

Model discussed in the NODA and in section IV.B.1 of today's final rule, EPA estimates that compliance with PSES based on the Option 2 technology will result in the closure of 9% of the existing indirect dischargers in this subcategory (10 of 112 existing SFF indirect dischargers). Option 2 technology is not economically achievable.

EPA has determined that Option 2 technology is not the best available technology economically achievable for existing indirect dischargers in the SFF subcategory, and therefore EPA is not revising PSES for this subcategory based on the Option 2 technology. Wastewater discharges to POTWs from these facilities will remain regulated by general pretreatment standards (part 403) and part 420.

4. Pretreatment Standards for New Sources (PSNS)

EPA proposed to establish PSNS for indirect dischargers in the SFF subcategory based on the Option 4 technology. Option 4 technology is similar to Option 2 (including Option 2 flow control and pollution prevention) but includes oils removal using ultrafiltration and solids separation by a microfilter (instead of a clarifier). As explained in section VI.A.4, EPA concluded its database is insufficient to support a determination that the Option 4 standards are technically achievable. Consequently, EPA is today rejecting Option 4 technology as the basis for PSNS in the SFF subcategory. EPA has selected "no further regulation" for new SFF indirect dischargers and is not revising PSNS for new SFF indirect dischargers. These facilities will remain subject to part 420.

F. Oily Wastes Subcategory

EPA is promulgating limitations and standards for existing and new direct dischargers in the Oily Wastes subcategory based on the proposed Option 6 technology (*see* section VI.F.1). EPA is not promulgating pretreatment standards for existing or new indirect dischargers in this subcategory.

1. Best Practicable Control Technology (BPT)

EPA is establishing BPT pH limitations and daily maximum limitations for two pollutants, oil and grease as hexane extractable material (O&G (as HEM)) and total suspended solids (TSS), for direct dischargers in the Oily Wastes subcategory based on the proposed technology option (Option 6). Option 6 technology includes the following treatment measures: (1) in-process flow control and pollution

prevention; and (2) chemical emulsion breaking followed by oil water separation (*see* section 9 of the TDD for today's final rule for additional details on the Option 6 technology).

The Agency concluded that the Option 6 treatment technology represents the best practicable control technology currently available and should be the basis for the BPT Oily Wastes limitations for the following reasons. First, this technology is available technology readily applicable to all facilities in the Oily Wastes subcategory. Approximately 42% of the direct discharging facilities in the Oily Wastes subcategory currently employ the Option 6 technology. Second, the cost of compliance with these limitations in relation to the effluent reduction benefits is not wholly disproportionate. None of these wastewater discharges are currently subject to national effluent limitations guidelines and the final rule will control wastewater discharges from a significant number of facilities (2,382 facilities).

EPA estimates that compliance with BPT limitations based on Option 6 technology will result in no closures of the existing direct dischargers in the Oily Wastes subcategory. Moreover, the adoption of this level of control will represent a significant reduction in pollutants discharged into the environment by facilities in this subcategory. For facilities in the Oily Wastes subcategory at Option 6, EPA estimates an annual compliance cost of \$13.8 million (pre-tax, 2001\$) and 480,325 pounds of conventional pollutants removed from current discharges into the Nation's waters at a cost of \$28.73/pound-pollutant removed (2001\$) (*see* Table VII-1). EPA has, therefore, determined the total cost of effluent reductions employing the Option 6 technology are reasonable in relation to the effluent reduction benefits. (In estimating the pounds of pollutant removed by implementing Option 6 technology for direct dischargers in the Oily Wastes subcategory, EPA used the sum of O&G (measured as HEM) and TSS pounds removed to avoid any significant double counting of pollutants).

The 2001 proposal also contains detailed discussions explaining why EPA rejected BPT limitations based on other BPT technology options (*see* 66 FR 457). The information in the record for today's final rule provides no basis for EPA to change this conclusion.

In the 2001 proposal, in addition to pH, O&G (as HEM), and TSS, EPA also proposed to regulate sulfide. In today's final rule, EPA has not established a sulfide limitation because it may serve

as a treatment chemical (*see* TDD). EPA also proposed three alternatives to control discharges of toxic organics in MP&M process wastewaters: (1) Meet a numerical limit for the total sum of a list of specified organic pollutants (similar to the Total Toxic Organic (TTO) parameter used in the Metal Finishing Effluent Limitations Guidelines); (2) meet a numerical limit for Total Organic Carbon (TOC) as an indicator parameter; or (3) develop and certify the implementation of an organic chemicals management plan. EPA evaluated the analytical wastewater and treatment technology data from OWS facilities and concluded it should not establish a separate indicator parameter or control mechanism for toxic organics. Optimizing the separation of oil and grease from wastewater using the Option 6 technology will similarly optimize the removal of toxic organic pollutants amenable to this treatment technology. Consequently, EPA is effectively controlling toxic organics and other priority and non-conventional pollutant discharges in OWS process wastewaters by regulating O&G (as HEM).

In its analyses, EPA estimated that facilities will monitor once per month for O&G (as HEM) and TSS. EPA expects that 12 data points for each pollutant per year will yield a meaningful basis for establishing compliance with the promulgated limitations through long-term trends and short-term variability in O&G (as HEM) and TSS pollutant discharge loading patterns.

Although EPA is not changing the technology basis from that proposed, EPA is revising all of the proposed Oily Wastes subcategory BPT limitations. This is a result of a recalculation of the limitations after EPA revised the data sets used to calculate the promulgated limitations to reflect changes including corrections and additional data (*see* 67 FR 38754).

2. Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (BCT)

In deciding whether to adopt more stringent limitations for BCT than BPT, EPA considered whether there are technologies that achieve greater removals of conventional pollutants than adopted for BPT, and whether those technologies are cost-reasonable under the standards established by the CWA. EPA generally refers to the decision criteria as the "BCT cost test." EPA is promulgating effluent limitations for conventional parameters (*e.g.*, pH, TSS, O&G) equivalent to BPT for this subcategory because it identified no technologies that can achieve greater removals of conventional pollutants