$\xi_{s}$孚


EPA's cost analysis is based on costing functions and/or unit costs for on- and off-site treatment and disposal costs and for on-site storage of recyclable materials. To develop the cost functions, EPA identified all of the treatment and disposal permutations that are available in the various baseline-Option scenarios. Similarly, EPA identified all of the possible storage practices available under any of the assumed baseline practices and regulatory options considered. The costing functions were developed by estimating costs for facilities of different sizes and curve-fitting these individual facility costs. For some equipment associated with disposal and storage practices, the Agency has used rental costs rather than purchase costs, irrespective of the quantities of material involved. EPA recognizes the likelihood that mineral processing facilities actually own this equipment, such as front end loaders and dump trucks. To be conservative, however, the Agency included rental costs as a simple way to account for the use of this equipment.

The cost functions and associated assumptions are presented in the following seven sections:

| a. | Annualization of Before-Tax Compliance Costs |
| :--- | :--- |
| b. | On-site Treatment and Disposal Costs |
| c. | Off-site Treatment and Disposal Costs |
| d. | Storage of Solid Materials |
| e. | Storage Of Liquid Materials |
| f. | Curve-fit Cost functions |
| g. | Costs of Groundwater Monitoring |

## D. 1 Annualization of Before-Tax Compliance Costs

Under Executive Order 12866, EPA must determine whether a regulation constitutes a "significant regulatory action." One criterion for defining a significant regulatory action, as defined under the Executive Order, is if the rule has an annual effect on the economy of $\$ 100$ million or more. To determine whether a rule is a significant regulatory action under this criterion, all costs are annualized on a before-tax basis assuming a seven percent real rate of return and a 20 -year operating life. The savings attributable to corporate tax deductions or depreciation on capital expenditures for pollution control equipment are not considered in calculating before-tax costs.

Annual before-tax compliance costs were determined for on-site treatment, disposal, and storage. Before-tax compliance costs were used because they represent a resource cost of the rule, measured before any business expense tax deductions available to affected companies. Also, as described in section 3.2.2 of this RIA, screening level economic impacts are computed based upon other pre-tax indications or financial wherewithal, such as value of shipments and value added. Accordingly, computing management and compliance costs on a pre-tax basis provides a consistent measure of impacts on all affected facilities, and is the method used throughout this RIA. In reformulating the costs of compliance, EPA used a public sector discount rate of seven percent and assumed a 20-year operating life for annualizing capital costs.

The following formula was used to determine the before-tax annualized costs:

| Before-Tax Costs $=$ | $($ Capital Costs $)($ CRF $)+($ Annual Capital + O\&M Costs $)+($ Closure <br> Costs $)^{*}(\mathrm{CRF}) /\left(1.07^{21}\right)$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| Where: CRF $=\quad$Capital recovery factor based on a 7 percent real rate of return (i) as <br> follows: |  |
|  | $\frac{(1+\mathrm{i})^{\mathrm{n}(\mathrm{i})}}{(1+\mathrm{i})^{\mathrm{n}}-1}=0.09439 \quad$ where $\mathrm{n}=20$ |

## D. 2 On-site Treatment and Disposal

## Neutralization and Precipitation of Acidic and Caustic Liquid Wastes

Neutralization is the process of adjusting either acidic or caustic liquid waste streams to a pH of approximately seven. Many manufacturing and processing operations produce effluents that are acidic or alkaline (caustic) in nature. Neutralization of acidic or caustic waste streams is necessary in a variety of situations: (1) to prevent metal corrosion and/or damage to other construction materials; (2) as a preliminary treatment for optimum operation of subsequent waste treatment processes; and (3) to provide neutral water for recycling, either as process water or as boiler feed. Treatment to adjust pH also may be desirable to break emulsions, to precipitate certain chemical species, or to control chemical reaction rates (e.g., chlorination). Precipitation, which may occur as a result of the addition of neutralization reagents, or which may require additional reagents, is necessary to remove dissolved solids, such as toxicity characteristic metals from solutions. Corrosive waste streams are neutralized by the addition of an alkaline material, such as lime. Caustic waste streams are neutralized by the addition of an acidic material, such as sulfuric acid. Additional reagent will cause precipitation of dissolved metals. The assumptions described in the following subsections were used in preparing cost estimates, with one exception: batch runs were assumed for 3,510 metric tons per year ( $\mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ ) and $350 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$, adjusting the operating hours per year to 876 and 88 , respectively, while 1,752 hours per year was assumed for waste flow rates of $35,130 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ to $350,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$.

## Capital Costs - Neutralization

The following assumptions were used in developing the direct capital cost equations for neutralization in Exhibit D-1:

- Stainless steel neutralization reactor (1) - $1 / 2$-hour retention time, $5 \%$ over design (based on waste and calcium hydroxide or sulfuric acid solution flows);
- $\quad$ Stainless steel mix tank (1) - two-hour retention time, $5 \%$ over design (based on $10 \%$ calcium hydroxide or $20 \%$ sulfuric acid solution flows);
- Piping, electrical, and instrumentation; and
- Neutralization is performed in <90 day accumulation treatment tanks (40 CFR 262.34); therefore, a RCRA permit is not required.


## Acidic Waste Only

- Carbon steel holding tank (1) - two-hour retention time, $5 \%$ over design (based on $10 \%$ calcium hydroxide solution flow);
- Carbon steel centrifugal pumps (3) - for the calcium hydroxide solution out of the mix tank and out of the holding tank, and for the waste flow into the reactor;
- $\quad$ Stainless steel centrifugal pump (1) - for the waste flow into the reactor;
- Cast iron agitators (2) - for the mix tank and the holding tank; and
- $\quad$ Stainless steel agitator (1) - for the reactor.


## Caustic Waste Only

- $\quad$ Stainless steel pump (1) - for sulfuric acid flow out of the mix tank;
- Carbon steel pumps (2) - for the waste flow into and out of the neutralization reactor; and
- $\quad$ Stainless steel agitators (2) - for the sulfuric acid mix tank and the neutralization reactor.

Capital costs are similar for either type of waste due to the use of a high cost stainless steel reactor in both designs.

## Operation and Maintenance Costs - Neutralization

The following assumptions were used in development of the O\&M cost equations for neutralization in Exhibit D-1:

- Operating hours - 90 percent operating factor (i.e., 330 days/year);
- Labor - one operator at 20 percent time for continuous systems, or $1 / 2$ hour of labor per batch;
- Power - electricity for pumps and agitators; and
- Materials - waste pH was assumed to be 1.0 (acidic wastes) and 13.0 (caustic wastes) and waste specific gravity was assumed to be 1.03 . Material quantities calculated from the stoichiometric addition of 0.033 gallon of $10 \%$ calcium hydroxide or 0.022 gallon of $20 \%$ sulfuric acid solution needed per gallon of waste.

O\&M costs are similar for either acidic or alkaline waste due to roughly equal neutralizing material costs.

## EXHIBIT D-1

## COST EQUATIONS FOR ON-SITE NEUTRALIZATION AND PRECIPITATION OF PHASE IV WASTES (1995 \$)

## Neutralization

Capital Costs $(350 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 370,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr})^{1}$
O\&M Costs / Yr ( $350 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 370,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ )

## Precipitation

Capital Costs $(350 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 370,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr})^{2}$
O\&M Costs / Yr $(350 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 370,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr})$

## Closure

Closure Costs ( Q < 37,910 mt/yr)
Closure Costs $(37,910 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 370,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr})$

Note:
For quantities above the upper limit of the cost equations, a second system is required.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{Q}=$ Annual quantity of acidic or caustic waste managed ( $\mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ ). Capital and O\&M equations apply to either type of waste (similar costs due to use of high cost stainless steel reactor in both designs and roughly equal neutralizing material costs). Fifteen percent of the waste stream neutralized and precipitated will need to be treated by stabilization due to sludge formation (see cost equations for Case A in Exhibit D-2 and use 0.15 * Q).

## Performance Assumptions

The following performance goals were assumed for neutralization:

- Neutralized waste exits with a pH of approximately seven;
- Solid residuals are generated, with half of inlet total suspended solids (TSS) level of 3.0\% assumed to settle and form a sludge with $10 \%$ solids content. Therefore, $15 \%$ of the original waste stream will leave the neutralization step as hazardous sludge, due to
precipitation of a portion of the 500 ppm TC-metals assumed to be in the inlet waste stream--this sludge will require dewatering, stabilization, and disposal; and
- The quantity of calcium hydroxide or sulfuric acid solutions added to the waste streams results in minimal flow changes.


## Closure Costs

Cost equations for closure of the neutralization tanks and associated equipment are listed in Exhibit D-1 and include the following components:

- Decontamination of tank interiors, pumps, and liners;
- Management and off-site disposal of decontamination residuals as hazardous waste;
- Testing rinsate to demonstrate tanks and equipment are successfully decontaminated; and
- Certification of closure by a professional engineer.


## Precipitation

EPA has assumed that in some cases, precipitation will require more reagent than used for neutralization, though these reagents will be added to the same reactor vessel. To account for this possibility, the Agency has determined that the capital cost for precipitation will consist of the cost of a small reagent holding tank, assumed to be 10 percent of the capital cost equation. $\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M}$ costs will consist of doubling the original reagent cost.

## Surge Capacity

EPA also has assumed that a seven day surge tank is needed. The cost of this tank was developed along with that of other storage tanks, and is presented below in section 5 .

## On-Site Dewatering and Stabilization

Chemical stabilization/fixation, which consists of cement solidification and pozzolonic (lime-fly ash) solidification, is used to solidify organic and inorganic sludges. It also may be used to reduce the leachability of solid residues by first dissolving the materials and subsequently precipitating and fixing the dissolved solids. This technology adds cement and water to hazardous sludges to form a rock-like material that binds waste constituents in a solidified matrix. The process improves the physical characteristics of the waste by increasing its strength and reducing the leachability of contaminants after the solidified waste is land disposed. Cement solidification is particularly successful with sludges generated by the precipitation of heavy metals because the high pH of the cement mixture tends to keep the metals in the form of insoluble hydrated oxides, hydroxides, or carbonates. There is probably no lower limit on the solids content of sludges handled by cement solidification, although dewatering is advantageous as a volume reduction measure.
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The stabilization process requires storage tanks and weighing equipment for both cement and the hazardous waste, a concrete mixer, and a loading hopper. Waste streams and cement are pumped from storage tanks to their respective weigh batchers, where the proper ratio for cement fixation is obtained. The two materials are then discharged from the weigh batchers to a concrete mixer. The proper amount of water is added to the two materials in the mixer, which then produces a homogeneous mixture. The mixture is discharged into a loading hopper, which may be transported by truck to a landfill site for disposal.

The assumptions described in the following subsections were used in generating cost equations for on-site dewatering and stabilization.

## Capital Costs

The following assumptions were used in development of the direct capital cost equations for dewatering and stabilization presented in Exhibit D-2:

- Stabilization direct capital costs include the purchase costs for storage bins, weigh batchers, a concrete mixer, a loading hopper, instruments, controls, and pumps;
- The dewatering direct capital cost includes a scroll centrifuge;
- Installation charges were estimated at $15 \%$ of the equipment purchase costs;
- Storage tanks have a maximum capacity to store waste and cement for five days. The system is run as a batch processing operation. Waste rates considered range from $350 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ to $370,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$; and
- Stabilization is performed in a <90 day accumulation treatment tank (40 CFR 262.34); therefore, a RCRA permit is not required.


## Operation and Maintenance Costs

The following assumptions were used in the development of the O\&M cost equations for stabilization in Exhibit D-2:

- Direct operation and maintenance costs consist of operating labor, electricity, and cement and water consumption;
- The cement mixer has a minimum retention time of 15 minutes;
- Operating hours--90\% operating factor (i.e., 330 days/year);


## EXHIBIT D-2 <br> COST EQUATIONS FOR ON-SITE DEWATERING AND STABILIZATION OF PHASE IV WASTES (1995 \$)

Case A - Dewatering of 1-10\% Solids-Containing Wastes
Capital Costs $(350 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 370,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr})^{1} \quad \operatorname{Cost}(\$)=95,354+664.48 \mathrm{Q}^{5}$
O\&M Costs / Yr $(350 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 370,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr})$

$$
\operatorname{Cost}(\$)=12,219+286.86 \mathrm{Q}^{5}
$$

Case B - Stabilization Only of $>10 \%$ ( $35 \%$ average) Solids-Containing Wastes

Capital Costs ( $425 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 200,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ )
O\&M Costs / $\mathrm{Yr}(425 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 200,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr})$

## Closure Costs

Closure Costs ( $350 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 200,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ )
${ }^{1} \mathrm{Q}=$ Annual quantity of waste managed ( $\mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ )

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Cost}(\$)=207.93 \mathrm{Q}^{.78} \\
& \operatorname{Cost}(\$)=87,839+52.16 \mathrm{Q}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\operatorname{Cost}(\$)=9,806+0.19 \mathrm{Q}
$$

- The dewatered sludge (Case A) has a specific gravity of 1.03 , while wastes with greater than 10 percent solids (Case B) have a specific gravity of 1.25 ;
- The Case A mixing ratio for fixation is $0.05: 0.50: 1.00$ (water : cement : waste) by weight. The mixing ratio assumes that the stabilized waste quantity is approximately equal to $9 \%$ of the initial sludge amount prior to being dewatered to a sludge consisting of $60 \%$ solids and specific gravity of 1.56 ; and
- $\quad$ The Case B mixing ratio for fixation is $0.05: 0.70: 1.00$ (water : cement : waste) by weight. The mixing ratio assumes that the stabilized waste quantity is equal to $100 \%$ of the initial sludge amount with a solids content of $35 \%$ and sludge specific gravity of 1.25 .


## Performance Assumptions

The following performance goals were assumed for stabilization:

- The subsequent leaching of hazardous constituents from land disposal of a stabilized waste is reduced by approximately two orders of magnitude; and
- The amount of solidified waste disposed of in a landfill is 1.55 (Case A) and 1.75 (Case B) times the quantity, on a weight basis, of the waste generated.


## Closure Costs

Cost equations for closure of the stabilization tanks and associated equipment are listed in Exhibit D-2 and include the following components:

- Decontamination of tank interiors, pumps, and lines;
- Management and off-site disposal of decontamination residuals as hazardous waste;
- Testing rinsate to demonstrate tanks and equipment are successfully decontaminated; and
- Certification of closure by a professional engineer.


## On-site Subtitle C Landfill

## Initial Capital Costs and Assumptions

The landfill design assumes a 20 -year operating life with one new cell opened per year ( 20 cells for 20 -year operating life). The following assumptions were used in the development of the initial capital cost equation for landfill operations in Exhibit D-3:

- Land, which includes 5 meters between cells, 15 meters between the cells and the edge of the active area, and a 46 -meter buffer around the 20 cell area;
- $\quad$ Site preparation, which includes clearing the 20 -cell area and the 21 meters around the 20cell area of vegetation;
- Gravel roads within the active area;
- A 50-foot x 35 -foot concrete pad for unloading waste and truck cleaning;
- Warning, stop, and directional signs;
- A maintenance building for equipment repair;
- Utilities site work that includes the installation of electricity, a septic system, a domestic well, a gas line to propane tank, and a telephone at the site;
- An earthen berm around the 20-cell active area for surface water control;
- A package leachate treatment system;
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## EXHIBIT D-3

## COST EQUATIONS FOR ON-SITE SUBTITLE C LANDFILLS PHASE IV WASTES (1995 \$)

Capital Costs ( $\mathrm{Q} \geq 1,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ )<br>$$
\operatorname{Cost}(\$)=83,378+23,422 \mathrm{Q}^{0.5}
$$<br>Annual Capital Costs ( $\mathrm{Q} \geq 1,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ )<br>$$
\operatorname{Cost}(\$)=3,137 \mathrm{Q}^{0.64}
$$<br>O\&M Costs / Yr (Q $\geq 1,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr})$<br>$$
\operatorname{Cost}(\$)=114,223+1,737 \mathrm{Q}^{0.5}
$$<br>Closure Costs ( $\mathrm{Q} \geq 1,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ )<br>$$
\operatorname{Cost}(\$)=1,829 \mathrm{Q}^{0.57}
$$<br>Post-Closure Costs / Yr ( $\mathrm{Q} \geq 1,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ )<br>$$
\operatorname{Cost}(\$)=1,523 \mathrm{Q}^{0.50}
$$<br>Cover Replacement Costs / Yr ( $\mathrm{Q} \geq 1,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ )<br>$\operatorname{Cost}(\$)=3,502 \mathrm{Q}^{0.59}$

Note: $\mathrm{Q}=$ Annual quantity of waste managed ( $\mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$ ) ranging from 1,000 to 150,000 MT/yr.

- A groundwater monitoring system that includes six upgradient wells (three shallow wells to provide a horizontal profile of groundwater composition and one cluster of three wells at different depths near one another to provide a vertical profile of groundwater composition) and a minimum of nine downgradient wells (three three-well clusters with the wells in each cluster at different depths). For facilities with an active area side dimension greater than 300 ft , the unit would have the minimum three three-well cluster for the first 300 ft , plus one cluster of three wells for every additional 150 ft .;
- Portable submersible pumps for cell dewatering and leachate removal if sump pump fails;
- Heavy equipment, which includes dozers, landfill compactors, scrapers, and utility trucks;
- Construction of the first cell with the following containment system design in descending order starting with the layer closest to the waste:
- $\quad 0.3$ meter protective soil layer;
- $\quad$ geotextile filter fabric;
- $\quad 0.3$ meter sand layer (LCS);
- $\quad 30$ mil HDPE liner;
- $\quad 0.3$ meter sand layer (LDS);
- $\quad 30 \mathrm{mil}$ HDPE liner; and
- $\quad 0.91$ meter clay layer;
- Wet wells and pumps for the leachate collection system and the leachate detection system;
- RCRA initial costs, which include the following items:
- ID number;
- waste analysis;
- waste analysis plan;
- inspection schedule;
- personnel training;
- alarm and spill equipment;
- arrangement with local land authority;
- contingency plan;
- operating record;
- groundwater monitoring plan;
- background groundwater monitoring;
- closure plan, closure cost estimate, post-closure plan, post-closure cost estimate;
- $\quad$ closure/post-closure financial assurance (obtain mechanism - excludes payments to mechanism);
- $\quad$ liability insurance (obtain mechanism - excludes payments to mechanism);
- $\quad$ Part A permit application; and
- Part B permit application; and
- Fees, which include construction quality assurance (CQA), engineering, construction and inspection, construction and field expenses, contractor's overhead and profit, spare parts inventory, and contingency.


## Annual Capital Costs and Assumptions

Annual capital costs include the construction of one new cell and closure (i.e., final cover) of the previously used cell each year for the operating life (i.e., 19 years). The following assumptions were used in the development of the annual capital cost equation for landfill operations in Exhibit D-3:

- Cell construction consisting of the same containment design as described in the initial capital cost assumptions;
- Construction of each cell's cover with the following cover system design in ascending order starting with the layer closest to the waste:
- $\quad 0.6$ meter clay layer;
- $\quad 30 \mathrm{mil}$ PVC liner;
- $\quad 0.3$ meter sand layer;
- geotextile filter fabric;
- $\quad 0.6$ meter topsoil layer; and
- vegetation; and
- Fees which include CQA, engineering, construction and inspection, contractor's overhead and profit, and contingency.


## Operation and Maintenance Costs and Assumptions

The following assumptions were used in the development of the $\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M}$ cost equation for landfill operations in Exhibit D-3:

- Labor for personnel to operate the landfill, which includes equipment operators, laborers, clerical, a technician, a manager, and an engineer;
- RCRA administrative costs, which include the following items:
- review waste analysis and plan;
- conduct and record inspections;
- training program review for facility personnel;
- review contingency plan;
- maintain operating record;
- review closure/post-closure plan;
- update closure/post-closure cost estimate;
- review closure/post-closure financial assurance mechanism;
- review third party liability mechanism;
- review corrective action schedule; and
- permit renewal (Assumed the Part B permit is renewed every five years.

Averaged the periodic costs out on an annual basis.);
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- Maintenance labor and supplies;
- Leachate treatment;
- Groundwater monitoring semi-annually for the following parameters: pH ; specific conductance; total organic carbon; total organic halogens; metals; and VOC's; and
- Utilities, which include fuel for heavy equipment, electricity for maintenance building and pumps, and heat for maintenance building.


## Closure Costs and Assumptions

The following assumptions were used in the development of the closure cost equation for landfill operations in Exhibit D-3:

- Construction of the final cell's (cell 20) cover consisting of the same cover design described in the annual capital cost assumptions;
- Decontamination by steam cleaning of heavy equipment (dozers, scrapers, compactors, and trucks). Assumed residuals generated at $100 \mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{hr}$ and managed off-site as a hazardous waste (transportation 100 miles one-way and commercial hazardous waste treatment);
- Pumps and lines decontaminated with an alkaline solution. Assumed residuals generated at $500 \mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{pump}$ and managed off-site as a hazardous waste (transportation 100 miles oneway and commercial hazardous waste treatment);
- Certification of closure by an independent registered professional engineer; and
- Fees, which include CQA, engineering, construction and inspection, contractor's overhead and profit, and contingency.


## Post-Closure Costs and Assumptions

The following assumptions were used in the development of the post-closure and cover replacement cost equations for landfill operations in Exhibit D-3:

- Survey plat indicating location and dimension of cells to permanently surveyed benchmarks;
- Waste record submitted to local land authority;
- Note added to property deed stating previous land use;
- Final cover inspected semi-annually;
- Maintenance of final cover (i.e., mow semi-annually and fertilize annually);
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- Reseed, fertilize, mulch, and water $1 / 6$ of entire 20 -cell area every five years;
- Conduct routine erosion damage repair of cover and ditch every five years;
- Exterminate for burrowing rodents every two years;
- Replace the cover on the first five cells during the last five years of post-closure;
- Leachate managed off-site as a hazardous waste (transportation 100 miles one-way and commercial hazardous waste treatment) for all landfill sizes;
- Pumps replaced annually;
- Groundwater monitoring semi-annually for the following parameters: pH ; specific conductance; total organic carbon; total organic halogens; metals; and VOC's;
- Certification of post-closure by an independent registered professional engineer; and
- Fees, which include administration, CQA, engineering, construction inspection testing, construction and field expenses, contractor's overhead and profit on the cover replacement cost, and contingency.


## Disposal of Solid Materials in On-site Subtitle D Piles

The waste pile disposal cost function includes land, a compacted soil base, and the costs of a dump truck to move the material to the pile.

EPA made the following assumptions in assembling these cost functions:

- The purchase cost of land is $\$ 2500$ /acre (from CKD Monofill Model Cost Documentation, 1995);
- The unit does not require a formal liner, though it is assumed that it will need at least a foot of compacted soil as a base;
- The cost of compacted soil is $\$ 0.2325 / \mathrm{ft} 3$ (from CKD Monofill Model Cost Documentation, 1995);
- The unit must be sized for 20 years' accumulation of waste;
- The necessary land area is determined by assuming the material is stored in a conical pile with a maximum height of 100 ft , where the height of the pile is $1 / 2$ the radius and the volume of the pile is calculated using the following formula: $\mathrm{V}=1 / 3 \pi \mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{~h}$;
- The length of a side of the square plot for a single pile is the twice the radius plus a ten foot buffer zone around the edge of the pile to move equipment; therefore, the area of the pile is $\left[2^{*}(\mathrm{r}+10)\right]^{2}$;
- The area of the square plot for multiple piles is calculated by assuming that the volume to be stored is equally divided by the number of piles, then adding the area of each individual pile with its buffer zone (to allow equipment to move between the piles);
- $\quad$ The density of solid materials is the same as crushed furnace slag ( $85 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft} 3$ );
- The cost of purchasing a 25 short ton capacity dump truck is $\$ 275,000$ (vendor quote, 1996);
- The cost of renting a 25 short ton capacity dump truck is $\$ 775 /$ day (from Means, 1995);
- The fuel and maintenance cost of the truck is $\$ 18.85 / \mathrm{hr}$ (from Means, 1995);
- The cost of labor to operate the truck is $\$ 22.80 / \mathrm{hr}$ (Engineering News Record,10/31/94, p. 49);
- It would take $1 / 2$ hour to drive the dump truck to the waste pile, empty it, and return to the point of generation;
- There is no cost associated with a conveying system at the waste pile; and
- Below $50 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$, facilities would not use a pile for disposal as it would be more economically attractive to send the material off-site for disposal, even for Subtitle C treatment and disposal.

The costs of disposing solid materials in on-site subtitle D piles are shown in Exhibit D-4.

## Disposal of Liquid Materials in Surface Impoundments (on-site Subtitle D)

On-site disposal of liquids (for the no prior treatment baseline) poses some interesting problems, in that release of wastewater is regulated under the NPDES programs, which places limits on what "pollutants" can be released into the environment, including heat, turbidity, and percent solids, to name a few. Because EPA has assumed simple release of materials (for this baseline) under the RCRA program, but some treatment or settling is required under the NPDES programs, EPA has assumed that a facility operator will "treat" liquid waste in surface impoundments, by adding reagent in a tank basin before the waste enters the surface impoundment. Further EPA has assumed that the facility will then hold the material in the surface impoundment for 15 days before release. Because, however, facility operators will have to treat these waste liquids to UTS levels in a tank system before release, EPA believes the cost of constructing the surface impoundment is a sunk cost, and should not be counted towards calculating the baseline cost. ${ }^{1}$

Equations were developed for the capital and $\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M}$ costs for on-site neutralization of acidic and caustic wastewaters subject to federal NPDES standards. The cost functions were developed by estimating the costs for different size facilities and curve fitting the results. These equations are presented in Exhibit D-5. Because the capital costs for acidic and caustic wastes are very close, EPA used the costs for acidic wastes for all waste streams in the cost model. The Agency based this decision on the assumption that the majority of corrosive mineral processing wastestreams were acidic rather than caustic.

[^0]Exhibit D-4
Annual Disposal Cost of Solids in Waste Piles

| Waste Pile - Disposal | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 50 | 500 | 5,000 | 50,000 | 75,000 | 100,000 | 250,000 | 500,000 |
| Waste Quantity (ft3/yr) |  | 1,297 | 12,968 | 129,682 | 1,296,824 | 1,945,235 | 2,593,647 | 6,484,118 | 12,968,235 |
| Total Unit Waste Quantity (ft3) |  | 25,936 | 259,365 | 2,593,647 | 25,936,471 | 38,904,706 | 51,872,941 | 129,682,353 | 259,364,706 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Piles |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 31 | 62 |
| Radius of Pile (ft) |  | 47 | 89 | 180 | 202 | 205 | 207 | 210 | 210 |
| Height of Pile (ft) |  | 18 | 40 | 85 | 96 | 98 | 98 | 100 | 100 |
| Unit size (ft2) |  | 8,733 | 31,772 | 130,272 | 1,142,363 | 1,683,210 | 2,223,596 | 5,463,850 | 10,927,699 |
| Unit size (acres) |  | 0.20 | 1 | 3 | 26 | 39 | 51 | 125 | 251 |
| Annualized Land (\$/yr) | \$2500/acre | 47 | 172 | 706 | 6,188 | 9,118 | 12,046 | 29,599 | 59,198 |
| Unit base (compacted soil) | \$0.2325/ft3 | 192 | 697 | 2,859 | 25,070 | 36,939 | 48,798 | 119,908 | 239,816 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dump Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of trips - Annual |  | 3 | 23 | 221 | 2,205 | 3,307 | 4,410 | 11,023 | 22,046 |
| Number of hours - annual |  | 1.5 | 12 | 111 | 1,103 | 1,654 | 2,205 | 5,512 | 11,023 |
| Annual Rental Cost | \$775/day | 2,325 | 17,825 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Number of Original Trucks Needed |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Lifetime of Truck(s) |  | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 16 | 12 | 14 | 12 |
| Total Number of Trucks Needed |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 |
| Annualized Purchase cost | \$275,000 | - | - | 25,957 | 25,957 | 34,915 | 37,646 | 107,762 | 188,224 |
| Annualized Labor Cost | \$22.80/hr | 34 | 262 | 2,519 | 25,137 | 37,700 | 50,274 | 125,662 | 251,324 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$18.85/hr | 28 | 217 | 2,083 | 20,782 | 31,168 | 41,564 | 103,892 | 207,784 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 2,626 | 19,173 | 34,124 | 103,135 | 149,841 | 190,329 | 486,823 | 946,345 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 52.53 | 38.35 | 6.82 | 2.06 | 2.00 | 1.90 | 1.95 | 1.89 |
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# Exhibit D-5 <br> COST EQUATIONS FOR ON-SITE DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATERS (TO MEET NPDES STANDARDS ONLY - 1995 \$) 

Capital Costs $(350 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 350,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr})^{1} \operatorname{Cost}(\$)=16,777+75.08 \mathrm{Q}^{5}$
O\&M Costs $/ \mathrm{Yr}(350 \leq \mathrm{Q} \leq 350,000 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}) \operatorname{Cost}(\$)=-113,989+19,114 \ln \mathrm{Q}$
${ }^{1} \mathrm{Q}=$ Annual quantity of waste managed (mt/yr)

## D. 3 Off-site Treatment and Disposal

The cost of sending liquids off-site for treatment and disposal of residues is $\$ 175 / \mathrm{mt}$, which includes a cost of $\$ 25 / \mathrm{mt}$ for transportation and a cost of $\$ 150 / \mathrm{mt}$ for treatment. The cost of sending solid waste off-site for treatment is $\$ 175 / \mathrm{mt}$, which includes $\$ 25 / \mathrm{mt}$ for transportation, $\$ 88 / \mathrm{mt}$ for stabilization, and $\$ 35 / \mathrm{mt}$ for disposal (which is adjusted to $\$ 61 / \mathrm{mt}$ because stabilization increases the mass of waste to be disposed to 175 percent of the original mass). The price of off-site treatment ofliquids was taken from the September 1994 document Estimating Costs for the Economic Benefit of RCRA Noncompliance. The cost of off-site Subtitle D disposal is taken from the Technical Background Document: Data and Analyses Addressing the Costs of CKD Management Alternatives. The commercial price for stabilization is estimated at $\$ 88 / \mathrm{mt}$, based on an $\$ 80 /$ short ton difference between off-site landfill and stabilization ( $\$ 170 /$ short ton) and off-site landfill alone (\$90/short ton) reported in EI Digest, November 1994.

## D. 4 Storage of Solid Materials

## Storage of Solid Materials in Drums

The drum storage cost function for solids includes the capital cost of the drums, labor to open and close drums, and labor to move the drums either manually (using a handtruck) or using a pallet truck. The drum(s) would be filled by placing them under a hopper or chute, and would then be closed by a laborer. The drum would be moved to a storage area within the same area of the facility either on a handtruck (using manual labor) or on a pallet truck. Later, the drum would be moved to the point of reentry and opened. The normal feed handling equipment would be used to reinsert the material back into the process.

The Agency made the following assumptions in assembling these cost functions:

- The capital cost of a carbon steel drum is $\$ 52$ (from Non-RCRA Tanks, Containers, and Buildings, December 1996, p. 17. This price includes $\$ 2$ per drum for freight);
- 55 gallon drums have 50 gallons of usable capacity;
- The density of solid materials is the same as crushed furnace slag (85 lb/ft3);
- A laborer could close (or open) drums at the rate of 12 drums per hour;
- A laborer could move a drum from the point of generation to the storage area (or back from the storage area to the point of reentry) using a handtruck at a rate of 8 drums per hour;
- A laborer could move drums from point of generation to the storage area (or back from the storage area to the point of reentry) using a pallet truck at a rate of 32 drums per hour;
- The material to be stored is generated continuously, therefore, unless more than 90 drums are generated, the efficiencies of using a pallet truck would be lost and facilities would use manual labor to move drums rather than use the pallet truck;
- The cost of unskilled labor is $\$ 19 / \mathrm{hr}$ (from CKD Monofill Model Cost Documentation, 1995);
- The cost of a small equipment operator is $\$ 24.60 / \mathrm{hr}$ (Engineering News Record, 10/31/94, p. 49);
- The cost of a handtruck is $\$ 209$, and the cost of a pallet truck is $\$ 3,020$ (from Peters and Timmerhaus, 1990, updated to 1995 dollars);
- The cost of fuel and maintenance for the pallet truck is $\$ 1.50 / \mathrm{hr}$, which is estimated to be the same as the fuel and maintenance cost of a gasoline powered cart (from Means Building Construction Cost Data, 1995, p. 18);
- Once a drum had been returned to the point of reentry it would be handled by the normal processing equipment, and would not incur any further "storage" costs; and
- The upper limit of material being stored in drums is $200 \mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{yr}$, because having more than 200 drums would both be impractical and impose opportunity costs that have not been fully accounted for (there is likely to be both a practical limit on the floor space available to store the drums, and a cost associated with using additional floor space).

The costs of storing solid materials in drums are shown in Exhibit D-6.

Exhibit D-6
Annual Storage Cost Assuming Quarterly Storage of Solids in Drums

| Drum Storage Cost (Solids) | Unit Cost | A | B | c | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 0.5 | 4 | 10 | 50 | 75 | 100 | 150 | 200 |
| Waste Quantities (mt/gtr) |  | 0.125 | 1 | 2.5 | 12.5 | 18.75 | 25 | 37.5 | 50 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/gtr) |  | 24.25 | 194.02 | 485.04 | 2425.22 | 3637.83 | 4850.44 | 7275.67 | 9700.89 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase of Drums |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Drums per quarter |  | 1 | 4 | 10 | 49 | 73 | 98 | 146 | 195 |
| Annualized Cost of Drums | \$52/drum | 4.91 | 19.63 | 49.08 | 240.51 | 358.30 | 481.01 | 716.61 | 957.11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Labor to Open/Close Drums |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Hours per year |  | 0.67 | 2.67 | 6.67 | 32.67 | 48.67 | 65.33 | 97.33 | 130.00 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$19/hr | 12.67 | 50.67 | 126.67 | 620.67 | 924.67 | 1241.33 | 1849.33 | 2470.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Move Drums |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ann. Handtruck Capital. Cost | \$209 | 19.73 | 19.73 | 19.73 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Ann. pallet truck Cap. Cost | \$3020 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 285.06 | 285.06 | 285.06 | 285.06 | 285.06 |
| Number of Hours - Annual |  | 1 | 4 | 10 | 12.25 | 18.25 | 24.5 | 36.5 | 48.75 |
| Annual Labor Cost | see notes | 19 | 76 | 190 | 301.35 | 448.95 | 602.7 | 897.9 | 1199.25 |
| Annual Fuel and O \& M Cost | \$1.50/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18.38 | 27.38 | 36.75 | 54.75 | 73.13 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 56.30 | 166.03 | 385.48 | 1465.96 | 2044.35 | 2646.85 | 3803.65 | 4984.55 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 112.60 | 41.51 | 38.55 | 29.32 | 27.26 | 26.47 | 25.36 | 24.92 |

## Storage of Solid Materials in Roll-off Containers

The roll-off container storage cost function includes the capital cost of the containers, and the rental of a truck to move full roll-offs first to the storage area and then to the point of re-entry. It also includes labor, fuel, and maintenance to operate the truck.

A roll-off container would be filled by parking it beneath a hopper or chute. It would then be driven across the site to a storage area by a truck designed to move roll-off containers. The container would be "rolled off" the truck and set on the ground. Later the container would be picked up by the truck and driven back across the site to the point of re-entry and the contents dumped into a pile beside the normal feed materials, where the material would be picked up by the normal feed handling equipment.

The Agency made the following assumptions in assembling these cost functions:

- The purchase price of a $20 \mathrm{yd}^{3}$ roll-off container is $\$ 2670$, a $30 \mathrm{yd}^{3}$ container is $\$ 3,045$ and a $40 \mathrm{yd}^{3}$ container is $\$ 3,510$ (from Non-RCRA Tanks, Containers, and Buildings, December, 1996, p.27);
- The cost of shipping is $\$ 320$ per container, based on a shipping cost of $\$ 1.60$ per mile and an assumed distance of 200 miles (from Non-RCRA Tanks, Containers, and Buildings, December, 1996, p.27);
- The cost of a tarp is $\$ 425$ (from Non-RCRA Tanks, Containers, and Buildings, December, 1996, p.25);
- The density of solid materials is the same as crushed furnace slag ( $85 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft} 3$ );
- It would take 2 hours to move a roll-off container from the point of generation to the storage area (or back from the storage area to the point of reentry);
- The roll-off truck must be rented in full day increments each time it is necessary to move a roll-off container;
- The cost of renting the roll-off truck is $\$ 500 /$ day or $\$ 4,500 /$ month (based on a vendor quote of $\$ 4,500 /$ month, and standard construction estimating practices that daily rental is a third of weekly rental, which is a third of monthly rental);
- The cost of labor to operate the roll-off truck is $\$ 22.80 / \mathrm{hr}$ (Engineering News Record, 10/31/94, p. 49);
- The fuel and maintenance cost of the roll-off truck is $\$ 18.85 / \mathrm{hr}$ (which is the fuel and maintenance cost of a 25 ton off-road dump truck from Means, 1995); and
- Once the contents of a roll-off container had been emptied into a pile at the point of reentry they would be handled by the normal processing equipment, and would not incur any further "storage" costs.

The costs of storing solid materials in roll-off containers are shown in Exhibit D-7.

## Storage of Solid Materials in Buildings

The building storage cost function includes the capital cost of constructing a dome style building, such as those used by regional highway departments to store road chemicals. This cost function also includes rental of a dump truck to move material from the point of generation to the storage area and later to the point of re-entry, labor to operate the truck, truck fuel, and maintenance as well as the capital, operating, and maintenance costs of a front end loader to fill the truck at the storage building. The following is a brief description of how materials would be stored in buildings.

The dump truck would be filled by parking it under a hopper or chute, and would then be driven across the site to a storage building where it would dump the material onto the pad outside the entrance to the building. The front end loader would then push the material into a pile in the dome. Later the material would be picked up by a front end loader and put back into the dump truck, be driven across the site to the point of re-entry and dumped into a pile beside the normal feed materials, where it would be picked up by the normal feed handling equipment.

The Agency made the following assumptions in assembling these cost functions:

- The capital cost of a building is based on the average price for dome buildings (see Tables 14, 15, and 16 of Non-RCRA Tanks, Containers, and Buildings, December, 1996, pp. 3233);
- The capacity utilization of these buildings is assumed to be 80 percent, since a conveying system is not used;
- The dome will be built on an asphalt base pad that is a square with sides equal in length to the diameter of the building plus 20 feet.
- The cost of the asphalt pad is $\$ 6.50 / \mathrm{yd}^{2}$ (from Means Site Work 1994, p. 59
- $\quad$ The density of solid materials is the same as crushed furnace slag ( $85 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft} 3$ );
- The cost of purchasing a 25 short ton capacity dump truck is $\$ 275,000$. The expected lifetime of this equipment is 26,000 operating hours (vendor quote, 1996);
- $\quad$ The fuel and maintenance cost of the truck is $\$ 18.85 / \mathrm{hr}$ (from Means, 1995);
- The cost of labor to operate the truck is $\$ 22.80 / \mathrm{hr}$ (Engineering News Record, 10/31/94, p. 49);
- It would take $1 / 2$ hour to drive the dump truck to the building, empty it, and return to the point of generation;
- It would take $1 / 2$ hour to drive the truck back from the storage area to the point of reentry, and dump the contents on the ground;

Exhibit D-7
Annual Storage Cost Assuming Quarterly Storage of Solids in Roll-Off Containers

| Rolloff Storage Cost | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 50 | 75 | 100 | 500 | 1,000 | 2,500 | 5,000 | 7,500 |
| Waste Quantities (mt/atr) |  | 12.5 | 19 | 25 | 125 | 250 | 625 | 1,250 | 1,875 |
| Waste Quantity (yd3/gtr) |  | 12.0 | 18 | 24 | 120 | 240 | 600 | 1,201 | 1,801 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase of Roll-offs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of 20 yd 3 Roll-offs |  | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cost of Roll-offs | \$2670/R-off | 2,670 | 2,670 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Number of 30 yd 3 Roll-offs |  | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cost of Roll-offs | \$3045/r-off | - | - | 3,045 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Number of 30 yd 3 Roll-offs |  | - | - | - | 4 | 7 | 16 | 31 | 46 |
| Cost of Roll-offs | \$3510/r-off | - | - | - | 14,040 | 24,570 | 56,160 | 108,810 | 161,460 |
| Tarp | \$425 each | 425 | 425 | 425 | 1,700 | 2,975 | 6,800 | 13,175 | 19,550 |
| Shipping | \$320 Each | 320 | 320 | 320 | 1,280 | 2,240 | 5,120 | 9,920 | 14,720 |
| Annualized Cost of Roll-offs |  | 322 | 322 | 358 | 1,607 | 2,811 | 6,426 | 12,451 | 18,475 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roll-off Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Trips - Annual |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 32 | 56 | 128 | 248 | 368 |
| Number of Rental days |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 32 | 56 | 128 | 248 | 365 |
| Annual Rental of Roll-off Truck | \$500/day | 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 | 16,000 | 28,000 | - | - | - |
| Annual Rental of Roll-off Truck | \$4500/mo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54000 | 54000 | 54000 |
| Number of Hours - Annual |  | 16 | 16 | 16 | 64 | 112 | 256 | 496 | 736 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$22.80/hr | 365 | 365 | 365 | 1,459 | 2,554 | 5,837 | 11,309 | 16,781 |
| Ann.Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$18.85/hr | 302 | 302 | 302 | 1,206 | 2,111 | 4,826 | 9,350 | 13,874 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 4,989 | 4,989 | 5,024 | 20,272 | 35,476 | 71,088 | 87,109 | 103,129 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 99.77 | 66.52 | 50.24 | 40.54 | 35.48 | 28.44 | 17.42 | 13.75 |
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- The cost of renting a 7.5 yd3 capacity 375 hp front end loader is $\$ 1,400 /$ day (from Means, 1995);
- The fuel and maintenance cost of the front end loader is $\$ 56.15 / \mathrm{hr}$ (from Means, 1995);
- The cost of labor to operate the front end loader is $\$ 26.90 / \mathrm{hr}$ (Engineering News Record, 10/31/94, p. 49);
- The front end loader can move 20 shovelfuls per hour;
- The front end loader must be rented for full days; and
- Once the contents of the dump truck had been emptied into a pile at the point of reentry they would be handled by the normal processing equipment, and would not incur any further "storage" costs.

The costs of storing solid materials in buildings are shown in Exhibit D-8.

## Storage of Solid Materials in RCRA Containment Buildings

The RCRA containment building storage cost function is similar to the regular building cost functions, with two exceptions: 1) the RCRA building is assumed to be rectangular rather than round, and 2) the building itself must meet the standards outlined in 40 CFR 264 Subpart DD. EPA used containment building costs from the Cost and Economic Impact Analysis of Land Disposal Restrictions for Newly Listed Wastes and Contaminated Debris (Phase 1 LDRs) Final Rule, EPA Office of Solid Waste, June 10, 1992. The annualized capital cost listed on Page 3-17 of that document includes the capital cost of the building (annualized using a 3 percent social discount rate over 20 years) as well as an $\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M}$ cost (equivalent to 10 percent of the initial capital). Because EPA has used a 7 percent discount rate in other parts of this analysis, the Agency backed out the original capital costs and re-annualized them using a seven percent discount rate. The Agency then used these annualized costs in the building cost calculations to compute the cost of storage in RCRA containment buildings.

The Agency made the following assumptions in assembling these cost functions:

- The necessary building area is determined by assuming the material is stored in a conical pile with a maximum height of 18 ft , (or for smaller piles the height of the pile is equal to the radius) where the volume of the pile is calculated using the following formula: $\mathrm{V}=$ $1 / 3 \pi \mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{~h}$;
- The length of a side of the building is the twice the pile radius plus a ten foot buffer zone around the edge of the pile to move equipment; therefore, the area of the building is $[2 *(r+10)]^{2}$;

Exhibit D-8
Annual Storage Cost Assuming Quarterly Storage of Solids in Dome Buildings

| Building Storage Cost | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 1,380 | 2,048 | 2,660 | 15,800 | 17,952 | 28,448 | 42,072 | 50,764 |
| Waste Quantities (mt/gtr) |  | 345 | 512 | 665 | 3,950 | 4,488 | 7,112 | 10,518 | 12,691 |
| Waste Quantity (ft3/gtr) |  | 8,948 | 13,279 | 17,248 | 102,449 | 116,403 | 184,460 | 272,800 | 329,160 |
| Waste Quantity (yd3/gtr) |  | 331 | 492 | 639 | 3,794 | 4,311 | 6,832 | 10,104 | 12,191 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Buildings |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Diameter of Building (ft) |  | 40 | 40 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 124 | 150 | 150 |
| size of base pad (yd2) |  | 400 | 400 | 544 | 1,600 | 1,600 | 2,304 | 3,211 | 3,211 |
| Asphalt Pad | 6.50/yd2 | 2,600 | 2,600 | 3,539 | 10,400 | 10,400 | 14,976 | 20,872 | 20,872 |
| Total Cost of Building |  | 50,500 | 62,500 | 72,000 | 121,000 | 134,000 | 190,000 | 343,000 | 381,500 |
| Annualized Cost of Building |  | 5,012 | 6,145 | 7,130 | 12,403 | 13,630 | 19,348 | 34,346 | 37,980 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dump Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of trips - quarter |  | 32 | 46 | 60 | 350 | 396 | 628 | 928 | 1,120 |
| Number of trips - annual |  | 128 | 184 | 240 | 1,400 | 1,584 | 2,512 | 3,712 | 4,480 |
| Number of hours - annual |  | 64 | 92 | 120 | 700 | 792 | 1,256 | 1,856 | 2,240 |
| Lifetime of Truck |  | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 14 | 12 |
| Annualized Purchase cost | \$275,000 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 36,018 | 37,793 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$22.80/hr | 1,459 | 2,098 | 2,736 | 15,960 | 18,058 | 28,637 | 42,317 | 51,072 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$18.85/hr | 1,206 | 1,734 | 2,262 | 13,195 | 14,929 | 23,676 | 34,986 | 42,224 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Front End Loader |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Hours (annual) |  | 9 | 13 | 17 | 101 | 115 | 182 | 269 | 325 |
| Number of Days (annual) |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 20 | 28 | 36 |
| Annual Rental | \$1,400/day | 5,600 | 5,600 | 5,600 | 16,800 | 16,800 | 28,000 | 39,200 | 50,400 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$26.90/hr | 238 | 353 | 458 | 2,722 | 3,093 | 4,901 | 7,248 | 8,745 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$ 56.15/hr | 496 | 736 | 957 | 5,681 | 6,455 | 10,230 | 15,129 | 18,254 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 39,969 | 42,623 | 45,100 | 92,718 | 98,922 | 140,748 | 209,243 | 246,468 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 28.96 | 20.81 | 16.95 | 5.87 | 5.51 | 4.95 | 4.97 | 4.86 |

April 15, 1997

- If the volume to be stored exceeds $290,600 \mathrm{ft} 3$, more than one building must be constructed;
- The costs of the dump truck and front end loader are based on the same assumptions used in calculating the dome building cost function.

The costs of storing solid material in RCRA containment buildings are shown in Exhibit D-9.

## Storage of Solid Materials in Lined Waste Piles (Assuming No Free Liquids)

The waste pile storage cost function includes land, a liner base, a liner, liner protections, the costs of a dump truck to move the material to the storage site and back, and a front end loader to move the material at the pile. The following is a brief description of how solid materials would be stored in waste piles.

A dump truck would be filled by parking it under a hopper or chute, and would then be driven across the site to a waste pile where it would dump the material (either on the lined site directly, or onto a conveyer system). The waste pile is lined with a foot of compacted soil under 3 feet of compacted clay. Later, the material is picked up by a front end loader, put back into the dump truck, driven across the site to the point of re-entry, and dumped into a pile beside the normal feed materials, where it would be picked up by the normal feed handling equipment.

EPA made the following assumptions in assembling these cost functions:

- The purchase cost of land is $\$ 2500$ /acre (from CKD Monofill Model Cost Documentation, 1995);
- The cost of compacted soil is $\$ 0.2325 / \mathrm{ft} 3$ (from CKD Monofill Model Cost Documentation, 1995);
- The cost of compacted clay is $\$ 0.3667 / \mathrm{ft} 3$ (from CKD Monofill Model Cost Documentation, 1995);The necessary land area is determined by assuming the material is stored in a conical pile with a maximum height of 100 ft , where the height of the pile is $1 / 2$ the radius and the volume of the pile is calculated using the following formula: $\mathrm{V}=$ $1 / 3 \pi \mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{~h}$;
- The length of a side of the square plot for a single pile is the twice the radius plus a ten foot buffer zone around the edge of the pile to move equipment; therefore, the area of the pile is $\left[2^{*}(\mathrm{r}+10)\right]^{2}$;
- The area of the square plot for multiple piles is calculated by assuming that the volume to be stored is equally divided by the number of piles, then adding the area of each individual pile with its buffer zone (to allow equipment to move between the piles);

Exhibit D-9
Annual Storage Cost Assuming Quarterly Storage of Solids in RCRA Containment Buildings

| Building Storage Cost | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 135 | 600 | 2,400 | 8,245 | 42,130 |
| Waste Quantities (mt/gtr) |  | 34 | 150 | 600 | 2,061 | 10,533 |
| Waste Quantity (ft3/gtr) |  | 875 | 3,890 | 15,562 | 53,462 | 273,176 |
| Waste Quantity (yd3/9tr) |  | 32 | 144 | 576 | 1,980 | 10,118 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fixed height pile |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Number of Buildings |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Average sq ft of building |  | 1,509 | 2,599 | 6,001 | 16,005 | 68,000 |
| Capital Cost of building |  | 400,679 | 514,305 | 777,438 | 1,375,466 | 4,784,231 |
| Maintenance cost of building |  | 40,068 | 51,430 | 77,744 | 137,547 | 478,423 |
| Annualized Cost of Building |  | 77,888 | 99,976 | 151,126 | 267,377 | 930,007 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dump Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of trips - quarter |  | 4 | 14 | 54 | 182 | 930 |
| Number of trips - annual |  | 16 | 56 | 216 | 728 | 3,720 |
| Number of hours - annual |  | 8 | 28 | 108 | 364 | 1,860 |
| Lifetime of Truck |  | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 14 |
| Annualized Purchase cost | \$275,000 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 36,039 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$22.80/hr | 182 | 638 | 2,462 | 8,299 | 42,408 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$18.85/hr | 151 | 528 | 2,036 | 6,861 | 35,061 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Front End Loader |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Hours (annual) |  | 1 | 4 | 15 | 53 | 270 |
| Number of Days (annual) |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 28 |
| Annual Rental | \$1,400/day | 5,600 | 5,600 | 5,600 | 11,200 | 39,200 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$26.90/hr | 23 | 103 | 413 | 1,420 | 7,258 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$ 56.15/hr | 49 | 216 | 863 | 2,965 | 15,149 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 109,850 | 133,018 | 188,458 | 324,080 | 1,105,121 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 813.71 | 221.70 | 78.52 | 39.31 | 26.23 |
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- The density of solid materials is the same as crushed furnace slag (85 lb/ft3);
- The cost of purchasing a 25 short ton capacity dump truck is $\$ 275,000$. The expected lifetime of this equipment is 26,000 operating hours (vendor quote, 1996);
- The fuel and maintenance cost of the truck is $\$ 18.85 / \mathrm{hr}$ (from Means, 1995);
- The cost of labor to operate the truck is $\$ 22.80 /$ hr (Engineering News Record, 10/31/94, p. 49);
- It would take $1 / 2$ hour to drive the dump truck to the waste pile, empty it, and return to the point of generation;
- There is no cost associated with a conveying system at the waste pile;
- It would take $1 / 2$ hour to drive the truck back from the storage area to the point of reentry, and dump the contents on the ground;
- The cost of renting a 7.5 yd3 capacity 375 hp front end loader is $\$ 1,400 /$ day (from Means, 1995);
- The fuel and maintenance cost of the front end loader is $\$ 56.15 / \mathrm{hr}$ (from Means, 1995);
- The cost of labor to operate the front end loader is $\$ 26.90 / \mathrm{hr}$ (Engineering News Record, 10/31/94, p. 49);
- The front end loader can move 20 shovelfuls per hour;
- The front end loader must be rented for full days; and
- Once the contents of the dump truck had been emptied into a pile at the point of reentry they would be handled by the normal processing equipment, and would not incur any further "storage" costs.

The costs of storing solid materials with no free liquids in waste piles are shown in Exhibit

## Storage of Solid Materials in Unlined Waste Piles (with Groundwater Monitoring)

The costs of storing materials in unlined waste piles are very similar to the costs of storing materials in lined waste piles, with two notable exceptions: The costs of the liner and liner protection are not used, and costs of groundwater monitoring have been added. (The development of groundwater monitoring costs is described later in this Appendix.) One of the stipulations of using these units is that if monitoring reveals contamination, the facility is responsible for the costs of corrective action. However, even without adding the potential costs of corrective action, these costs of regular monitoring are higher than the costs of liners. Therefore, EPA considered this option to be economically inferior to storage in waste piles with liners, and did not attempt to add corrective action costs to the costs shown in Exhibit D-11.

Exhibit D-10
Annual Storage Cost Assuming Quarterly Storage of Solids with No Free Liquids in Lined Waste Piles

| Waste Pile - No Free Liquids | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 500 | 5,000 | 15,000 | 25,000 | 40,000 | 70,000 | 90,000 | 120,000 |
| Waste Quantities (mt/gtr) |  | 125 | 1,250 | 3,750 | 6,250 | 10,000 | 17,500 | 22,500 | 30,000 |
| Waste Quantity (ft3/gtr) |  | 3,242 | 32,421 | 97,262 | 162,103 | 259,365 | 453,888 | 583,571 | 778,094 |
| Waste Quantity (yd3/qtr) |  | 120 | 1,201 | 3,602 | 6,004 | 9,606 | 16,811 | 21,614 | 28,818 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit size (ft2) |  | 3,218 | 9,825 | 17,987 | 24,118 | 31,772 | 44,394 | 51,693 | 61,619 |
| Annualized Land (\$/yr) | \$2500/acre | 17 | 53 | 97 | 131 | 172 | 240 | 280 | 334 |
| Ann. Liner base (compacted soil) | \$0.2325/ft3 | 71 | 216 | 395 | 529 | 697 | 974 | 1,134 | 1,352 |
| Annualized Liner (3 ft of clay) | \$0.3667/ft3 | 334 | 1,020 | 1,868 | 2,504 | 3,299 | 4,610 | 5,368 | 6,398 |
| Ann. Liner Protection (cmpct. soil) | \$0.2325/ft3 | 71 | 216 | 395 | 529 | 697 | 974 | 1,134 | 1,352 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dump Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of trips - quarter |  | 12 | 112 | 332 | 552 | 882 | 1,544 | 1,986 | 2,646 |
| Number of trips - annual |  | 48 | 448 | 1,328 | 2,208 | 3,528 | 6,176 | 7,944 | 10,584 |
| Number of hours - annual |  | 24 | 224 | 664 | 1,104 | 1,764 | 3,088 | 3,972 | 5,292 |
| Number of Original Trucks Needed |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Lifetime of Truck(s) |  | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 13 | 10 |
| Total Number of Trucks Needed |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Annualized Purchase cost | \$275,000 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 35,533 | 68,529 | 73,324 | 78,617 |
| Annualized Labor Cost | \$22.80/hr | 547 | 5,107 | 15,139 | 25,171 | 40,219 | 70,406 | 90,562 | 120,658 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$18.85/hr | 452 | 4,222 | 12,516 | 20,810 | 33,251 | 58,209 | 74,872 | 99,754 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Front End Loader |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Hours (annual) |  | 3.20 | 32.02 | 96.06 | 160.10 | 256.16 | 448.28 | 576.37 | 768.49 |
| Number of Days (annual) |  | 4 | 8 | 16 | 24 | 36 | 60 | 76 | 100 |
| Annual Rental | \$1,400/day | 5,600 | 11,200 | 22,400 | 33,600 | 50,400 | 84,000 | 106,400 | 140,000 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$26.90/hr | 86 | 861 | 2,584 | 4,307 | 6,891 | 12,059 | 15,504 | 20,672 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$56.15/hr | 180 | 1,798 | 5,394 | 8,990 | 14,384 | 25,171 | 32,363 | 43,151 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 33,316 | 50,651 | 86,745 | 122,529 | 185,543 | 325,173 | 400,942 | 512,289 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 66.63 | 10.13 | 5.78 | 4.90 | 4.64 | 4.65 | 4.45 | 4.27 |

April 15, 1997

Exhibit D-11
Annual Storage Cost Assuming Quarterly Storage of Solids in Unlined Waste Piles with Groundwater Monitoring

| Waste Pile - Free Liquids | Unit Cost | A | B | c | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 500 | 5,000 | 15,000 | 25,000 | 40,000 | 70,000 | 90,000 | 120,000 |
| Waste Quantities (mt/gtr) |  | 125 | 1,250 | 3,750 | 6,250 | 10,000 | 17,500 | 22,500 | 30,000 |
| Waste Quantity (ft3/qtr) |  | 3,242 | 32,421 | 97,262 | 162,103 | 259,365 | 453,888 | 583,571 | 778,094 |
| Waste Quantity (yd3/9tr) |  | 120 | 1,201 | 3,602 | 6,004 | 9,606 | 16,811 | 21,614 | 28,818 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit size (ft2) |  | 3,218 | 9,825 | 17,987 | 24,118 | 31,772 | 44,394 | 51,693 | 61,619 |
| Annualized Land (\$/yr) | \$2500/acre | 17 | 53 | 97 | 131 | 172 | 240 | 280 | 334 |
| Unit base (compacted soil) | \$0.2325/ft3 | 71 | 216 | 395 | 529 | 697 | 974 | 1,134 | 1,352 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Groundwater Monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Downgradient Wells |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Annualized Capital Cost |  | 6,722 | 6,722 | 6,722 | 6,722 | 6,722 | 6,722 | 6,722 | 6,722 |
| Annual O \& M Cost |  | 7,290 | 7,290 | 7,290 | 7,290 | 7,290 | 7,290 | 7,290 | 7,290 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dump Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of trips - quarter |  | 12 | 112 | 332 | 552 | 882 | 1,544 | 1,986 | 2,646 |
| Number of trips - annual |  | 48 | 448 | 1,328 | 2,208 | 3,528 | 6,176 | 7,944 | 10,584 |
| Number of hours - annual |  | 24 | 224 | 664 | 1,104 | 1,764 | 3,088 | 3,972 | 5,292 |
| Number of Original Trucks Needed |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Lifetime of Truck(s) |  | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 13 | 10 |
| Total Number of Trucks Needed |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Annualized Purchase cost | \$275,000 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 35,533 | 68,529 | 73,324 | 78,617 |
| Annualized Labor Cost | \$22.80/hr | 547 | 5,107 | 15,139 | 25,171 | 40,219 | 70,406 | 90,562 | 120,658 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$18.85/hr | 452 | 4,222 | 12,516 | 20,810 | 33,251 | 58,209 | 74,872 | 99,754 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Front End Loader |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Hours (annual) |  | 3.20 | 32.02 | 96.06 | 160.10 | 256.16 | 448.28 | 576.37 | 768.49 |
| Number of Days (annual) |  | 4 | 8 | 16 | 24 | 36 | 60 | 76 | 100 |
| Annual Rental | \$1,400/day | 5,600 | 11,200 | 22,400 | 33,600 | 50,400 | 84,000 | 106,400 | 140,000 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$26.90/hr | 86 | 861 | 2,584 | 4,307 | 6,891 | 12,059 | 15,504 | 20,672 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$56.15/hr | 180 | 1,798 | 5,394 | 8,990 | 14,384 | 25,171 | 32,363 | 43,151 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 46,923 | 63,427 | 98,495 | 133,508 | 195,560 | 333,601 | 408,452 | 518,551 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 93.85 | 12.69 | 6.57 | 5.34 | 4.89 | 4.77 | 4.54 | 4.32 |

April 15, 1997

## Storage of Solid Materials in Unlined, Unmonitored Waste Piles

The costs of storing materials in unlined, unmonitored waste piles are similar to the costs of storing wastes in lined piles. The notable exception is the cost of the liner and liner protection. These costs are listed in Exhibit D-12. In addition, EPA developed the costs of just the operation and maintenance costs of storing materials in unlined, unmonitored units for baseline-option combinations that induce a change of storage units from land based to non-land based units (i.e., storing sludges in the prior treatment baseline and in RCRA containment buildings in Option 1). The $\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M}$ costs of storing materials in unlined, unmonitored piles are shown in Exhibit D-13.

## D. 5 Storage of Liquid Materials

## Storage of Liquid Materials in Drums or Mobile Mini-Bulk Tanks

Low volumes of liquid materials can be stored in either drums or mobile mini-bulk containers, which are small tanks that are designed to be moved by a pallet truck. The costs associated with storing liquid materials in drums are calculated in same manner as storing solid materials in drums, with the following exceptions:

- Liquid materials are stored for 30 days, while solid materials are stored for 90 days. Therefore, fewer drums are required;
- Because liquid materials are often corrosive, polyethylene drums and mini-bulk containers are used;
- The density of liquid materials is the same as water ( $62.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft} 3$ );
- The capital cost of a 55 -gallon polyethylene drum is $\$ 127$ (from Non-RCRA Tanks, Containers, and Building, December 1996, p. 17. This price includes $\$ 2$ per drum for freight);
- The capital cost of a 220-gallon polyethylene mini-bulk tank is $\$ 285$ (from Non-RCRA Tanks, Containers, and Building, December 1996, Appendix D); and
- A laborer could move mini-bulks from point of generation to the storage area (or back from the storage area to the point of reentry) using a pallet truck at a rate of 4 tanks per hour;

The costs of storing liquid materials in drums and mobile mini-bulk tanks are shown in Exhibit D-14.

Exhibit D-12
Annual Storage Cost Assuming Quarterly Storage of Solids in Unlined, Unmonitored Waste Piles

| Waste Pile - Free Liquids | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 500 | 5,000 | 15,000 | 25,000 | 40,000 | 70,000 | 90,000 | 120,000 |
| Waste Quantities (mt/gtr) |  | 125 | 1,250 | 3,750 | 6,250 | 10,000 | 17,500 | 22,500 | 30,000 |
| Waste Quantity (ft3/qtr) |  | 3,242 | 32,421 | 97,262 | 162,103 | 259,365 | 453,888 | 583,571 | 778,094 |
| Waste Quantity (yd3/qtr) |  | 120 | 1,201 | 3,602 | 6,004 | 9,606 | 16,811 | 21,614 | 28,818 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit size (ft2) |  | 3,218 | 9,825 | 17,987 | 24,118 | 31,772 | 44,394 | 51,693 | 61,619 |
| Annualized Land (\$/yr) | \$2500/acre | 17 | 53 | 97 | 131 | 172 | 240 | 280 | 334 |
| Unit base (compacted soil) | \$0.2325/ft3 | 71 | 216 | 395 | 529 | 697 | 974 | 1,134 | 1,352 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dump Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of trips - quarter |  | 12 | 112 | 332 | 552 | 882 | 1,544 | 1,986 | 2,646 |
| Number of trips - annual |  | 48 | 448 | 1,328 | 2,208 | 3,528 | 6,176 | 7,944 | 10,584 |
| Number of hours - annual |  | 24 | 224 | 664 | 1,104 | 1,764 | 3,088 | 3,972 | 5,292 |
| Number of Original Trucks Needed |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Lifetime of Truck(s) |  | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 13 | 10 |
| Total Number of Trucks Needed |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Annualized Purchase cost | \$275,000 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 35,533 | 68,529 | 73,324 | 78,617 |
| Annualized Labor Cost | \$22.80/hr | 547 | 5,107 | 15,139 | 25,171 | 40,219 | 70,406 | 90,562 | 120,658 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$18.85/hr | 452 | 4,222 | 12,516 | 20,810 | 33,251 | 58,209 | 74,872 | 99,754 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Front End Loader |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Hours (annual) |  | 3.20 | 32.02 | 96.06 | 160.10 | 256.16 | 448.28 | 576.37 | 768.49 |
| Number of Days (annual) |  | 4 | 8 | 16 | 24 | 36 | 60 | 76 | 100 |
| Annual Rental | \$1,400/day | 5,600 | 11,200 | 22,400 | 33,600 | 50,400 | 84,000 | 106,400 | 140,000 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$26.90/hr | 86 | 861 | 2,584 | 4,307 | 6,891 | 12,059 | 15,504 | 20,672 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$56.15/hr | 180 | 1,798 | 5,394 | 8,990 | 14,384 | 25,171 | 32,363 | 43,151 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 32,911 | 49,415 | 84,483 | 119,495 | 181,547 | 319,589 | 394,439 | 504,538 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 65.82 | 9.88 | 5.63 | 4.78 | 4.54 | 4.57 | 4.38 | 4.20 |

April 15, 1997

Exhibit D-13
Annual Storage Cost ( $\mathbf{O}$ \& M only) Assuming Quarterly Storage of Solids in Unlined, Unmonitored Waste Piles

| Waste Pile - Free Liquids | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 500 | 5,000 | 15,000 | 25,000 | 40,000 | 70,000 | 90,000 | 120,000 |
| Waste Quantities (mt/gtr) |  | 125 | 1,250 | 3,750 | 6,250 | 10,000 | 17,500 | 22,500 | 30,000 |
| Waste Quantity (ft3/qtr) |  | 3,242 | 32,421 | 97,262 | 162,103 | 259,365 | 453,888 | 583,571 | 778,094 |
| Waste Quantity (yd3/qtr) |  | 120 | 1,201 | 3,602 | 6,004 | 9,606 | 16,811 | 21,614 | 28,818 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit size (ft2) |  | 3,218 | 9,825 | 17,987 | 24,118 | 31,772 | 44,394 | 51,693 | 61,619 |
| Annualized Land (\$/yr) | \$2500/acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit base (compacted soil) | \$0.2325/ft3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dump Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of trips - quarter |  | 12 | 112 | 332 | 552 | 882 | 1,544 | 1,986 | 2,646 |
| Number of trips - annual |  | 48 | 448 | 1,328 | 2,208 | 3,528 | 6,176 | 7,944 | 10,584 |
| Number of hours - annual |  | 24 | 224 | 664 | 1,104 | 1,764 | 3,088 | 3,972 | 5,292 |
| Number of Original Trucks Needed |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Lifetime of Truck(s) |  | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 13 | 10 |
| Total Number of Trucks Needed |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Annualized Purchase cost | \$275,000 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 25,957 | 35,533 | 68,529 | 73,324 | 78,617 |
| Annualized Labor Cost | \$22.80/hr | 547 | 5,107 | 15,139 | 25,171 | 40,219 | 70,406 | 90,562 | 120,658 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$18.85/hr | 452 | 4,222 | 12,516 | 20,810 | 33,251 | 58,209 | 74,872 | 99,754 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Front End Loader |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Hours (annual) |  | 3.20 | 32.02 | 96.06 | 160.10 | 256.16 | 448.28 | 576.37 | 768.49 |
| Number of Days (annual) |  | 4 | 8 | 16 | 24 | 36 | 60 | 76 | 100 |
| Annual Rental | \$1,400/day | 5,600 | 11,200 | 22,400 | 33,600 | 50,400 | 84,000 | 106,400 | 140,000 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$26.90/hr | 86 | 861 | 2,584 | 4,307 | 6,891 | 12,059 | 15,504 | 20,672 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$56.15/hr | 180 | 1,798 | 5,394 | 8,990 | 14,384 | 25,171 | 32,363 | 43,151 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 32,823 | 49,146 | 83,991 | 118,835 | 180,678 | 318,374 | 393,025 | 502,852 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 65.65 | 9.83 | 5.60 | 4.75 | 4.52 | 4.55 | 4.37 | 4.19 |

April 15, 1997

Exhibit D-14
Annual Storage Cost Assuming 30 Day Storage of Liquids in Drum and Mini-Bulks

| Drum Storage Cost (liquids) | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 0.5 | 10 | 50 | 75 | 100 | 150 | 200 | 250 |
| Waste Quantities (mt/mo) |  | 0.042 | 0.833 | 4.167 | 6.250 | 8.333 | 12.500 | 16.667 | 20.833 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/mo) |  | 11.01 | 220.24 | 1101.20 | 1651.79 | 2202.39 | 3303.59 | 4404.78 | 5505.98 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase of Drums |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Drums |  | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Annualized Cost of Drums | \$127/drum | 127.00 | 635.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Number of 220-gallon Mini-bulks |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 21 | 26 |
| Cost of Mini-bulk | \$285/tank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1881.00 | 2508.00 | 3448.50 | 5016.00 | 6583.50 | 8151.00 |
| Annualized Capital Cost |  | 11.99 | 59.94 | 177.55 | 236.73 | 325.50 | 473.46 | 621.42 | 769.37 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Labor to Open/Close Drums |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Hours per year |  | 2 | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$19/hr | 38 | 190 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Move Drums |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ann. Handtruck Capital. Cost | \$209 | 19.73 | 19.73 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Ann. Pallet Truck Cap. Cost | \$3020 | 0 | 0 | 285 | 285 | 285 | 285 | 285 | 285 |
| Number of Hours - Annual |  | 1 | 5 | 12 | 16 | 22 | 32 | 42 | 52 |
| Annual Labor Cost | \$19/hr | 19 | 95 | 228 | 304 | 418 | 608 | 798 | 988 |
| Ann. Fuel and Maintenance Cost | \$1.5/hr | 0 | 0 | 18 | 24 | 33 | 48 | 63 | 78 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 88.72 | 364.67 | 708.61 | 849.79 | 1061.56 | 1414.52 | 1767.47 | 2120.43 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 177.43 | 36.47 | 14.17 | 11.33 | 10.62 | 9.43 | 8.84 | 8.48 |

## D-33

## Storage of Liquid Materials in Tanks

The tank storage cost function includes the capital cost of the tanks, as well as piping to move the liquids from the point of generation to the storage area and then back to the point of re-entry. Liquid materials would be piped from the point of generation to storage tanks. When these materials are going to be reused they would be piped back through the same pipes to the point of re-entry, where they would be handled by the normal feed dispersing equipment.

The Agency made the following assumptions in assembling the tank storage cost function:

- Liquids are stored for a maximum of 30 days;
- The density of liquid materials is the same as water ( $62.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft} 3$ );
- Tank capital and $\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M}$ costs were developed following the method used by DPRA for the "Organic Dyes and Pigments Waste Listings," 1995, and include the minimal plumbing associated with the tank only;
- For tanks with a capacity of or less than 25,000 gallons, the base capital cost was updated using the price of a single walled vertical tank (from Non-RCRA Tanks, Containers, and Building, December 1996, p. 22.)
- For tanks greater than 25,000 gallons EPA used the cost from the "Organic Dyes and Pigments Waste Listings document" (these costs were adjusted to use the correct discount rate and retention time);
- The distance from the point of generation to the storage tank, and from the storage tank back to the point of reentry are a function of the amount of material to be stored. Small volumes of liquid material to be stored do not require additional piping, while large volumes of material to be stored will need to be piped to storage areas further away;
- There is no cost associated with pumping the material to and from the tank; and
- Once the liquid has been returned to the point of reentry it will be handled by the normal processing equipment, and would not incur any further "storage" costs.

The costs of storing liquid materials in tanks are shown in Exhibit D-15.

## Storage of Liquid Materials in RCRA Tanks

The RCRA storage tank cost function is similar to the regular storage tank cost functions, with the exception that the tank must have secondary containment, and be inspected daily. (See 40 CFR 264 Subpart J.) EPA assumed double walled tanks to meet the secondary containment requirement. EPA used the prices from Non-RCRA Tanks, Containers, and Building, December 1996, p. 22 for tanks with a capacity of 25,000 gallons or less, and vendor quotes for large field erected double walled tanks.

Exhibit D-15
Annual Storage Cost Assuming 30 Day Storage of Liquids in Tanks

| Tank Storage Cost (Liquids) | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 45.4 | 227.0 | 1,135.1 | 22,702.6 | 90,810.4 | 181,620.7 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/yr) |  | 12,000 | 60,000 | 300,000 | 6,000,000 | 24,000,000 | 48,000,000 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/mo) |  | 1,000 | 5,000 | 25,000 | 500,000 | 2,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| Waste Flow rate (gal/day) |  | 33 | 167 | 833 | 16,667 | 66,667 | 133,333 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase of Tanks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Tanks |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap. Cost of Double Walled Tanks |  | 1,246 | 3,466 | 9,405 |  |  |  |
| Freight and Installation |  | 374 | 1,040 | 2,822 |  |  |  |
| Indirect Capital |  | 518 | 1,442 | 3,912 |  |  |  |
| Annualized Cost of Tanks |  | 202 | 561 | 1,523 | 9,318 | 23,897 | 40,604 |
| Annual O \& M |  | 141 | 393 | 1,065 | 6,515 | 16,710 | 28,392 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Piping |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of additional pipe (ft) |  | - | - | - | 500 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Piping - Annualized Capital |  | - | - | - | 425 | 821 | 821 |
| Piping - Annual O \& M |  | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 343 | 954 | 2,589 | 17,258 | 42,428 | 70,817 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 7.55 | 4.20 | 2.28 | 0.76 | 0.47 | 0.39 |

EPA also assumed that it would take a skilled laborer ( $\$ 39.50 / \mathrm{hr}$, from CKD Monofill Model Cost Documentation, 1995) a half hour per day to inspect a tank and file any necessary paperwork. The cost of storage in RCRA storage tanks are shown in Exhibit D-16.

## Storage of Liquid Materials in Lined Surface Impoundments

The surface impoundment storage cost function includes the capital cost of land, site preparation, a liner, and piping of liquids to the surface impoundment. Liquid materials would be piped from the point of generation to the surface impoundment. When these materials are going to be reused they would be piped back through the same pipes to the point of reentry, where they would be handled by the normal feed equipment.

The Agency made the following assumptions in assembling the surface impoundment storage cost function:

- Liquid materials are stored for a maximum of 30 days;
- The density of liquid materials is the same as water ( $62.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft} 3$ );
- The purchase cost of land is $\$ 2500$ /acre (from CKD Monofill Model Cost Documentation, 1995);
- The cost of excavation is $\$ 0.1077 / \mathrm{ft} 3$ (from CKD Monofill Model Cost Documentation, 1995); The cost of a 40 mil HDPE geomembrane liner is $0.5602 / \mathrm{ft} 2$ (from CKD Monofill Model Cost Documentation, 1995);
- The area of the surface impoundment is calculated using the formulas described in section D.7;
- The distance from the point of generation to the surface impoundment, and from the surface impoundment back to the point of reentry, are a function of the amount of material to be stored, but the minimum distance is 500 feet. Larger quantities of material to be stored will need to be piped 1000 feet away;
- There is no cost associated with pumping the material to and from the surface impoundment; and
- Once the liquid has been returned to the point of reentry it will be handled by the normal processing equipment, and would not incur any further "storage" costs.

Exhibit D-16
Annual Storage Cost Assuming 30 Day Storage of Liquids in RCRA Tanks

| Tank Storage Cost (Liquids) | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 45.4 | 227.0 | 1,135.1 | 5,221.6 | 21,340.4 | 52,261.4 | 184,390.4 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/yr) |  | 12,000 | 60,000 | 300,000 | 1,380,000 | 5,640,000 | 13,812,000 | 48,732,000 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/mo) |  | 1,000 | 5,000 | 25,000 | 115,000 | 470,000 | 1,151,000 | 4,061,000 |
| Waste Flow rate (gal/day) |  | 33 | 167 | 833 | 3,833 | 15,667 | 38,367 | 135,367 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase of Tanks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Tanks |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap. Cost of Double Walled Tanks |  | 1,619 | 6,164 | 17,417 | 110,000 | 200,000 | 350,000 | 900,000 |
| Freight and Installation |  | 486 | 1,849 | 5,225 | 33,000 | 60,000 | 105,000 | 270,000 |
| Indirect Capital | 32\% of cap | 674 | 2,564 | 7,245 | 45,760 | 83,200 | 145,600 | 374,400 |
| Annualized Cost of Tanks |  | 262 | 998 | 2,821 | 17,817 | 32,395 | 56,691 | 145,776 |
| Annual O \& M |  | 183 | 698 | 1,973 | 12,458 | 22,651 | 39,640 | 101,930 |
| Annual Inspection Cost (Labor) | \$39.5/hr | 7,209 | 7,209 | 7,209 | 7,209 | 7,209 | 7,209 | 7,209 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Piping |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of additional pipe (ft) |  | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Piping - Annualized Capital |  | - | - | - | 821 | 821 | 821 | 821 |
| Piping - Annual O \& M |  | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 446 | 1,697 | 4,794 | 32,096 | 56,867 | 98,151 | 249,528 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 9.81 | 7.47 | 4.22 | 6.15 | 2.66 | 1.88 | 1.35 |

The costs of storing liquid materials in lined surface impoundments are shown in Exhibit D-17.

## Storage of Liquid Materials in Unlined Surface Impoundments with Groundwater Monitoring

The costs of storing materials in unlined surface impoundments are very similar to the costs of storing materials in lined surface impoundments, with two notable exceptions: The cost of the liner is not used, and costs of groundwater monitoring have been added. (The development of groundwater monitoring costs are described later in this Appendix.) One of the stipulations of using these units is that if monitoring reveals contamination, the facility is responsible for the costs of corrective action. However, even without adding the potential costs of corrective action, these costs of regular monitoring are higher than the costs of liners. Therefore, EPA considered this option to be economically inferior to storage in surface impoundments with liners, and did not attempt to add corrective action costs to the costs shown in Exhibit D-18.

## Storage of Liquid Materials in Unlined, Unmonitored Surface Impoundments

The costs of storing materials in unlined, unmonitored surface impoundments are similar to the costs of storing wastes in lined surface impoundments. The notable exception is the cost of the liner. The costs of storing liquid materials in unlined surface impoundments without groundwater monitoring are shown in Exhibit D-19. In addition, EPA developed the costs of just the operation and maintenance costs of storing materials in unlined, unmonitored units for baseline-option combinations that induce a change of storage units from land based to non-land based units (i.e., storing by-products in the prior treatment baseline and in RCRA tanks in Option 1). The $\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M}$ costs of storing materials in unlined, unmonitored surface impoundments are shown in Exhibit D-20.

## D. 6 Curve Fit Cost Functions

The Agency plotted and curve fit each set of cost results (from Exhibits D-4, and D-6 through D-20) to transform the costs into cost functions. Exhibit D-21 presents these curve fit storage and disposal cost functions, along with the range for which these cost equations are valid. EPA determined the breakeven points between the relevant storage methods for each Baseline or Option. Exhibit D-21 also presents the optimum management ranges allowed under each baseline and option. Cells in this exhibit which have been blacked out under a particular option or baseline are unallowable management methods. Finally, Exhibits D-22 through D-38 present graphs of the individual cost for our sample waste generation rates along with the resulting curve fit cost functions.

Exhibit D-17
Annual Storage Cost Assuming Quarterly Storage of Solids in Unlined, Unmonitored Waste Piles

| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 500 | 5,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 | 100,000 | 200,000 | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities ( $\mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{mo}$ ) |  | 42 | 417 | 2,083 | 4,167 | 8,333 | 16,667 | 83,333 | 166,667 |
| Waste Quantity ( $\mathrm{ft3} / \mathrm{mo}$ ) |  | 1,472 | 14,721 | 73,604 | 147,209 | 294,418 | 588,835 | 2,944,177 | 5,888,355 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/mo) |  | 11,012 | 110,120 | 550,598 | 1,101,196 | 2,202,392 | 4,404,784 | 22,023,919 | 44,047,837 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/day) |  | 367 | 3,671 | 18,353 | 36,707 | 73,413 | 146,826 | 734,131 | 1,468,261 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit size (ft2) |  | 4,061 | 6,410 | 15,688 | 26,478 | 47,192 | 87,314 | 395,890 | 774,557 |
| Unit size (acres) |  | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.61 | 1.08 | 2.00 | 9.09 | 17.78 |
| Annualized Land (\$/yr) | \$2500/acre | 22 | 35 | 85 | 143 | 256 | 473 | 2,145 | 4,196 |
| Annualized Excavation | \$0.17077/ft3 | 24 | 237 | 1,186 | 2,373 | 4,746 | 9,491 | 47,457 | 94,914 |
| Ann. Liner (40 mil geomembrane) | \$0.5602/ft2 | 215 | 339 | 830 | 1,400 | 2,495 | 4,617 | 20,934 | 40,956 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Material Handling |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distance to Unit (ft) |  | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Piping - annualized capital |  | 425 | 425 | 425 | 425 | 821 | 904 | 1,120 | 1,390 |
| Piping - annual O \& M |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 1,685 | 2,036 | 3,526 | 5,341 | 9,318 | 16,485 | 72,655 | 142,457 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 3.37 | 0.41 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.07 |

Exhibit D-18
Annual Storage Cost Assuming 30 Day Storage of Liquids in Unlined Surface Impoundments with Groundwater Monitoring

| Surface Impoundment | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 500 | 5,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 | 100,000 | 500,000 | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| Waste Quantities ( $\mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{mo}$ ) |  | 42 | 417 | 2,083 | 4,167 | 8,333 | 41,667 | 83,333 | 166,667 |
| Waste Quantity (ft3/mo) |  | 1,472 | 14,721 | 73,604 | 147,209 | 294,418 | 1,472,089 | 2,944,177 | 5,888,355 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/mo) |  | 11,012 | 110,120 | 550,598 | 1,101,196 | 2,202,392 | 11,011,959 | 22,023,919 | 44,047,837 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/day) |  | 367 | 3,671 | 18,353 | 36,707 | 73,413 | 367,065 | 734,131 | 1,468,261 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit size (ft2) |  | 4,061 | 6,410 | 15,688 | 26,478 | 47,192 | 204,364 | 395,890 | 774,557 |
| Unit size (acres) |  | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.61 | 1.08 | 4.69 | 9.09 | 17.78 |
| Annualized Land (\$/yr) | \$2500/acre | 22 | 35 | 85 | 143 | 256 | 1,107 | 2,145 | 4,196 |
| Annualized Excavation | \$0.17077/ft3 | 24 | 237 | 1,186 | 2,373 | 4,746 | 23,729 | 47,457 | 94,914 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Groundwater Monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Downgradient Wells |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 13 |
| Annualized Capital Cost |  | 6,722 | 6,722 | 6,722 | 6,722 | 7,840 | 11,193 | 14,545 | 17,898 |
| Annual O \& M Cost |  | 7,290 | 7,290 | 7,290 | 7,290 | 8,760 | 13,170 | 17,580 | 21,990 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Material Handling |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distance to Unit (ft) |  | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Piping - annualized capital |  | 425 | 425 | 425 | 425 | 821 | 985 | 1,120 | 1,390 |
| Piping - annual O \& M |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 15,483 | 15,709 | 16,709 | 17,954 | 23,423 | 51,183 | 83,847 | 141,388 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 30.97 | 3.14 | 0.67 | 0.36 | 0.23 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.07 |

Exhibit D-19
Annual Storage Cost Assuming 30 Day Storage of Liquids in Unlined, Unmonitored Surface Impoundments

| Surface Impoundment | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 500 | 5,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 | 100,000 | 500,000 | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| Waste Quantities (mt/mo) |  | 42 | 417 | 2,083 | 4,167 | 8,333 | 41,667 | 83,333 | 166,667 |
| Waste Quantity (ft3/mo) |  | 1,472 | 14,721 | 73,604 | 147,209 | 294,418 | 1,472,089 | 2,944,177 | 5,888,355 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/mo) |  | 11,012 | 110,120 | 550,598 | 1,101,196 | 2,202,392 | 11,011,959 | 22,023,919 | 44,047,837 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/day) |  | 367 | 3,671 | 18,353 | 36,707 | 73,413 | 367,065 | 734,131 | 1,468,261 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit size (ft2) |  | 4,061 | 6,410 | 15,688 | 26,478 | 47,192 | 204,364 | 395,890 | 774,557 |
| Unit size (acres) |  | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.61 | 1.08 | 4.69 | 9.09 | 17.78 |
| Annualized Land (\$/yr) | \$2500/acre | 22 | 35 | 85 | 143 | 256 | 1,107 | 2,145 | 4,196 |
| Annualized Excavation | \$0.17077/ft3 | 24 | 237 | 1,186 | 2,373 | 4,746 | 23,729 | 47,457 | 94,914 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Material Handling |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distance to Unit (ft) |  | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Piping - annualized capital |  | 425 | 425 | 425 | 425 | 821 | 985 | 1,120 | 1,390 |
| Piping - annual O \& M |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 1,470 | 1,697 | 2,696 | 3,941 | 6,823 | 26,820 | 51,722 | 101,500 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 2.94 | 0.34 | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |

Exhibit D-20
Annual Storage Cost (O \& M only) Assuming 30 Day Storage of Liquids in Unlined, Unmonitored Waste Piles

| Surface Impoundment | Unit Cost | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Quantities (mt/yr) |  | 500 | 5,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 | 100,000 | 500,000 | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| Waste Quantities ( $\mathrm{mt} / \mathrm{mo}$ ) |  | 42 | 417 | 2,083 | 4,167 | 8,333 | 41,667 | 83,333 | 166,667 |
| Waste Quantity ( $\mathrm{ft3} / \mathrm{mo}$ ) |  | 1,472 | 14,721 | 73,604 | 147,209 | 294,418 | 1,472,089 | 2,944,177 | 5,888,355 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/mo) |  | 11,012 | 110,120 | 550,598 | 1,101,196 | 2,202,392 | 11,011,959 | 22,023,919 | 44,047,837 |
| Waste Quantity (gal/day) |  | 367 | 3,671 | 18,353 | 36,707 | 73,413 | 367,065 | 734,131 | 1,468,261 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit size (ft2) |  | 4,061 | 6,410 | 15,688 | 26,478 | 47,192 | 204,364 | 395,890 | 774,557 |
| Unit size (acres) |  | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.61 | 1.08 | 4.69 | 9.09 | 17.78 |
| Annualized Land (\$/yr) | \$2500/acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annualized Excavation | \$0.17077/ft3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Material Handling |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distance to Unit (ft) |  | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Piping - annualized capital |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Piping - annual O \& M |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Cost (\$/yr) |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Unit Cost (\$/mt) |  | 2.00 | 0.20 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Exhibit D-21
Relevant Ranges of Use for Curve Fit Cost Functions

| Solids | Equation | Range | NPT, MPT | PT SL/BP | PT SM | Opt. 1 | Opt. 2 | Opt. 3 | Opt. 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drums - solid | $y=24.589 x+132.23$ | 0.5-200 | 0-200 | 0-200 | 0-200 | 0-200 | 0-200 | 0-200 | 0-200 |
| Roll-off | $y=-0.0022 x^{\wedge} 2+29.272 x+4840.9$ | 50-7500 | 200-935 | 200-935 | 200-1343.1 | 200-7500 | 200-1343.1 | 200-1343.1 | 200-935 |
| Building | $y=0.00002 x^{\wedge} 2+3.2395 x+35800$ | 1300-51000 |  |  | 1343.1 ++ |  | 1343.1 ++ | 1343.1 ++ |  |
| RCRA BUilding | $y=23.399 x+121689$ | 120-45000 |  |  |  | 7500-45000 |  |  |  |
| LIne Pile | $y=4.0924 x+27676$ | 500-120,000 |  |  |  | 45000++ | 45000++ | 45000++ |  |
| Unlined Pile | $y=4.0335 x+26522$ | 500-120,000 | 935 ++ | 935 ++ |  |  |  |  | 935 ++ |
| Unlined Pile - O \$ M | $y=4.0207 x+26271$ | 500-120,000 | 935 ++ | $935++$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposal Pile | $y=1.8703 x+12308$ | 50-500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Liquids |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drum | $y=-0.0074 x^{\wedge} 2+9.4798 x+189.34$ | 0.5-250 | 0-220 | 0-220 | 0-220 | 0-250 | 0-220 | 0-220 | 0-220 |
| Tanks | $y=-9 e-7 x^{\wedge} 2+0.55 x+1795.7$ | 45-200000 | 220-500 | 220-500 | 220++, |  | 220-1 million | 220-1 million | 220-500 |
| RCRA Tanks | $y=-4 e-6 x^{\wedge} 2+2.0665 x+6953.8$ | 45-200000 |  |  |  | 250-1 million |  |  |  |
| Lined SI | $y=0.0704 x+1955.1$ | 500-2000000 |  |  |  | 1 million ++ | 1 million ++ | 1 million ++ |  |
| Unlined SI | $y=0.05 x+1565.9$ | 500-2000000 | 500++ | 500++ |  |  |  |  | 500++ |
| Unlined SI (O \& M) | $y=1000$ | 500-2000000 | 500++ | 500++ |  |  |  |  | 500++ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DIsposal SI | $y=0.025 x+1491.4$ | 500-2000000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Exhbit D-22
Storage of Solids in Drums


April 15, 1997

Exhibit D-23
Storage of Solids in Roll-off


April 15, 1997


April 15, 1997

Exhibit D-25

Storage of Solids in RCRA Containment Building


April 15, 1997

Exhibit D-26

Storage Cost of Solids in Lined Piles


April 15, 1997

Exhibit D-27

Storage of Solids in Unlined Piles


April 15, 1997


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ EPA believes it is inappropriate to include sunk capital costs in the baseline, because the incremental costs of this rule are calculated as the diffrence between the post rule costs and the baseline costs. If EPA included these non-recoverable costs in the baseline, the incremental cost of the rule would be understated.

