whether the wastewater treatment system (1) was effective in removing pollutants; (2) treated wastes received from a variety of sources, (3) employed either novel treatment technologies or applied traditional treatment technologies in a novel manner, and (4) applied waste management practices that increased the effectiveness of the treatment unit. An additional facility was sampled to characterize the wastes received and treatment processes of a facility that treated only non-hazardous waste. From the data collected at the non-hazardous waste treatment facility, waste stream characteristics were similar to that of a facility that treats hazardous waste. The other 17 facilities visited were not sampled, because they did not meet these criteria.

During each sampling episode, facility influent and effluent streams were sampled. Samples were also taken at intermediate points to assess the performance of individual treatment units. This information is summarized in the Technical Development Document. In the first two sampling episodes, streams were analyzed for over 480 pollutants to identify the range of pollutants possible at these facilities. After the analytical data were reviewed for the first two sampling episodes, the number of pollutants analyzed were reduced to approximately 180 that were detected in the initial sampling efforts.

In 1994, an additional four facilities were visited that are not included in the 85 Centralized Waste Treatment facilities identified in 1989. These facilities were not in business at the time the questionnaire was mailed. These facilities specialized in the treatment of bilge waters and unstable oil-water mixtures. From these site visits, one facility was chosen to be sampled based on the on-site treatment and type of oily waste accepted for treatment. As previously discussed, the data has not been reviewed at the time of this proposal, but the data is included in the regulatory record and will be evaluated prior to promulgation.

1. Metal-Bearing Waste Treatment and Recovery Sampling

From the ten sampling episodes completed from 1989 to 1994, only six sampling episodes contained data which were used to characterize this subcategory's waste streams and treatment technology performance. All of the facilities used some form of precipitation for treatment of the metalbearing waste streams. Only one facility was a direct discharger and was therefore designed to effectively treat the conventional pollutants important for this subcategory, TSS and Oil and Grease.

2. Oily Waste Treatment and Recovery Sampling

From the sampling data collected between 1989 and 1994, five sampling episodes contained data which are applicable to the treatment of oily wastes. Data for the remaining five sampling episodes could not be used because the facilities did not accept oily waste for treatment or recovery. Identification of facilities to be sampled was difficult because most facilities in the oily waste treatment subcategory had other centralized waste treatment processes on-site. Three of the four facilities had other on-site Centralized Waste Treatment processes. The oily wastewater after emulsion-breaking was commingled with other subcategory waste streams prior to further treatment of the oily waste stream. In all three cases most of the pollutants of concern that were detected prior to commingling were at a non-detect level after commingling. Therefore, dilution resulted from the mixing and no further treatment may have occurred. Data from the three facilities could be used only to characterize the untreated waste streams after emulsion-breaking. Data from one of the facilities could not be evaluated prior to this proposal but is included in the public record. Therefore, data from only one facility could be used to assess treatment performance at the facilities in this subcategory.

3. Organic Waste Treatment and Recovery Sampling

Similar to the case with the Oily Waste Subcategory, identification of facilities for assessing waste streams and treatment technology performance was difficult, because most organic waste treatment facilities had other industrial operations on-site. The centralized waste treatment waste streams were small in comparison to the overall site flow. Two facilities were identified and sampled which treated a significant portion of off-site generated organic waste streams. Data from one of the facilities could not be used when developing technology options for proposal because the treatment system performance was not optimal at the time of sampling, but data from this facility was used to characterize the raw waste streams.

Therefore, sampling data from one facility was used to determine the treatment technology basis for this subcategory.

## C. 1991 Waste Treatment Industry Questionnaire (Census of the Industry)

Under the authority of Section 308 of the Clean Water Act, EPA sent a questionnaire in 1991 to 455 facilities that the Agency had identified as possible Centralized Waste Treatment facilities. Since the Centralized Waste Treatment Industry is not represented by a SIC code, identification of facilities was difficult. Directories of treatment facilities, Agency information, and telephone directories were used to identify the 455 facilities to which the questionnaires were mailed. The responses from 416 facilities indicated that 89 facilities treated, or recovered material from, industrial waste from offsite in 1989 and the remaining 327 facilities did not treat, or recover materials from, industrial waste from off-site. Out of the 89 facilities that received industrial waste from off-site for treatment, four facilities received all of the off-site waste via pipeline. For the reasons discussed previously, this proposed regulation does not cover waste transferred from the original source of generation by pipeline. Therefore, based on this data base, 85 facilities are currently in the scope of this regulation. The questionnaire specifically requested information on: (1) the type of wastes accepted for treatment; (2) the industrial waste management practices used; (3) the quantity, treatment, and disposal of wastewater generated during industrial waste management; (4) available analytical monitoring data on wastewater treatment; (5) the degree of co-treatment (treatment of centralized waste treatment wastewater with wastewater from other industrial operations at the facility); and (6) the extent of wastewater recycling and/or reuse at the facility. Information was also obtained through follow-up telephone calls and written requests for clarification of questionnaire responses. Information obtained by the 1991 Waste Treatment Industry Questionnaire is summarized in the Technical Development Document for today's proposed rule.

## D. Detailed Monitoring Questionnaire (Follow-Up Questionnaire to a Subset of the Industry)

EPA also requested a subset of centralized waste treatment facilities to submit wastewater monitoring data in the form of individual data points rather than monthly aggregates. These wastewater monitoring data included information on pollutant concentrations and waste receipt data for a six week period. The waste receipt data were