APPENDIX A

CONSULTATION LETTERS

This appendix includes consultation/approval letters between the U.S. Department of Energy and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding threatened and endangered species, and between other state and Federal agencies as needed.



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE 446 Neal Street Cookerille, TN 38501

June 15, 2000

Mr. Roy Spears National Energy Technology Laboratory U.S. Department of Energy 3610 Collins Ferry Road Morgantown, West Virginia 26507-0880

Subject: Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Kentucky Pioneer Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle Demonstration Project, Clark County, Kentucky.

Dear Mr. Spears:

Fish and Wildlife Service personnel have reviewed the subject notice. Please consider the following comments during preparation of the EIS.

Our endangered species database contains a record of running buffalo clover (Trifolium stoloniferum) at a location approximately 11 miles from the proposed project site. This federally listed (endangered) species may occur within the project boundary. We recommend that you evaluate the potential for impact to the species and report your findings to this office. A finding of "may affect" would likely result in a need to coordinate further to develop protection measures.

Construction or operation of the facility could cause negative impacts to wetlands or streams. Further, withdrawal of water from the Kentucky River could result in significant aquatic impacts. The Kentucky River is an important fishery and contains several mussel beds downstream of the proposed project. Because a map of the proposed project location was not included with the subject notice, we were unable to screen for wetland and stream impacts. We recommend that potential impacts to wetlands and aquatic resources be examined in detail.

Thank you for this opportunity to review the scoping notice. Please contact David Pebren of my staff at 931/528-6481 (cxt. 204) or by e-mail at *david_pelren@fws.gov* if you have questions concerning these comments.

Sincerely,

Lee A. Barclay, Ph.D. Field Supervisor

A-3



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE 446 Neal Street Cookeville, TN 38501

July 25, 2000

Mr. Chuck Pergler EIS Ecological Resources Leader Tetra Tech, Inc. 2502 35th Street Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

Dear Mr. Pergler:

Thank you for your letter, dated June 21, 2000, regarding the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Kentucky Pioneer Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle Demonstration Project in Clark County, Kentucky. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) personnel have reviewed the information submitted and offer the following comments.

Endangered species collection records available to the Service do not indicate that federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species occur within the impact area of the project. We note, however, that collection records available to the Service may not be all-inclusive. Our data base is a compilation of collection records made available by various individuals and resource agencies. This information is seldom based on comprehensive surveys of all potential habitat and thus does not necessarily provide conclusive evidence that protected species are present or absent at a specific locality.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please contact Steve Alexander of my staff at 931/528-6481, ext. 210, or via c-mail at steven_alexander@fws.gov.

Sincerely,

Build

Lee A. Barclay, Ph.D. Field Supervisor



JUL 2 6 2002

Education, Arts and Humanities Cabinet

KENTUCKY HERITAGE COUNCIL The State Historic Preservation Office

Paul E. Patton Governor Marlene M. Helm Cabinet Secretary David L. Morgan Executive Director and SHPO

July 10, 2002

Mr. Roy Spears US Department of Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory 3610 Collins Ferry Road P.O. Box 880 Morgantown, WV 26507-0880 Mail Stop N-03

Re: Kentucky Pioneer Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle Demonstration Project; Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Clark County, Kentucky.

Dear Mr. Spcars:

The State Historic Preservation Office has received for review and approval the above referenced draft environmental impact statement. On page S-11 of the document it states that, "The 1,263-hectare (3,120-acre) J.K. Smith tract is located within the Kentucky River Basin. The site is a hilly highland bounded by the Upper Howard Creek on the North and West, the freight rail line on the East, and the Kentucky River on the South. The land at the site has been previously disturbed and graded during the initial phases of the discontinued J.K. Smith Power Station constructed in the 1980's. Extensive cultural resources investigations have been completed in the J.K. Smith site area. Based on literature and records review of the 121-hectare (300-acre) project site, prehistoric resources were identified. Details of the findings are presented in Section 4.4.3, Cultural Resources of the Proposed Facility Location."

We are in agreement that the larger sitc has been previously disturbed and that cultural resources were identified and recorded/excavated. The Section 106 Review process was completed for this projects Area of Potential Effect in December of 1980. The terms of the Memorandum of Agreement drawn up in conjunction with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for the proposed J.K. Smith Power Station project have been met and further identification, evaluation, mitigation, consultation activities are no longer required. Therefore, in accordance with 36CFR Part 800.4(d) of the Advisory

300 Washington Street Frankfort, Kentucky 40601 An equal opportunity employer M/F/D



Telephone (502) 564-7005 FAX (502) 564-5820 Printed on recycled paper Page 2 Mr. Roy Spears July 10, 2002

Council's revised regulations, our finding is that there is No Effect on Historic **Properties** for this undertaking.

Should you have any questions, feel free to contact Craig Potts of my staff at (502) 564-7005 ext. 121.

Sincerely,

Durid L. Morgan

David L. Morgan, Director Kentucky Heritage Council and State Historic Preservation Officer

Cc: John Preston (Army Corps of Engineers)

JAMES E. BICKFORD



PAUL E. PATTON

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION CABINET DEPARTMENT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT 14 REILLY RD FRANKFORT KY 40601-1190

June 27, 2002

REC S

JUL 01 2002

Mr. Dwight N. Lockwood, P.E., Manager Regulatory Affairs Global Energy, Inc. Suite 2000 312 Walnut Street Cincinnati, OH 45202

RE: Kentucky Pioneer Energy IGCC Project Clark County

Dear Mr. Lockwood:

I am writing you in response to your letter of October 9, 2000 concerning the applicability of the solid waste statutes and administrative regulations to the proposed gasification of municipal solid waste (MSW) pellets at the planned Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle plant near Trapp, Kentucky. According to your predicted characterization, a contractor would make the pellets as follows: first, the recyclables would be removed, leaving about 70% paper and 10% plastics; then, the manufacturer would mix binders with the material and extrude the mix into pellets. The finished product would be typical for most Refuse Derived Fuels (RDF).

The Division of Waste Management (DWM) has determined that the above-described MSW pellets would be a RDF. Also, the **RDF** is a recovered material, and that the clean-coal project you describe in your letter will be considered a recovered material processing facility. This determination is based on the description of the planned Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle plant that you provide in your letter 9, 2000,

The statute defines "Refuse Derived Fuel" as "... a sized, processed fuel product derived from the extensive separation of municipal solid waste, which includes the extraction of recoverable materials for recycling and the removal of nonprocessables such as dirt and gravel prior to processing the balance of the municipal solid waste into the refuse-derived fuel product" (KRS 224.01-010(23)). This determination that no waste permit is needed for the gasification process is also dependent on Pioneer Energy using RDF that conforms to the statutory definition. At least thirty (30) days before beginning gasification, Pioneer Energy must send the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet (cabinet) the description of the selected RDF process. The cabinet will evaluate if the manufacturing of the fuel meets the statutory definition.



Mr. Dwight N. Lockwood, P.E. Page No. 2 June 27, 2002

This determination does not release the company from properly handling, storing and disposing of all waste generated by the facility. Please remember that a hazardous waste determination must be conducted on the resulting ash and other wastestreams in accordance with 401 KAR 32:010, Section 2. For the ash, this normally entails the Toxic Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) for metals. Underground storage tanks containing petroleum or hazardous materials are regulated by DWM under 401 KAR 42:020 and KRS 224.60-105, as well. The company must also have a valid permit from the Division for Air Quality (DAQ) before construction may begin. As you know, DAQ issued a permit (no. V-00-049) to the company on June 7, 2001, and the company initiated administrative litigation to challenge the permit in *Kentucky Pioneer Energy*. *LLC v. NREPC*, File No. DAQ-25321-037. That case remains pending.

If the process you describe in your October 9, 2000 letter will change in any manner, please provide DWM with a written description of that change, so that we may re-evaluate the determination we are making today. If the company decides to process solid waste into RDF in Kentucky, DWM may determine that the facility is a materials recovery facility. Materials recovery facilities are solid waste management facilities that do require permits. If the company is considered to have a materials recovery facility, it may be eligible for a registered-permit-by-rule for a solid waste transfer station. In order to obtain a registered-permit-by-rule, a public notice is stipulated two weeks before submittal of the registration form, and a public meeting may also be required.

As the project moves forward, please stay in touch with DWM to discuss the applicability of waste requirements. Please feel free to contact George Gilbert at (502) 564-6716 regarding any concerns or questions about the project.

Sincerely

Robert H. Daniell Director

RHD/GFG/gfg

c: Clark County Fiscal Court Todd Royer, P.E., URS Division for Air Quality Frankfort Regional Office Solid Waste Branch

APPENDIX B

NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE KENTUCKY PIONEER INTEGRATED GASIFICATION COMBINED CYCLE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, TRAPP, KY AND NOTICE OF FLOODPLAIN INVOLVEMENT

The following is the Notice of Intent published by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) on April 14, 2000, in the *Federal Register* announcing its intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project (65 FR 20142). DOE notified interested persons, including federal, state, and local government agencies, public interest groups, regulators, and members of the general public, to participate in the scoping process.

The PEIS will evaluate the environmental effects associated with alternatives developed through the Request for Expressions of Interest and during the scoping process. Issues to be addressed include, but are not limited to: cultural and historic resources and impacts on the adjacent USS Missouri and USS Arizona Memorial; biological resources and habitat as may be impacted by in-water construction; water resources and hydrology; soils and geology; public services and utilities; traffic and noise; public health and safety; hazardous materials and wastes; and environmental justice. The analysis will include an evaluation of the direct, indirect, short-term, and cumulative impacts. No decision to implement any alternative, including the No-Action Alternative, will be made until the NEPA process is complete.

The DON will conduct two public scoping meetings to identify potentially significant issues, and to notify interested and affected parties of the PEIS process. A brief presentation describing the proposed action, historic resources related to the Pearl Harbor National Historic Landmark, and the NEPA process will precede the public's opportunity to comment relating to the scope of the PEIS. The purposes and format of the meetings are provided to invite public input on historic resource issues as part of the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act, as well as public involvement requirements specified under NEPA. It is important that interested federal, state, and local agencies, organizations and individuals take this opportunity to identify environmental and other related concerns that they believe should be addressed during preparation of the PEIS.

To allow time for all views to be shared, speakers will be asked to limit their oral comments to three minutes. Agencies and the public are invited to provide written comments in addition to, or in lieu of, oral comments at the public meetings. Scoping comments should clearly describe specific issues or topics that the commentor believes the PEIS should address and those that the NHPA process should address. Written comments are to be filed with Mr. Stanley Uehara (Code PLN231), Pacific Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, 258 Makalapa Drive, STE 100, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, and must be postmarked no later than May 15, 2000.

Dated: April 7, 2000. J.L. Roth, Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer. [FR Doc. 00–9369 Filed 4–13–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Kentucky Pioneer Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle Demonstration Project, Trapp, KY and Notice of Floodplain Involvement

AGENCY: U.S. Department of Energy. **ACTION:** Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Notice of Floodplain Involvement.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) announces its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), and the DOE NEPA regulations (10 CFR part 1021), to assess the potential environmental and human health impacts of a proposed project to design, construct, and operate a demonstration electric-power generating plant in Trapp, Clark County, Kentucky. The proposed Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) project, selected under the Clean Coal Technology Program, would be the first commercialscale demonstration of the fixed bed British Gas Lurgi (BGL) gasification process in the United States. The proposed project would also demonstrate a high-temperature molten carbonate fuel cell and would involve the construction and operation of a nominal 400 MWe (megawatt-electric) IGCC power station. Feed to the BGL gasifiers would be solid fuel briquettes. The EIS will help DOE decide whether to provide 18 percent (approximately \$78M) of the funding for the currently estimated \$432 M proposed project. The purpose of this Notice of Intent

The purpose of this Notice of Intent is to inform the public about the proposed action; announce the plans for a public scoping meeting; invite public participation in (and explain) the EIS scoping process; and solicit public comments for consideration in establishing the proposed scope and content of the EIS. The EIS will evaluate the proposed project and reasonable alternatives. Because the proposed project may affect floodplains, the EIS will include a floodplain assessment and a statement of findings in accordance with DOE regulations for compliance with floodplain environmental review requirements (10 CFR part 1022).

DATES: To ensure that all of the issues related to this proposal are addressed, DOE invites comments on the proposed scope and content of the EIS from all interested parties. Comments must be received by May 31, 2000, to ensure consideration. Later comments will be considered to the extent practicable. In addition to receiving comments in writing and by telephone, DOE will conduct a public scoping meeting in which agencies, organizations, and the general public are invited to present oral comments or suggestions with regard to the range of actions, alternatives, and impacts to be considered in the EIS. The scoping meeting will be held at Trapp Elementary School, Trapp, Kentucky on May 4, 2000, beginning at 7:00 p.m. (See Public Scoping Process). The public is invited to an informal session at this location beginning at 4:00 p.m. to learn more about the proposed action. Displays and other forms of information about the proposed agency action and location will be available, and DOE personnel will be present to answer questions.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the proposed EIS scope and requests to participate in the public scoping meeting should be addressed to: Mr. Roy Spears, NEPA Document Manager for the Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project, National Energy Technology Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy, 3610 Collins Ferry Road, Morgantown, WV 26507-0880. People who would like to otherwise participate in the public scoping process should contact Mr. Spears directly at: telephone 304-285-5460; toll free telephone 1-800-432-8330 (extension 5460); fax 304-285-4403; or e-mail rspears@netl.doe.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To obtain additional information about this project or to receive a copy of the draft EIS for review when it is issued, contact Mr. Roy Spears at the address provided above. For general information on the DOE NEPA process, please contact Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance (EH–42), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585–0119; telephone 202–586–4600 or leave a message at 1– 800–472–2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background and Need for Agency Action

Under Public Law 102–154, the U.S. Congress provided authorization and funds to DOE for conducting cost-shared Clean Coal Technology Program projects for the design, construction, and operation of facilities that significantly advance the efficiency and environmental performance of coalusing technologies and are applicable to either new or existing facilities. The purpose of this proposed agency action. which is known as the Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project, is to establish the commercial viability of the fixed bed BGL gasification process in the United States and the operation of a high temperature molten carbonate fuel cell using coal derived gas. The IGCC plants have long been recognized as being environmentally superior to conventional coal-fired power plants while operating at significantly higher efficiencies. The proposed project would demonstrate the improved economic viability and process flexibility of the BGL technology and promote fuel cells as a viable commercial source of electricity. A slipstream of syngas would be routed to a fuel cell to produce additional electricity in this demonstration project.

Since the early 1970s, DOE and its predecessor agencies have pursued research and development programs that include long-term, high-risk activities that support the development of innovative concepts for a wide variety of coal technologies through the proof-of-concept stage. However, the availability of a technology at the proofof-concept stage is not sufficient to ensure its continued development and subsequent commercialization. Before any technology can be considered seriously for commercialization, it must be demonstrated. The financial risk associated with technology demonstration is, in general, too high for the private sector to assume in the absence of strong incentives. The Clean Coal Technology Program is a congressionally authorized program designed to accelerate the development of innovative technologies to meet the Nation's near-term energy and environmental goals; to reduce technological risk to the business community to an acceptable level; and to provide private sector incentives required for continued activity in innovative research and development directed at providing solutions to longrange energy supply problems.

Proposed Action

The proposed action is for DOE to provide, through a cooperative agreement with Kentucky Pioneer Energy, L.L.C., financial assistance for the design, construction, and operation of the proposed project. The Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project would be designed for at least 20 years of commercial operation, beginning with a 2-year Clean Coal Technology demonstration, and would cost a total of approximately \$432 M; DOE's share would be approximately \$78 M (18%).

The proposed project includes the design, construction, and operation of a new 400 MWe IGCC power plant in rural Clark County, Kentucky. Kentucky Pioneer Energy, L.L.C. would use licensed gasification technology to fuel an electric generating facility. The facility would demonstrate the three following innovative technologies: (1) Gasification of fuel briquettes; (2) use of the syngas product as a clean fuel in combined cycle turbine generator sets; and (3) operation of a high temperature molten carbonate fuel cell on coal derived syngas. This project would be the first commercial scale application of the BGL gasification technology in the United States. This would also be the first commercial scale demonstration of a molten carbonate fuel cell operating on coal derived gas. Construction of the proposed plant would be expected to require approximately 30 months.

The project consists of the following components: Briquettes and raw material transportation, receipt, and storage; sulfur removal and recovery; a gasification plant; a combined cycle power unit; and a fuel cell. The IGCC facility would provide needed power capacity to the central and eastern Kentucky areas.

To supply the proposed plant and other potential customers with fuel briquettes, the parent company of the applicant, Global Energy, Inc., would construct a production facility at an offsite location. The briquettes would be made from high-sulfur coal (at least 50%) and refuse (municipal solid waste). The location of the briquette manufacturing facility remains to be determined. However, sources of lowcost high-sulfur coal, refuse availability and supporting infrastructure would be considered by Global in siting the facility. The EIS will consider potential environmental impacts from operation of a briquette facility.

The IGCC technology that Kentucky Pioneer Energy, L.L.C. would be demonstrating consists of the following four steps: (1) Generation of syngas by reacting fuel briquettes with steam and oxygen, creating a high-temperature, chemically reducing atmosphere; (2) removal of contaminants, including particulates and sulfur; (3) combustion of clean syngas in a turbine generator to produce electricity; and (4) recovery of residual heat in the hot exhaust gas from the gas turbine in a heat recovery steam generator and use of the steam to produce additional electricity in a steam turbine generator.

The proposed project site comprises approximately 300 acres located within a 3,120-acre tract, owned by East Kentucky Power Cooperative (EKPC) in Clark County, Kentucky. The tract is 34 kilometers (21 miles) southeast of the city of Lexington. The site can be reached by State Highway 89 and accessed through a gated perimeter fence and access road.

The 300-acre proposed project site was previously disturbed by preliminary construction activities when EKPC began construction of its first-phase power station in the mid-1980s. That project was canceled in the early 1990s when decreased demand for electric power made the project uneconomical. EKPC completed preliminary grading, primary foundations, fire protection piping and rail spur access infrastructure installation before the project was cancelled.

The Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project would be designed to minimize expected or potential adverse impacts to the environment. Advanced process technology, efficient pollution control technology, and effective pollution prevention measures, including extensive reuse of internal process water, would be employed to minimize impacts.

Alternatives

Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA requires that agencies discuss the reasonable alternatives to the proposed action in an EIS. The purpose for agency action determines the range of reasonable alternatives. The goals of the proposed agency action establish the limits of its reasonable alternatives. Congress established the Clean Coal Technology Program with a specific purpose: To demonstrate the commercial viability of technologies that use coal in more environmentally benign ways than conventional coal technologies. Congress also directed DOE to pursue the goals of the legislation by means of partial funding (cost sharing) of projects owned and controlled by non-Federal government sponsors. This statutory requirement places DOE in a much more limited role than if the Federal

government were the owner and operator of the project. In the latter situation, DOE would be responsible for a comprehensive review of reasonable alternatives for siting the project. However, in dealing with an applicant, the scope of alternatives is necessarily more restricted because the agency must focus on alternative ways to accomplish its purpose that reflect both the application before it and the functions the agency plays in the decision process. It is appropriate in such cases for DOE to give substantial consideration to the applicant's needs in establishing a project's reasonable alternatives.

DOE developed an overall NEPA compliance strategy for the Clean Coal Technology Program that includes consideration of both programmatic and project-specific environmental impacts during and after the process of selecting a proposed project. As part of the NEPA strategy, the EIS for the Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project will tier from the Clean Coal **Technology** Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) that DOE issued in November 1989 (DOE/EIS–0146). Two alternatives were evaluated in the PEIS: (1) The no-action alternative, which assumed that the Clean Coal Technology Program was not continued and that power suppliers would continue to use conventional coal-fired technologies with flue gas desulfurization and nitrogen oxide controls to meet New Source Performance Standards: and (2) the proposed action, which assumed that Clean Coal Technology Program projects would be selected and funded, and that successfully demonstrated technologies would undergo widespread commercialization by the year 2010.

The range of reasonable options to be considered in the EIS for the proposed Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project is determined in accordance with the overall NEPA strategy. The EIS also will include an analysis of the noaction alternative, as required under NEPA. Under the no-action alternative, DOE would not provide partial funding for the design, construction, and operation of the project. In the absence of DOE funding, the Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project probably would not be constructed. If the proposed Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project were not built, EKPC may use alternative, less efficient sources for electric power to meet future demands of its customers. Alternatives to the proposed project could include purchasing power from other sources, adding generation capacity that does not rely on the IGCC technology, or using

some other current technology. DOE will consider other reasonable alternatives that may be suggested during the public scoping period.

Because of DOE's limited role of providing cost-shared funding for the proposed Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project, and because of advantages associated with the proposed location, DOE does not plan to evaluate alternative sites for the proposed project. Site selection was governed primarily by benefits that EKPC could realize. EKPC preferred the proposed project site because the costs would be much higher and the environmental impacts would likely be greater for an undisturbed area.

Under the proposed action, project activities would include engineering and design, permitting, fabrication and construction, testing, and demonstration of the technology. DOE plans to complete the EIS and issue a Record of Decision within 15 months of publication of this Notice of Intent, assuming timely delivery of information from Kentucky Pioneer Energy, L.L.C. that DOE needs for preparing the EIS. Upon completion of the demonstration, the facility could continue commercial operation.

Preliminary Identification of Environmental Issues

The following issues have been tentatively identified for analysis in the EIS. This list, which was developed on the basis of analyses of similar projects and from agency concerns, and is presented to facilitate public comment on the scope of the EIS, is neither intended to be all-inclusive nor a predetermined set of potential impacts. Additions to or deletions from this list may occur as a result of the scoping process.

The issues include:

(1) Atmospheric resources: Potential air quality impacts resulting from emissions during construction and operation of the Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project and the briquette manufacturing plant;

(2) Water resources: Potential effects on surface and groundwater resources and withdrawal of water from the Kentucky River;

(3) Infrastructure and land use, including potential effects resulting from the manufacture, transportation, and storage of the briquettes required for the proposed project;

(4) Solid waste: Pollution prevention and waste management practices, including impacts caused by waste generation and treatment at the proposed project and briquette manufacturing plant; (5) Noise: Potential impacts resulting from construction, transportation of materials, and plant operation for the proposed project and briquette manufacturing plant;

(6) Construction: Impacts associated with traffic patterns and construction related emissions;

(7) Floodplains: Impacts associated with extension of a water intake structure in the Kentucky River;

(8) Community impacts, including impacts from local traffic patterns, socioeconomic impacts on public services and infrastructure, and environmental justice (Executive Order 12898) with respect to the surrounding community;

(9) Cumulative effects that result from the incremental impacts of the proposed project when added to the other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions; and,

(10) Visual impacts associated with plant structures.

Public Scoping Process

To ensure that all issues related to this proposal are addressed, DOE will conduct an open process to define the scope of the EIS. The public scoping period will run until May 31, 2000. Interested agencies, organizations, and the general public are encouraged to submit comments or suggestions concerning the content of the EIS, issues and impacts to be addressed in the EIS, and the alternatives that should be analyzed. Scoping comments should describe specific issues or topics that the EIS should address in order to assist DOE in identifying significant issues. Written, e-mailed, or faxed comments should be communicated by May 31, 2000 (see ADDRESSES).

DOE will conduct a public scoping meeting at Trapp Elementary School in Trapp, Kentucky on May 4, 2000, at 7 p.m. The address of Trapp Elementary School is 11400 Irvine Road, Highway 89 South, Winchester, Kentucky 40391. In addition, the public is invited to an informal session at this location beginning at 4 p.m. to learn more about the proposed action. Displays and other information about the proposed agency action and location will be available, and DOE personnel will be present to answer questions.

The formal scoping meeting will begin on May 4, 2000, at 7 p.m. DOE asks people who wish to speak at this public scoping meeting to contact Mr. Roy Spears, either by phone, fax, computer, or in writing (see **ADDRESSES** in this Notice). People who do not arrange in advance to speak may register at the meeting (preferably at the beginning of the meeting) and may speak after previously scheduled speakers. Speakers who want more than five minutes should indicate the length of time desired in their request. Depending on the number of speakers, DOE may need to limit speakers to five minutes initially, and provide additional opportunities as time permits. Speakers may also provide written materials to supplement their presentations. Oral and written comments will be given equal consideration.

DOE will begin the meeting with an overview of the proposed Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project. The meeting will not be conducted as an evidentiary hearing, and speakers will not be cross-examined. However, speakers may be asked questions to help ensure that DOE fully understands their comments or suggestions. A presiding officer will establish the order of speakers and provide any additional procedures necessary to conduct the meeting.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 10th day of April, 2000.

David Michaels,

Assistant Secretary, Environment, Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 00–9301 Filed 4–13–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Notice of Availability of Solicitation

AGENCY: Idaho Operations Office, Department of Energy. **ACTION:** Notice of availability of solicitation—enhanced geothermal systems project development.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Idaho Operations Office, is seeking applications for projects to verify the electrical power generating potential of enhanced geothermal systems (EGS). Concept definition studies will comprise Phase One of this solicitation. Up to ten financial assistance awards, valued at a maximum of \$200,000 each, will be made for Phase One. The period of performance for Phase One is anticipated to be four months. Upon evaluation of the results from Phase One, the DOE will select the most promising projects for field validation. Validation will comprise Phase Two of the solicitation.

DATES: The deadline for receipt of applications is 3 p.m. MDT May 24, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Applications should be submitted to: Procurement Services Division, U. S. Department of Energy,

Idaho Operations Office, Attention: Elizabeth Dahl [DE–PS07–00ID13913], 850 Energy Drive, MS 1221, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401–1563.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Dahl, Contract Specialist, at dahlee@id.doe.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The statutory authority for this program is the Geothermal Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Pub.L. 93–410). The issuance date of Solicitation No. DE–PS07–00ID13913 is on or about April 14, 2000. The solicitation is available in full text via the Internet at the following address: *http://www.id.doe.gov/doeid/psd/proc-div.html.* Technical and non-technical questions should be submitted in writing to Elizabeth Dahl by e-mail *dahlee@id.doe.gov,* or facsimile at 208–526–5548 no later than April 21, 2000.

Issued in Idaho Falls on April 7, 2000.

Michael L. Adams,

Acting Director, Procurement Services Division.

[FR Doc. 00–9300 Filed 4–13–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office of Fossil Energy, National Coal Council; Meeting

AGENCY: Department of Energy. **ACTION:** Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice announces a meeting of the National Coal Council. Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. No. 92–463, 86 Stat. 770) requires notice of these meetings be announced in the **Federal Register**.

DATED: Wednesday, May 3, 2000, 9:00 am to 12 noon.

ADDRESS: Westin Fairfax Hotel, 2100 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Margie D. Biggerstaff, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy, Washington, DC 20585. Phone: 202/ 586–3867.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose of the Committee: To provide advice, information, recommendations to the Secretary of Energy on matters relating to coal and coal industry issues. Tentative Agenda:

- Call to order E. Linn Draper, Jr., Chairman
- Remarks by Secretary of Energy, Bill Richardson (invited)
- Remarks by Ms. Kathy Karpen, Office of Surface Mining
- Remarks by Mr. John Neumann, Edison Electric Institute

- Administrative business
- Report by James K. Martin, Chairman of Council Study Working Group, on Progress of Council's Current Study on Carbon Sequestration
- Other business
- Adjournment

Public Participation

The meeting is open to the public. The Chairperson of the Committee will conduct the meeting to facilitate the orderly conduct of business. If you would like to file a written statement with the Committee, you may do so either before or after the meeting. If you would like to make oral statements regarding any of the items on the agenda, you should contact Margie D. Biggerstaff at the address or telephone number listed above. You must make your request for an oral statement at least five business days prior to the meeting, and reasonable provisions will be made to include the presentation on the agenda. Public comment will follow the 10-minute rule.

Transcripts

The transcript will be available for public review and copying within 30 days at the Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, 1E–190, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 11, 2000.

Rachel M. Samuel,

Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 00–9367 Filed 4–13–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Secretary of Energy Advisory Board; Notice of Open Meeting

AGENCY: Department of Energy. SUMMARY: This notice announces an open meeting of the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board's Task Force on the Department of Energy's Nonproliferation Programs in Russia. The Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, 86 Stat. 770), requires that agencies publish these notices in the Federal Register to allow for public participation. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the Task Force's review of the Department of Energy's nonproliferation programs in Russia. NAME: Secretary of Energy Advisory Board—Task Force on the Department of Energy's Nonproliferation Programs in Russia.

APPENDIX C

KENTUCKY PIONEER INTEGRATED GASIFICATION COMBINED CYCLE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT CONTRACTOR DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The following is the disclosure statement, pursuant to 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* 1506.5(c) provided by Tetra Tech, Inc., the preparer of this Environmental Impact Statement.

NEPA DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FOR PREPARATION OF THE KENUCKY PIONEER INTEGRATED GASIFICATION COMBINED CYCLE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

CEQ Regulations at 40 CFR 1506.5(c), which have been adopted by the DOE (10 CFR 1021), require contractors who will prepare an EIS to execute a disclosure specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project. The term "financial interest or other interest in the outcome of the project" for purposes of this disclosure is defined in the March 23, 1981 guidance "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations," 46 FR 8026-18038 at Question 17a and b.

"Financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" includes "any financial benefit such as a promise of future construction or design work in the project, as well as indirect benefits the contractor is aware of (e.g., if the project would aid proposals sponsored by the firm's other clients) (46 FR 18026-18038 at 18031).

In accordance with these requirements, the offeror and any proposed subcontractors hereby certify as follows: (check either (a) or (b) to assure consideration of your proposal).

- (a) <u>X</u> Offeror and any proposed subcontractor have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project.
- (b) _____ Offeror and any proposed subcontractor have the following financial or other interest in the outcome of the project and hereby agree to divest themselves of such interest prior to award of this contract.

Financial or Other Interests

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Certified by: Chomes SIGNATURE

Thomas E. Magette, Vice President PRINTED NAME AND TITLE

> Tetra Tech, Inc. COMPANY

_____October 17, 2001 DATE

<u>APPENDIX E</u>

UNIVERSAL TREATMENT STANDARDS FRIT TEST RESULTS

This appendix provides the full screen analysis for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Universal Treatment Standards constituents. The relevancy of the leach test results presented here are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3 of this EIS. Note that the sample that provided these results originated from a commercial scale British Gas Lurgi gasifier that is operating on a 100 percent coal feed.

		<u>Non WW</u> Standard		Analytical Res	ults
<u>Regulated Constituent</u>		mg/kg or as	<u>Concn,</u>	<u>Concn, mg/l</u>	Detection Limit mg/kg
Common Name	CAS Number		mg/kg	<u>(TCLP)</u>	<u>or mg/l</u>
Acenaphthylene	<u>208-96-8</u>	$\frac{3.4}{2.4}$	ND ND		<u>0.00755</u>
Acenaphthene	<u>83-32-9</u> 67-64-1	$\frac{3.4}{160}$	<u>ND</u>		$\frac{0.00552}{0.00482}$
<u>Acetone</u> <u>Acetonitrile</u>	<u>07-04-1</u> 75-05-8	$\frac{160}{38}$	<u>ND</u> ND		0.00289
Acetophenone	<u>75-05-8</u> 96-86-2	<u>38</u> 9.7	<u>ND</u> ND		0.00356
2-Acetylaminofluorene	<u>53-96-3</u>	<u>9.7</u> <u>140</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00708
Acrolein	<u>107-02-8</u>	<u>140</u> <u>NA</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00491
Acrylamide	<u>79-06-1</u>	$\frac{141}{23}$	<u>11D</u>		0.00471
Acrylonitrile	107-13-1	<u>84</u>	ND		0.0015
Aldicarb sulfone	<u>1646-88-4</u>	0.28	<u>11D</u>		0.0015
<u>Aldrin</u>	<u>309-00-2</u>	<u>0.066</u>			
4-Aminobiphenyl	<u>92-67-1</u>	<u>NA</u>			
Aniline	<u>62-53-3</u>	$\frac{14}{14}$	ND		0.0180
Anthracene	<u>120-12-7</u>	$\frac{14}{3.4}$	ND		0.00902
Aramite	140-57-8	<u>NA</u>	<u>110</u>		0.00702
alpha-BHC	319-84-6	0.066			
beta-BHC	<u>319-85-7</u>	<u>0.066</u>			
delta-BHC	<u>319-86-8</u>	<u>0.066</u>			
gamma-BHC	<u>58-89-9</u>	0.066			
Barban	<u>101-27-9</u>	<u>0.000</u> <u>1.4</u>			
Bendiocarb	<u>101-27-5</u> 22781-23-3	$\frac{1.4}{1.4}$			
Bendiocarb phenol	<u>22761-23-5</u> 22961-82-6	$\frac{1.4}{1.4}$			
Benomyl	17804-35-2	$\frac{1.4}{1.4}$			
	71-43-2		ND		0.000625
<u>Benzene</u> Benz(a)anthracene	<u>56-55-3</u>	$\frac{10}{3.4}$	<u>ND</u> ND		0.00572
Benzal chloride	<u>98-87-3</u>	$\frac{5.4}{6.0}$			0.00372
Benzo(b)fluoranthene (difficult	<u>205-99-2</u>	<u>6.8</u>	ND		0.00829
to distinguish from	<u>205-77-2</u>	0.0	<u>11D</u>		0.00022
benzo(k)fluoranthene)					
Benzo(k)fluoranthene (difficult	207-08-9	<u>6.8</u>	ND		0.00856
to distinguish from					
<u>benzo(b)fluoranthene)</u>					
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<u>191-24-2</u>	$\frac{1.8}{3.4}$ $\frac{15}{15}$			<u>0.00599</u>
Benzo(a)pyrene	<u>50-32-8</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00862
Bromodichloromethane	<u>75-27-4</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>.000377</u>
Bromomethane/Methyl bromide	<u>74-83-9</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.000623</u>
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	<u>101-55-3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00734
n-Butyl alcohol	<u>71-36-3</u>	<u>2.6</u>			
Butylate	2008-41-5	<u>1.4</u>			
Butyl benzyl phthalate	<u>85-68-7</u>	<u>28</u>	ND		<u>0.0111</u>
2-sec-Buty1-4,6-	<u>88-85-7</u>	<u>2.5</u>			
dinitrophenol/Dinoseb_		_			
<u>Carbaryl</u>	<u>63-25-2</u>	<u>0.14</u>			

		<u>Non WW</u> <u>Standard</u>		Analytical Results	
<u>Regulated Constituent</u> <u>Common Name</u> <u>Carbenzadim</u>	<u>CAS Number</u> <u>10605-21-7</u>	mg/kg or as mg/l TCLP <u>1.4</u>	<u>Concn,</u> <u>mg/kg</u>	<u>Concn, mg/l</u> (TCLP)	<u>Detection</u> <u>Limit mg/kg</u> <u>or mg/l</u>
<u>Carbofuran</u>	1563-66-2	<u>0.14</u>			
Carbofuran phenol	1563-38-8	<u>1.4</u>			
Carbon disulfide	<u>75-15-0</u>	<u>4.8 mg/l</u> TCLP	<u>ND</u>	<u>< 0.00003</u> (estimated)	<u>0.00065</u>
<u>Carbon tetrachloride</u> Carbosulfan	<u>56-23-5</u> 55285-14-8	<u>6.0</u> 1.4	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.000426</u>
<u>Chlordane (alpha and gamma</u> isomers)	57-74-9	0.26			
p-Chloroaniline Chlorobenzene Chlorobenzilate 2-Chloro-1,3-butadiene	<u>106-47-8</u> <u>108-90-7</u> <u>510-15-6</u> <u>126-99-8</u>	<u>16</u> <u>6.0</u> <u>NA</u> <u>0.28</u>	<u>ND</u> ND ND		0.0110 0.000455 0.00571
<u>Chloroethane</u> <u>bis(2-Chloroethoxy)methane</u>	<u>124-48-1</u> <u>75-00-3</u> 111-91-1	<u>15</u> <u>6.0</u> <u>7.2</u>	<u>ND</u> ND		<u>0.000695</u> <u>0.00543</u>
bis(2-Chloroethyl)ether Chloroform bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	<u>111-44-4</u> <u>67-66-3</u> <u>39638-32-9</u>	<u>6.0</u> <u>6.0</u> <u>7.2</u>	ND ND		<u>0.00500</u> <u>0.000487</u>
p-Chloro-m-cresol 2-Chloroethyl vinyl ether	<u>59-50-7</u> 110-75-8	<u>14</u> NA	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.00758</u>
Chloromethane/Methyl chloride		<u>30</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00127
2-Chloronaphthalene 2-Chlorophenol 3-Chloropropylene Chrysene o-Cresol	<u>91-58-7</u> <u>95-57-8</u> <u>107-05-1</u> <u>218-01-9</u> <u>95-48-7</u>	5.6 5.7 <u>30</u> <u>3.4</u> 5.6	ND ND ND ND		$\frac{0.00787}{0.00515}$ $\frac{0.00114}{0.00638}$
<u>m-Cresol (difficult to</u> <u>distinguish from p-cresol)</u> p-Cresol (difficult to distinguish	<u>108-39-4</u>	<u>5.6</u>			
<u>from m-cresol</u> <u>m-Cumenyl methylcarbamate</u>	<u>106-44-5</u> <u>64-00-6</u>	<u>5.6</u>			
Cyclohexanone	<u>04-00-0</u> 108-94-1	<u>1.4</u> 0.75 mg/1 <u>TCLP</u>			
o,p'-DDD p,p'-DDD o,p'-DDE p,p'-DDE o,p'-DDT p,p'-DDT	<u>53-19-0</u> <u>72-54-8</u> <u>3424-82-6</u> <u>72-55-9</u> <u>789-02-6</u> <u>50-29-3</u>	0.087 0.087 0.087 0.087 0.087 0.087			
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene Dibenz(a,e)pyrene	<u>53-70-3</u> <u>192-65-4</u>	<u>8.2</u> <u>NA</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.00609</u>
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane	<u>96-12-8</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.000987</u>

		<u>Non WW</u> <u>Standard</u>		Analytical Res	ults
<u>Regulated Constituent</u> <u>Common Name</u>	CAS Number	<u>mg/kg or as</u> mg/l TCLP	<u>Concn,</u> mg/kg	<u>Concn, mg/l</u> (TCLP)	<u>Detection</u> <u>Limit mg/kg</u> <u>or mg/l</u>
1,2-Dibromoethane/Ethylene	106-93-4	<u>15</u>	ND		0.00646
<u>dibromide</u>					
Dibromomethane	<u>74-95-3</u>	<u>15</u>	ND		<u>0.000645</u>
m-Dichlorobenzene	<u>541-73-1</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.00556</u>
o-Dichlorobenzene	<u>95-50-1</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.00530</u>
<u>p-Dichlorobenzene</u>	<u>106-46-7</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.00530</u>
Dichlorodifluoromethane_	<u>75-71-8</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.000605
1,1-Dichloroethane	<u>75-34-3</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.000588</u>
1,2-Dichloroethane	107-06-2	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.000537
1,1-Dichloroethylene	75-35-4	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.000997</u>
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	<u>156-60-5</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.001</u>
2,4-Dichlorophenol	<u>120-83-2</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00294
2,6-Dichlorophenol	<u>87-65-0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.00761</u>
2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic	<u>94-75-7</u>	<u>10</u>			
<u>acid/2,4-D</u>		10			0.000 645
<u>1,2-Dichloropropane</u>	<u>78-87-5</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.000645
cis-1,3-Dichloropropylene	<u>10061-01-5</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.000407
trans-1,3-Dichloropropylene	<u>10061-02-6</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.000659</u>
<u>Dieldrin</u>	<u>60-57-1</u>	<u>0.13</u>			
Diethylene glycol, dicarbamate	<u>5952-26-1</u>	<u>1.4</u>			
Diethyl phthalate	<u>84-66-2</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>0.0123</u>		<u>0.00881</u>
p-Dimethylaminoazobenzene_	<u>60-11-7</u>	NA			<u>0.00809</u>
2-4-Dimethyl phenol	<u>105-67-9</u>	$\frac{14}{22}$	<u>ND</u>		0.0404
Dimethyl phthalate	<u>131-11-3</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00576
Dimetilan	<u>644-64-4</u>	<u>1.4</u>			
Di-n-butyl phthalate	<u>84-74-2</u>	<u>28</u>			
1,4-Dinitrobenzene	100-25-4	<u>2.3</u>			
4,6-Dinitro-o-cresol	<u>534-52-1</u>	<u>160</u>			
2,4-Dinitrophenol	<u>51-28-5</u>	<u>160</u>	ND		0.231
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	<u>121-14-2</u>	<u>140</u>	ND		<u>0.00530</u>
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	<u>606-20-2</u>	28	<u>ND</u>		0.00827
Di-n-octyl phthalate	<u>117-84-0</u>	<u>28</u>			
Di-n-propylnitrosamine	<u>621-64-7</u>	<u>14</u>			
1,4-Dioxane	<u>123-91-1</u>	<u>170</u>			
Diphenylamine (difficult to	122-39-4	<u>13</u>			
distinguish from					
diphenylnitrosamine)					
Diphenylnitrosamine (difficult	<u>86-30-6</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.0235</u>
to distinguish from					
<u>diphenylamine)</u>					
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	122-66-7	<u>NA</u>			
Disulfoton	<u>298-04-4</u>	<u>6.2</u>			
Dithiocarbamates (total)	<u>137-30-4</u>	<u>28</u>			
<u>Endosulfan I</u>	<u>959-98-8</u>	<u>0.066</u>			
	·				

		Non WW			
		<u>Standard</u>		Analytical Res	<u>ults</u>
				-	Detection
Regulated Constituent		<u>mg/kg or as</u>	<u>Concn,</u>	<u>Concn, mg/l</u>	<u>Limit mg/kg</u>
Common Name	CAS Number		<u>mg/kg</u>	(TCLP)	<u>or mg/l</u>
Endosulfan II	<u>33213-65-9</u>	<u>0.13</u>			
Endosulfan sulfate	<u>1031-07-8</u>	<u>0.13</u>			
Endrin_	72-20-8	<u>0.13</u>			
Endrin aldehyde	7421-93-4	<u>0.13</u>			
<u>EPTC</u>	<u>759-94-4</u>	<u>1.4</u>			
Ethyl acetate	<u>141-78-6</u>	<u>33</u>			
Ethyl benzene	<u>100-41-4</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.000729</u>
Ethyl cyanide/Propanenitrile	<u>107-12-0</u>	<u>360</u>			
Ethyl ether	<u>60-29-7</u>	<u>160</u>			
bis(2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate	<u>117-81-7</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.0640</u>
Ethyl methacrylate	<u>97-63-2</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.000391</u>
Ethylene oxide	<u>75-21-8</u>	<u>NA</u>			
<u>Famphur</u>	<u>52-85-7</u>	<u>15</u>			
<u>Fluoranthene</u>	<u>206-44-0</u>	$\frac{3.4}{3.4}$	<u>0.0170</u>		0.00443
Fluorene	<u>86-73-7</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.00628</u>
Formetanate hydrochloride	<u>23422-53-9</u>	<u>1.4</u>			
Formparanate	<u>17702-57-7</u>	<u>1.4</u>			
<u>Heptachlor</u>	<u>76-44-8</u>	<u>0.066</u>			
Heptachlor epoxide	<u>1024-57-3</u>	0.066			
Hexachlorobenzene	<u>118-74-1</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00554
Hexachlorobutadiene	<u>87-68-3</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.00662</u>
<u>Hexachlorocyclopentadiene</u>	<u>77-47-4</u>	$\frac{2.4}{2.2}$	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.130</u>
<u>HxCDDs (All</u> <u>Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxins)</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>0.001</u>			
Hexacinorodibenzo-p-dioxins) HxCDFs (All	NA	0.001			
HxcDrs (All Hexachlorodibenzo-furans)	<u>INA</u>	0.001			
Hexachloroethane	67-72-1	<u>30</u>	ND		0.00804
Hexachloropropylene	1888-71-7	<u>30</u>	ND		0.00675
Indeno (1,2,3-c,d) pyrene	193-39-5	3.4	ND		0.00526
Iodomethane	74-88-4	65	ND		0.000814
Isobutyl alcohol	78-83-1	170			
Isodrin	<u>465-73-6</u>	<u>0.066</u>			
Isolan	<u>119-38-0</u>	<u>1.4</u>			
Isosafrole	120-58-1	2.6	<u>ND</u>		0.0176
Kepone	143-50-0	0.13			
Methacrylonitrile_	<u>126-98-7</u>	<u>84</u>			
Methanol	67-56-1	<u>0.75 mg/l</u>			
		TCLP			
Methapyrilene	<u>91-80-5</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.112</u>
<u>Methiocarb</u>	2032-65-7	<u>1.4</u>			
<u>Methomyl</u>	<u>16752-77-5</u>	<u>0.14</u>			
Methoxychlor	<u>72-43-5</u>	<u>0.18</u>			
3-Methylcholanthrene	<u>56-49-5</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.0232

		<u>Non WW</u> <u>Standard</u>		Analytical Res	
Regulated Constituent Common Name 4.4-Methylene bis(2-	<u>CAS Number</u> <u>101-14-4</u>	mg/kg or as mg/l TCLP <u>30</u>	<u>Concn,</u> <u>mg/kg</u>	<u>Concn, mg/l</u> (TCLP)	<u>Detection</u> <u>Limit mg/kg</u> <u>or mg/l</u>
<u>chloroaniline)</u> <u>Methylene chloride</u> Methyl ethyl ketone	<u>75-09-2</u> 78-93-3	<u>30</u> <u>36</u>	<u>0.00158</u>		0.000545
Methyl isobutyl ketone Methyl methacrylate	<u>108-10-1</u> <u>80-62-6</u>	$\frac{33}{160}$	<u>ND</u> ND		<u>0.000923</u> <u>0.000686</u>
<u>Methyl methansulfonate</u> <u>Methyl parathion</u>	<u>66-27-3</u> <u>298-00-0</u>	<u>NA</u> <u>4.6</u>			
<u>Metolcarb</u> <u>Mexacarbate</u>	<u>1129-41-5</u> <u>315-18-4</u>	<u>1.4</u> <u>1.4</u>			
<u>Molinate</u> Naphthalene	<u>2212-67-1</u> <u>91-20-3</u>	<u>1.4</u> <u>0.00072</u>	ND		0.000441
<u>2-Naphthylamine</u> <u>o-Nitroaniline</u> <u>p-Nitroaniline</u> <u>Nitrobenzene</u> 5-Nitro-o-toluidine	<u>91-59-8</u> <u>88-74-4</u> <u>100-01-6</u> <u>98-95-3</u> <u>99-55-8</u>	$\frac{\underline{NA}}{\underline{14}}$ $\frac{\underline{14}}{\underline{28}}$ $\underline{14}$ $\underline{28}$	<u>ND</u> <u>ND</u> <u>ND</u>		<u>0.0354</u> <u>0.00565</u> <u>0.00750</u> <u>0.00686</u>
o-Nitrophenol p-Nitrophenol N-Nitrosodiethylamine N-Nitrosodimethylamine N-Nitroso-di-n-butylamine	88-75-5 100-02-7 55-18-5 62-75-9 924-16-3	$ \begin{array}{r} 13\\ \underline{29}\\ \underline{28}\\ \underline{2.3}\\ 17 \end{array} $	<u>ND</u> <u>ND</u> <u>ND</u> <u>ND</u>		0.00796 0.0277 0.0106 0.0199 0.00765
<u>N-Nitrosomethylethylamine</u> <u>N-Nitrosomorpholine</u> <u>N-Nitrosopiperidine</u> <u>N-Nitrosopyrrolidine</u> <u>Oxamyl</u> Derethion	<u>10595-95-6</u> <u>59-89-2</u> <u>100-75-4</u> <u>930-55-2</u> <u>23135-22-0</u> <u>56 28 2</u>	$ \frac{2.3}{2.3} \\ \frac{35}{35} \\ 0.28 \\ 4.6 $	<u>ND</u> <u>ND</u> <u>ND</u> ND		<u>0.0213</u> <u>0.00752</u> <u>0.0109</u> <u>0.00784</u>
<u>Parathion</u> <u>Total PCBs (sum of all PCB</u> <u>isomers, or all Aroclors)</u>	<u>56-38-2</u> <u>1336-36-3</u>	<u>4.6</u> <u>10</u>			
<u>Pebulate</u> <u>Pentachlorobenzene</u> <u>PeCDDs (All</u> <u>Pentachlorodibenzo-p-dioxins)</u>	<u>1114-71-2</u> <u>608-93-5</u> <u>NA</u>	$\frac{1.4}{10}$ <u>0.001</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.00496</u>
PeCDFs (All Pentachlorodibenzo-furans)	<u>NA</u>	<u>0.001</u>			
Pentachloroethane Pentachloronitrobenzene Pentachlorophenol Phenacetin Phenanthrene Phenol o-Phenylenediamine Phorate	76-01-7 82-68-8 87-86-5 62-44-2 85-01-8 108-95-2 95-54-5 298-02-2	$ \begin{array}{r} \underline{6.0} \\ \underline{4.8} \\ \overline{7.4} \\ \underline{16} \\ \underline{5.6} \\ \underline{6.2} \\ \underline{5.6} \\ \underline{4.6} \end{array} $	ND ND ND ND ND ND		$\begin{array}{r} \underline{0.0109}\\ \underline{0.0368}\\ \underline{0.179}\\ \underline{0.00919}\\ \underline{0.00567}\\ \underline{0.00920} \end{array}$

		Non WW			
		<u>Non WW</u> Standard		Analytical Res	ults
		Stullulu		<u>Indiytical Res</u>	Detection
Regulated Constituent		mg/kg or as	Concn,	Concn, mg/l	Limit mg/kg
Common Name	CAS Number		mg/kg	(TCLP)	or mg/l
Phthalic acid	100-21-0	28		<u>.</u>	
Phthalic anhydride	85-44-9	<u>28</u>			
Physostigmine	57-47-6	1.4			
Physostigmine salicylate	57-64-7	1.4			
Promecarb_	2631-37-0	1.4			
Pronamide	23950-58-5	1.5			
Propham	122-42-9	<u>1.4</u>			
Propoxur_	114-26-1	<u>1.4</u>			
Prosulfocarb	<u>52888-80-9</u>	$\frac{1.4}{1.4}$			
<u>Pyrene</u>	<u>129-00-0</u>	<u>1.4</u> <u>8.2</u>			
<u>Pyridine</u>	<u>129-00-0</u> 110-86-1	<u>8.2</u> <u>16</u>	ND		0.0230
Safrole	<u>110-80-1</u> 94-59-7	$\frac{10}{22}$	<u>ND</u> ND		0.00842
Silvex/2,4,5-TP	<u>94-39-7</u> 93-72-1	$\frac{22}{7.9}$	<u>ND</u>		0.00842
1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	95-94-3	<u>14</u>	ND		0.00513
<u>TCDDs (All Tetrachlorodi-</u>	<u>NA</u>	0.001			0.00515
benzo-p-dioxins)	<u>1111</u>	0.001			
TCDFs (All	NA	0.001			
Tetrachlorodibenzofurans)					
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	<u>630-20-6</u>	<u>6.0</u>	ND		<u>0.000696</u>
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	<u>79-34-5</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.000868</u>
<u>Tetrachloroethylene</u>	127-18-4	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00105
2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	<u>58-90-2</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.0179</u>
<u>Thiodicarb</u>	<u>59669-26-0</u>	<u>1.4</u>			
Thiophanate-methyl	<u>23564-05-8</u>	<u>1.4</u>			
<u>Tirpate</u>	<u>26419-73-8</u>	0.28			
Toluene	<u>108-88-3</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.000497</u>
<u>Toxaphene</u>	8001-35-2	<u>2.6</u>			
<u>Triallate</u>	<u>2303-17-5</u>	<u>1.4</u>			
Tribromomethane/Bromoform	<u>75-25-2</u>	<u>15</u>			
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	120-82-1	<u>19</u>	<u>ND</u>		<u>0.00696</u>
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	<u>71-55-6</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.000737
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	<u>79-00-5</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.000727
Trichloroethylene	<u>79-01-6</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.000935
Trichloromonofluoromethane	75-69-4	<u>30</u>			
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	<u>95-95-4</u>	<u>7.4</u> <u>7.4</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00850
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	88-06-2		<u>ND</u>		0.00463
2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxyacetic	<u>93-76-5</u>	<u>7.9</u>			
<u>acid/2,4,5-T</u> 1 2 3 Trichloropropage	06 19 4	20	ND		0.000847
<u>1,2,3-Trichloropropane</u> <u>1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-</u>	<u>96-18-4</u> <u>76-13-1</u>	$\frac{30}{30}$	<u>ND</u> ND		<u>0.000847</u> 0.000761
trifluoroethane	<u>70-13-1</u>	<u>30</u>			0.000701
<u>Triethylamine</u>	<u>101-44-8</u>	<u>1.5</u>			
tris-(2,3-Dibromopropyl)	<u>126-72-7</u>	<u>0.10</u>			
phosphate	120 12-1	0.10			
<u></u>					

		<u>Non WW</u> Standard		Analytical Res	nlts
		Stundund		<u>Indiytical Res</u>	Detection
<u>Regulated Constituent</u> <u>Common Name</u>	CAS Number	<u>mg/kg or as</u> mg/l TCLP	<u>Concn,</u> mg/kg	<u>Concn, mg/l</u> (TCLP)	Limit mg/kg or mg/l
Vernolate	1929-77-7	<u>1.4</u>			
Vinyl chloride	75-01-4	<u>6.0</u>	<u>ND</u>		0.00115
Xylenes-mixed isomers (sum of	1330-20-7	30	ND		0.00153
o-, m-, and p-xylene					
concentrations)					
Antimony	<u>7440-36-0</u>	<u>2.1 mg/l</u> <u>TCLP</u>		<u>0.0065</u>	<u>0.00309</u>
Arsenic	<u>7440-38-2</u>	<u>5.0 mg/l</u> TCLP		<u>0.0145</u>	<u>0.00156</u>
<u>Barium</u>	<u>7440-39-3</u>	<u>7.6 mg/l</u> TCLP		<u>0.159</u>	0.00052
<u>Beryllium</u>	7440-41-7	<u>0.014 mg/1</u> TCLP		<u>0.0079</u>	<u>0.00007</u>
<u>Cadmium</u>	<u>7440-43-9</u>	<u>0.19 mg/1</u> TCLP		<u>ND</u>	<u>0.0003</u>
Chromium (Total)	7440-47-3	<u>0.86 mg/1</u> TCLP		0.0222	<u>0.00109</u>
Cyanides (Total) ¹	57-12-5	590			
Cyanides (Amenable) ¹	57-12-5	30			
Fluoride ²	16984-48-8	NA			
Lead	7439-92-1	<u>0.37 mg/l</u> <u>TCLP</u>		<u>0.0043</u>	<u>0.00118</u>
MercuryNonwastewater from Retort	<u>7439-97-6</u>	<u>0.20 mg/1</u> TCLP			
MercuryAll Others	<u>7439-97-6</u>	<u>0.025 mg/1</u> TCLP		<u>ND</u>	<u>0.00006</u>
Nickel	<u>7440-02-0</u>	<u>5.0 mg/l</u> TCLP		<u>0.379</u>	<u>0.00168</u>
<u>Selenium</u>	<u>7782-49-2</u>	<u>0.16 mg/l</u> <u>TCLP</u>		<u>ND</u>	<u>0.00388</u>
<u>Silver</u>	<u>7440-22-4</u>	<u>0.30 mg/1</u> TCLP		<u>ND</u>	<u>0.00087</u>
Sulfide	18496-25-8	NA			
<u>Thallium</u>	7440-28-0	<u>0.078 mg/l</u> <u>TCLP</u>		<u>ND</u>	<u>0.0048</u>
Vanadium ²	<u>7440-62-2</u>	<u>0.23 mg/1</u> TCLP		<u>0.0486</u>	<u>0.00059</u>
Zinc ²	<u>7440-66-6</u>	<u>5.3 mg/l</u> <u>TCLP</u>		<u>0.0111</u>	<u>0.00233</u>

Notes:

CAS means Chemical Abstract Services. When the waste code and/or regulated constituents are described as a combination of a chemical with it's salts and/or esters, the CAS number is given for the parent compound only.44.

Concentration standards for wastewaters are expressed in mg/l and are based on analysis of composite samples.

Except for Metals (EP or TCLP) and Cyanides (Total and Amenable) the nonwastewater treatment standards expressed as a concentration were established, in part, based upon incineration in units operated in accordance with the technical requirements of 40 CFR part 264, subpart O, or 40 CFR part 265, subpart O, or based upon combustion in fuel substitution units operating in accordance with applicable technical requirements. A facility may comply with these treatment standards according to provisions in Sec. 268.40(d). All concentration standards for nonwastewaters are based on analysis of grab samples.

ND means Non-District, Concn means concentration, and TCLP means Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure.

¹ Both Cyanides (Total) and Cyanides (Amenable) for nonwastewaters are to be analyzed using Method 9010 or 9012, found in "Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods", EPA Publication SW-846, as incorporated by reference in 40 CFR 260.11, with a sample size of 10 grams and a distillation time of one hour and 15 minutes. ² These constituents are not "underlying hazardous constituents" in characteristic wastes, according to the definition at Sec. 268.2(i).

Source: Global Energy 2001c.