 18770, 19364, 19620
100.....19964
223.....20571
229.....19365
300.....19147
635.....19147
648.....19805

REMINDERS

The items in this list were editorially compiled as an aid to Federal Register users. Inclusion or exclusion from this list has no legal significance.

RULES GOING INTO EFFECT APRIL 20, 2004

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

Exportation and importation of animals and animal products:

Cattle from Australia and New Zealand: brucellosis testing; published 4-20-04

Classical swine fever; disease status change—

France and Spain; published 4-20-04

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Industry and Security Bureau

Export administration regulations:

Commerce Control List—

Addition of Aruba, Netherlands Antilles, East Timor, and Democratic Republic of Congo; update of country names; published 4-20-04

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Superfund program:

National oil and hazardous substances contingency plan—

National priorities list update; published 2-20-04

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT OFFICE

Federal Employee Student Loan Assistance Act:

Student loans repayment; published 4-20-04

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

Federal Aviation Administration

Airworthiness directives:

AeroSpace Technologies of Australia Pty Ltd.; published 3-3-04

Bombardier; published 3-1-04

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Motor vehicle safety standards:

Occupant crash protection—

Safety equipment removal; exemptions from make inoperative prohibition for persons with disabilities; published 4-20-04

COMMENTS DUE NEXT WEEK

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

Crop insurance regulations:

Apples; comments due by 4-28-04; published 3-29-04 [FR 04-06938]

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Fishery conservation and management:

Magnuson-Stevens Act provisions—

Essential fish habitat; comments due by 4-26-04; published 2-25-04 [FR 04-04149]

Northeastern United States fisheries—

Atlantic mackerel, squid, and butterfish; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-26-04 [FR 04-06856]

Northeast multispecies; comments due by 4-30-04; published 2-24-04 [FR 04-04018]

Summer flounder, scup, and black sea bass; comments due by 4-29-04; published 4-14-04 [FR 04-08488]

COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Semi-annual agenda; Open for comments until further notice; published 12-22-03 [FR 03-25121]

ENERGY DEPARTMENT

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Electric rate and corporate regulation filings:

Virginia Electric & Power Co. et al.; Open for comments until further notice; published 10-1-03 [FR 03-24818]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Air pollutants, hazardous; national emission standards; and air pollution; standards of performance for new stationary sources:

Electric utility steam generating units; comments due by 4-30-04; published 3-16-04 [FR 04-04457]

Air programs; State authority delegations:

Louisiana; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-26-04 [FR 04-06299]

Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States:

Florida; comments due by 4-28-04; published 3-29-04 [FR 04-06824]

Environmental statements; availability, etc.:

Coastal nonpoint pollution control program—

Minnesota and Texas; Open for comments until further notice; published 10-16-03 [FR 03-26087]

Water pollution control:

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System—

North Dakota; comments due by 4-28-04; published 3-29-04 [FR 04-06928]

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Federal sector equal employment opportunity:

Complaint processing data posting; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-23-04 [FR 04-06393]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Common carrier services:

Controlling the Assault of Non-Solicited Pornography and Marketing Act of 2003 and Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991; implementation—

Consumer protection from unwanted mobile service commercial messages and national do-not-call registery revisions; comments due by 4-30-04; published 3-31-04 [FR 04-07226]

Radio stations; table of assignments:

Illinois; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-17-04 [FR 04-06043]

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Medicare and Medicaid:

Long term care facilities; nursing services; nurse staffing information posting; comments due by 4-27-04; published 2-27-04 [FR 04-03732]

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Food and Drug Administration

Biological products:

Human cells, tissues, and cellular and tissue-based products; establishment registration and listing; comments due by 4-26-04; published 1-27-04 [FR 04-01733]

Food additives:

Polymers—

Polymer films/layers; technical amendment; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-26-04 [FR 04-06738]

Reports and guidance documents; availability, etc.:

Evaluating safety of antimicrobial new animal drugs with regard to their microbiological effects on bacteria of human health concern; Open for comments until further notice; published 10-27-03 [FR 03-27113]

HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT

Coast Guard

Anchorage regulations:

Maryland; Open for comments until further notice; published 1-14-04 [FR 04-00749]

Drawbridge operations:

Connecticut; comments due by 4-30-04; published 3-1-04 [FR 04-04489]

Maritime security:

Continuous Synopsis Record; application availability; comments due by 4-27-04; published 2-27-04 [FR 04-04210]

Regattas and marine parades:

Cuyahoga Rowing Regatta; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-11-04 [FR 04-05466]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Fish and Wildlife Service

Endangered and threatened species:

Critical habitat designations—

Mexican spotted owl; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-26-04 [FR 04-06764]

Santa Ana sucker; comments due by 4-26-04; published 2-26-04 [FR 04-04226]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT
Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement Office
Permanent program and abandoned mine land reclamation plan submissions:
Iowa; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-25-04 [FR 04-06734]
West Virginia; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-25-04 [FR 04-06735]

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT
Drug Enforcement Administration
Schedules of controlled substances:
Alpha-methyltryptamine and 5-methoxy-N,N-diisopropyltryptamine; placement into Schedule I; comments due by 4-30-04; published 3-31-04 [FR 04-07218]

LABOR DEPARTMENT
Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Safety and health standards:
Assigned protection factors; comments due by 4-29-04; published 3-30-04 [FR 04-07074]

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION
Credit unions:
Share insurance and appendix—
Living trust accounts; comments due by 4-26-04; published 2-26-04 [FR 04-04217]

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT OFFICE
Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; Title II implementation; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-31-04 [FR 04-07197]

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Investment companies:
Investment advisory contracts approval; disclosure requirements; comments due by 4-26-04; published 2-19-04 [FR 04-03535]
Securities:
Section 18 covered securities; designation; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-26-04 [FR 04-06815]

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
Disaster loan areas:
Maine; Open for comments until further notice; published 2-17-04 [FR 04-03374]

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
Federal Aviation Administration
Airworthiness directives:
Airbus; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-25-04 [FR 04-06678]
Boeing; comments due by 4-26-04; published 2-26-04 [FR 04-04258]
Bombardier; comments due by 4-30-04; published 3-31-04 [FR 04-06774]
Eurocopter France; comments due by 4-27-04; published 2-27-04 [FR 04-04356]
General Electric Co.; comments due by 4-26-04; published 2-26-04 [FR 04-03798]
McDonnell Douglas; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-11-04 [FR 04-05518]
McDonnell Douglas; comments due by 4-27-04; published 2-27-04 [FR 04-04475]
Raytheon; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-1-04 [FR 04-04372]
Saab; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-26-04 [FR 04-06685]
Short Brothers; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-25-04 [FR 04-06680]
Airworthiness standards:
Special conditions—
Avidyne Corp., Inc.; various airplane models; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-26-04 [FR 04-06748]

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Fuel economy standards:
Corporate Average Fuel Economy Program; comments due by 4-27-04; published 12-29-03 [FR 03-31890]
Corporate Average Fuel Economy Program; product plan information request; comments due by 4-27-04; published 12-29-03 [FR 03-31891]
Motor vehicle safety standards:
Bus emergency exits and window retention and release; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-12-04 [FR 04-05691]
Rear impact guards; comments due by 4-27-04; published 2-27-04 [FR 04-04276]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT
Comptroller of the Currency
Corporate activities:
National banks; operating subsidies annual report; comments due by 4-26-04; published 3-25-04 [FR 04-06710]

LIST OF PUBLIC LAWS

This is a continuing list of public bills from the current session of Congress which have become Federal laws. It may be used in conjunction with "PLUS" (Public Laws Update Service) on 202–741–6043. This list is also available online at *http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/public_laws/public_laws.html*.

The text of laws is not published in the **Federal Register** but may be ordered in "slip law" (individual pamphlet) form from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 (phone, 202–512–1808). The text will also be made available on the Internet from GPO Access at *http://www.gpoaccess.gov/plaws/index.html*. Some laws may not yet be available.

H.R. 2584/P.L. 108–219

To provide for the conveyance to the Utrok Atoll local government of a decommissioned National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ship, and for other purposes. (Apr. 13, 2004; 118 Stat. 615)

Last List April 14, 2004

Public Laws Electronic Notification Service (PENS)

PENS is a free electronic mail notification service of newly enacted public laws. To subscribe, go to *http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html*

Note: This service is strictly for E-mail notification of new laws. The text of laws is not available through this service. **PENS** cannot respond to specific inquiries sent to this address.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS' SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE

Know when to expect your renewal notice and keep a good thing coming. To keep our subscription prices down, the Government Printing Office mails each subscriber *only one renewal notice*. You can learn when you will get your renewal notice by checking the number that follows month/year code on the top line of your label *as shown in this example:*

A renewal notice will be sent approximately 90 days **before the shown date.**

```
                                   /
AFR SMITH212J                  DEC97 R 1
JOHN SMITH
212 MAIN STREET
FORESTVILLE MD 20704
```

A renewal notice will be sent approximately 90 days **before the shown date.**

```
                                   /
AFRDO SMITH212J                DEC97 R 1
JOHN SMITH
212 MAIN STREET
FORESTVILLE MD 20704
```

To be sure that your service continues without interruption, please return your renewal notice promptly. If your subscription service is discontinued, simply send your mailing label from any issue to the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, DC 20402–9372 with the proper remittance. Your service will be reinstated.

To change your address: Please SEND YOUR MAILING LABEL, along with your new address to the Superintendent of Documents, Attn: Chief, Mail List Branch, Mail Stop: SSOM, Washington, DC 20402–9373.

To inquire about your subscription service: Please SEND YOUR MAILING LABEL, along with your correspondence, to the Superintendent of Documents, Attn: Chief, Mail List Branch, Mail Stop: SSOM, Washington, DC 20402–9373.

To order a new subscription: Please use the order form provided below.

Superintendent of Documents **Subscription** Order Form

Order Processing Code:
*** 5468**

Charge your order. It's Easy!

To fax your orders (202) 512–2250
Phone your orders (202) 512–1800

☐ **YES**, enter my subscription(s) as follows:

_____ subscriptions to **Federal Register (FR);** *including* the daily Federal Register, monthly Index and List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA), at $764 each per year.

_____ subscriptions to **Federal Register**, *daily only* (FRDO), at $699 each per year.

The total cost of my order is $_____. **Price includes regular domestic postage and handling**, and is subject to change. International customers please add 25%.

Company or personal name (Please type or print)

Additional address/attention line

Street address

City, State, ZIP code

Daytime phone including area code

Purchase order number (optional)

May we make your name/address available to other mailers? YES ☐ NO ☐

Please Choose Method of Payment:

☐ Check Payable to the Superintendent of Documents
☐ GPO Deposit Account ☐☐☐☐☐☐ – ☐
☐ VISA ☐ MasterCard Account
☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

☐☐☐☐ (Credit card expiration date)

Thank you for your order!

Authorizing signature 10/01

Mail To: Superintendent of Documents
P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954

Printed on recycled paper