

Young / Sommer LLC

ENVIRONMENTAL BREAKFAST CLUB REGULATORY SUMMARY

December 9, 2019

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 and Guidance

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
AIR			
<p>NEW YORK STATE State Ambient Air Quality Standards 6 NYCRR Part 257</p>	<p>DEC revised its state-specific ambient air quality standards to eliminate duplicative standards and update testing methods. New York had adopted its own ambient air quality standards, many of which duplicate the federal standards and/or are outdated. Like the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS), the state standards define what is considered acceptable ambient air quality for purposes of protecting public health and the environment. The recent rulemaking repealed the following state standards in 6 NYCRR Part 257: 24-hour and annual standards for suspended particles (PM₁₀); carbon monoxide; photochemical oxidants (superseded by federal ozone standard); nonmethane hydrocarbons; nitrogen dioxide; and beryllium. DEC retained the following ambient air quality standards that are unique to New York: 30, 60 and 90 day standards for suspended particles less than 10 microns; fluorides (addresses deposition of fluoride compounds during primary aluminum manufacturing); and hydrogen sulfide (focused on landfills, sewage treatment plants and pulp mills). DEC also updated the methods for measuring suspended and settleable particulate, total fluorides and hydrogen sulfide. DEC postponed repeal of the sulfur dioxide standards until EPA completes its designation of nonattainment areas under the 2010 revisions to the standards.</p> <p>The regulation can be found on DEC’s website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/117415.html.</p>	<p>The rule eliminates outdated provisions and so is unlikely to affect day-to-day permitting activities. The change will, however, eliminate any confusion concerning the potential applicability of the state standards, many of which were adopted more than 40 years ago and are no longer relevant.</p>	<p>The rule took effect December 6, 2019.</p>
<p>NEW YORK STATE Reasonably Available Control Technology for Major Sources of Oxides of Nitrogen 6 NYCRR Part 200 and Subpart 227-2</p>	<p>DEC revised its regulations establishing reasonably available control technology (RACT) requirements for major sources of nitrogen oxides (NOx) to eliminate outdated requirements and make organizational changes. The regulations require stationary combustion sources such as boilers, turbines and engines at major NOx sources to implement specific NOx emission controls and comply with monitoring/testing, reporting and recordkeeping requirements. With this rulemaking, DEC: (1) updated 6 NYCRR § 200.9 to include the most recent version of federal regulations; (2) deleted references in 6 NYCRR Subpart 227-2 to provisions that have sunset (i.e., are no longer applicable) or are otherwise out-of-date. For example, DEC eliminated a provision requiring owners/operators subject to the standard to submit a Title V permit application by July 1, 2012; and (3) consolidated the provisions relating to the compliance averaging period into the testing, monitoring and reporting requirements section.</p> <p>The regulation can be found on DEC’s website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/117420.html.</p>	<p>The rule is primarily of interest to major NOx emission sources that operate combustion installations and are therefore subject to Subpart 227-2.</p>	<p>The rule took effect December 7, 2019.</p> <p>DEC made various changes to the final regulations in response to comments from EPA.</p>

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
HAZARDOUS WASTE			
<p>FEDERAL Adding Aerosol Cans to the Universal Waste Regulations 40 CFR Part 273 et al. 84 Fed. Reg. 67202 (Dec. 9, 2019)</p>	<p>EPA has added aerosol cans to the list of universal wastes regulated under 40 CFR Part 273. The universal waste regulations establish streamlined requirements for managing common hazardous waste streams generated by large numbers of different types of facilities. Currently, aerosol cans often must be handled as hazardous waste either because the propellant is flammable or because the contents of the cans are hazardous waste when discarded. With the recent rulemaking, EPA added aerosol cans to the list of universal wastes and established specific requirements to address the unique issues associated with the management of aerosol cans. Key provisions of the regulations are set forth below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicability. The rule covers “aerosol cans,” which is defined as “a non-refillable receptacle containing a gas compressed, liquefied or dissolved under pressure, the sole purpose of which is to expel a liquid, paste or powder and fitted with a self-closing release device allowing the contents to be ejected by the gas.” This definition is consistent with that used by the U.S. Department of Transportation to simplify management across regulatory programs. Although the rule does not apply to non-hazardous waste aerosol cans or empty containers, generators can handle these cans as universal waste if they wish. • Empty containers. Although EPA declined to adopt special rules for determining when aerosol containers are empty, aerosol cans that have been punctured and drained (see below) prior to recycling are considered exempt scrap metal. • Waste management. Consistent with the existing universal waste program, the regulations distinguish between large and small quantity universal waste handlers based on whether they accumulate less than 5,000 kilograms of universal waste at any time. In general, handlers must manage aerosol cans to prevent releases of waste by storing cans in structurally sound, compatible, leakproof containers and storing leaking cans in separate containers packed with absorbent. They may sort cans by type, mix intact cans in a single container, and remove actuators to reduce the risk of accidental release. In addition, handlers may puncture and drain aerosol containers and manage the containers as scrap metal provided specific procedures are followed that are designed to prevent leaking and uncontrolled emissions and ensure proper characterization and management of the contents. <p>Consistent with the existing universal waste regulations, handlers must note when the universal waste is generated, must ship waste offsite to a destination/disposal facility within one year of generation, and comply with labeling, employee training, waste tracking (large quantity handlers only) and other requirements.</p> <p>The final universal waste regulations can be found in the December 9, 2019 Federal Register at: www.govinfo.gov.</p>	<p>As with other universal wastes (e.g., bulbs, batteries, certain pesticides and mercury-containing equipment), generators of waste aerosol cans have the option of managing them either as traditional hazardous waste or universal waste. Aerosol cans managed as universal waste are not included in a facility’s determination of its waste generator status (i.e., very small, small or large-quantity generator). EPA anticipates that adding aerosol cans to the list of universal wastes will increase the number of cans diverted from municipal solid waste landfills and incinerators to recycling facilities. The term universal waste handler covers both generators and facilities that consolidate universal waste from multiple generators. Because the rule allows consolidation of aerosol cans at central locations, small generators are expected to have an easier time managing their universal waste.</p>	<p>The rule takes effect February 7, 2020.</p> <p>DEC is currently in the early stages of updating its hazardous waste regulations to incorporate recent federal rule changes. Assuming DEC decides to adopt the aerosol can rule, it may incorporate the changes into the draft rule currently under development. In the alternative (or as a precursor), DEC may issue an enforcement discretion memorandum announcing its intent to implement the federal rule pending revision to the state regulation.</p>

Proposed Statutes, Regulations and Guidance

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
SOLID WASTE			
<p>NEW YORK STATE Plastic Bag Reduction, Reuse and Recycling 6 NYCRR Part 351</p>	<p>DEC proposed regulations implementing a series of laws regulating the plastic carryout bags distributed by retailers to customers. In 2009, the legislature adopted a law requiring stores with 10,000 square feet or more and chains which operate five or more stores in the state with greater than 5,000 square feet of retail space that provide plastic carryout bags to customers to place bins for the collection of bags and have the bags recycled. The legislature expanded the law in 2015 to cover film plastic packaging such as newspaper and dry cleaning bags. Earlier this year, the legislature went a step further, banning the distribution of plastic carryout bags to customers. Until now, the plastic bag laws have been implemented based on the statutes alone. However, DEC has concluded that the carryout bag ban statute requires clarification to eliminate loopholes and ensure that the ban is implemented efficiently and effectively. The new regulation—which will be set forth at 6 NYCRR Part 351—addresses all aspects of the various plastic bag laws as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicability. The law applies to any person required to collect tax (i.e., vendors of tangible personal property required to collect sales tax), store operators, operators of enclosed malls and manufacturers (i.e., producers of film plastic sold to a store or their agent/broker). • Prohibition. The law prohibits persons required to collect tax from distributing any plastic carryout bags to their customers other than exempt bags. The list of exempt bags includes meat and deli packaging, plastic used to package bulk items such as fruit or nuts, bags sold in bulk quantities, and newspaper and dry cleaning bags, among others. Store operators are specifically prohibited from distributing exempt bags as a replacement for plastic carryout bags. In addition, they must make reusable bags available to customers for sale or free and allow customers to bring their own reusable bags. • Bag collection. Stores covered by the existing bag collection laws must continue to collect plastic carryout bags and other film plastic in bins and send it out for recycling. Owners of most enclosed shopping malls must place bins at reasonable intervals around the mall to collect bags and film. Store and mall owners must keep records describing how much plastic is collected by weight. Manufacturers must keep records of how much plastic they accept. <p>The proposed rule can be found on DEC’s website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/118810.html.</p>	<p>The rule is primarily of interest to owners of retail stores and their customers. Effective March 1, 2020, any retailer of tangible goods required to collect sales tax is barred from providing non-exempt plastic carryout bags to its customers. Retailers must provide reusable bags (either free or for sale) to their customers and allow customers to bring their own bags. Reusable bags must meet specific criteria regarding durability spelled out in the regulation, presumably to ensure that stores do not bypass the ban by handing out cheap “reusable” bags as a substitute for plastic carryout bags. Larger retail stores and enclosed malls must continue to collect plastic bags and film in bins and send them to manufacturers for recycling.</p>	<p>DEC is accepting comments on the proposed rule until February 3, 2020. A public hearing will be held on January 27, 2020 at 1:00 p.m. at DEC’s Central Office, 625 Broadway, Room 129, Albany.</p>

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
WATER			
<p>FEDERAL Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Steam Electric Power Generating Point Source Category 40 CFR Part 423 84 Fed. Reg. 64620 (Nov. 22, 2019)</p>	<p>EPA proposed major changes to its technology-based guidelines and standards for wastewater discharges from steam electric generating facilities, which were revised in 2015 but never fully implemented. These so-called “categorical standards,” set forth at 40 CFR Part 423, contain effluent limits applicable to steam electric generating point sources that discharge both directly and to publicly owned treatment works (POTW). The rule sets standards for specific wastewater streams from fossil fuel and nuclear-fired power plants as follows: best available technology economically achievable (BAT) (applicable to direct discharges from existing facilities); pretreatment standards for existing sources (PSES) that discharge to a POTW; and new source performance standards (NSPS)/pretreatment standards for new sources (PSNS) (applicable to new generating units that discharge directly to surface waters or to a POTW, respectively. For each type of standard—BAT, PSES, NSPS, and PSNS—EPA divided dischargers into subcategories based on the type of process generating the wastewater, setting separate standards for discharges from flue gas desulfurization (FGD) wastewater, fly ash transport water, bottom ash transport water, flue gasification wastewater, combustion residual leachate, and non-chemical metal cleaning wastes. In a controversial decision, the 2015 regulations included zero discharge limits for certain wastewater streams discharged from fossil fuel-fired power plants. The 2015 rule was challenged by both industry and environmental groups and the Trump administration adopted a rule postponing the earliest compliance date in the rule pending further review. With the recent rulemaking, EPA is proposing to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the technology-based effluent limitations guidelines and standards applicable to FGD wastewater and bottom ash transport water to reflect recent technological developments and provide greater flexibility in the operation and maintenance of these systems. • Establish new subcategories for high flow facilities, low utilization boilers and boilers retiring by 2028 and establish requirements tailored to those categories; • Revise the voluntary incentives program for FGD discharges to provide additional time for plants to adopt process changes and controls to address FGD wastewater. • Establish extended compliance deadlines where the BAT limitations in the proposed rule are more stringent than previously established best practicable technology limitations. <p>The proposed regulation can be found in the November 22, 2019 Federal Register at: www.govinfo.gov.</p>	<p>In adopting the 2015 rule, EPA estimated that were approximately 1,100 facilities potentially covered by the standards and concluded that steam electric power plants contribute significant quantities of toxic pollutants to surface waters relative to other industries regulated under the Clean Water Act. According to EPA, since the 2015 rule was adopted, several less costly wastewater technologies have emerged that are capable of removing similar quantities of pollutants. These technological developments are reflected in the proposed rule.</p>	<p>EPA is accepting comment on the proposed regulation until January 21, 2020.</p> <p>The program policy took effect November 20, 2019.</p>

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
ENFORCEMENT			
<p>NEW YORK STATE Order on Consent Enforcement Policy DEC Program Policy OGC-11</p>	<p>DEC has proposed an updated policy addressing administrative settlement of enforcement actions, excluding those entered by the agency’s Division of Law Enforcement. As described by DEC, the policy—entitled <i>Order on Consent Enforcement Policy</i>—provides detailed guidance to Department staff on when Orders on Consent (OC) are required and the content of such orders. The policy explains the necessary elements of an OC as well as certain elements that may be added in order to meet program goals and objectives. Key aspects of the policy are summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicability. According to the policy, OCs generally should not be used where a minor violation (as described in program-specific guidance) can be corrected within a short period of time. • Purpose. The policy specifies the general purposes of OCs and clarifies that they should not be used to bypass permitting processes or authorize the commencement or long-term expansion of unpermitted activities. • Long vs. short form OCs. Short form OCs are orders based on a pre-approved template and are typically used by program staff (rather than counsel). Short form OCs may require payable penalties up to \$10,000 with an additional \$10,000 suspended and may authorize remedial actions up to 6 months in duration. • Required OC elements. Although OCs may vary based on the regulatory program involved and other factors, each of the following elements must be sent forth in the Order: penalties (required unless General Counsel’s approval is obtained); admission clauses (required unless General Counsel’s approval is obtained); violations addressed, effective date and termination clauses; default payment clause; modifications and extensions of OCs; access for site and records inspection; natural resource damages; indemnification; failure, default and violation of order; reopener and reservation of rights; binding effect; and entirety of order. • Additional elements. OCs may also contain the following additional elements: remedial or restoration program, compliance schedule, interim measures, limits and controls, best management practices, financial obligations, force majeure, stipulated and suspended penalties, regulatory fees, and environmental benefit projects. Additional provisions apply to remedial orders. The policy also spells out the procedures for drafting, executing and serving orders. <p>The proposed OC program policy can be found on DEC’s website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/2381.html.</p>	<p>The proposed OC program policy is generally of interest to companies in New York that are regulated under the Environmental Conservation Law and so potentially subject to a DEC enforcement action. The current version of the OC enforcement policy was issued in 1990.</p> <p>For the first time, DEC is proposing to post all OCs on the Department’s public website. Currently, policies regarding posting OCs online differ among DEC regions.</p>	<p>DEC is accepting comments on the proposed policy until 5:00 p.m. on January 21, 2020.</p>

Other Recent Developments (Final)

AIR

FEDERAL: Following a public comment period, EPA issued a final memorandum addressing **when “adjacent” facilities are considered a single facility under the Clean Air Act (CAA) Title V and new source review (NSR) programs**. Both the Title V and NSR laws apply to “stationary sources,” which encompass pollutant-emitting activities that belong to the same industrial grouping (i.e., two digit Standard Industrial Classification [SIC] code), are located on one or more contiguous or adjacent properties, and are under the control of the same person (or persons under common control). Over the years, significant questions have arisen about the precise meaning of the term “contiguous or adjacent.” These questions culminated in a court decision in 2012, which concluded that the term adjacent referred solely to physical proximity and that EPA could not take functional relatedness into account in making an “adjacency” determination. With the recent memo, EPA reviewed the history of the concept of adjacency and concluded that it was appropriate to focus exclusively on physical proximity when considering whether operations are adjacent for purposes of deciding whether two facilities should be considered a single stationary source. In support, EPA cited: the dictionary definition of adjacent, which focuses on physical proximity; the difference between “contiguous” and “adjacent;” and the practical difficulties associated with incorporating functional relatedness into the concept of adjacency. EPA declined to establish a fixed threshold for determining whether two operations are “adjacent,” emphasizing that permitting authorities will remain responsible for making case-specific determinations that comport with the “common sense notion of a plant.” Although states are not required to follow the guidance, EPA emphasized that applying this interpretation would provide greater uniformity in permitting decisions. The memorandum can be found on EPA’s website at: www.epa.gov/nsr/adjacent-guidance.

Implications: The guidance is potentially of interest to entities that own/operate air emissions sources that are located in close proximity to one another or that are contemplating the acquisition of nearby sources or expansion to nearby locations. The guidance does not apply to oil and natural gas activities covered by SIC major group 13.

FEDERAL: EPA issued **guidance clarifying the definition of “ambient air” under Title I of the CAA**, a move that could affect compliance demonstrations under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program. The Clean Air Act regulates “ambient” air quality, which is limited to the “portion of the atmosphere, *external to buildings*, to which the general public has access.” 40 C.F.R. § 50.1(e) (emphasis added). This definition excludes areas inside buildings from regulation with some regulatory exceptions. In addition, a 1980 guidance document clarified that the “exemption from ambient air is available only for the atmosphere over land owned or controlled by the source and to which public access is precluded by a fence or other physical barriers.” With the recent guidance EPA expanded the types of measures for deterring/precluding public access that may be considered in identifying “ambient air.” EPA’s *Revised Policy on Exclusions from “Ambient Air”* provides that “the atmosphere over land owned or controlled by the stationary source may be excluded from ambient air where the source employs measures, which may include physical barriers, that are effective in precluding access to the land by the general public.” For example, the air over land that is monitored by closed circuit cameras and/or

periodically patrolled could be excluded from consideration as “ambient air” for CAA purposes. Under this scenario, a facility seeking a PSD permit does not have to comply with the NAAQS within the area excluded from definition of ambient air under the new policy. Likewise, states do not have to consider exceedances of the NAAQS within the excluded area for purposes of assessing attainment. The guidance can be found at: www.epa.gov/nsr/ambient-air-guidance.

Implications: The guidance is primarily of interest to major sources that are potentially subject to the PSD program.

FEDERAL: EPA announced that it was no longer reconsidering its 2007 rule **clarifying when changes at a facility have a “reasonable possibility” of triggering NSR and therefore are subject to recordkeeping requirements**. Under the 2002 revisions to the NSR applicability rules, EPA determined that a source making a change need not keep records of its emissions unless the source believes there is a “reasonable possibility” that the change will result in a significant emission increase. In the 2005 challenge to the NSR rule, the court remanded the “reasonable possibility” provision back to EPA after concluding that EPA failed to explain how it could ensure NSR compliance without the relevant data. In response to the remand, EPA revised the NSR regulation to specify that a change is considered to have a “reasonable possibility” of resulting in a significant emission increase if the projected increase in emissions associated with the modification would exceed 50 percent of the significant modification threshold as well as where projected emissions—when added to excluded emissions attributable to an independent factor, such as demand growth—exceed the 50 percent threshold. These sources must document their projected emissions before the change and monitor emissions and keep records of emissions after the change to show that the change was not significant. The Obama administration announced plans to reconsider the reasonable possibility rule in response to a petition from New Jersey but never took final action. In a recent letter, EPA announced that no further reconsideration is necessary. The letter to New Jersey announcing EPA’s final decision can be found at: www.epa.gov/nsr/reasonable-possibility-rule-reconsideration-response-new-jersey-0.

Implications: The announcement is of general interest to major facilities that are potentially subject to NSR.

Other Recent Developments (Proposed)

CHEMICALS

FEDERAL: EPA proposed **corrections to its existing Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) regulations**. According to EPA, the corrections maintain previous regulatory actions and do not alter existing reporting requirements or impact compliance burdens or costs. Under Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community-Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA), certain facilities that manufacture, process or otherwise use listed hazardous chemicals in amounts above specified thresholds must report the amount of the chemical released to air or water or disposed of on land on an annual basis. With the recent rulemaking, EPA is proposing to revise the TRI implementing regulations at 40 CFR Part 372 to: (1) remove chemical names that have been delisted or moved to other listings; (2) make lists organized by Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) Registry Number and chemical name consistent; (3) correct inaccurate CAS numbers; (4) correct other errors in the chemical lists; and (5) revise the chemical lists to include only the primary chemical name and any secondary names

found on EPA's Substance Registry Service. In addition, the TRI excludes from regulation mixtures containing a de minimis concentration of listed chemicals (1% for chemicals generally and 0.1% for carcinogens). The current de minimis exemption cross-references an Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) regulatory provision relating to carcinogens that no longer exists. With this rulemaking, EPA is proposing to incorporate the previous definition from the OSHA regulations in the TRI regulations. EPA is accepting comments on the proposed rule until **January 28, 2020**; it can be found in the November 29, 2019 Federal Register at www.govinfo.gov.

Implications: The rule is potentially of interest to companies required to submit TRI reports; however, the changes proposed are comparatively minor.

GENERAL

FEDERAL: EPA proposed major changes to the **rules governing the appeal of federal permitting decisions to the Environmental Appeals Board (EAB)**. EPA created the EAB in 1992 to hear administrative appeals of enforcement proceedings and EPA-issued permits. An appeal to the EAB is a prerequisite for judicial review of permits subject to EAB jurisdiction. With the recent rulemaking, EPA is proposing changes designed to streamline and shorten the permit appeal process. Of perhaps greatest note, the revised regulations, would impose mandatory alternative dispute resolution (ADR) as a precondition to judicial review. Currently, once the permit appeal process has begun, the parties may opt into the ADR program with the goal of resolving the dispute. The proposed regulations would require all permit disputes to go through the ADR process, which would be confidential. If the issues are not resolved, the parties can agree either to extend the process or proceed with an EAB appeal. If they don't agree to one of the two options, the permit would become final and could be challenged in federal court. Other proposed changes include: (1) clarifying the scope and standard of the EAB's review, including eliminating a provision allowing EPA to consider appeals based on "important policy considerations;" (2) eliminating a provision authorizing submission of amicus curiae briefs; (3) eliminating the EAB's authority to review permit decisions on its own initiative; (4) imposing a 60-day deadline for the EAB to issue a decision once an appeal has been fully briefed and argued; and (5) establish a mechanism by which the EPA administrator can issue a dispositive legal interpretation in any matter pending before the EAB or addressed by the EAB. The rulemaking does not address the EAB's enforcement functions. EPA is accepting comment on the proposed rule until **January 2, 2020**; it can be found in the December 3, 2019 Federal Register at: www.govinfo.gov.

Implications: The rule is limited to permits issued by EPA. In New York, authority to implement many types of federal permits has been delegated to the State. The changes to the EAB procedures will not affect these permits.

Upcoming Deadlines

NOTE: This calendar contains items of general interest.

December 10, 2019: Public workshop scheduled on DEC's proposed rulemaking initiative to revise and update the hazardous waste regulations to incorporate EPA regulations adopted since 2013. The workshop will be held at 10:00 a.m. at DEC's Central Office, 625 Broadway, Room 129, Albany. Information about the initiative can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/117115.html.

December 11, 2019: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's proposed revisions to its incinerator regulations, including the requirements for crematories and MSW incinerators. See DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/118193.html for details.

December 11, 2019: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's proposed revisions to the endangered and threatened species regulations (extended from November 10, 2019). See DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/propregulations.html for details.

December 16, 2019: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's draft *National Water Reuse Action Plan*. See EPA's website at www.epa.gov/waterreuse/water-reuse-action-plan for a copy of the plan.

December 16, 2019: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed residual risk/periodic technology review findings for the rubber tire manufacturing NESHAP source category. See the October 30, 2019 Federal Register at www.govinfo.gov for details.

December 16, 2019: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed residual risk/periodic technology review findings for the following NESHAP source categories: surface coating of automobiles and light-duty trucks; surface coating of miscellaneous metal parts and products; and surface coating of plastic parts and products. See the November 1, 2019 Federal Register at www.govinfo.gov for details.

December 18, 2019: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's policy approaches for addressing "baseline issues" relating to water quality trading under the NPDES program (extended from November 18, 2019). See the September 19, 2019 Federal Register at www.govinfo.gov for details.

December 23, 2019: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed update to its NPDES/SPDES monitoring regulations. See the October 22, 2019 Federal Register at www.govinfo.gov for details.

December 24, 2019: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's announced changes to New York's list of endangered and threatened species. See DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/34113.html for details.

January 2, 2020: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the EAB rules governing permit appeals. See the December 3, 2019 Federal Register at www.govinfo.gov for details.

January 7, 2020: Public hearing on proposed revisions to DEC's procedures for conducting enforcement hearings to be held at 1:00 p.m. at DEC's Central Office, 625 Broadway, Albany.

January 13, 2020: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the SDWA's lead and copper rule. See the November 13, 2019 Federal Register at www.govinfo.gov for details.

January 21, 2020: Deadline for submitting comments on proposed revisions to effluent limitations guidelines and standards for the steam electric power generating point source category. See the November 22, 2019 Federal Register at www.govinfo.gov for details.

January 21, 2020: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's proposed OGC-11: Order on Consent Enforcement Policy (due 5:00 p.m.). The draft program policy can be found on DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/2381.html.

January 27, 2020: Public hearing on proposed plastic bag reduction and recycling rule to be held at 1:00 p.m. at DEC's Central Office, 625 Broadway, Room 129, Albany.

January 28, 2020: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed corrections to the TRI reporting requirements. See the November 29, 2019 Federal Register at www.govinfo.gov for details.

January 31, 2020: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's proposed update to its procedures for enforcement and related hearings. See DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/118492.html for details.

February 3, 2020: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's proposed plastic bag reduction and recycling rule. See DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/118810.html for details.