DRAFT SUMMARY OF MINUTES OF APRIL 30, 1996 MEETING OF EPA AND REPRESENTATIVES OF LEAD RECOVERY FROM BATTERIES

April 30, 1996, 1:00 - 2:00 p.m.
2800 Crystal Station
Arlington, VA
2nd Floor, Conference Room B

ATTENDEES

Mary Cunningham, EPA/OSW/WTB
Michael Petruska, EPA/OSW/HWMMD
C. Pan Lee, EPA/OSW/HWMMD
Anita Cummings, EPA/OSW/WTB
Suzanne Wade, Versar
Robert Steinwurzel, Swidler & Berlin/ABR
Susan Panzik, S&B
Jean Beaudoin, JCBGI/BCI
Jack Waggener, RCI
Charles M. West, RCI
Katie Champon, WBN

Introduction

The purpose of this meeting was for EPA and representatives of lead recovery from batteries (Association of Battery Recyclers, Resource Consultants Inc., and Battery Council International) to discuss proposed treatment standards for lead characteristic wastes. Mary Cunningham opened the meeting by explaining the historical background for setting treatment standards under the Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Program. For listed waste codes, residuals carry the waste code forever, unless the waste is delisted. After treatment to the LDR levels, listed wastes may be placed in a Subtitle C landfill. For characteristic wastes, residuals are considered characteristic until they no longer exhibit the characteristic of hazardousness. For wastes treated by recovery of lead, residuals may be placed in a Subtitle D landfill if the lead concentration in the leachate is less than the TCLP limit. If this standard is not met, the characteristic waste could be disposed of in a Subtitle C landfill or undergo further treatment until it no longer exhibits the characteristic of hazardousness, at which time it could be placed in a Subtitle D landfill.

Discussion

The following questions, concerns, and issues were discussed:

1. Universe of wastes treated by recovery of lead

   EPA: What other types of wastes are treated with battery wastes? (Cunningham) What are the underlying hazardous constituents? Do the characteristics of the slag

remain the same (no substantial differences) when other wastes are added to the treatment process? (Petruska)

Ind.: Believes the main issue is slag (residuals). If other wastes are going into the blast furnace, are they also "treated" by "recovery of lead"? Feedstock includes Appendix 11 list constituents (lead materials from various industries). (Steinwurzel)

Conclusions: Based on limited information, EPA could state that the primary waste treated is lead and that other wastes do not appear to significally change the characterics of the slag. EPA could ask for public comment on this issue in the Notice of Data Availability (NODA).

2. Lead-contaminated soil and other non-smelter D008 wastes

Ind.: How is lead-contaminated soil to be managed? (Steinwurzel) How are other D008 wastes to be managed that don't go through smelters, such as remedial wastes, building debris, soil and debris. Industry has data on 7 sites for mobile, commercial excavation plus stabilization (pug mill or phosphate stabilization). It was stated that these wastes usually go to Subtitle D landfills after treatment or are capped in place. (Beaudoin)

EPA: In the Phase II Rule, all available data was evaluated when UTS was promulgated. Limited data and comments were received, so the Agency went forward with UTS based on the available data. It was the Agency's belief that existing stabilization processes (as evidenced by the data) are not optimized for the lower UTS levels, so these stabilizatiom data may not be reflective of actual capabilities. (Cunningham) EPA believes stabilization can achieve lower levels, but there is little supporting data. When the Phase II Notice was published, little feedback was received to suggest that characteristic lead wastes are substantially different from metal wastes in EPA's database and couldn't meet UTS. EPA's position with respect to characteristic soil is that it is substantially different from the metal wastes in EPA's database, so it is assigned case-by-case standards. (Cunningham)

Conclusion: EPA: If there is limited capacity, implementation of the rule for these metal-bearing waste streams could be deferred. Otherwise case-by-case standards could be allowed until the HWIR Media Rule is in place. Alternatively, a generic variance could be used. (Petruska)

Ind.: ABR would prefer to defer implementation and maintain the characteristic level of 5 ppm as the standard until HWIR goes into effect. Cleanup limits for Superfund sites include characteristic levels and site-specific standards (ARARs). It was noted that cleanup is usually under state supervision, so more stringent limits may be imposed. (Steinwurzel)

3. Additional treatment of secondary lead

EPA: What types of treatments are used for secondary lead (after recovery of lead)? East Penn. runs their lead waste through a reverberator repeatedly until it is non-hazardous (i.e., passes TCLP test for characteristic metals). (Petruska)

Ind.: Usually stabilization or further HTMR is used for secondary lead treatment.

Conclusion: See ABR response above.

4. Capacity issues

EPA: Pan Lee is working on capacity issues. Large quantity remediation sites sometimes treat onsite for economic reasons. Mobile, commercial stabilization units are more commonly used. Regions 4 and 10 rejected soil washing as a viable option for most lead-contaminated soil because it only works reliably on sandy soil. Pan Lee noted that LDRs are not in effect if the treatment is in-situ, for example, if surface contamination is present, then chemicals can be plowed into the soil for treatment. It is believed that less than 10 percent of stabilization sites use insitu treatment. (Pan) For abandoned sites it is more economical to do stabilization than run the waste through furnace again. It may be feasible to run the waste through the furnace at RCRA corrective action sites, if there is an operational furnace present. (Petruska)

Ind.: Industry has data on 7 sites for mobile, commercial excavation plus stabilization (pug mill or phosphate stabilization). It was stated that these wastes usually go to Subtitle D landfills after treatment or are capped in place. (Beaudoin) Dozens of Superfund sites involved. Can get lower numbers than characteristic, but not to UTS. Smelters with RCRA Part B permits doing Corrective Action. LDR still applies to corrective action. (Steinwurzel)

Conclusion: Analysis needs to be completed to determine capacity. Not a problem for existing standard, but may be for UTS (see next issue).

5. Capacity of processes to treat below 5 ppm for lead

EPA: What is the capacity of stabilizers treating to below 5 ppm? Some can do it but not all. This could be capacity problem for treatment levels below 5 ppm for lead.

Ind.: Stabilization process is limited by chemical reactions. Not necessarily better to add more of everything. Must be tailored for each site. Some variability must always be expected. Approximately 3 ppm is probably the best consistent target. (West) Feedstock is variable also. (Beaudoin)

Conclusion: There are probably no capacity problems unless the lead standard is changed to 0.37 ppm, then there could be some problems. The issue of whether to use a variance or an alternate plan is still under consideration.

6. Proposal for contingent management options

Ind.: The idea was introduced for an alternative LDR for generated lead if it can be proven that the lead does not leach. The industry would like to get away from the treatment emphasis on secondary lead and instead try a contingent management scenario like monofills instead of Subtitle C. (Steinwurtzel)

EPA: HWIR may be an appropriate rule to incorporate this type of idea. (Petruska)

Conclusion: See EPA response above.

7. Underlying hazardous constituents

Ind.: Would underlying hazardous constituents (UHC) have to meet BDAT levels? (Champon)

EPA: Flexibility is decreased by specifying treatment method, but then limits are not needed for other constituents. Treaters would only have to meet characteristic level.

Conclusion: See EPA response above.

Closing/Summary

The Notice of Data Availability is scheduled to go out next week. June 30 is the deadline for the rule. Industry does not plan to submit additional data. A videotape of the lead recovery process was provided to EPA.