

again, of the procedural protocols for an exception and the outcome that may come if there's objection to it that has some technical merit it may result to a hearing.

Okay, Subsection B. This is alternative closure methods. The intent of the proposed provision is to allow operators to propose an alternative closure method to waste excavation and removal or on-site deep-trench burial.

For clarification, the references that you see for this provision are only for temporary pits and closed-loop systems.

If the operator wishes to request an exception to any of the requirements of either of the two specified closure methods -- which would be those that are listed above -- any specific exception to it, that request for exception should be pursued under the general exceptions under subpart A and not made up under this provision.

A request for an alternative closure method would be a request for something other than the two specified closure methods which are waste excavation and removal or deep-trench burial.

A possible example would include utilizing the solidified pit contents to construct a tank battery. That would be an example of such a request.

The OCD's intent is not to limit the imagination of the applicant by listing which alternatives are





approvable. If we identify which ones are approvable, it would put a restriction on applicants to propose something different, and that's not our intent with this provision.

1.0

There are several footnotes to this. Footnote 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68 -- if I'm not mistaken, a lot of these were based on something that's not proposed in this rule. In the draft version provided to the task force, in order to pursue this exception, OCD originally proposed an economic demonstration as part of the consideration for onsite closure.

We received several comments from task force members regarding the assessment of such a demonstration.

OCD actually reviewed the information available at the APPA [sic] website that was suggested by a certain party to possibly be used to make a determination on the information. What we did determine was that the information was quite outdated. I believe it was -- the most recent information available on that website was from December of '03, 2003.

- Q. Now what website was this?
- A. It was -- I'll have to find the comment. It was a suggestion provided by one of the task force members, and -- looking at my comments here, there's -- which one it would be. If someone sees it, please let me know. Do you see it, Wayne? I'm sorry? 66, it was the footnote 66. It





