30218

(approximately 30 million toxic pound equivalents) as the proposed zero discharge option alone. At the same time, the Zero/P2 Option is expected to result in a reduced annualized cost (\$32.7 million in \$1988 or \$39.4 million in \$1995) and fewer facility closures (no facility closures) and line closures (162) than would result from the zero discharge option in the proposed rule. EPA has determined that the Zero/P2 Option is economically achievable. **DATES:** Comments on the proposed rule must be received in writing by July 10, 1995 at the following address. **ADDRESSES:** Send comments in writing to Ms. Shari H. Zuskin, Engineering & Analysis Division (4303), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

The complete record for this rulemaking is available for review at EPA's Water Docket; 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460. For access to Docket materials, call (202) 260–3027 between 9 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. for an appointment. The EPA public information regulation (40 CFR part 2) provides that a reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional technical information write or call Ms. Zuskin at (202) 260–7130. For additional information on the economic impact analyses contact Dr. Lynne G. Tudor at the above address or by calling (202) 260–5834.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

II. Changes to Scope

- A. Sanitizers
- B. Pool Chemicals
- C. Other Pesticide Active Ingredients
- 1. Microorganisms
- 2. Mixtures
- 3. PAIs That Have Been Determined Not To Pass Through
- D. Wastewater Sources
- E. Clarification of Definitions
- III. Pollution Prevention Alternative
- A. Authority
- B. Background
- C. Structure of the Alternative
- 1. Alternative to Zero
- 2. Definition of Pollution Prevention Allowable Discharge
- 3. Description of Specified Practices
- 4. Implementation of the Pollution
- Prevention Alternative
- IV. Costing Methodology
- V. Estimated Costs, Economic Impacts, and Cost-Effectiveness
- VI. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
- VII. Solicitation of Comment
- Appendix A—PAIs Considered for Exemption
- Appendix B—Sample Regulatory Text Considered for the Final Rule
- Appendix C—List of PAI Specific Treatment Technologies
- Appendix D-List of Acronyms

I. Background

In a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on April 14, 1994 (59 FR 17850), EPA proposed effluent limitations guidelines and standards for the control of wastewater pollutants from the Pesticide Formulating, Packaging and Repackaging (PFPR) industry. This proposed rulemaking would have established a zero discharge limitation of wastewater pollutants for almost all of the formulating, packaging and repackaging of FIFRA registered pesticide active ingredients. Only a small number of PAIs were not completely covered by the proposed zero discharge.

As result of disproportionate economic impacts, EPA proposed a partial exemption for the exterior wastewaters¹ from small sanitizer facilities. Small sanitizer facilities were defined as those facilities which formulate, package or repackage 265,000 lbs/yr or less of all FIFRA registered products containing one or more sanitizer active ingredients (listed in Table 8 of the regulation) and no other active ingredients at a single pesticide producing establishment (i.e., a single PFPR facility). The production cutoff of 265,000 lbs/yr represents the production level (of these sanitizer products) at the largest facility that would experience economic impacts if there was no exemption of wastewater treatment requirements for non-interior wastewater sources. (See Section II.A. of this notice for a description of revisions made to this exemption).

EPA based the zero discharge limitation on pollution prevention, recycle/reuse and, when necessary, treatment through the Universal Treatment System (UTS) for reuse. EPA visualized the UTS as a flexible system consisting of a variety of treatment technologies that have been determined to be effective for treating PFPR wastewaters. In calculating compliance costs, EPA included costs for treatment technologies such as emulsion breaking, hydrolysis, chemical oxidation, metals precipitation and carbon adsorption. EPA also included costs for contract hauling treatment residuals (sludges) from the UTS for incineration. Because of the estimates of reduced wastewater volumes based on the increase in reuse/ recycle practices, the overall volume of wastewaters being contract hauled offsite for incineration was not expected to increase. Thus, EPA did not include additional costs for contract hauling of PFPR wastewaters in the original proposal. Based on comments, revised costs for the proposed zero discharge option have been included in this notice.

The public comment on the proposed rule was originally 60 days and was extended for 30 additional days. EPA received 93 individual comment letters, including those requesting an extension of the comment period. The subject of the comments spanned a variety of topics, including changes to scope of the regulation, EPA's pesticide crosscontamination policy and its effect on the industry's ability to meet zero discharge, increased cross-media impacts due to contract hauling of wastewater for incineration to meet zero discharge, and requests for a discharge allowance when following specific pollution prevention practices.

II. Changes to Scope

A large portion of the comment letters addressed issues concerning the scope and applicability of the proposed regulation. Many commenters requested that the partial exemption of the listed sanitizer active ingredients be expanded to be a total exemption from the regulation for all antimicrobial active ingredients. Others requested that the exemption for sodium hypochlorite (bleach) be extended to other "pool chemicals." Commenters also requested that EPA exempt from the regulation certain low risk PAIs, such as cloves and citronella; specific wastewater sources such as aerosol leak test water, safety equipment cleaning water, laboratory equipment rinse water and storm water; and experimental/ research facilities. In response to the information and data supplied by commenters, EPA is considering whether to revise some aspects of the scope of the proposed PFPR effluent guidelines. EPA is using today's notice to solicit comment on these issues.

If the Agency determines to exclude any of the pollutants discussed in this section of the notice from the scope of the rule, PFPR facilities that discharge such pollutants directly into navigable waters (i.e., direct discharge PFPR/ Manufacturers) will still need to comply with the general NPDES permitting requirements, including the possible establishment by the permitting authority of case-by-case effluent limitations based upon Best Professional Judgement (BPJ) under CWA section 402(a)(1)(B). (See 40 CFR 125.3). In addition, those PFPR facilities that indirectly discharge such excluded PAI pollutants to navigable waters through a

¹ At the time of proposal, exterior wastewaters included: exterior equipment cleaning water, floor wash, leak and spill cleanup water, safety equipment cleaning water, DOT aerosol test bath water, air pollution control scrubber water, laboratory rinsate and contaminated precipitation runoff.