capability and performance of the POTW be recognized and taken into account in regulating the discharge of pollutants from indirect dischargers. Rather than compare the mass or concentration of pollutants discharged by the POTW with the mass or concentration of pollutants discharged by a BAT facility, EPA compares the percentage of the pollutants removed by the plant with the POTW removal. EPA takes this approach because a comparison of mass or concentration of pollutants in a POTW effluent with pollutants in a BAT facility's effluent would not take into account the mass of pollutants discharged to the POTW from non-industrial sources nor the dilution of the pollutants in the POTW effluent to lower concentrations from the addition of large amounts of nonindustrial wastewater. The volatile override test is the last step in determining is a pollutant will "passthrough." If a pollutant has a Henry's Law Constant greater than 2.4×10-5 atm-m $^3$ /mole, or  $10^{-3}$ mg/m $^3$ /mg/m $^3$ , it is determined to "pass-through" and will be regulated by PSES regardless of the percent removal data.

For past effluent guidelines, a study of 50 well-operated POTWs was used for the pass-through analysis. Because the data collected for evaluating POTW removals included influent levels of pollutants that were close to the detection limit, the POTW data were edited to eliminate influent levels less than 10 times the minimum level and the corresponding effluent values, except in the cases where none of the influent concentrations exceeded 10 times the minimum level. In the latter case, where no influent data exceeded 10 times the minimum level, the data were edited to eliminate influent values less than 20 μg/l and the corresponding effluent values. These editing rules were used to allow for the possibility that low POTW removal simply reflected the low influent levels.

EPA then averaged the remaining influent data and also averaged the remaining effluent data from the 50 POTW database. The percent removals achieved for each pollutant was determined from these averaged influent and effluent levels. This percent removal was then compared to the percent removal for the BAT option treatment technology. Due to the large number of pollutants applicable for this industry, additional data from the Risk Reduction Engineering Laboratory (RREL) database was used to augment the POTW database for the pollutants for which the 50 POTW Study did not cover. Based on this analysis, 78 of the 87 pollutants regulated under

Regulatory Option 1 (the combinations of Metals Option 3, Oils Option 2, and Organics Option 1) and 51 of the 87 pollutants regulated under Regulatory Option 2 (the combinations of Metals Option 3, Oils Option 3, and Organics Option 1) for BAT passed through POTWs and are proposed for regulation for PSES. The pollutants determined not to "pass-through" are listed in Table V.E–1.

TABLE V.E-1.—POLLUTANTS THAT DO NOT PASS-THROUGH POTWS FOR THE CENTRALIZED WASTE TREAT-MENT INDUSTRY

| Subcategory  | Pollutant   |
|--|---|
| Metals subcategory Oils Subcategory— Option 2. Organics Subcategory. | Barium. Nickel, Zinc, Tripropyleneglycol Methyl Ether. Phenol, 2-Propanone, Lead, Pyridine, Zinc. |

b. Options considered. The Agency today is proposing to establish pretreatment standards for existing sources (PSES) based on the same technologies as proposed for BPT and BAT for 78 of the 87 priority and nonconventional pollutants regulated under BAT for Regulatory Option 1 (the combinations of Metals Option 3, Oils Option 2, and Organics Option 1) and 81 of the 87 priority pollutants regulated under BAT for Regulatory Option 2 (the combinations of Metals Option 3, Oils Option 3, and Organics Option 1). These standards would apply to existing facilities in all subcategories of the Centralized Waste Treatment Industry that discharge wastewater to publiclyowned treatment works (POTWs). These limitations were developed based on the same technologies as proposed today for BPT/BAT, as applicable to each of the affected subcategories. PSES set at these points would prevent pass-through of pollutants, help control sludge contamination and reduce air emissions.

EPA estimated the cost and economic impact of installing BPT/BAT PSES technologies at the indirect discharging facilities. The total estimated annualized cost in 1993 for all the subcategories is approximately \$22.9 million (if PSES is Oils Option 3) and approximately \$2.78 million (if PSES is Oils Option 2). EPA concluded the cost of installation of these control technologies, in the case of metalbearing and organic-bearing waste streams, is clearly economically achievable. EPA's assessment shows none of the indirect discharging facilities in these subcategories go from

a profitable to unprofitable status as a result of the installation of the necessary technology.

EPA is asking for comment on whether it should adopt Oils Option 3 as PSES for this subcategory, given that annual costs are approximately ten times greater than Option 2. EPA is particularly interested in comments on whether Option 3 is economically achievable, given the EPA economic assessment showing that despite its high cost, it results only in a slight increase in the number of facilities going from a profitable to unprofitable status. In the case of Oils Option 2, four of 31 indirect dischargers would go from a profitable to unprofitable status and for Option 3, six would experience a change from a profitable to unprofitable status. Additional information is provided in the Economic Impact Analysis.

The Agency considered the age, size, processes, other engineering factors, and non-water quality environmental impacts pertinent to facilities in developing PSES. The Agency did not identify any basis for establishing different PSES limitations based on age, size, processes, or other engineering factors. As previously explained for BPT, adoption of standards based on the proposed technologies for metal-bearing wastes and organic-bearing wastes would have important non-water quality effects. The metals standards should reduce landfill disposal of metals treatment residuals and the organic waste streams would reduce volatilization of organic compounds.

c. Monitoring to Demonstrate Compliance with the Regulation. See Section V.F.

## 6. Pretreatment Standards for New Sources

Section 307(c) of the Act requires EPA to promulgate pretreatment standards for new sources (PSNS) at the same time it promulgates new source performance standards (NSPS). New indirect discharging facilities, like new direct discharging facilities, have the opportunity to incorporate the best available demonstrated technologies, including process changes, in-facility controls, and end-of-pipe treatment technologies.

As set forth in Section VIII.E.4(a) of this preamble, EPA determined that a broad range of pollutants discharged by Centralized Waste Treatment Industry facilities pass-through POTWs. The same technologies discussed previously for BAT, NSPS, and PSES are available as the basis for PSNS.

EPA is proposing that pretreatment standards for new sources be set equal to NSPS for priority and non-