standard establishes the quality or quantity of pollutants or pollutant properties controlled by this section which may be introduced into a publicly owned treatment works by a source subject to the provisions of this subpart.

(1) There shall be no discharge to publicly owned treatment works of polychlorinated biphenyl compounds such as those used for transformer fluid.

(2) The quantity of copper discharged in metal cleaning wastes to publicly owned treatment works shall not exceed the quantity determined by multiplying the flow of metal cleaning wastes times 1 mg/l.

(3) The quantity of oil and grease in the plant's combined discharge to the publicly owned treatment works shall not exceed the quantity determined by multiplying the flow of the combined discharge time 100 mg/l.

(c) Any owner or operator of any source to which the pretreatment standards required by § 423.14(a), § 423.24(a) and § 423.34(a) are applicable, shall be in compliance with such standards upon the effective date of such standards. The time for compliance with standards required by § 423.14(b), § 423.24(b) and § 423.34(b) shall be within the shortest time but not later than three years from the effective date of such standards.

§ 423.34 Pretreatment standards for existing sources.

For the purpose of establishing pretreatment standards under Section 307 (b) of the Act for a source within the general unit subcategory, small unit subcategory or old unit subcategory, the provisions of 40 CFR 128 shall not apply. The pretreatment standards for an existing source within the general unit subcategory (§ 423.14), small unit subcategory (§ 423.24) and old unit subcategory (§ 423.34) are set forth below.

(a) No pollutant (or pollutant property) introduced into a publicly owned treatment works shall interfere with the operation or performance of the works. Specifically, the following wastes shall not be introduced into the publicly owned treatment works:

(1) Pollutants which create a fire of explosion hazard in the publicly owned treatment works.

(2) Pollutants which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case pollutants with a pH lower than 5.0, unless the works is designed to accommodate such pollutants.

(3) Solid or viscous pollutants in amounts which would cause obstruction to the flow in sewers, or other interference with the proper operation of the publicly owned treatment works.

(4) Pollutants at either a hydraulic flow rate or pollutant flow rate which is excessive over relatively short time periods so that there is a treatment process upset and subsequent loss of treatment efficiency.

(b) In addition to the general prohibitions set forth in paragraph (a) of this section, the following pretreatment standard establishes the quality or quantity of pollutants or pollutant properties controlled by this section which may be introduced into a publicly owned treatment works by a source subject to the provisions of this subpart.

(1) There shall be no discharge to publicly owned treatment works of polychlorinated biphenyl compounds such as those used for transformer fluid.

(2) The quantity of copper discharged in metal cleaning wastes to publicly owned treatment works shall not exceed the quantity determined by multiplying the flow of metal cleaning wastes times 1 mg/l.

(3) The quantity of oil and grease in the plant's combined discharge to the publicly owned treatment works shall not exceed the quantity determined by multiplying the flow of the combined discharge times 100 mg/l.

(c) Any owner or operator of any source to which the pretreatment standards required by § 423.14(a), § 423.24(a) and § 423.34(a) are applicable, shall be in compliance with such standards upon the effective date of such standards. The time for compliance with standards required by § 423.14(b), § 423.24(b) and § 423.34(b) shall be within the shortest time but not later than three years from the effective date of such standards.

§ 423.44 Pretreatment standards for existing sources.

For the purpose of establishing pretreatment standards under section 307 (b) of the Act for a source within the area runoff subcategory, the provisions of 40 CFR 128 shall not apply. The pretreatment standards for an existing source within the area runoff subcategory are set forth below.

(a) No pollutant (or pollutant property) introduced into a publicly owned treatment works shall interfere with the operation or performance of the works. Specifically, the following wastes shall not be introduced into the publicly owned treatment works:

(1) Pollutants which create a fire or explosion hazard in the publicly owned treatment works.

(2) Pollutants which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case pollutants with a pH lower than 5.0, unless the works is designed to accommodate such pollutants.

(3) Solid or viscous pollutants in amounts which would cause obstruction to the flow in sewers, or other interference with the proper operation of the publicly owned treatment works.

(4) Pollutants at either a hydraulic flow rate or pollutant flow rate which is excessive over relatively short time periods so that there is a treatment process upset and subsequent loss of treatment efficiency.

(b) Any owner or operator of any source to which the pretreatment standards required by § 423.44(a) are applicable, shall be in compliance with such standards upon the effective date of such standards.

[FR Doc.77-8550 Filed 3-22-77;8:45 am]

[FRL 702-6]

PART 425—LEATHER TANNING AND FINISHING POINT SOURCE CATEGORY PRETREATMENT STANDARDS FOR EXISTING SOURCES

Final Regulations

Notice is hereby given that pretreatment standards for existing sources set forth in final form below are promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or Agency). On April 9, 1974, EPA promulgated a regulation adding Part 425 to Chapter 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (39 FR 12960). That regulation established effluent limitations and guidelines for existing sources and standards of performance and pretreatment standards for new sources for the leather tanning and finishing point source category. The regulation set forth below will amend 40 CFR 425—leather tanning and finishing point source category by adding § 425.14 of the hair pulp, chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory (Subpart A), § 425.24 of the hair save, chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory (Subpart B), § 425.34 of the hair save, non-chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory (Subpart C), § 425.44 of the retan-wet finish subcategory (Subpart D), § 425.54 of the no beamhouse subcategory (Subpart E), and § 425.64 of the through-the-blue subcategory (Subpart F), and section 425.74 of the shearling subcategory (Subpart G), pursuant to section 307(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1251, 1316(b) and 1317 (b) and (c),1251, 1317(b), 86 Stat. 816 et seq.; Pub. L. 92-500) (the Act).

(a) *Legal Authority.* Section 307(b) of the Act requires the establishment of pretreatment standards for pollutants introduced into publicly owned treatment works (POTW) and 40 CFR 128 establishes that the Agency will propose specific pretreatment standards at the time effluent limitations are established for point source discharges. Pretreatment standards for existing sources in the leather tanning and finishing point source category were proposed on April 9, 1974 (39 FR 12960). Section 425.14 of the hair pulp, chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory (Subpart A), § 425.24 of the hair save chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory (Subpart B), § 425.34 of the hair save, non-chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory (Subpart C), § 425.44 of the retan-wet finish subcategory (Subpart D), § 425.54 of the no beamhouse subcategory (Subpart E), § 425.64 of the through-the-blue subcategory (Subpart F), and § 425.74 of the shearling subcategory (Subpart G) set forth below establish pretreatment standards for existing sources within the leather tanning and finishing point source category.

(b) *Summary and Basis of Pretreatment Standard for Existing Sources.* The regulation set forth below establishes pretreatment standards for pollutants introduced to publicly owned treatment works from existing sources

within the subparts set forth in paragraph (a) above. This regulation establishes pretreatment standards known as prohibited discharge standards, which are designed to prevent inhibition or interference with the municipal treatment works by prohibiting the discharge of pollutants of such nature or quantity that the mechanical or hydraulic integrity of the publicly owned treatment works is endangered. These prohibited discharge standards with minor changes are identical to the prohibitions contained in the general pretreatment regulation now found at 40 CFR 128.131.

With respect to the subcategories governed by this regulation, the general pretreatment requirements set forth in 40 CFR Part 128 are superseded. Those requirements were proposed on July 19, 1973 (38 FR 19236) and published in final form on November 8, 1973 (38 FR 30982). They limit the discharge of pollutants which pass through or interfere with the operation of publicly owned treatment works, but do not set numerical limitations or explicitly list particular pollutants to be regulated. The provisions of the present regulation overlap to a considerable degree with the language of the general pretreatment requirements. For the purpose of clarity, sources affected by the present regulation are exempted from 40 CFR Part 128. In its place, the specific pretreatment standards applicable to each subcategory are set forth in detail below as the pretreatment standard for that subcategory. This mechanism will eliminate any possible confusion as to the materials which are limited or controlled by the pretreatment standard for each subcategory. This decision is also warranted because new general pretreatment regulations have been proposed (42 FR 6476 et seq., Feb. 2, 1977), which will revoke and replace 40 CFR Part 128 upon promulgation. When the general pretreatment regulations are promulgated, these standards will be reviewed for consistency with the general policy stated therein.

A supplemental technical study was made to determine the levels of pretreatment requirements which are appropriate considering the limitations established for direct dischargers under sections 301 and 304 and the requirements of section 307(b). The findings of this study and technical rationale for the establishment of pretreatment standards and guidance levels are summarized in Attachment A to this preamble. The report entitled "Supplement for Pretreatment to the Development Document for the Leather Tanning and Finishing Point Source Category" details the additional technical analysis undertaken in support of the final regulation set forth herein and is available for inspection at the EPA Public Information Reference Unit, Room 2922 (EPA Library), Waterside Mall, 401 M St., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, at all EPA Regional offices and at State water pollution control offices. An additional limited number of copies of these reports are available. Persons wishing to obtain a copy may write the Environmental Protection Agency, Effluent Guidelines Division, Washington, D.C. 20460, Attention: Distribution Officer, WH-552. Copies of the technical documentation will be available from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

A supplementary analysis prepared for EPA of the possible economic effects of the regulation is also available for inspection at these locations. Copies of the economic analysis document will be available through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA. 22151.

(c) *Public Participation.* Prior to this publication, many agencies and interest groups were consulted and given an opportunity to participate in the development of these standards. As a result of comments received on the proposed regulation and upon further consideration by the Agency, additional study of the pretreatment requirements for the leather tanning and finishing point source category has been made. Immediately prior to this rulemaking the results of this study were circulated for additional comments to persons known to be interested. A summary of public participation in this rulemaking, public comments and the Agency's response and reconsideration of these is contained in Appendix B of this preamble.

Interested persons are encouraged to submit written comments. Comments should be submitted in triplicate to the Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, Attention: Distribution Officer, WH-552.

A copy of all public comments is available for inspection and copying at the EPA Public Information Reference Unit, Room 2922 (EPA Library), Waterside Mall, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. A copy of the technical studies and economic study referred to above, and certain supplementary materials will be maintained at this location for public review and copying. The EPA information regulation, 40 CFR Part 2, provides that a reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

(d) Economic Impact and Inflationary Impact Analysis. The economic impact is expected to be minimal for all subcategories in this industry and no price increase is anticipated as a result of the regulations. Additionally, no plant closures or production curtailments are anticipated. In the event that all affected municipalities exercise their prerogative to impose the entire complement of optional pretreatment technologies for all subcategories as identified in the development document, the total investment cost for this industry is estimated at $12.2 million, while the total annual costs are estimated at $1.5 million. The economic impact is discussed in greater detail in Appendix A, which also contains the inflationary impact analysis.

In addition, section 8 of the FWPCA authorizes the Small Business Administration, through its economic disaster loan program, to make loans to assist any small business concerns in effecting additions to or alterations in their equipment, facilities, or methods of operation so as to meet water pollution control requirements under the FWPCA, if the concern is likely to suffer a substantial economic injury without such assistance.

For further details on this Federal loan program write to EPA, Office of Analysis and Evaluation, WH-586, 401 M St., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

(e) *Compliance Date.* Compliance with the prohibited discharge standards is required immediately upon the effective date of these regulations since these standards are essentially the same as 40 CFR 128.131 and since the deadline for compliance with 40 CFR 128.131 has passed.

The Agency was subject to an order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia entered in *Natural Resources Defense Council* v. *Train et al.* (Civ. No. 2153-73, 75-0172, 75-1698 and 75-1267) which required the promulgation of pretreatment standards for this industry category no later than February 15, 1977.

It has not been practical to develop and republish regulations for this category in proposed form and to provide a 30 day comment period within the time constraints imposed by the court order referred to above. Accordingly, the Agency has determined pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b) that notice and comment on the final regulations prior to promulgation would be impractical and contrary to the public interest. Good cause is also found for these regulations to become effective as set forth below.

(f) *Final Rulemaking.* In consideration of the foregoing, 40 CFR 425 is hereby amended as set forth below and shall become effective thirty days from the date of promulgation.

Dated: March 11, 1977.

DOUGLAS M. COSTLE,
Administrator.

ATTACHMENT A

TECHNICAL SUMMARY AND BASIS FOR REGULATIONS

This Attachment summarizes the basis of final pretreatment standards for existing sources in the leather tanning and finishing point source category.

(1) General methodology. The pretreatment standards set forth herein were developed in the following manner. The point source category was first studied for the purpose of determining whether separate standards are appropriate for different segments within the category. This analysis included a determination of whether differences in raw material used, product produced, manufacturing process employed, age, size, wastewater constituents and other factors require development of separate standards for different segments of the point source category. The raw waste characteristics for each such segment were then identified. This included an analysis of the source, flow and volume of water used in the process employed, the sources of waste and wastewaters in

the operation and the constituents of all waste water. The principal basis used in developing the pretreatment standards for this industry is analogous to the technology based derivations used in developing the regulations for the direct dischargers. In this regard, the treatment technology employed by direct dischargers is the same as that utilized by POTW to achieve secondary treatment requirements, i.e., primary treatment plus secondary biological treatment. Another integral part of the basis for these standards is the identification of pollutants which either upset or pass through POTW.

The control and treatment technologies existing within each segment were identified. This included an identification of each distinct control and treatment technology, including both in-plant and end-of-process technologies, which is existent or capable of being designed for each segment. It also included an identification of, in terms of the amount of constituents and the chemical, physical, and biological characteristics of pollutants, the effluent level resulting from the application of each of the technologies. The problems, limitations, and reliability of each treatment and control technology were also identified. In addition, the nonwater quality environmental impact, such as the effects of the application of such technologies upon other pollution problems, including air, solid waste, noise, and radiation were identified. The energy requirements of each control and treatment technology were determined as well as the cost of the application of such technologies.

The information, as outlined above, was then evaluated in order to determine what levels of technology reflected the application of the best practicable pretreatment technologies. In identifying such technologies, various factors were considered. These included the total cost of application of technology, the age of equipment and facilities involved, the process employed, the engineering aspects of the application of various types of control techniques, process changes, nonwater quality environmental impact (including energy requirements) and other factors.

The data upon which the above analysis was performed included EPA permit applications, EPA sampling and inspections, consultant reports, and industry submissions.

(2) Summary of conclusions with respect to the leather tanning and finishing point source category.

(i) Categorization. For the purpose of establishing pretreatment standards, factors such as types of raw materials, manufacturing processes and final products, age, size, and location of plants, wastewater volume, pollutant content, and treatability by typical POTW including secondary treatment technology, were all considered as potential basis for subcategorizing the leather tanning and finishing industry. In general, the principal factors which contributed most to subcategorization were hide or skin type, presence and type of beamhouse, tanyard, and retan-wet finish operations, type of tanning agent, and wastewater characteristics. Subcategorization by these principal factors was substantiated by assessment of other factors such as relative wasteload and hydraulic contributions to POTW, type of secondary treatment at a POTW (e.g.—trickling filter, activated sludge, etc.), and influent pollutant concentrations.

(ii) Waste characteristics. For all seven subcategories, the known significant wastewater pollutants and pollutant properties include flow, pH, total suspended solids (TSS), total dissolved solids (TDS); BOD5, COD, oil and grease, total chromium, sulfide, total kjeldahl nitrogen, ammonia, chlorides, alkalinity, temperature, color, and fecal coliform.

(iii) Origins of wastewater pollutants. Processing steps within a leather tanning and finishing plant which generate wastewater include washing and soaking, degreasing, unhairing, bating, pickling, tanning, retanning, coloring, fatliquoring, drying, and a few finishing operations which may generate wastewater such as wet scrubbing of buffing dust and spray booth wash down.

Washing and soaking generate large quantities of wastewater which contain dirt, manure, salt (chlorides and other dissolved solids), and other foreign material. Degreasing (usually only for sheepskins and pigskins) generates animal fat and related waste material from the skins, plus spent detergents or solvents. When solvent degreasing is performed, most plants utilize a solvent recovery system. Detergents can be of any polar form (anionic, cationic, or nonionic) depending upon the type of hide or skin to be degreased. Unhairing is performed by either the hair save or the hair burn methods. The hair save process utilizes mechanical removal of chemically loosened hair. Many plants dispose of this hair in a landfill, although some allow the hair to enter the wastewater. The hair burn process dissolves the hair completely. This process is the single most significant source of proteinaceous organic and inorganic (lime) pollutants, characterized by high pH (range of 10 to 12), and substantial amounts of BOD5, TSS, sulfides, alkalinity, and nitrogen. Beamhouse processes (washing through unhairing) typically generate up to 75 percent of the waste load from a complete tannery. Bating produces additional inorganic calcium salts, small additional amounts of proteinaceous hair and waste hide substance, as well as large quantities of ammonia. Pickling generates a highly acid waste stream (pH of 2.5 to 3.5) which also contains salt. Tanning is accomplished primarily by trivalent chromium salts, or by tannins in extracts derived from special types of tree bark. Spent chrome tanning liquors contain high concentrations of trivalent chromium in acid (pH of 2.5 to 3.5) solution with low concentrations of BOD5 and TSS, and elevated temperature. Blowdown to maintain vegetable tanning liquor quality is highly colored, and also contains significant amounts of BOD5, COD, and dissolved solids. Retanning, coloring, and fatliquoring generate additional quantities of trivalent chromium, vegetable tannins, synthetic tannins, natural and synthetic oils, and spent acid dyes, all relatively low in BOD5 and TSS, slightly higher in COD, in fairly large volumes which occasionally are highly colored, and at elevated temperature. Relatively small quantities of low strength wastewater are produced by drying and other finishing operations (pasting frame washing, rewet conditioning, vacuum dryer cooling water, wet scrubbers for buffing dust, spray booth wash down, etc.). Average raw waste loads, including volumes and pollutant contents, are presented by subcategory in the "Supplement to the Development Document for Pretreatment for the Leather Tanning and Finishing Point Source Category."

(iv) Treatment and control technology. (a) Rationale for Pretreatment Standards. Wastewater treatment and control technologies have been studied for this industry to determine what is the best practicable pretreatment technology.

The following discussions of treatment technologies outline the bases for the pretreatment standards. These discussions do not preclude the selection by individual municipalities with different circumstances of other wastewater treatment alternatives which provide equivalent or better levels of treatment.

Performance data for joint POTW treating leather tanning wastewater indicate that where treatment systems are properly designed to handle this specific wastewater, pollutants of concern (i.e., BOD5, TSS, sulfide, oil and grease, and chromium) are removed to consistenly low concentrations, and therefore do not pass through a POTW inadequately treated. Where joint POTW are not meeting their NPDES permits, there are contributing problems, such as hydraulic overloading (related to increased residential or commercial development), POTW operational problems, or very stringent water quality constraints which are not technology based. The pollutants proposed (existing sources) and promulgated (new sources) for pretreatment, chromium (in its trivalent form) and oil and grease, do not cause upsets of a POTW. Trivalent chromium and oil and grease in this industry are compatible with combined primary and secondary treatment. With regard to sulfides, review of the entire record has revealed that the potentially severe sulfide interference problems identified originally as widespread were actually occasional isolated instances, and not uniform or significant on a national basis. Almost all of the POTW which receive major contributions from leather tanning and finishing plants, where sulfide problems could potentially be severe, have implemented measures primarily to control fluctuations in pH and thereby ensure that sulfide upsets are minimized. Sulfides are readily oxidized in secondary biological treatment facilities and do not pass through inadequately treated. Moreover, existing sewer ordinances for all surveyed municipalities have been

found to include provision for authority to control sulfides, either by a direct limitation of the concentration of sulfides discharged to sewers, or an indirect general prohibition on the discharge to sewers of all odorous, corrosive, explosive and lethal materials. Therefore, no limitation on sulfide has been established in the regulation. Where problems have occurred, however, they have been severe. Sewer crown corrosion, odor, asphyxiation and death of POTW workers, and electrical and mechanical equipment corrosion within collection systems and at treatment works have all been documented. In addition, while sulfides are completely oxidized, they present an immediate and very high demand on dissolved oxygen in aerobic biological treatment units, such as in activated sludge aeration basins. This situation may be most evident during summer months when high rates of biological activity also exert high rates of dissolved oxygen demand. A few cases of malodorous conditions during these periods have been reported. Some of these circumstances have been attributed to concurrent POTW operational difficulties or poor worker safety practices. In individual situations where sulfide was specifically of concern, currently available and practicable technology (catalytic oxidation) is capable of removing most if not all dissolved sulfides and alleviate any problems. Where a leather tanning plant has segregated the sulfide bearing beamhouse wastewater for reuse and/or separate catalytic oxidation, carryover of residual sulfide by the hides or skins into tanyard and wet finishing wastewaters may preclude achieving a very low sulfide concentration in the combined flow, such as 1 mg/l. Additional discussion of sulfide control is presented in sections VII and IX of the "Supplement for Pretreatment to the Development Document for the Leather Tanning and Finishing Point Source Category."

Performance data available for both joint POTW and separate industrial treatment systems indicate that ammonia-nitrogen is a pollutant which may pass through even well designed and operated secondary biological treatment systems. No specific POTW design or operational deficiencies have been identified to account for this finding. Moreover, there is no currently available or practicable technology in the leather industry to remove ammonia, either as a pretreatment or as a tertiary treatment process. For example, nitrification experience to date has not been completely satisfactory, and ammonia stripping has not even been applied at pilot scale. The only other feasible alternatives are beamhouse stream segregation and precipitation of proteins (from pulped hair) after sulfides have been oxidized, and substituting for ammonia in the bating process. The latter alternatives will be seriously considered as a part of the BATEA revision study currently underway. Nevertheless, an ammonia pretreatment limitation cannot be justified at this time.

The Agency has reviewed the proposed pH range of 6.0 to 9.0 with special regard for the control of hydrogen sulfide gas evolution and trivalent chromium precipitation at low values of pH. It has been determined that for maximum control of sulfides in gravity collection systems and POTW headworks, and for maximum removal of trivalent chromium largely in primary clarifers, the optimum pH range is 8.0 to 10.0. Below a pH of 7.0, evolution of potentially dangerous quantities of sulfides can occur, and below a pH of 6.0 failure to adequately remove trivalent chromium can occur. At pH greater than 10.0, the potential may exist for disruption of biological treatment systems. Therefore, the appropriate general sections of the regulation have been amended to require, pH to be greater than 7.0 and no higher than 10.0 for those four subcategories which include beamhouse operations; and pH to be greater than 6.0 and no higher than 10.0 for the retan-wet finish, no beamhouse, and shearling subcategories.

(b) Suggested Guidance for Affected Municipalities. While the Agency has concluded that pretreatment regulations which include substantive limitations on a national basis are not required, it must be recognized that the wastewater from leather tanning and finishing plants have the potential to create or contribute to a number of problems for collection systems and treatment facilities at POTW. For instance, large pieces of scrap hide, leather trimmings, hair and other small scale screenable solids can clog or foul pipes, pumps, and other equipment. Leather tanning and finishing is comprised of batch processes which can produce wide fluctuations in pH, and hydraulic and pollutant loading. Unhairing wastewaters containing sulfides have the potential to create odor, corrosion, hazardous gas evolution problems. Depending upon local circumstances, disposal of sludges containing chromium can be problematic. Finally, ammonia nitrogen may pass through POTW. It must be noted that other industrial wastewaters with similar characteristics may also contribute to one or more of these potential problems, especially where general prohibited discharge regulations are not observed. When a leather tanning and finishing plant makes a concerted effort to control these problems, the resulting wastewaters are amenable to treatment and do not upset or pass through POTW. However, mitigating and site specific circumstances can dictate the need for case-by-case requirements for pretreatment.

Chromium removal prior to discharge by a contributing tannery utilizing recovery and reuse or clarification may be necessary. For instance, chromium removal by pretreatment may be necessary in cases where very stringent water quality limitations on total chromium in the final effluent have been imposed in the POTW NPDES permit. Pretreatment to remove chromium may be necesary where a POTW must utilize a sludge destruction process, such as incineration, pyrolysis, or wet oxidation, which most probably generates hexavalent chromium, which in turn cannot be disposed of for a lack of appropriate controlled landfill sites. Chromium removal may also be necessary where the particular mix of municipal and industrial wastewater contributions and their specific constituents, either singly or in combination, is such that the influent pH to primary clarifiers is not in the proper range (pH 8 to 10) for maximum precipitation of hydroxides of chromium. Other circumstances not alluded to may also warrant pretreatment to remove chromium.

Sulfide removal may be necessary, for example, where a tannery is connected to the POTW by a long and large gravity sewer in which it is impractical to maintain sufficiently high pH (greater than 8.0) to prevent significant sulfide evolution; or where the municipality has experienced a history of severe odor and corrosion problems in spite of specific control mechanisms built into the physical system and operational procedures.

Equalization (at least 24 hours) can be extremely important especially where a tannery, which is a major contributor to a POTW, exhibits widely fluctuating discharge patterns (pH, flow, organic and solids loading), or where significant production shut down periods (such as two days of every week) do not allow consistent wastewater feed to high-rate, short detention time activated sludge systems. Lack of equalized, consistent flow can result in the loss of adequate acclimated biological population in activated sludge, which is very difficult and slow to rebuild during very cold weather. Hydraulic surges can cause complete wash out of clarifier sludge blankets, which would include chromium precipitated in primary clarifiers.

Control of pH is a necessary adjunct to equalization for effective physical removal of chromium, the chemistry of which is known to be extremely complex, and prevention of sulfide gas evolution. Tanning plants which use copious quantities of sulfides and sulfhydrates in the unhairing process must be particularly cognizant of pH control. Where beamhouse wastewaters are segregated from tanyard and other wastewaters for separate pretreatment and/or recovery and reuse, extreme care must be exercised in mixture of these alkaline and acid wastewaters to maintain high pH levels. Where no beamhouse operations are included, lime or a similar chemical may have to be added to maintain a pH of at least 6.0, preferably 8.0 to ensure trivalent chromium removal in primary clarifiers at POTW.

Effective fine screening (with openings in the range of 0.040 inches to remove easily separated scraps, fibers, and hair) was found to be lacking at most leather tanning and finishing plants in the industry. If fine screening is not accomplished, pipes could be clogged and damage can be incurred in pumps, clarifier sludge rakes, and other related equipment.

In cases where municipalities have very stringent BOD5 and TSS limitations; or there is a lack of treatment system capacity due to domestic or especially industrial growth; or other site specific circumstances which prevent adequate treatment by a POTW; further pretreatment may be a cost effective alternative for a tanner to reduce expenditures for the proportional share in POTW operation and maintenance costs. Clarification and sludge handling for segregated wastewater streams will offer significant removals for most pollutants, while also allowing additional potential for by-product recovery and reuse; for example protein recovery from beamhouse wastewaters, and chromium recovery and reuse from tanyard wastewater as cited above.

It must be emphasized that readily implemented inplant measures should be accomplished to reduce, recover, and reuse constituents of various tannery wastewater streams. Among the measures involved are recycle of noncontact cooling water, recovery and reuse of spent unhairing, chrome tanning, and vegetable tanning liquors as makeup, and general water conservation and housekeeping programs. Each of these offer highly cost-effective alternatives to reduce both production costs, and the size and cost for wastewater pretreatment facilities. Concomitant reductions in cost for residual sludge disposal can also be realized, especially for those sludges which contain chromium.

Future efforts in this area should focus on process changes which either substantially reduce or eliminate wastewater constituents which cause problems at POTW or landfill sites and require pretreatment. For instance, development of processes and markets for sale of proteins recovered from segregated beamhouse wastewaters can provide at least partial payback of disposal costs for non-recoverable sludges. Substitution for ammonia in the bating process can significantly reduce the amount of dissolved ammonia in tannery wastewater. When this substitution is made in combination with protein recovery, the majority of the total kjeldahl nitrogen and ammonia present will be removed and specific pretreatment or tertiary treatment to remove ammonia may not be necessary. Other major process changes have been researched which offer potential for major reductions in both the amount of pollutants and volumes of wastewater generated. Where such reductions are realized, the resulting unused portion of a leather tanning and finishing plant's contractually allowed discharge to a POTW may then permit expansion in production.

Pretreatment limitations have not been established for this industry. Moreover, national effluent limitations for indirect dischargers do not require implementation of specific pretreatment technologies, even for industries where limitations have been found to be necessary. A few example circumstances have been identified, however, which may indicate the need for a municipality to exercise its prerogative to establish plant specific pretreatment requirements. It is intended that this preamble and the supplementary development document should provide only general assistance to municipalities in identifying problems, and potential solutions with associated costs. Specific on-site engineering and cost evaluation should still be made by municipal engineers or their consultants to more fully evaluate all local circumstances, which may allow a unique and cost effective solution to problems which are identified.

Recently revised general guidelines have been made available, per FEDERAL REGISTER notice (42 FR 838) dated January 4, 1977, for use by municipalities in the establishment of more stringent pretreatment regulations and case-by-case limitations where local circumstances warrant. Moreover, new general pretreatment regulations have been published in proposed form (42 FR 6476 et seq., Feb. 2, 1977), which will set aside and replace 40 CFR 128.

(c) *Solid Waste Disposal Considerations.* As noted above, solid waste control must be carefully considered by the affected municipality, and possibly by the contributing tannery where pretreatment is necessary. Pretreatment technologies, such as clarification, require disposal of pollutants removed from wastewaters in the form of solid waste. In many cases these are nonhazardous substances requiring only minimal custodial care. However, some constituents may be potentially hazardous and require special consideration.

It has been noted that incineration or similar sludge destruction processes used by some POTW can generate hexavalent chromium, which is more soluble than trivalent chromium in the range of pH generally found in landfills. Some evidence has been presented which indicates that landfill sites which may not be adequately controlled, especially where excessively acid conditions are allowed to develop, may allow oxidation of trivalent chromium to hexavalent chromium. In turn, potential can be created for groundwater supply contamination. Removal and reuse of trivalent chromium by pretreatment at the tannery can substantially reduce the amount of chromium to be handled by the POTW, and concentrate most of the residual chromium in smaller quantities of sludge generated at the tannery. Therefore, to ensure long-term protection of the environment from these hazardous or harmful constituents, special consideration of disposal sites must be made. All landfill sites where such potentially hazardous wastes are disposed should be selected so as to prevent horizontal and vertical migration of these contaminants to ground or surface waters. In cases where soil and geologic conditions may not reasonably ensure this, adequate legal and mechanical precautions (e.g. impervious liners) should be taken to ensure long term protection to the environment from hazardous materials. Where appropriate, the location of solid hazardous materials disposal sites should be permanently recorded in the appropriate office of legal jurisdiction.

(v) Cost estimates for control of waste water pollutants. Cost information was obtained directly from industry, engineering firms, equipment suppliers, government sources and available literature. Costs are based on actual industry installations or engineering estimates for projected facilities as supplied by contributing companies. In the absence of such information, cost estimates have been developed from either plant-supplied costs for similar waste treatment installations at plants making similar products or general cost estimates for treatment technology.

(vi) Energy requirements and nonwater quality environmental impacts. The major nonwater quality consideration which may be associated with pretreatment technologies which may be locally required is the generation of solid wastes which contain chromium from pH adjustment, settling, and possibly POTW sludge destruction facilities. In some cases these wastes can be reprocessed to recover various constituents such as chromium, but in most cases these wastes will be landfilled. As noted above, where sludge which may contain hexavalent chromium must be disposed, special care must be exercised.

Other nonwater quality aspects, including energy, noise, and air pollution, will not be perceptibly affected.

(vii) Economic impact analysis. This section summarizes the economic and inflationary impacts of the pretreatment standards for the leather tanning and finishing point source category.

(a) Inflationary Impact. Executive Order 11821 (November 27, 1974) requires that major proposals for legislation and promulgation of regulations and rules by Agencies of the executive branch be accompanied by a statement certifying that the inflationary impact of the proposal has been evaluated. The Administrator has directed that all regulatory actions which are likely to exceed any of the following four criteria will require certification.

1. Additional national annualized costs of compliance, including capital charges (interest and depreciation), will total $100 million within any calendar year by the attainment date, if applicable, or within five years of implementation.

2. Total additional cost of production of any major product is more than 5% of the selling price of the product.

3. Net national energy consumption will be increased by the equivalent of 25,000 barrels of oil a day (equal to 50 trillion BTU per year or 5 billion kilowatt-hours per year).

4. Additional annual demands are created or annual supply is decreased by more than 3% for any of the following materials by the attainment date, if applicable, or within five years of implementation: plate steel, tubular steel, stainless steel, scrap steel, aluminum, copper, manganese, magnesium, zinc, ethylene, ethylene glycol, liquified pe-

troleum gases, ammonia, urea, plastics, synthetic rubber, or pulp.

No significant capital cost is anticipated since discharges are normally within the prescribed pH ranges. However, in the unlikely event that all affected municipalities exercise their prerogative to impose all of the optional pretreatment technologies, including fine screening, equalization, pH control, and sulfide oxidation, total investment cost for this industry is estimated to be as high aes $12.2 million, while total annual costs are estimated to be $1.5 million. These costs are in first quarter 1976 dollars. Total annual costs are equal to operation and maintenance costs plus a capital cost based on a ten (10) year depreciation and a nine (9) percent interest rate. This is based upon the documents entitled "Supplement for Pretreatment to the Development Document for the Leather Tanning and Finishing Point Source Category" and "Economic Impact of Pretreatment Standards for the Leather Tanning Industry."

As can be seen above, the potential total national annualized costs of compliance for the pretreatment standards are well below $100 million per year. In addition, the increase in cost of production is less than 5% of the selling price. Energy consumption may be increased by a nominal amount. Finally, the projected increase in demand or decrease in supply for any of the above materials is nominal. Thus an inflationary impact statement is not necessary.

(b) Economic Impact Analysis. The Agency has considered the economic impact of the internal and external costs of the effluent limitations guidelines. Internal costs are defined as investment and annual cost, where annual cost is composed of operating costs, maintenance costs, the cost of capital and depreciation. External cost deals with the assessment of the economic impact of the internal costs in terms of price increases, production curtailments, plant closures, resultant unemployment, community and regional impacts, international trade, and industry growth.

In order to determine what possible impact could result if municipalities required any of the optional pretreatment technologies, an incremental cost analysis was performed. For each model plant developed, an impact analysis was completed using an incremental capital cost approach with capital costs ranging from $25,000 to $300,000; each increment being $25,000. For each leather tanning and finishing model plant, an analysis was completed for each of the following impact indicators: required price increase; after tax income; after tax return on sales; after tax return on invested capital.

A separate report on the economic analysis indicates the range of impacts to be expected for each model developed. Plant closures and production curtailments for each industry subcategory are discussed as follows.

1. Hair Pulp or Save, Chrome Tan, Retan-Wet Finish. With the exception of the extra-small tanneries (those tanning approximately 100 cattlehides per day) there is little impact in this subcategory. For the extra-small tanneries, pollution investment costs above $75,000 could be a hardship for the plant. Costs above $125,000 could result in plant closures. However, the majority of the optional treatment systems are developed for the large plants, and no impact is expected in this category.

2. Hair Save, Non-Chrome Tan, Retan-Wet Finish. According to the impact analysis, any required investment in pollution control costs will result in a plant closure. However, the baseline net present value cases for this subcategory are negative which means that the plants presently operating are marginal at best. Since it is likely that plants in this category have economic conditions which are not consistent with those of the model plants, it is doubtful that in most cases pretreatment requirements alone would be the decisive shut down factor.

3. Retan-Wet Finish. For this subcategory, if investment was required to go above $150,000, the plants would begin to feel a severe economic impact. Plant closure would begin occurring if investments above $200,000 were required.

4. No Beamhouse. With the exception of the vegetable tanneries, the sheepskin tanneries are the least profitable of all of the subcategories. Still, allowing for the low baseline case, the only impacts that could be felt would be by the small tanneries (approximately 1200 skins per day). These tanneries would begin feeling the strain of investment costs above $50,000 and plant closures would begin to occur above $125,000.

5. Shearling. No impacts are expected for this subcategory.

6. Through-the-Blue. Analysis has not been completed, although impacts are not expected at this time.

The impact of these regulations is expected to be minimal for the leather tanning and finishing industry and little or no price increase is projected. No production curtailment or plant closures are projected, while there will be a negligible effect on profitability on plants which are indirect dischargers. Based upon this analysis, the effects on employment, industry growth, and international trade are expected to be minimal.

ATTACHMENT B

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Prior to this publication, copies of the draft document were sent to the industry trade association, Federal agencies, State, local, and territorial pollution control agencies, and ESWQIAC (the Effluent Standards and Water Quality Information Advisory Committee established under Section 515 of the Act). In addition, copies were sent to many leather tanning and finishing plants which discharge to a POTW. Each of these parties was given an opportunity to participate in the development of pretreatment standards by submitting written comments. In addition, a public meeting was held on December 21, 1976, at EPA headquarters in Washington, D.C. at which interested parties were invited to express their views publicly. Public comments were also solicited when pretreatment standards for these segments were proposed in the FEDERAL REGISTER on April 9, 1974.

The following responded with comments: ESWQIAC; Armira Corporation; Chestnut Operating Co.; Eagle Ottawa Leather Co.; A. C. Lawrence Leather Co., Inc.; Legallet Tanning Co.; Prime Tanning Co.; Seal Tanning Co.; Seton Leather Co.; Tanners' Council of America, Inc.; Berwick Sewer Distict, Berwick, ME; City of Concord, NH; Manchester Highway Department, Manchester, NH; Metropolitan Sewerage District, Milwaukee, WI; Napa Sanitation District, Napa, CA; Passaic Valley Sewerage Authority, Newark, NJ; City of Sidney, OH; Paris Utility District, South Paris, ME; City of South San Francisco, CA: Synopsis of Public Comment Meeting, December 21, 1976.

The primary issues raised by commenters during the development of the pretreatment regulations for the leather tanning and finishing industry are as follows:

1. Many commenters indicated that the occurrence of problems related to the presence of sulfides in tannery wastewater in sewer collection systems and at POTW was not consistent or universal, since many factors influence the existence of problems, such as length and type of collection system, and wastewater pH. Where problems do occur, local ordinances include provision for authority to control them, therefore a national regulation is not justified.

The Agency has reviewed all available data and information in light of these comments, and has concluded that problems attributable to sulfides found in tannery wastewater are not nationwide in scope. The original data and information collected identified only specific isolated cases of sulfides related problems. One case involved the ingestion of fatal doses of sulfide gases by POTW personnel. Lack of adequate safety precautions may have contributed to this instance. In other cases, isolated but significant odor and corrosion problems have been reported. POTW operational difficulties have been cited as contributing factors. Some POTW and their collection systems have been specifically designed and operated to minimize problems such as sulfide gas evolution. Hence, sulfide related problems have not been found to be uniformly severe on a national basis. Where sulfide related problems do occur, currently available and practicable technology is available to remove the bulk of sulfides. Moreover, existing sewer ordinances for all surveyed municipalities have been found to include provision for authority to control sulfides either by a direct limitation on the concentration of sulfides discharged to sewers, of or an absolute prohibition for the discharge to sewers all odorous, corrosive, explosive, and lethal materials. Finally, available information indicates that sulfides do not pass through a secondary biological treatment system. Therefore,

the recommendation for sulfide removal contained in the draft development document has been rejected and no limitation has been established in the regulation.

2. Several commenters expressed concern about the difficulty of achieving a very low sulfide concentration, for instance 1.0 mg/l. More specifically, undissolved sulfide which is bound to organic matter present in tannery wastewater is not removed by catalytic oxidation. Further, for those plants which have segregated the sulfide bearing beamhouse wastewater for separate sulfide oxidation, carryover of sulfides into tanyard and wet finishing wastewaters by the hides or skins would preclude achieving a 1.0 mg/l standard. Reuse of lime-sulfide unhairing floats, as now practiced by a few tanners, while affording significant reductions in wastewater volume and lime and sulfide content, will not achieve a 1.0 mg/l standard.

The Agency has reviewed the design and system performance basis for sulfide removal (catalytic oxidation), as well as the raw waste load data for all subcategories, including the retan-wet finishing subcategory. Available data and information indicates that the catalytic oxidation process can be designed to remove all dissolved sulfides. However, residual sulfur forms, which are ostensibly chemically bound to organic matter in the wastewater and therefore not removed by the catalytic oxidation process, are subsequently redissolved in varying quantities. This reappearance of sulfide could easily occur in a long sewer collection system. Further, alternative sulfide control systems, such as spent liquor reuse, will remove the majority of sulfides, but will not permit achievement of a 1.0 mg/l level. Therefore, the Agency agrees that these factors militate against the validity of a national limitation on sulfide.

3. The comment was made that total chromium should be limited since stringent water quality standards cannot be achieved without pretreatment by contributing tanneries to remove chromium prior to discharge to the POTW collection system.

In cases where the NPDES permit conditions for a POTW are based upon locally specific water quality criteria rather than technology, different criteria must be established on a case-by-case basis to assess the need for pretreatment by an industrial indirect discharger, such as a leather tanning and finishing plant. Therefore, because national pretreatment regulations are based upon technology and not water quality criteria, and because chromium in its trivalent form was not found to pass through or interfere with biological treatment at a POTW, a pretreatment limitation for chromium is not warranted.

4. A number of contributing commenters indicated that a pretreatment regulation which included sulfide control, or any substantive limitations, could not be complied with by the July 1, 1977, statutory deadline.

Since limitations are not being established for this industry on a national basis at this time, timely compliance is a moot issue.

5. One comment indicated that ammonia and sulfides are effectively removed in the activated sludge process in practically all POTW, and alternative approaches to control may have to be established if necessary.

The Agency recognizes that a significant number of POTW, treating mixes of domestic and industrial wastewaters other than from leather tanning plants, have demonstrated effective removal of sulfide and ammonia. Sulfides from leather tanning plants have not been found to pass through secondary biological treatment systems. In the case of ammonia, however, even properly designed and operated POTW utilizing the activated sludge process to treat largely tannery wastewater, have not shown the same consistently low affluent ammonia concentrations as have other applications for different industrial and domestic wastewaters. Further, there are no currently available or practicable pretreatment technologies applicable to this industry for ammonia removal. Therefore, no limitation for ammonia has been established at this time.

6. The comment was made that disposal of sludges which contain chromium generated by a POTW can be a serious problem and may require pretreatment by tanneries to alleviate these problems.

The circumstances which lead to difficulty in disposing of sludges which contain chromium are largely site specific. Landfills which are not properly designed and maintained to control surface runoff and subsurface leaching, can be significant sources of surface water and groundwater contamination. Moreover, tannery sludges which are incinerated, pyrolyzed, or otherwise destroyed by high temperature or pressure oxidation, will most probably contain hexavalent chromium, which is more soluble and potentially more toxic than trivalent chromium. The development document and Appendix A of this preamble discuss these problems in greater detail to provide guidance to municipalities in assessing local sludge disposal problems. Since a national problem could not be identified, no pretreatment requirement for chromium has been established at this time based upon sludge considerations.

7. One commenter indicated that water conservation programs undertaken by some plants may warrant reconsideration of the need for pretreatment, where the concentrations of pollutants in smaller volumes of raw wastewater can increase significantly.

The Agency has noted the occurrence of this circumstance for at least one plant where conservation and reuse programs have been a continuing part of production procedure and management policy. While some minor problems of POTW operation have occurred in this case, similar circumstances of a national scope have not occurred. While some increases in raw waste loads can be anticipated with major conservation and reuse programs, the Agency has not identified the need to alter the regulation or discourage such in-plant control programs at this time. However, the Agency is now engaged in a review of the 1983 best available technology economically achievable effluent limitations. The effort may disclose information which would warrant modification of this pretreatment regulation at a later date to account for in-plant conservation and reuse programs designed to control or eliminate the discharge of some pollutants while concentrating the presence of other pollutants.

8. The removal of pretreatment requirements from the regulations concerned one commenter who indicated that in the absence of federal regulations, individual municipalities would find it difficult to deal with tanneries where problems do exist.

The Agency has considered this policy question in formulating this regulation. As noted in Attachment A of this preamble, while tannery wastewater can present significant problems, properly designed and operated POTW which meet secondary treatment requirements and include primary and secondary biological treatment technology effectively remove the major pollutants of concern, specifically BOD5, TSS, oil and grease, total (trivalent) chromium, and sulfides. Since the problems which have been documented are site specific, exercise of local authorities can more effectively deal with these problems. Where operational or sludge disposal problems occur or stringent water quality standards have been incorporated into the NPDES permit of a POTW, local authority should be invoked to require pretreatment where necessary. It is also intended that the development document for this regulation provide general assistance to municipalities in the identification of problems, and in the selection of available pretreatment technologies where necessary.

9. The comment was made that a pH range of 6.0 to 9.0 as previously proposed should be reconsidered in the light of chromium and sulfide control requirements and other aspects of tannery discharges to a POTW.

The Agency has reviewed the proposed pH range, with special regard for the control of hydrogen sulfide gas evolution and trivalent chromium removal at low values of pH. It has been determined that for maximum control of sulfides in gravity collection systems and POTW headworks, and for maximum removal of trivalent chromium largely in primary clarifiers, the optimum pH range is 8.0 to 10.0. Below a pH of 71.0, potentially dangerous evolution of sulfides can occur, and below a pH of 6.0 failure to adequately remove trivalent chromium potentially can occur. At pH greater than 10.0, the potential may exist for disruption of biological treatment systems. Therefore, the appropriate general sections of the regulation have been

amended to require, pH to be no lower than 7.0 and no higher than 10.0 for the four subcategories which include beamhouse operations; and pH to be no lower than 6.0 and no higher than 10.0 for the retan-wet finish, no beamhouse, and shearling subcategories.

§ 425.10 [Amended]

1. § 425.10 is amended by inserting the phrases "and to the introduction of pollutants into treatment works which are publicly owned" after the word "discharges."

2. Subpart A is amended by adding § 425.14 as follows:

§ 425.14 Pretreatment standards for existing sources.

For the purpose of establishing pretreatment standards under section 307 (b) of the Act for a source within the hair pulp, chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory, the provisions of 40 CFR 128 shall not apply. The pretreatment standards for an existing source within the hair pulp, chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory are set forth below.

(a) No pollutant (or pollutant property) introduced into a publicly owned treatment works shall interfere with the operation or performance of the works. Specifically the following wastes shall not be introduced into the publicly owned treatment works:

(1) Pollutants which create a fire or explosion hazard in the publicly owned treatment works.

(2) Pollutants which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case pollutants with a pH lower than 7.0 or greater than 10.0, unless the works is designed to accommodate such pollutants.

(3) Solid or viscous pollutants in amounts which would cause obstruction to the flow in sewers, or other interference with the proper operation of the publicly owned treatment works.

(4) Pollutants at a flow rate and/or pollutant discharge rate which is excessive over relatively short time periods so that there is a treatment process upset and subsequent loss of treatment efficiency.

(b) Any owner or operator of any source to which the pretreatment standards required by § 425.14(a) are applicable, shall be in compliance with such standards upon the effective date of that subsection.

§ 425.20 [Amended]

3. § 425.20 is amended by inserting the phrase "and to the introduction of pollutants into treatment works which are publicly owned" after the word "discharges."

4. Subpart B is amended by adding § 425.24 as follows:

§ 425.24 Pretreatment standards for existing sources.

For the purpose of establishing pretreatment standards under section 307 (b) of the Act for a source within the hair save, chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory, the provisions of 40 CFR 128 shall not apply. The pretreatment standards for an existing source within the hair save, chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory are set forth below.

(a) No pollutant (or pollutant property) introduced into a publicly owned treatment works shall interfere with the operation or performance of the works. Specifically the following wastes shall not be introduced into the publicly owned treatment works:

(1) Pollutants which create a fire or explosion hazard in the publicly owned treatment works.

(2) Pollutants which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case pollutants with a pH lower than 7.0 or greater than 10.0, unless the works is designed to accommodate such pollutants.

(3) Solid or viscous pollutants in amounts which would cause obstruction to the flow in sewers, or other interference with the proper operation of the publicly owned treatment works.

(4) Pollutants at a flow rate and/or pollutant discharge rate which is excessive over relatively short time periods so that there is a treatment process upset and subsequent loss of treatment efficiency.

(b) Any owner or operator of any source to which the pretreatment standards required by §.425.24(a) are applicable, shall be in compliance with such standards upon the effective date of that subsection.

§ 425.30 [Amended]

5. § 425.30 is amended by inserting the phrase "and to the introduction of pollutants into treatment works which are publicly owned" after the word "discharges."

6. Subpart C is amended by adding § 425.34 as follows:

§ 425.34 Pretreatment standards for existing sources.

For the purpose of establishing pretreatment standards under Section 307 (b) of the Act for a source within the hair save, non-chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory, the provisions of 40 CFR 128 shall not apply. The pretreatment standards for an existing source within the hair save, non-chrome tan, retan-wet finish subcategory are set forth below.

(a) No pollutant (or pollutant property) introduced into a publicly owned treatment works shall interfere with the operation or performance of the works. Specifically the following wastes shall not be introduced into the publicly owned treatment works:

(1) Pollutants which create a fire or explosion hazard in the publicly owned treatment works.

(2) Pollutants which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case pollutants with a pH lower than 7.0 or greater than 10.0, unless the works is designed to accommodate such pollutants.

(3) Solid or viscous pollutants in amounts which would cause obstruction to the flow in sewers, or other interference with the proper operation of the publicly owned treatment works.

(4) Pollutants at a flow rate and/or pollutant discharge rate which is excessive over relatively short time periods so that there is a treatment process upset and subsequent loss of treatment efficiency.

(b) Any owner or operator of any source to which the pretreatment standards required by § 425.34(a) are applicable, shall be in compliance with such standards upon the effective date of that subsection.

§ 425.40 [Amended]

7. § 425.40 is amended by inserting the phrase "and to the introduction of pollutants into treatment works which are publicly owned" after the word "discharges."

8. Subpart D is amended by adding § 425.44 as follows:

§ 425.44 Pretreatment standards for existing sources.

For the purpose of establishing pretreatment standards under section 307(b) of the Act for a source within the retan-wet finish subcategory, the provisions of 40 CFR 128 shall not apply. The pretreatment standards for an existing source within the retan-wet finish subcategory are set forth below.

(a) No pollutant (or pollutant property) introduced into a publicly owned treatment works shall interfere with the operation or performance of the works. Specifically the following wastes shall not be introduced into the publicly owned treatment works:

(1) Pollutants which create a fire or explosion hazard in the publicly owned treatment works.

(2) Pollutants which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case pollutants with a pH lower than 6.0 or greater than 10.0, unless the works is designed to accommodate such pollutants.

(3) Solid or viscous pollutants in amounts which would cause obstruction to the flow in sewers, or other interference with the proper operation of the publicly owned treatment works.

(4) Pollutants at a flow rate and/or pollutant discharge rate which is excessive over relatively short time periods so that there is a treatment process upset and subsequent loss of treatment efficiency.

(b) Any owner or operator of any source to which the pretreatment standards required by § 425.44(a) are applicable, shall be in compliance with such standards upon the effective date of that subsection.

§ 425.50 [Amended]

9. § 425.50 is amended by inserting the phrase "and to the introduction of pollutants into treatment works which are publicly owned" after the word "discharges."

10. Subpart E is amended by adding § 425.54 as follows:

§ 425.54 Pretreatment standards for existing sources.

For the purpose of establishing pretreatment standards under section 307

(b) of the Act for a source within the no beamhouse subcategory, the provisions of 40 CFR 128 shall not apply. The pretreatment standards for an existing source within the no beamhouse subcategory are set forth below.

(a) No pollutant (or pollutant property) introduced into a publicly owned treatment works shall interfere with the operation or performance of the works. Specifically the following wastes shall not be introduced into the publicly owned treatment works:

(1) Pollutants which create a fire or explosion hazard in the publicly owned treatment works.

(2) Pollutants which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case pollutants with a pH lower than 6.0 or greater than 10.0, unless the works is designed to accommodate such pollutants.

(3) Solid or viscous pollutants in amounts which would cause obstruction to the flow in sewers, or other interference with the proper operation of the publicly owned treatment works.

(4) Pollutants at a flow rate and/or pollutant discharge rate which is excessive over relatively short time periods so that there is a treatment process upset and subsequent loss of treatment efficiency.

(b) Any owner or operator of any source to which the pretreatment standards required by § 425.54(a) are applicable, shall be in compliance with such standards upon the effective date of that subsection.

§ 425.60 [Amended]

12. § 425.60 is amended by inserting the phrase "and to the introduction of pollutants into treatment works which are publicly owned" after the word "discharges."

13. Subpart F is amended by adding § 425.64 as follows:

§ 425.64 Pretreatment standards for existing sources.

For the purpose of establishing pretreatment standards under section 307(b) of the Act for a source within the through-the-blue subcategory, the provisions of 40 CFR 128 shall not apply. The pretreatment standards for an existing source within the through-the-blue subcategory are set forth below.

(a) No pollutant (or pollutant property) introduced into a publicly owned treatment works shall interfere with the operation or performance of the works. Specifically the following wastes shall not be introduced into the publicly owned treatment works:

(1) Pollutants which create a fire or explosion hazard in the publicly owned treatment works.

(2) Pollutants which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case pollutants with a pH lower than 7.0 or greater than 10.0, unless the works is designed to accommodate such pollutants.

(3) Solid or viscous pollutants in amounts which would cause obstruction to the flow in sewers, or other interference with the proper operation of the publicly owned treatment works.

(4) Pollutants at a flow rate and/or pollutant discharge rate which is excessive over relatively short time periods so that there is a treatment process upset and subsequent loss of treatment efficiency.

(b) Any owner or operator of any source to which the pretreatment standards required by § 425.64(a) are applicable, shall be in compliance with such standards upon the effective date of that subsection.

§ 425.70 [Amended]

14. § 425.70 is amended by inserting the phrase "and to the introduction of pollutants into treatment works which are publicly owned" after the word "discharges."

15. Subpart G is amended by adding § 425.74 as follows:

§ 425.74 Pretreatment standards for existing sources.

For the purpose of establishing pretreatment standards under section 307(b) of the Act for a source within the shearling subcategory, the provisions of 40 CFR 128 shall not apply. The pretreatment standards for an existing source within the shearling subcategory are set forth below.

(a) No pollutant (or pollutant property) introduced into a publicly owned treatment works shall interfere with the operation or performance of the works. Specifically the following wastes shall not be introduced into the publicly owned treatment works:

(1) Pollutants which create a fire or explosion hazard in the publicly owned treatment works.

(2) Pollutants which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case pollutants with a pH lower than 6.0 or greater than 10.0, unless the works is designed to accommodate such pollutants.

(3) Solid or viscous pollutants in amounts which would cause obstruction to the flow in sewers, or other interference with the proper operation of the publicly owned treatment works.

(4) Pollutants at a flow rate and/or pollutant discharge rate which is excessive over relatively short time periods so that there is a treatment process upset and subsequent loss of treatment efficiency.

(b) Any owner or operator of any source to which the pretreatment standards required by § 425.74(a) are applicable, shall be in compliance with such standards upon the effective date of that subsection.

[FR Doc.77-8548 Filed 3-22-77;8:45 am]

Title 45—Public Welfare

CHAPTER X—COMMUNITY SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

PART 1071—GRANTEE PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

Moratorium on Grantee Excess Property Acquisition

Pursuant to the provisions of Pub. L. 94-519, the General Services Administration has issued GSA Bulletin FPMR H-28 requiring, inter alia, that each agency report on all excess government personal property in possession of its grantees by June 14. In order to meet this requirement, CSA has requested an inventory of all such excess personal property from each of its grantees by May 1.

As the continuing acquisition of excess property by grantees during the progress of this inventory would delay its completion and/or render it outdated and inaccurate, it is necessary for CSA to impose a moratorium on its grantees obtaining further excess property through CSA. Since time to complete this inventory is short, it is impracticable and contrary to the public interest to allow the full thirty day period between publication date and effective date of this issuance.

Therefore, effective April 1, 1977, the provisions of 45 Code of Federal Regulations 1071.30 (CSA Instruction 7001-01a, section 4a) are suspended indefinitely, pending further GSA action implementing Pub. L. 94-519 and revision of 45 CFR 1071.30.

(78 Stat. 528 (42 U.S.C. 602(h)))

Effective date: April 1, 1977.

ROBERT C. CHASE,
Acting Director.

[FR Doc.77-8720 Filed 3-22-77;8:45 am]

Title 49—Transportation

CHAPTER X—INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SUBCHAPTER A—GENERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS

[No. MC-C-4000 (Sub-No. 1)]

PART 1047—EXEMPTIONS

Exempt Zone—Dulles and Baltimore-Washington Airports [1]

AGENCY: Interstate Commerce Commission.

ACTION: Minor rule modification.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this document is to give recognition to the fact that that certain airport, located near Baltimore, Md., and formerly named "Friendship International Airport," has

[1] The former title of this proceeding was *Exempt Zone—Dulles and Friendship Airports*, 100 M.C.C. 53 (1965).