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Chapter 11
Managing Industrial Wastes Dumped in Marine Waters

INTRODUCTION

Marine disposal of industrial waste involves two primary modes of delivering wastes to marine waters. Dumping typically involves the use of barges to deliver industrial sludges and slurries directly to surface waters at designated marine dumping sites. In general, dumping of such wastes is not as significant in causing environmental impacts as are the far greater quantities of industrial waste directly discharged through pipelines or outfalls into marine waters within a short distance of the coastline (ch. 8).

Marine dumping of industrial wastes has been greatly reduced in the United States in the last decade, with respect to both number of permittees and quantities of waste. Prior to 1973, over 300 firms used marine waters for dumping; by 1979 the number had fallen to 13 (6), and currently only 3 firms are dumping wastes in marine waters (139). The quantity of dumped industrial wastes has steadily declined from 4.6 million metric tons in 1973 to about 200,000 metric tons in 1985 (figure 36).

Numerous sites have been used by the United States for marine dumping of industrial wastes, but only three have received significant amounts since 1977. These sites, which are administered by EPA Region II, are: 1) the New York Bight Acid Waste Disposal Site, 2) Deepwater Industrial Waste Disposal Site, and 3) the Pharmaceutical Waste Site off Puerto Rico. Only the first two are in current use (see figure 3 in ch. 3), receiving waste from three firms (139). Use of the Puerto Rico site was discontinued in 1981 (594).

Industrial waste disposal planning involves considerable capital investment, and the decreasing availability of marine waters as a viable disposal option caused many firms to make long-term investments in land-based disposal or treatment options (140). However, some previously attractive land-based options are now subject to much stricter regulation and this may increase pressure to consider marine dumping. Indeed, for particular waste types in some regions of the country and for new generators, the marine option may be very attractive. It is difficult to predict the extent of future pressures to use marine environments for dumping or to gauge what effect a change in regulations might have on marine dumping.

This chapter discusses the marine dumping of drilling fluids, acid and alkaline wastes, pharmaceutical wastes, fish processing wastes, and coal ash and flue gas desulfurization (FGD) sludges. For each waste type considered, the following topics are covered wherever data are available: waste composition; quantities generated and marine-disposed;
management and disposal practices currently used; the fate, availability, and impacts of waste constituents or contaminants; and the current regulatory framework. Table 28 provides a summary of current management practices for the various wastes considered in this chapter. Table 29 summarizes the regulatory framework governing their marine disposal.

Table 28.—Current Management Practices for Industrial Wastes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste type</th>
<th>Drilling fluids</th>
<th>Acid/alkaline</th>
<th>Pharmaceuticals</th>
<th>Fish processing</th>
<th>Coal ash/sludge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine pipeline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine dumping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land disposal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical, chemical, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biological treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-cineration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling/landfilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers indicate relative prevalence of use of an option; x indicates an option used to a lesser extent than the numbered options, but to an unknown extent relative to the other options.

Land disposal includes landfills, surface impoundment, and deep-well injection.


Table 29.—Regulatory Framework for Marine Disposal of Industrial Wastes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste type</th>
<th>Statute</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program or regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drilling muds</td>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>NPDES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>New Source Performance Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outer Continental Shelf (OCS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lands Act</td>
<td>MMS</td>
<td>Ocs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid/alkaline</td>
<td>MPRSA</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Ocean dumping regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical</td>
<td>MPRSA (dumping)</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Ocean dumping regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWA (pipeline)</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Ocean dumping regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWA (sewer)</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Pretreatment regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish processing</td>
<td>MPRSA</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Ocean dumping regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal ash/FGD sludge</td>
<td>MPRSA</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Ocean dumping regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: CWA = Clean Water Act  
MPRSA = Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act  
MMS = Minerals Management Service, U.S. Department of the Interior  
FGD = flue gas desulfurization  
NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System  
NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System  


DRILLING FLUIDS

Composition

The discharge of spent drilling fluids accompanies the exploration and development phases, but not the production phase, of offshore oil and gas activities. Hundreds of compounds are used in drilling fluids formulations, depending on the particular needs of each well. However, four materials account for over 90 percent of the mass of essentially all drilling fluids: barium sulfate (or barite), clays, lignosulfates, and lignites (50 FR 34592, Aug. 26, 1985).

Drilling fluids can be water- or oil-based. Water-based fluids are more commonly used for offshore operations, for both regulatory and technical reasons. EPA's chemical analysis of 8 generic water-based fluids detected no priority pollutant organic chemicals, but 10 priority pollutant metals were detected. In particular, mercury and cadmium were found in all formulations tested (50 FR 34592, Aug. 26, 1985; ref. 384).
Quantities of Waste Generated and Marine-Disposed

About 2 million dry metric tons of drilling fluid components are used annually in offshore drilling activities and discharged directly into marine waters. About 3,900 offshore platforms currently produce oil and gas, accounting for roughly 20 percent of all domestic production (50 FR 34592, Aug. 26, 1985). Almost all (98 percent) such operations are located in the Gulf of Mexico, and over 90 percent of drilling fluid discharges occur there (384); however, increasing exploration in the waters of southern California and Alaska (the only other major sites for drilling fluid discharges) is expected to alter this distribution. EPA estimates that about 800 new platforms will be built between 1986 and 2000, a rate greatly reduced from that between 1972 to 1982, when an average of 1,100 new wells were drilled each year.

Management and Disposal Practices

Under existing regulations, used oil-based drilling fluids (or water-based fluids significantly contaminated with oil) are prohibited from marine discharge. Such fluids must be transported to land for disposal in a facility permitted under the Resource Recovery and Conservation Act or for reconditioning and reuse (40 CFR 435, Subpart A). In contrast, used water-based drilling fluids typically are dumped overboard or discharged from a pipe; both of these practices require a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Most coastal EPA Regions have prohibited direct offshore discharge near certain drilling sites because of ecological sensitivity at the sites (482). In addition, some State laws require land disposal for spent fluids generated in coastal waters (384). Using barges to transport used drilling fluids to shore or to distant ocean sites can be expensive and logistically difficult.

Fate, Availability, and Impact of Waste Constituents

In most areas on the continental shelf, the majority of particles present in drilling fluids and cuttings settle rapidly to the seabed, generally within 1,000 meters of the point of discharge (384). Further dispersion may occur because of bottom currents or tidal action. A plume of particles, however, remains in suspension and is subject to relatively more rapid dispersion and dilution.

The main environmental concerns related to marine disposal of drilling fluids include potential toxicity of various chemical additives or trace metals, increased turbidity in the water column, physical burial of benthic organisms or alteration of physical substrates available to these organisms, and possible long-term accumulation of metals in sediments and marine organisms. The primary acute effects appear to be physical and limited to the benthic environment.

Evidence indicates that most water-based drilling fluids are relatively nontoxic to marine organisms at the concentrations that are achieved shortly after discharge (384). For those fluids exhibiting significant toxicity, it appears to be primarily attributable to the presence of diesel fuel, which can comprise as much as 2 to 4 percent of the total volume.

While most research has focused on acute effects, the concentrations of potentially toxic constituents present at most sites are in a range that is more likely to induce chronic or sublethal effects. Data are limited on such impacts, however, so considerable uncertainty remains regarding the long-term environmental impacts associated with marine disposal of drilling fluids.

Regulatory Framework

The principal authority to regulate marine disposal of drilling discharges lies with EPA, through the NPDES program of the Clean Water Act (Section 402). Such discharges are subject to the ‘best practicable control technology’ (BPT) and ‘best available technology’ (BAT) limitations of the Clean Water Act (ch. 7). Offshore oil and gas operations do not receive individual NPDES permits and instead are covered by a general NPDES permit (ch. 8), unless a facility requests its own permit. Prior to issuance of an individual NPDES permit, EPA must determine that the discharges will not unreasonably degrade the marine environment, in compliance with the Ocean Discharge Criteria of the Clean Water Act (40 CFR 125, Subpart M).
Using this regulatory authority, EPA has imposed a variety of permit conditions, including: limits on the amount of toxic substances or total hydrocarbons in drilling fluids, requirements to conduct toxicity testing of drilling fluid formulations prior to use, seasonal or zonal restrictions on discharges, and special monitoring and reporting requirements (482).

EPA recently proposed BAT effluent limitation guidelines and new source performance standards for offshore oil and gas facilities (50 FR 34592, Aug. 26, 1985). In addition to maintaining the prohibitions against the discharge of oil-based drilling fluids and water-based fluids containing oil, EPA proposed two further controls: a limit on the acute toxicity of drilling fluid discharges and a limit on the discharge of cadmium and mercury to a maximum of 1 part per million (ppm).

A recently renewed general permit covering drilling operations in the Gulf of Mexico (51 FR 24897, July 9, 1986) incorporates the proposed BAT limits, but not the proposed limit for mercury and cadmium. General permits incorporating the BAT limits on these two metals have been issued for Alaska (51 FR 35460, Oct. 3, 1986) and proposed for southern California (50 FR 34036, Aug. 22, 1985).

The Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior regulates drilling discharges through lease stipulations and Outer Continental Shelf operating orders, some of which prohibit the use of certain additives. In addition, individual States may impose further requirements on drilling discharges for operations taking place in their territorial waters.

While drilling fluids are not classified as hazardous, their disposal on land is regulated under the solid waste provisions of RCRA.

ACID AND ALKALINE WASTES

Quantities of Waste Generated

Most liquid acid and alkaline wastes are classified generically as corrosive wastes, a RCRA category that also includes sludges and solids. Corrosive wastes comprise almost half of the total hazardous waste generated in the United States (140,690), but it is not known what fraction of these are relatively uncontaminated acids and alkalis with potential for marine disposal.

Management and Disposal Practices

Most corrosive wastes are disposed or treated on-site, using methods such as deep-well injection and neutralization. Only 1 to 2 percent of corrosive wastes are disposed off-site (140), including the acid and alkaline wastes that are currently dumped in marine waters. When disposed of in marine waters, these wastes are barged to the disposal site and then dumped in bulk at a permitted rate into the wake of the vessel.

Composition and Quantities of Waste Disposed of in Marine Waters

Acid and alkaline wastes from three industrial firms are presently dumped in marine waters (table 30). Under current permit schedules, about 200,000 metric tons from Allied Chemical, DuPont-Edge Moor, and DuPont-Grasselli will continue to be dumped annually after 1986 (139).

Quantities of waste dumped at the New York Bight Acid Waste Site by Allied Chemical have decreased from a high of 60,000 metric tons in 1973 to the current level of about 40,000 metric tons annually; no change is anticipated in the amount of waste to be dumped during the next several years (L. Mattioli, Allied Chemical, pers. comm., Dec. 1986). The current permit expires September 30, 1988; application for renewal of the permit is due

3Unless otherwise noted the following discussion is based on material from references 139 and 140.
Table 30.—Origin and Quantities of Acid and Alkaline Wastes Currently Dumped in Marine Waters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Type of waste/process</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Dumpsite</th>
<th>Annual quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allied Chemical</td>
<td>Hydrochloric acid from fluorocarbon refrigerants and polymer manufacturing</td>
<td>About 300/0 HCl 1 to 2.5°/0 fluoride Suspended solids and total organic carbon in 10s ppm range Petroleum hydrocarbons in 1-10 ppm range Chromium, nickel, zinc in &lt;0.1 to 3 ppm range Arsenic, cadmium, copper, lead, mercury in &lt;0.01 to 1 ppm range pH &lt;1.0</td>
<td>New York Bight Acid Waste Site</td>
<td>30,000 mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Pent-Edge Moor</td>
<td>Iron and other acidic metal chlorides from titanium dioxide production</td>
<td>Chromium in 100s ppm range Zinc and lead in 10s ppm range Copper and nickel in 1-10 ppm range Cadmium in 0.001 ppm range pH 0.1 to 1.0</td>
<td>Deepwater Industrial Waste Site</td>
<td>50,000 mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Pent-Grasselli</td>
<td>Sodium sulfate from agricultural chemical production</td>
<td>10°/0 sodium sulfate Low molecular weight organics in 10s-1000s ppm range Chromium, copper, nickel, lead in 0.01 to 0.1 ppm range Cadmium in 0.001 ppm range pH 10 to 12.5</td>
<td>Deepwater Industrial Waste Site</td>
<td>110,000 mt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Based on present permit limits 
*b Fluorocarbon polymer manufacturing facility was recently sold to Ausimont U. S. A., Inc. (L. Mattioli, Allied Chemical, personal communication, December 1986).


by April 3, 1988. The only alternative to marine disposal currently being used is to sell the waste for use as hydrochloric acid; about 10 percent of the waste was sold in 1984 and about 6 percent was sold in 1985 (L. Mattioli, Allied Chemical, pers. comm., Dec. 1986).

DuPont-Edge Moor has dumped acid wastes at the Deepwater Industrial Waste Site since 1968. Since 1973, its permits have contained provisions for the cessation of ocean dumping and the development of feasible alternatives. By 1984, such changes had reduced ocean dumping by 70 percent, to less than 115,000 wet metric tons. The current permit expires June 30, 1987, but it can be renewed provided that, despite good-faith efforts, DuPont-Edge Moor has been unable to develop sufficient land-based alternatives to completely replace marine disposal; an application for a new 3-year permit is being submitted on this basis (R. Schwer, E.I. du Pent de Nemours & Co., pers. comm., Nov., 1986).

DuPont-Grasselli has dumped alkaline wastes from 1968 to 1973 at the New York Bight Acid Waste Site and from 1968 to the present at the Deepwater Industrial Waste Site. Between 1973 and 1983, amounts dumped ranged from 118,000 to 290,000 wet metric tons per year. The last permit, valid through the end of 1986, required the development of alternative treatment methods, but contained no deadline for halting dumping.

**Fate, Availability, and Impact of Waste Constituents**

The rationale for allowing marine disposal of acid and alkaline wastes is that they rapidly (within 1 to 4 hours) neutralize after coming into contact with seawater, which has a high natural buffering capacity (157). In addition, discharge into the turbulent wake of the vessel provides rapid mixing and a several thousand-fold dilution. Acute impacts due to transient changes in acidity may occur prior to
neutralization. Such effects, however, would generally be limited to the immediate vicinity of the discharge, and past monitoring has not detected any observable effects on marine life (83, 157). Trace pollutants, primarily toxic metals, may pose longer term risks, although such pollutants are generally rapidly and extensively diluted under typical disposal conditions. Some metals (primarily iron and magnesium) precipitate upon entering marine waters and can remain in suspension for several days or more.

Regulatory Framework

Most acid and alkaline wastes are generically classified under RCRA as hazardous due to their corrosivity. However, wastewater treatment sludges from the DuPont-Edge Moor facility, which are usually disposed of by landfilling or ocean dumping, have been delisted and excluded from regulation as a hazardous waste (45 FR 72037, Oct. 30, 1980), and wastewater from the DuPont-Grasselli facility is not considered hazardous because it does not exceed the upper pH limit specified for corrosivity by RCRA (R. Schwer, E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., pers. comm., Nov. 1986). In all cases, however, dumping of acid and alkaline wastes in marine waters is allowed only after a case-by-case determination of compliance with the Ocean Dumping Criteria of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA). Permits issued by EPA under authority of MPRSA do not contain requirements for specific treatment of acid and alkaline wastes that are to be dumped; rather they require that dilution to background levels be achieved in a specified length of time.

PHARMACEUTICAL WASTES

Composition

Pharmaceutical wastes originate from the biological production of antibiotics and the chemical production of pharmaceuticals. They are typically aqueous suspensions near neutral pH; have densities similar to seawater; and contain about 1 percent suspended solids, 2 percent organic carbon, and very low (<1 ppm) levels of metals or high molecular weight organochlorines (relative to other industrial wastes). However, they can contain high concentrations (10 to 100 ppm) of any of several common industrial solvents (139,594).

Management and Disposal Practices

Most U.S. pharmaceutical companies responded to EPA regulations by investing in land-based disposal, including onsite incineration and secondary wastewater treatment (e.g., anaerobic digestion, activated sludge treatment). Marine dumping generally is only attractive to those pharmaceutical companies not yet having secondary treatment (138).

Quantities of Waste Marine-Disposed

Seven pharmaceutical companies in Puerto Rico dumped pharmaceutical wastes at the designated Pharmaceutical Waste Site (74 km north of Puerto Rico) from at least 1973 until 1981. The amounts dumped increased from 38,000 wet metric tons in 1973 to over 300,000 metric tons in the late 1970s and early 1980s (594).

Because of lower disposal costs and EPA mandates, these wastes are now discharged into a secondary sewage treatment plant completed at Barceloneta in 1981 (Black and Veatch, cited in ref. 594). Almost half of the wastewater entering the plant is pharmaceutical wastes. Effluent from the plant is not disinfected and is discharged through a pipeline 800 meters offshore, in waters less than 30 meters deep (208). The volume of pharmaceutical wastes entering the plant is about fourfold higher than that previously marine dumped, but is about tenfold less concentrated in suspended solids, organic carbon, and nitrogen (594).

Fate, Availability, and Impact of Waste Constituents

The dispersive high-energy conditions at the Puerto Rico dumpsite diluted dumped wastes by a factor of up to 100,000-fold soon after dumping and by a factor of about 10,000,000-fold over a long-term period (594). However, one clearly demonstrated change at the dumpsite was the almost complete replacement, within 7 years after disposal...
began, of resident bacteria with other bacterial species (including several human pathogens—e.g., Salmonella and Vibrio) (207). Some experts attribute the change to a selection for the other species able to degrade particular pharmaceutical waste components, but this conclusion has been questioned (594). Shifts also occurred in the composition and size of the phytoplankton community in the vicinity of the dumpsite (594).

Other potentially more serious impacts have been attributed to the discharge of pharmaceutical wastes into the Barceloneta secondary treatment plant. These include frequent disruption of the treatment process, reduced removal of bacterial pathogens prior to effluent discharge, and significantly elevated levels of fecal bacteria (including human pathogens) in coastal waters (208). Because discharge now occurs close to shore in shallow waters, concerns have been raised that human health impacts under the current disposal system may be greater than those associated with the previous ocean dumping of untreated pharmaceutical waste. In particular, currents and wave action in the area of discharge have been demonstrated to carry waste constituents back to shore (208, 594).

Regulatory Framework

Dumping of pharmaceutical wastes at the Puerto Rico dumpsite was regulated under the Ocean Dumping Criteria of MPRSA. The present discharge of effluent from the Barceloneta treatment plant is regulated under an NPDES permit.

FISH PROCESSING WASTES

Composition and Quantities of Waste Generated

These wastes arise from the processing of seafood for a variety of products. The large tuna and fishmeal industries engage in year-round operations; most other food waste generators are small, seasonal, specialized facilities. Prior to treatment, these wastes are composed entirely of organic matter and “conventional” pollutants: oil, grease, and solids (139). In 1980, 1.4 to 2.0 million metric tons of seafood processing material was produced, an increase of 35 to 41 percent since 1970 (138).

Management and Disposal Practices

Most seafood processing material is converted to marketable meal and fertilizer or is recycled (140). The remaining waste can be treated prior to NPDES-permitted discharge, or directly disposed of by landfiling, land application, or marine dumping. Data on the relative use of these options are not available.

Primary treatment using dissolved air flotation (DAF) systems is typically employed by large processing facilities (140). These systems use coagulant to remove solids from wastewater, thereby generating DAF sludges which are not exempt from ocean dumping regulations. The small quantity of DAF sludge currently generated is disposed of in landfills. EPA is considering requiring DAF systems for virtually all seafood processing waste generators. If applied throughout the industry, about 2000 metric tons of DAF sludge would be produced annually (140).

Quantities of Waste Marine-Disposed

The only site designated for dumping of fish processing wastes is in the Pacific Ocean near American Samoa (45 FR 77435, Nov. 24, 1980; ref. 86). This interim site, which is administered by EPA Region IX, was approved for up to 118,000 wet metric tons per year and for a period of 3 years, pending completion of further studies. Actual quantities of waste dumped at the site were 17,000 wet metric tons in 1982 and 19,500 wet metric tons in 1983 (648).

Region IX expects an increase in requests to dump seafood processing wastes in marine waters, primarily DAF treatment sludge from tuna canneries (140). EPA has proposed to designate a dump-
site in the Southern California Bight for cannery wastes generated by Star-Kist Foods, Inc. (102).

**Fate, Availability, and Impact of Waste Constituents**

Disposal of these wastes in poorly mixed or relatively enclosed coastal marine environments could cause nutrient overloading. Proper disposal in well-mixed ocean environments appears to be essentially nonhazardous, although some concerns have been raised over potential impacts of the chemical coagulants introduced during DAF treatment (140).

**COAL ASH AND FLUE GAS DESULFURIZATION SLUDGES**

**Composition**

Coal ash is the incombustible, inorganic, or mineral fraction of coal remaining after its combustion in industrial and public-owned boilers. It includes fly ash captured by stack scrubbers and bottom ash/slag that is left behind in the boiler. FGD sludges are produced when sulfur-containing flue gases react with air pollution control scrubber reagents (usually calcium carbonate or limestone).

The chemical composition of coal ash varies considerably with the type of coal from which it is derived (288). Primary constituents include the salts and oxides of silicon, aluminum, iron, calcium, magnesium, sodium, potassium, titanium, and sulfur. Other significant trace (<1 percent) constituents include barium, strontium, manganese, and boron. Coal ash leachate has a pH between 6 to 11.5. The composition and quantity of FGD sludge depends on the type of air pollution controls that are employed. It typically contains 5 to 15 percent solids initially and 30 to 80 percent solids after dewatering, and has a pH of 3 to 13 (139,141). Primary components are calcium sulfites, sulfates, and carbonate; major trace elements include barium, boron, copper, fluorine, manganese, molybdenum, nickel, and zinc (288).

Currently, coal ash and FGD sludge from electric utilities are characterized as nonhazardous under RCRA (40 CFR 261.4(b)(4)). However, EPA has proposed new procedures for testing the toxicity of leachates from wastes, which could lead to the classification of some utility wastes as hazardous. The original exemption of such wastes from regulation as hazardous wastes was intended to allow EPA to complete environmental impact studies and determine a course of action (141).

**Quantities of Waste Generated**

Estimates of the amount of coal ash and FGD sludge generated annually in the United States vary considerably, but they are clearly very high-volume wastes that will continue to increase in quantity at least through the end of this century (table 31). Coal-burning utilities are estimated to produce about 95 percent of total utility ash; the remainder arises from burning of other fossil fuels. Rapid increases in the generation of these wastes are occurring, due to wider application and greater efficiency of sulfur dioxide removal technology, as well as increased coal consumption. 

The East Coast States, from Pennsylvania south, and the Gulf States of Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana, are the major sources of utility coal ash and FGD sludge. These States are also expected to exhibit the largest increase in waste generation through 2000 (141; Tobin, 1982, cited in ref. 140).

**Management and Disposal Practices**

Most utility coal waste is presently disposed of onsite, in unlined landfills and impoundments (table 31); however, the use of unlined impoundments is declining because of concerns about ground-
Table 31.—Quantities and Current Management of Utility Coal Ash and FGD Sludge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coal ash</th>
<th>FGD sludge</th>
<th>Reference*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual quantities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>85 mmt</td>
<td>18 mmt</td>
<td>USWAG, 1982; EG&amp;G, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>155 mmt</td>
<td>52 mmt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current management practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent disposed onsite</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>JRB, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent disposed off site</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>EG&amp;G, 1983; EPRI, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent sold</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in landfills</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in wet ponds</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in mines</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent used commercially</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A list of references at end of report.

Quantities are in million metric tons (wet weight).

SOURCE Office of Technology Assessment, 1987

water contamination and land reclamation (141). These wastes are distinguished from unprocessed wastes arising from seafood cleaning, which are exempted from ocean dumping regulations (40 CFR 220. l(c)(l)).

Some 10 to 20 percent of utility coal wastes are currently recycled or reused in cement manufacture, building materials, road surfacing, sand blasting, roofing, and ice and snow control. While recycling and reuse will increase somewhat, it is not expected to keep up with increases in waste generation. By the year 2000, only an estimated 16 percent of utility coal ash and a much smaller fraction of FGD sludge will be recycled or reused (680). Thus, the vast majority of coal wastes will continue to require disposal.

In contrast to present practices, most future disposal—at least 80 percent—is expected to take place offsite because of insufficient onsite disposal capacity (Tobin, 1982, cited in ref. 140).

**Potential for Marine Disposal**

No coal ash or FGD sludge is currently disposed of in marine waters, except for research purposes. However, with land for disposal becoming increasingly scarce, and with accelerating coal conversion taking place in New England, the use of the ocean for such disposal has recently received attention: in particular, ConEdison of New York has requested permission to dump fly ash at the 106-mile deepwater dumpsite (488). In the absence of regulatory restrictions on the ocean disposal of coal ash, over one-fourth of the total ash generated in the coastal regions (representing over one-tenth of the national total) might be economically disposed of in the ocean by 2000. Estimates for FGD sludge are even higher: about 40 percent of all the FGD sludge generated in coastal regions in 2000, representing over one-fourth of the national total (140). Estimated costs for ocean disposal are about $5 per metric ton, compared to about $16 per metric ton for landfilling (1982 dollars).

Utility coal ash has been dumped in marine waters for many years by the United Kingdom (131, 401). In the United States, two research projects involving dumping of consolidated coal ash in the New York Bight have been conducted (131), and it is possible that coal-waste blocks could be used to construct artificial reefs in both marine and freshwater environments (131, 213).

**Fate, Availability, and Impact of Waste Constituents**

The principal problems associated with marine disposal of untreated coal ash or FGD sludge include dissolved oxygen depletion, increased turbidity, sulfite toxicity to marine organisms, smothering of benthic organisms, and release of metals. These concerns particularly limit the potential for disposing of FGD wastes in marine waters (131).

A promising potential option to address these problems involves the consolidation of a mixture...
of FGD sludge, fly ash, and lime into solid forms (433). The resulting material exhibits significantly decreased release rates for sulfite and metals, and resulting leachates show reduced toxicity to marine organisms. The consolidated material maintains structural integrity over periods of years in the marine environment, and may therefore be an appropriate material for building artificial reefs to provide substrates for colonization by marine organisms and enhance fisheries.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Administrative Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAT</td>
<td>Best Available Technology (Economically Achievable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCT</td>
<td>Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMR</td>
<td>Baseline Monitoring Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD</td>
<td>Biochemical Oxygen Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPJ</td>
<td>Best Professional Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPT</td>
<td>Best Practicable Control Technology (Currently Available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBP</td>
<td>Chesapeake Bay Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ</td>
<td>Council on Environmental Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCLA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>Compliance Sampling Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Combined Sewer Overflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZMA</td>
<td>Coastal Zone Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAF</td>
<td>Dissolved Air Flotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDT</td>
<td>Dichlorodiphenyl Trichloroethane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMR</td>
<td>Discharge Monitoring Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF</td>
<td>Environmental Defense Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIL</td>
<td>Environmental Impairment Liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Enforcement Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>Extraction Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA</td>
<td>Food and Drug Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDF</td>
<td>Fundamentally Different Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Flue Gas Desulfurization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWS</td>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>General Accounting Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCWDA</td>
<td>Gulf Coast Waste Disposal Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDC</td>
<td>London Dumping Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLW</td>
<td>Low-level Radioactive Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDSID</td>
<td>Monitoring and Data Support Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRSA</td>
<td>Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACOA</td>
<td>National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>Nuclear Energy Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEMP</td>
<td>Northeast Monitoring Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEP</td>
<td>National Estuary Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMBY</td>
<td>Not In My Backyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMFS</td>
<td>National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMPP</td>
<td>National Marine Pollution Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRDC</td>
<td>Natural Resource Defense Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSPS</td>
<td>New Source Performance Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAD</td>
<td>Ocean Assessments Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCRSF</td>
<td>Organic Chemicals, Plastics, and Synthetic Fibers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMSP</td>
<td>Office of Marine and Estuarine Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAH</td>
<td>Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB</td>
<td>Polychlorinated Biphenyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>Permit Compliance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFRP</td>
<td>Process to Further Reduce Pathogens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRT</td>
<td>Pretreatment Implementation Review Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTW</td>
<td>Publicly Owned Treatment Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSES</td>
<td>Pretreatment Standards for Existing Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSNS</td>
<td>Pretreatment Standards for New Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRP</td>
<td>Process to Significantly Reduce Pathogens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSWQA</td>
<td>Puget Sound Water Quality Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QNCR</td>
<td>Quarterly Noncompliance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFF</td>
<td>Resources For the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB</td>
<td>Science Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASSR</td>
<td>Semi-Annual Statistical Summary Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>Submerged Aquatic Vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCWWRP</td>
<td>Southern California Coastal Water Research Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNC</td>
<td>Significant Noncompliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPMS</td>
<td>Strategic Planning and Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBT</td>
<td>Tributyltin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCDD</td>
<td>Tetrachlorodioxidin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCDF</td>
<td>Tetrachlorodibenzofuran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCLP</td>
<td>Toxic Characteristic Leachate Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCA</td>
<td>Toxic Substances Control Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRAC</td>
<td>Violation Review Action Criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>