prior to treatment because the oily wastewater is effectively diluted by the other wastewater to the point that the compounds are no longer detectible. The treatment system on which the Options 2 through 4 effluent limitations are based was designed specifically for the treatment of segregated oily wastewater.

See Section V.F. for further information regarding Monitoring to Demonstrate Compliance with the Regulation.

(iii) Subcategory C—Organics
Subcategory. The Agency is today
proposing BPT limitations for the
Organics Subcategory for 39 pollutants.
EPA identified two regulatory options
for consideration in establishing BPT
effluent reduction levels for this
subcategory of the Centralized Waste
Treatment Industry. For a more detailed
discussion of the basis for the
limitations and technologies selected
see the Technical Development
Document.

The two technology options considered for the Organics Subcategory BPT are:

- Option 1—Equalization, Air-Stripping, Biological Treatment, and Multi-media Filtration. BPT Option 1 effluent limitations are based on the following treatment system: equalization, two air-strippers in series equipped with a carbon adsorption unit for control of air emissions, biological treatment in the form of a sequential batch reactor (which is operated on a batch basis,) and finally multi-media filtration units for control of solids.
- Option 2—Equalization, Air-Stripping, Biological Treatment, Multi-Filtration, and Carbon Adsorption.
 Option 2 is the same as Option 1 except for the addition of carbon adsorption units.

The Agency is proposing to adopt BPT effluent limitations based on the Option 1 technology for the Organics Subcategory. The demonstrated effluent reductions attainable through Option 1 control technology represent the best practicable performance attainable through the application of currently available treatment measures. EPA's decision to propose effluent limitations defined by the removal performance of the Option 1 treatment systems is based primarily on consideration of several factors: the effluent reductions attainable, the economic achievability of the option and non-water quality environmental benefits. Once again, the age and size of the facilities, processes and other engineering factors were not considered pertinent to establishment of BPT limitations for this subcategory.

The Agency is proposing to adopt BPT limitations based on the removal performance of the Option 1 treatment system for the following reasons. First, the cost of achieving the pollutant discharge levels associated with the Option 1 treatment system is reasonable. The annualized costs for treatment are low.

According to the data collected, the Option 1 treatment system provides a greater effluent pollutant reduction level than the more expensive Option 2. Theoretically, Option 2 should provide for the maximum reduction of pollutants discharged due to the addition of carbon adsorption units, but specific pollutants of concern increased across the carbon adsorption unit according to the analytical data collected. Due to the poor performance of carbon adsorption in EPA's database for this industry, Option 2 is rejected. The poor performance may be a result of pH fluctuations in the carbon adsorption unit resulting in the solubilization of metals. Similar trends have been found for all of the data collected on carbon adsorption units in this industry. The EPA is soliciting comments, additional information, and performance data on carbon adsorption units used within the industry.

The Agency used biological treatment performance data from the OCPSF regulation to establish direct discharge limitations for BOD₅ and TSS, because the facility from which Option 1 and 2 limitations were derived is an indirect discharger and the treatment system is not operated to optimize removal of conventional pollutants. EPA has concluded that the transfer of this data is appropriate given the absence of adequate treatment technology for these pollutants at the only otherwise welloperated BPT CWT facility. Given the treatment of similar wastes at both OCPSF and centralized waste treatment facilities, use of the data is warranted. Moreover, EPA has every reason to believe that the same treatment systems will perform similarly when treating the wastes in this subcategory.

Once again, the selected BPT option is based on the performance of a single facility. Many facilities that are treating wastes that will be subject to effluent limitations for the Organic-Bearing Waste Subcategory also operate other industrial processes that generate much larger amounts of wastewater than the quantity of off-site generated organic waste receipts. The off-site generated organic waste receipts are directly mixed with the wastewater from the other industrial processes for treatment. Therefore, identifying facilities to sample for limitations development was

difficult because the waste receipts and treatment unit effectiveness could not be properly characterized for off-site generated waste. The treatment system for which Options 1 and 2 was based upon was one of the few facilities identified which treated organic waste receipts separately from other on-site industrial wastewater.

See Section V.F. for further information regarding Monitoring to Demonstrate Compliance with the Regulation.

2. BCT

In today's rule, EPA is proposing effluent limitations guidelines and standards equivalent to the BPT guidelines for the conventional pollutants covered under BPT. In developing BCT limits, EPA considered whether there are technologies that achieve greater removals of conventional pollutants than proposed for BPT, and whether those technologies are cost-reasonable according to the BCT Cost Test. In all three subcategories, EPA identified no technologies that can achieve greater removals of conventional pollutants than proposed for BPT that are also cost-reasonable under the BCT Cost Test, and accordingly EPA proposes BCT effluent limitations equal to the proposed BPT effluent limitations guidelines and standards.

EPA may also decide to adopt BPT effluent limitations based on treatment technologies less stringent than the Regulatory Options that are the basis for today's proposal. Consequently, EPA has also evaluated the costreasonableness of BCT limits if EPA were to adopt BPT limitations based on less stringent technologies. For all three categories, this assessment does not support the adoption of BCT limitations for conventional pollutants that are more stringent than BPT limitations based on a reduced level of treatment.

3. BAT

EPA today is proposing BAT effluent limitations for all subcategories of the Centralized Waste Treatment Industry based on the same technologies selected for BPT for each subcategory. The BAT effluent limitations proposed today would control identified priority and non-conventional pollutants discharged from facilities.

EPA has not identified any more stringent treatment technology option which it considered to represent BAT level of control applicable to facilities in this industry for the metals, oils, and organics subcategories, EPA identified an add-on treatment technology—carbon adsorption—that should have