

**APPENDIX 4B NARRATIVE DISCUSSION OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTANTS AND FUTURE  
CHANGES IN ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS, REGULATIONS,  
OR STANDARDS**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: AIR IMPACTS .....	1
1.1    NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS .....	1
1.2    PARTICULATE MATTER .....	1
1.3    OZONE.....	3
1.4    CARBON MONOXIDE.....	5
1.5    SULFUR DIOXIDE AND NITROGEN OXIDES (ACID RAIN PROGRAM).....	6
1.6    PROPOSED REVISIONS TO NO <sub>2</sub> NAAQS .....	7
1.7    BART .....	9
1.8    LEAD .....	11
SECTION 2: POTENTIAL FUTURE REGULATED POLLUTANTS: .....	13
2.1    CARBON DIOXIDE .....	13
2.2    PROPOSED CO <sub>2</sub> SEQUESTRATION REGULATIONS .....	14
2.3    PROPOSED MANDATORY GREENHOUSE GAS REPORTING RULE .....	16
2.4    PROPOSED ENDANGERMENT AND CAUSE OR CONTRIBUTE FINDINGS FOR GREENHOUSE GASES UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT .....	17
2.5    CALIFORNIA GREENHOUSE GAS WAIVER REQUEST .....	18
2.6    H.R. 2454: THE AMERICAN CLEAN ENERGY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2009 .....	20
2.7    MERCURY .....	21
2.8    HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS .....	22
2.9    MULTI-POLLUTANT IMPACTS .....	23
SECTION 3: WATER IMPACTS .....	24
3.1    CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 316(A) THERMAL DISCHARGE REGULATIONS OR POLICY .....	24
3.1.1    SIBLEY, LAKE ROAD AND IATAN NPDES PERMITS .....	24
3.2    CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 316(B) FISH IMPINGEMENT REGULATIONS.....	25
3.3    ZEBRA MUSSEL INFESTATION .....	26
3.4    TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS (TMDL).....	27
SECTION 4: WASTE MATERIAL IMPACTS .....	30
4.1    POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS (PCB'S) .....	30
4.2    COAL COMBUSTION PRODUCTS (CCP'S).....	30

In accordance with 4 CSR 240-22.040(2)(B)(1), this section identifies a list of environmental pollutants for which additional environmental laws or regulations may be imposed at some point within the planning horizon. Environmental laws or regulations may impact air emissions, water discharges, or disposal of materials generated. The following sections summarize pollutants which could result in compliance costs that could have a significant impact on utility rates.

In accordance with 4 CSR 240-22.070(2)(C), this section also identifies future changes in environmental laws, regulations or standards.

## **SECTION 1: AIR IMPACTS**

### **1.1 NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS**

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for six common air pollutants. These commonly found air pollutants (also known as "criteria pollutants") are particulate matter (PM), ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>), nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), and lead. EPA calls these pollutants "criteria" air pollutants because it regulates them by developing human health-based and/or environmentally-based criteria (science-based guidelines) for setting permissible levels. The set of limits based on human health is called primary standards. Another set of limits intended to prevent environmental and property damage is called secondary standards.<sup>i</sup>

### **1.2 PARTICULATE MATTER**

EPA revised the air quality standards for PM in 2006. The 2006 standards tightened the 24-hour fine particle standard from 65 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m<sup>3</sup>) to 35 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, and retained the annual fine particle standard at 15 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. EPA retained the existing 24-hour PM<sub>10</sub> standard of 150 µg/m<sup>3</sup> but revoked the annual PM<sub>10</sub> standard.

The CAA requires EPA to review the latest scientific information and standards every five years. Before new standards are established, policy decisions undergo rigorous review by the scientific community, industry, public interest groups, the general public and the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC).<sup>ii</sup>

On March 29, 2007, the EPA issued a rule defining requirements for state plans to clean the air in areas with levels of fine particle pollution that do not meet national air quality standards. State plans under this final rule are known as the Clean Air Fine Particle Implementation Rule.

Once an area is designated as nonattainment, the Clean Air Act requires the state to submit an implementation plan to EPA within three years. For the 1997 fine particle standards, state plans were due in April 2008.

States must meet the PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard by 2010. However, in their 2008 implementation plans, states may propose an attainment date extension for up to five years. Those areas for which EPA approves an extension must achieve clean air as soon as possible, but no later than 2015.

For each nonattainment area, the CAA requires the state to demonstrate that it has adopted all reasonably available control measures, considering economic and technical feasibility and other factors, that are needed to show that the area will attain the fine particle standards as expeditiously as practicable. The rule includes a presumption that for power plants subject to the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR), compliance with CAIR would satisfy these requirements for sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides (with certain conditions).

Five main types of pollutants contribute to fine particle concentrations: direct PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions; sulfur dioxide; nitrogen oxides; ammonia; and volatile organic compounds. However, the effect of reducing emissions of each of these pollutants varies by area, depending on the fine particle composition, emission levels, and other area-specific factors. For this reason, the final rule establishes the following policies for evaluating and controlling sources of these emissions:

- PM<sub>2.5</sub> direct emissions (including organic carbon, elemental carbon and crustal material) must be evaluated for emission reduction measures in all nonattainment areas.
- Sulfur dioxide must be evaluated for emission reduction measures in all nonattainment areas.
- Nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) must be evaluated for emission reduction measures in each area unless the state and EPA demonstrate that NO<sub>x</sub> is not a significant contributor to PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations in a specific area.
- Volatile organic compounds are not required to be evaluated for emission reduction measures in each area unless the state or EPA demonstrates that VOCs significantly contribute to PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations in a specific area.
- Ammonia is not required to be evaluated for emission reduction measures in each area unless the state or EPA demonstrates that ammonia significantly contributes to PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations in a specific area.<sup>iii</sup>

The final revised standards are being implemented. EPA's review for future revisions to the PM standard has already started. Non-attainment of a revised standard could ultimately result in regulations requiring additional PM reduction technologies, emission limits or both on fossil-fueled units. PM<sub>2.5</sub> may also require additional NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> control as precursors.

### **1.3 OZONE**

Ground-level or "bad" ozone is not emitted directly into the air, but is created by chemical reactions between oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and volatile organic compounds (VOC) in the presence of sunlight. Emissions from industrial facilities and electric utilities, motor vehicle exhaust, gasoline vapors, and chemical solvents are some of the major sources of NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC.<sup>iv</sup>

On March 12, 2008, EPA significantly strengthened the NAAQS for ground-level ozone. EPA's final rule revises both ozone standards: the *primary* standard, designed to protect human health; and the *secondary* standard, designed to protect welfare (such as vegetation and crops). The existing primary and secondary standards, set in 1997, are identical: an 8-hour standard of 0.08 parts per million (ppm). (In practice, because of rounding, an area meets the standard if ozone levels are 0.084 ppm or lower.)

EPA set the primary (health) standard to a level of 0.075 ppm. EPA is also strengthening the secondary 8-hour ozone standard to the level of 0.075 ppm making it identical to the revised primary standard.

The CAA requires EPA to designate areas as attainment (meeting the standards), nonattainment (not meeting the standards), or unclassifiable (insufficient data to classify) after the Agency sets a new standard, or revises an existing standard. The following schedule will apply to the revised ozone standards:

- States must make recommendations to EPA no later than March 2009 for areas to be designated attainment, nonattainment and unclassifiable.
- EPA will issue final designations of attainment, nonattainment and unclassifiable areas no later than March 2010 unless there is insufficient information to make these designation decisions. In that case, EPA will issue designations no later than March 2011.
- States must submit State Implementation Plans outlining how they will reduce pollution to meet the standards by a date that EPA will establish in a separate rule. That date will be no later than three years after EPA's final designations. If EPA issues designations in 2010, then these plans would be due no later than 2013.

States are required to meet the standards by deadlines that may vary based on the severity of the problem in the area.<sup>v</sup>

In 2008, MDNR released a proposed recommendation that the Kansas City area violates the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS based on the 2005-07 monitoring data. The proposed boundaries for the 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas in Kansas City include the following Missouri counties: Cass, Clay, Clinton, Jackson, and Platte.

There currently is no ozone monitoring in Buchanan County, but MDNR has recommended the installation of a monitor that will begin operation for the 2009 ozone season.<sup>vi</sup>

In 2008, KDHE released a draft recommendation that the Kansas City area violates the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS based on the 2006-08 ozone monitoring data. The proposed boundaries for the 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas in Kansas City include the following Kansas counties: Johnson and Wyandotte. No other counties in Kansas were recommended for nonattainment designation.<sup>vii</sup>

Both KDHE and MDNR accepted comments on the recommendations and submitted their recommendations to EPA in March 2009. EPA may accept the state's recommendations or they could designate additional counties as nonattainment of the standard. Nonattainment designations could ultimately result in regulations requiring additional NO<sub>x</sub> reduction technologies, emission limits or both on fossil-fueled units in those counties.

#### **1.4 CARBON MONOXIDE**

Carbon monoxide is formed when carbon in fuel is not burned completely. It is a component of motor vehicle exhaust, other non-road engines, industrial processes, residential wood burning, and natural sources such as forest fires.<sup>viii</sup>

EPA's main approaches to reduce CO have been to establish NAAQS, to require national controls for motor vehicle emissions, and to require reductions from large industrial facilities.

EPA set two national health protection standards for CO: a one-hour standard of 35 parts per million and an eight-hour standard of 9 parts per million. Across the nation, air quality stations measure the levels of CO and other pollutants in the air. These measurements are compared to the standards. Areas that have CO levels that are too high must develop and carry out plans to reduce CO emissions.

Starting in the early 1970's, EPA has set national standards that have considerably reduced emissions of CO and other pollutants from motor vehicles, including tailpipe emissions, new vehicle technologies, and clean fuels programs. Since 1970, CO emissions from on-road vehicles have been reduced by over 40 percent.<sup>ix</sup>

Revisions to the CO standard upon review may occur. Non-attainment of a revised standard could ultimately result in regulations requiring additional CO reduction technologies, emission limits or both on fossil-fueled units.

## **1.5 SULFUR DIOXIDE AND NITROGEN OXIDES (ACID RAIN PROGRAM)**

The overall goal of the Acid Rain Program (ARP) is to achieve significant environmental and public health benefits through reductions in emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>—the primary causes of acid rain.<sup>x</sup>

The ARP set a goal of reducing annual SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 10 million tons below 1980 levels. To achieve these reductions, the law required a two-phase tightening of the restrictions placed on fossil fuel-fired power plants.

Phase I began in 1995 and affected mostly coal-burning electric utility plants located in 21 eastern and midwestern states. Emissions data indicate that 1995 SO<sub>2</sub> emissions at these units nationwide were reduced by almost 40 percent below their required level.

Phase II, which began in the year 2000, tightened the annual emissions limits imposed on these large, higher emitting plants and also set restrictions on smaller, cleaner plants fired by coal, oil, and gas.



The ARP also called for a 2 million ton reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by the year 2000. A significant portion of this reduction has been achieved by coal-fired utility boilers installing low NO<sub>x</sub> burner technologies to meet new emissions standards.<sup>xi</sup>

## **1.6 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS**

On June 26, 2009, EPA proposed to strengthen the primary NAAQS for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). EPA is proposing to establish a new 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> standard at a level between 80 – 100 parts per billion (ppb). This standard would protect against health effects associated with short-term exposures to NO<sub>2</sub>, which are generally highest on and near major roads. The Agency is taking comment on alternative levels for the 1-hour standard down to 65 ppb and up to 150 ppb. EPA is proposing to retain the current annual average NO<sub>2</sub> standard of 53 ppb. In addition to proposing an averaging time and a range of levels for the standard, EPA is also proposing a “form” for the standard. The form is the air quality statistic that is compared to the level of the standard to determine if an area meets the standard. EPA is also proposing changes to the ambient air monitoring and reporting requirements for NO<sub>2</sub>. Changes to the NO<sub>2</sub> air quality monitoring network would include:

- Monitors in locations to measure peak concentrations that occur over shorter periods of time to support the proposed 1-hour standard. These locations will typically be near major roads in urban areas because cars, trucks and other mobile sources are key contributors to the maximum outdoor NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations.
- Monitors in large urban areas to measure the highest concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> that occur over wider areas.

The proposed changes would not affect the secondary NO<sub>2</sub> standard, set to protect public welfare. EPA is considering the need for changes to the secondary standard under a separate review.

EPA is proposing a schedule for implementing the proposed new standard. EPA will issue the final primary national air quality standard for NO<sub>2</sub> by January 22, 2010. If EPA promulgates a new standard for NO<sub>2</sub>, the Agency expects to identify or “designate” areas as meeting or not meeting the standard or as unclassifiable by January 2012, within two years of the effective date of the standard. <sup>xii</sup>

## **1.7 CLEAN AIR INTERSTATE RULE**

On March 10, 2005, EPA issued the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR), a rule that will dramatically reduce air pollution that moves across state boundaries. CAIR will permanently cap emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) in the eastern United States. When fully implemented, CAIR will reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions in these states by over 70 percent and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by over 60 percent from 2003 levels. <sup>xiii</sup>

Through the use of the proven cap-and-trade approach, CAIR achieves substantial reductions of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions and will assist the eastern U.S. meet EPA’s protective air quality standards for ozone or fine particles. SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> contribute to the formation of fine particles and NO<sub>x</sub> contributes to the formation of ground-level ozone.

CAIR covers 28 eastern states and the District of Columbia. States must achieve the required emission reductions using one of two compliance options: 1) meet the state’s emission budget by requiring power plants to participate in an EPA-administered interstate cap and trade system that caps emissions in two stages, or 2) meet an individual state emissions budget through measures of the state’s choosing.

CAIR provides a Federal framework requiring states to reduce emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>. EPA anticipates that states will achieve this primarily by reducing emissions from the power generation sector. The CAA requires that states meet the new national, health-based air quality standards for ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards by requiring reductions from many types of sources. Some areas may

need to take additional local actions. CAIR reductions will lessen the need for additional local controls.<sup>xiv</sup>

On July 11, 2008, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals vacated the CAIR in its entirety and sent it back to EPA to promulgate a rule that is consistent with its opinion. On October 21, 2008, the Court issued an order on its own motion directing responses to the EPA petition for rehearing asking whether any party is seeking vacatur or whether the court should stay its mandate until EPA promulgates a revised rule. On November 5, 2008 responses were filed. On November 17, 2008, EPA filed a brief opposing the court implementing its vacatur. EPA argued that the court should give it “relief from vacatur” through a remand, stay of the vacatur, or rehearing because “severe harms” would result if the court proceeds with full vacatur of the rule. EPA indicated such a remedy would be justified because most other parties in the lawsuit submitted briefs supporting remand rather than vacatur.

On December 23, 2008, the Court issued an order remanding the CAIR to EPA instead of vacating the rule. This means that CAIR will remain in place at least for now. The Court did not place EPA on a schedule for the remand rulemaking but indicated it was not an indefinite stay of the effectiveness of this court’s decision. On the same day, the Court denied all petitions for rehearing and subsequently issued its mandate. It is not known how or if EPA will revise CAIR in compliance with the Court’s decision or promulgate entirely new regulations. On remand CAIR could be rewritten by EPA with possibly greater emission reductions, no interstate allowance trading, not use the Title IV SO<sub>2</sub> allowances, change the NO<sub>x</sub> fuel factor adjustment, include additional states potentially Kansas, or ultimately trigger a legislative response. There is also a possibility that a multi-pollutant legislation could be passed that ultimately replaces CAIR.

## **1.8 BART**

On June 15, 2005, the EPA finalized amendments to the July 1999 regional haze rule. These amendments apply to the provisions of the regional haze rule that

require emission controls known as best available retrofit technology, or BART, for industrial facilities emitting air pollutants that reduce visibility by causing or contributing to regional haze.

The pollutants that reduce visibility include PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and compounds which contribute to PM<sub>2.5</sub> formation, such as NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and under certain conditions volatile organic compounds, and ammonia.

The BART requirements of the regional haze rule apply to facilities built between 1962 and 1977 that have the potential to emit more than 250 tons a year of visibility-impairing pollution. Those facilities fall into 26 categories, including utility and industrial boilers, and large industrial plants such as pulp mills, refineries and smelters.

Under the 1999 regional haze rule, states are required to set periodic goals for improving visibility in the 156 natural areas. As states work to reach these goals, they must develop regional haze implementation plans that contain enforceable measures and strategies for reducing visibility-impairing pollution.

States were to develop their implementation plans by December, 2007. States identified the facilities that will have to reduce emissions under BART and then set BART emissions limits for those facilities.<sup>xv</sup>

Revisions to the SO<sub>2</sub> standard is expected because it is well past EPA's 5 year review. Non-attainment of a revised standard could ultimately result in regulations requiring additional SO<sub>2</sub> reduction technologies, emission limits or both on fossil-fueled units.

EPA has proposed revisions to the NO<sub>x</sub> standard. Non-attainment of a revised standard could ultimately result in regulations requiring additional NO<sub>x</sub> reduction technologies, emission limits or both on fossil-fueled units.

Future BART progress goals could result in additional SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and PM controls or reduction technologies on fossil-fired units.

## 1.9 LEAD

Lead is a metal found naturally in the environment as well as in manufactured products. The major sources of lead emissions have historically been motor vehicles and industrial sources. Due to the phase out of leaded gasoline, metals processing is the major source of lead emissions to the air today. The highest levels of lead in air are generally found near lead smelters. Other stationary sources are waste incinerators, utilities, and lead-acid battery manufacturers.

EPA set identical health-protection (primary) and welfare-protection (secondary) national air quality standards for lead in 1978. Across the nation, there are monitoring stations that measure the levels of lead and other pollutants in the air. These measurements are compared to the national standards. Areas that have lead levels that are too high must develop and implement a plan to reduce the levels.

Thirty years ago, cars and trucks were the major contributors of lead emissions to the air. Due to EPA's regulatory efforts to remove lead from gasoline, emissions of lead from the transportation sector have dramatically declined (95 percent between 1980 and 1999), and levels of lead in the air have decreased by 94 percent between 1980 and 1999. Transportation sources, primarily airplanes, now contribute only 13 percent of lead emissions.

The large reductions in lead emissions from motor vehicles have changed the nature of the air quality lead problem in the United States. Industrial processes, particularly primary and secondary lead smelters and battery manufacturers, are now responsible for most of lead emissions and all violations of the lead air quality standards. Emissions from industrial processes have decreased by only 6 percent since 1988. EPA's lead air quality monitoring strategy now focuses on areas surrounding these industrial sources.<sup>xvi</sup>

On October 15, 2008, EPA substantially strengthened the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for lead. EPA revised the level of the primary

(health-based) standard from 1.5 micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ), to 0.15  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , measured as total suspended particulates (TSP). EPA revised the secondary (welfare-based) standard to be identical in all respects to the primary standard.

In conjunction with strengthening the lead NAAQS, EPA is improving the existing lead monitoring network by requiring monitors to be placed in areas with sources such as industrial facilities that emit one ton or more per year of lead and in urban areas with more than 500,000 people. EPA estimates that 236 new or relocated monitoring sites will be necessary to satisfy these monitoring requirements. Approximately half of all newly required monitors are to be operational by January 1, 2010, with the other half of the monitors operational by January 1, 2011. EPA anticipates the following implementation schedule:

- States are required to make recommendations for areas to be designated attainment, nonattainment, or unclassifiable by October 2009.
- EPA would issue final designations of attainment, nonattainment and unclassifiable areas no later than January 2012.
- States are required to submit State Implementation Plans outlining how they will reduce pollution to meet the standards no later than June 2013.
- States are required to meet the standards no later than January 2017.<sup>xvii</sup>

Non-attainment of a revised standard could ultimately result in regulations requiring additional lead reduction technologies, emission limits or both on coal units.

## **SECTION 2: POTENTIAL FUTURE REGULATED POLLUTANTS:**

### **2.1 CARBON DIOXIDE**

#### **Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Regulating Greenhouse Gases**

On July 11, 2008, the EPA released an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) inviting public comment on the benefits and ramifications of regulating greenhouse gases (GHGs) under the Clean Air Act (CAA). This only solicits comments but could be seen as a first step in EPA regulating GHGs. This ANPR in itself does not give EPA the authority to regulate GHGs.

The ANPR is one of the steps EPA has taken in response to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Massachusetts v. EPA*. The Court found that the Clean Air Act (CAA) authorizes EPA to regulate tailpipe greenhouse gas emissions if EPA determines they cause or contribute to air pollution that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.

The ANPR reflects the complexity and magnitude of the question of whether and how greenhouse gases could be effectively controlled under the Clean Air Act. A decision to regulate GHG emissions under one section of the CAA could or would lead to regulation of GHG emissions under other sections of the Act, including sections establishing permitting requirements for major stationary sources of air pollutants.

The document summarizes much of EPA's work and lays out concerns raised by other federal agencies during their review of this work. EPA is publishing this notice at this time because it is impossible to simultaneously address all the agencies' issues and respond to the agency's legal obligations in a timely manner.

Key Issues for Discussion and Comment in the ANPR:

- Descriptions of key provisions and programs in the CAA, and advantages and disadvantages of regulating GHGs under those provisions
- How a decision to regulate GHG emissions under one section of the CAA could or would lead to regulation of GHG emissions under other sections of the Act, including sections establishing permitting requirements for major stationary sources of air pollutants
- Issues relevant for Congress to consider for possible future climate legislation and the potential for overlap between future legislation and regulation under the existing CAA
- Scientific information relevant to, and the issues raised by, an endangerment analysis
- Information regarding potential regulatory approaches and technologies for reducing GHG emissions

EPA accepted public comment on the ANPR and ultimately could continue with the rulemaking process with promulgating proposed and final rules.<sup>xviii</sup>

## **2.2 PROPOSED CO<sub>2</sub> SEQUESTRATION REGULATIONS**

On July 15, 2008, EPA proposed new federal requirements under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) for the underground injection of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) for the purpose of long-term underground storage, or geologic sequestration (GS). The regulation is proposed under the authority of SDWA to ensure protection of underground sources of drinking water from injection related activities. The Agency is received comments on the proposed rule.

While the elements of the proposal are based on the existing regulatory framework of EPA's Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program, modifications address the unique nature of CO<sub>2</sub> injection for GS. The relative buoyancy of CO<sub>2</sub>, its corrosivity in the presence of water, the potential presence of impurities in captured CO<sub>2</sub>, its mobility within subsurface formations, and large injection



volumes anticipated at full scale deployment warrant specific requirements tailored to this new practice.

EPA's proposal applies to owners or operators of wells that will be used to inject CO<sub>2</sub> into the subsurface for the purpose of long-term storage. It will also affect state agencies that choose to administer the program in the future. The proposed rule is the proposed framework for permitting GS wells, but does not require any facilities to capture and/or sequester CO<sub>2</sub>.

EPA's proposed rule would establish a new class of injection well—Class VI—and technical criteria for geologic site characterization; area of review and corrective action; well construction and operation; mechanical integrity testing and monitoring; well plugging; post-injection site care; and site closure for the purposes of protecting underground sources of drinking water.

The elements of the proposal build upon the existing UIC regulatory framework, with modifications based on the unique nature of CO<sub>2</sub> injection for GS, including:

- Geologic site characterization to ensure that GS wells are appropriately sited;
- Requirements to construct wells with injectate-compatible materials and in a manner that prevents fluid movement into unintended zones;
- Periodic re-evaluation of the area of review around the injection well to incorporate monitoring and operational data and verify that the CO<sub>2</sub> is moving as predicted within the subsurface;
- Testing of the mechanical integrity of the injection well, ground water monitoring, and tracking of the location of the injected CO<sub>2</sub> to ensure protection of underground sources of drinking water;
- Extended post-injection monitoring and site care to track the location of the injected CO<sub>2</sub> and monitor subsurface pressures; and

- Financial responsibility requirements to assure that funds will be available for well plugging, site care, closure, and emergency and remedial response.

The proposal discusses long term liability for GS operations and seeks comment on this issue as part of the proposed rulemaking. The proposal also includes public participation requirements that would be associated with the issuance of permits for GS wells.

When finalized, the GS rule will provide certainty to industry and the public about requirements that would apply to GS by providing consistency in requirements across the nation, and transparency regarding the requirements that apply to owners and operators. Many components of the proposed rule provide flexibility by allowing the permitting authority discretion to set certain permit criteria that are appropriate to local geologic settings.<sup>xix</sup>

### **2.3 PROPOSED MANDATORY GREENHOUSE GAS REPORTING RULE**

On March 10, 2009, EPA issued a proposed rule for mandatory greenhouse gas (GHG) reporting from large GHG emissions sources in the United States. EPA developed a proposed rule that would require mandatory reporting of GHGs from large emission sources in the United States, as required by the FY2008 Consolidated Appropriations Act. This is a reporting rule to collect accurate and comprehensive emissions data to inform future policy decisions.

In general, the proposed rule calls for suppliers of fossil fuels or industrial greenhouse gases, manufacturers of vehicles and engines, and facilities that emit 25,000 metric tons or more of GHG emissions per year to submit annual reports to EPA. The proposed threshold for reporting is 25,000 metric tons or more of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) equivalent per year. About 85-90% of total national U.S. GHG emissions, from approximately 13,000 facilities, would be covered by the proposed rule. The first annual report would be submitted to EPA in 2011, for the calendar year 2010, except for vehicle and engine

manufacturers, which would begin reporting for model year 2011. Most small businesses would fall below the 25,000 metric ton threshold and would not be required to report GHG emissions to EPA. Most emission sources from the agriculture sector would not be covered by the rule, with the exception of livestock operations with GHG emissions from manure management systems that meet or exceed the threshold of 25,000 metric tons. EPA modeling estimates that fewer than 50 very large livestock operations would meet this threshold. EPA would be responsible for verifying the data.<sup>xx</sup>

#### **2.4 PROPOSED ENDANGERMENT AND CAUSE OR CONTRIBUTE FINDINGS FOR GREENHOUSE GASES UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT**

On April 2, 2007, in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, the Supreme Court found that greenhouse gases are air pollutants covered by the Clean Air Act. The Court held that the Administrator must determine whether or not emissions of greenhouse gases from new motor vehicles cause or contribute to air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare, or whether the science is too uncertain to make a reasoned decision. In making these decisions, the Administrator is required to follow the language of section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act. The Supreme Court decision resulted from a petition for rulemaking under section 202(a) filed by more than a dozen environmental, renewable energy, and other organizations.

On April 17, 2009, EPA proposed to find that greenhouse gases in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations. The Administrator is also proposing to find that greenhouse gas emissions from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines are contributing to the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. This action is being taken under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act. The action, if finalized, would not itself impose any requirements on industry or other entities.

The EPA proposal has two distinct findings regarding greenhouse gases under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act:

- Endangerment Finding: EPA is proposing to find that the current and projected concentrations of the mix of six key greenhouse gases - carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) - in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations.
- Cause or Contribute Finding: The EPA is further proposing to find that the combined emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and HFCs from new motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines contribute to the atmospheric concentrations of these key greenhouse gases and hence to the threat of climate change.

This proposed action, as well as any final action in the future, would not itself impose any requirements on industry or other entities. An endangerment finding under one provision of the Clean Air Act would not by itself automatically trigger regulation under the entire Act.<sup>xxi</sup>

## **2.5 CALIFORNIA GREENHOUSE GAS WAIVER REQUEST**

On June 30, 2009, EPA granted a waiver of Clean Air Act preemption to California for its greenhouse gas emission standards for motor vehicles beginning with the 2009 model year.

The California Air Resources Board originally requested this waiver in December 2005. That request was denied by EPA on March 6, 2008. Early this year the California Air Resources Board requested that EPA reconsider its waiver denial. Then on January 26, 2009, President Obama signed a Presidential Memorandum directing EPA to assess whether denial of the waiver based on California's application was appropriate in light of the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air Act gives California special authority to enact stricter air pollution standards for motor vehicles than the federal government's. EPA must approve a waiver, however, before California's rules may go into effect. Once California files a waiver request, EPA publishes a notice for public hearing and written comment in the Federal Register. The written comment period typically remains open for a period of time after the public hearing. Once the comment period expires, EPA reviews the comments and the administrator determines whether California has satisfied the law's requirements for obtaining a waiver.

The decision makes it clear that the California waiver does not constitute regulation of GHG under the Clean Air Act. EPA discusses the potential impact of granting the waiver on prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) requirements for stationary sources under the CAA's new source review program. EPA states:

Several commenters suggest that there would be a major consequence if an EPA waiver were to trigger other requirements under the Act, including Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) requirements, and should it grant the waiver, EPA should state clearly that the waiver does not render GHGs "subject to regulation" under the Act. EPA also received comment suggesting that the question of when and how GHGs should be addressed in the PSD program or otherwise regulated under the Act should instead be addressed in separate proceedings dedicated to evaluating the complicated issues and impacts associated with those issues. EPA agrees that these issues are not relevant to the waiver decision criteria, and are most appropriately addressed in a separate forum. EPA is not addressing these issues in today's decision.<sup>xxii</sup>

## **2.6 H.R. 2454: THE AMERICAN CLEAN ENERGY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2009**

On June 26, 2009, the U.S. House of Representatives voted to pass H.R. 2454, the American Clean Energy and Security Act, marking the first time a body of Congress has passed legislation to regulate GHG emissions

The bill establishes a 20 percent efficiency and renewable electricity standard by 2020 starting with an initial 6 percent requirement by 2012. The bill also establishes a greenhouse gas cap and trade program with 3, 17, 42, and 83 percent reduction targets below 2005 levels by 2012, 2020, 2030, and 2050, respectively. In addition, the bill establishes a 50 percent CO<sub>2</sub> emission performance standards for new coal-fired units that receive an initial permit after 2009 and a 65 percent reduction for new coal-fired units permitted after 2020. Electricity consumers would initially receive about 44 percent of the allowances in 2012 which would be phased-out by 2029. Up to 2 billion tons of offsets is established in the bill.

The bill would not allow performance standard to be established under CAA new source performance standards to address GHG emissions from a capped source. GHGs would be exempted from several CAA programs including NAAQS, hazardous air pollutants, Title V, and new source review based on their effect on climate change.<sup>xxiii</sup>

CO<sub>2</sub> could be listed as a criteria pollutant and require a standard be developed. Non-attainment of a standard could ultimately result in regulations requiring CO<sub>2</sub> reduction technologies, emission limits or both on fossil-fired units. Future EPA regulations could also regulate CO<sub>2</sub> as applied to stationary through new source performance standards or prevention of significant deterioration programs.

Climate change legislation or regulations could require CO<sub>2</sub> control technology, retiring units, or fuel shifting.

- a. Legislation possibilities range from: cap and trade program with allowances either granted, auctioned or both, safety valve to no safety valve, early implementation at lower baselines to later implementation at greater baselines.
- b. Regulation possibilities are similar as legislation with the potential for command and control CO<sub>2</sub> requirements

## **2.7 MERCURY**

In December 2000, EPA announced its finding that it was "appropriate and necessary" to regulate coal- and oil-fired electric utilities under section 112 of the Clean Air Act. This finding, known as the Utility Air Toxics Determination, triggered a requirement for EPA to propose regulations to control air toxics emissions, including mercury, from these facilities.

On January 30, 2004, EPA proposed a rule with two basic approaches for controlling mercury from power plants. One approach would require power plants to meet emissions standards reflecting the application of the "maximum achievable control technology" (MACT) determined according to the procedure set forth in section 112(d) of the Clean Air Act. A second approach proposed by EPA would create a market-based "cap and trade" program that. EPA proposed to pursue the cap and trade approach either under Section 111 or Section 112 of the Clean Air Act.

The January 30, 2004 EPA proposed rule also proposed to revise the Agency's December 2000 finding that is "appropriate and necessary" to regulate utility hazardous air emissions using the MACT standards provisions (section 112) of the Clean Air Act. This action would give EPA the flexibility to consider a more efficient and more cost effective way to control mercury emissions.

On March 15, 2005, EPA issued the final Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR), which builds on EPA's Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) to significantly reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants. When fully implemented, these rules will

reduce utility emissions of mercury from 48 tons a year to 15 tons, a reduction of nearly 70 percent.

The CAMR establishes “standards of performance” limiting mercury emissions from new and existing utilities and creates a market-based cap-and-trade program that will reduce nationwide utility emissions of mercury in two distinct phases. In the first phase, due by 2010, emissions will be reduced by taking advantage of “co-benefit” reductions – that is, mercury reductions achieved while reducing SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> under CAIR. In the second phase, due in 2018, utilities will be subject to a second cap, which will reduce emissions to 15 tons upon full implementation.

On May 31, 2006 EPA issued its determination that regulation of electric utility steam generating units under section 112 of the Clean Air Act was neither necessary nor appropriate (the section 112 rule).

On February 8, 2008, The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit vacated EPA's rule removing power plants from the CAA list of sources of hazardous air pollutants. At the same time, the court vacated the CAMR. EPA is reviewing the court's decisions and evaluating its impacts.<sup>xxiv</sup>

In May 2008, petitions for rehearing of the matter by the full court were denied. In February 2009 an appeal to the Supreme Court was denied. It is likely that the EPA will develop MACT standards for mercury emissions. These MACT standards, if adopted, could impact both KCP&L's new and existing facilities requiring mercury control technologies to be installed.

## **2.8 HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS**

The CAA requires EPA to regulate emissions of toxic air pollutants from a published list of industrial sources referred to as “source categories.” As required under the Act, EPA has developed a list of source categories that must meet control technology requirements for these toxic air pollutants. The EPA is



required to develop regulations (also known as rules or standards) for all industries that emit one or more of the pollutants in significant quantities.<sup>xxv</sup>

Future additional regulation of HAPs could require Maximum Achievable Control Technology Standards (MACT) for HAPs for fossil-fired units.

## **2.9 MULTI-POLLUTANT IMPACTS**

Future EPA revisions to the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) could require near PSD limits for new units or major modifications of fossil-fired units.

Future multi-pollutant legislation or regulations could require additional control technology or reduced emissions at all fossil-fired units.

Legislation possibilities include criteria pollutants, HAPs, or CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions without grandfathering units.

Regulation possibilities include a regulatory response to criteria pollutants, HAPs, or CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions without grandfathering units.

Future New Source Review (NSR) enforcement actions could result in penalties and additional controls or greater emission reductions at impacted fossil-fired units.

## **SECTION 3: WATER IMPACTS**

### **3.1 CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 316(A) THERMAL DISCHARGE REGULATIONS OR POLICY**

#### **3.1.1 SIBLEY, LAKE ROAD AND IATAN NPDES PERMITS**

The Sibley, Lake Road, and Iatan Stations current NPDES permit have expired. KCPL GMO submitted a renewal application within the required timeframe. The current permits remain in effect until MDNR issues new NPDES permit.

MDNR has placed a hold on the issuance of Missouri River NPDES permits based on a discussions between MDNR and EPA on thermal discharges to the Missouri River. The permits generally defines a specific limit, i.e., exceedance, for thermal discharge in btu/day based on a state Water Quality Standard (WQS) discharge temperature of 90°F. However, the MDNR permit defines a violation in thermal discharge based on a complex formula involving discharge temperature, river volume, etc. It is this difference between exceedance and violation that is the basis for the discussion between EPA and MDNR. KCP&L GMO's river plants at times exceed the WQS limits but not the calculated limits as defined in the permit as a violation.

The EPA has collected information on the Missouri River intake temperature from numerous utility plants located upstream of the state of Missouri which indicates that the Missouri River temperature currently is in the 88-89 ° F temperature range as it enters the state of Missouri.

Future regulations or policy could be issued that restricts thermal discharges requiring alternative cooling technologies to be installed at coal fired units using once through cooling.

### **3.2 CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 316(B) FISH IMPINGEMENT REGULATIONS**

EPA is developing regulations under §316(b) of the Clean Water Act. Section 316(b) requires that the location, design, construction and capacity of cooling water intake structures reflect the best technology available for minimizing adverse environmental impact. Industrial facilities use large volumes of cooling water from lakes, rivers, estuaries or oceans to cool their plants, including steam electric power plants, pulp and paper makers, chemical manufacturers, petroleum refiners, and manufacturers of primary metals like iron and steel and aluminum.

Cooling water intake structures cause adverse environmental impact by pulling large numbers of fish and shellfish or their eggs into a power plant's or factory's cooling system. There, the organisms may be killed or injured by heat, physical stress, or by chemicals used to clean the cooling system. Larger organisms may be killed or injured when they are trapped against screens at the front of an intake structure.<sup>xxvi</sup>

The final rule requires protection against these losses. For example, impingement requirements call for the number of organisms pinned against parts of the intake structure to be reduced by 80 to 95 percent from uncontrolled levels. Entrainment requirements call for the number of aquatic organisms drawn into the cooling system to be reduced by 60 to 90 percent from uncontrolled levels. Large power plants have flexibility to comply and to ensure energy reliability. The rule provides several compliance alternatives, such as using existing technologies, selecting additional fish protection technologies (such as screens with fish return systems), and using restoration measures.<sup>xxvii</sup>

Effective July 9, 2007, EPA suspended the section 316(b) rule. The Second Circuit's decision remanded key provisions of the Phase II requirements, including the determination of BTA and the performance standard ranges. This

suspension responds to the Second Circuit's decision, while EPA considers how to address the remanded issues.

EPA did not suspend the requirement that permitting authorities develop BPJ controls for existing facility cooling water intake structures that reflect the best technology available for minimizing adverse environmental impact.<sup>xxviii</sup>

On April 11, 2008, the Supreme Court granted certiorari to hear the following question "whether CWA 316(b) authorizes EPA to compare costs with benefits in determining the best technology available for minimizing adverse environmental impacts at cooling water intake structures." On April 1, 2009, the Supreme Court ruled that EPA permissibly relied on cost-benefit analysis in setting the national performance standards and in providing for cost-benefit variances from those standards as part of the applicable 316(b) regulations. The decision concludes that EPA may use cost-benefit analysis. This reverses the Lower Court on this component of the 316(b) rules only. Although the Supreme Court has ruled that EPA can apply cost benefit analysis; it is not known whether EPA will propose regulations to include cost benefits assessments.

EPA is currently, on remand, developing future section 316(b) regulations which could severely restrict cooling water inlet structures potentially requiring closed cycle cooling technologies instead.

### **3.3 ZEBRA MUSSEL INFESTATION**

Zebra mussels first entered Missouri during the flood of 1993 along the Mississippi River. Since that time they have invaded the waters of the Lower Mississippi and several reservoirs in the South. They have moved upstream on the Arkansas River into Oklahoma, at one time shutting down the Ark One nuclear plant. In Oklahoma, they have been transported to several reservoirs from the Arkansas River including Kaw Reservoir, Keystone Reservoir, Oologh Lake and Shiatook Lake. In Kansas, they have infested El Dorado, Cheney and Perry Reservoirs, the Walnut River and Winfield City Lake. Zebra mussel's were

found in Missouri in the Lake of the Ozarks and Lake Taneycomo. Nebraska has reported zebra mussel's in the Missouri River and at Base Lake, Offutt Air Force Base.

KCP&L GMO has been monitoring for zebra mussel's at our generation facilities since 1993. From March to October we pull monthly samples from the lakes and the Missouri River that are sent to Wolf Creek to be analyzed for the presence of zebra mussel veligers, the immature stage of their life cycle. We also visually inspect the equipment. Zebra Mussels were found at several location along the Missouri River in the Kansas City area. In the Spring and Fall, we also cooperate with the Missouri Conservation Department and Kansas Wildlife and Parks to boat the Missouri River and search for adult zebra mussel's. We also do shoreline sampling and visual inspections of equipment at the lake plants.

### **3.4 TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS (TMDL)**

A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) is a calculation of the maximum amount of a given pollutant that a body of water can absorb before its quality is affected. Under the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) requires states to list impaired waters for which the necessary pollution controls have not yet been required and for which a TMDL study has not been written. The state is required to develop a TMDL for all waters on the 303(d) list. Each TMDL document will include allocations of the acceptable load for all sources of the pollutant. It will also include an implementation plan to identify how the load will be reduced to a level that will protect water quality.

If a water body is determined to be impaired, a watershed management plan will be developed that will include the TMDL calculation. Missouri has established acceptable standards for drinking water, fishing, swimming, aquatic life and other designated uses. Waters that don't meet these standards are placed on the 303(d) list.

A stream is considered impaired when it fails to meet Water Quality Standards established by the Clean Water Commission. Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act requires states to identify and list all impaired waters. The list is revised and updated every two years. After studying the scientific data, waters are added or subtracted from the list depending on the status of their health. Once a TMDL is assigned to a water body, a facility's NPDES permit on renewal will incorporate the TMDL. TMDL that will impact our facilities include temperature, mercury, TSS or example. We will continue to monitor the 303(d) list.

The 2004/2006 316(d) list does not list the Missouri River as impaired. The 2002 316(d) list included the Missouri River for PCB and chlordane. MDNR did make the following comments regarding mercury. General observations of mercury data would indicate that contamination of certain fish may be a state-wide problem. Generally, waters that have mercury levels sufficient to contaminate fish are considered eligible for placement on the 303(d) List. However, listing only the few waters with data available may create a misconception that only those waters are affected. Likewise, listing all of the state's waters could cause a belief that all waters contain fish unsafe to eat. Neither scenario is likely true.

Furthermore, the listing may cause an excessive focus on sources of mercury within Missouri when most of the mercury in fish sampled in this state comes from sources outside of the state via atmospheric deposition. Because of the complexity of the problem, the department is participating in a state mercury taskforce to inventory, track and recommend controls for mercury sources in Missouri. Placing a few or all waters on the 303(d) List may confuse, rather than facilitate, the ongoing efforts to address the broader-based mercury concern.

A thermal TMDL could also be applied.

Future TMDL standards for containments in discharges could restrict these discharges requiring equipment be installed to minimize or control the discharge.

Future effluent limitations regarding settling or holding ponds discharges could require compliance with lower standards or elimination of pond usage.

Future storm water effluent limitations on storm water discharge could require storm water settling basins be constructed to comply with the standards.

## **SECTION 4: WASTE MATERIAL IMPACTS**

### **4.1 POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS (PCB'S)**

KCP&L GMO has been removing PCB's from our systems since 1980. It is estimated that our distribution system has less than five percent of the transformers with 50 to 500 ppm PCB's. Typically, we find the distribution contaminated equipment when it comes out of service. No contaminated equipment is put back into service but is disposed.

PCB phase-out initiatives are occurring abroad and in the United States. While the current PCB regulations in the United States do not mandate phase-out, EPA has indicated a PCB advanced notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) may occur in 2009 which may be influenced by international phase-out efforts. In particular, last year's Canadian rule establishing mandatory phase-out dates for PCB-containing equipment has the potential to influence EPA's rulemaking.

The most important aspect of the increased regulation for KCP&L GMO would be the necessity of inventorying all our PCB containing equipment. An inventory would require a walk down of our distribution system and testing of all devices that could contain PCB's.

### **4.2 COAL COMBUSTION PRODUCTS (CCP'S)**

CCPs are produced from the burning of fossil fuels. This includes all ash, slag, and particulates removed from flue gas. EPA conducted two regulatory determinations on the management and use of coal combustion products (CCPs), in 1993 and in 2000. In conducting these two regulatory determinations, EPA did not identify any environmental harm associated with the beneficial use of coal combustion products and concluded in both determinations that these materials did not warrant regulation as a hazardous waste. The beneficial use of coal combustion products can include both encapsulated and unencapsulated



applications. EPA recognizes that unencapsulated uses of coal combustion product require proper hydrogeologic evaluation to ensure adequate groundwater protection. The 2000 regulatory determination recommended a separate review addressing the use of coal combustion wastes as fill for surface or underground mines, which is currently underway.<sup>xxix</sup>

Since EPA issued its 2000 regulatory determination, additional information on the disposal of CCP in landfills and surface impoundments has become available. EPA is made this information available for public review and comment. The Agency will consider all the information provided through this notice, the comments and new information submitted on it, as well as the results of the peer review of the draft risk assessment as it continues the follow-up on its Regulatory Determination for CCW disposed of in landfills and surface impoundments.<sup>xxx</sup>

The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sought comments on proposed regulations pertaining to permit application requirements and performance standards related to the placement of CCPs on sites with a surface coal mining operations permit or in the reclamation of abandoned mine lands.

In 2003, Congress directed the EPA to commission an independent study of the health, safety, and environmental risks associated with the placement of CCPs in active and abandoned coal mines in all major U.S. coal basins. As a result, the National Research Council (NRC) established the Committee on Mine Placement of Coal Combustion Wastes in September 2004. The NRC published the committee's findings on March 1, 2006, in a report entitled "Managing Coal Combustion Residues in Mines".

The report states that the committee "concluded that putting CCPs in coal mines as part of the reclamation process is a viable management option as long as (1) CCP placement is properly planned and is carried out in a manner that avoids significant adverse environmental and health impacts and (2) the regulatory process for issuing permits includes clear provisions for public involvement." The committee notes that the placement of CCPs in coal mines "can assist in

meeting reclamation goals (such as remediation of abandoned mine lands)" and "avoids the need, relative to landfills and impoundments, to disrupt undisturbed sites." However, the committee cautioned that "an integrated process of CCP characterization, site characterization, management and engineering design of placement activities, and design and implementation of monitoring is required to reduce the risk of contamination moving from the mine site to the ambient environment." In addition, the report states that "comparatively little is known about the potential for minefilling to degrade the quality of groundwater and/or surface waters particularly over longer time periods." The committee recommended the establishment of "enforceable federal standards" to govern the placement of CCPs in mines.<sup>xxx</sup>

On March 9, 2009, EPA issued Information Request Letters to electric utilities that have surface impoundments or similar units that contain coal combustion residuals. The letters request information to assist EPA in evaluating the structural integrity of these management units. EPA, working closely with other federal agencies and the states, will review the information provided by the facilities to identify impoundments or similar units that need priority attention. As part of this assessment effort, EPA will also be visiting many of these facilities to see first hand that the management units are structurally sound. EPA will require appropriate remedial action at any facility that is found to pose a risk for potential failure.

The December 2008 release of coal ash from TVA's Kingston, Tennessee facility flooded more than 300 acres of land, damaging homes and property. Coal ash from the release flowed into the Emory and Clinch rivers, filling large areas of the rivers and resulting in fish kills.

EPA is also developing regulations to address the management of coal combustion residuals. EPA anticipates having a proposed rule ready for public comment by the end of the year.<sup>xxx</sup>

Future regulations or legislation could require existing landfills to be closed and replaced with new landfills designed to more stringent standards.

Future regulations or legislation could require the existing use of mine reclamation for disposal of combustion waste products to be eliminated or designed to more stringent standards.

Future regulations or legislation could require existing ash handling ponds to be closed and replaced with dry ash handling or disposal.

Future regulations or legislation could require beneficial use of combustion waste products to be eliminated or limited requiring landfill disposal.

- 
- <sup>i</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/air/urbanair/6poll.html>
- <sup>ii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/air/particlepollution/standards.html>
- <sup>iii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/pmdesignations/1997standards/documents/Mar07/factsheet.htm>
- <sup>iv</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/air/ozonepollution/basic.html>
- <sup>v</sup> [http://www.epa.gov/air/ozonepollution/pdfs/2008\\_03\\_factsheet.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/air/ozonepollution/pdfs/2008_03_factsheet.pdf)
- <sup>vi</sup> <http://www.dnr.mo.gov/env/apcp/docs/morecsummary-08.pdf>
- <sup>vii</sup> [http://www.kdheks.gov/bar/air-monitor/OzoneDesig/2009\\_designation\\_ver10\\_w\\_app.pdf](http://www.kdheks.gov/bar/air-monitor/OzoneDesig/2009_designation_ver10_w_app.pdf)
- <sup>viii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/air/urbanair/co/>
- <sup>ix</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/air/urbanair/co/effrt1.html>
- <sup>x</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/progsregs/arp/index.html>
- <sup>xi</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/progsregs/arp/basic.html>
- <sup>xii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/air/nitrogenoxides/pdfs/20090626fs.pdf>
- <sup>xiii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/cair/>
- <sup>xiv</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/cair/basic.html>
- <sup>xv</sup> [http://www.epa.gov/air/visibility/fs\\_2005\\_6\\_15.html](http://www.epa.gov/air/visibility/fs_2005_6_15.html)
- <sup>xvi</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/air/lead/>
- <sup>xvii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/air/lead/pdfs/20081015pbfactsheet.pdf>
- <sup>xviii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/epahome/anprfs.htm>
- <sup>xix</sup> [http://www.epa.gov/safewater/uic/pdfs/fs\\_uic\\_co2\\_proposedrule.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/safewater/uic/pdfs/fs_uic_co2_proposedrule.pdf)
- <sup>xx</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/downloads/ProposedRule-FactSheet.pdf>
- <sup>xxi</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment/downloads/Determination.pdf>
- <sup>xxii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/ca-waiver.htm>
- <sup>xxiii</sup> [http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c111:H.R.2454:](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c111:H.R.2454)
- <sup>xxiv</sup> [http://www.epa.gov/mercury/control\\_emissions/decision.htm#Chronology](http://www.epa.gov/mercury/control_emissions/decision.htm#Chronology)

---

<sup>xxv</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/eparules.html>

<sup>xxvi</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/316b/basic.htm#316b>

<sup>xxvii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/316b/phase2/phase2final-fs.htm>

<sup>xxviii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-WATER/2007/July/Day-09/w13202.htm>

<sup>xxix</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/osw/conserved/c2p2/resources.htm>

<sup>xxx</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/industrial/special/fossil/noda07.htm>

<sup>xxxi</sup> [http://www.nap.edu/webcast/webcast\\_detail.php?webcast\\_id=322](http://www.nap.edu/webcast/webcast_detail.php?webcast_id=322)

<sup>xxxii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/industrial/special/fossil/coalashletter.htm>