Comments on EPA Definition of Solid Waste ANPR

CIBO Environment Committee

Meeting

March 3, 2009

Comments on Definition of Solid Waste

- 65 comments are found in EPA's E-Docket.
 They can be broken down into:
 - Trade associations (CIBO, AFPA, ACC, API, RMA, CPA, UARG, USWAG, AISI, TFI, NMA, etc)
 - Material users (Alabama Scrap Tire Commission, Bluefire Ethanol, Florida Sugar, Institute of Scrap Recycling)
 - Sanitation Districts (sludges)
 - States (Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kentucky)
- No environmental group comments are found in the docket!

Most comments were supportive:

- Flexible legitimacy criteria are needed
- Many materials are properly in the fuel category
- The concept of "discarded" is important
- No bright line on Btu content is needed
- Discarded materials that are subsequently recovered and used (processed?) are not wastes
- Comparing contaminants with those in fossil fuels is unnecessary
- The hazardous waste program is not necessarily a good model for this program
- States should remain the principal regulators
- Units burning de minimis quantities of waste should not be CISWI

- A few were not supportive
 - ASTSWMO:
 - Wants states to be able to manage non-waste materials as wastes under some circumstances
 - Concerned about pressure not to go beyond federal rules in above example
 - Concerned about continuum of being generated as a byproduct & being defined as a legitimate material
 - Concerned about being able to regulate as a solid waste materials that are subsequently processed (C & D materials)
 - Concerned about processed material stored for speculative accumulation or for sham recycling
 - Concerned about volatility of secondary materials markets

- A few were not supportive
 - Kentucky:
 - Would like tires defined as solid waste; no way for tires headed to cement kilns to be differentiated from tires going to a dump
 - State has definitions that do not allow "recovered materials" to be burned for energy recovery
 - So, some materials would require a state solid waste-to-energy permit

- A few were not supportive
 - Wisconsin has "serious concerns which need to be addressed":
 - Modified definition of solid waste causes problems for state programs "that limit environmental impacts from the storage and handling of solid wastes that become secondary materials"
 - Identification of solid wastes as secondary materials "should be limited to delivery at the combustion unit"
 - "We do not support changing the RCRA Subtitle D definition of solid waste as proposed in the ANPRM"
 - Waste producers incentivized to categorize wastes as fuels despite environmental impacts; sham recycling
 - Could undercut regulation of non-disposal solid waste facilities (tire processors)

- A few were not supportive
 - Minnesota:
 - EPA published notice in manner that state air permitting staff unable to "adequately respond"
 - "disheartening to learn of EPA's proposal to draft air emissions standards for industrial boilers through an ANPR related to defining solid waste"
 - State treats many materials as solid wastes until they are used, and managed appropriately
 - State law doesn't allow animal manure to be classified as a fuel
 - Could be good reasons to regulate materials under S.
 129

- A few were not supportive
 - Environmental Technology Council
 - EPA must be careful "not to undermine the safeguards" found in the Subtitle C DSW when developing a rule for non-hazardous solid waste
 - "no question" EPA goals best served by "continuing to consider used oil as a solid waste within the RCRA framework"
 - "EPA should also maintain the specific heating value of 5,000 Btu/lb to define alternative fuels"
 - "The presence of non-fuel contaminants in secondary materials burned as fuel should be a significant concern to EPA"