Document Log

From	То	
"Dave Goss" <dcgoss@acaa-usa.org></dcgoss@acaa-usa.org>	John Sager/DC/USEPA/US@EPA	
СС	BCC	
Subject		
FW: Re: URGENTFW: HB 388 Environment- Pozzolan Use and Disposal	02/01/2008 10:10 AM	
		•

Document Body

745-B-00-004:

```
----Original Message----
From: William Aljoe [mailto:WILLIAM.ALJOE@NETL.DOE.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2008 1:09 PM
To: Dave Goss
Subject: RE: Re: URGENT---FW: HB 388 Environment- Pozzolan Use and
Disposal
Dave,
If I recall correctly, the central question under TRI reporting is:
exactly, constitutes a "release to land" that is reportable as such
under
TRI?
For example, placement in a permitted surface landfill or use for mine
reclamation is certainly reportable as a "release to land." Page 4-46
the publication EPA 745-B-00-004, "EPCRA Section 313 Industry Guidance,
ELECTRICITY GENERATING FACILITIES (attached for reference) says:
"EPCRA Section 313 chemicals in ash sent off-site for use in mining
reclamation or to be used as aggregate in road construction are also
considered off-site transfers of wastes for disposal. These uses of ash
are
not considered analogous to using a substitute material with a
commercial
value. You must report amounts of EPCRA Section 313 chemicals in ash
off-site for mining reclamation or for use as road aggregate on the Form
Because these chemicals are being managed as a waste by the off-site
location, the de minimis exemption does not apply."
But sale to a ready-mix supplier for use in concrete is not reportable,
```

if that concrete is eventually placed into contact with land, e.g., as poured concrete in a bridge pier. Again quoting from page 4-46 of EPA

"Electricity generating facilities may also distribute ash into commerce for

use in the construction industry, or for metals recovery. When ash is distributed in commerce to be directly used by an off-site entity, the amounts of EPCRA Section 313 chemicals distributed in commerce are not reported on the Form R. For example, an electricity generating facility that

sells ash to a construction facility who incorporates the ash directly into

the manufacture of cement, does not report quantities of EPCRA Section 313

chemicals in that ash on the Form R."

The gray area is when the CCP is sold for use in a commercial product such

as "Poz-o-Tec" or "Stabil-Fill" that is subsequently used for a road base or $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right$

mine reclamation - is this a "release to land" (reportable as a release) or

"distributed into commerce" (not reportable)? If the beneficial use involves

the latter italicized case rather than the former, then the affected utilities would appear to be justified in not reporting under TRI.

Bill

William W. Aljoe General Engineer/Project Manager U.S. Department of Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory 626 Cochrans Mill Road PO Box 10940 Pittsburgh, PA 15236-0940

Phone: 412-386-6569 Cell: 412-605-9757 Fax: 412-386-5917

E-Mail: aljoe@netl.doe.gov

>>> "Dave Goss" <dcgoss@acaa-usa.org> 1/31/2008 10:46 AM >>> Thanks, Bill. Good ideas. I won't be able to attend this as I am traveling

from Phoenix to Washington to attend a meeting on TRI on Friday the 14th.

There are concerns from Region 3 about why beneficial use of CCPs is not being reported under TRI. Again, it stems back to Maryland. Dave

----Original Message----

From: William Aljoe [mailto:WILLIAM.ALJOE@NETL.DOE.GOV]

Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2008 8:18 AM

To: Dave Goss Cc: Jim Roewer

Subject: RE: Re: URGENT---FW: HB 388 Environment- Pozzolan Use and Disposal

Dave,

It would probably help if the Maryland utilities would attend the Hearing on this bill - According to the website, it is scheduled for Feb. 13 at 1:00 PM.

A good approach would be for the utilities to voice their support of a State

regulatory program for disposal that looks as much as possible like the voluntary program that USWAG has developed.

Simultaneously, they need to bring evidence, in the form of research results, to show that contaminant leaching from CCP beneficial use in roadbuilding and land reclamation is much less likely than when the same CCP

materials are put in landfills. I would suspect that UMW-Milwaukee, Univ. of

New Hampshire, and Ohio State (Warren Dick) can provide assistance in this regard.

Bill

William W. Aljoe General Engineer/Project Manager U.S. Department of Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory 626 Cochrans Mill Road PO Box 10940 Pittsburgh, PA 15236-0940

Phone: 412-386-6569 Cell: 412-605-9757 Fax: 412-386-5917

E-Mail: aljoe@netl.doe.gov

>>> "Dave Goss" <dcgoss@acaa-usa.org> 1/31/2008 9:36 AM >>>
Thanks, Bill.

I just wanted to make sure you were aware of the issues. As usual, any suggestions or thoughts you might have would be appreciated. I am working

with Jim Roewer and a number of the utilities to follow this. I will go to

the beneficial use hearing on February 26th in Baltimore, too.

Take care, Dave

From: William Aljoe [mailto:WILLIAM.ALJOE@NETL.DOE.GOV]

Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2008 7:09 AM

To: David Goss

Subject: Fwd: Re: URGENT---FW: HB 388 Environment- Pozzolan Use and

Disposal

Dave,

I have no doubt this bill is a knee-jerk response to the contamination that has occurred as the result of the Gambrills fly ash landfill (see attached articles). Hopefully cooler heads will prevail and the bill will die

somewhere in committee. The web site where you can download the bill and track its progress is: http://mlis.state.md.us/2008RS/billfile/hb0388.htm

Bill

<edil@engr.wisc.edu>;

William W. Aljoe General Engineer/Project Manager U.S. Department of Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory 626 Cochrans Mill Road PO Box 10940 Pittsburgh, PA 15236-0940 Phone: 412-386-6569 Cell: 412-605-9757 Fax: 412-386-5917 E-Mail: aljoe@netl.doe.gov >>> <Lueckenhoff.Dominique@epamail.epa.gov> 1/30/2008 8:51 AM >>> Dave - we're gathering more info on this. Our understanding is that this stems from well contamination resulting from the disposal of fly ash in sand and gravel pits. Does the Association have a scientific/technical response to such risk concerns? ---- Original Message -----From: "Dave Goss" [dcgoss@acaa-usa.org] Sent: 01/29/2008 08:19 PM MST To: <Jason.Harrington@dot.gov>; "Rob Jolly" <robb@revisionsd.com>; Dominique Lueckenhoff; Mary Hunt; John Sager; Robert Burchard; "Jim Roewer" <jroewer@eei.org>; "William Weissman" <wweissman@venable.com>; "John Ward" <jward@headwaters.com>; "John Jeffcoat" <john.l.jeffcoat@constellation.com>; "Hank Keiper" <hkeiper@sefagroup.com>; "Jimmy Knowles" <jknowles@sefagroup.com>; "'Dedrickson, Yvonne A'" <Yvonne.A.Dedrickson@constellation.com> Cc: "Bill Aljoe" <aljoe@netl.doe.gov>; "Tuncer Edil"

```
"Craig Benson" <benson@engr.wisc.edu>; "Kevin Gardner"
<kevin.gardner@unh.edu>; "Chad A. Haynes Ph. D"
<Chad.Haynes@ars.usda.gov>;
"Mary Shultz" <mary.shultz@mirant.com>; "Pat Miglio"
<patrick.miglio@mirant.com>; "Peter Stephanos"
<shaadmin@sha.state.md.us>;
"Jeffrey Withee" <jwithee@sha.state.md.us>
Subject: FW: URGENT---FW: HB 388 Environment- Pozzolan Use and Disposal
```

Colleagues,

The attached proposal from Maryland prohibiting CCPs (known as fly ash or pozzolans) in land reclamation, agriculture and soil improvements, would have a serious impact on the Green Highways Partnership, C2P2

have a serious impact on the Green Highways Partnership, C2P2, beneficial

use, harmonization of standards and other related activities.

Are any of you aware of the reason for this House Bill? It seems to go well

beyond the proposed revision to Maryland's solid waste and beneficial use regulations.

Any suggestions on how to approach this issue?

Thanks, Dave Goss

----Original Message----

From: Tuncer B. Edil [mailto:tbedil@wisc.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2008 6:52 PM

To: 'Dave Goss'

Cc: 'Craig H. Benson'

Subject: FW: URGENT---FW: HB 388 Environment- Pozzolan Use and Disposal

Dave

Are you aware of this? What is going on?

Tuncer