



ENVIRONMENTAL BREAKFAST CLUB REGULATORY SUMMARY

March 2, 2012

Prepared by:
Elizabeth Morss
Young/Sommer LLC
5 Palisades Drive
Albany, NY 12205
(518) 438-9907, ext. 232
emorss@youngsommer.com
<http://www.youngsommer.com>

Final Statutes, Regulations and Guidance

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
AIR			
<p>FEDERAL National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants from Coal and Oil-Fired Power Plants 40 CFR Part 63, subpart UUUUU; Part 60, subparts Da, Db, and Dc 77 Fed. Reg. 9304 (Feb. 16, 2012)</p>	<p>EPA adopted National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for coal and oil-fired electric utility steam generating units (EGUs) more than 11 years after adding EGUs to the list of Clean Air Act (CAA) § 112 sources. After completing a series of studies, EPA declared in 2000 that it was “necessary and appropriate” to regulate coal and oil-fired EGUs under CAA § 112 and added EGUs to the list of regulated source categories. Several years later, EPA rescinded the 2000 finding and adopted a mercury cap-and-trade program and New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) in place of a NESHAP. In 2008, a federal appeals court vacated the rule after concluding that EPA failed to comply with procedural requirements when it removed EGUs from the list of regulated sources. With the current rulemaking, EPA confirmed its 2000 findings and proposed maximum achievable control technology standards for EGUs that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emission limits for mercury, hydrogen chloride (a surrogate for toxic acid gases) and filterable particulate matter (PM) (a surrogate for non-mercury metallic hazardous air pollutants) from coal and solid oil-derived fuel-fired EGUs. • Emission limits for filterable PM, hydrogen chloride and hydrogen fluoride from liquid oil-fired EGUs. • Work practice standards to ensure optimal combustion and prevent dioxin/furan emissions. • Alternative emission limits for certain subcategories. • Work practice standards in lieu of numeric limits during periods of startup and shutdown. • Consistent with other NESHAPs, an affirmative defense to civil penalties for exceedances of limits caused by malfunctions. • Performance testing, monitoring, notification, recordkeeping and reporting requirements. <p>The rule can be found in the February 16, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.</p>	<p>EPA estimates that the rule will affect approximately 1,400 coal and oil-fired units at 600 power plants nationwide. According to EPA, power plants are responsible for 50% of all mercury emissions and 75% of acid gas emissions in the United States. EPA anticipates that most power plants will be able to achieve the limits through installation of proven control technologies.</p> <p>Following the public comment period, EPA made the following changes to the regulation: (1) substituted filterable PM for total PM as a surrogate for metal hazardous air pollutant limits; (2) revised the definition of coal subcategories; (3) added subcategories for non-continental oil-fired units and limited use oil-fired units; (4) established work practice standards in lieu of numeric limits applicable during startup and shutdown; and (5) provided an alternative compliance option for sources that plan to comply by averaging emissions across multiple units.</p>	<p>The rule takes effect April 16, 2012.</p> <p>As part of the same rulemaking, EPA also revised the NSPS for EGUs, set forth at 40 CFR Part 60, subpart Da. The rule, which applies to sources constructed, reconstructed or modified after May 3, 2011, revised the emission limits for PM, sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. EPA also changed the method used to calculate compliance with the standards and adopted exemptions from the standards for certain units/activities. Finally, EPA revised aspects of the NSPS for industrial boilers set forth in 40 CFR Part 60, subparts Db and Dc.</p>

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
WATER			
<p>FEDERAL Reissuance and Modification of Nationwide Permits 77 Fed. Reg. 10184 (Feb. 21, 2012)</p>	<p>The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) reissued its existing nationwide permits (NWP)s, general conditions, and definitions, with some modifications; it also issued two new nationwide permits. Individuals proposing to undertake activities that will disturb wetlands or waterways frequently must obtain a permit from the ACOE. To streamline the permit approval process, the ACOE has issued NWPs for project categories that typically result in minimal disturbances. These activities include bank stabilization, minor discharges, minor dredging, temporary construction, access and dewatering, and cleanup of hazardous and toxic waste, among many others. Major changes to the NWPs recently issued by the ACOE include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding new NWPs for land-based renewable energy generation facilities and water-based renewable energy generation pilot projects. • Omitting NWP 47, Pipeline Safety Program Designated Time Sensitive Inspections and Repairs, after finding that the permit is no longer necessary. • Revising the text of numerous other NWPs, including major changes to the NWPs for survey activities, bank stabilization, response operations for oil and hazardous substances (formerly oil spill cleanup), surface coal mining activities, aquatic habitat restoration, establishment, and enhancement activities, and existing commercial shellfish aquaculture. Several NWPs were revised to change size limits and/or add limits for streambed losses. • Add new general conditions relating to migratory bird and bald and golden eagle permits, safety of impoundment structures, and discovery of previously unknown remains and artifacts; revise other general conditions. <p>The notice can be found in the February 21, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.</p>	<p>The new/reissued nationwide permits authorize certain activities that could potentially disturb wetlands or waterways. Applicants for certain NWPs must submit written pre-construction notifications and/or satisfy ACOE regional conditions and conditions imposed by the state to preserve coastal zone consistency or protect water quality (via the water quality certification process).</p>	<p>The new NWPs take effect March 19, 2012.</p> <p>Publication of the final NWPs in the Federal Register triggers DEC's 60-day period for issuing required water quality certifications; the notice also begins the 90-day period for coastal states such as New York to complete the coastal zone consistency determination review process.</p>

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
OTHER			
<p>NEW YORK STATE Revisions to Environmental Assessment Forms 6 NYCRR § 617.20, Appendices A and B</p>	<p>DEC revised its long and short environmental assessment forms (EAF), which are required under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) to assess the environmental significance of projects and determine whether to require a full environmental impact statement. Major changes to the EAFs generally include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revising the forms to better gather information needed to analyze zoning and planning actions. • Eliminating separate forms for visual assessments and documenting determinations of nonsignificance and merging the contents into the main forms. • Making the forms a better tool for gathering information. <p>DEC made the following major changes to the short EAF, which is used primarily for assessing unlisted actions under SEQRA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacing the general list of possible adverse environmental impacts with a more detailed list of yes/no questions on specific types of impacts to be completed by the applicant. • Separating the list of environmental impacts (completed by the applicant) from the impact assessment (completed by the lead agency). <p>DEC made the following major changes to the long EAF, which is used to assess the environmental impact of Type I SEQRA actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a three-part EAF consisting of Part 1, Project and Setting (completed by the applicant), Part 2, Identification of Potential Project Impacts (completed by the lead agency), and Part 3, Evaluation of the Magnitude and Importance of Project Impacts and Determination of Significance. • Significantly expanding the information sought about the project, including adding questions relating to air emissions (including greenhouse gases), bulk storage, hazardous waste, transportation impacts, dams, and contamination history, among other subjects. • Reorganizing the impact assessment section to add cross-references to the background section. <p>The new forms and related rulemaking documents can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/permits/70293.html.</p>	<p>The revisions are potentially of interest to anyone engaged in projects that require environmental assessment under SEQRA. The forms are used by agencies to assess the environmental significance of actions they plan to undertake, fund or approve and so are crucial to the SEQRA process. The long EAF had not been substantially revised since 1978, while the short EAF had not been substantially revised since 1987.</p> <p>In response to public comments, DEC made various changes to the proposed forms, including: (1) reducing the length of Part 1 of the full EAF to eliminate DEC centric and redundant questions; (2) simplifying questions to reduce the need for the applicant to hire a consultant to obtain the necessary information; and (3) restoring a table to Part 2 of the Full EAF that allows the sponsor to classify impacts as “no, or small impact” or “moderate to large impact” and requires the lead agency to characterize only those impacts in the latter category.</p>	<p>The forms take effect October 12, 2012.</p> <p>In addition to the changes already noted, DEC is proposing to facilitate completion of the forms by: (1) providing electronic access to spatial data, such as maps that identify the location of key resources; and (2) preparing a workbook containing background information, examples, and resource links.</p>

Proposed Statutes, Regulations and Guidance

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
AIR			
<p>FEDERAL Residual Risk and Periodic Technology Review of Hard and Decorative Chromium Electroplating and Chromium Anodizing Standards 40 CFR Part 63, subpart N 77 Fed. Reg. 6628 (Feb. 8, 2012)</p>	<p>EPA proposed supplemental revisions to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for hard and decorative chromium electroplating and chromium anodizing sources in conjunction with its residual risk and periodic technology review. Under CAA § 112, EPA must assess whether any residual risk remains after imposing technology-based NESHAPs and revise the standard as necessary; EPA also must conduct a periodic review of the underlying technology to confirm that it remains current. In October 2010, EPA announced the results of its residual risk and periodic technology review of the chromium electroplating NESHAP, proposing to revise 40 CFR Part 63, subpart N to: (1) prohibit the addition of certain wetting agent fume suppressants used on electroplating or anodizing tanks; (2) impose housekeeping requirements to minimize emissions of chromium-laden dust; and (3) fix editorial errors and make clarifications.</p> <p>More than a year later, EPA is seeking comment on possible new emission limits for sources regulated under the chromium electroplating and anodizing NESHAP. After obtaining more complete and up-to-date emissions data on the source category, EPA proposed to tighten the emission and surface tension limits for new and existing chromium electroplating and anodizing facilities after concluding that they can achieve the proposed reductions at a reasonable cost. In so doing, EPA concluded that while the overall risks associated with sources in the chromium electroplating categories are acceptable, there are some cancer risks due to hexavalent chromium emissions and that implementing the proposed reductions would provide an ample margin of safety to protect public health at a reasonable cost. As part of the supplemental rulemaking, EPA also proposed to require electronic reporting of performance test reports to EPA.</p> <p>The proposed supplemental rule can be found in the February 8, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.</p>	<p>The supplemental proposal is primarily of interest to facilities engaged in chromic acid anodizing, decorative chromium electroplating, and hard chromium electroplating. EPA estimates that there are approximately 680 hard chromium electroplating, 590 decorative chromium electroplating, and 180 chromium anodizing plants currently in operation nationwide.</p>	<p>EPA is accepting comments on the supplemental proposed rule until March 26, 2012.</p>

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
AIR			
FEDERAL Residual Risk/Periodic Technology Review of Secondary Aluminum Production Standards 40 CFR Part 63, subpart RRR 77 Fed. Reg. 8576 (Feb. 14, 2012)	<p>EPA proposed findings under the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants program for secondary aluminum production sources following a residual risk and periodic technology review. Among other things, EPA concluded that the existing maximum achievable control technology (MACT) standards for secondary aluminum production sources protect public health with an ample margin of safety and that no changes are necessary to address residual risk. EPA also concluded that there have been no advances in practices, processes, and control technologies applicable to the source category sufficient to justify adopting stricter technology-based standards. However, consistent with other recent NESHAP rulemakings, EPA proposed to require facilities to comply with MACT standards at all times, including during startup and shutdown, and establish an affirmative defense to civil penalties for exceedances of emission standards caused by malfunctions. In addition, EPA proposed amendments to correct and clarify the rule, including: (1) establishing criteria that facilities must follow when changing furnace classification from one type to another; (2) adding testing requirements for hydrogen fluoride emissions; and (3) requiring monthly verification of lime injection rates for facilities operating lime injection systems. Finally, EPA proposed to require electronic reporting of performance test reports to EPA.</p> <p>The proposed rule can be found in the February 14, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.</p>	<p>The rule is primarily of interest to facilities that produce aluminum from scrap aluminum materials. EPA estimates that there are approximately 161 secondary aluminum production facilities in the United States, 53 of which are major sources of hazardous air pollutants.</p>	<p>EPA is accepting comments on the proposed rule until March 30, 2012.</p>

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
WATER			
<p>NEW YORK STATE Draft Revised Design Standards for Intermediate-Sized Wastewater Treatment Systems</p>	<p>DEC made available for comment draft revised <i>Design Standards for Intermediate-Sized Wastewater Treatment Systems</i>, which is intended to provide licensed professional engineers and others with guidance on the design, operation and maintenance of intermediate-sized wastewater treatment facilities, a category that includes systems that discharge more than 1,000 gallons per day (gpd) of sanitary-only wastewater to ground water or any quantity to surface water. The manual is organized into nine sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Facility planning and permitting.</i> Process for planning, locating and designing a wastewater treatment system (WWTS) under the State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and SEQRA processes. • <i>Project evaluation and design description.</i> Site and soil evaluation criteria, flood protection requirements, wastewater characterization, and design flows based on type of establishment served. • <i>Sewage systems and sewage pump (lift) stations.</i> Addressing conventional sewers and alternative collection systems. • <i>Preliminary and primary treatment, flow measurement and appurtenances.</i> Information on components that precede secondary treatment, e.g., septic tanks, effluent filters, grease interceptors, distribution boxes and flow splitters, discharges to soil-based treatment systems, or alternatives to conventional onsite treatment. • <i>Subsurface treatment and discharge.</i> Application of pretreated wastewater to soil. • <i>Secondary treatment.</i> Information on fixed film (e.g., sand filters, fabric, gravel, peat and other materials) and suspended growth systems (e.g., activated sludge and sequencing batch reactors). • <i>Tertiary treatment.</i> Information on granular media filtration, physical-chemical treatment, biological nutrient removal and constructed wetlands. • <i>Innovative systems and variances.</i> • <i>Surface water discharges, including disinfection and reoxygenation.</i> • <i>Operation, maintenance and control.</i> Addresses need for certified plant operators, management of residuals, emergency repair and rehabilitation, and instrumentation and alarms, among other subjects. <p>The draft design standards can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/41392.html.</p>	<p>The design standards apply to wastewater treatment systems serving residences, restaurants, businesses and other facilities that discharge more than 1,000 gpd of sanitary wastewater, without the admixture of industrial or other wastes to groundwater and any discharge of sanitary-only wastewater to surface water, regardless of quantity. Smaller residential systems (i.e., those discharging less than 1,000 gpd of sanitary wastewater onsite) are regulated by the New York State Department of Health under 10 NYCRR Appendix 75-A.</p>	<p>DEC is accepting comments on the draft design standards until March 30, 2012.</p>

Other Recent Developments (Final)

AIR

FEDERAL: EPA **designated all areas of the country as “unclassifiable/attainment” under the 2010 primary nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS)** based on available air quality data. EPA adopted a new one-hour primary NO₂ NAAQS of 100 parts per billion in 2010 based on studies linking short-term NO₂ exposures with increased respiratory effects, particularly in people with asthma. To implement the standard, EPA made major changes to its NO₂ monitoring program, including requiring increased monitoring near roadways in certain cities. While existing monitoring data show that all areas of the country currently meet the 2010 standards, redesignations may be made in 2016 or 2017 after the new monitors are installed and at least three years of ambient air monitoring data have been collected. EPA’s final rule establishing NO₂ area designations can be found in the February 17, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The unclassifiable/attainment designation means states need not adopt additional measures to reduce NO₂ emissions for purposes of addressing NO₂ nonattainment problems; however, nitrogen oxides also are ozone precursors and so may be regulated to address ongoing ozone nonattainment problems.

WATER

FEDERAL: EPA issued a **revised National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System general permit for discharges from construction activity**. The general permit incorporates technology-based effluent limitations guidelines and new source performance standards adopted by EPA in December 2009 to minimize stormwater-related pollution from construction sites. Consistent with the requirements of these new categorical standards set forth at 40 CFR Part 450, the general permit contains non-numeric standards, including erosion and sediment controls, soil stabilization requirements, dewatering requirements, pollution prevention measures, and prohibited discharges. The permit also includes special requirements for sites that discharge to waters impaired for sediment and other construction-related parameters. However, the general permit does not contain a numeric turbidity limit in the wake of the agency’s 2010 decision to stay the limit after determining that it was based on faulty analyses. The general permit became effective on February 16, 2012; EPA’s notice regarding the general permit can be found in the February 29, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The general permit applies in areas/states where EPA is the permitting authority. In addition, states such as New York with their own stormwater permitting programs must incorporate the requirements contained in 40 CFR Part 450 into their own stormwater general permits.

Other Recent Developments (Proposed)

AIR

FEDERAL: EPA **proposed the first of two rules required to implement the 2008 revisions to the ozone NAAQS** in the wake of President Obama's decision in September 2011 to abandon EPA's review of that standard. The proposed rule contains thresholds for classifying nonattainment areas as marginal, moderate, serious, severe or extreme under the 0.075 part per million (ppm) 8-hour ozone NAAQS. EPA classified areas using the "percent above the standard" method used to classify areas under the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Under that method, EPA sets the classification thresholds based on the percentage difference between the original 1-hour ozone NAAQS and the limit assigned to each nonattainment classification in the CAA. The proposed rule also contains attainment dates for areas in each nonattainment classification. EPA plans to propose a separate rule addressing the steps states must take to implement the NAAQS and the timing of those steps. EPA recently sought comment on its proposed response to state ozone nonattainment area designations recommended under the 2008 NAAQS and plans to issue final area designations by mid-2012. EPA is accepting comments on its proposed NAAQS classification rulemaking until **March 15, 2012**; it can be found in the February 14, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: EPA has identified two ozone nonattainment areas in New York under the 0.75 ppm 8-hour ozone standard – the New York City metropolitan area (comprising New York City, Long Island and Westchester and Rockland Counties) and Jamestown (Chautauqua County).

FEDERAL: In conjunction with proposed revisions to the chromium electroplating NESHAP discussed above, EPA also **proposed changes to the NESHAP for steel pickling-HCl process facilities and hydrochloric acid regeneration plants**, set forth at 40 CFR Part 63, subpart CCC. EPA announced the results of its residual risk and periodic technology review for this source category in October 2010. With the current rulemaking, EPA is supplementing the proposed rule to: (1) delete language allowing acid regeneration facilities to set their own site-specific emission standard; and (2) require electronic reporting of performance test reports to EPA. EPA is accepting comments on the proposed supplemental rulemaking until **March 26, 2012**; it can be found in the February 8, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The proposed revisions are primarily of interest to iron and steel mills, ferroalloys manufacturing operations, and steel products manufacturing plants.

REMEDATION

FEDERAL: EPA is seeking comment on a **proposed reinterpretation of its position regarding the management of certain wastestreams containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) generated during building renovation projects**. Under the Toxic Substances Control Act PCB regulations set forth at 40 CFR Part 761, caulk and paint containing 50 ppm or greater PCBs is regulated

as PCB bulk product waste when disposed while waste containing PCBs from spills, releases and other unauthorized disposal is regulated as PCB remediation waste. Currently, where PCBs from caulk or paint leach into other building materials those materials must be managed as PCB remediation waste. EPA is proposing to reinterpret the regulations to allow such materials to be managed as PCB bulk product waste where they are affixed to the caulk or paint. However, where the caulk or paint is separated from the underlying building material that material must be managed as remediation waste if it is contaminated with PCBs. EPA believes that the change will facilitate cleanups of PCB-contaminated buildings by simplifying disposal of cleanup materials. EPA is accepting comment on the proposed reinterpretation until **March 30, 2012**. An overview of the change can be found in the February 29, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The proposed reinterpretation is of potential interest to individuals engaged in building renovation activities.

OTHER

NEW YORK STATE: DEC proposed revisions to rules prohibiting the importation of out-of-state **firewood** that has not been treated to eliminate invasive species, fungi and pathogens. The regulations, which are set forth at 6 NYCRR Part 192, also limit the transportation of untreated firewood within the state to less than 50 miles from the point of origin. With the current proposal, DEC reorganized the regulations to make them more user-friendly. In addition, DEC proposed to: (1) revise the definition of “firewood” to expressly exclude kiln-dried lumber and make other changes; (2) adopt a new provision clarifying that failure to obey quarantine orders constitutes a violation of the Environmental Conservation Law; and (3) eliminate a provision requiring firewood consumers to retain source of origin documentation for firewood possessed on private property where it will be used. DEC previously adopted the firewood restrictions to stop the influx and spread of tree-killing pests such as the emerald ash borer, asian longhorned beetle, and sirenix wood wasp. DEC is accepting comments on the proposed revisions until **April 14, 2012**. Information about the rulemaking can be found on DEC’s website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/propregulations.html.

Implications: The rule is of general interest to anyone who produces, transports or uses firewood.

Recent Decisions

NEW YORK STATE: In a pair of recent decisions, supreme courts in Tompkins and Otsego Counties **upheld local laws banning hydraulic fracturing as an appropriate exercise of local power to regulate land use**. In the first such case, the Town of Dryden amended its local zoning ordinance to ban all activities related to the exploration for, and production or storage of, natural gas and petroleum. A natural gas development company challenged the law in *Anschutz Exploration Corp. v. Town of Dryden*, Tompkins Co. Index No. 2011-0902, arguing that it was preempted by Environmental Conservation Law (ECL) § 23-0302(2), which provides that the state’s Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Law (OGSML) “shall supersede all local laws or ordinances relating to the regulation of the oil, gas and solution mining industries.” The court rejected this argument, relying on the Court of Appeals decision in *Frew Run Gravel Products v. Town of Carroll*, 71 NY2d 126 (1987), which interpreted similar language under the state’s Mined Land

Reclamation Law and concluded that it superseded local ordinances that directly regulate mining activities but not zoning ordinances that address land use generally. In reaching its conclusion, the court in *Anschutz* rejected efforts to distinguish between the language and purpose of the two laws; the court also compared the OGSML law with others containing more precise language preempting local zoning power. The Otsego County Supreme Court reached a similar conclusion a few days later in *Cooperstown Holstein Corp. v. Town of Middlefield*, Otsego Co. Index No. 2011-0930, focusing extensively on the legislative history of the OGSML to support its conclusion that ECL § 23-0302(2) was not intended to supersede local zoning laws banning oil, gas and solution drilling but was instead focused on ensuring statewide standards relating to the manner and method of drilling.

Implications: Various upstate communities have adopted bans on natural gas drilling with the goal of preventing high volume hydraulic fracturing. The failure of challenges to such bans may prompt other local governments to enact similar laws. Several bills have been introduced in the state legislature that address local regulation of hydraulic fracturing.

Upcoming Deadlines

NOTE: This calendar contains items of general interest.

March 2, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's draft New York State 2012 Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waters and key components of its Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology. See DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/31290.html for details.

March 5, 2012: Deadline for submitting information and data concerning EPA's numeric turbidity limit for discharges of stormwater from certain construction sites. See the January 3, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

March 5, 2012: Public hearing on DEC's proposed CO₂ emission standards and environmental justice review requirements for major electric generating facilities under the Power NY Act scheduled for 3:00 p.m. at DEC Headquarters, 625 Broadway, Albany. NOTE: Additional public hearings are scheduled later in the week in New York City and Buffalo.

March 6, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's uniform standards for heat exchangers proposed in conjunction with revisions to the petroleum refinery NESHAP. See the January 6, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

March 9, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the Group IV polymers and resins, pesticide active ingredient production, and polyether polyols production NESHAPs. See the January 9, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

March 15, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's proposed CO₂ emission standards and environmental justice review requirements for major electric generating facilities under the Power NY Act. See DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/propregulations.html for details.

March 15, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed rule establishing nonattainment classifications and deadlines for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. See the February 14, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

March 26, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the chromium electroplating and steel pickling NESHAPs. See the February 8, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

March 30, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the secondary aluminum production NESHAP. See the February 14, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

March 30, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the chemical manufacturing area source NESHAP. See the January 30, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

March 30, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed reinterpretation of the rules governing the management of certain PCB-contaminated building materials. See the February 29, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

March 30, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's draft revisions to the *Design Standards for Intermediate-Sized Wastewater Treatment Systems*. The draft can be found on DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/41392.html.

April 14, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's proposed revisions to its firewood management regulations. See DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/propregulations.html for details.

April 16, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the UST regulations to incorporate requirements under the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and make other changes/updates (extended from February 16, 2012). See the November 18, 2011 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.