

<u>SUBJECT</u>		<u>DATE</u>
1448. Definitions of Inactive Portion, Active Portion and Closed Portion of a RCRA TSDF		AUG 12, 2021
1449. Dangerous Waste Designations and Dangerous Waste Code Determinations		AUG 19, 2021
1450. Method Detection Limits and Hazardous Waste Determinations	ENCORE	AUG 26, 2021
1451. Method Detection Limits and Hazardous Waste Determinations II	ENCORE	SEP 2, 2021
1452. Totals Analysis vs. TCLP and Dividing by 20	ENCORE	SEP 9, 2021
1453. Decharacterized RCRA Waste - Manifesting and LDR Reporting	ENCORE	SEP 16, 2021
1454. Decharacterized Hazardous Waste Listed Solely for Non-Toxic Characteristics	ENCORE	SEP 23, 2021
1455. Decharacterized Wastes and the LDR Dilution Prohibition	ENCORE	SEP 30, 2021
1456. The "Derived from Rule", the "Mixtures Rule", and the "Contained-In Policy"	ENCORE	OCT 7, 2021
1457. Hazardous Debris and Options to Exclude as a Dangerous Waste		OCT 14, 2021
1458. Regulatory Status of Characteristic Baghouse Dust Destined for Reclamation		OCT 21, 2021
1459. RCRA Point of Generation and Baghouse Dust Collection Systems		OCT 28, 2021
1460. Pumps Containing Liquid Hazardous Wastes and Liquids in Landfill Prohibition	ENCORE	NOV 4, 2021
1461. Pumps Containing Liquid Hazardous Waste and Land Disposal Restrictions	ENCORE	NOV 11, 2021
1462. Pumps Containing Liquid Hazardous Wastes and RCRA Empty Containers		NOV 18, 2021
1463. Multiple Characteristic Hazardous Waste Codes and Underlying Hazardous Constituents	ENCORE	NOV 23, 2021
1464. LDR Notifications/Certifications and Generator Permitted Treatment, Storage, or Disposal Facility	ENCORE	DEC 2, 2021
1465. Multiple Characteristic and Listed Hazardous Waste Codes and the "in lieu of" LDR Principle	ENCORE	DEC 9, 2021
1466. Universal Wastes - Recycling versus Disposal	ENCORE	DEC 16, 2021
1467. 'Twas the Night Before Christmas – The Twenty-Eighth Edition		DEC 24, 2021
1468. Spent Lead Acid Batteries vs., Universal Wastes	ENCORE	DEC 30, 2021
1469. Hazardous Debris and Radioactively Contaminated Cadmium Batteries	ENCORE	JAN 6, 2022
1470. Hazardous Debris and Radioactively Contaminated Lead-Acid Batteries	ENCORE	JAN 13, 2022
1471. Mercury Wet Cell Batteries - Debris or Not Debris	ENCORE	JAN 20, 2022
1472. Hazardous Debris and Non-Radioactive Lead Acid Batteries	ENCORE	JAN 27, 2022
1473. Hazardous Debris and LDR High/Low Mercury Subcategories	ENCORE	FEB 3, 2022

Approved for Public Release;
Further Dissemination Unlimited

DISCLAIMER - "Two Minute Training" ("2MT") is a peer-to-peer communication, presented to share the benefit of the author's work experience with other professionals, who can independently evaluate his analysis. 2MT does not necessarily reflect the opinions, conclusions or policies of the author's past or current employers or the US Department of Energy. The author's employers do not take any responsibility for the accuracy of its conclusions. 2MT is not intended to be used as authoritative guidance or direction by any person or entity. Anyone transmitting or reproducing it is prohibited from modifying its content, this disclaimer, or other text, or republishing it independent of its original source.

TWO MINUTE TRAINING

TO: CENTRAL PLATEAU CLEANUP COMPANY

FROM: PAUL W. MARTIN, RCRA Subject Matter Expert
CPCCo Environmental Protection, Hanford, WA

SUBJECT: HAZARDOUS DEBRIS AND LDR HIGH/LOW MERCURY SUBCATEGORIES

DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2022

<u>CPCCo Projects</u>	<u>CPCCo Functionals</u>	<u>HMIS</u>	<u>Hanford Laboratories</u>	<u>Other Hanford Contractors</u>	<u>Other Hanford Contractors</u>
Tania Bates	Jeff Bramson	Brett Barnes		Bill Bachmann	Dan Saueressig
Theresa Boles	Bob Bullock	Mike Demiter	(TBD)	Dean Baker	Lana Strickling
Justin Bolles	Frank Carleo	Kip George	<u>DOE RL, ORP, WIPP</u>	Scott Baker	Joelle Moss
Rene Catlow	Bob Cathel	Jerry Cammann		Michael Carlson	Greg Varljen
Peter Ceton	Danielle Collins	Garin Erickson	Duane Carter	Paul Crane	Robin Varljen
Richard Clinton	Stacy Cutter	Dashia Huff	Tony McKarns	Tina Crane	Julie Waddoups
Patty Drago	Jeanne Elkins	Mark Kamberg		Ron Del Mar	Jay Warwick
Paul Fernandez	Jonathan Fullmer	Jon McKibben		John Dorian	Ted Wooley
Ryan Fisher	Bailey Hardy	Saul Martinez		Mark Ellefson	
Randal Fox	Steve Heninger	Matt Mills		Darrin Faulk	
Andrew Getz	John Hultman	Carly Nelson		James Hamilton	
Cory Grabeel	Julie Johanson	Eric Pennala		Leah Hare	
Lawanda Grow	Mitch Marrott	Jon Perry		Andy Hobbs	
Char Hall	Stewart McMahand	Christina Robison		Stephanie Johansen	
Stuart Hildreth	Carlie Michaelis	Christian Seavoy		Ryan Johnson	
Sarah Horn	Brian Mitcheltree	David Shaw		Megan Lerchen	
Aprill Jivelekas	Anthony Nagel	John Skoglie		Mike Lowery	
Sasa Kosjerina	Chris Plager	Greg Sullivan		Michael Madison	
William Krueger	Linda Petersen			Terri Mars	
Richard Lipinski	Brent Porter			Cary Martin	
Stuart Mortensen	Deborah Singleton			Steve Metzger	
Edward Myers	Dale Snyder			Tony Miskho	
Trey Reppe	Dave St. John			Tom Moon	
Dave Richards	Kat Thompson			Chuck Mulkey	
Melissa Sahn-dame	Daniel Turlington			Michelle Oates	
Sean Sexton	Britt Wilkins			Kirk Peterson	
Dave Shea	Jennifer Williams				
Seth Slater					
Phil Sheely					
Jeff Westcott					
Richard Willson					
Nick Wood					
Jon Wright					

Approved for Public Release;
Further Dissemination Unlimited

DISCLAIMER - "Two Minute Training" ("2MT") is a peer-to-peer communication, presented to share the benefit of the author's work experience with other professionals, who can independently evaluate his analysis. 2MT does not necessarily reflect the opinions, conclusions or policies of the author's past or current employers or the US Department of Energy. The author's employers do not take any responsibility for the accuracy of its conclusions. 2MT is not intended to be used as authoritative guidance or direction by any person or entity. Anyone transmitting or reproducing it is prohibited from modifying its content, this disclaimer, or other text, or republishing it independent of its original source.

TWO MINUTE TRAINING

SUBJECT: Hazardous Debris and LDR High/Low Mercury Subcategories

Q: A customer has a hazardous debris contaminated with mercury at concentrations >260 ppm. The customer is aware of the waste-specific treatment standards under 40 CFR 268.40, "Applicability of treatment standards" and the low and high mercury subcategories that require, respectively, treatment to <0.20 mg/l TCLP and treat for underlying hazardous constituents; or treatment via retorting of mercury (RMERC) and/or incineration of mercury (IMERC). The customer is concerned that since the debris meets the high mercury subcategory the use of the alternative treatment standard of debris at 40 CFR 268.45 precludes the use of immobilization technologies such as macroencapsulation. So, if the debris waste has mercury contamination >260 ppm, is treatment via macroencapsulation not allowed?

A: Per 40 CFR 268.45(a), it basically states that hazardous debris must be treated per the debris treatment standards in 40 CFR 268.45 or the waste-specific treatment standards in 40 CFR 268.40. This means that the customer has a choice to treat the mercury debris via one of the debris standards such as macroencapsulation or via the waste specific treatment standards of incineration (IMERC), or recovery of mercury (RMERC). Note that this is assuming the customer's mercury waste meets the definition of debris found at 40 CFR 268.2(g). As an example, if the waste was unbroken mercury batteries, the waste would be considered intact containers and not debris. The only Land Disposal Restriction (LDR) treatment options in this case would be the specified treatment standards of IMERC or RMERC. However, if the waste was broken mercury batteries and therefore nonintact containers, the alternative treatment standards for debris such as macroencapsulation would be a viable treatment option.

And as further clarification, an EPA memo dated October 23, 2003, ([RO 14685](#)), entitled, "Treatment Standards for Mercury-Containing Debris" states:

"The treatment technologies that generally apply to mercury containing debris are microencapsulation and macroencapsulation. These technology options do not distinguish between debris containing high and low levels of mercury."

This means that if the mercury containing debris is treated via the alternative treatment standards for debris at 40 CFR 268.45, as opposed to the waste-specific treatment standards of 40 CFR 268.40, the debris can be treated via macroencapsulation with no regard to whether or not the mercury would be considered a high mercury subcategory or a low mercury subcategory.

SUMMARY:

- Hazardous debris contaminated with mercury can be treated by either the waste-specific treatment standards of 40 CFR 268.40 or the alternative debris standards of 40 CFR 268.45
- If treated by 40 CFR 268.40, i.e., RMERC or IMERC, the applicable subcategories of mercury apply.
- If treated by 40 CFR 268.45, e.g., macroencapsulation, the subcategories of mercury do not apply.

The October 23, 2003, EPA memo is attached to the e-mail. If you have any questions, please contact me at [Paul W. Martin@rl.gov](mailto:Paul_W_Martin@rl.gov) or at (509) 376-6620.

TWO MINUTE TRAINING - ATTACHMENT

SUBJECT: Hazardous Debris and LDR High/Low Mercury Subcategories

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Treatment Standards for Mercury-Containing Debris

FROM: Robert Springer, Director
Office of Solid Waste

TO: RCRA Senior Policy Advisors
State Waste Managers

This memorandum discusses issues pertaining to the treatment and disposal of mercury containing debris subject to the RCRA land disposal restrictions debris requirements at 40 CFR 268.45. This memorandum:

- clarifies the types of hazardous mercury-containing wastes that are eligible for management under the debris treatment standards, including whether containerized mercury is excluded as debris;
- provides information on the improved capabilities of mercury “retorters” to accept and recover mercury from debris-like waste; and
- describes how to meet the performance standards for the hazardous debris treatment technologies.

The topics that are discussed in this memorandum have been raised to the Agency as areas for clarification or have arisen from advancements in research and technology developments. However, we are aware that the information that we are providing will not answer all of the questions that you may encounter as you consider the appropriateness of technologies for site-specific conditions.

Background

Treatment Standards for Non-Debris Hazardous Wastes. For D009 wastes (wastes that meet the toxicity characteristic for mercury) that are not classified as debris and are not wastewaters or mixed (radioactive and hazardous) wastes, the RCRA land disposal restrictions (LDRs) set four treatment standards (see 40 CFR 268.40). These wastes are in either the “low mercury subcategory” (i.e., containing less than 260 mg/kg total mercury), or the “high mercury inorganic subcategory” (i.e., containing more than 260 mg/kg total mercury). The treatment standard for low mercury wastes requires that leachate from treatment residuals, using the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP), have a mercury concentration of less than 0.025 mg/L (or 0.20 mg/L for residues from retorting). Treatment by stabilization can be used to achieve this standard. The treatment standard for “high mercury inorganic category” wastes, which contain more than 260 mg/kg total mercury, is mercury recovery (“RMERC”) in a thermal processing unit that volatilizes and subsequently condenses the mercury. These units are commonly referred to as “retorters,” and the recovery process as “retorting.” (40 CFR, 268.42, Table 1).

TWO MINUTE TRAINING -ATTACHMENT

SUBJECT: Hazardous Debris and LDR High/Low Mercury Subcategories

Treatment Standards for Hazardous Debris Wastes. The treatment requirements for hazardous debris, which were promulgated in 1992, are based on performance standards and specified technologies that reflect the technical challenges of treating debris-like objects and cleaning up remediation sites (see 40 CFR 268.45). These requirements allow use of specified technologies as an alternative to meeting the standards for non-debris hazardous wastes (40 CFR 268.45(a)) that are otherwise required; in this memo, we refer to these treatment standards as the alternative debris standards. The treatment technologies that generally apply to mercury containing debris are microencapsulation and macroencapsulation¹. These technology options do not distinguish between debris containing high and low levels of mercury. EPA's guidance on how to best achieve the performance requirements for these technology options is described below.

It is important to remember that if the alternative debris standards are not used as the basis of compliance for the land disposal restrictions, the mercury-containing hazardous debris are subject to the non-debris standards, which include retorting for high-mercury wastes. The non-debris standards will also apply if the alternative debris standards cannot be adequately met.

What are Debris/Hazardous Debris?

Definition of Debris. Debris is defined at 40 CFR 268.2 (g) as a "solid material exceeding a 60 mm particle size that is intended for disposal and that is: A manufactured object; or plant or animal matter; or natural geologic material." The next section describes the exceptions to this definition.

Definition of Hazardous Debris. Under 40 CFR 268.2(h), *hazardous debris* means debris that contains a listed hazardous waste or exhibits a characteristic of hazardous waste. Deliberately mixing prohibited waste with debris to change the treatment classification from waste to hazardous debris is not allowed under the dilution prohibition in 40 CFR 268.3.

What Is Not Hazardous Debris?

Exclusions from the Debris Definition. The debris regulations specifically exclude certain materials from the definition of "debris." One exception under the 40 CFR 268.2(g) debris definition of great pertinence to mercury-containing wastes is for "intact containers of hazardous waste that are not ruptured and that retain at least 75% of their original volume." The preamble to the Debris Rule discusses this exclusion in detail (see 57 FR 37225, August 18, 1992: "Intact Containers Are Not Debris").

EPA has long interpreted certain manufactured objects that hold liquids, including mercury-containing pumps² and batteries, to be "containers." Under 40 CFR 260.10, containers are defined as "any portable device in which a material is stored, transported, treated, disposed of, or otherwise handled." Under this definition, mercury-containing items such as thermometers, pumps, manometers, thermostats, jars of elemental mercury, batteries, dental amalgam collection devices,

¹Although "source separation" is not identified as a specific technology under the debris treatment standards, for waste streams with readily identifiable mercury sources, it is a preferred method of removing liquid mercury from hazardous debris waste streams, or of removing the mercury characteristic from the hazardous debris. (See further discussion of this technology later in the memorandum.)

²Note that the debris rule preamble describes circumstances where pumps can be debris (57 FR 37225 and 37229). Pumps containing enclosed mercury, however, function as containers and would not be eligible as debris if the criteria for the intact container exclusion are met.

TWO MINUTE TRAINING - ATTACHMENT

SUBJECT: Hazardous Debris and LDR High/Low Mercury Subcategories

and ampules are containers. These items, therefore, do not fall under the debris definition and are subject to the non-debris mercury treatment standards.³

In situations where intact containers are mixed with true debris (i.e., materials classified as debris under the debris rule) and the mixture is RCRA hazardous, the intact containers would have to be removed and managed separately. EPA also recognizes that certain states have passed regulations that prohibit disposal and require mercury recovery from mercury-containing devices.

Size Limitations. The debris standards require that debris contain materials 60 mm or greater in size. Many mercury-containing devices, such as automotive switches, are substantially smaller than 60 mm and would not be eligible for treatment under the debris treatment standard because of their size. It is important to note, however, that many switches would not likely be eligible as debris because they are intact containers, as discussed above.

What Hazardous Debris is Exempt from RCRA Subtitle C?

We are aware that there is some confusion about the regulatory status of certain hazardous debris that is currently exempted from RCRA Subtitle C. At the federal level, there are two main exemptions from the RCRA hazardous waste regulations that pertain to hazardous debris-like mercury-containing wastes. The first is for mercury wastes from households, such as the thermostats and thermometers, which are exempted from the RCRA hazardous waste regulations under the household waste exclusion (see 40 CFR 261.4(b)(1)). The second exemption is for hazardous wastes that are generated by conditionally exempt small quantity generators (CESQGs; see 40 CFR 261.5). CESQGs are defined as those generators that generate less than 100 kg of hazardous waste per calendar month or less than 1 kg of acutely hazardous waste per calendar month. CESQG requirements also limit the facility's waste accumulation to less than 1,000 kg of hazardous waste, 1 kg of acute hazardous waste, or 100 kg of any residue from the cleanup of a spill of acute hazardous waste at any time.⁴

As an example, under federal regulations, a small dental office collecting mercury amalgam scrap that exhibits the hazardous characteristic for mercury would be a CESQG if it did not exceed the hazardous waste limits noted above. EPA strongly recommends that households and CESQGs make every effort to preserve the integrity of mercury-containing devices and that such devices are collected and recycled.

It is important to note that certain states have passed laws or regulations requiring that collected mercury-containing household wastes or mercury-containing CESQG wastes be subject to specific treatment and management standards, such as retorting. In addition, nearly half of the states have not adopted the less stringent CESQG requirements, and generators of mercury-containing hazardous waste in such states are subject to the small (or large) quantity generator requirements, or to other more stringent state requirements. Therefore, you should consult your state agency(s) to determine whether more stringent state requirements are applicable.

³States may have designated certain mercury-containing items such as thermostats as universal wastes' under state regulations. Such designations allow for streamlined collection requirements, but do not exempt such wastes from the hazardous waste treatment requirements.

⁴Note that most mercury wastes will not be "acutely hazardous," and the larger generation and accumulation amounts would apply for purposes of this exemption. See 40 CFR 261.30(b).

TWO MINUTE TRAINING - ATTACHMENT

SUBJECT: Hazardous Debris and LDR High/Low Mercury Subcategories

Treatment Technologies for Mercury-Containing Debris

Table 1 of 40 CFR 268.45 (the debris regulation), Alternative Treatment Standards for Hazardous Debris, contains technology descriptions, performance and/or design and operating standards for each technology, and restrictions on contaminants for specific technologies. Table 1 categorizes technologies into three technology groups--extraction (physical and chemical), destruction (biological and chemical), and immobilization (macroencapsulation, microencapsulation, and sealing).⁵ In our experience, the treatment technologies listed in Table I that are applicable to mercury-containing debris are microencapsulation and macroencapsulation. However, source separation and retorting can also be effective technologies for mercury contaminated debris.

The following section describes each of these technologies and EPA's guidance on how to best achieve the performance standard for microencapsulation and macroencapsulation. This guidance reflects the technical challenges associated with treating mercury, which can be difficult to stabilize and has the potential to become volatile at ambient conditions.

Retorting. Mercury retorters are capable of accepting many mercury-containing materials, including mercury-containing debris, with certain limitations and exceptions. The websites of existing vendors list a variety of retortable materials that could be potentially associated with debris, including cleanup materials, building materials and many mercury-added products such as those referenced earlier in this memorandum. In addition, vendors can manage different forms of mercury salts and compounds. Since the hazardous debris rule was promulgated in 1992, vendors have increased their capability to handle larger objects in their retorters. Vendors typically manage drums of waste, but can, in some instances, handle even larger objects, such as roll-off containers of wastes. In general, we encourage you to contact the vendors to determine if there are any size, concentration, or contaminant restrictions that would require pre-treatment or special management considerations, or that would prevent the waste from undergoing retorting. RCRA regulations for mercury retorting are found at 40 CFR 266.100(d), which conditionally exempts certain metal recovery units from regulation under RCRA Subtitle C. To retain this conditional exemption, retorters must comply with waste limitations regarding organic matter content and heating value. Specifically, under 40 CFR 266.100(d)(2), a retorter cannot accept wastes exceeding 500 ppm by weight of Appendix VIII organics, as fired, and cannot accept wastes exceeding a heating value of 5000 BTU/lb or more. Please see 40 CFR 266.100(d) for more details on these provisions. To ensure that air emissions from mercury retorters are controlled adequately, the Agency also specified, as part of the Best Demonstrated Available Technology (BDAT) determination under the RCRA land disposal restrictions regulations, that the retorting unit either: (a) be subject to the mercury National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP); (b) be subject to a Best Available Control Technology (BACT) or Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) for mercury retorting are found at 40 CFR 266.100(d), which conditionally exempts certain metal recovery units from regulation under RCRA Subtitle C. To retain this conditional exemption, retorters must comply with waste limitations regarding organic matter content and heating

⁵Destruction technologies are not applicable to metal contaminants. We are not aware of chemical extraction technologies that could be applied to remove mercury from debris. Physical extraction technologies listed under the debris standard, including abrasion, grinding, spalling, or vibratory finishing, might be capable of removing mercury contamination from certain contaminated surfaces; we are not, however, aware of any examples where these technologies have been used for this purpose. We anticipate that physical extraction technologies would present potential cross-media contamination, especially volatilization of mercury into atmosphere, that could make the technology unacceptably risky to the environment. Permitting authorities should ensure that this potential for risk is minimized. In addition, the removed mercury, associated media, and extraction materials that fail the Toxicity Characteristic for mercury would be subject to the RCRA hazardous waste requirements for non-debris wastes

TWO MINUTE TRAINING - ATTACHMENT

SUBJECT: Hazardous Debris and LDR High/Low Mercury Subcategories

value. Specifically, under 40 CFR 266.100(d)(2), a retorter cannot accept wastes exceeding 500 ppm by weight of Appendix VIII organics, as fired, and cannot accept wastes exceeding a heating value of 5000 BTU/lb or more. Please see 40 CFR 266.100(d) for more details on these provisions. To ensure that air emissions from mercury retorters are controlled adequately, the Agency also specified, as part of the Best Demonstrated Available Technology (BDAT) determination under the RCRA land disposal restrictions regulations, that the retorting unit either: (a) be subject to the mercury National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP); (b) be subject to a Best Available Control Technology (BACT) or Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) standard for mercury imposed pursuant to a Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit; or (c) that it be subject to a state permit that establishes emission limitations (within the meaning of section 302 of the Clean Air Act (CAA)) for mercury (see 40 CFR 268.42 Table 1 (RMERC), and <http://www.epa.gov/air/caa/caa302.txt>). This standard is enforceable under RCRA pursuant to the authority in section 3008(a). There are no Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standards for mercury retorters set under the CAA at this time. See 55 FR 22569-22570 (the June 1, 1990, Land Disposal Restrictions Third Third Rule) for more details on the RCRA requirements for retorters. For more information on the CAA requirements cited here, see <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/catc/rblc/htm/rbxplain.html> and http://www.epa.gov/ttn/nsr/psd_abs.html.

Source Separation. For mercury-containing debris exhibiting the D009 characteristic for mercury, we use the term “source separation” to refer to the process of removing mercury contaminated material from the bulk of the debris. For example, mercury-contaminated piping or broken gauges could be removed and managed under the non-debris treatment standards for hazardous wastes. Although source separation is not listed as a specific technology under the debris standards on Table 1, in many circumstances, it will be the preferred approach to remove mercury-containing devices or other items with readily identifiable mercury from the debris, and may even result in removing the mercury characteristic from the debris.⁶ Moreover, as noted earlier, where intact containers containing hazardous waste are mixed with true debris, the intact containers (such as mercury-added products) must be removed and managed separately as nondebris hazardous waste.

Microencapsulation. This technology involves mixing wastes with reagents and stabilization materials to produce a more stable waste form. The Table 1 performance standard for microencapsulation is that “the leachability of the hazardous contaminants must be reduced.” EPA recently published the results of treatment research conducted on non-debris mercury wastes and pure elemental mercury to assess whether the current retorting standard could be supplemented with an alternative disposal standard (Notice of Data Availability (NODA), 68 FR 4481, January 29, 2003). The results of this study are applicable to mercury-containing debris. In the study, treated wastes were subjected to a range of highly buffered pH liquids and were sampled to determine the amount of mercury in the subsequent leachate. We concluded that the waste forms that we examined were not sufficiently stable across the range of expected Subtitle C landfill conditions for the Agency to propose an alternative treatment standard for all hazardous non-debris mercury wastes. The Agency also concluded, however, that, on a site-specific basis, taking into consideration actual disposal conditions, mercury wastes could be potentially treated via microencapsulation and disposed of in a protective manner.

⁶As is the case for all characteristic wastes, removing the characteristic will not necessarily result in achieving compliance with the land disposal restriction treatment standards for that waste. Please also note, under 40 CFR 268.45(c), hazardous debris contaminated with a listed waste that is treated by an immobilization technology specified in Table I must be managed in a subtitle C facility.

TWO MINUTE TRAINING - ATTACHMENT

SUBJECT: Hazardous Debris and LDR High/Low Mercury Subcategories

EPA's treatment research provides information on specific factors that may be considered when evaluating microencapsulation for treatment and disposal of mercury-containing hazardous debris. These factors assist you in determining whether or not the performance standard for microencapsulation—"leachability of the hazardous contaminants must be reduced"—is being met.⁷ For example, the results of the treatability studies discussed above demonstrate that each treatment technology exhibits its own pattern of mercury leaching from the treated waste forms across a range of plausible pH conditions. The research also found a significant increase in leachability of one treated waste form as leachate salinity was increased (only one treated waste form was tested with increasing salinity). When assessing the appropriateness of microencapsulation for mercury-containing debris, the primary factors to keep in mind include the chemical composition of the leachates to which the stabilized waste will be exposed, including pH and major anions, cations and organic compounds. It is also important to consider what additional measures, if any (e.g., macroencapsulation), will be put in place to prevent leachate from mobilizing the hazardous constituents. Please note, as well, that free liquids are prohibited from land disposal in microencapsulated debris (see discussion in the debris rule preamble at 57 FR 37235 and RCRA regulations at 40 CFR 264.314 and 265.314).

Macroencapsulation. This technology uses surface coatings or jackets to substantially reduce surface exposure to potential leaching media. The performance standard listed in Table 1 for this technology is that the "encapsulating material must completely encapsulate debris and be resistant to degradation by the debris and its contaminants and materials into which it may come into contact after placement (leachate, other waste microbes)." Methods for ensuring that the encapsulating material completely encapsulates the waste are specific to the technology used. For example, leak-tightness or pressure testing of High-Density Polyethylene (HDPE) pipes or containers has been approved for testing of treated debris. Visual inspection may be appropriate for verifying that sprayed-on or applied coatings have complete integrity, without cracks, voids or protruding waste to ensure that the hazardous debris is completely encapsulated. The performance standard also requires that the encapsulating material be resistant to degradation by the debris itself and the case-specific disposal environment. Information on the durability of potential encapsulating materials when exposed to multiple organic compounds can be found on the internet from many vendors of HDPE/Low Density Polyethylene (LDPE) products. For example, LDPE has general resistance to chemicals, although it is slowly attacked by strong oxidizing agents, and some solvents will cause softening or swelling. HDPE generally has higher chemical resistance than LDPE, but it too can be affected by solvents. In general, if significant organics are present in the waste or in the disposal environment leachate, plastic encapsulating materials should not be used as the primary basis of meeting the debris treatment standard, or should be carefully researched. It may be necessary to conduct case-specific testing, if you cannot find information in the literature on materials that would pertain to specific disposal conditions.

Another measure of the ability of a macroencapsulation technology to substantially surface exposure to potential leaching media is the structural integrity of the waste form produced by the technology. This factor is especially significant for mercury-bearing wastes, as mercury is volatile at disposal temperatures, and if present in liquid form, is directly mobile. Because of the mobility of mercury as a gas and liquid, macroencapsulation may be an inappropriate technology for hazardous debris containing readily removable liquid mercury.⁸ An assessment of structural integrity

⁷ Note that HSWA 3004(m) requires EPA to "promulgate regulations specifying those levels or methods of treatment, if any, which substantially diminish the toxicity of the waste or substantially reduce the likelihood of migration of hazardous constituents from the waste so that short-term and long-term threats to human health and the environment are minimized."

⁸ Some states consider land disposal of macroencapsulated waste containing liquid mercury as prohibited disposal of containerized liquids. You should consult with your state agency(s) to determine whether they take such a position.

TWO MINUTE TRAINING - ATTACHMENT

SUBJECT: Hazardous Debris and LDR High/Low Mercury Subcategories

will depend upon the specifics of the encapsulating technology and the case-specific disposal environment. Note that the disposal environment may include significant short-term stresses from management in the disposal cell, including driving of heavy equipment over disposed wastes. Disposed waste forms also will be subjected to burial stresses, which can result in compression and long-term creep; these stresses can be significant, especially if load bearing will be accommodated at pressure points. Some vendors of macroencapsulation technologies can provide information, based on testing or modeling, of the ability of their technology to withstand burial pressures, drops onto soft or hard material (e.g., concrete), internal pressures caused by the wastes, puncture (such as to simulate forklift puncture), and vibration (to simulate transportation). In addition, some waste forms, such as those involving plastics, will lose strength after burial and exposure to the temperature, pressure and chemical conditions in the disposal cell. As discussed above, information on the durability of potential encapsulating materials when exposed to organic compounds and to temperature can be found on the internet from many vendors of HDPE/LDPE products.

Questions?

Any questions on management of mercury-containing debris should be directed to Laurie Solomon on my staff at (703) 308-8443.

RO 14685