

Young / Sommer LLC

ENVIRONMENTAL BREAKFAST CLUB REGULATORY SUMMARY

November 3, 2017

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

Final Statutes, Regulations, Guidance and Cases

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
TRANSITION			
<p>FEDERAL Directive Promoting Transparency and Public Participation in Consent Decrees and Settlement Agreements October 16, 2017</p>	<p>EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt issued a <i>Directive Promoting Transparency and Public Participation in Consent Decrees and Settlement Agreements</i>, designed to end so-called “sue and settle” practices in the agency. Over the years, environmental advocacy groups have commenced hundreds of lawsuits seeking to compel EPA to implement legislative mandates, such as adopting regulations by a specific date. These lawsuits are frequently settled via consent decrees or settlement agreements that contain an implementation schedule. The Trump administration EPA contends that many of these decrees and settlements appear to have been the result of collusion with the outside groups and that they have led to the creation of regulations outside the normal administrative process. In response, Administrator Pruitt has issued a directive outlining measures to promote transparency and public participation in the consent decree and administrative settlement process. These measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publishing notices of intent to sue and complaints/petitions for review filed against EPA online within 15 days of receipt and notifying affected states and/or regulated entities of complaints/petitions and seeking their concurrence before settlement. • Publishing an online searchable list of consent decrees and settlement agreements that continue to govern EPA actions and updating the list with new decrees/agreements. • Barring EPA from entering into a consent decree with terms that the court would otherwise have lacked the authority to order if the parties had not resolved the litigation. • Seeking to exclude the payment of attorney’s fees for litigation that is settled via consent decree or settlement agreement on the theory that there is no “prevailing party.” • Ensuring any schedules for issuing final rules included in decrees/agreements allow sufficient time to modify a proposed rule, provide adequate notice and comment, and conduct meaningful agency review. • Posting any proposed decree or settlement agreement online and provide notice in the Federal Register, together with an opportunity for comment. <p>The full directive and an accompanying memorandum can be found on EPA’s website at: www.epa.gov/newsroom/directive-promoting-transparency-and-public-participation-consent-decrees-and-settlement.</p>	<p>The directive is of general interest to the regulated community. EPA often misses statutory deadlines for adopting environmental rules. As a result, the schedules for issuing the rulemakings frequently are set in settlement agreements or consent decrees, outside of the public eye. The Trump administration EPA contends that this practice relinquishes some of the agency’s discretion over its priorities and duties and hands them over to special interests and the courts. The directive attempts to address this issue by providing opportunities for public notice and comment of decrees and settlement agreements. It also denies attorney’s fees for lawsuits that are settled without trial, a move which may prompt more prolonged litigation.</p>	

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
TRANSITION			
<p>FEDERAL Final Report on Review of Agency Actions that Potentially Burden the Safe, Efficient Development of Domestic Energy Resources Under Executive Order 13783 October 25, 2017</p>	<p>EPA issued a report on implementing President Trump’s Executive Order 13783 to curb regulatory burdens in order to promote energy production and economic growth. The Executive Order directed various agencies, including EPA, to review existing regulations, orders, policies and other agency actions that potentially burden domestic energy production. In conjunction with that effort, EPA established a Regulatory Reform Task Force and reached out to the public for feedback on possible reform. The results of these efforts are summarized in the <i>Final Report on Review of Agency Actions that Potentially Burden the Safe, Efficient Development of Domestic Energy Resources under Executive Order 13783</i>. The report identified four key initiatives that it believes will further the goal of reducing burdens on the development and use of domestic energy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Source Review (NSR) reform. The NSR program imposes strict emission control and other requirements on newly constructed and significantly modified major sources of air pollutants. For years, industry has complained that the regulations are too complicated and discourage plant modernization because companies fear that improvements will trigger NSR. EPA believes opportunities exist to simplify the NSR permitting process and make other changes and plans to convene a task force to consider NSR reforms. • National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) reform. EPA sets NAAQS for six air pollutants and must review the standards every five years. After EPA sets a new NAAQS, it must determine if areas meet the standard and issue regulations and guidance to assist states in developing programs to achieve and maintain the NAAQS. Commenters have raised concerns about various issues, including the stringency of certain new standards, the short time between reviews, and EPA delays in issuing NAAQS implementation rules and guidance and approving state implementation plans (SIP). Although EPA’s options for reforming the NAAQS process are limited, it has committed to streamlining the SIP approval process and reducing the SIP backlog. • Employment evaluations. Various statutes require EPA to assess the impact of regulatory changes on employment. According to EPA, these assessments have not been done. In the report, EPA commits to performing these evaluations consistent with applicable statutory requirements. • Smart Sectors. As previously announced, EPA is initiating its Smart Sectors program to engage the regulated community by designating EPA staff as liaisons with specific industries to build relationships, develop industry-specific expertise, and inform the planning of future policy, regulations and agency processes. <p>The report can be found at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-10/documents/eo-13783-final-report-10-25-2017.pdf.</p>	<p>Although the focus of the report is on encouraging domestic energy production, the proposed initiatives are of potential interest to industry generally. Efforts to reform the NSR and NAAQS process will be somewhat hampered by the fact that many key requirements of the programs—such as the mandate to review NAAQS every five years—are set by statute and cannot be changed without congressional intervention. Moreover, changes to the NSR program are likely to meet strong opposition from the environmental community who have used to program as a means of forcing improvements at certain large emission sources, including power plants.</p>	

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
REMEDICATION			
<p>NEW YORK STATE Brownfield Cleanup Program Applications and Agreements DEC Program Policy DER-32</p>	<p>DEC revised DER-32, <i>Brownfield Cleanup Program Applications and Agreements</i>, which summarizes the procedure for applying for, and obtaining approval of, a Brownfield Cleanup Agreement (BCA) under DEC’s Brownfield Cleanup Program (BCP). DEC revised DER-32 to implement changes to the BCP statute, including the definition of brownfield site and the formula for awarding tax credits, and make other changes. Key steps in the BCP application process as set forth in DER-32 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application process</i>, including preapplication meeting, preapplication studies, application completion, submission of multiple applications, application submittal, land use, tangible property credit limitations, and contact list and document repository. • <i>Determination of complete application</i>, including the preliminary review process, outreach to the State’s Oil Spill Fund to identify outstanding claims, notice to the requestor, procedures for responding to incomplete applications, and issuance of a letter of completeness. • <i>Submission of reports and draft work plans with the application</i>, outlining procedures for conducting simultaneous review of reports or work plans with the application. • <i>Application approval/disapproval</i>, including timing of decision, possible criteria for denial, response to public comments, and mailing of approval/denial letter. • <i>BCA overview</i>, containing information about issuance of certificates of completion (COCs), the model BCA, and deadlines for executing BCAs. • <i>Amendments to the BCA</i>, distinguishing between major and minor modifications of the BCA and BCA corrections that do not require amendments and establishing procedures for reviewing and approving each type of modification/correction. • <i>Termination of the BCA</i>, establishing procedures for terminating the BCA by either the applicant or DEC. <p>Program Policy DER-32 can be found on DEC’s website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/2393.html.</p>	<p>DER-32 is potentially of interest to individuals/companies that own or are considering acquiring contaminated property that is eligible for the BCP.</p> <p>The recent revisions to DER-32 were made to conform the guidance to recent amendments to the BCP statute and make other changes. Key revisions include: requiring preapplication studies to show that contamination exceeds applicable cleanup objectives and so qualifies as a brownfield site; simplifying the provisions relating to existing and future land use; adding guidance summarizing the limitations on eligibility for tangible property tax credits; revising the criteria for denying a BCP application; clarifying that no partial or early COCs will be issued; deleting the model BCA from the guidance as an attachment; and significantly revising the provisions for modifying a BCA, including clarifying the difference between major and minor modifications.</p>	

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
WATER			
<p>NEW YORK STATE Lead Testing of School Drinking Water 10 NYCRR subpart 67-4</p>	<p>The New York State Department of Health (DOH) adopted a fourth emergency rule imposing lead testing requirements for school drinking water to extend the program while it finalizes a permanent rule. The rule requires all school districts, including those already classified as public water systems, to test potable water outlets for lead and develop and implement a lead remediation plan, where necessary. For buildings serving elementary school age children (prekindergarten through fifth grade), the first samples were required to be collected by September 30, 2016, with an October 31, 2016 deadline for all other schools. If the results exceed 15 parts per billion, the school must: prohibit use of the outlet until the problem is remediated; supply the building with adequate potable water; immediately report the test results to the local health department; and notify staff and parents in writing and via the school’s website. Schools also must post a list of buildings found to be lead-free and report the sample results to DOH and others by November 11, 2016 through DOH’s electronic reporting system. Additional samples must be taken in 2020 and at least every five years thereafter.</p> <p>The emergency rule can be found at: https://regs.health.ny.gov/regulations/proposed-rule-making.</p>	<p>The regulation implements A.10740, which was signed by Governor Cuomo on September 6, 2016. The emergency rule is primarily of interest to school districts and board of cooperative education service facilities (collectively public schools) and to the students, teachers and staffs in those schools. The rule does not apply to private schools.</p>	<p>DOH proposed a permanent regulation to replace the emergency rule and accepted comment through June 26, 2017. The most recent emergency rule expires November 26, 2017.</p>

Proposed Statutes, Regulations and Guidance

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
CLIMATE CHANGE			
<p>FEDERAL Proposed Repeal of Clean Power Plan 40 CFR Part 60 82 Fed. Reg. 48035 (Oct. 16, 2017)</p>	<p>In fulfillment of a campaign promise by President Trump, EPA proposed to repeal the Clean Power Plan (CPP), President Obama’s signature climate change initiative, after concluding that EPA lacked the statutory authority for the program. EPA adopted the CPP under Clean Air Act (CAA) § 111(d), 42 USC § 7411(d), which requires EPA to set emission guidelines based on the “best system of emission reduction” for any pollutant regulated under a New Source Performance Standard (NSPS) that is not a “criteria pollutant.” The CPP called for each state to reduce carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from existing power plants 32% from 2005 levels by 2030. To achieve this goal, EPA set CO₂ emission performance rates for coal- and oil-fired power plants and natural gas-fired combined cycle generating units. Compliance with the guidelines was to be achieved by applying three “building blocks:” (1) reducing the carbon intensity of generation at individual units through heat rate improvements; (2) substituting less carbon-intensive generating units (e.g., replacing coal with natural gas); and (3) increasing reliance on low or zero-carbon generation sources (such as solar and wind). Each state was expected to develop state-specific plans designed to achieve the interim and final goals of the CPP using one or more of the three building blocks.</p> <p>The rule was challenged by more than half the states and numerous trade associations and implementation was ultimately stayed by the U.S. Supreme Court pending judicial resolution. Upon taking office, the Trump administration issued an executive order that called for review and possible repeal of the CPP; it also asked the circuit court to put the pending litigation on hold while it reviewed the rule. With the recent notice, EPA proposed to repeal the CPP based on the conclusion that its earlier finding that the rule was authorized under CAA § 111(d) was incorrect. Under EPA’s new interpretation, the definition of best system of emission reduction is limited to emission reduction measures that can be applied to or at the individual stationary source covered by the standard. Because the CPP calls for emission reductions from sources other than existing power plants covered by the emission guidelines, it violates the CAA.</p> <p>The proposal to repeal the CPP can be found in the October 16, 2017 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.</p>	<p>The CPP was touted by the Obama administration as a major step toward reducing emissions that contribute to global climate change. The rule received strong support from environmentalists and certain states; opposition came from business interests and other states, including those with large numbers of coal-fired power plants and/or coal mines.</p>	<p>EPA is accepting comment on the proposed repeal of the CPP until January 16, 2018 (extended from December 15, 2017).</p> <p>Under the CAA, because EPA has adopted new source performance standards for GHG emissions from new power plants under CAA § 111(b), it is arguably compelled to adopt GHG emission guidelines for existing sources in the category. According to the notice, EPA has not yet decided the scope of the potential rule and plans to issue an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeking information on systems of emission reductions that accord with EPA’s new interpretation of the rule.</p>

Other Recent Developments (Final)

AIR

FEDERAL: EPA issued the results of its review of the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for nutritional yeast manufacturing facilities following a residual risk/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 technology underlying the NESHAP to confirm that the standard remains current. The nutritional yeast manufacturing NESHAP, set forth at 40 CFR Part 63, subpart CCCC, applies to major sources that manufacture yeast used in foods intended for human consumption, a process that generates acetaldehyde, a probable carcinogen. After reviewing the existing standard, EPA concluded that the risks remaining after application of the NESHAP were acceptable and that the standards protect public health with an ample margin of safety. EPA also found that there were no cost-effective developments in practices, processes or control technologies and that no changes in the NESHAP were necessary to address technological improvements. EPA also: (1) revised the form of the volatile organic compound (VOC) emission limits to address the statutory requirement that emission standards apply at all times; (2) revised the rule's testing, monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting requirements, including mandating submission of electronic copies of compliance reports, including performance test and performance evaluation results; (3) deleted the exemption for excess emissions during malfunction events; and (4) made other changes and corrections. The final rule, which took effect October 16, 2017, can be found in the Federal Register issued on the same date at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: According to EPA, there are four facilities in the country subject to the nutritional yeast NESHAP.

FEDERAL: EPA issued the results of its review of the NESHAP for publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) following a residual risk/periodic technology review. The POTW NESHAP, set forth at 40 CFR Part 63, subpart VVV, applies to two types of larger POTWs that treat industrial wastewater: POTWs that are themselves major sources of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) and POTWs that are used by industrial sources to satisfy their emission control obligations under another NESHAP. With this rulemaking, EPA announced the results of its residual risk/periodic technology reviews and made changes to the applicability, recordkeeping and other requirements of the rule. In particular, EPA: (1) revised the applicability provisions to clarify the original intent of the rule, which was to cover all POTWs that provide the treatment necessary to ensure that an industrial source complies with any applicable NESHAPs as well as POTWs that are themselves a major source of HAPs; (2) revised the names and definitions of the two subcategories identified in the NESHAP, replacing the terms "industrial" and "nonindustrial" POTW treatment plants with "Group 1" and "Group 2" plants; (3) found that the risks remaining after application of the NESHAP are acceptable and that the standards protect public health with an ample margin of safety; (4) made changes following the periodic technology review, including requiring Group 1 (i.e., industrial) POTWs to meet the requirements of both the other applicable NESHAP and the POTW NESHAP; (5) mandated submission of electronic copies of required performance test and other performance evaluation reports; (6) deleted the exemption for excess emissions during startup, shutdown and malfunction events; and (7) made other changes and corrections. However, EPA declined to finalize various proposed

changes, including a provision that would have required the inclusion of emissions from collection systems (i.e., sewer systems) in deciding whether a POTW is a major source. The final rule, which took effect October 26, 2017, can be found in the Federal Register issued on the same date at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: According to EPA, there are currently six POTWs out of approximately 16,000 nationwide that are subject to the POTW NESHAP. Most POTWs serve small municipalities and/or do not treat wastewater from industrial users. As a result, they are not potentially subject to the regulation. Those that do treat industrial wastewater require pretreatment prior to authorizing discharge to the POTW, which reduces potential emissions from the POTW below major source thresholds.

FEDERAL: EPA issued the results of its review of the NESHAP for chemical recovery combustion sources at kraft, soda, sulfite and stand-alone semichemical pulp mills following a residual risk/periodic technology review. The NESHAP, which is set forth at 40 CFR Part 63, subpart MM, is one of two NESHAPs adopted for the pulp and paper industry and applies to major sources of HAP emissions from chemical recovery combustion sources such as recovery furnaces, lime kilns and kraft black liquor oxidation units. After reviewing the existing NESHAP, EPA concluded that the risks remaining after application of the NESHAP were acceptable and that the standards protect public health with an ample margin of safety. With respect to the periodic technology review, EPA retained most of the existing emission standards while making the following changes: strengthening the opacity monitoring allowance for recovery furnaces and lime kilns equipped with electrostatic precipitators (ESP); adding an ESP parameter monitoring requirement for recovery furnaces and lime kilns equipped with ESPs; and making other changes to monitoring requirements. EPA also required facilities to meet the NESHAP at all times, including during periods of startup, shutdown and malfunction and provide alternative monitoring parameters for wet scrubbers and ESPs during these periods. EPA also required mills to submit electronic copies of required compliance reports, including performance test reports. The final rule, which took effect October 11, 2017, can be found in the Federal Register issued on the same date at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: According to EPA, there are currently 108 major source paper manufacturing facilities in the United States that conduct chemical recovery combustion operations, the vast majority of which are kraft pulp mills.

NEW YORK STATE: DEC allowed an August 2016 proposal to replace its existing rules governing the burning of waste fuel for energy recovery to expire without taking action. The rule, set forth in 6 NYCRR subpart 225-2, proposed to: update key definitions, including dropping the distinction between Waste A and Waste B fuels, a change that would have caused facilities that burn used oil containing chemical waste and off-spec waste oils that do not meet the limitations in subpart 225-2 to be regulated under 6 NYCRR Part 212 (process operations) or the hazardous waste regulations; lowering the constituent limits for PCBs and lead and dropping a 99% combustion efficiency requirement; expanding eligibility to burn waste oil by lowering the minimum permissible heat input requirement from 20 to 10 million British thermal units (mmBtus); and expanding the permitting exemption for “automotive maintenance/service facilities” by broadening the term to include junkyards and fleet maintenance facilities. The expiration of the rulemaking means DEC must publish a new notice of proposed rulemaking before proceeding with changes to subpart 225-2. The withdrawal notice can be found in the October 18, 2017 State Register at: <https://docs.dos.ny.gov/info/register/2017/oct18/toc.html>.

Implications: The notice is primarily of interest to facilities that burn waste oils in combustion, incineration and process sources, including automotive maintenance/service facilities burning their own waste oil in space heaters. The proposed changes would have expanded the number of facilities allowed to burn waste oil as fuel while shifting the regulation of facilities burning waste oil combined with chemical waste to 6 NYCRR Part 212.

WATER

NEW YORK STATE: DEC **revised the classifications of waterbodies in the Lake Champlain drainage basin**, following a periodic review to ensure that the assigned classifications are consistent with the waterbodies' best use. In accordance with the Clean Water Act goal that all surface waters be "fishable," DEC upgraded over 100 Class D "item numbers" (i.e., waterbody segments) from Class D (protective of fish survival) to Class C (fishable); numerous additional segments were upgraded to Class C(T) (trout) or higher. In addition, some portions of Lake Champlain were upgraded from Class AA to AA(T) to protect trout, while Lake George was upgraded from Class AA Special to AA Special (TS) to protect trout spawning. Where DEC concluded that specific item numbers must remain Class D, it prepared a use attainability analysis explaining its decision not to upgrade the use. The imposition of higher classifications means the waterbody segments will be subject to stricter water quality standards. This, in turn, could potentially affect the discharge limits assigned to facilities with State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permits. As part of the same rulemaking, DEC also reorganized the regulation (which is set forth at 6 NYCRR Part 830), added/revised definitions, revised and updated maps and made other minor changes/corrections. The rule can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/107391.html.

Implications: The rule is potentially of interest to any facility that discharges wastewater into the Lake Champlain drainage basin. According to DEC, its review shows that the reclassifications will not impact existing SPDES-permitted facilities, with one exception.

NEW YORK STATE: DEC **repealed outdated regulations and updated references to the SPDES program**. In particular, DEC repealed 6 NYCRR Part 500—Floodplain Management Regulations Development Permits—because the underlying statute has not been in effect since 1992 when it was repealed by the legislature. DEC also changed references to the SPDES program from 6 NYCRR Part 750-758 to 6 NYCRR Part 750. The SPDES regulations were consolidated into Part 750 in 2003 when the program was overhauled and many of the references to this program in DEC's regulations were never updated to reflect the change. Information about the revisions can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/110588.html.

Implications: The revisions are intended to eliminate confusion caused by the outdated regulations.

Other Recent Developments (Proposed)

CHEMICAL

FEDERAL: EPA has proposed **reporting requirements to assist the agency in developing an inventory of mercury supply, use and trade** in the United States under Section 8(b)(10)(D) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). EPA published its initial mercury inventory report on March 29, 2017, which identified numerous data gaps and limitations in the publicly available data on the mercury market in the United States. With the current rulemaking, EPA is proposing to require persons who manufacture (including import) mercury or mercury-added products, or otherwise intentionally use mercury in a manufacturing process, to report amounts of mercury (in pounds) used in such activities during a designated reporting year. Reports would identify the specific mercury compounds, mercury-added products, manufacturing processes, and how mercury is used in those processes, as applicable, from pre-selected lists. This information will allow EPA to prepare a national mercury inventory as required by TSCA. It will also help the United States fulfill its obligations under the Minamata Convention, an international agreement targeted at protecting human health and the environment from manmade mercury emissions and releases. EPA is accepting comments on the proposed rule until **December 26, 2017**; it can be found in the October 26, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The proposed rule is primarily of interest to companies that use or import mercury for manufacturing purposes. The reporting requirements would not apply to persons engaged in the generation, handling or management of mercury-containing waste, unless that person manufactures or recovers mercury with the intent of using it.

RELEASE REPORTING

FEDERAL: EPA proposed **interim guidance to help farmers comply with requirements to report certain releases of hazardous substances to the air** under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA). Both CERCLA and EPCRA require the reporting of releases of specific hazardous substances above a reportable quantity measured over a 24-hour period. The list of hazardous substances includes hydrogen sulfide and ammonia, both of which are emitted in significant quantities from animal waste at large farms. Earlier this year, a federal court struck down a 2008 law exempting air emissions from animal waste on farms from CERCLA and EPCRA reporting. To implement the ruling, which takes effect November 15, 2017, EPA issued interim guidance addressing compliance with this requirement. In general, large-scale concentrated animal feeding operations that emit 100 pounds of ammonia or hydrogen sulfide over a 24-hour period must notify the National Response Center (NRC). Because these releases are continuous rather than one-time events, farms are expected to take advantage of the streamlined reporting process for continuous releases, under which farms can call the NRC and inform them that they are making an initial continuous release notification. They must then follow up with an initial written notification of the release to the appropriate EPA regional office. The farm must then submit a follow-up written notification a year later. EPA is accepting comment

on the interim policy until **November 24, 2017**; it can be found at: www.epa.gov/epcra/cercla-and-epcra-reporting-requirements-air-releases-hazardous-substances-animal-waste-farms. In conjunction with the interim guidance, EPA and the U.S. Department of Agriculture issued *Agricultural Air Quality Conservation Measures: Reference Guide for Poultry and Livestock Production*, which identifies measures for reducing emissions from animal waste at farms.

Implications: The interim guidance is primarily of interest to large-scale concentrated animal feeding operations that emit significant quantities of air contaminants.

Upcoming Deadlines

NOTE: This calendar contains items of general interest.

November 21, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed residual risk/periodic technology review for the portland cement manufacturing NESHAP (extended from November 6, 2017). See the September 21, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

November 23, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's notice of intent to establish voluntary criteria for radon credentialing organizations (extended from October 23, 2017). See the August 23, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

November 24, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's interim guidance on reporting air emissions from large animal farms under CERCLA and EPCRA. See www.epa.gov/epcra/cercla-and-epcra-reporting-requirements-air-releases-hazardous-substances-animal-waste-farms for details.

December 26, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed reporting requirements for the TSCA mercury inventory. See the October 26, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

January 16, 2018: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan (extended from December 15, 2017). See the October 16, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.