of various pollutants and is requesting comments on the extent to which operating practices could influence emissions. To evaluate the effectiveness of waste segregation programs, the EPA is specifically soliciting detailed descriptions of the programs and results of performance tests conducted to demonstrate pollutant emission levels from the MWI prior to implementation of the program and subsequent to implementation of the program. This information is critical to a thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of the program. In addition, the EPA solicits comments on how such a program could be incorporated into the MWI regulations. Whenever information is submitted relative to Hg emissions, the EPA requests that, if available, Hg emissions data be broken out by various species emitted (for example mercury chloride or elemental mercury).

I. MACT Floor and MACT for New MWI's

Section 129 of the Clean Air Act requires that emission standards reflect MACT. According to section 129, the degree of reduction in emissions that is deemed achievable for new MWI's may not be less stringent than the emissions control that is achieved in practice by the best controlled similar unit. As a result. the emission limits selected to reflect MACT for new MWI's must. at a minimum, be as stringent as the emission levels achieved by the best controlled similar unit. This minimum performance level is known as the MACT floor. Beyond the MACT floor, in determining what performance level should be adopted in the standards as MACT, the Administrator is to consider the costs, any nonair-quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements associated with such emission limits.

The basis for MACT determinations are presented for each subcategory in paragraphs I1, I2, and I3 of this section. The EPA solicits comments on whether test data are available from MWI's that are achieving better control than the systems used as the basis for the MACT determinations. If submitting Hg data, EPA specifically requests that, if available, Hg emission data be broken down by various species emitted (for example, mercury chloride and elemental mercury).

While the paragraphs that follow focus on specific control technologies in determining the MACT floor and MACT for new MWI's, the standards do not require the use of any specific technology. The Agency's assessment of the performance of specific technologies is used to develop emission limitations, which appear in the regulation. Any control technology that can comply with the emission limitations may be used.

1. MACT Floor and MACT for New Continuous MWI's

As discussed in section VI, the discussion that follows is based in part on limited test data on wet scrubber systems. The EPA requests comment on the performance and costs of wet scrubber systems.

The MACT floor for continuous MWI's consists of the emission levels that are achievable with DI/FF with carbon injection. The MACT floor is based on these emission levels because DI/FF with carbon injection achieves the lowest emission levels for all pollutants, and it is used to control emissions from at least one existing continuous MWI. While the lowest emission levels for most of the pollutants are achieved by several different control technologies (including DI/FF with carbon injection), the lowest Hg and CDD/CDF emission levels for continuous MWI's are achieved only with DI/FF with carbon injection.

Because the MACT floor is the most effective level of control for continuous units, there are no alternatives beyond the MACT floor to consider. The level of emission control achieved by a DI/FF system with carbon injection is considered MACT for continuous MWI's.

As discussed earlier, NO_X control has not been demonstrated on MWI's and acid gas controls are not effective in reducing SO₂ emissions from MWI's. Therefore, MACT reflects no control of NO_X and SO₂. However, because the Act requires EPA to set numerical emission limits for NO_X and SO_2 , the limits are proposed at 210 ppmv for NO_X and 45 ppmv for SO_2 , the highest uncontrolled NO_X and SO₂ emission rates measured during the EPA test program. The EPA specifically solicits comments on the emission limits of 45 ppmv set for SO₂ and 210 ppmv set for NO_X and whether these levels accurately reflect uncontrolled emissions of NO_X and SO₂ at MWI's.

2. MACT Floor and MACT for New Intermittent MWI's

As discussed in section VI, the discussion that follows is based in part on limited test data on wet scrubber systems. The EPA requests comment on the performance and costs of wet scrubber systems.

The MACT floor for intermittent MWI's is based on the emission levels that are achievable with a combination of two control technologies. The VS/PB and DI/FF without carbon injection technologies are each used to control emissions from at least one intermittent MWI. The MACT floor is based on both of these technologies because VS/PB achieves the lowest CDD/CDF emissions, but DI/FF without carbon injection achieves the lowest PM, Pb, and Cd emissions. The MACT floor emission levels for the other pollutants can be achieved with either technology. Therefore, one way to achieve all of the MACT floor emission levels for intermittent MWI's would be to use a combination of both VS/PB and DI/FF without carbon injection.

Another approach, which is less complex and less costly than the above combination of controls, could also be used to achieve the MACT floor emission levels. As noted in the discussion of the MACT floor for continuous MWI's, the CDD/CDF emission levels achievable with the DI/ FF with carbon injection are even lower than those achievable with the VS/PB system. Even though this technology is not known to be used with existing intermittent MWI's, it could achieve better performance for a much lower cost than the combination of controls described above, and therefore the MACT floor for new intermittent MWI's is based on these emission levels.

Because the MACT floor is the most effective level of control for intermittent units, there are no alternatives beyond the MACT floor to consider. The level of emission control achieved by a DI/FF system with carbon injection is considered MACT for intermittent MWI's.

As discussed earlier, NO_X control has not been demonstrated on MWI's and acid gas controls are not effective in reducing SO₂ emissions from MWI's. Therefore, MACT reflects no control of NO_X and SO₂. However, because the Act requires EPA to set numerical emission limits for NO_X and SO_2 , the limits are proposed at 210 ppmv for NO_X and 45 ppmv for SO₂, the highest uncontrolled NO_X and SO_2 emission rates measured during the EPA test program. The EPA specifically solicits comments on the emission limits of 45 ppmv set for SO₂ and 210 ppmv set for NO_X and whether these levels accurately reflect uncontrolled emissions of NO_X and SO₂ at MWI's.

3. MACT Floor and MACT for New Batch MWI's

As discussed in section VI, the discussion that follows is based in part on limited test data on wet scrubber systems. The EPA requests comment on the performance and costs of wet scrubber systems.