RCRA Permit Appeal Fact Sheet **1990**

FACILITY: Chevron Chemical Company (Chevron)
Richmond, California
CAD 043 237 486
RCRA Appeal No. 90-15

PETITIONERS:
- Chevron
- The Pipe Trades Council of Northern California (Pipe Trades Council)
- Citizens for a Better Environment (CBE)
- The West County Toxics Coalition

PETITIONS FILED:
- June 7, 1990 (Chevron and Pipe Trades Council)
- June 13, 1990 (CBE and West County Toxics Coalition)

STATUS OF PETITIONS: See Permit Appeal Status Report

ISSUES: Miscellaneous other issues (trade secrets; waste feed limitation; mass feed rates of toxic metals; source reduction and recycling requirements; monitoring requirements; cumulative risk assessment; reapplication requirements; other corrections)

Summary of Petitions:

Chevron, the Pipe Trades Council, CBE, and the West County Toxics Coalition are petitioning for review of the RCRA hazardous waste permit issued by Region 9 to Chevron's incinerator in Richmond, California. The four petitioners raise different and overlapping conditions for review.

Chevron's petition addresses procedural and technical issues associated with reapplication requirements, limits on waste capacity and mass feed rates of toxic metals, and requirements for monitoring scrubber flow rate and combustion chamber pressure. In addition, Chevron seeks review and correction of several conditions that contain typographical or other minor errors.

The Pipe Trades Council contends that Chevron and EPA have not provided information necessary to analyze the permit. The Pipe Trades Council, CBE, and the West County Toxics Coalition argue that the permit violates RCRA by not limiting the waste feed to those wastes identified in the permit. These petitioners also argue that the permit does not adequately address source reduction and recycling. CBE and the West County Toxics Coalition propose that the cumulative risk from the entire plant be assessed to protect the public from significant cumulative risk.

- **Trade Secrets.** The Pipe Trades Council argues that both Chevron and Region 9 have withheld information concerning the chemical composition and volume of the wastes to be incinerated from public review claiming that they are "trade secrets." Chevron's attempt to deny the public the opportunity to comment on the permit should not be allowed - all relevant information should be released and the permit review period should be extended.

  - The petitioner argues that *Pennzoil Company v. Federal Power Commission* (5th Cir. 1976) decided that the mere fact that certain information is encompassed within the "trade secrets" exclusion of the Freedom of Information Act does not prohibit its disclosure to the public.

  - The petitioner contests that claims of confidentiality are not permitted by RCRA where disclosure would not be likely to cause substantial harm to the business's competitive position (Section 2.208(d)). Chevron's confidentiality claim violates RCRA, because disclosure would not harm Chevron's competitive position.

  - The petitioner contends that chemical and physical analyses of the hazardous waste to be handled at the facility, including quantities, composition and all other information which must be known to dispose of the wastes properly, are required for the Part B permit application by 42 USC 6295(b) and 40 CFR Section 270.14(b)(2). Without this information, it is not possible to assess whether the principal organic hazardous constituents (POHCs) tested in the trial burn are reasonable, if the waste analysis plan is sufficient, and if the proposed incinerator operating conditions are adequate.

- **Waste Feed Limitation.** Chevron objects to conditions that limit waste feed for any one year during the term of the permit. These conditions are new to the final permit and bear no relation to the operating rate demonstrated during the trial burn and evaluated in the risk assessment.

  The Pipe Trades Council, CBE, and the West County Toxics Coalition contend that the permit is written so as to allow Chevron to incinerate wastes not specifically identified in the permit. The Pipe Trades Council also argues that the permit violates RCRA for it allows Chevron to incinerate wastes in addition to those identified in the permit by simply notifying the EPA Division Director of the intent to incinerate. All three petitioners are concerned that the permit grants Chevron a carte blanche to incinerate almost any waste without the regulatory scrutiny demanded by RCRA. The Pipe Trades Council is concerned about grandfathering in waste from Chevron's refinery into the waste feed, and CBE and the West County Toxics Coalition are concerned about incineration of a new herbicide waste.

- **Mass Feed Rates of Toxic Metals.** Chevron argues that the permit imposes mass feed rates for beryllium and cadmium that are technologically impossible to demonstrate. Specifically, the petitioner argues that these feed rates are so close to the practical quantitation limits and method detection limits that it is not possible to achieve a statistically sound basis for compliance or noncompliance. Chevron also contends that there is no technical or legal basis for the permit to contain lower mass feed rates for arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, and chromium than were originally contained in the draft permit.

- **Source Reduction and Recycling Requirements.** The Pipe Trades Council, CBE, and the West County Toxics Coalition think that permit conditions requiring waste minimization are inadequate, because they fail to require specific reductions in the amount of hazardous waste generated and do not provide deadlines for these activities.

  - The Pipe Trades Council believes that EPA should make hydrocarbon waste recycling a condition of the permit and include a deadline for commencement of the recycling. Chevron should also be required to recycle all toluene, carbon tetrachloride, and methylene chloride waste.

  - CBI and the West County Toxics Coalition contend that Chevron should evaluate substitutes for methylene chloride. Until Chevron has clearly demonstrated, with data on chemical substitution, that it has fully explored this waste minimization strategy, the petitioners state that the incinerator permit should be denied. These petitioners also argue that Chevron has not properly assessed waste minimization through recycling, and that further recycling appears to be technologically feasible.

- **Monitoring Requirements.** Chevron notes that its draft permit contained requirements for monitoring Venturi scrubber flow rate and the combustion chamber pressure but did not contain waste feed cut-off requirements. These requirements were added to the final permit without any prior notice to Chevron. The petitioner also believes that the monitoring requirements are inconsistent, for they show monitoring of flow rate and pressure "every two hours in operating record." Chevron argues that it not possible to have continuous waste feed cut-off capability if the instrumentation is set for periodic monitoring.

- **Cumulative Risk Assessment.** CBE and the West County Toxics Coalition believe it is inappropriate to permit a hazardous waste incinerator in a community such as Richmond, California, which already faces a cumulative toxic hazard burden from many industrial sources of routine air emissions, hazardous waste generation, wastewater discharge, and handling of extremely hazardous substances and flammable and explosive materials. Consequently, these petitioners maintain that EPA should require Chevron to conduct a risk assessment that analyzes the cumulative risk from the pesticide plant and not just from the

incinerator itself. If cumulative risk is determined to be greater than one cancer per million, either the incinerator permit should be denied, or permit conditions should be changed to require a reduction in waste feed, source reduction from the pesticide plant, additional air pollution control, or other means necessary to reduce the cumulative risk.

- **Reapplication Requirements.** Chevron objects to permit conditions requiring the company to repeat the entire trial burn procedure as part of any reapplication to continue operating its hazardous waste incinerator following expiration of the present five-year permit. According to 40 CFR 270.19, Chevron argues that it would be entitled to a new permit to operate the incinerator, without conducting a new trial burn, if the company could demonstrate that: (1) the waste stream to be burned in the future would be the same or similar to that burned during the term of the previous permit; (2) the incinerator had not materially changed since the 1989 trial burn; and (3) based on the five years' previous operating data, the incinerator meets the performance standards of 40 CFR 264.343.

- **Other Corrections.** Chevron points out a number of minor errors in the permit that should be corrected (e.g., incorrect references, incorrect instrument identification codes).

(Slip Opinion)

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication. Readers are requested to notify the Environmental Appeals Board, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460, of any typographical or other formal errors, in order that corrections may be made before publication.

BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C.

In the Matter of:	)	
Chevron Chemical Co. (Richmond, CA Facility)	)	RCRA Appeal No. 90-15
RCRA Permit No. CAD 043 237 486	)	

[Decided April 27, 1992]

ORDER DENYING REVIEW IN PART AND REMANDING IN PART

Before Environmental Appeals Judges Ronald L. McCallum, Edward E. Reich, and Timothy J. Dowling (Acting).

CHEVRON CHEMICAL CO. (RICHMOND, CA FACILITY)

RCRA Appeal No. 90-15

ORDER DENYING REVIEW IN PART AND REMANDING IN PART

Decided April 27, 1992

Syllabus

This case involves a petition for review of a permit issued by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The permit authorizes Chevron Chemical Company to operate a hazardous waste incineration facility in Richmond, California. Petitioners (Chevron, the Pipe Trades Council of Northern California (PTC), and Citizens for a Better Environment) raise a total of twelve issues on appeal.

After filing its appeal, Chevron filed a motion requesting consideration of additional information. Chevron contends that this information will correct what it characterizes as erroneous factual assumptions made by the Region.

Held: The proceeding is remanded and the Region is instructed to determine whether the record should be supplemented with the new information submitted by Chevron and, if so, whether the permit should be revised. Given the nature and volume of this information, it would not be appropriate for the Board to attempt to determine its significance for the first time on appeal. On remand, the Region is also instructed to address two arguments raised by Chevron and PTC respectively. First, the Region must clarify its rationale for selecting a cancer risk level of 10^{-6} rather than the 10^{-5} level recommended by an EPA guidance document cited by Chevron and a proposed EPA regulation. Second, the Region must consider whether information submitted by Chevron that was classified as confidential business information (CBI) should nevertheless be released to the public pursuant to the "Special rules governing certain information obtained under the Solid Waste Disposal Act," 40 C.F.R. §2.305.

All other proposed grounds for relief raised by the several petitioners have been considered and rejected for the reasons stated in the Region's response.

Before Environmental Appeals Judges Ronald L. McCallum, Edward E. Reich, and Timothy J. Dowling (Acting).

Opinion by Judge McCallum:

On May 8, 1990, U.S. EPA Region IX issued a permit under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 901-6992k, authorizing Chevron Chemical Company to operate a hazardous waste incineration, storage, and treatment facility located in Richmond, California. [1] Three appeals have been filed under 40 C.F.R. §124.19 by Chevron, the Pipe Trades Council of Northern California (PTC), and Citizens for a Better Environment (CBE) in conjunction with the West County Toxics Coalition. As requested by the Agency's Judicial Officer, [2] the Region filed a response to the petitions dated November 30, 1990 (Region's Response).

The parties raise a total of twelve issues for consideration on appeal. [3] Chevron argues that the permit improperly requires it to repeat the entire trial burn procedure as part of any reapplication following expiration of the permit in 1995; that the permit's limitations on the total amount of wastes entering the incinerator are overly restrictive; and that the mass feed rates for certain metals entering the incinerator are overly restrictive and, in some cases, technically impossible to demonstrate. PTC makes the following arguments: the Region improperly withheld information from the public regarding wastes at the facility on the ground that such information is confidential; the permit's metal feed rates are higher than those measured in the trial burn; the risks to sensitive receptors in the community, such as children and the elderly, were not adequately evaluated; the permit should contain a limit on zinc emissions; trial burn measurements of the metal feed and emissions rates were inaccurate; and the Region's selection of Principle Organic Hazardous Constituents (POHCs) regulated by the permit was flawed. PTC and

---

[1] All wastes stored or treated at the facility are generated on-site by the production, formulation or packaging of pesticides or other chemical products.

[2] At that time, the Agency's Judicial Officers provided support to the Administrator in his review of permit appeals. Subsequently, effective on March 1, 1992, the position of Judicial Officer was abolished and all cases pending before the Administrator, including this case, were transferred to the Environmental Appeals Board. 57 Fed. Reg. 5321 (Feb. 13, 1992).

[3] In its appeal, Chevron raised several additional issues regarding various inconsistencies and errors in the final permit. Chevron and the Region have agreed to resolve these matters through a Class 1 permit modification under 40 C.F.R. §270.42. These issues have therefore been rendered moot and need not be addressed in today's order.

CBE both argue that the permit improperly allows Chevron to burn wastes not specified in the permit and that the permit's waste minimization provisions are inadequate. Finally, CBE argues that the Region failed to consider the cumulative risk from the facility as a whole.

On July 3, 1991, Chevron filed a motion requesting permission to supplement the record to correct what it characterizes as erroneous factual assumptions made by the Region in writing the permit and in responding to the petitions for review. This supplemental information was submitted along with the motion. Specifically, Chevron seeks to present additional information regarding the Region's decision: 1) to limit the total amount of wastes entering the incinerator to 300,000 tons for the five-year permit term and to 75,000 annually; [4] and 2) to include mass feed rates for certain metals (arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, and chromium) more restrictive than those in the draft permit. [5] Chevron contends that the Region's decision on these issues was arbitrary and lacked any technological or health-based justification.

The Region has not submitted a substantive response to the new information or otherwise expressed its views as to its significance. Although Region IX now states that the appeal should be resolved based on the existing administrative record, [6] at a June 20, 1991 meeting, the Region purportedly encouraged Chevron to file this

---

[4] *See* Final Permit Condition I.K.4. These limits were added in response to public comments on the draft permit.

[5] Final Permit Condition IV C.16. provides:

> The mass feed rates of toxic metals to the incinerator * * * shall not exceed:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Arsenic: | .0410 (lbs./hr.) |
> | Beryllium: | .0008 (lbs./hr.) |
> | Cadmium: | .0006 (lbs./hr.) |
> | Chromium: | .0233 (lbs./hr.) |

[6] *See* Letter from Laurie Williams, Assistant Regional Counsel, to David R. Heckler, Assistant Judicial Officer (November 18, 1991).

supplemental information, [7] thereby arguably suggesting that the Region views the new material as relevant to the present proceeding.

Given the nature and volume of the information submitted by Chevron, [8] it would not be appropriate to attempt to discern its significance for the first time on appeal. The permitting rules contemplate that the Region will initially consider and analyze information relevant to the final permit determination. [9] Immediate consideration of the newly submitted information on appeal would circumvent that orderly process, forcing the Board to either forego the Region's views – an obviously undesirable consequence – or to solicit them separately (along with those of other interested parties), thereby running the risk of transforming the appeal process into a full fledged public comment process – a matter best left to the Region in the first instance. Indeed, the Region itself has suggested that if the additional evidence is to be considered, the affected permit issues should be remanded to the Region for further consideration. [10]

To ensure adequate consideration of Chevron's request, this proceeding will be remanded for additional limited proceedings. The Region is directed to consider whether, under the circumstances, the record should be supplemented with the additional information

---

[7] *See* Letter from Margaret Rosegay, Esq., Counsel for Chevron, to Bessie Hammiel, U.S. EPA Hearing Clerk (July 3, 1991).

[8] In its Supplemental Filing, Chevron presents information alleging that the Region – in limiting the total waste feed to the incinerator to 300,000 tons for the permit's five-year term (75,000 tons annually) – may have failed to appreciate the dynamic nature of the specialty chemical market which, according to Chevron, requires that a manufacturer be able to respond to changing market conditions within a three to six-month period or lose business to competitors. Moreover, Chevron provides information to show that an increase in the volume of waste handled by the incinerator to 130,000 tons/year would not require any change to the facility, its equipment, or its personnel. Chevron asserts that the incinerator contains state-of-the-art technology, "is operated by highly trained personnel with the benefit of sophisticated computerized process controls and oversight, much of which has been added since the trial burn." Supplemental Filing at 2. Chevron also presents risk assessment data alleging that, contrary to the Region's assertion, a capacity limitation of 75,000 tons/year is not necessary to protect public health and the environment.

[9] *See generally* 40 C.F.R. Part 124, Subpart A.

[10] *See* Letter from Laurie Williams, Assistant Regional Counsel, to David R. Heckler, Assistant Judicial Officer (November 18, 1991).

supplied by Chevron. If the Region determines that this information should become part of the administrative record, it shou' solicit public comment thereon. The Region should then determine whether the permit's current limitation on the amount of wastes entering the incinerator and the mass feed rates for the four metals mentioned above should be revised.

On remand, the Region must also clarify its rationale for selecting a cancer risk level of 1×10^{-6} rather than the 1×10^{-5} level recommended by an EPA guidance document cited by Chevron as well as the proposed rules for owners and operators of hazardous waste incinerators. *See* Guidance on Metals and Hydrogen Chloride Controls for Hazardous Waste Incinerators, Volume IV of the Hazardous Waste Incinerator Guidance Series, at Appendix I-13 (August 1989); Standards for Owners and Operators of Hazardous Waste Incinerators (Proposed Rule), 55 Fed. Reg. 17,862, 17,874 (April 27, 1990). In its response, the Region correctly notes that there is nothing that requires it to choose a risk level of 10^{-5}. [11] Nevertheless, this explanation does not provide a very satisfying basis for dispensing with the issue Chevron raises. Accordingly, the Region must provide a more reasoned justification for proposing a risk level that differs from the level specified in the EPA guidance and the proposed rules. [12]

Finally, the Region must reconsider its refusal to release certain information classified as confidential business information (CBI). *See* 40 C.F.R. §2.208 (substantive criteria for use in confidentiality determinations). PTC contends that the Region's failure to release this information denied PTC and other interested parties any meaningful

---

[11] The Region also notes that a risk level of 10^{-4} is "consistent * * * with the clean-up level sought at most Superfund Sites which are remediated pursuant to CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §9601 *et seq.* and the National Contingency Plan, 40 C.F.R. §300.430(e)(2)(i)(A)(ii)." Region's Response at 15.

[12] The Board notes for the parties consideration that the four metals at issue here are listed as hazardous pollutants under section 112(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §7412(b)(1). Under section 112(f)(2)(A) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §7412(f)(2)(A), whenever it is determined that technology-based emission standards promulgated under section 112(d) for sources of pollutants classified as known, probable, or possible carcinogens, do not reduce lifetime cancer risks to the maximum exposed individual to less than "one in one million," the Administrator is authorized to promulgate health-based standards for such sources.

opportunity to comment on the permit. In its response, the Region contends, *inter alia*, that once the CBI determination was made, it had no discretion to release the disputed information. The Region, however, fails to consider the "Special rules governing certain information obtained under the Solid Waste Disposal Act," 40 C.F.R. §2.305, which allow the release of CBI to the public under certain circumstances. On remand, the Region shall consider whether the special rules apply and, if so, whether the disputed information should be released to the public. The Region's determination on this issue shall constitute final Agency action. If the Region determines that the CBI was properly withheld from the public, PTC may pursue all available avenues of relief in the appropriate federal court.

All other proposed grounds for review raised by the several petitioners have been considered and rejected for the reasons contained in the Region's response. Under the rules governing this proceeding, there is no appeal as of right from the Region's permit decision. Ordinarily, a RCRA permit determination will not be reviewed unless it is based on a clearly erroneous finding of fact or conclusion of law or involves an important matter of policy or exercise of discretion that warrants review. *See* 40 C.F.R. §124.19(a); *In re Chemical Waste Management Inc.*, RCRA Appeal No. 87-12, at 2 (May 27, 1988); *In re Higbway 36 Land Development Co.*, RCRA Appeal No. 87-5, at 2 (September 2, 1987). The preamble to the regulations states that "this power of review should only be sparingly exercised" and that "most permit conditions should be finally determined at the Regional level * * *." 45 Fed. Reg. 33,412 (May 19, 1980). The burden of demonstrating that review is warranted is on the Petitioners. Petitioners have failed to meet this burden with respect to the other proposed grounds for review.

CONCLUSION

This proceeding is remanded and the Region is directed to reopen the permit proceedings for the limited purposes mentioned above. The Region shall give public notice of this decision under 40 C.F.R. §124.10.

So ordered.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the forgoing Order Denying Review In Part And Remanding In Part in the matter of Chevron Chemical Company (Richmond, California Facility), RCRA Appeal No. 90-15, were sent by First Class Mail to the following persons:

Laurie J. Williams
Assistant Regional Counsel
U.S. EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Margaret Rosegay-Kott
Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro
Post Office Box 7880
San Francisco, CA 94120

Julia May
Research Associate
Citizens for a Better Environment
942 Market Street, Suite 505
San Francisco, CA 94102

David H. Silverman
Adams & Broadwell
Post Office Box 5049
1875 South Grant Street, Suite 600
San Mateo, CA 94402

Dated: APR 27 1992

Brenda H. Selden
Legal Staff Specialist