

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY**
40 CFR Part 265
[39-FRL-3092-1]
**Interim Status Standards for Owners
and Operators of Hazardous Waste
Treatment, Storage, and Disposal
Facilities; Final Rule**
AGENCY: Environmental Protection
Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency is today amending the interim status regulations for closing and providing postclosure care for hazardous waste surface impoundments (40 CFR Part 265, Subpart K), under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

The Agency proposed today's modifications to the interim status standards on July 26, 1982. Today's amendments provide conformance between certain interim status requirements for surface impoundments and those requirements contained in the permitting rules of 40 CFR Part 264, that were also published on July 26, 1982. The Agency is also setting forth its interpretation of the regulatory requirements applying to closure of storage facilities regulated under both permits and interim status.

EFFECTIVE DATE: These final regulations become effective on September 15, 1987, which is six months from the date of promulgation, as RCRA section 3010(b) requires.

ADDRESS: The docket for this rulemaking (Docket No. F-87-CCF-FFFFF) is located in Room MLG100, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC and is available for viewing from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Call Mia Zmud at 475-9327 for appointments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: RCRA hotline at (800) 424-9346 (in Washington, DC, Call 382-3000) or for technical information contact Ossi Meyn, Office of Solid Waste (WH-585E), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC 20460, telephone (202) 382-4854.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
I. Authority

These regulations are issued under the authority of sections 1006, 2002(a), 3004 and 3005 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA), as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery

Act (RCRA) of 1976, as amended (42 U.S.C 6905, 6912(a), 6924, and 6925).

II. Background

Subtitle C of RCRA creates a "cradle-to-grave" management system intended to ensure that hazardous waste is safely treated, stored, or disposed. First, Subtitle C requires the Agency to identify hazardous waste. Second, it creates a manifest system designed to track the movement of hazardous waste, and requires hazardous waste generators and transporters to employ appropriate management practices as well as procedures to ensure the effective operation of the manifest system. Third, owners and operators of treatment, storage, and disposal facilities must comply with standards the Agency established under section 3004 of RCRA that "may be necessary to protect human health and the environment." Ultimately, these standards will be implemented exclusively through permits issued to owners and operators by authorized States or the Agency. However, until these permits are issued, existing facilities are controlled under the interim status regulations of 40 CFR Part 265 that were largely promulgated on May 19, 1980. Under RCRA interim status, the owner or operator of a facility may operate without a permit if: (1) it existed on November 19, 1980, (or it existed on the effective date of statutory or regulatory changes under RCRA that render the facility subject to the requirements to have a permit under section 3005); (2) he has complied with the notification requirements of section 3010 of RCRA; (3) he applied for a permit (Part A application) in accordance with section 3005 of RCRA. Interim status is retained until the regulatory agency makes a formal decision to issue or deny the permit or until the facility loses its interim status by statute for failure to submit Part B permit application and/or certification of compliance with applicable groundwater monitoring and financial assurance requirements.

In regulations promulgated on July 26, 1982, [40 CFR Part 264, 47 FR 32274], the Agency established permitting standards in 40 CFR Part 264 covering the treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes in surface impoundments, waste piles, land treatment units, and landfills. Owners and operators of such facilities must meet these standards to receive RCRA permits. Also included in the Federal Register on that date were a series of changes to the interim status requirements of Part 265, which were promulgated to ensure consistency with

the new Part 264 standards. There were, however, a few additional Part 265 conforming changes that the Agency believed should first be proposed for public comment because, in most cases, the public had not had sufficient opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of applying them during the interim status period. Many of the changes that were proposed on July 26, 1982, were promulgated in final regulations on April 23, 1985 (50 FR 18044). Today, the Agency is making final the remaining changes to the surface impoundment closure and post-closure care requirements (§ 265.228) that were proposed on July 26, 1982.

III. Discussion of Today's Amendments

The Part 264 rules issued on July 26, 1982, for surface impoundment closure and post-closure care (§§ 264.228 and 264.310) are in many ways similar to the interim status requirements (§§ 265.228 and 265.310). The Part 264 closure rules, however, contain more specific performance standards to assure adequate protection of human health and the environment. For reasons discussed below, the Agency believes the more explicit Part 264 closure rules should also be implemented during interim status. Moreover, EPA believes that the closure process is adequate to apply these closure requirements. The existing review process for interim status closure and post-closure care plans will provide an opportunity for the Agency to review the specifics of the plans for compliance with the closure performance standards. Thus, any problems with misinterpretation of the closure requirements by the owner or operator would be identified and rectified prior to actual closure. In fact, the review process for closure and post-closure care plans during interim status is similar to the review process of closure and post-closure care plans conducted during the permitting process. Therefore, the Agency believes that these closure requirements are capable of being properly implemented during interim status.

The § 265.228 closure rules proposed on July 26, 1982, and promulgated today, retain the basic format of existing regulations by allowing owners and operators to choose between removing hazardous wastes and waste residues (and terminating responsibility for the unit) or retaining wastes and managing the unit as a landfill. (An additional choice for closure is proposed elsewhere in today's Federal Register.) The requirements for both choices are made more specific in today's amendments.

If the owner or operator chooses not to remove or decontaminate the waste and waste residues, then the rules promulgated today provide that the owner or operator must: (1) Eliminate free liquids by either removing them from the impoundment or solidifying them, (2) stabilize the remaining waste and waste residues to support a final cover, (3) install a final cover to provide long-term minimization of infiltration into the closed impoundment, and (4) perform post-closure care and ground-water monitoring.

The Part 265 regulations promulgated today (like the existing Part 264 regulations for permitted units) allow owners and operators of surface impoundments to remove or decontaminate wastes to avoid capping and post-closure care requirements (§ 265.228(a)(1)). They must remove or decontaminate all wastes, waste residues, contaminated containment system components (e.g., contaminated portions of liners), contaminated subsoils, and structures and equipment contaminated with waste and leachate. All removed residues, subsoils, and equipment must be managed as hazardous waste unless there is compliance with the delisting provisions of § 261.3(d). (Smaller Part 266 closure and post-closure care rules for waste piles were promulgated on July 28, 1982.)

The new requirements for closure by removal differ significantly from the previous Part 265 requirements in one respect. The previous interim status requirement in § 265.228(b) required owners or operators to remove all waste residues and contaminated soil or to demonstrate, using the procedures in § 261.3 (c) and (d), that the materials remaining at any stage of the removal were no longer a hazardous waste. Once an owner or operator made a successful demonstration under § 261.3 (c) and (d), (a) he could discontinue removal and certify closure.

Under § 261.3 (c) and (d), materials contaminated with listed waste (as evidenced by the presence of Appendix VIII constituents) are hazardous waste by definition unless the material is delisted. Materials contaminated with characteristic wastes, however, are only hazardous wastes to the extent that the material itself exhibits a characteristic. Thus to meet the old closure by removal standard, owners or operators of characteristic waste impoundments had only to demonstrate that the remaining material did not exhibit the characteristic that first brought the impoundment under regulatory control.

This demonstration, however, arguably allowed significant and potentially harmful levels of hazardous

constituents (i.e., those contained in Appendix VIII of Part 261) to remain in surface impoundment units without subjecting the units to landfill closure, post-closure care, or monitoring requirements.

For example, the previous version of the rule allowed residues from waste that originally exhibited the characteristic of extraction procedure (EP) toxicity to remain in place at "clean closure" if the residue was no longer EP toxic. This could allow an environmentally significant quantity of hazardous constituents to remain at a facility site that will receive no further monitoring or management. While EP toxic criterion would preclude only a concentration that exceeds 100 times the drinking water standard, constituents may remain at levels significantly above the drinking water standards. If such constituents are close to the saturated zone, they may contaminate ground water at levels exceeding the ground-water protection standard. Furthermore, the waste residues may contain significant and potentially harmful levels of other hazardous constituents (listed in Appendix VIII of Part 261) that are not found through EP testing. Hence, the language "or demonstrate what remains is no longer a hazardous waste" has been dropped from the interim status regulations because it is inconsistent with the overall closure performance standard requiring units to close in a manner that eliminates or minimizes the post-closure escape of Appendix VIII constituents.

Making this conforming change ensures that no Appendix VIII constituent presents any threat to human health and the environment. This is also consistent with several of the new requirements added by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984. For example, new section 3094(u) of PCRA requires corrective action for releases not only of hazardous wastes, but also hazardous constituents. Similarly, section 3001(f) requires the Agency to consider, when evaluating waste delisting petitions, all hazardous constituents found in the waste, not just those for which the waste was listed as hazardous. Finally, new section 3005(i) requires owners and operators of landfills, surface impoundments, waste piles, or land treatment units that qualify for interim status and receive waste after July 28, 1982, to meet the ground-water monitoring and corrective action standards found in Subpart F to 40 CFR Part 264. These regulations also require owners and operators to monitor and clean up the full range of Appendix VIII constituents found in a waste.

The question has also arisen during the implementation of previous closures by removal whether § 265.228 requires consideration of potential ground-water contamination in addition to soil contamination. The answer to this question is yes. The closure by removal requirements in § 265.228 (a)(1) and (b) require removal or decontamination (i.e., flushing, pumping/treating the aquifer) of "underlying and surrounding contaminated soils." Since contamination of both saturated and unsaturated soils may threaten human health or the environment, the Agency interprets the term "soil" broadly to include both unsaturated soils and soils containing ground water. Thus the closure by removal standard requires consideration of both saturated and unsaturated soils. Uncontaminated ground water is, therefore, a requirement for "clean closure" under Part 265 (and Part 264) as revised today as well as under the previous regulation.

The one comment received on the proposed § 265.228 surface impoundment closure and post-closure care requirements for "clean closure" argued that clay liners should be allowed to remain in place at closure even if they are contaminated because their excavation is expensive and hazardous to workers removing the waste. EPA disagrees. While excavation may be expensive, the additional cost of removing the liner will usually be small in comparison to the cost of removing the waste. Therefore, if an owner or operator is willing to expend the resources to remove the waste, it is not unduly burdensome to go one step further and remove the liner. This burden is justified by the benefit of removing contamination from the impoundment. (See discussion below.) If extensive excavation is needed, thereby considerably increasing the cost of removal, it is generally because extensive contamination of the clay and underlying soils has occurred. In these cases, it may be cheaper to install a proper final cover and perform post-closure care rather than remove the contamination. In addition, we do not believe that removal of the liner will be any more hazardous to workers than is the removal of the waste. With proper safety procedures, removal of the waste and liner should not pose an undue hazard to workers.

EPA's Interpretation of the "Remove or Decontaminate" Standard

The sole commenter on the proposed rule also suggested that, in addition to the case where all wastes, residues, and contaminated liners and soils are

removed, no final cover should be required where the type and quantity of waste in the liner can be shown to pose no public health or environmental threat. This comment touches upon an issue that has arisen in other contexts, that is: What is the necessary extent of removal or decontamination of wastes, waste residues, contaminated liners, and soils (including contaminated ground water) to avoid the landfill closure and post-closure care requirements under both Parts 264 and 265 regulations? The issue concerning how much removal or decontamination of wastes and waste residues is necessary to protect human health and the environment is relevant in a broad range of regulatory contexts currently being examined by the Agency including closure and corrective actions under RCRA and response actions under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) programs.

The removal and decontamination issue arises directly from differences in regulatory strategy between disposal and storage. A storage unit holds wastes temporarily, and the wastes are eventually removed for treatment or disposal elsewhere. The goal at closure is to leave no materials at the storage site that require further care; in contrast, a disposal unit, by definition, is closed with wastes and residues remaining at the site. The goal at closure is to assure that these remaining wastes and residues are managed in a manner that protects human health and the environment. There is no need for post-closure oversight of storage units since all potentially harmful wastes and contaminated materials are removed. This is not true for disposal units; hence, the Agency has promulgated regulations requiring post-closure care for disposal units. (For further discussions on a proposed alternative closure option, see the preamble to proposed §§ 264.310 and 265.310 elsewhere in today's Federal Register).

To assist the reader, we describe below EPA's interpretation of the "remove and decontaminate" language in §§ 264.228 and 265.228, i.e., we describe the amount of removal or decontamination that obviates the need for post-closure care for both interim status and permitted surface impoundment units. With regard to storage units regulated under both Parts 264 and 265, the Agency interprets the terms "remove" and "decontaminate" to mean removal of all wastes and liners, and the removal of leachate and materials contaminated with the waste or leachate (including ground water)

that pose a substantial present or potential threat to human health or the environment. The Agency recognizes that at certain sites limited quantities of hazardous constituents might remain in the subsoil and yet present only insignificant risks to human health and the environment. Because regulations for storage facilities require no further post-closure care, the Agency must be certain that no hazardous constituents remain that could harm human health or the environment (now or in the future). To provide the necessary level of assurance, the Agency will require owners or operators to remove all wastes and contaminated liners and to demonstrate that any hazardous constituents left in the subsoil will not cause unacceptable risks to human health or the environment. The Agency will review site-specific demonstrations submitted by facility owners and operators that document that enough removal and decontamination has occurred so that no further action is necessary. Owners or operators wishing to avail themselves of the site-specific removal option must include in their closure plans specific details of how they expect to make the demonstration, including sampling protocols, schedules, and the exposure level that is intended to be used as a standard for assessing whether removal or decontamination is achieved (see discussion below). The Agency is presently developing a guidance document explaining the technical requirements for achieving a "clean closure". This guidance document should be available in draft form by January 1987. In the meantime, the following discussion presents the framework for the demonstration procedure.

The closure demonstrations submitted by facility owners and operators must document that the contaminants left in the subsoil will not impact any environmental media including ground water, surface water, or the atmosphere in excess of Agency-recommended limits or factors, and that direct contact through dermal exposure, inhalation, or ingestion will not result in a threat to human health or the environment. Agency recommended limits or factors are those that have undergone peer review by the Agency. At the present time these include water quality standards and criteria (Ambient Water Quality Criteria 45 FR 79318, November 28, 1980; 49 FR 5831, February 15, 1984; 50 FR 30784, July 29, 1985), health-based limits based on verified reference doses (RfDs) developed by the Agency's Risk Assessment Forum (Verified Reference Doses of USEPA, ECAO-CIN-475,

January 1986) and Carcinogenic Potency Factors (CPF) developed by the Agency's Carcinogen Assessment Group (Table 9-11, Health Assessment Document for Tetrachloroethylene (Perchloroethylene) USEPA, OHEA/600/8-82/005F, July 1985) to be used to determine exposure at a given risk, or site-specific Agency-approved public health advisories issued by the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry of the Center for Disease Control, Department of Health and Human Services.

The Agency is currently compiling toxicity information on many of the hazardous constituents contained in Appendix VIII to Part 261. The facility owner and operators should check with the Office of Solid Waste, Characterization and Assessment Division, Technical Assessment Branch (202) 382-4781 for the latest toxicity information. However, for some hazardous constituents, formally recommended exposure limits do not yet exist. If no Agency recommended exposure limits exist for a hazardous constituent then the owner or operator must either remove the constituent down to background levels, submit data of sufficient quality for the Agency to determine the environmental and health effects of the constituent, or follow landfill closure and post-closure requirements. Data submitted by the owner or operator on environmental and health effects of a constituent should, when possible, follow the toxicity testing guidelines of 40 CFR Parts 797 and 798 (50 FR 36252, September 27, 1985). The Agency does not believe there are many situations where developing exposure levels will be a realistic option for owners and operators because the testing required by 40 CFR Parts 797 and 798 to produce reliable toxicity estimates is expensive and time-consuming.

The Agency believes it is necessary to present policy on the appropriate point of exposure for the various pathways of exposure in order to provide some national consistency in dealing with the potential impacts of the release of hazardous constituents from closing units. The following point of exposure was chosen because the Agency believes it represents a realistic and at the same time reasonably conservative estimate of where either environmental or human receptors could be exposed to the contaminants released from the unit. For the purpose of making a closure by removal demonstration, the potential point of exposure to hazardous waste constituents is assumed to be directly at or within the unit boundary for all

routes of exposure (surface-water contact, ground-water ingestion, inhalation, and direct contact). Potential exposure at or within the unit boundary must be assumed because no further oversight or monitoring of the unit is required if the unit is closed by removal. (Recall that the land overlying a unit that closes by removal may be transferred and developed freely without giving notice of its prior use.) Therefore, no attenuation of the hazardous waste constituents leaching from the waste residues can be presumed to occur before the constituents reach exposure points.

This approach differs from the existing "delisting procedure" developed in response to the requirements of §§ 261.3 (c) and (d), 260.20, and 260.22. As discussed previously, the "clean closure" approach is based on the premise that, after closure by removal is satisfied, no further management control over the waste (or unit) is necessary. In contrast, delisted solid waste remains subject to the regulatory controls promulgated by the Agency under Subtitle D of RCRA. Subtitle D contains performance criteria for the management of non-hazardous waste. Although the Agency is currently assessing whether more specific Federal regulatory requirements are needed for waste management under Subtitle D, most states have already adopted specific regulatory requirements for Subtitle D waste management. Therefore, even though a waste may be delisted its management continues to be controlled. In contrast, closure by removal will not be followed by any regulatory controls; hence, an environmentally conservative approach is needed to assure no further risk to human health and the environment. Therefore, unlike the current "delisting procedure" that is based on a generic process that only considers the ground-water route of exposure, the demonstration procedure discussed here is waste-specific and site-specific, considers all potential exposure pathways, and assumes no attenuation.

The demonstration should be conservative in the sense that it eliminates the uncertainties associated with contaminant fate and transport, focusing on the waste contaminant levels and contaminant characteristics. Therefore, arguments relying on fate and transport calculations will not be accepted. The Agency is pursuing this relatively conservative approach at this time because we are confident that it will be protective of human health and the environment. After a few years of experience with "clean closure"

demonstrations, the Agency may decide that a less stringent approach is sufficiently reliable to assure that closures based on such analyses are fully protective of human health and the environment. At that time, the Agency may change its position on the use of fate and transport arguments for "clean closure" demonstrations. (Elsewhere in today's Federal Register, the Agency is proposing a third closure option that would incorporate fate and transport factors. However, unlike the closure by removal option, that option would require closure to be followed by verification monitoring to verify the fate and transport predictions and assume that the closure protects human health and the environment.)

To make the demonstration with respect to the direct contact pathway, owners or operators must demonstrate that contaminant levels in soil are less than levels established by the Agency as acceptable for ingestion or dermal contact. Total waste constituent levels in soil should be used for this analysis. Arguments based on exposure control measures such as fencing or capping will not be acceptable since the long-term future use of the property cannot be reliably controlled and hence the long-term effectiveness of these measures is uncertain.

To make the demonstration with respect to the ground-water pathway, owners or operators must remove enough contaminated soil and saturated subsols (i.e., ground water) to demonstrate that constituent levels in ground water do not exceed Agency-established chronic health levels (based on RfD or CPF values) and that residual contaminant levels remaining in the soil will not contribute to any future contamination of ground water. (Note: this demonstration may in some cases require constituent-specific ground water data beyond that required by §§ 265.90 through 265.100). The demonstration related to residual soil contamination levels must show that levels of constituents found in leachate from the residual soil contamination are not above Agency-established exposure levels. Levels of constituents in leachate may be estimated based on known characteristics of the waste constituents (e.g., solubility and partitioning coefficients) or determined by the results of actual soil leaching tests. The Agency is exploring the appropriateness of using the extraction procedures (but not the acceptable contaminant levels) found in the Toxicity Characteristics Leaching Procedure (TCLP); Federal Register of January 14, 1985 (51 FR 1860). The current EP Toxicity leaching

procedure is insufficient for this demonstration because it does not capture the organic constituents in the waste.

The analysis of potential air exposures should assess contaminants migrating from the soils into the atmosphere. The demonstration should include emission calculations, available monitoring data, and safe inhalation levels based on Agency-established exposure levels.

The potential surface water exposure analysis should compare Agency-established water quality standards and criteria (45 FR 79318, November 28, 1980) with the levels of constituents that may leach from the residual contaminated soil. Tests described previously should be used to estimate the level of constituents in the leachate. The surface water exposure analysis should also consider existing surface water contaminant concentrations.

IV. State Authority

A. Applicability of Rules in Authorized States

Under section 3006 of RCRA, EPA may authorize qualified States to administer and enforce the RCRA program within the State. (See 40 CFR Part 271 for the standards and requirements for authorization.) Following authorization, the Agency retains enforcement authority under sections 3006, 7003 and 3013 of RCRA, although authorized States have primary enforcement responsibility.

Prior to the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA), a State with final authorization administered its hazardous waste program entirely in lieu of the Federal program. The Federal requirements no longer applied in the authorized State, and the Agency could not issue permits for any facilities in a State where the State was authorized to permit. When new, more stringent Federal requirements were promulgated or enacted, the State was obligated to enact equivalent authority within specified time frames. New Federal requirements did not take effect in an authorized State until the State adopted the requirements as State law.

In contrast, under section 3006(g) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6926(g), new requirements and prohibitions imposed by HSWA take effect in authorized States at the same time that they take effect in nonauthorized States. The Agency is directed to carry out those requirements and prohibitions in authorized States, including the issuance of permits, until the State is granted