## ENVIRONMENTAL BREAKFAST CLUB REGULATORY SUMMARY

June 9, 2015

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, Rulemakings, Guidance and Cases

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
AIR			
NEW YORK STATE Process Operations 6 NYCRR Part 212	<ul> <li>DEC replaced its existing General Process Emission Source regulation with a new Process Operations regulation. Under 6 NYCRR Part 212, DEC assigns an environmental rating to air contaminants and determines the level of control required based on the source's emission rate potential. The revised rule establishes a new "step-wise" approach to regulating process operations.</li> <li><i>Applicability</i>. The new Part 212 applies to process operations—activities that involve changing the properties of materials or conveying/storing materials without change. Like the existing rule, the new rule exempts materials/activities regulated under more specific DEC air regulations.</li> <li><i>Relationship to federal standards</i>. With certain exceptions, sources that comply with New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) or National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) need not comply with the limits in subpart 212-2 for contaminants subject to the federal standards, except for specified high toxicity air contaminants (HTACs).</li> <li><i>Non-federally regulated contaminants</i>. Facilities emitting contaminants not subject to a NSPS or NESHAP above certain levels must provide a list of control. This step requires modeling to show that emissions do not exceed national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) (criteria contaminants) or guideline concentrations (non-criteria contaminants). With respect to HTACs, facilities can avoid regulation by showing that HTACs are below specified mass emission limits.</li> <li><i>T-BACT</i>. If a facility cannot meet the limits specified in the regulations for non-criteria contaminants, it must undertake a facility-specific toxic best available control technology (T-BACT) analysis to identify possible control technology options. Special rules apply to certain persistent and bioaccumulative (PB) toxics. The regulation can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/100007.html.</li> </ul>	The Part 212 regulations apply to all regulated air emission sources that are not subject solely to more specific emission standards. The rule, which has been in place for over 40 years, has not been significantly revised since 1985. The new rule is intended to provide consistency with the federal NESHAP program and ensure proper regulation of the most toxic contaminants. In particular, DEC has lowered the applicability threshold for A- rated (i.e., toxic) contaminants from 1 lb/hour to 0.1 lb/hour to ensure highly toxic contaminants are properly controlled. DEC also has established special rules for HTACs and PBs. Sources emitting contaminants that are not regulated under a NSPS or NESHAP will be expected to conduct modeling to show that emissions from the facility do not cause exceedances of the NAAQS or guideline concentrations. For the first time, DEC has exempted temporary, exempt and trivial sources under 6 NYCRR Part 201 from regulation under Part 212.	The rule takes effect June 13, 2015 (30 days after filing). The new standards will be phased in over time with Part 212 applying (1) when a regulated entity applies for a new or modified permit or registration or (2) upon issuance of a renewal for an existing permit or registration.

Supplemental Generic Environmental ImpactStatement (FSGEIS) on its proposal to establish a permitting program for horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing (HVHF), marking the end of its environmental review of this controversial practice. The FSGEIS follows an announcement by Governor Andrew Cuomo in December 2014 that the state would not allow HVHF based on a report from the New York State Department of Health (DOH) which concluded that there were "significant uncertainties" about the adverse health outcomes associated with HVHF. The FSGEIS provides an overview of the review process, together with a detailed analysis of all environmental aspects of HVHF, including geology, natural gas development activities and HVHF, potential environmental impacts (water resources, ecosystems and wildlife, air resources, greenhouse gas emission impacts, socioeconomic impacts, visual, noise and community character impacts, transportation impacts, and seismicity), mitigation measures, and the permit process and regulatory coordination, among other issues. Based on that analysis, DEC concurred with DOH about the potential health impacts of HVHF. DEC went on to note that itmoratorium on HVHF in 2008 when DEC began the process of preparing a SGEIS to assess the environmental impacts of the process. DEC followed up the SGEIS with draft regulations addressing HVHF. DEC received over 260,000 public comments on the SGEIS and regulations.Statement to complete environmental environ mental impacts of HVHF.	Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes		
Supplemental Generic Environmental ImpactStatement (FSGEIS) on its proposal to establish a permitting program for horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing (HVHF), marking the end of its environmental review of this controversial practice. The FSGEIS follows an announcement by Governor Andrew Cuomo in December 2014 that the state would not allow HVHF based on a report from the New York State Department of Health (DOH) which concluded that there were "significant uncertainties" about the adverse health outcomes associated with HVHF. The FSGEIS provides an overview of the review process, together with a detailed analysis of all environmental aspects of HVHF, including geology, natural gas development activities and HVHF, potential environmental impacts (water resources, ecosystems and wildlife, air resources, greenhouse gas emission impacts, scioeconomic impacts, visual, noise and community character impacts, transportation impacts, and seismicity), mitigation measures, and the permit process and regulatory coordination, among other issues. Based on that analysis, DEC concurred with DOH about the potential health impacts of HVHF. DEC went on to note that itmoratorium on HVHF in 2008 wen DEC began the process of preparing a SGEIS to assess the environmental impacts of the sGEIS with draft regulations.Statement to complete environmental review of preparing a SGEIS to assess the environmental impacts of the SGEIS of lowed up the SGEIS of lowed up the SGEIS more associated up the sGEIS and regulations.Statement to complete environmental review of preparing a SGEIS to assess the environmental impacts of the review process, together with a detailed analysis of all environmental aspects of HVHF, including geology, natural gas development activities and HVHF, potential environmental impacts, scioeconomic impacts, visual,<						
considered expanding mitigation measures to address those impacts but found that the restrictions would significantly limit where HVHF could occur and would necessitate extensive regulatory oversight, negatively impacting the economic benefits associated with HVHF.	HYDRAULIC FRACTU NEW YORK STATE Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement on	IC FRACTURINGK STATE tal Generic matal ImpactDEC released its Final Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FSGEIS) on its proposal to establish a permitting program for horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing (HVHF), marking the end of its environmental review of this controversial practice. The FSGEIS follows an announcement by Governor Andrew Cuomo in December 2014 that the state would not allow HVHF based on a report from the New York State Department of Health (DOH) which concluded that there were "significant uncertainties" about the adverse health outcomes associated with HVHF. The FSGEIS provides an overview of the review process, together with a detailed analysis of all environmental aspects of HVHF, including geology, natural gas development activities and HVHF, potential environmental impacts (water resources, ecosystems and wildlife, air resources, greenhouse gas emission impacts, socioeconomic impacts, visual, noise and community character impacts, transportation impacts, and seismicity), mitigation measures, and the permit process and regulatory coordination, among other issues. Based on that analysis, DEC concurred with DOH about the potential health impacts of HVHF. DEC went on to note that it considered expanding mitigation measures to address those impacts but found that the restrictions would significantly limit where HVHF could occur and would necessitate extensive regulatory oversight, negatively impacting the	New York imposed a moratorium on HVHF in 2008 when DEC began the process of preparing a SGEIS to assess the environmental impacts of the process. DEC followed up the SGEIS with draft regulations addressing HVHF. DEC received over 260,000 public comments on the SGEIS and regulations.	DEC must issue a Findings Statement to complete its environmental review of HVHF under the State Environmental Quality		

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
OCCUPATIONAL SAF	ETY AND HEALTH	·	
FEDERAL Confined Space Standards in Construction 29 CFR Part 1926 80 Fed. Reg. 25366 (May, 4, 2015)	<ul> <li>More than seven years after proposal, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has adopted standards addressing confined spaces in construction. The standards are modeled after the general industry confined space standards but have been modified to address issues unique to the construction industry. Under OSHA, confined space is any space that: (1) is large enough for a worker to enter; (2) has limited means of entry or exit; and (3) is not designed for continuous occupancy. Spaces that pose a particular hazard because they may have a hazardous atmosphere, the potential for engulfment or suffocation, or other serious hazards are considered permit-required confined spaces and can be entered only by trained employees with proper authorization. Consistent with the existing general industry confined space standard, the new construction rule includes the following requirements for safe entry:</li> <li><i>Preparation.</i> The standard requires pre-entry planning that includes: evaluating the worksite to identify confined spaces; for permit-required confined spaces, identifying the means of entry and exit, proper ventilation methods and elimination and control of hazards; testing the air to ensure it is safe; for permit-required confined spaces, removing or controlling hazards in the space and determining rescue procedures/equipment; and providing proper controls where air in the space is unsafe.</li> <li><i>Ongoing practices.</i> While activities are occurring in the confined spaces to prevent unauthorized workers from entering the space.</li> <li>Although the regulation largely tracks the confined space standard for general industry, it has been revised to address certain construction-specific issues, most notably the higher level of turnover and mobility among construction employees, the presence of multiple contractors on-site, and the constantly evolving nature of construction. The standard emphasizes training, continuous work site evaluation, and communication. The standard also accounts for advan</li></ul>	The construction confined space standard represents the culmination of an effort that began in 1980 when EPA published an advance notice of proposed rulemaking on confined spaces in the construction industry. The rule affects establishments in various sectors of the construction industry, including work involving buildings, highways, bridges, tunnels, utility lines, and other types of projects. Also potentially affected are general contractors, specialty trade construction contractors, and employers engaged in certain types of residential construction work. In conjunction with the rule, OSHA issued fact sheets addressing the application of the new standard to different types of confined spaces, including crawl spaces and attics, sewer systems, and pits.	The final rule takes effect August 3, 2015.

4

### Proposed Statutes, Rulemakings, and Guidance

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
WATER			
NEW YORK STATE Sewage Pollution Right- to-Know Law 6 NYCRR Parts 750 and 621	<ul> <li>DEC proposed revisions to its State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) regulations to implement New York's Sewage Pollution Right-to-Know Act (SPRTK) Act, enacted in 2013. The SPRTK Act requires publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) and publicly owned sewer systems (POSS) to notify DEC and local or State health officials of discharges of untreated or partially treated sewage within 2 hours of discovery and alert local government officials and the public within 2 hours thereafter. After working over the past two years to develop the necessary reporting infrastructure, DEC proposed the revisions to the SPDES regulations needed to formalize SPRTK implementation. Major changes include:</li> <li>Adding or amending definitions of combined sewer overflow, combined sewer system, partially treated sewage, publicly owned sewer system, and untreated sewage.</li> <li>Requiring registration of POSSs, defined as "a sewer system owned by a municipality and which discharges to a POTW owned by another municipality." In particular, owners of POSS must register their systems with DEC and comply with certain basic operating requirements relating to preventative/corrective maintenance, development of written operating and maintenance procedures, and training.</li> <li>Requiring POTWs and POSSs to report discharges of untreated or partially treated sewage, including CSOs, within 2 hours of the discharge stops. Notifications to the general public must be made each day until the discharge stops. Notifications to the general public must be made through "appropriate electronic media as determined by the Department."</li> <li>Where a municipality lacks real-time telemetered discharge monitoring and detection for CSOs, requiring owners/operators of POTWs and POSSs to use predictive models and other means to determine when enough rain has fallen that CSOs are likely to pose a potential health concern and require notification.</li> </ul>	The proposed regulation is of interest to municipalities that own/operate POTWs and POSSs. Although municipalities have been required to report the discharge of untreated and partially treated sewage for several years, the proposed regulations formalize the reporting requirements. In addition, municipalities that own POSSs will be required to register those systems with DEC for the first time. Previously, these systems were not formally regulated under the SPDES program. DEC estimates that there are approximately 620 permitted POTWs and 300 identified POSSs statewide. DEC will make information concerning sewage discharges available through the State's existing NY-Alert System, which is used by the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for public safety messaging.	DEC is accepting comments on the proposed SPRTK implementation regulations until <b>July 31, 2015</b> . A public information meeting on the proposed regulation is scheduled for July 7, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. at DEC Headquarters, 625 Broadway in Albany. Additional public information sessions will be held in Rochester, Stone Ridge, and Utica.

**Other Recent Developments (Final)** 

### AIR

FEDERAL: **EPA published a direct final rule implementing the U.S. Supreme Court's 2014 decision vacating a key component of EPA's controversial 2010 greenhouse gas (GHG) tailoring rule.** Under the tailoring rule, EPA concluded that GHGs are regulated under the Title V and Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) programs and established higher "tailored" major source thresholds to avoid triggering permitting requirements for comparatively small facilities. In *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA*, the Supreme Court concluded that EPA may not require a source to comply with the Title V or PSD permit program based solely on its GHG emissions. However, where a source must comply with PSD for other pollutants and the source/modification exceeds specified thresholds for GHGs, the source can be required to comply with best available control technology (BACT) for GHGs. With the direct final rule, EPA is amending the PSD regulations to allow for the rescission of certain PSD permits issued by EPA and delegated states consistent with the Court's decision. The rule will take effect July 6, 2015 without further notice unless EPA receives adverse comments by June 8, 2015. The direct final rule and notice of proposed rulemaking can be found in the May 7, 2015 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

<u>Implications</u>: The rulemaking is primarily of interest to facilities that were required to obtain PSD permits based solely on their GHG emissions. According to EPA, no revisions to the Title V permit regulations are needed to enable sources to seek rescission of Title V permits.

FEDERAL: EPA finalized its determination that it has satisfied its obligations under Section 112(c)(6) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), which requires EPA to adopt a sufficient number of maximum achievable control technology (MACT) or health-based standards under the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant program to ensure that 90% of the aggregate emissions of each of seven specifically-listed pollutants are subject to standards. EPA announced in 2011 that it had adopted the required standards but that finding was vacated by a federal court after it found that the determination was a rulemaking that could not be issued without public notice and comment. The recent rule includes a table that lists the standards that fulfill EPA's CAA § 112(c)(6) obligations (including cites to the relevant Federal Register notices) and identifies the particular 112(c)(6) pollutant(s) addressed by each standard. In determining whether it had adopted standards sufficient to achieve the 90% goal, EPA considered both direct emissions of the seven listed pollutants under Section 112(c)(6) and emissions of other pollutants that serve as a surrogate for those pollutants. The final determination can be found in the June 3, 2015 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys; it took effect on that date.

<u>Implications</u>: The rule is primarily of interest to sources that emit one or more of the following pollutants: alkylated lead compounds, polycyclic organic matter, hexachlorobenzene, mercury, polychlorinated biphenyls, 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzofurans, and 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin.

6

### CHEMICALS

FEDERAL: As required by federal statute, the **Department of Homeland Security (DHS) published guidance establishing an expedited review program under the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards (CFATS) program.** CFATS requires facilities that possess one or more specifically listed chemicals of interest (COI) above the screening threshold quantity (STQ) listed in the regulation to submit a "top-screen" analysis to DHS. DHS reviews the top-screen analysis and other relevant information to determine whether to require the facility to prepare a security vulnerability assessment (SVA) or alternative analysis. DHS reviews any required SVAs to determine whether a particular facility is high-risk and must submit a site security plan (SSP) or alternative plan for DHS approval. The COI list includes several hundred flammable, explosive and toxic chemicals that pose a potential threat from release, theft, or sabotage. The recent guidance, entitled *DHS Guidance for the Expedited Approval Program*, allows facilities currently assigned to lower risk categories (Tier 3 or 4) to meet their CFATS obligations by participating in an optional expedited program. Under that program, sites may submit a SSP to DHS that follows prescriptive measures described in the guidance document or certifies that any material deviations from the guidance meet each of the 18 risk-based performance standards (RBPS) contained in the CFATS. The RBPS include: restrict area perimeter; secure site assets; screen and control access; deter, detect and delay attacks; shipping receipt and storage; theft and diversion; and sabotage and cyber sabotage, among many other site security issues. The guidance was announced in the May 13, 2015 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

<u>Implications</u>: The guidance is of interest to any facility that stores COIs above STQs but poses a comparatively low risk as defined under CFATS. Congress amended the CFATS statute to require issuance of the guidance with the hope of expediting review and approval of SSPs for lower risk facilities.

### WATER

NEW YORK STATE: New York's highest court recently upheld **an appellate division decision that DEC's SPDES general permit for stormwater discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) did not violate the Clean Water Act** (CWA). The MS4 general permit authorizes municipalities with MS4s to discharge stormwater provided they submit a notice of intent (NOI) seeking coverage under the permit and develop and implement a stormwater management program. In *Natural Resources Defense Council v. DEC*, the petitioners alleged, among other things, that the general permit program violated the CWA because it did not provide an opportunity for public notice and comment on the NOI. After a comprehensive review of the language of the CWA, conflicting federal decisions concerning whether NOIs are subject to the CWA's public participation requirements, and New York's statutory provisions relating to general permits, the New York Court of Appeals concluded that the petitioners' attempt to require a more comprehensive review of NOIs blurred the distinction between individual and general permits by asking that NOIs be treated like permit applications rather than requests for coverage under a permit that had already been issued. The court went on to find that DEC's determination that reviewing NOIs for completeness constituted a sufficient level of technical review and that the public participation requirements for NOIs were sufficient were reasonable judgments under the Environment Conservation Law. The court

<sup>7</sup> 

<sup>© 2015</sup> YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

went on to reject the petitioners' other challenges to the 2010 MS4 general permit, affirming the lower court's decision without comment. Three judges dissented after finding that the 2010 General Permit does not provide for adequate review of NOIs or meaningful public participation in accordance with the CWA.

<u>Implications</u>: The decision upholds DEC's existing MS4 permit program and eliminates broader questions about the viability of the Department's SPDES general permit program.

NEW YORK STATE: DEC has issued guidance clarifying the circumstances under which those seeking coverage under the new stormwater construction general permit (CGP) can continue to use a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) developed in conformance with the 2010 version of DEC's New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual (hereinafter "Design Manual"). DEC recently issued a new General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity and revised and updated the Design Manual. Shortly thereafter, however, DEC concluded that a transition period was needed in light of the economic impact to certain construction activities that had already started the planning, design and review process before the new CGP and Design Manual were issued. Under the guidance, entitled *New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual 2015 Update Transition Policy*, construction activities by owners that applied to a governmental entity prior to January 29, 2015 for review and approval of an application, including a SWPPP developed using the 2010 Design Manual, may obtain CGP coverage with a SWPPP that conforms to the 2010 Design Manual. The guidance can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/43133.html.

<u>Implications</u>: The guidance is potentially of interest to owners/operators of ongoing construction projects that are subject to the CGP.

### **OTHER**

FEDERAL: The Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration (PHMSA), in coordination with the Federal Railroad Administration, **revised the hazardous material transportation regulations to improve the safety of rail transport of large quantities of Class 3 flammable liquids**. In the past several years, the quantity of crude oil and ethanol transported by rail has increased dramatically and several high-profile accidents/incidents have occurred involving trains carrying flammable liquids. With this rulemaking, EPA adopted new rules for "high-hazard flammable trains" HHFTs, defined as trains comprised of 20 or more carloads of Class 3 flammable liquids in a continuous block or 35 cars of flammable liquid across the entire train. Key components of the regulations include: (1) improved classification and characterization of mined gases and liquids, including a requirement to develop a written sampling and testing program that addresses sampling frequency, position on the supply chain, sampling and testing methods, and other information; (2) rail routing risk assessment that calls for considering various safety and security factors; (3) a mechanism for the public to obtain information about the routing of hazardous materials through their jurisdictions; (4) reduced operating speeds; (5) enhanced braking, including special requirements for certain HHFTs; and (6) enhanced

<sup>8</sup> 

standards for new and existing tank cars used in HHFTs. The final rule takes effect **July 7, 2015**; it can be found in the May 8, 2015 Federal Register at: <u>www.gpo.gov/fdsys</u>.

<u>Implications</u>: The rule is potentially of interest to crude oil producers, shippers and distribution facilities. Albany has become a major transshipment point for Bakken crude oil. As a result, there is major local interest in the rule.

### **Other Recent Developments (Proposed)**

### AIR

FEDERAL: EPA proposed to **revise the New Source Performance Standards regulations to require affected facilities to submit certain air emissions data reports to EPA electronically** rather than on paper. The NSPS establish technology-based emission standards applicable to new, modified and reconstructed sources in specific source categories. To demonstrate compliance with these emission standards, the NSPS typically require installation of continuous emission monitoring systems, performance testing, or other measures to confirm emissions. Traditionally, sources have been required to report the results of these monitoring efforts to EPA on paper. With this rulemaking, EPA is proposing to revise the general NSPS rule and the majority of the category-specific NSPS to require sources to submit certain emission reports electronically to its Central Data Exchange (CDX). Reports covered by the rule include summary reports and/or excess emissions and monitoring systems performance reports, performance test reports (i.e., stack tests), and performance evaluation reports (i.e., relative accuracy test audit or "RATA" reports); other reports may be included later. EPA has not proposed to require electronic reporting for existing facility state emission guidelines because these standards are implemented directly by the states. The rule provides an overview of the electronic reporting process, explains the rationale for its decisions regarding electronic reporting, and contains separate lists of the standards that are affected and unaffected by the proposed rule. EPA is accepting comments on the proposed rule until **June 18, 2015** (extended from May 19, 2015). It can be found in the March 20, 2015 Federal Register at: <u>www.gpo.gov/fdsys</u>.

<u>Implications</u>: The proposed rule will potentially affect sources subject to most NSPS, although certain important source categories, including those applicable to boilers, are specifically excluded.

NEW YORK STATE: DEC made available for comment its proposed annual monitoring network plan, which describes New York's air monitoring network. As required by the Clean Air Act, DEC maintains a network of air monitors throughout the state to collect ambient air quality monitoring data for various pollutants, including ozone, particulate matter, and nitrogen oxides, as well as key meteorological data. These data are used by DEC to determine whether an area is achieving national ambient air quality standards; they are also used to determine the impact of a project under the PSD and other programs. The proposed monitoring plan includes an overview of New York's air quality monitoring program, followed by a detailed description of each of the state's air monitoring locations. DEC plans to eliminate its Camp Georgetown monitoring station in Madison County and its Scotchtown lead background monitoring site in Orange County. In addition, DEC is proposing to add a permanent monitoring station in South Albany, in large part

9

<sup>© 2015</sup> YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

in response to concerns about emissions associated with oil handing operations at the Port of Albany. DEC is accepting comments on the proposed plan until **June 19, 2015**; it can be found on DEC's website at: <u>www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/33276.html</u>. <u>Implications</u>: The plan is primarily of interest to engineers performing air impact analyses.

### HAZARDOUS WASTE

FEDERAL: EPA proposed guidance to help regulators in evaluating the length of post-closure care required under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The RCRA hazardous waste regulations establish a post-closure care period (typically 30 years) for certain hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities and specify post-closure care activities. The guidance, entitled *Guidelines for Evaluating and Adjusting the Post-Closure Care Period for Hazardous Waste Disposal Facilities under Subpart C of RCRA*, outlines the basic rules regarding post-closure care and establishes a list of criteria to consider in deciding whether to extend or shorten the post-closure care period. These factors include: continued presence of hazardous waste, nature of hazardous waste remaining, type of unit, leachate, groundwater, siting and site geology/hydrogeology, facility history (i.e., past noncompliance), gas collection system integrity, integrity of cover system, and long-term care. The memo also outlines the process for reviewing sites as they approach the end of the post-closure period. The guidance counsels that contaminant conditions on a site that is the subject of continued monitoring be evaluated so that justifications for continued monitoring can be properly adjusted to address site-specific conditions. EPA is accepting comments on the draft guidance until June 30, 2015; it can be found on EPA's web site at: www.epa.gov/osw/hazard/tsd/td/ldu/pdf/post\_closr\_gd.pdf.

<u>Implications</u>: According to EPA, many facilities are currently approaching the end of their initial 30-year post-closure period, raising questions about how best to determine whether the post-closure care period must be adjusted.

### WATER

NEW YORK STATE: DEC sought comment on a draft general permit authorizing certain activities undertaken for habitat management purposes in DEC-controlled freshwater wetlands. Draft General Permit GP-0-15-004, *Habitat Management by NYSDEC*, applies to activities in freshwater wetlands in DEC wildlife management areas, cooperative areas, multiple use areas and unique areas. The permit authorizes a host of activities under the broad categories of: reconstruction and in-kind replacement of existing structures; management of constructed impoundments; new docks, piers, observation/hunting blinds and platforms, boardwalks or similar structures to provide access; vegetation management (including application of certain herbicides); and dredging. Entities seeking to take advantage of the permit must submit an application to DEC using the Joint Application Form. DEC will review the application to determine if the project can be authorized under the general permit. Assuming the permittee receives written authorization, it may proceed with the project provided it complies with the conditions spelled out in the general permit. The deadline for submitting comments on the draft general permit has closed; the draft can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/permits/6061.html.

<sup>© 2015</sup> YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

Implications: The rule is primarily of interest to entities planning certain types of work in DEC-controlled freshwater wetlands.

### **Upcoming Deadlines**

**NOTE:** This calendar contains items of general interest.

**June 15, 2015:** Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposal to add 1-bromopropane to the list chemicals subject to reporting under the TRI program. See the April 15, 2015 Federal Register at <u>www.gpo.gov/fdsys</u> for details.

**June 15, 2015:** Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's *Draft EJ 2020 Action Agenda Framework*. The document can be found on EPA's website at <u>www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/ej2020</u>.

**June 18, 2015:** Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed rule requiring electronic submission of certain reports under the NSPS program (extended from May 19, 2015). See the March 20, 2015 Federal Register at <u>www.gpo.gov/fdsys</u> for details.

**June 19, 2015:** Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's proposed annual air monitoring network plan describing the details of DEC's ambient air monitoring network. See DEC's website at <u>www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/33276.html</u> for details.

**June 30, 2015:** Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's draft *Guidelines for Evaluating and Adjusting the Post-Closure Care Period for Hazardous Waste Disposal Facilities under Subtitle C of RCRA.* The document can be found at www.epa.gov/osw/hazard/tsd/td/ldu/pdf/post\_closr\_gd.pdf.

**July 6, 2015:** Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposal to require TSCA reporting/recordkeeping for nanoscale materials. See the April 6, 2015 Federal Register at <u>www.gpo.gov/fdsys</u> for details.

**July 7, 2015:** Public information meeting on Sewage Pollution Right-to-Know implementing regulations to be held at 7:00 p.m. at DEC Headquarters, 625 Broadway, Albany. Additional meetings will be held in Rochester, Stone Ridge, and Utica. See DEC's web site at <u>www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/101977.html</u> for details.

July 17, 2015: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed effluent limitations guidelines prohibiting the discharge of hydraulic fracturing wastewater to POTWs (extended from June 8, 2015). See the April 7, 2015 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

<sup>11</sup> 

July 31, 2015: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's proposed regulations implementing New York's Sewage Pollution Right-to-Know Act. See DEC's website at <u>www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/101977.html</u> for details.

**October 9, 2015:** Deadline for submitting information in response to OSHA's RFI on alternative approaches to workplace chemical management, including possible updating of permissible exposure limits (extended from April 8, 2015). See the October 10, 2014 Federal Register at <u>www.gpo.gov/fdsys</u> for details.