

who are currently employing denitrification technology. This would enable EPA to calculate the actual BOD to TKN ratio for each subcategory for use in the final rule. EPA would specifically like monitoring data from the influent to the biological treatment system for BOD and TKN and information on the level of denitrification that is occurring in the system (e.g., data on Total Nitrogen at the influent and effluent or nitrate+nitrite at the influent and effluent of the system).

6. Lagoon Bypass. As discussed in Section III, EPA has estimated costs for facilities to bypass some of the wastewater around the anaerobic lagoons if data indicated that the concentration of BOD leaving the anaerobic lagoon is not at least three times the concentration of TKN. Stakeholders reviewing EPA's cost model commented that EPA underestimated the costs for lagoon bypass. EPA's cost estimates were based on the lagoon bypass observed at one of the facilities EPA has sampled which may be less complex than the lagoon bypass discussed by commenters. EPA solicits comment on the capital and operating and maintenance costs associated with less complex and more complex systems used to bypass anaerobic lagoons.

7. Use of Methanol as Carbon Source. EPA includes costs, as necessary, for facilities to use methanol on weekends (when the plant is not in operation) as a carbon source for the biomass. Commenters are concerned that methanol would cause biomass upset if the biomass is not acclimated to it. EPA does not believe that the quantity of methanol that it estimates to be used over the weekends is sufficient to cause toxicity to the biomass. EPA solicits comment on the quantity of methanol found to be "toxic" to biological systems used to treat red meat and poultry processing wastewater.

8. EPA received a request from permitting authorities to clarify the distinction between animal feeding operations (AFOs)/CAFOs and animal holding areas in the MPP industry. Animal holding areas at MPP facilities where animals are held for short durations (one to several days) prior to slaughter are not considered AFOs, but rather are considered part of the MPP facility and any process wastewater from these areas is subject to MPP effluent guidelines. EPA solicits comment on an approach that would articulate these clarifying points in the regulatory text of the Meat and Poultry Products ELG. (See Section V.A for the relevant discussion.)

9. EPA is considering revising the existing and proposed limitations and standards for fecal coliforms to allow for results to be reported in either MPN units or CFU units per 100 ml. EPA solicits comment on this possible revision. (See Section V.C for the relevant discussion.)

10. Some facilities use ultraviolet (UV) technology to disinfect their wastewater before discharge instead of using chlorine or other chemical disinfectants. EPA intends to further review sampling episode data and to consider the self-monitoring data from facilities that use UV technology. EPA solicits comments and data on UV performance and costs for reducing fecal coliforms in MPP wastewaters. EPA also solicits comment on the extent to which water quality standards are driving the MPP industry to shift from chlorination/dechlorination to UV to achieve water quality standards for chlorine and chlorination byproducts and whether this shift necessitates a revised fecal coliforms limit that is consistently achievable with UV technology. (See Section V.C for the relevant discussion.)

11. EPA is considering using five forecasting methods when determining facility closures for the final rule. A facility would be projected to close if the present value (PV) of future compliance costs exceeds the forecast PV of net income under three of the five forecasting methods. Alternately, EPA might use some subset of the five forecasting methods. EPA solicits comment on the appropriate use of these forecasting methods for future facility income in the MPP industry. (See Section VI.A.1 for the relevant discussion.)

12. Because fewer than 40 percent of direct discharging facilities provided facility-level financial data in the detailed survey, EPA is considering a closure analysis at the company level in addition to the facility level. EPA solicits comment on the aggregation of facility-level compliance costs to the company level, and the use of a company-level closure analysis. In addition, EPA solicits comment on the methodology used to estimate compliance costs for the closure analysis for the 70 non-surveyed facilities which are owned by the same parent companies as the 55 detailed survey recipients. (See Section VI.A.3 for the relevant discussion.) EPA also solicits comment on appropriate methods for "scaling-up" the facility-level and company-level closure analyses to provide national projections given that there are sufficient data to analyze only a subset of facilities/companies.

13. To address commenters' concerns about the effect of the proposed rule on poultry exports, EPA derived its trade elasticities based on Armington's framework in which one country's meat products are an imperfect substitute for those of other countries. EPA solicits comment on its revised trade elasticity methodology. (See Section VI.B for the relevant discussion.)

14. Based on public comments received on the proposed rule, EPA is considering possible revisions to its approach for determining environmental benefits. For modeling water quality, EPA solicits comment on the use of the six-parameter Water Quality Index (instead of the four-parameter Index) to assess the environmental improvements from the MPP regulation. In particular, EPA solicits comment on the inclusion of nitrogen and phosphorous in the kinetics model. EPA also solicits comment on the use of NAWQA data to calibrate the baseline, and solicits other sources of data to use in the calibration effort. (See Section VII.A.1 for the relevant discussion.)

15. EPA is considering site-specific or watershed-specific models to evaluate the effects of nutrients and pollutants on receiving waterbodies from individual representative MPP facilities. EPA solicits comment on the applicability of the AQUATOX, QUAL2E and BASINS models to model the environmental benefits of the MPP regulation. (See Section VII.A.2 for the relevant discussion.)

16. EPA solicits comment on the use of Mitchell and Carson's valuation function for estimating the monetized benefit for the MPP industry. If more site-specific valuation information becomes available, EPA may decide to incorporate those site-specific values for estimating the monetized benefit. (See Section VII.B.1 for the relevant discussion.)

17. EPA solicits comment on its approach to estimating monetized benefits associated with reduced TSS concentrations at drinking water intakes. (See Section VII.D.1 for the relevant discussion.)

18. EPA solicits comment on the use of a regional vulnerability assessment for the MPP environmental assessment. (See Section VII.D.3 for the relevant discussion.)

19. EPA did not use data from two pre-proposal sampling episodes (6335 and 6446) in its analyses presented in today's notice. EPA solicits comment on the potential use of data from Episodes 6446 and 6335 for use in developing pollutant loading estimates and limitations and standards for the final