

and red meat facilities with respect to raw wastewater nitrogen concentrations, the level of cost savings attributable to reduced chemical additions for alkalinity, the cost and required dosage for polymer additions, the need for final holding lagoon to achieve consistent compliance, the practicality of achieving a 10 times recycle rate in the anoxic tank, and the incremental labor necessary to operate the treatment system.

Using revised assumptions that they believed were more realistic, these commenters estimated costs for 9 sample facilities that ranged from 4 to 8 times the cost estimates projected by EPA for these same facilities. EPA is still reviewing the revised assumptions used by these commenters, but preliminarily believes that some of them may be overly conservative and thus tend to overstate costs. EPA solicits comment and especially real-world data from plants operating the various technology options under consideration for the final rule to aid in determining realistic parameter estimates and assumptions for its cost models.

EPA received limited wastewater sampling data for seven specific facilities in response to its request in the proposed rule. These data were submitted by two individual facilities, two companies, one provided site-specific data for four facilities and one provided generalized data for its facilities, an industry coalition, and an industry trade association. The data submitted by the industry coalition and the industry trade association were the same, and represented data for four pollutants for one of the poultry facilities sampled by EPA for the proposal. This data has not been incorporated into the analyses for today's notice. Of the seven facilities for which data were submitted, data for two of the facilities was the same as the data provided in the facilities' detailed surveys (this data was provided only for TKN). EPA included this data in the loadings and cost analyses in today's notice. EPA did not use data from the remaining facilities for its analyses for today's notice because EPA requires supporting information about the facilities (e.g., treatment system type, production type) before the data can be used in order to classify the data properly. Once the supporting information is submitted by the facilities, EPA anticipates that it will be able to use this data for the final rule. EPA did not incorporate the data submitted by the remaining company because it only supplied a typical range of TKN values for a number of its poultry facilities, and not for any

specific facility. EPA has since requested facility-specific data from this commenter for each of its facilities (see Section II.B regarding DMR data requests).

E. Incorporation of All Surveys and Additional Survey Follow-Up

As discussed in the preamble to the proposed rule (67 FR 8593), EPA was not able to incorporate data from all complete survey responses prior to publication. In the proposal, EPA stated that it would use information from all screener and detailed surveys, including those collected after the cut-off dates (April 24, 2001 and May 29, 2001, respectively), in the analyses presented in this Notice of Data Availability. For the proposal, EPA was able to include information from 961 of 1500 screener survey responses and some of the information from 241 of 328 detailed survey responses. EPA notes that not all surveys returned to EPA provide complete information (even with EPA follow-up). For today's notice, EPA is using responses from 1,254 screener surveys and 328 detailed surveys. EPA notes that the analyses presented in today's notice focus on the 53 (of 328) detailed survey recipients who are non-small meat and poultry slaughterhouses discharging directly to surface waters. However, EPA included all the usable screener surveys and detailed surveys in its calculation of survey weights for developing national estimates (see Section III.B.3 for a discussion of survey weights). EPA has also analyzed detailed survey data from 5 additional direct dischargers which include three small facilities (two poultry facilities and one red meat facility), one poultry further processing facility, and one facility that only performs rendering operations. EPA has included data from these facilities in its analyses for small slaughterhouses, further processors, and renderers in Section 21.1 of the docket and intends to use the data from these facilities in developing the final rule. See Section X, for a discussion of EPA's revised estimates of compliance costs, pollutant reductions and economic impacts.

1. Confirmation of Screener Survey Information

In addition to incorporating the survey data described above, EPA sought to clarify screener survey information and collected additional information from screener survey sites in response to comments regarding the validity of EPA's database and EPA's characterization of the baseline pollutant loadings from the MPP industry. EPA contacted 34 screener

survey facilities that appeared to be direct dischargers based on their screener survey responses. These 34 facilities represent direct dischargers that were not engaged in slaughtering operations (i.e., they only performed further processing or rendering). The majority of these sites were identified as further processors, however, 5 sites were renderers. EPA contacted these facilities to discuss the wastewater treatment systems in place at the site in 1999 (the base year of the survey) as well as to verify the following information: Manufacturing type (e.g., red meat further processor vs. poultry further processor); wastewater flows; production classification (small vs. non-small); discharge mode/wastewater management type (e.g., indirect discharge to POTW, direct discharge to receiving water, land application); monitored pollutant parameters; current wastewater treatment system and target concentrations; and discharge/receiving water body. EPA obtained responses from 30 sites. Of these, 18 were in fact direct dischargers, 11 turned out to be indirect dischargers and one was not currently operating. EPA has incorporated this information into the analyses of further processors and renderers in Section 21.1., DCNs 125606 and 126002 of the docket. EPA also received discharge monitoring report (DMR) data from three further processing sites in response to these follow-up discussions. This DMR data has also been incorporated into the analyses of further processors and renderers in Section 19.3.3 of the docket. Non-confidential responses are provided in Section 19.3.1 of the public record for today's notice.

2. Confirmation of Detailed Survey Information

EPA conducted several follow-up efforts to ensure that the detailed survey data collected from MPP facilities are as complete and accurate as possible, including follow-up phone calls to facilities if survey responses were incomplete or if there were discrepancies in the data reported in the detailed surveys. EPA then made an effort to systematically confirm information for all direct discharge detailed survey recipients. Specifically, EPA mailed a summary of facility-specific responses (referred to as a "fact sheet") to the 58 detailed survey respondents that indicated they were direct dischargers in their survey response. EPA did not send "fact sheets" to indirect dischargers because, as proposed and based on further evaluation as discussed above, EPA is not considering further regulation of