



30

COLUNIO STATE DOCUMENTS JEFFERSON COMANIO 89996 DO LIDRARY MAR 0 2 1992 LAICE PUBLICATIONS STATE PUBLICATIONS Colorado State Library

# WESTERN STATES REGIONAL AGREEMENT CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE JANUARY 1991

Prepared for.

# United States Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC

Submitted by:



Western Governors' Association 600 17th Street Suite 1705 South Tower Denver, Colorado 80202-5442 (303) 623-9378

January 1991

# I. <u>Introduction</u>

### A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide EPA Regions VIII, IX, and X with an update of the Western States' hazardous waste management capacity assurance progress, in compliance with the supplemental conditions imposed by EPA on the parties to the Western States' Regional Agreement in relation to approval of their capacity assurance plans.

# B. Organization

The text of this report is structured as follows. An overview of the current status of the western states' capacity surpluses/deficits is provided immediately below within this Introduction. The text continues with a description of the data tables used to portray commercial, captive, and on-site hazardous waste treatment and disposal capacity available in the western states. A section of observations then highlights changes in both existing capacity and potential future capacity, as illuminated by the aforementioned data tables. The regional dialogue then is discussed, as well as ongoing and planned activities initiated in support of the regional dialogue.

# C. Overview

This overview of the current status of western states' hazardous waste treatment and disposal capacity derives from, and briefly highlights, Section III, Observations, below.

During the 1989 capacity assurance process, the Western States agreed that the aggregation of the projected regional demand for and supply of hazardous waste management capacity demonstrated that the states are addressing the potential need for additional hazardous waste management capacity. It was believed that the potential capacity of existing facilities, combined with that of facilities currently undergoing permit review, reasonably meets or exceeds the projected demand for such facilities.

In general, this capacity update confirms that belief held on the part of the Western States. Since the 1989 capacity assurance process, additional capacity has been permitted to address specific commercial deficits identified in the 1989 submission. As well, newly permitted capacity has reinforced existing capacity surpluses recognized in 1989. Finally, newly proposed potential future capacity has served to increase the potential capacity available to the region for future waste management.

Since the 1989 submission, the State of Kansas has approached the Western Governors' Association regarding the possibility of participating in the Western States Regional Agreement, beginning with the 1991 capacity assurance submission. Such cooperation between the State of Kansas and the Western States is likely to be mutually beneficial. Hazardous waste management capacity in Kansas includes a surplus of incineration capacity. This capacity would help to offset the current commercial incineration deficit experienced

by the Western States. The Western States, in turn, have a surplus of landfill capacity for which the State of Kansas currently has a deficit.

# II. Description of Data Tables

Four tables illustrate the changes in capacity in the Western States since the submittal of the 1989 CAP reports. These tables are:

- <u>Table I</u>: Revised Projections for In-Region Supply and Demand for Hazardous Waste Management Capacity by SARA Management Category;
- <u>Tables I(A)</u>, <u>I(B)</u>, and <u>I(C)</u>: Capacity Changes and Revised 1995 Projections (Commercial, Captive, and On-site, respectively);
- <u>Table II</u>: Potential Future Regional TD Capacity by SARA Management Category; and
- <u>Table II(A)</u>: Tracking Potential Future Regional TD Capacity.

Additionally, two tables (Table III, Explanation for Changes in Projections for In-Region Supply and Demand for Hazardous Waste Management Capacity, and Table IV, Explanation for Changes in Potential Future Regional TD Capacity) document and detail the specific changes summarized in Tables I, II, and III.

### Table I

Table I summarizes revisions to the regional projected 1995 TD capacity surpluses/deficits reported in the 1989 CAP. The table is divided into two groups of four columns each. The first group displays the projected 1995 surpluses/deficits in commercial, captive, and onsite capacity as reported in the 1989 CAP. The second group of columns represents the newly updated projected 1995 TD capacity surpluses/deficits, reflecting changes reported by the states as having occurred in capacity availability since the 1989 submission. These changes in capacity have occurred primarily as a result of four factors:

- the closure of facilities included in the original (1989) 1995 projections;
- the expansion or modification of existing facilities;
- the inclusion of facilities which newly have been permitted or have come on-line in the 14 months since the 1989 CAP; and/or
- greater accuracy in states' databases.

Table III discusses the specific causes of these changes, by SARA Category, facility type (commercial, captive, or on-site), and state.

## Tables I(A), I(B), and I(C)

Tables I(A), I(B), and I(C) document changes in projected 1995 capacity by state and SARA management category, for commercial, captive, and on-site facilities. For each state, the first two rows of capacity numbers are the Base Year Capacity and the Projected 1995 Capacity reported in the 1989 capacity submission. The third row, Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990, displays the difference (negative or positive) in the state's current existing capacity in relation to the Base Year Capacity: how much capacity has been added or removed since the 1989 CAP. This change in capacity is utilized to revise the 1989 CAP's 1995 capacity projection to generate the Revised 1995 Projection, as enumerated in the next line of numbers.<sup>1</sup> The final row, Change in Projected 1995 Capacity, represents the arithmetic difference between the state's 'new' revised 1995 projection and the original 1995 projection from the 1989 CAP.

### Table II

Table II, Potential Future Regional TD Capacity by SARA Management Category, summarizes all changes since 1989 in the estimates of potential future capacity. The table displays three groups of three columns each. The first group represents commercial, captive, and on-site potential future capacity as reported in the 1989 CAP. The second represents potential future capacity as reflecting changes since 1989 in the capacity for which permits are being sought. These changes may have resulted from four possible events:

- the withdrawal of a permit application from the permit process;
- the denial of a permit;
- the modification of a submitted permit application; and/or
- the activation of a facility upon receipt of a permit.

The third group of columns displays the differences between the original 1989 CAP numbers and the updated 1990 potential future capacity. Table IV, Explanation for Changes in Potential Future Capacity, documents the specific changes by SARA category, facility type (commercial, captive, and on-site), and state.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In most cases, the Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990) can be traced back to both the Base Year Capacity (1987) and the Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989) by subtracting the Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990. Some variations, however, may occur. On occasion, in revising the 1995 projection, it was necessary to take into consideration factors such as facility closure and/or modification, which have not yet occurred but which are expected to occur sometime in the future prior to 1995. Such alterations in capacity would not be reflected in the Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990 figures, and, consequently, for such instances, Tables I(A), I(B), and I(C) would not contain explicit records of the specific facilities responsible for the changes occurring to capacity. These changes are documented by a separate table, Table III Explanation for Changes in Existing Capacity.

新闻 化液合成 2月,新闻14月

# Table II(A)

Table II(A), Tracking Potential Future Regional TD Capacity, serves to document major facilities in the Western States currently undergoing permit review for TD capacity. The table is organized by state and provides five categories of facility-specific information.

- facility name;
- capacity type (commercial, captive, or on-site);
- SARA management category;
- total proposed capacity (in tons per year);<sup>2</sup> and
- a process code, which signifies whether, and how, the facility was included in the 1989 submission, and how the facility is being included in this capacity update.

This facility-specific information is followed by a series of columns used to track the facility as it proceeds through a state's permit process. Because of the complexity of state permit processes and the variation across states, the table simplifies the permit process into four primary permitting activity categories:

- pre-application activities;
- permit processing and review, and issuance of notice of deficiency;
- issuance of draft permit and public comment period; and
- issuance of final decision.

A fifth column indicates whether the facility has come on-line.

### III. Observations

Significant progress has been made in addressing many of the commercial shortfalls identified in the 1989 capacity assurance submission. As well, other capacity gains since 1989 have served to reinforce capacity surpluses highlighted in the 1989 submission. Changes in capacity availability of particular note are described below.

<sup>2</sup> All capacity is represented in units of tons per year (tpy) except that for landfill. Landfill capacity is represented throughout the text and tables in units of tons. This is due to the finite nature of landfill capacity and to the factor of annual utilization, and thus diminishment, of that capacity.

4

A. Changes in Existing Capacity - Commercial

Incineration The 1989 capacity assurance submission highlighted regional shortfalls in liquid and solid/sludge incineration capacity, SARA categories 4 and 5. In the year since the states submitted CAPs, a total of 57,200 tpy of incineration capacity has been added to the region. 56,000 tpy is attributable to the permitting of liquid and solid/sludge incineration capacity at the Aptus, Inc., facility in Utah. The newly permitted capacity has reduced the region's liquid incineration deficit to a shortfall of 48,953 tpy; the deficit of solid/sludge incineration has been reduced to 82,498 tpy.

<u>Energy Recovery</u> The 1989 submission identified a regional deficit of 2,122 tpy. This deficit has been removed and a surplus of 15,393 tpy has been created by the permitting of the proposed expansion of California's National Cement facility, which had been listed as potential future capacity in the 1989 CAP.

<u>Aqueous Inorganic Treatment</u> This update indicates the region maintains a surplus in this type of management, albeit a reduced one. Since the 1989 submission, aqueous inorganic treatment capacity surplus has been reduced from 1,638,980 tpy to 457,141 tpy, principally due to a loss of 1,248,646 tpy in California. This change in California is primarily due to alterations at the Chemical Waste Management/Kings facility, in which some treatment units were combined and others, closed. As a result of these changes, this facility's total remaining capacity, 42,000 tpy, is now listed under Other Treatment.

<u>Stabilization</u> While the region still maintains a surplus in stabilization capacity, this surplus has been reduced since 1989, from 14,187,768 tons to 3,311,273 tons. This decrease in capacity is attributable to two major factors. The State of California has removed approximately 12,224,201 tons of capacity from its ledgers to reflect changed assumptions about the utilization of that capacity. California now believes that, as a result of the Land Disposal Restrictions (LDRs), wastes destined for landfill will first be pre-treated, thus eliminating much of the demand for stabilization capacity. An additional 326,774 tons was lost in Oregon. In the 1989 CAP, Oregon equated its stabilization capacity with that of landfill. Continuing this procedure, Oregon has altered its calculation of stabilization capacity to reflect the 326,774-ton decrease in landfill capacity caused by utilization.

Despite these decreases in stabilization capacity, some additions have been made. Idaho has recalculated its available capacity, resulting in an increase of 1,143,576 tons. Recalculation of capacity in Washington has contributed an additional 6,904 tons to the regional surplus. Colorado, like Oregon, has equated its stabilization capacity with landfill capacity; the 524,000-ton increase in stabilization capacity here reflects a change in the calculation of landfill capacity, discussed below.

n in the second and the second se Second second

Landfill Commercial landfill capacity has experienced an increase of 6,063,635 tons, from 13,455,386 tons to 19,519,021 tons. California contributed 5,168,439 tons to this increase. Since 1989, California has permitted additional capacity at three facilities - Chemical Waste Management/Kings, Laidlaw Environmental/Imperial, and Laidlaw Environmental/Kern. As well, it has been decided to list as existing capacity most of the proposed capacity associated with these three facilities. Consequently, some of the capacity gained here will appear as a loss in the tables representing, and the discussion of changes in, potential future capacity.

Other gains in landfill capacity have occurred in Colorado and Utah. Colorado has corrected its representation of the capacity at its CECOS landfill to result in an increase of 524,000 tons. Utah has issued a permit to Envirocare, previously listed as potential future capacity, to result in an addition of 1,200,000 tons (adjusted from 1,350,000 tons to reflect utilization) to the regional surplus.

Losses of landfill capacity have taken place in Idaho and Oregon. Idaho has reassessed annual utilization to amend the 1995 projection with a reduction of 502,030 tons. Oregon, too, has decreased its projection, by 326,774, tons to reflect utilization.

<u>Other Disposal</u> The region maintains a surplus in other disposal capacity, although a decrease of 19,289,696 tpy has taken place in California. All but 55,434 tpy of California's surface impoundment capacity has closed as a result of the LDRs. [In future, wastes demanding this type of treatment may be managed using evaporative tank systems.]

Other more moderate changes in capacity have occurred in the remaining SARA management categories: metals recovery, solvents recovery, other recovery, aqueous inorganic treatment, aqueous organic treatment, other treatment, and sludge treatment. These changes are detailed in Table III.

# B. Changes in Existing Capacity - Captive and On-Site

Although several changes have taken place, most have been gains in capacity. The overall surplus/deficit picture for the region remains very like that portrayed in 1989. In general, regional demand for captive and on-site hazardous waste TD capacity is met by regional supply of such capacity.

Specific changes are identified in Table III, Explanation for Changes in Projections for In-Region Supply and Demand for Hazardous Waste Management Capacity. Several of the

losses are attributed to the exclusion in this update of mixed waste capacity at facilities such as Hanford, Washington, as jointly decided by the Hazardous Waste Advisory Group.<sup>3</sup>

# C. Changes in Potential Future Capacity

Table IV, Explanation for Changes in Potential Future Regional TD Capacity, documents the specific causes of changes in potential regional capacity. Overall potential future capacity has decreased since 1989, primarily due to a shift of much potential future capacity to existing capacity, as a result of the issuance of permits to six proposed facilities and/or expansions.

Regional potential future capacity continues to address capacity deficits identified in the 1989 CAP or to reinforce capacity surpluses. In addition, much newly proposed capacity contributes to this end. Specifically, twelve facilities have begun the permitting process since the 1989 submission. For commercial capacity, ten newly proposed facilities would contribute capacity to the SARA management categories of metals recovery, aqueous inorganic treatment, aqueous organic treatment, other treatment, stabilization, landfill, and other disposal. For on-site capacity, two facilities would offer capacity for liquid incineration, solid/sludge incineration, and other treatment. This newly identified potential future capacity occurs in the states of California, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, and Washington.

SARA management categories experiencing significant changes in potential future capacity include incineration and landfill.

Incineration Both liquid and solid/sludge incineration have experienced apparent losses. Liquid incineration capacity has decreased by 23,500 tpy, resulting in an updated regional potential future capacity of 384,500 tpy. Solid/sludge incineration has decreased by 46,000 tpy to result in a new potential future capacity of 325,400 tpy. These losses are entirely attributable to the issuance of permits for this capacity and the resulting transference of this capacity to the existing capacity tables.

Landfill The region has experienced a decrease in potential future commercial landfill capacity of 2,800,375 tons, leaving potential future landfill capacity at 5,424,409 tons. As mentioned in the discussion of changes in existing capacity, most proposed landfill capacity in the State of California has been transferred to the existing capacity tables. This alone accounts for 196,375 tons of the apparent loss

7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Mixed wastes (combined radioactive and hazardous wastes) require entirely separate management capacity from that allocated to hazardous wastes alone. Consequently, the Hazardous Waste Advisory Group determined it to be inappropriate to include mixed waste management capacity in an aggregation of regional capacity designed to address regional management of hazardous wastes.

andra algebra an a' Angebra an <sup>Ag</sup>ra

of capacity. An additional 1,350,000 tons is "lost" as a result of the issuance of a permit to Utah's Envirocare facility; this capacity has been transferred to the existing capacity tables (less projected utilization). Finally, the capacity associated with Colorado's CECOS, 2,096,000 tons, has been shifted to the revised 1995 projection. One increase has occurred in this category: Idaho's ESII landfill has proposed adding 842,000 tons of capacity.

Other moderate changes have occurred since the 1989 CAP. Commercial potential future capacity for aqueous inorganic and organic treatments has increased by 118,279 tpy and 229,252 tpy, respectively, due to newly proposed capacity in California and Colorado. As well, commercial potential future stabilization capacity has increased 802,200 tons as a result of newly proposed capacity in California and a correction in the representation of Idaho's proposed capacity. For captive capacity, 3,105,800 tpy has been removed from the other treatment category in the potential future capacity tables because the proposed Idaho facility failed to submit an application. These changes, and all others, can be reviewed in greater detail by referring to Table IV.

An analysis of the potential future capacity proposed since the 1989 CAP, and of that which remains in the permit 'pipeline', indicates that the existing deficits in commercial capacity in such categories as incineration are likely to be offset by capacity permitted in the future. As stated in the 1989 submission, the proposed capacity of facilities currently in permit review by individual Western States (in combination with existing capacity) reasonably meets or exceeds the projected regional need for hazardous waste management capacity in 1995 and 2009.<sup>4</sup>

IV. <u>Regional Dialogue Activities</u>

Within the context of the Western States Regional Agreement, the participating states agreed to maintain a regional dialogue to discuss hazardous waste management issues identified during the preparation of the 1989 regional CAP. In particular, the states identified six issues for possible investigation within the context of a continuing regional dialogue:

Net and the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Please note that in displaying this potential future capacity, the Western States in no way commit to permitting any specific individual facilities. Final permit decisions must continue to be made in accordance with each state's legislated procedures. A commitment to permitting future capacity within this document would act to prejudge the outcome of the permitting process. The regional approach to assuring capacity should be viewed as a planning process and not as a commitment to develop specific capacity. The regional approach does not allocate capacity to individual states, nor does it direct or restrict the flow of wastes among states.

- the commitment of each state to manage its wastes within its borders;
- the role in-state tipping fees play in the interstate movement of waste;
- an examination of how different definitions of hazardous wastes in each state can be integrated with uniform management standards across all states;
- a discussion on how to communicate about and minimize any inequitable impacts of each state's siting and other policies which influence the location of TSD facilities;
- a plan to develop and provide additional information to the public and the private sector on the need for TSD facilities so as to discourage over-building by the private market; and
- a discussion on how to cooperate and share expertise in the technical aspects of waste management in the West.

To date, the states participating in the regional dialogue have worked to address the first four of these issues. The first issue, the commitment to in-state management, has been addressed through the development of a commitment memorandum which explicitly defines the terms of the Western States' commitment to one another. The states plan to monitor individual state activities in relation to the terms of this "commitment memorandum."

The next three issues have, for the most part, been addressed through the preparation of a regional waste flow analysis. This analysis focused on identifying the factors responsible for influencing the interstate flow of hazardous waste. Through this analysis the states have identified the key factors influencing interstate flow and the degree to which differential fees and different definitions of hazardous waste affect this flow. The states plan to use this analysis as a basis for addressing the fourth issue, inequitable impacts, to the extent that states believe such impacts exist.

In recent months, the Western States have focused on preparing documents for meeting their EPA supplemental conditions. In particular, states have reviewed and revised hazardous waste capacity estimates submitted in 1989 and have prepared documentation of waste minimization activities. In coming months, the regional dialogue is expected to focus on preparing the 1991 capacity assurance submission. This will include using past regional dialogue discussions and issues analysis to act as the basis for preparing and formalizing a regional agreement taking the states through October 1993.

# V. <u>Summary</u>

As a whole, this capacity assurance update confirms the Western States' belief, avowed during the 1989 capacity assurance process, that, based on analysis of the regional demand for and supply of hazardous waste management capacity, the states are addressing the potential need for additional capacity. As well, the aggregation of existing capacity and that

n an an galan an Allena. Tha tha an Allena

capacity associated with facilities currently seeking permits reasonably meets or exceeds the projected regional demand for such capacity.

Since 1989, newly permitted capacity has addressed commercial deficits and reinforced existing capacity surpluses, as identified in the 1989 submission. The number of newly proposed facilities amplifies this progress, increasing the potential capacity available to the region for future hazardous waste management.

Despite the permitting of new capacity since 1989, deficits in existing capacity for liquid and solid/sludge incineration remain. These deficits may be resolved by the possible permitting of newly proposed potential future capacity identified in this update. Additionally, further progress in assuring adequate capacity for these management categories may be made as discussions continue with respect to the prospective participation of the State of Kansas in the Western States Regional Agreement. Should Kansas participate in the Agreement, the deficits in regional liquid and solid/sludge incineration capacity may be reduced.

and the second second

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT CAPACITY BY SARA MANAGEMENT CATEGORY (1995) **REVISED PROJECTIONS FOR IN-REGION SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR** CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) **TABLE I** 

(2,303) (30,366) 55,434 (21,196) 35,144,605 15,133 57,761 6,739,610 17,198 19,774,568 108,525 204 864 1,514,963 3,091,199 287,584 3, 331, 631 Total Projected 1995 Surplus/Deficit (End 1990) 274,498 0 5,195 o ε 20,358 7,641,783 9,896 52, 166 46.287 3,499 27,757 2,791,932 1,351,127 3,017,281 41,794 **On-Site** (1,280) (18,951) (1.291) (616, 6) ¢ £ 2,248 0 0 (1,283) 2,419 242,017 3,710,567 Ó 3,490,537 ğ Captive (2,303) (82,498) Commercial (48,953) 15,393 163,732 75,198 9,755 3,773 55,434 23,792,255 99,912 98,946 457,141 3,311,273 16,431 19,519,021 (65,175) (72,104) (2, 303)19,345,130 60,409,377 95,704 111,744 15,468 25,246 3,991,002 16,841 13,435,933 8,047,525 976,968 14, 204, 224 283,174 Total Projected 1995 Surplus/Deficit (1989) (502) ò 16,316 6,942,795 0 1,374 2,460 ε 12,378 39,028 31,287 951,127 2,974,008 976 37,384 2,876,966 On-Site (18,951) (616'E) (1,162) (800.1) 9 2,248 **1**40 0 Ó 4,776,272 2,429 Q 0 1,022,963 242,017 3,531,579 Captive (2.122) (696'5) (2, 303)(655.17) Commercial 13,617 3,773 19,345,130 48,690,310 95,492 106,855 16,513 (860,111) 1,638,980 25,841 14,187,768 13,455,386 2 \* ŝ Ś Ś ~ 90 ¢, 0 = 2 **C**4 en 4 Aqueous inorganic treatment Incineration (Sludge/Solid) Aqueous organic treatment Incineration (Liquid) Deepwell injection Solvents recovery Energy recovery Sludge treatment Metals recovery Other treatment Land treatment Other recovery Other disposal Stabilization TOTAL Landfill μo **K** X ∑ < Z K O H Σu  $z \vdash$ Ö < - $\odot \propto$ - 12 ŝ ∢ ŝ

25-Jan-91

Table I, Page I of I

TABLE I(A) CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) CAPACITY CHANGES AND REVISED 1995 PROJECTIONS COMMERCIAL CAPACITY

						고등 문화로 속하는	SARC	NANAN V	JEMEN	SAKA MANAUEMENI CALEUUKIES	ORIES					
		Recovery	Solvents Recovery	Other Recovery	Incineration (Liquid)	Incineration (Sludge/solid)	Energy Recovery	Aqu. Inorg. Treat.	Aqu. Org. Treat.	Other Treat.	Sludge Treat.	Stabilization	Treat.	Indfill	Deepwell	Other Disposel
			-				1. 1. 1. <b>1</b> . 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	Constant Constant	8	•	01	11	12	13 - 13 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 -	1	15
AK B	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0	0	0
54	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	Ö	0	0	0	0	0	0	: 	0	•	0	<b>0</b> ,	0	0	0
<u> </u>	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	0	. 0	0	<b>0</b> ,	0	0	0
4	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0		Ó	0	o o	•	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CA B	Base Year Capacity (1987)	34,037	119,382	0	0	0	20,043	1,356,785	16,000	68,400	0	1,538,465	0	1,538,465	0	19,345,136
<u>54</u>	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	34,037	119,382	0	0	22,500	20,043	1,356,785	16,000	68,400	0	12,392,904	0	12, 392, 904	0	19,345,136
<u> </u>	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	4,420	58,696	0	Ö	0	212,71	(1,248,646)	125,121	78,842	0	(1,369,762)	Ö	4,565,935	0	(19,289,696)
<u>~</u>	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	38,457	178,078	0	0	22,500	37,558	108,139	141,121	147,242	0	168,703	0	17,561,343	0	55,440
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	4,420	58,696	0	0	0	17,515	(1,248,646)	125,121	78,842	0	(12,224,201)	0	5,168,439	0	(19,289,696)
CO B	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	19,600	0	65	65	0	0	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	0	0
4	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	000'61	0	65	3	0	6		0  	4,000	. 786,000	° o	786,000	0	0
<u></u>	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	(009)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	2,096,000	0	2,096,000	0	0
<b>~</b>	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	19,000	ò	<b>\$9</b>	65	0	0	• • •	0	80	1,310,000	0	1,310,000	0	0
4	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(000)(2)	524,000	0	524,000	0	0
H	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	2,624	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Q	0	0	0
<u></u>	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	2,624	0	0	Ó	0	• 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u> </u>	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	Ó	0	0	0	°	•	•	0	0	0	0	0
<u> 4</u>	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1950)	0	2,624	0	0	0	0	0	0	°	0	0	0	0	0	0
t	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>ه</u> ۵	Banc Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,976,179	0	0
<u>a.</u>	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	o	0	0	0	¢	20,000	20,000	0	0	35,224	0	1,456,179	0	•
<u>_</u>	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	1,178,800	0	(000,197)	0	0
<u>~</u>	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	Ö	0	Q	0	0	20,000	20,000	0	•	1,178,800.	0	954,149	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,143,576	0	(502,030)	0	0
MTB	Base Year Capacity (1987)	.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	0	. <del>.</del>	0	•	0	•	0	0	0	0
<u></u>	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	: : :	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>~</u>	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	0		0	•	0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
a Oz	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
۵.	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	a 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u> </u>	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	• <b>•</b>			<u>`</u> ``		0	0	0	0
×	Kevised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	Ċ	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u> </u>	Change in Projected 1995 Canacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	U

Table I(A), Page 1 of 2

TABLE I(A) CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) CAPACITY CHANGES AND REVISED 1995 PROJECTIONS COMMERCIAL CAPACITY

0000 000 0 0 (19,289,696) ¢ 0 0 0 ö 0 o 000 0 0 . . . . o 0 0 0 0 Disposel 15 Other 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Ó 0 0 0 0 Ó 0 0 0 0 o 0 0000 ¢ 0 o 0 0 Injection Decowell 0 0 0 0 0 6,063,635 0 0 0 ø ø 0 0 0 o 855,000 0 2.055.000 1,200,000 0 456,500 (845,829) 753, 813 (326, 774) 0 1075,914 ¢ 1,958,829 080,587 1,690,722 1,075,914 Indfill **9** 0 ó  $\circ$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3,887 0 o 3,887 3,887 0 0 0 0 0 ¢ 0 000 0 0 Ó 0 ¢ ð Treat. Land 2 (3, 862) (10, 876, 495) 0 0 0 52,805 52,805 6,804 0 0 143,649 6,904 52,805 ٥ c 150,553 • 0 0 143,649 1,275 1,080,587 (845,829) 753,813 c ¢ 1 275 (326, 774) Stabilization. 1,275 1,958,829 0 C (862) 0 0 0 0 0 0 Ó 0 862 36.2 0 ٢ 0 0 0 0 12,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Treat. 12,000 12,000 SARA MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES Sludge 0 81,167 2,325 8,615 ¢ 0 0 0 6,290 2.325 0 29,730 6,290 2,480 29,730 29,730 0 2,480 0 0 0 0 ٥ ¢ Ó 208 208 ¢ ٥ 80 0 Other Trcal. 14,583 0 0 0 0 137,891 1,813 12,770 ିତ 0 1,813 12,770 0 0 o 0 0 o 0 0 0 0 0 0 0000 0 Aqu. Inorg. | Aqu. Org. 0 Trcat. (1, 181, 839) 422,806 0 0 0 0 0 28,800 28,800 28,800 422,806 66,807 489,613 66,807 0 0 0 0 o 0 Ó 24,000 0 0 Ó 0 24,000 0 0 0 Treat. 17,515 Ó 0 0 0 0 0000 Recovery Eacryy 28,600 0 0 28,000 Ó 8 o ¢ 0 0 0 28,000 0 8 8 0 0 ø 0 0 0 ð 0 0 0 0 0 Ó Q 0 0 (Sludge/solid) Incincration 28,600 ø Ó 28,000 ٢ ٢ 8 8 8 G 0 C 28,000 0 0 000 Ó a 0 Ó 0000 ò 000 0 Incineration (Liquid) (82) 18,502 (82) 18,420 (32) ٩ 0 Ġ 0 ٢ 0 ò 18,502 0000000 000 ò ò Ö 0000 ò Recovery Other 33,395 66,718 66,718 100,113 33,395 ٩ Ó ٢ 0 0 92,091 ö 0 1,334 1,334 Ó ٢ 0 0 0 1.334 0 0 972 572 972 0000 o Recovery Solventa 4,420 15,000 000'51 0 0 15,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 ð 000 0 ٢ 0 o ò Ö o ö 0 84,000 84,000 ò 0 à Recovery Metals Regional Net Change of Projected Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990) (008) (066) (066) 08 Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990) 1995 Capacity (December 1990) Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dee Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990 Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990 Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990 Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990) Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990) Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990) Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989) Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989) Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990) Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989) Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989) Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990) Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990) Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989) Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989) Base Year Capacity (1987) Buse Year Capacity (1987) Base Year Capacity (1987) Base Year Capacity (1987) Base Year Capacity (1987) Base Year Capacity (1987 WA ž N 5 SD 0R

Table I(A), Page 2 of 2

J

1

1

.....

							SAR/	MANA	GEMENT	SARA MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES	RIES					
		Recovery	Solventa	Unter Recovery	Incineration (Liquid)	Incineration (Sludge/solid)	Energy	Aqu. Inorg. Treat.	Treat.	Uther Treat.	Treat.	Stabilization	Treat.	Ililiual	Injection	Disposel
		1	2	3	in the state of the second	1997 See 2007 State	9		8	6	01		12	13. J.S. 13.		15 N
ÅK	( Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	312	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u> </u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312	0	0	0	0	0	0
·	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	0	0
5 C	A Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	501,232	0	0	0	0	242,417	0	0	0
·····	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	0	501,232	0	0	0	0	242,417	0	0	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	¢	. <del>.</del>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	501,232	0	Ó	0	Q	242,417	0	0	0
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ò	0	0	0	0	0
<u>8</u>		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	0	0	0	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	•	•	0	0	0	0	ò	0	Ö	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990		0	Ö	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	0	ò	0	0	0
~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	ò	0	Ó	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0		0	0	65,158	Ō	0	0	0	0	Ö	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	0	65,158	0	0	1,450	0	0	0	0	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	•	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	ò	0	0	0	0	0	65,158	0	0	1,450	0	0	0	o	0
ľ	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	o	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>a</u>		0	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	ġ,	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	ð	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ŭ	0	0
i.		Ó	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	o	0
MT		ġ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Revixed 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	¢.	0
		0	ò	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
۵ z	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	Q	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	<b>.</b>	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0
-	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C	0	0	0	0	0

Table I(B), Page 1 of 2

TABLE I(B) CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) CAPACITY CHANGES AND REVISED 1995 PROJECTIONS CAPTIVE CAPACITY	
---	--

							SARA	SARA MANAGEMENT	EMENT	CATEGORIES	JRIES	-			н. 1944 1	
		Mcult	Solventa	Other	Incineration d longer	Incineration (Studeo/colid)	Energy	Aqu. Inorg.	Aqu. Org. Treat	Other	Sludge	Stabilization	Treat	Landfill	Decowell	Other Disposel
			Vauvery	Nej Urany		(and a solution	9		80	6	01	1	12	13	14	
NN	Base Year Capacity (1987).	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ö
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct. 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	o	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0	ō
	Revixed 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0	0	0	0	0	Ō
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1930)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	284	0	0	148	0	916,667	0	522	1,007	0	0	0	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	285	0	•	148	0	916,667	0	523	1,007	0	•	0	0	•
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	284	0	•	148	0	916,667	0	522	1,007	0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.	0	0	0
ŝ	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct. 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Capacity Change Bane Year to Dec 1990	0	Ċ.	0	•	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	•	0	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	o.	•	0	•	0	Ò.	Ö	0.	0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ц	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	. 0	0	0	0	0	.0.	0	. 0	•			0	0	0	0.
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.	0
·.	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	O	0	0		0	0	0	0	.o	0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ś	WA Buse Year Capacity (1987)	121	2,227	253	0	0	0	2,055,275	0	1,024,303	0.	140	0	0	0.	0
<b>.</b>	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	121	2,227	253	0	Ö	0	2,055,275	0	1,024,303	•	140	0	0	0	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	(121)	(0)	(233)	0	. 0.	•	(41,042)	5	(1,024,243)	0	(140)	0	0	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	2,217	0	0	0	0	2,014,233	9	8	0	0 0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	(121)	(01)	(23)	0	0	0	(41,042)	10	(1,024,243)	0	(0+0)	0	0	0	0
Š	f Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ō
:	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	o
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
iu	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	• •	0	0	•	0	0
Ĺ	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	]-: 0	0	0	•
	Regional Net Change of Projected 1995 Canacity (December 1990)	1961	WO	0630				(GIV 117	FO1	WF6 FG0 17	c	(UFU)	c		0	0
		(171)					-			A STATE AND A				and the second se	The second secon	

Table I(B), Page 2 of 2

TABLE I(C) CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) CAPACITY CHANGES AND REVISED 1995 PROJECTIONS ON-SITE CAPACITY

. .

and the second second

								1 A ALL TOARD	A All Ore	Other	Sludec		Land		Decowell	345
		Metals		Other	Incincration	Incineration (Studee/action	Recovery	Treat.	_	Treat.	Treat.	Stabilization	Treat	llijpur j	Injection	Disposel
		kecovery	kecovery	Necuvery	Inmheri	land second	9	North Control	8	0	0		12	- 13	14	<b>15</b>
AVIO	0		74	C	C	0	10.650	0	0	169	8	0	0	0	0	•
			3 6	, c			10 650	0	0	169	8	0	0	0	0	0
Ŝ	Projected 1993 Lapacity (uct 1999)	<u>5</u> °	3 3	> <	> <						0	0	0	0	0	0
J	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	⇒	>	>		· · ·						-	C	0	0	0
až,	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	5	23	0	•	•	10,63			2	1				0	0
6	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	0		_	>				
CA B.	Base Year Capacity (1987)	VN	YN	VN	NA	VN	¥N.	YN.	YN.	VN N	ž	Ž	Ž.	Z	<b>4</b> 2	
<u>.</u>	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)										-					
<u>0</u>	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990															
ž	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)								·			-				
0	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	•	0
CO B	Ree Ver Crucity (1987)	0	<b>6</b>	0	0	558	1,100	960,232	215,184	1,731,305	0	592	0	0	•	•
	Protected 1905 Canacity (Oct 1989)	0	427	0	。 	558		960,232	215,184	1,677,215	0	15,022	0	0	•	0
: <u>c</u>	Canadiu Change Base Verrio Dec 1000		404		0			(24)	0	(100,291)	219	15,000	1,060	275,000	•	<u> </u>
<u></u>	Baulerd 1005 Breitestine (Dec. 1900)	:	404				1,100	960,208	215,184	1,701,014	515	15,595	1,060	275,000	•	•
10	Chines in Projected 1006 Cancily (Dec 160)							(24)	0	23,799	219	573	090'1	275,000	0	0
a				_		0	0	74,142	0	5	0	0	1,750	<u> </u>	0	•
<u> </u>	Proincited 1995 Connective (Oct 1989)		<b></b>		<u>.                                    </u>			<u>.</u>	0	0	0	0	1,750	0	•	0
G	Canacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	•	
ã	Revixed 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0			<u>0</u>	0	0	0 76,309	0	0	0	0	1,750	•	0	•
10	Change in Projected 1995 Canacity (Dec 1990)	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0
Ţđ	Base Year Capacity (1987)		×		12,30	009	200	477,398	3 20,000	358,112	2 421	1,561	0	0	0	
đ	16861					1,300	200		0	390,247	7 421	1,531	•	0	• •	0
Q	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	8,518		0			0	ۍ	380,000	46,609	0	3,439	0	0	•	
ž	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	8,525	200	0		11,200	200	0 26,550	400,000	404,721	1 421	. 5,000	0	0	0	
To	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	8,518	0	0	(101)	006'6		0 (42,450)	00'00 <del>1</del>	14,474	0	3,469	0	0		
MT B	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0		. 0	0	0 2,006	6 930	0	23,568			
<u>6</u>	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct. 1989)	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0 2,006	6 930	0	23,568			
<u>U</u>	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	•	0		0	0	. 0	0		0			
<u>×</u>	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0		0	)  0	0 2,006	6 930	0	23,568			
$\overline{10}$	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0		0		) 0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0		
NDB	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	3,24	0 860			0	0 8,280		0		. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
4	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	a	0	0	3,24	0 860	•. 	0	0	0 8,280	0	0 				:
<u>ب</u>	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990		0	0		0 0	0	0	0	-	0	0				
<u>∝</u>	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	•	0	0		0	0	0	0	0 8,280		0	0			0
Ľ												×	<			

Table I(C), Page 1 of 2

TABLE I(C) CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) CAPACITY CHANGES AND REVISED 1995 PROJECTIONS ON-SITE CAPACITY	
---	--

							SARA	SARA MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES	EMENT	CATEGC	RIES					
		Meint	Solvent	Other	Incineration	Incinctation (Studied	- Energy	Aqu. Inorg.	Aqu. Org. Treat	Other	Sludge Treat	Stabilization	Treat.	Landfill	Deepwell Injection	Disposal
		Accovery		RECOVERY	(redmin)	(allung)	Active y			6	0	1	12	13	14	15
R	Rave Year Canacity (1987)	C			0.00	000 M	0	0	833	225	0	0	0	0	0	0
			3		un s		G	0	833	225	0	Ö	0	0	0	0
	Constant Annual Base Varie to Day 1000	<b>,</b>	1 9	> <			, c	c	- C	C	C	Ó	0	0	0	0
	Capacity cuarge were 1 an to the 1720	> <	3 6	> <	2	000 112	• c	, c	118	202	0	0	0	0	0	0
		>	47		Ava'r	2015							<	U		0
Ĩ	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	•	0	0	9	<b>)</b>	a.	2	5	2	>			
OR	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0	0	•	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	o	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	¢	0	0	ð	q	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD	Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	0	0	0	Ö	0	0	0	0
	Capacity Change Basic Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	•	o	0	0	Ø	0	Ö	0	0	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	0	•	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	0	0	0	0	, O	0	0	0	0
5	Base Year Capacity (1987)	311	160	0	3,964	4,996	20,181	1,400,994	876,000	75,883	0	Ö	0	153,639	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	311	81	. 0	3,964	4,996	20,181	1,400,994	876,000	75,883	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	311	160	0	23,684	9,132	20,181	1,400,994	876,000	75,883	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	021,91	4,136	0	0	0	0	0	Q	0	0	0	0
WA W	WA Base Year Capacity (1987)	1,066	1,302	0	2	01	0	370,491	49,737	825,624	0	0	16,272	0	0	0
	Projected (995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	1,066	1,302	0	2	0/	0	370,491	49, 737	825,624	0	0	16,272	•	0	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	4	000'1	• •	0	0	15,000	(42,560)	0	5,000	<b>000'</b>	0	3,350	0 :	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec. 1990)	1,070	2,362	0	2	70	15,000	169,756	49,737	830,624	4,000	0	19,622	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	4	1,060	0	0	0	15,000	(42,560)	0	5,000	4,000	0	3,350	0	0	0
ΥV	(Base Year Capacity (1987)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,500	0	0	1,500	0	0	0
	Projected 1995 Capacity (Oct 1989)	Ó	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	•	0	0
	Capacity Change Base Year to Dec 1990	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Revised 1995 Projection (Dec 1990)	0	Ö	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	e	0	1,500	0	0	0
	Change in Projected 1995 Capacity (Dec 1990)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Regional Net Change of Projected	 	ero i		061.31	11.19	(102) S 1	ALLO SA	WW.WW	126 IV	910 \$	4 (M2	4,410	275.000	0	0
	1222 Lapacity (Decenition 1230)	222'8	<u>v20,1</u>	⊃ 	<u>۷٬ ۲٬ ۲</u>					C17.5*	4,617	7 1/1 1	1			

Table I(C), Page 2 of 2

TABLE II CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) POTENTIAL FUTURE REGIONAL TD CAPACITY (tons/yr) BY SARA MANAGEMENT CATEGORY

		Potential Capa	Capacity (Oct	icity (October 1989)	Update Update	Updated Future Potential	tential	Re	Revisions (1990)	() · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		Commercial	Captive	On-Site	Commercial	Captive	On-Site	Commercial	Captive	On-Site	
	Metals recovery		0	0	49,460	0	Ó	49,460	0	0	
·	S Solvents recovery 2	88	0	0	88	0	0	0	0	0	
							C	c			
	Incineration (Liquid)	408.00	5.62	16.21	384 500	5.623	2	(23.500)	, 0	(19.720)	
<del></del>	A Incineration (Sludge/Solid) 5	-			325.400	2.640		(46.000)	(12.480)	(4,136)	. ,
	Energy recovery				5,150	18,758	0	(12,365)	0	0	
		71,321	0	0	189,600	0	0	118,279	0	0	
	E Aqueous organic treatment 8	19,321	0	0	248,573	0	0	229,252	0	0	
	T Other treatment 9	728,581	3,107,100	0	743,728	1,300	12,002	15,147	(3,105,800)	12,002	
	C Sludge treatment 10		0	0	3,753	0	0	753	0	0	
·····		172,800	0	0	975,000	0	0	802,200	0	0	
	G Land treatment 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	R Landfill. 13	8,224,784	0	0	5,424,409	0	0	(2,800,375)	0	0	 
	E Deepwell injection 14	0	0	0			0		0	<b>0</b>	
	Other disposal 15	0	300	0	33,600	0	0	33,600	(300)	0	
	TOTAL	10,016,790	3,146,901	23,854	8,383,241	28,321	12,000	(1,633,549)	(3,118,580)	(11,854)	

Table II, Page 1 of 1

	FACILIT	Y INFOR	FACILITY INFORMATION				PERMIT PRO	PERMIT PROCESS STEPS		
			SARA		Process	Pre-	Permit Review		Issue	
		Facility	Facility Management	Capacity	Code	Application	and Processing;	Draft Permit;	Final	Facility
	Facility	Type	Category	(tons/yr)	*	Activities	Notice of Deficiency	Public Comment	Decision	On-Line
×	AK None									
										- - - -
<u>0</u>	CA Engelhard West Inc.	Comm		1,460	C.	Part A				
	AAA Dist/Dry Clean Serv.	Comm	2	1,216		Status Survey				
	Baron Blakeslee (Alameda)	Comm	<b>C1</b>	2,520				Renewal		
	Bayday	Comm	2	252			Part A			
	Hölchem Inc.	Comm	2	2,100	-	-		Part A	12/90	ISD
	osco	Comm	2	37,800	1 1 1		Part B		-	
, ,	Rho-Chem	Comm	4	33,600					10/90	
	Ramie	Comm	4	32,009					Part B	· · ·
S	Safety Kleen Corp.	Comm	2	68	2			X	6/91	
<b>[</b>	Safety Kleen Corp.	Comm	2	29,400				X	16/9	
<	Solvent Services	Comm	2	26,208					12/90	(SD
	Rhone-Poulenc	Comm	*	142,000	2		×			
<u>ليا</u>	Cal. Thermal Trt. Sys.	Comm	5						Pending	-
	Chemical Waste Management	Comm	<u>s</u>	86,400	2			x		
	National Cement	Comm	9	17,515	2					×
***	Appropriate Technologies II	Comm	4	37,380	-				Part A	
	Chem Clear Inc.	Comm		183,100	6				Pending	
	Oil Process Co.	Comm		8,064					8/90	and the second
	Pacific Treatment #1	Comm	4	25,000						Closure 1/91
	Solvent Services	Comm	1	069'L1 ·	1				12/90	ISD
*****	So. CA Chemical Co.	Comm		2,856	-					Prop Clos
	0500	Comm	00	217,073	3	X				
	Pacific Trt. #1	Comm	00	25,000	ſ					Prop Clos 1/91
	<ul> <li>1 The capacity associated with this facility was counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables addressing capacity surplus/deficit.</li> <li>2 The capacity associated with this facility was not counted in the state's 1989 CAP surplus/deficit capacity tables but was</li> </ul>	ty was count	ed in the state's 1989 sunted in the state's	9 CAP tables at 1989 CAP surp	ddressing caps lus/deficit cap	CAP lables addressing capacity surplus/deficit. 989 CAP surplus/deficit capacity tables but was		Abbreviationa explained:	ISD - interim status determina NOD - Notice of Deficiency Pron Clos - proposing closure	ISD - interim status determination NOD - Notice of Deficiency Pron Clas - proposing closure
	portrayed in the potential future capacity tables. 3 The capacity associated with this facility is a new addition to potential future capacity.	ity tables. Ity is a new at	ddition to potential f	future capacity.					A&B - RCRA P	A&B - RCRA penuit Parts A and B

The capacity associated with this facility was counted in the state" a 1999 CAP surplus/deficit capacity sur

25-Jan-91

Table II(A) Page 1 of 4

.

	FACILITY INFORMATION	Y INFOR	MATION				PERMIT PRC	PERMIT PROCESS STEPS		
			SARA		Process	Pre-	Permit Review		Issue	
		Facility	Facility Management	Capacity	Code	Application	and Processing;	Draft Permit;	Final	Facility
	Facility	Type	Category	(tons/yr)	***	Activities	Notice of Deficiency	Public Comment	Decision	On-Line
CA	A Americhem, Inc.	Comm	6	4,395	~	Part A			Pending	
	Laidlaw Environmental	Comm	6	705,533	2	×				
	Pacific Treatment #1	Comm	6	60,000						Prop Clos
<u></u>	Pacific Treatment #1	Comm		5,000		1				Prop Clos
	Casmalia Resources	Comm	<b>C</b> 1	2,949,800	6				Pending	
	Chemical Waste Management	Comm	13	8,175,165	4		×			
	Laidlaw Environmental (Imperial)	Comm		1,567,609	r					1998
	Laidlaw Environmental (Imperial)	Comm	13	734,078	*					1995
and and a second	Laidlaw Environmental (Kern)	Comm	<b>.</b>	244,412	4					1661
	Laidlaw Environmental (Kern)	Comm	13	3,569,258	4					As Needed
s	Laidlaw Environmental (Kern)	Comm	1	1,559,180	4					Built
<u></u>	Laidlaw Environmental (Kern)	Comm	9	105,350	*					×
<	Chemical Waste Management	Comm	15	33,600	<b>E</b>	×		-		
E CO	Oil & Solvent Process Co.	Comm		120,000	3		Part B	-		
	CF&I Sted Corp.	Ou		15,000			Closure plan			×
	CECOS International Inc.	Comm		2,096,000	+					3/91
	CECOS International Inc.	Comm	7	2,096,000	ħ					3/91
	Sentry	Comm	1	6,500			DON			
	Sentry	Comm	80	6,500	3		CION .			
	Sentry	Comm	1	13,000	6		NOD			
	Chemical Handling	Comm	\$	33,800	6	×				
	Advanced Technology, Inc.	Comm	4	3,500	2		X			
					- -					
*	The capacity associated with this facility was counted in the state's 1080	a wee counter	d in the state's 1080	CAP tehles ad	tdessing can	CAP tables addressing suracity survively first		Attracting	ISD - interim str	ISD - interim status determination
	2 The capacity araccisted with this facility was not conned in the state's a		nted in the state's ?		ins/deficit can	order and the second se		exolained.	NOD - Notice of Deficiency	f Deficiency
	postrayed in the potential future capacity tables.	v tubles.							Prop Clos - proposing closure	soring closure
	3 The capacity associated with this facility is a new addition to potential future capacity.	v is a new ad	dition to potential fu	dure capacity.	•				A&B - RCRA p	A&B - RCRA permit Parts A and B
					•				,	

portrayed in the potential future capacity tables. 3 The capacity associated with this facility is a new addition to potential future capacity. 4 The capacity associated with this facility has been incorporated into the revised 1995 projections.

25-Jan-91

Table II(A) Page 2 of 4

. . . . . . . .

ID     Blount Inc       ESII     ESII       ESII     ESII       ESII     ESII       INEL     INEL       INE     INEL       INN     Disposal Control Servic       Doff     N		<b>6</b>	FACILI	FACILITY INFORMATION	MATION				PERMIT PR	PERMIT PROCESS STEPS		
Indication         Facility         Facility         Facility         Facility         Facility         Facility         Processing:         Draft Permit:           Indication         Biount lac         Type         Camponit         0         3.735         0         Activities         Notice of Deficiency         Public Commont           Est         Comm         10         3.735         0         X         Activities         Notice of Deficiency         Public Commont           Est         Comm         11         842,000         1         842,000         X         X         Activities         Public Commont           Null         Null         On         4         1,300         1         842,000         X         X         Activities         Public Commont           Null         Null         On         4         1,300         1         X					SARA		Process	Pre-	Permit Review		Issue	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				Facility	Management		Code	Application	and Processing;	Draft Permit;	Final	Facility
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			Facility	Type	Category	(tons/yr)	*	Activities	Notice of Deficiency	Public Comment	Decision	On-Line
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$												
EstiComm11842,0003NXXINEComm13842,0003XXXXINEOn1842,0001842,0001XXXINEOn13,6559011XXXXINEOn311,2001XXXXXINEOn949,7211XXXXXINEOn949,7211XXXXXINEOn13,00013XXXXXNUNueOn949,7211XXXXXNUNueOn949,7211XXXXXNUNueOn940,7211XXXXXNUNueOn93,0003XXXXXDisposal Control Services, Inc.Comm53,0003XXXXDisposal Control Services, Inc.Comm53,0003XXXXDisposal Control Services, Inc.Comm53,0003XXXXDisposal Control Services, Inc.Comm53,0003XXXDDisposal Control Services, Inc.Co	F		Blount Inc	Comm	01	3,753	3		NOD			
EditControl13842,0003NELOn1 $8,235$ 1NELOn511,2001NELOn7 $2,6550$ 1NELOn7 $2,6550$ 1NELOn7 $2,6550$ 1NELOn9 $8,400,000$ 1NELOn9 $8,00,000$ 1NELOn1 $5,000$ 1NELOn1 $5,000$ 1NELOn1 $5,000$ 1NELOn1 $5,000$ 1NetOn1 $5,000$ 1NetOn1 $5,000$ 1NetOn1 $5,000$ 1NetOn1 $5,000$ 2NetDisposal Control Services, Inc.Comm $5$ $3,500$ Disposal Control Services, Inc.Comm $5$ $3,500$ $2$ Disposal Control Services, Inc.Comm $5$ $3,500$ $2$ Disposal Control Services, Inc.Comm $5$ $3,500$ $2$ Disposal Control Services, Inc.Comm $6$ $5,150$ $2$ Disposal Control Services, Inc.Comm $6$ $7,000$ $3$ Disposa		*******	ESII	Comm	11	842,000	· 3		X			
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			ESI	Comm	<u>E1</u>	842,000	ſ		×			
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				ð	3	8,525			X			
INEL         On         5         11.200         1         X         X         X           INEL         On         7         26,550         1         X         X         X         X           INEL         On         9         403,720         1         X         X         X         X           INEL         On         9         403,720         1         X         X         X         X         X           ND         None         0         11         5,000         1         X         X         X         X         X           ND         None         -         0         11         5,000         1         X		. <b>A</b> irmana	INEL STORES	ő	*	11,200	-		×			
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			INEL	uO	5	11,200	1		X			
INEL         On         8         400,000         1           INEL         On         9         403,721         1           INEL         On         9         403,721         1           INEL         On         11         5,000         1         ×           MU         None         -         0n         11         5,000         ×         ×           ND         None         -         -         0n         11         5,000         ×         ×         ×           ND         Disposal Control Services, Inc.         Comm         4         3,500         2         ×			INEL	чÖ	7	26,550			×		* • •	
INEL         On         9         404,721         1           INEL         On         11         5,000         1           ND         None         0n         11         5,000         1           ND         None         0n         11         5,000         1           ND         Nue         0n         11         5,000         2           ND         Disposal Control Services, Inc.         Comm         4         3,500         2           Disposal Control Services, Inc.         Comm         4         3,500         2         X         X           Disposal Control Services, Inc.         Comm         5         3,500         2         X         X           Disposal Control Services, Inc.         Comm         5         3,500         2         X         X         X           Disposal Control Services, Inc.         Comm         5         3,500         2         X         X         X           Disposal Control Services, Inc.         Com         9         12,000         3         X         X         X           Defense Systems Corp.         On         9         12,000         3         X         X         X         <			INEL	ō	20	400,000			×		-	
INEL     On     11     5,000     1       MT     None     0n     11     5,000     1       ND     Name     0n     1     5,000     2       NN     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     4,000     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     5,150     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     7,000     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     7     X     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     9     1,,000     3       Doff Nevada Test Sile     Cap     9     1,200     3       Doff Nevada Test Sile     Cap				u0	6	404.721			X			
MT     None     MT     None       ND     None     4     3,500     2       NV     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2       NV     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     2       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     5,150     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     9     1,200     3       Doff Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3       Doff Nevada Test Site     Cap     <			INEL	- BO	11	5,000			X			
MT     None     None     None       ND     Name     4     3,500     2       NV     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2       NV     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     5,150     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     5,150     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     5,150     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     7,000     3       Dolenes Systems Corp.     On     9     1,200     3     X     X       DOE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     X     X       1 The capacity and thin facility war ocumed in the state's 1999 CAP tables adeity tables but was counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables adeity tables but was counted in the state' a 1989 CAP tables adeity tables but was counted in the state's 1989 CAP ta	in											
ND     None     X     X       NV     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2       NV     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     4,000     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     4,000     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     2     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     5,150     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     9     12,000     3     X     X       Defense Systems Corp.     On     9     12,000     3     X     X       Defense Systems Corp.     On     9     1,200     3     X     X       DoE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     X     X       1 The capacity associated with this facility was counted in the sate's 1980 CAP amplu/deficit capacity tables but was control in the potential future capacity tables.     A&/AB		E	NAME									
ND     None     4     3,500     2     X       NV     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2       NV     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     4,000     3       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     2     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     5,150     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     9     1,200     3     X     X       Defense Systems Corp.     On     9     1,200     3     X     X       DOE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     X     X       ODE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     X     X       2     The capacity associated with this facility was counted in the sate's 1989 CAP amplu/deficit capacity tables but was control in the sate's 1989 CAP amplu/deficit capacity tables but was control in the potential future capacity tables.     Abbreviation												
NUD     None     Null       NV     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2     X     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2     X     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     2     X     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     5,150     3     X     X       Defense Systema Corp.     On     9     12,000     3     X     X       DoE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     X     X       DOE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     X     X       The capacity associated with this facility was conneed in the state's 1989 CAP to the addressity tables but was conneed in the state's 1989 CAP amplue/deficit capacity tables but was conneed in the state's 1989 CAP amplue/deficit capacity tables but was conneed in the state's 1989 CAP amplue/deficit capacity tables but was conneed in the state's 1989 CAP amplue/deficit capacity tables but was     Capacity andicat	and i	-†										
NV     Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     4,000     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     2     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,000     3     X       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     6     5,150     3     X       Defense Systems Corp.     On     9     2     3     X     X       Defense Systems Corp.     On     9     1,200     3     X     X       DOE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     X     X       DOE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     X     X       DOE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     X     X       The capacity associated with this facility was counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables addressing capacity surplus/deficit.     Capacity surplus/deficit.     A&B       *     The capacity associated with this facility was counted in the state's 1989 C			None									
Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     3,500     2     X     N       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     4     4,000     3     X     N       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     2     X     N       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X     N       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X     N       Disposal Control Services, Inc.     Comm     5     3,500     3     X     N       Defense Systems Corp.     On     9     2     3     X     X     N       Defense Systems Corp.     On     9     1,200     3     X     X     X       DOE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     A&B     A&B       DOE Nevada Test Site     Cap     9     1,200     3     A&B     A&B       The capacity associated with this facility was counted in the state's 1989 CAP turplua/deficit capacity turplua/deficit cap	(11)										A Design of the second s	
Comm44,0003XNComm53,5002XXComm65,1503XXComm65,1503XXComm912,0003XXOn912,0003XXCap91,2003A&BCap91,2003A&BSelity was counced in the state's 1989 CAP tables addressing capacity tables but was applicationsAblee but was capacity tables but was counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables addressing capacity tables but wasAblee but was	4	-	Disposal Control Services, Inc.	Comm	4	3,500		X				
CommS3,5002XXComm54,0003XXComm65,1503XXOn923XXOn912,0003XXCap912,0003A&BCap91,2003A&BScility was counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables addressing capacity surplus/deficit.Abler visitionsspacity tables.addressing capacity tables but wasAbler visitions			Disposal Control Services, Inc.	Comm	4	4,000		×				
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			Disposal Control Services, Inc.	Comm	5	3,500		X				
Comm65,1503XXOn923On912,0003On91,2003Cap91,2003Scility was counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables addreasing capacity tables but was apacity tables.A&BActive state's 1989 CAP tables addreasing capacity tables but was apacity tables.A&BActive state's 1989 CAP tables addreasing capacity tables but was apacity tables.AbbreviationsActive state's 1989 CAP tables addreasing capacity tables but wasAbbreviationsActive state's 1989 CAP tables addreasing capacity tables but wasAbbreviationsActive state's 1989 CAP tables addreasing capacity tables but wasAbbreviations			Disposal Control Services, Inc.	Comm	5			X				
On     9     2     3     X       On     9     12,000     3       Cap     9     1,200     3       Cap     9     1,200     3       In this facility was not counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables addreasing capacity tables but was     A&B       Abbreviations       Mure capacity tables.			Disposal Control Services, Inc.	Comm	9		n	×				
On     9     12,000     3     A&B       Cap     9     1,200     3       Cap     9     1,200     3       th this facility was counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables addreasing capacity tables but was     A&B     Abbreviations       th this facility was not counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables addreasing capacity tables but was     Abbreviations     Abbreviations			Defense Systems Corp.	uO	6		-		×			
Cap         9         1,200         3           with this facility was counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables addressing capacity surplus/deficit.         A&B         Abbreviations           with this facility was not counted in the state's 1989 CAP tables addressing capacity tables but was         Abbreviations         Abbreviations			Fallon Naval Air Station	u O	6				A&B		• . • .	A
CAP tables addressing capacity surplus/deficit. 989 CAP surplus/deficit capacity tables but was			DOE Nevada Test Sile	Cap	6	1,200	6		A&B			
CAP tables addressing capacity surplus/deficit. 989 CAP surplus/deficit capacity tables but was					<b>Sector of the sector of the s</b>	والمستخدمة والمستحدية والمراجع						
CAP tables addressing capacity auplus/deficit. 989 CAP auplus/deficit capacity tables but was		•			- 2					A block i con	ISD - Intrim e	stas determination
		ŀ	<ol> <li>The capacity associated with this fac 3. The consists</li></ol>	itity was counted	id in the state's 195	19.CAP tables in 1020 CAP minut	daressing capa	city surpus/ociticit. seity tables but was		contained;	NOD - Notice	of Deficiency
			2 INC UNDER A DESCRIPTION AND THE PACTAGE AND AND THE PACTAGE AND	shiy was nu cu oin tahia			aten unumnent	THE ING BAIMIN LINKS			Prop Clot pro	posing closure
			The contract the provident of the second states of the second sec	they have a set of	i laine to motorial i	utine entry					A&B - RCRA	semit Parts A and B

First capacity associated with this facility way counted in the state a 1999 CAP suplus/deficit capacity tables but was
 The capacity associated with this facility way not counted in the state's 1989 CAP suplus/deficit capacity tables but was
 portrayed in the potential future capacity tables.

 The capacity associated with this facility has been inconted in the state's 1989 CAP suplus/deficit capacity tables but was
 portrayed in the potential future capacity tables.
 The capacity associated with this facility has been incorporated into the revised 1995 projections.

25-Jan-91

Table II(A) Page 3 of 4

		FACILITY INFORMATION	<b>VINFOR</b>	MATION				PERMIT PRO	PERMIT PROCESS STEPS		
				SARA		Process	Pre-	Permit Review		Issue	
			Facility	Facility Management	Capacity	Code	Application	and Processing;	Draft Permit;	Final	Facility
•		Facility	Type	Category	(tons/yr)	•	Activities	Notice of Deficiency	Public Comment	Decision	On-Line
	OR	Chem-Waste Management	Comm	13	937,423	-					X
		Chem-Waste Management	Comm	13	570,203						As Needed
		Chem-Waste Management	Comm	ĥ	1,507,626	-					As Needed
*/											
	SD	None									
	5	Apus, Inc.	Comm	4	28,000	4				3.90	
_		Aptus, Inc.	Comm	S	28,000	4				3-90	
		Envirocare	Comm	13	1,350,000	4				06-11-30	
S		Tooele Army Depot	on	*	19,720	4				6-89	
ţ		Toxele Army Depot	чÖ	2	4,136	4				6-89	
<		USPCI CIF	Comm	*	196,000	2			Druft Issued 12-90		
H		USPCI CIF	Comm	5	196,000	5			Draft Issued 12-90		
ш											
	WA	WA RECONTEK	Comm	1	48,000	ŕ	×				
		Rabanco Grant County Waste Mgmt	Comm	4	17,500	2		NOD			
		Rabanco Grant County Waste Mgmt	Comm	5	17,500	2		NOD			
		ECOS	Comm	4	18,000	2		X			
		ECOS	Comm	S	18,000	2		X			
		ECOS	Comm	13	65,000	2		×			
	WΥ	None									
	¥							n - A da and			
	•	I fac capacity associated with this facility was counted in the state s 1989	was counted	d in the state's 1985	LCAP tables ad	dressing capac	CAP tables addressing capacity surplus/deficit.		Abbreviations	ISD - Internet	ISD - interm status determination

2. The capacity associated with this facility was not counted in the state a 1989 CAP surplus/deficit capacity tables but was concreted in the state a 1989 CAP surplus/deficit capacity tables but was

portrayed in the potential future capacity tables. 3 The capacity associated with this facility is a new addition to potential future capacity. 4 The capacity associated with this facility has been incorporated into the revised 1995 projections.

Prop Clos - proposing closure A&B - RCRA permit Parts A and B

NOD - Notice of Deficiency

explained:

25-Jan-91

Table II(A) Page 4 of 4

TABLE III	EXPLANATION FOR CHANGES IN PROJECTIONS FOR IN-REGION SUPPLY AND
CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991)	DEMAND FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT CAPACITY (1995)

SARA Category Metals Recovery 1 Solvents Recovery 2 Other Recovery 3 Other Recovery 3	Type 1 Comm 2 Comm 3 Comm 4 Comm	n Capacity Change by 4,420 92,091 (82) (82) n 28,600	Regional Projected           1995 Surplus/Defici           1989 CAP         1990 Rev           95,492         99,           106,855         198,           106,855         198,           16,513         16,           (77,553)         (48,	t 912 946 953)	C C A C C A W A W A W A W A W A W A W A	Capacity Change by State 4,420 58,696 14,189 9,000 9,000 9,807 9,807 28,000 600	acity ange State Cause of Capacity Change 4,420 More accurate capacity numbers 58,696 More accurate capacity numbers 14,189 Sol-Pro/Lilyblad recalculation of capacity 399 McClary Columbia expansion, recalculation of capacity 9,000 Northwest Processing expansion 9,807 Recalculation of capacity numbers (82) More accurate capacity numbers (82) More accurate capacity numbers 600 Aptus, Inc. permit issued and shift from potential future table 600 Penberthy Electromelt omitted in 1989 CAP
Incineration (Solid/Sludge) 5	5 Comm	n 28,600	(111,098)	(82,498) UT WA	UT W	28,000 600	28,000 Aptus, Inc. permit issued and shift from potential future table 600 Penberthy Electromelt omitted in 1989 CAP
Energy Recovery 6	6 Comm	n 17,515	(2,122)	15,393	CA	17,515	17,515 National Cement expansion permitted and shift from potential future table
Aqueous Inorganic Trt.	Comm	n (1,181,839)	1,638,980	457,141	KA WA	(1,248,646) 66,807	<ul> <li>(1,248,646) More accurate capacity numbers; alteration of Chem Waste Mgmt treatment units (capacity now classified as Other Treatment)</li> <li>66,807 More accurate capacity numbers</li> </ul>
Aqueous Organic Trt. 8	8 Comm	n 137,891	25,841	163,732 CA	CA WA	125,121 12,770	125,121 More accurate capacity numbers 12,770 McClary Columbia expansion of capacity

. ..... .

Ī

and the second se

# TABLE III CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) EXPLANATION FOR CHANGES IN PROJECTIONS FOR IN-REGION SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT CAPACITY (1995)

			Capacity	Regional	Regional Projected		Capacity	
			Change by	1995 Sur	1995 Surplus/Deficit		Change	
SARA Category	H	ype	Type SARA Category	1989 CAP	<b>1990 Revision State</b>	State		Cause of Capacity Change
Other Treatment	9 Comm	omm	81,167	(5,969)	75,198	S	78,842	Two facilities (Broco; Crosby & Overton) came on-line; Chem Waste
						WA	2,325	Mgmt capacity previously classified as Aqueous Inorganic Treatment 2,325 More accurate capacity numbers
Sludge Treatment	10 Comm	umo	(3,862)	13,617	, 9,755	× S	(3,000) (862)	(3,000) OSCO did not begin permit process (862) More accurate capacity numbers
Stabilization	11 Comm	u uo	(10,876,495)	14,187,768	3,311,273	\$8 <b>≘</b> %	(12,224,201) 524,000 1,143,576 (326,774)	<ul> <li>(12,224,201) Change in assumptions for calculating stabilization capacity</li> <li>524,000 Utilization mistakenly listed as capacity</li> <li>1,143,576 ESH recalculation of capacity</li> <li>(326,774) Reflects utilization of landfill capacity</li> </ul>
Landill	13	Comm	6,063,635	13,455,386	19,519,021	CA VA	6,904 5,168,439	<ul> <li>6,904 More accurate capacity numbers</li> <li>5,168,439 Additional capacity permitted (Chemical Waste Mgmt, 2 Laidlaw Environmental sites) and shift from potential future table</li> </ul>
						S ⊟ ¥	524,000 (502,030) (326,774)	524,000 Utilization mistakenly listed as capacity (502,030) Utilization greater than projected (326,774) Utilization of landfill capacity
						5	1,200,000	, 200,000 Eavinceare permit issued (less projected utilization) and shift from potential future table
Other Disposal	15 C	Comm	(19,289,696)	19,345,130	55,434	CA	(19,289,696)	(19,289,696) Closure of most surface impoundment capacity due to LDRs (some Chemical Waste Management capacity remains in operation);
								reculation of capacity

Table III, Page 2 of 5

CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) EXPLANATION FOR CHANGES IN PROJECTIONS FOR IN-REGION SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT CAPACITY (1995) TABLE III

\*

			Capacity Change by	Regional 1995 Surr	Regional Projected 1995 Surplus/Deficit		Capacity Change	
SARA Category	E -	Type	SARA Category	1989 CAP	1989 CAP 1990 Revision State	State.	by State	Cause of Capacity Change
Metals Recovery	-	Cap	(121)	(1,162)	(1,283) WA	M	(104)	<ul> <li>(104) More accurate capacity numbers</li> <li>(17) Hanford mixed waste facilities no longer included</li> </ul>
Solvents Recovery	5	Cap	(10)	2,429	2,419	YM.	( <del>(</del> )	<ul> <li>(4) Washington Chemicals reduction and recalculation of capacity</li> <li>(6) Hanford mixed waste facilities no longer included</li> </ul>
Other Recovery	9	Cap	(253)	(1,038)	(1,291) WA	٨٨	(253)	(253) Hanford mixed waste facilities no longer included
Aqueous Inorganic Trt.	7 0	Cap	(41,042)	3,531,579	3,490,537 WA	WA	(41,042)	(41,042) More accurate capacity numbers
Aqueous Organic Trt.	~~~~	Cap	104	0	104	NA	104	104 The Boeing Company/Everett omitted in 1989 CAP
Other Treatment		Cap	(1,024,243)	1,022,963	(I,280) WA	WA	(1,153,565) 129,322	(1,153,565) Hanford mixed waste facilities no longer included 129,322 More accurate capacity numbers
Stabilization		Cap	(140)	140	0	VM 0	(140)	(140) Hanford mixed waste facilities no longer included

Table III, Page 3 of 5

TABLE III CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) EXPLANATION FOR CHANGES IN PROJECTIONS FOR IN-REGION SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT CAPACITY (1995)

			Capacity	Regional	Regional Projected		Capacity	
SARA Category		Type	Change by SARA Category	1989 CAP	9 CAP   1990 Revision State	State	by State C	Cause of Capacity Change
Metals Recovery	· · · · ·	ő	8,522	1,374	9,896	G∛	8,518 IR 4 M	8,518 INEL recalculation of capacity 4 More accurate capacity numbers
Solvents Recovery	3	e O	1,039	2,460	3,499	× C	(21) E 1,060 N	(21) Eagle Picher did not begin permit process 1,060 More accurate capacity numbers
Incineration (Liquid)	4	on	15,379	12,378	27,757	<u>e ę</u>	(1,101) II (3,240) C	(1,101) INEL recalculation of capacity (3,240) Closure of AMOCO facility
Incineration (Sludge/Solid)	Ś	on	13,138	39,028	52,166	5 84	(38) C	<ul> <li>19, 720 Toocle Army Depot permit issued and shift from potential future table (38) Closure of EI DuPont by 1995</li> </ul>
						₽₽5	4,136 T	9, 900 INEL recalcutation of capacity (860) Closure of AMOCO facility 4, 136 Toocle Army Depot permit issued and shift from potential future table
Energy Recovery	9	on	15,000	31,287	46,287	MA	15,000 N	15,000 More accurate capacity numbers
Aqueous Inorganic Trt.	<b>C</b>	ő	(85,034)	2,876,966	2,791,932	Å Ð Ç	(24) C (24) C (42,450) I (42,560) N	<ul> <li>(24) Closure of EI DuPont by 1995</li> <li>(42,450) INEL recalculation of capacity</li> <li>(42,560) More accurate capacity numbers</li> </ul>
Aqueous Organic Trt.		ы	400,000	951,127	1,351,127	<u> </u>	400,000	400,000 NEL recalculation of capacity

Table III, Page 4 of 5

TABLE III

ż

ż

# CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) EXPLANATION FOR CHANGES IN PROJECTIONS FOR IN-REGION SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT CAPACITY (1995)

.

		:	Change by	Kegional 1995 Surp	kegional Projected 995 Surplus/Deficit		Change	
SARA Category		Type	SA	1989 CAP	<b>1990 Revision State</b>	State		Cause of Capacity Change
Other Treatment	0	on	43,273	2,974,008	3,017,281	8	23,799	23,799 Closure (CF&I, 3 Eagle Picher sites); recalculation of base year
						Q	14,474	capacity 14,474 INEL recalculation of capacity
				******		<b>A</b> W	5,000	5,000 More accurate capacity numbers
Sludge Treatment	0	On	4,219	976	5,195	8	219	219 Conoco omitted in 1989 CAP
						W.V	4,000	4,000 More accurate capacity numbers
Stabilization	unnd d	on	4,042	16,316	20,358	S.	573	573 Martin Marietta - correction of 1989 CAP's 1995 projection table
						Q	3,469	3,469 INEL recalculation of capacity
Land Treatment	12	On	4,410	37,384	41,794 CO	8	1,060	1,060 Western Slope Refining omitted in 1989 CAP
					<u></u>	<b>W</b> A	3,350	3,350 More accurate capacity numbers
Landňil	<u>m</u>	on	275,000	(502)	274,498	8	275,000	275,000 CF&I - recalculation of capacity

Table III, Page 5 of 5

		T						3				• . • •				
		Cause of Capacity Change	1,460 Engelhard West newly proposed capacity 48,000 RECONTEK newly proposed capacity	4,000 Disposal Control Services - recalculation of capacity	(28,000) Apius, Inc. permit issued and capacity shifted to revised 1995 projection	500 Grant County Waste Mgmt - recalculation of capacity	(22,500) Cal. Thermal Trt. Systems inadvertently double-counted in 1989	CAP: listed in both projected 1995 and potential future capacity tables 4,000 Disposal Control Services - recalculation of capacity (28,000) Actus. Inc. permit issued and capacity shifted to revised 1995		500 Grant County Waste Mgmt - recalculation of capacity	(17,515) National Cement expansion permitted and capacity shifted to revised	5,150 Disposal Control Services, Inc. newly proposed capacity	(7,774) Pacific Treatment #2 closed	183, 100 Chem Clear Inc. newly proposed capacity	6,500 Sentry newly proposed capacity	(52,000) Waste-Tech did not complete permit process for this capacity
Capacity	Change	by State	1,460 48,000	4,000	(000,82)	200	(22,500)	4,000		200	(17,515)	5,150	(1,774)	183,100	6,500	
		State	CA WA	≥!	5	МА	CA	N F	5	M.A.	CA	NV	CA		8	W V
Regional	Potential Future Capacity	1990 Revision State	49,460	384,500			325,400				5,150 CA		189,600			
Reg	Potential Fu	1989 CAP	0	408,000			371,400	ŕ			17,515		71,321			÷
Capacity	Change by	SARA Category	49,460	(23,500)			(46,000)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			12,365		118,279			
		Type	Comm	Comm			Comm	, ,			Comm		Comm		******	
				4	-		Ś				्		1	÷		
		SARA Category	Metals Recovery	Incineration (Liquid)			Incineration (Solid/Sludge)			a.	Energy Recovery		Aqueous Inorganic Trt.			

TABLE IV CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) EXPLANATION FOR CHANGES IN POTENTIAL FUTURE REGIONAL TD CAPACITY

s. S

25-Jan-91

Table IV, Page 1 of 3

TABLE IV CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) EXPLANATION FOR CHANGES IN POTENTIAL FUTURE REGIONAL TD CAPACITY

•

Ş

\*.

Ŷ

			Capacity	Regi	Regional		Capacity	
		::	Change by	Potential Ful	Potential Future Capacity		Change	
SARA Category	T	Type 5	SARA Category	1989 CAP	1990 Revision State	State	by State	Cause of Capacity Change
Aqueous Organic Trt.	00 C 8	Comm	229,252	19,321	248,573	CA	217,073 25,000	217,073 OSCO newly proposed capacity 25,000 Pacific Treatment #1 newly proposed capacity
<b>.</b>						A C	(7,774) 6,500 (11,547)	<ul> <li>(7,774) Pacific Treatment #2 closed</li> <li>6,500 Sentry newly proposed capacity</li> <li>(11,547) Hanford mixed waste facilities no longer included</li> </ul>
Other Treatment	0 C0	Comm	15,147	728,581	743,728	<u>₹</u> 8	(18,653) 33,800	(18,653) Pacific Treatment #2 closed 33,800 Chemical Handling newly proposed capacity
Sludge Treatment	10 Comm	E .	753	3,000	3,753	8 ≘	(3,000) 3,753	(3,000) OSCO permit not submitted 3,753 Blount newly proposed capacity
Stabilization		Comm	802,200	172,800	975,000	S	120,000	120,000 OSCO newly proposed capacity 13.000 Sentry newly proposed capacity
						₽Å	842,000 I (172,800) I	842,000 [ESII recalculation of capacity (172,800) Hanford mixed waste facilities no longer included
Landfill	13 Co	Comm	(2,800,375)	8,224,784	5,424,409	58	(196,375)	(196,375) Capacity now incorporated into revised 1995 projection (2) 096,000) CFCOS permit issued and capacity shifted to revised 1995 projection
		<del></del>				8 9 5	842,000 (1,350,000)	842,000 ESII newly proposed capacity (1,350,000) Envirocare permit issued and capacity shifted to revised 1995
								projection
Other Disposal	15 Co	Comm	33,600	0	33,600	CA	33,600	33,600 Chemical Waste Management newly proposed capacity

25-Jan-91

Table IV, Page 2 of 3

.

TABLE IV CAPACITY ASSURANCE UPDATE (JANUARY 1991) EXPLANATION FOR CHANGES IN POTENTIAL FUTURE REGIONAL TD CAPACITY

(4,136) Tooele Army Depot permit issued and capacity shifted to revised 1995 (19,720) Toocle Army Depot permit issued; recalculation of capacity; and CA has not yet provided updated captive capacity numbers 0 CA has not yet provided updated captive capacity numbers 0 CA has not yet provided updated captive capacity numbers 12,000 Fallon Naval Air Station newly proposed capacity Defense Systems Corp. newly proposed capacity (12,480) Dugway Proving Ground application withdrawn capacity shifted to revised 1995 projection 1,200 DOE Nevada Test Site is seeking permit (300) Ft. Richardson application withdrawn Cause of Capacity Change (3, 107,000) Facility not currently listed projection 0 3 by State Change Capacity 1989 CAP | 1990 Revision State S <u>5</u>5  $\Omega \gtrsim$ S AK Ð UT  $\sum_{n=1}^{n}$ 3 2,640 5,623 18,758 1,300 12,002 0 0 Potential Future Capacity Regional 5,623 15,120 18,758 300 19,718 4,136 3,107,100 0 (4,136) (12, 480)(3,105,800) (300) SARA Category (19,720) Ò 0 12,002 Change by Capacity Type Cap Cap Cap Cap Cap on ő ő ŝ Ś 5 Ś \$ ক d σ Incineration (Sludge/Solid) Incineration (Solid/Sludge) Incineration (Liquid) Incineration (Liquid) Energy Recovery Other Treatment SARA Category Other Treatment Other Disposal

Table IV, Page 3 of 3