

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT



RCRA Permit Appeal Fact Sheet

1991

FACILITY: Beazer East, Inc. and Koppers Industries, Inc. (Beazer/Koppers)
Guthrie, Kentucky
KYD 006 383 392
RCRA Appeal No. 91-25

PETITIONER: Beazer/Koppers

PETITION FILED: October 30, 1991

STATUS OF PETITION: See Permit Appeal Status Report

ISSUES:

- RFI conditions are not justified
- Due process
- Other corrective action issues (use of appendices as guidance; reporting requirements for releases; time frames for submitting the final RFI report and conducting confirmatory sampling)
- Procedural issues
- Joint permitting
- Miscellaneous other issues (effect of permit)

Summary of Petition:

Beazer/Koppers are petitioning for review of the final HSWA permit issued by Region 4 to their facility in Guthrie, Kentucky. The majority of Beazer/Koppers' comments consist of objections to RFI and confirmatory sampling requirements for specific solid waste management units (SWMUs) and areas of contamination (AOCs), which they believe have already been adequately addressed. The petitioners also object to several provisions that interfere with the permittee's right to administrative appeal of permit modifications.

- **RFI Conditions are not Justified.** The petitioners maintain that a number of RFI requirements regarding certain SWMUs and AOCs are unjustified.
 - The petitioners object to the inclusion of the tram draw out track as a SWMU requiring an RFI because the area is currently involved in a drip pad retrofit project pursuant to 40 CFR Part 265, Subpart W. Beazer/Koppers maintain that further characterization under an RFI would be unnecessary, duplicative and potentially inconsistent.



RCRA Permit Appeal Fact Sheet

1991

- The petitioners contend that the drip track area does not require an RFI because this area was paved, contained drip and precipitation collection, and is currently being replaced as part of the drip pad retrofit project. Beazer/Koppers also maintain that an RFI is not warranted for the oil and lubricant storage building area because the area is located in close proximity to the drip track area and investigative activities have resulted in adequate characterization of the area.
- The petitioners object to the requirement that they perform an RFI for the collection sump because the unit and surrounding contaminated soil were removed during a tank farm renovation project, and groundwater monitoring and soil boring activities conducted around the tank area have shown that further characterization under an RFI is not necessary.
- Beazer/Koppers maintain that conducting an RFI for the swampy area is unnecessary because the area has been planned for excavation and backfill as an interim measure under the Kentucky Agreed Order. In addition, because of its proximity to the former lagoon area, this area has been adequately characterized.
- The petitioners object to the requirement to perform an RFI for the north and south land farm areas because these areas have been studied as part of the investigation under the Kentucky Agreed Order.
- Beazer/Koppers maintain that an RFI is not warranted for the product storage areas because these areas are not a source of constituents contributing to the general environmental condition at the facility, but rather are a source of de minimis drippage from treated wood as discussed in the new wood treatment listing rules.
- The petitioners contend that performing RFIs for the old lagoon and old surface impoundment areas is not necessary because these areas have been investigated extensively pursuant to State action, and do not merit additional study.
- The petitioners object to the requirement to perform confirmatory sampling in the surge tank, surge tank collection sump, and preheat tank areas, because these areas are within the tank farm area, which has been excavated, paved and diked with concrete. Beazer/Koppers also note that soil sampling in these areas would be extremely impractical, if not impossible.



RCRA Permit Appeal Fact Sheet

1991

- Beazer/Koppers are opposed to requiring confirmatory sampling in the basement sump area because this area has been extensively cleaned and is maintained in a "dry state." The petitioners also note that soil sampling in this area would be extremely impractical, if not impossible.
- Beazer/Koppers contend that confirmatory sampling in the primary separator area should not be required because this unit has been removed from the facility. The petitioners also note that the unit was located near the former lagoon area, where extensive investigation has been conducted.
- The petitioners oppose the requirement to perform confirmatory sampling in the storage tank area because the tank has been out of service for a number of years. The permittee is currently planning to clean the tank, thus allowing a visual inspection of the interior. There are no plans to use the tank for future storage of wood treating chemicals.
- **Due Process.** The petitioners object to language in the permit that interferes with the permittee's right to administrative appeal of permit modifications that are initiated and finalized by the Regional Administrator according to procedures outlined in Appendix E. The petitioners argue that EPA has no authority to preclude administrative appeal of permit modifications.
- **Use of Appendices as Guidance.** The petitioners object to language contained in the final permit requiring that the RFI and CMS work plans meet the requirements of Appendices B and C. The petitioners argue that the appendices are intended only as guidelines for preparing these work plans.
- **Reporting Requirements for Releases.** The petitioners argue that requiring the permittee to provide information concerning the release of any "hazardous constituent" is unjustified because EPA cannot require the permittee to report releases of constituents for which it is not required to monitor or that fall outside the subject matter of the permit. Beazer/Koppers suggest that the term "hazardous constituent" be replaced by "hazardous waste constituent" in order to clarify the permittee's reporting responsibilities.
- **Time Frames for Submitting the Final RFI Report and Conducting Confirmatory Sampling.** The petitioners object to time periods set for submission of the final RFI report and conducting confirmatory sampling.



RCRA Permit Appeal Fact Sheet

1991

- The petitioners object to the requirement that the permittee submit a final RFI report to the Regional Administrator within 30 calendar days of receipt of the Regional Administrator's comments on the draft RFI report. Beazer/Koppers contend that 30 days is an unreasonably short time period for finalization of the RFI report.
- The petitioners object to the requirement that confirmatory sampling be completed within 45 days. Beazer/Koppers maintains that 45 days does not provide adequate time to complete the entire confirmatory sampling scope of work, and may not even provide adequate time to complete sampling itself.
- **Procedural Issues.** The petitioners maintain that changes in the required time periods for completing confirmatory sampling and submitting the confirmatory sampling report were not included in the final permit.
 - The petitioners note that although EPA decided in its response to comments to extend the period for confirmatory sampling to 90 days, this modification was not included in the final permit.
 - Beazer/Koppers argue that although EPA suggested that the due date for the confirmatory sampling report should be changed from 60 calendar days after approval of the confirmatory sampling work plan to a date "in accordance with the approved confirmatory sampling work plan," this modification was omitted from the final permit, and new language retaining a 45 day time period and adding provisions for modifying that period was included.
 - In addition, the petitioners object to the requirement to perform confirmatory sampling for treatment cylinders, heated storage tanks and dehydrator. Beazer/Koppers notes that although EPA indicated in its response to comments that these units would be re-characterized as requiring no further action and were removed from Appendix A.3, they were not added to Appendix A.2.
- **Joint Permitting.** The petitioners note that Appendix A of the permit, which lists SWMUs and AOCs for which an RFI or confirmatory sampling is required, contains a number of units which have already been addressed and characterized through several environmental investigations at the site, including an investigation that is ongoing pursuant to an Agreed Order with the State of Kentucky. Beazer/Koppers argue that it is essential that corrective action under both the Federal permit and the Kentucky post-closure care permit be coordinated with the corrective action efforts already being undertaken pursuant to the Kentucky Agreed Order to avoid duplication of efforts, inconsistencies and costly studies.



RCRA Permit Appeal Fact Sheet

1991

- **Effect of Permit.** The petitioners object to language in the permit stating that “compliance with this RCRA permit constitutes compliance, for purposes of enforcement with Subtitle C of RCRA, except for those requirements not included in the permit which become effective by statute, [or] which are promulgated...” Beazer/Koppers argue that the permit should be modified to ensure that this language is consistent with 40 CFR Section 270.4 and the existing case law.

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication. Readers are requested to notify the Environmental Appeals Board, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460, of any typographical or other formal errors, in order that corrections may be made before publication.

*Before Environmental Appeals Judges Nancy B. Firestone,
Ronald L. McCallum, and Edward E. Reich.*

**BEAZER EAST, INC. AND
KOPPERS INDUSTRIES, INC.**

RCRA Appeal No. 91-25

**ORDER DENYING REVIEW IN PART
AND REMANDING IN PART**

Decided March 18, 1993

Syllabus

Koppers Industries, Inc. and Beazer East, Inc. (Beazer) petition for review of the federal portion of a permit issued by Region IV under the 1984 Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. The petition seeks review of a permit for Beazer's wood treatment facility in Guthrie, Kentucky. Beazer asks that review be granted with respect to whether: 1) permit condition I.A. is inconsistent with the language of 40 C.F.R. §270.4(a) (1991); 2) the permit's use of the term "hazardous constituent" rather than "hazardous waste constituent" is arbitrary and capricious; 3) the characterization of the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Workplan Outline and the Corrective Measure Study Plan Outline as "requirements" rather than "guidelines" is improper; 4) the 30-day period for submitting the final RFI report is unreasonably short; 5) many of the permit's corrective action requirements are duplicative and unnecessary in light of prior and ongoing remediation; 6) the permit improperly requires further investigation of various solid waste management units or areas of concern; and 7) the permit's abbreviated procedure for Agency-initiated modifications to the schedule of compliance improperly deprives Beazer of the right to an administrative appeal.

Held: The permit is remanded and the Region is directed to remove the abbreviated modification procedure (Appendix E) from the permit and revise Permit Condition II.I.2. to specify that Agency-initiated modifications to the schedule of compliance must proceed in accordance with 40 C.F.R. §270.41. Review is denied with regard to all other issues.

***Before Environmental Appeals Judges Nancy B. Firestone,
Ronald L. McCallum, and Edward E. Reich.***

Opinion of the Board by Judge McCallum:

I. BACKGROUND

Koppers Industries, Inc. (the owner) and Beazer East, Inc. (the operator) (hereinafter referred to collectively as "Beazer")¹ have filed a petition seeking review of the federal portion of a permit issued by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IV (the "Region") under the 1984 Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA), 42 U.S.C.A. §§6901-6992k, for Beazer's wood treatment facility in Guthrie,

¹ Both parties are listed on the final permit.

BEAZER EAST, INC. AND
KOPPERS INDUSTRIES, INC.

Kentucky.² As requested by the Agency's Judicial Officer,³ the Region filed a response to Beazer's petition for review.

Since approximately 1913, the facility has produced treated wood products using a pressurized creosote process. The primary wastes of concern from Beazer's operations contain creosote and constituents released from the degradation of creosote. These wastes originate from, among other things, the drippage of freshly treated wood and from process wastewater from which K001 sludge is generated.⁴ According to a 1987 Interim RCRA Facility Assessment Report (dated June 9, 1987), releases of creosote contaminated waste have occurred and may have migrated off-site. The final HSWA permit determination (dated September 30, 1991) requires, among other things, investigation of releases at several of the facility's solid waste management units (SWMUs) or areas of concern and requires Beazer to comply with all land disposal restrictions applicable to the facility. In appealing the permit determination, Beazer argues that: 1) Permit Condition I.A. contains language inconsistent with the language of 40 C.F.R. §270.4(a) (1991); 2) the term "hazardous constituents" in Permit Condition I.D.14. should be replaced by "hazardous waste constituents;" 3) the characterization of the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Workplan Outline and the Corrective Measure Study (CMS) Plan Outline (Appendix B and C to the final HSWA permit) as requirements rather than guidelines is arbitrary and capricious; 4) the 30-day period for submitting the Final RFI Report in Permit Condition II.E.3.b. is unreasonably short; 5) many of the permit's corrective action requirements are duplicative and unnecessary in light of ongoing investigations and remediation efforts required by the State; 6) the

² The non-HSWA portion of the permit was issued by the State of Kentucky, an authorized State under RCRA §3006(b), 42 U.S.C. §6926(b).

³ At that time, the Agency's Judicial Officers provided support to the Administrator in his review of permit appeals. Subsequently, effective on March 1, 1992, the position of Judicial Officer was abolished and all cases pending before the Administrator, including this case, were transferred to the Environmental Appeals Board. 57 Fed. Reg. 5321 (Feb. 13, 1992).

⁴ K001 waste is a specific-source waste listed under 40 C.F.R. §261.32 as "[b]ottom sediment sludge from the treatment of wastewaters from wood preserving processes that use creosote and/or pentachlorophenol."

permit improperly requires investigation of certain SWMUs and areas of concern; and 7) the permit's abbreviated procedure for Agency-initiated modifications to the schedule of compliance (Permit Condition II.I.2. & Appendix E) is contrary to the regulations and constitutes an abuse of discretion.

II. DISCUSSION

Under the rules governing this proceeding, a RCRA permit ordinarily will not be reviewed unless it is based on a clearly erroneous finding of fact or conclusion of law, or involves an important matter of policy or exercise of discretion that warrants review. See 40 C.F.R. §124.19; 45 Fed. Reg. 33,412 (May 19, 1980). The preamble to section 124.19 states that "this power of review should only be sparingly exercised," and that "most permit conditions should be finally determined at the Regional level * * *." *Id.* The burden of demonstrating that review is warranted is on the Petitioner. See *Pollution Control Industries of Indiana, Inc.*, RCRA Appeal No. 92-3, at 3 (EAB, August 5, 1992); *Sandoz Pharmaceuticals Corp.*, RCRA Appeal No. 91-14, at 3 (EAB, July 9, 1992).

1. Permit Condition I.A.

Permit Condition I.A. of the draft HSWA permit stated in pertinent part as follows:

Compliance with this RCRA permit constitutes compliance, for purposes of enforcement with Subtitle C of RCRA, except for those requirements not included in the permit which become effective by statute, which are promulgated, or those which restrict placement of hazardous wastes in or on the land.

In its comments on the draft permit, Beazer argued that this language did not accurately reflect the language of 40 C.F.R. §270.4. Comments on Draft Permit at 1 (Exh. A to Petition for Review). 40 C.F.R. §270.4(a) (1991) provides:

**BEAZER EAST, INC. AND
KOPPERS INDUSTRIES, INC.**

Compliance with an [sic] RCRA permit during its term constitutes compliance for purposes of enforcement, with Subtitle C of RCRA except for those requirements not included in the permit which become effective by statute, or which are promulgated under part 268 of this chapter restricting the placement of hazardous wastes in or on the land.

In its Petition for Review Beazer argued that "[t]he Permit should be modified to ensure that Condition I.A. is consistent with 40 C.F.R. § 270.4 and the existing caselaw [sic] * * *." Petition for Review at 2. As the Region stated in its Response, however, the permit has already been revised to accurately reflect the language of §270.4.⁵ Region's Response at 3. This issue is therefore moot.

2. Release of Hazardous Constituents

Permit Condition I.D.14.a. provides:

The Permittees shall report any noncompliance which may endanger human health or the environment. Any such information shall be reported orally to the RA within 24 hours from the time the Permittees become aware of the circumstances. This report shall include:

- i. Information concerning the release of any hazardous waste or hazardous constituent which may endanger public drinking water supplies.
- ii. Information concerning the release or discharge of any hazardous waste or hazardous constituents, or of a fire or explosion at the facility, which could threaten the environment or human health outside the facility.

⁵ Due to an administrative error, the revised condition was not included in the final HSWA permit originally sent to Beazer. This error has been corrected and the modified condition has been incorporated into the final permit contained in the record on appeal.

Beazer argues that use of the term "hazardous constituents" in the above-quoted provision creates confusion regarding its reporting obligations and should be replaced by "hazardous waste constituents." According to Beazer, the latter term is employed in the permit to define its monitoring responsibilities, and is narrower in scope than "hazardous constituents." Therefore, without the change, Beazer believes it would be required to report releases of constituents that it is not required to monitor. Petition for Review at 3.

The principal problem we have with this argument is that Beazer does not provide any citations to the permit or the record to support its belief that there is a permit term obligating it to monitor "hazardous waste constituents," as opposed to monitoring "hazardous constituents." Our own examination of the permit fails to disclose any use of the term "hazardous waste constituents," but it does disclose numerous instances where the permit employs the term "hazardous constituents." ⁶ In addition, we fail to see how use of the latter term is in any way objectionable. It is clear that the Agency has the authority under section 3004(u) of RCRA to regulate releases of hazardous constituents from any solid waste management unit at Beazer's facility. In interpreting section 3004(u), which authorizes the Agency to regulate "all releases of hazardous waste or constituents from any solid waste management unit," the Agency has relied upon the legislature history of RCRA in arriving at the determination that these so-called "hazardous

⁶ In addition to obligating Beazer to comply with the various terms and conditions explicitly set forth in the permit, the permit also states that Beazer must comply with various regulations, specifically, 40 CFR Parts 260 through 264, 266, 268, 270, and 124. We have not combed every single word in these regulations to discover whether the term "hazardous waste constituents" is ever used, but we do note that one of the principal provisions governing monitoring uses the term "hazardous constituents." See 40 CFR §264.97 ("General ground-water monitoring requirements"). Although not mentioned in the permit, the Agency's proposed "Subpart S" regulations, which represent the Agency's most recent, comprehensive statement on corrective action under RCRA Section 3004(u), see *In re General Electric Company*, RCRA Appeal No. 91-7, at 17, n. 9 (EAB, November 6, 1992), similarly appears to employ the "hazardous constituent" terminology, rather than the term "hazardous waste constituents." See 55 Fed. Reg. 30,798 *et seq.* (July 27, 1990).

BEAZER EAST, INC. AND
KOPPERS INDUSTRIES, INC.

constituents" should be defined by reference to Appendix VIII of 40 CFR Part 261.⁷

The term "hazardous constituent" as used in this section is intended to mean those constituents listed in Appendix VIII to 40 CFR Part 261 [H.R. Rep. No. 198, 98th Cong., 1st Sess., part 1, 60-61(1983)] and includes hazardous constituents released from solid waste and hazardous constituents that are reaction byproducts. S. Rep. No. 98-284, 98th Cong., 1st Sess. 32 (1983).

50 Fed. Reg. 28713 (July 15, 1985) (brackets in original); *see also* RCRA §3004(u), 42 U.S.C. §6924(u); 40 C.F.R. §264.101; *In re Owen Electric Steel Company of South Carolina*, RCRA Appeal No. 89-37, at 6-7 (Adm'r, Feb. 28, 1992) (upholding the Region's legal authority to require a permittee to report releases of hazardous constituents from SWMUs). As used in the permit, the term "hazardous constituents" has a discrete meaning: it is defined as "substances" listed in Appendix VIII to 40 C.F.R. Part 261. *See* Permit Condition I.G.2. The Agency has previously upheld a corrective action permit's monitoring provision that required monitoring of Appendix VIII hazardous constituents. *In re Hoechst Celanese Corporation*, RCRA Appeal No. 87-13 (Adm'r, Feb. 28, 1989). Beazer has not explained how an obligation to report releases of these substances would result in it being required to report releases of constituents not falling within the lawful scope of its monitoring responsibilities under the permit. Nor has Beazer shown that the permit is defective in any respect for employing the term "hazardous constituents." It is a defined term in both the permit and the regulations. We therefore reject Beazer's contention that the term "hazardous constituents" in the reporting provisions of the permit

⁷ Appendix VIII, which is denominated "Hazardous Constituents," consists of a list of substances that have been shown "to have toxic, carcinogenic, mutagenic or teratogenic effects on humans or other life forms." 40 C.F.R. §261.11(a)(3). Appendix VIII was first published on May 19, 1980, prior to the enactment of section 3004(u) of RCRA in 1984. *See* 45 Fed. Reg. 33066, 33132-33 (May 19, 1980). At that time, Appendix VIII served as one of several criteria used by the Agency to identify and list hazardous wastes. *Id.* at 33121 (codified at 40 CFR §261.11(a)(3)). Appendix VIII currently serves that same function, *see* 40 CFR §261.11(a)(3) (1992), as well the additional function of defining hazardous constituents for purposes of section 3004(u) of RCRA.

should be modified in any respect. Accordingly, the Region has not overstepped its bounds. Review of this issue is denied.

3. *RFI and CMS Minimum Requirements*

Beazer objects to Permit Conditions II.E.1.c. and II.G.1.b., which require, *inter alia*, that the RFI Workplan and the CMS Plan meet the requirements of permit Appendices B (RCRA RFI Workplan Outline) and C (CMS Plan Outline) respectively. Specifically, Beazer contends that these documents are intended as guidelines for preparing RFI and CMS workplans and "should not be given inflated importance by referring to them as 'requirements'." Apparently, Beazer is concerned that by referring to these provisions as "requirements," the Region will apply them in an overly rigid manner without adequate regard for site-specific considerations. See Comments on Draft Permit at 4 (Exh. A to Petition for Review) (stating that the term "requirements" "appears to be too rigid").

We agree that corrective action requirements must not be so rigid as to ignore site-specific conditions at a facility. See *In re General Motors Corporation*, RCRA Consolidated Appeal Nos. 90-24, 90-25, at 10 (EAB, November 6, 1992) ("[T]o the extent practicable[,] corrective action requirements must be tailored to site-specific conditions at the facility."). In the present case, however, the Region points out that the permit allows Beazer to deviate from the corrective action requirements in appropriate circumstances. That is, although the disputed permit conditions refer to Appendices B and C as "requirements," both conditions provide that the Regional Administrator may allow omissions or deviations where the permittee provides sufficient written justification. Thus, the permit allows both the RFI Workplan and CMS plan to be tailored to the facility based on site-specific considerations. Beazer's concerns regarding the rigidity of the disputed permit conditions are therefore exaggerated and do not warrant further review.⁸

⁸ Beazer also states in its petition for review that "[b]ecause EPA is asserting that these two guidelines represent minimum requirements for the RFI and CMS workplans respectively and because no statutory or regulatory authority exists supporting this assertion, these conditions of the Permit are arbitrary, and capricious and represent an

(continued...)

BEAZER EAST, INC. AND
KOPPERS INDUSTRIES, INC.

4. *Final RFI Report Deadline*

Beazer objects to that portion of Permit Condition II.E.3.b. which requires Beazer to submit to the Regional Administrator (RA) a final RFI report within 30 days of receiving the RA's comments on the draft RFI report. Beazer contends that because the extent of the RA's comments on the draft report are unknown, the possibility exists that 30 days may not provide enough time to submit the final report. Beazer does not point to any evidence in the record, however, to suggest that Beazer will be unable to meet the 30-day deadline. Beazer's concerns are thus purely speculative. Review is therefore denied.⁹ See *In re Hytek Finishes Co.*, RCRA Appeal No. 88-45, at 2 (Adm'r, January 13, 1989) (Agency administrative appeal procedure should not be used to pursue speculative concerns).

⁸(...continued)

abuse of discretion." Petition for Review at 4. This objection, however, is so conclusory as to preclude meaningful review. That is, Beazer fails to explain exactly why it believes the disputed permit provisions exceed the Region's statutory or regulatory authority and we find nothing in the record on appeal that sheds additional light on the substance of its argument. In Beazer's comments on the draft permit, Beazer stated:

[Permit Condition II.E.1.c] refers to the "requirements" and "minimum requirements" of Appendix B. This language appears to be too rigid. It is our understanding that Appendix B parallels a model document which was originally intended to address most potential situations encountered during a RFI. As such, we agree with the use of Appendix B as a guideline, and are in agreement with the stipulation that deviations or omissions should be justified and approved. This same comment applies to the requirements of the CMS Plan, * * *.

Comments on Draft Permit at 4. Thus, Beazer concedes that this condition is appropriate at least where the permit allows deviations in appropriate circumstances. That is the case here. Beazer's request for review on this basis is also denied.

⁹ Region IV has stated that Beazer may request a modification of the permit should it become clear that additional time will be required. Region's Response to Comments on the Draft Permit at 7 (Exh. C to Region IV's Response). Because the Region is presumably aware that the amount of time required for it to process certain types of modification requests may exceed 30-days, we assume that the Region will not seek to penalize Beazer for a late submission of the final RFI report if it has previously made a timely and good faith modification request seeking an extension of time to file the final report.

5. *Duplicative Corrective Action Requirements*

Beazer contends that the permit's corrective action requirements improperly duplicate similar requirements imposed by the State of Kentucky pursuant to an Agreed Order (dated June 25, 1987) ¹⁰ signed by the Koppers Company and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet (Cabinet), and a Corrective Action Order (dated March 15, 1991) ¹¹ issued by the Cabinet. According to Beazer, the permit requires the permittee "to duplicate work that has already been done under the State's purview, especially with regard to the submission of RFI workplans and Confirmatory Sampling workplans for units that have already been fully characterized." Petition for Review at 5. Beazer also argues that the Region has failed to coordinate the permit's corrective action requirements with efforts already undertaken in cooperation with the State.

As the Board stated in *General Motors, supra*, where a permittee has already initiated remediation efforts, corrective action requirements should reflect sufficient site-specificity to avoid imposing duplicative and unnecessary requirements on the permittee. *Id.* at 8. In *General Motors*, Region V had imposed corrective action requirements even though the permittee was already engaged in ongoing remediation efforts with the approval of State and local officials. We denied review, however, because the Region had agreed to consider all data generated by the permittee through prior investigations and to allow the use of these data (where appropriate) to satisfy the permit's corrective action requirements. *Id.* at 9. Thus, any unnecessary duplication would be avoided.

Similarly, in the present case, the Region has stated that Beazer may:

rely on and incorporate into the RFI Workplan or
Confirmatory Sampling Workplan any investigations or

¹⁰ Exh. E to Region IV's Response.

¹¹ Exh. F to Region IV's Response.

BEAZER EAST, INC. AND
KOPPERS INDUSTRIES, INC.

other work performed to date. * * * Based on the information submitted with the workplans, the Agency may determine that a deletion of a unit from either of the workplans is warranted, or the Agency may limit the scope of work required under the workplans. The Agency will then require implementation of the RFI/Confirmatory Sampling in accordance with the approved workplans. In this way, *the Agency will take full advantage of the Permittees' prior efforts.*

Region's Response at 6 (emphasis added). The Region also states that, in accordance with a Memorandum of Agreement with the Kentucky Department of Environmental Protection, it will work closely with the Department to coordinate the State program with the federal HSWA program and to minimize duplication of work at the site. *Id.* Given the Region's willingness to take advantage of Beazer's prior efforts and to consider the data generated to date in determining whether Beazer has satisfied the permit's corrective action requirements, we see no reason to grant review. *See General Motors, supra*, at 9.

6. Sampling and Investigation Requirements

Beazer objects to the requirement that it conduct an RFI or perform confirmatory sampling at several of the facility's SWMUs and areas of concern (AOCs). Specifically, Beazer contends that an RFI is unnecessary at the following areas: the tram draw out track, the drip track area, the collection sump, the swampy area, the North and South land farm areas, the oil and lubricant storage building, the product storage areas, and the old lagoon and surface impoundment areas. As to the confirmatory sampling requirement, Beazer contends that there are several areas where it is unnecessary: the surge tank area, the surge tank collection sump and preheat tank, the basement sump, the primary separator, and the storage tank area.

With regard to most of these areas ¹² Beazer argues that the work conducted and the data gathered to date render the RFI or confirmatory sampling requirements duplicative and therefore unnecessary. As the Region has stated, however, any information obtained from prior or ongoing remediation at these areas may be incorporated into the RFI or submitted for review with the Confirmatory Sampling Workplan. See Region's Response at 7-10 (noting that the permittee should submit for review any information obtained through prior studies or removal activities in order to minimize duplication of work); Region's Response to Comments on the Draft Permit at 9 (Exh. C to Region IV's Response) ("[A]ny information gained from earlier studies * * * can and should be submitted for review as *part* of the HSWA required RFI or Confirmatory Sampling Workplans.") (emphasis in original). The Region will therefore consider Beazer's prior remediation efforts and determine whether they are sufficient to satisfy the permit's corrective action requirements. The Region has also indicated that, to the extent possible, it will coordinate the federal corrective action requirements with those of the State. See Region's Response to Comments at 8. We therefore reject Beazer's assertion that the HSWA permit will require unnecessary duplication of effort. See *General Motors, supra*, at 9 (denying review based on the Region's willingness to consider data gathered from prior remediation).

The remaining areas consist of the product storage area, the basement sump, and the storage tank area. As to the product storage area, Beazer objects to the requirement that it perform an RFI because this site "is not a source of constituents contributing to the general environmental condition at the Guthrie facility * * *." Petition for Review at 8. Beazer provides no support for this assertion. Moreover, the record on appeal indicates that stained soil was observed in several locations surrounding the product storage area during the visual site inspection (VSI). See Interim RCRA Facility Assessment Report at III-6, C-10 (Exh. H to Region IV's Response). Based on such observations, the Facility Assessment Report concludes that there is a high potential

¹² The areas include the tram draw out track, the drip track area, the collection sump, the swampy area, the north and south land farm areas, the oil and lubricant storage building, the surge tank area, the surge tank collection sump and preheat tank, the primary separator, and the old lagoon and old surface impoundment areas.

BEAZER EAST, INC. AND
KOPPERS INDUSTRIES, INC.

for a release of creosote in the product storage area. *Id.* at III-6. Given these findings (which Beazer does not dispute), we reject Beazer's assertion that the permit improperly requires that an RFI be performed at this site.

As to the basement sump area, Beazer objects to the permit requirement that confirmatory sampling be performed there because this area has already been extensively cleaned and is maintained in a "dry" state. As stated above, however, the Region has agreed to consider any information obtained from prior remediation efforts. Thus, if Beazer's remediation efforts have been as extensive as it alleges, its future obligations should not be substantial. In addition, as the Region states in its Response, whether or not the basement sump area is currently maintained in a "dry" state is irrelevant to whether contamination remains from past releases. Region's Response at 10. We therefore find nothing unreasonable in the permit's confirmatory sampling requirement for this area.¹³

Finally, the storage tank area is also subject to a confirmatory sampling requirement to which Beazer objects. Beazer contends that the tank has been out of service for many years and is scheduled to be cleaned out. Beazer also states that "[t]here are no plans to use the tank for future storage of wood treating chemicals." Petition for Review at 10. As the Facility Assessment Report indicates, however, this area consists of an above ground tank used to store creosote, and "[s]tained soil was observed around the tank during the VSI."¹⁴ Facility Assessment Report, *supra*, at C-4. The Region therefore determined that confirmatory sampling was required in order to assess the extent of any releases into the surrounding soil (if any). Beazer has failed to convince us that there is anything unreasonable about this determination.

¹³ We note that according to the Facility Assessment Report, Beazer's duty to conduct soil sampling and analysis at the basement sump does not arise unless there is a negative report on the structural integrity of the unit itself. See Facility Assessment Report at III-3 (Exh. H to Region IV's Response). Moreover, although the permit includes this unit on a list of SWMUs requiring confirmatory sampling, the permit only requires that integrity testing be performed. See Permit Appendix A.3. (Exh. A to Region IV's Response).

¹⁴ Beazer does not dispute this finding.

7. Administrative Review of Permit Modifications

Permit Condition II.I.2. bars administrative appeals from modifications to the corrective action schedule of compliance that are initiated by the Regional Administrator. ¹⁵ Beazer contends that the

¹⁵ This provision provides:

Modifications [to the corrective action schedule of compliance] that are initiated and finalized by the Regional Administrator according to proper procedure, as outlined in appendix E, shall not be subject to administrative appeal.

Appendix E (Modification of the Corrective Action Schedule of Compliance) provides, in part:

I. If at any time the Regional Administrator determines that modifications of the Corrective Action Schedule of Compliance is necessary, he or she may initiate a modification to the Schedule of Compliance according to this procedure. If the Regional Administrator initiates a modification, he or she shall:

A. Notify the Permittee in writing of the proposed modification and the date by which comments on the proposed modification must be received; and

B. Publish a notice of the proposed modification in a locally distributed newspaper, mail a notice to all persons on the facility mailing list * * * and place a notice in the facility's information repository * * *.

1. If the Regional Administrator receives no written comment on the proposed modification, the modification shall become effective five (5) calendar days after the close of the comment period.

2. If the Regional Administrator receives written comment on the proposed modification, the Regional Administrator shall make a final determination concerning the modification after the end of the comment period.

C. Notify the Permittee in writing of the final decision.

(continued...)

BEAZER EAST, INC. AND
KOPPERS INDUSTRIES, INC.

Region lacks the authority to include such a provision.¹⁶ For the following reasons, we agree that the Region lacks the regulatory authority to include this abbreviated procedure in the permit.

In *General Motors, supra*, the Board addressed an objection to a virtually identical permit modification provision. In that case, as here, the abbreviated permit modification procedure allowed the Regional Administrator to modify the schedule of compliance without providing an opportunity for administrative appeal. *Id.* at 15-16. As the Board stated in that case:

[T]he permit's abbreviated modification procedure represents a change in existing regulatory requirements set forth in 40 C.F.R. §270.41. Because this procedure has not been adopted by regulation, the Region must remove [it] from the permit * * *.

General Motors, supra, at 17. We find no substantive difference between the abbreviated modification procedure in *General Motors* and the one in the present case. Accordingly, the permit is remanded and the Region is directed to remove Appendix E from the permit and revise Permit Condition II.I.2. to specify that Agency-initiated

¹⁵(...continued)

1. If no written comment was received, the Regional Administrator shall notify individuals on the facility mailing list in writing that the modification has become effective * * *.

2. If written comment was received, the Regional Administrator shall provide notice of the final modification decision in a locally distributed newspaper * * *.

II. Modifications that are initiated and finalized by the Regional Administrator according to this procedure shall not be subject to administrative appeal.

¹⁶ Beazer argues that the Region lacks both the statutory and regulatory authority to bar administrative appeals from Agency-initiated modifications to the schedule of compliance. Because we conclude that the Region lacks the regulatory authority to include this permit provision, we do not reach the question of whether the Region also lacks statutory authority.

modifications to the schedule of compliance must proceed in accordance with 40 C.F.R. §270.41.¹⁷ *Id.*

III. CONCLUSION

The permit is remanded and the Region is directed to reopen the permit proceedings for the limited purpose mentioned above.¹⁸ Appeal of the remand decision will not be required to exhaust administrative remedies under 40 C.F.R. §124.19(f)(1)(iii). On the

¹⁷ The Region incorrectly relies on the following language in *In re United Technologies Corporation Pratt & Whitney Group*, RCRA Appeal No. 88-34, at 3-4 (Adm'r, Feb. 12, 1990), to support the inclusion of the abbreviated modification procedure:

[T]he permit properly gives to the Region final authority to make various interim decisions during the corrective action process, with the ultimate corrective measures to be added to the permit through a major modification (which will afford Petitioner an opportunity for administrative review at that time). * * * Allowing an administrative appeal from such interim decisions and approvals would lead to unnecessary and undesirable delays in the corrective action process. If petitioner is dissatisfied with an interim decision by the Region, it is free to pursue any available opportunities for judicial review.

United Technologies upholds the Region's authority to make certain "interim decisions and approvals" during the corrective action process. When read in context, the reference to the non-appealability of "such interim decisions and approvals" properly refers to interim decisions that do not constitute permit modifications for the purpose of 40 C.F.R. §270.41. In the present case, the disputed permit provisions explicitly allow the Region to revise the permit's existing schedule of compliance without complying with 40 C.F.R. §270.41. Such revisions are clearly permit modifications, not "interim decisions and approvals," and must therefore be adopted through existing regulatory procedures. The Region's reliance on *United Technologies* is therefore misplaced.

¹⁸ Although 40 C.F.R. §124.19 contemplates that additional briefing typically will be submitted upon a grant of a petition for review, a direct remand without additional submissions is appropriate where, as here, it does not appear as though further briefs on appeal would shed light on the issues addressed on remand. See, e.g., *In re GSX Services of South Carolina, Inc.*, RCRA Appeal No. 89-22, at 20 (EAB, December 29, 1992).

BEAZER EAST, INC. AND
KOPPERS INDUSTRIES, INC.

other issues raised by Beazer, review is denied for the reasons set forth above.¹⁹

So ordered.²⁰

¹⁹ In its Petition for Review, Beazer also objected to certain language in Permit Condition II.D.1. and to the listing of the treatment cylinders, heated storage tanks, and the dehydrator as areas of concern. These issues have subsequently been resolved by the parties and are not addressed in this Order. See Letter from Monica Gambino to Suzanne Gale Rubini, Assistant Regional Counsel (December 12, 1991) (Exh. D to Region IV's Response).

²⁰ Beazer has requested that the Board stay the disputed permit provisions pending judicial review. Because we find no basis upon which to issue such a stay, however, Beazer's request is denied.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the forgoing Order Denying Review in Part and Remanding in Part in the matter of Beazer East, Inc. and Koppers Industries, Inc., RCRA Appeal No. 91-25, were sent to the following persons in the manner indicated:

First Class Mail,
Postage Prepaid:

Suzanne Gale Rubini
Assistant Regional Counsel
U.S. EPA, Region IV
345 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30365

Donald C. Bluedorn, II
Babst, Calland, Clements
& Zomnir, P.C.
Two Gateway Center
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Arthur Williams
Woodward, Hobson & Fulton
2500 First National Tower
101 South Fifth Street
Louisville, KY 40202

Billie S. Flaherty
Beazer East, Inc.
436 Seventh Ave.
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Dated: MAR 18 1993


Mildred T. Connelly
Secretary