

November 26, 2018

Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality
Land Protection Division
Attn: Ms. Hillary Young
PO Box 1677
Oklahoma City, OK 73101-1677

Submitted via electronic mail (per ODEQ instructions)

Re: Public Comments of Sierra Club, Waterkeeper Alliance, and LEAD Agency Regarding the Solid Waste Draft Permit for the Big Fork Ranch CCR Landfill

To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept these public comments submitted jointly by Sierra Club, Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc., and LEAD Agency (collectively the “Citizen Groups”) regarding the Solid Waste Draft Permit (“Draft Permit”) for Evans and Associates Construction Company, Inc. (“Evans”), to operate a coal combustion residuals (“CCR”) landfill at Big Fork Ranch in Noble County, Oklahoma. The Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (“ODEQ”) published the Draft Permit for comment on October 23, 2018, with the comment period advertised as running through today’s date, November 26, 2018.¹ The Citizen Groups are non-profit organizations interested and engaged in public health and environmental protection, whose members reside in Noble County, throughout Oklahoma, and across the United States.

ODEQ should decline to approve the Draft Permit at this time or in its present form. For one, the Draft Permit is ill-timed, given the current state of flux and uncertainty surrounding federal and state laws that directly impact the contours and fundamental legality of state-issued CCR permits in Oklahoma. DEQ should therefore decline to issue CCR permits until the applicable legal frameworks have materially congealed. In addition, the Draft Permit is substantively deficient in multiple regards. It fails to adequately safeguard human health and the environment from the threats and impacts of hazardous CCR material, which is already harming local Oklahomans and their surroundings by contaminating the water with CCR toxins and polluting the air and land

¹ Counterintuitively and problematically, ODEQ’s online portal for submitting comments – <http://www.deq.state.ok.us/mainlinks/publicpermits.html> – apparently ceases to accept comments at 12:00 am on the morning that the comment period closes; by contrast, normally portals close at the end of the evening of the day listed as the deadline. This unorthodox convention could very well thwart members of the public from succeeding in leaving a comment on the last day of the period. In addition, the online portal does not support the uploading of attachments, which inhibits members of the public from submitting Word documents, PDFs, or other files—which are common, often necessary vehicles for public comments—short of calling ODEQ and figuring out whom to email. The Citizen Groups urge ODEQ to address both of these problematic and unusual shortcomings, each of which tends to undermine full and fair public participation.

surfaces with coal ash dust. It also fails to guarantee sufficient transparency and public process for affected residents, or to take into account environmental justice. Therefore, as discussed in greater detail below, ODEQ should not approve this troubling and legally vulnerable Draft Permit.

I. The Citizen Groups and Their Members

Sierra Club is a non-profit organization headquartered in Oakland, California, with more than 3 million members and supporters nationwide, including more than 4,200 members in the Oklahoma Chapter, some near Big Fork Ranch. America's largest grassroots environmental group, Sierra Club's mission is to explore, enjoy, and protect the wild places of the earth; to practice and promote the responsible use of the Earth's resources and ecosystems; to educate and enlist humanity to protect and restore the quality of the natural and human environment; and to use all lawful means to carry out those objectives. Its activities include public education, advocacy, and litigation to enforce environmental laws.

Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc. is a non-profit organization headquartered in New York, New York. Waterkeeper Alliance unites more than 300 Waterkeeper Member Organizations and Affiliates on the frontlines of the global water crisis, patrolling and protecting more than 2.5 million square miles of waterways on six continents. From the Great Lakes to the Himalayas, Alaska to Australia, the Waterkeeper movement defends the fundamental human right to drinkable, fishable, and swimmable waters, and combines firsthand knowledge of local waterways with an unwavering commitment to the rights of communities. Within the United States, Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc. works with more than 170 Waterkeeper Member Organizations and Affiliates.

LEAD Agency is a non-profit organization headquartered in Vinita, Oklahoma, with a satellite office in Miami, Oklahoma, and with members in the Grand River Watershed. LEAD Agency focuses on issues that affect the Grand River Watershed and its water quality. LEAD Agency has advocated for the cleanup of Tar Creek and the Tar Creek Superfund Site, and for the downstream restoration and eventual cleanup of the Tri-State Mining District affecting three states with legacy mining of lead and zinc. It is a Waterkeeper Member Organization and stands with the Waterkeeper movement for drinkable, fishable, and swimmable waters.

II. The CCR Landfill at Big Fork Ranch Is Toxic and Dangerous.

Coal ash is a hazardous material that can harm human health and the environment when handled and disposed of improperly. Unfortunately, thousands of tons of CCR produced each year by coal-fired Oklahoma power plants are not being managed with adequate care and precaution. This includes coal ash generated by the Sooner Generating Station operated by Oklahoma Gas

and Electric Company (“OG&E”), which trucks its CCR waste up to the nearby Big Fork Ranch to be dumped in the landfill that is the object of the Draft Permit.

CCR is made up of fly ash, bottom ash, scrubber sludge and boiler slag. It contains some of the most toxic and deadliest chemicals known, including carcinogens, neurotoxins, and poisons such as arsenic, cadmium, hexavalent chromium, lead, mercury, and thallium. When CCR is dumped without proper safeguards, hazardous chemicals are released to groundwater, surface water, soil, and air, and nearby communities and ecosystems are harmed. As detailed below and in public comments, attached hereto as **Appendix A**, submitted earlier this year by the Citizen Groups to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”), there is ample evidence that CCR regulatory oversight has failed to prevent contamination of Oklahoma’s waters, or to stop CCR from blowing into and harming Oklahoma communities.²

These dangers are neither hypothetical nor remote. Rather, the transportation, disposal, and storage of CCR are already causing actual harm to citizens and the environment around Big Fork Ranch specifically, in addition to other CCR sites across the state (and nation).

III. ODEQ Should Not Approve State CCR Permits Without the Greater, Forthcoming Clarity Concerning the Laws Underpinning Them.

Due to ongoing regulatory revisions and lawsuits, there is currently a state of significant flux and uncertainty surrounding the scope and legitimacy of the federal and state laws that necessarily constrain state CCR permits and allow their issuance by ODEQ. In light of this legal murkiness, ODEQ should decline to issue any state CCR permits until greater clarity and certainty about the applicable legal frameworks are achieved.

For one, the form of the so-called CCR Rule—the federal law concerning CCR regulation that sets out, *inter alia*, minimum requirements for lawful CCR management—is doubly in flux. First, significant aspects of the 2015 CCR Rule were recently held by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit to be unlawfully narrow and lax, including its exemption of “legacy ponds” as well as its regulatory treatment of unlined and clay-lined impoundments. *Util. Solid Waste Activities Grp. v. Env’tl. Prot. Agency*, 901 F.3d 414 (D.C. Cir. 2018), judgment entered, No. 15-1219, 2018 WL 4158384 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 21, 2018). Accordingly, the Rule was partially vacated and remanded to EPA for revision consistent with that ruling. Second, just before that decision, EPA issued a final rule purporting to soften aspects of the 2015 version of the rule (which was held to be unlawfully weak shortly thereafter). *Hazardous and Solid Waste Management*

² See March 19, 2018, Comments on Oklahoma: Approval of State Coal Combustion Residuals State Permit Program, 83 Fed. Reg. 2100 (January 16, 2018), Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OLEM-2017-0613 (Appendix A hereto).

System: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electric Utilities; Amendments to the National Minimum Criteria (Phase One, Part One), 83 Fed Reg. 36,435 (July 30, 2018). A petition for review of that rulemaking is now pending in the D.C. Circuit.³ In sum, the core obligations and parameters set out in the federal law, with which state CCR programs, permits, and regulated entities must comply, are currently tentative and evolving.

Meanwhile, the legitimacy of the Oklahoma state program under which ODEQ has the color of authority to issue state CCR permits like the Draft Permit is in doubt. Namely, a citizen suit filed this fall by the Citizen Groups in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia is challenging the lawfulness of EPA’s approval of Oklahoma’s state coal ash program, and seeking vacatur thereof. *See Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc. v. Wheeler*, D.D.C. Civ. Action No. 1:18-cv-2230 (Sept. 26, 2018). That lawsuit is poised to affect the validity of state CCR permits issued by ODEQ.

It would be wasteful and imprudent for ODEQ now to finalize and issue state CCR permits, given the pendency of multiple concurrent regulatory and judicial proceedings that directly affect such permits’ shape and basic legitimacy. ODEQ should therefore decline to issue state CCR permits until the applicable legal framework has congealed. Alternatively, ODEQ should at least revise the Draft Permit to include an express reopener clause—requiring fresh public comment on, and regulatory re-examination of, Big Fork Ranch’s CCR permit following any material regulatory or judicial development concerning any federal or state law undergirding the permit.

IV. The CCR at Big Fork Ranch Presents Risks to Groundwater and Surface Water, Hence the Landfill Should Not Be Allowed to Close with the Toxic Ash Left in Place.

Groundwater monitoring at Big Fork Ranch demonstrates that coal ash contaminants are entering both local groundwater and, likely, the surface water of the Arkansas River. Groundwater monitoring results have revealed repeating high levels exceeding either maximum contaminant levels⁴ (“MCL”) or groundwater protection standards of coal ash contaminants in the groundwater, as applicable—including those for arsenic, cobalt, lead, lithium, boron, sulfate, and antimony. Evans only began assessment monitoring at Big Fork Ranch on January 6, 2018, thus limiting the scope of available groundwater monitoring data for many of the contaminants.⁵ Yet,

³ A link to that petition for review can be accessed at <https://earthjustice.org/news/press/2018/environmental-groups-challenge-trump-administration-coal-ash-rule-rollback-in-court>.

⁴ *See* 40 C.F.R. § 141.51.

⁵ *See* Emera Corporation, Interim/2018 Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring and Corrective Action Report (Jul. 2018) at 245-290 (hereinafter “2018 Groundwater Monitoring Report”), available at <http://evansandassociatesconstructioncompany.com/Docs/Interim2018%20Semi-Annual%20Groundwater%20Monitoring%20and%20Corrective%20Action%20Report.pdf>.

testing has nonetheless demonstrated the following examples of coal ash contaminants entering groundwater at Big Fork Ranch at unsafe levels.⁶

- Arsenic has been detected at levels exceeding the MCL at GWMP #6A, as shown in samples taken on 03/03/18 and 04/14/18.
 - Arsenic causes multiple types of cancer, neurological damage, and other health effects.
- Cobalt has been detected at up to 14 times the groundwater protection standard recently set by EPA⁷ at GWMP #6A and #10A as shown in samples taken on 03/03/18 and 04/14/18.
 - Cobalt harms the heart, blood, thyroid, and other parts of the body.
- Lead has been detected at up to 3.5 times EPA’s “action level”⁸ at GWMP #6A on 3/3/18 and 4.14.18 and #10A on 04/14/18.
 - Lead causes severe neurological damage and is also categorized by the U.S. EPA as a “probable” carcinogen.
- Lithium has been detected at up to 1.7 times the groundwater protection standard recently set by EPA at GWMP #6A on 03/03/18 and 04/14/18.
 - Lithium presents multiple health risks, including neurological impacts.
- Boron has been detected at up to 1.5 times EPA’s drinking water health advisory in GWMP #10A, including in samples taken on 03/03/18, 04/14/18, 01/06/18, 11/11/17, 10/14/17, 07/29/17, and 09/10/17.
 - Boron poses developmental risks to humans, such as low birth weight, and can result in stunted growth and plant toxicity in aquatic ecosystems. It is also a key coal ash “indicator” pollutant, often used to detect the release of coal ash contaminants because it leaches from coal ash but very few other sources.
- Sulfate has been detected at more than double EPA’s drinking water advisory of 500 mg/L in GWMP #10A, including in samples taken on 03/03/18, 04/14/18, 01/06/18, 11/11/17, 10/14/17, 07/29/17, and 09/10/17.
 - Sulfate causes diarrhea and can lead to dangerous levels of dehydration in young children.
- Antimony has been detected at unsafe levels on at GWMP #6A, on 03/03/18.
 - Antimony may damage the liver and kidneys and affect the heart.

⁶ See Earthjustice, *Groundwater Contamination from Oklahoma Coal Ash Dumps and Noncompliance with the Federal Coal Ash Rule* (June 2018), available at <https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/files/OK%20Fact%20Sheet%20Groundwater%20Contamination%20and%20Noncompliance%20FNL%206.18.18.pdf>.

⁷ See 40 C.F.R. § 257.95(h)(2).

⁸ See *id.* § 141.80.

These contaminants are also likely entering the Arkansas River. Maps submitted by Evans demonstrate that the groundwater under the Big Fork Ranch site flows directly to the river, while GWMP #10A—where many contaminants are being detected—is the farthest downgradient monitoring well.⁹ Furthermore, mapping provided in Evans’ Big Fork Ranch CCR permit application suggests that coal ash may be saturated in groundwater at the site. For example, “Map 7A”, the cross-section plot at the bottom right of the map shows “fly ash” that may be situated lower than the high and low water mark.¹⁰

Under the Draft Permit, Big Fork Ranch’s closure plan would allow coal ash to be left in place and covered.¹¹ Groundwater monitoring results demonstrate, however, that the coal ash is leaching dangerous contaminants into groundwater at unsafe levels—contamination that would continue if the coal ash were left in place, especially if coal ash is in contact with groundwater. Therefore, no permit should be finalized without requiring that closure of the Big Fork Ranch landfill must entail removal of all coal ash and disposal in a lined landfill.

V. Big Fork Ranch’s Groundwater Monitoring Plan Should Require Monitoring All Aquifers at the Site.

Big Fork Ranch’s application, in particular Map 7A, shows two different “low water” and “high water” points.¹² This suggests that there may be two different aquifers under the site. In order to adequately monitor the groundwater impacts of the coal ash, Big Fork Ranch’s groundwater monitoring plan should be designed so that it monitors water quality in all underlying geologic formations and/or aquifers underneath the site. Otherwise, contamination of the groundwater with CCR toxins could go undetected and would risk harming the Oklahomans who use it.

⁹ 2018 Groundwater Monitoring Report, *supra* n.5, at 5.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Evans and Associates Construction Co., *Map 7A* (Sept. 2017), available at <http://evansandassociatesconstructioncompany.com/Docs/Full%20Tier%20III%20Permit%20Application%20and%20Maps/mp-7A.pdf>.

¹¹ Evans and Associates Construction Co., *Closure and Post Closure Plans* at 4, available at <http://evansandassociatesconstructioncompany.com/Docs/Closure%20and%20Post-Closure%20Plans/Closure%20and%20Post%20Closure%20Plans.pdf>.

¹² *Map 7A*, *supra* n.10, available at <http://evansandassociatesconstructioncompany.com/Docs/Full%20Tier%20III%20Permit%20Application%20and%20Maps/mp-7A.pdf>.

VI. No CCR Permit Should Be Granted “For Life,” as Underscored by the Conditions and Risks Shifting Over Time at Big Fork Ranch.

The Draft Permit troublingly provides: “OAC 252:517-3-1 mandates the duration of this permit is for the life of the facility.”¹³ Oklahoma’s proposed new practice of granting permits “for life” is one reason many of the undersigned groups are challenging EPA’s approval of Oklahoma’s coal ash program in federal court, as noted above. The ongoing risks at Big Fork Ranch serve to illustrate the critical, commonsense point that it is imprudent and dangerous (besides legally infirm) to grant CCR disposal sites a permit for life, without requiring periodic re-examination and re-approval (as is the norm in other environmental regulatory programs).

- a. The risk of increased seismic activity at Big Fork Ranch may lead to a need to revisit and modify the permit in the future.*

Over the past decade, Noble County has experienced extraordinary increases in the frequency and severity of earthquakes, in connection with increased deep wastewater disposal.¹⁴ There remains a continued risk of severe seismic activity at Big Fork Ranch, and the risks of this kind of seismic activity have not been considered by Evans and are not contemplated in the Draft Permit.¹⁵ Granting Big Fork Ranch a CCR landfill permit for life prevents the public from reviewing and commenting on permit modifications that may be needed if seismic activity creates risks at Big Fork Ranch. This is just one of many reasons why a coal ash facility, with extensive environmental and health risks, should not be granted a lifetime solid waste permit.

- b. The complicated hydrogeology at Big Fork Ranch underscores the need for continued public participation in evaluating the adequacy of any future revisions to important reports and plans.*

Maps provided as part of Evans’ Big Fork Ranch CCR permit application suggest that aspects of the hydrogeology are potentially complicated or unknown, as noted above.¹⁶ Maps such as Map 7A suggest that water levels may be different levels throughout the site, and that the soil composition is unknown in some locations. If plans for monitoring, closure, post-closure, and corrective action need to be revised in the future to reflect new information, the public may not have a chance to comment on them. These documents and decisions could have widespread impacts on public health and environmental impacts. The public should have an opportunity to

¹³ Draft Permit at 3.

¹⁴ See, e.g., U.S. Geological Survey, *Induced Earthquakes*, available at <https://earthquake.usgs.gov/research/induced/hazards.php> (accessed on November 25, 2018).

¹⁵ Evans and Associates Construction Co., CCR Permit Application (Sept. 2017) at 13.

¹⁶ See, e.g., Map 7A, *supra* n.10.

review and comment on such important developments modifications that affect their health, community, and environment.

VII. It Is Critical That Evans Posts Documents on a Public Website in a Timely and Reasonably Accessible Manner.

The Citizen Groups emphasize the importance of material information about Big Fork Ranch being timely and reasonably accessible to the public. As provided by the Draft Permit, Evans must continue to make all required documents available to the public by posting the information on a publicly accessible Internet site in accordance with OAC 252:517-19-3.¹⁷ Clear, intuitive public access to information such as the Groundwater Monitoring and Corrective Action report is vital to interested Oklahomans' awareness of, and engagement regarding, the health and environmental risks and impacts of Big Fork Ranch.

VIII. ODEQ Fails to Recognize or Mitigate the Current Harms to Ponca Tribe Members that Big Fork Ranch's CCR Landfill Is Causing, Raising Environmental Justice Concerns.

The Big Fork Ranch CCR landfill constitutes a direct threat and source of ongoing harm to local Oklahomans, including Ponca Tribe members. The case of Casey Camp-Horinek, a Ponca Tribal Council member who lives about two miles southeast of Big Fork Ranch, is illustrative. Ms. Camp-Horinek and her family are exposed to coal ash pollution in a number of ways, have been deeply concerned about it, and expect regulators to protect them from unjust, undue harm.

The harms experienced by Ms. Camp-Horinek and her family include, for example, their exposed to coal ash dust. The trucks that carry coal ash from the Sooner plant up to Big Fork Ranch pass near Ms. Camp-Horinek's residence, and she has witnessed the dust blowing from those trucks towards her home. Her family has needed to change the filters for their air conditioning and heating system more and more frequently, and she has ceased gardening due to concerns about the settling CCR dust.

Additionally, they are exposed to CCR pollution in nearby surface waters. They are concerned about a pond at the Big Fork Ranch, for one, whose trout they used to fish and eat, but which they no longer do as a result of the perceived sickening of the fish. Further, her family is exposed to CCR pollution of the Arkansas River, which Big Fork Ranch abuts just a few miles upstream from Ms. Camp-Horinek's home, and where they used to fish, pick fruit, and forage for mushrooms. They no longer do so, given their concerns about the CCR contamination, and have similarly ceased hunting deer in the area.

¹⁷ See Draft Permit at 8.

Ms. Camp-Horinek is also concerned about CCR pollution of groundwater. The groundwater under and around her home is only about eight to twenty feet below the ground's surface. Her home, like many in the Marland community, has a well from which her family used to procure water for drinking and other household uses. However, due to concerns about CCR, her household has stopped drinking well water and instead has resorted to buying drinking water.

Regrettably, neither Evans nor ODEQ's Draft Permit recognizes these harms, let alone takes adequate steps to mitigate and prevent them. This failure raises concerns about not only general vigilance and lawfulness, but also environmental justice, in view of the adverse effect on members of the Native American community. The Citizen Groups urge ODEQ to acknowledge these problems, to require adequate steps by Evans to address them, and to enhance ODEQ's engagement with the Ponca Tribe and the rest of the affected local community about CCR issues, now and into the future.

* * *

As discussed above, the Citizen Groups respectfully urge ODEQ not to issue, at this time or in its present form, the Draft Permit for the CCR landfill at Big Fork Ranch. The Citizen Groups thank ODEQ for considering these comments, and exhort it to act in the best interests of the health and wellbeing of Oklahomans and their environment.

Sincerely,

Johnson Grimm-Bridgwater
Director, Oklahoma Chapter, Sierra Club
600 NW 23rd, Suite 204
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73103
johnson.grimm-bridgwater@sierraclub.org

Matthew E. Miller
Staff Attorney, Sierra Club
50 F Street NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20001
matthew.miller@sierraclub.org

Larissa U. Liebmann
Staff Attorney, Waterkeeper Alliance
180 Maiden Lane, Suite 603
New York, NY 10038
LLiebmann@waterkeeper.org

Appendix A

*March 19, 2018, Comments of the Citizen Groups submitted to U.S. EPA re:
Oklahoma: Approval of State Coal Combustion Residuals State Permit Program,
83 Fed. Reg. 2100 (January 16, 2018), Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OLEM-2017-0613*

March 19, 2018

Mary Jackson
Materials Recovery and Waste Management Division
Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery (5304P)
Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20460
jackson.mary@epa.gov
<https://www.regulations.gov>

Re: Comments on Oklahoma: Approval of State Coal Combustion Residuals State Permit Program, 83 Fed. Reg. 2100 (January 16, 2018), Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OLEM-2017-0613.

Dear Ms. Jackson:

On behalf of Earthjustice, Grand Riverkeeper, Local Environmental Action Demanded, Inc. (“LEAD Agency, Inc.”), the Sierra Club, Tar Creekkeeper, and Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc., please accept the following comments on the Environmental Protection Agency’s (“EPA”) notice of availability and request for comment concerning Oklahoma: Approval of State Coal Combustion Residuals State Permit Program, 83 Fed. Reg. 2100 (January 16, 2018), Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OLEM-2017-0613. We urge EPA to deny Oklahoma’s request for approval of its coal combustion residuals program (“Oklahoma’s Application”) for failure to meet requirements of the 2016 Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (the “WIIN Act”), the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (“RCRA”), and implementing regulations. We further note that EPA must not approve Oklahoma’s Application, or any other state CCR program application, unless and until it promulgates guidelines for public participation in such programs pursuant to RCRA § 7004(b)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 6974(b)(1).

I. Coal Combustion Residuals are Causing Ongoing, Serious Harm to the People and Environment of Oklahoma.

Each year, coal-fired power plants in Oklahoma generate many thousands of tons of coal combustion residuals (“CCR” or “coal ash”), a toxic waste made up of fly ash, bottom ash, scrubber sludge and boiler slag. CCR contains some of the most toxic and deadliest chemicals known, including carcinogens, neurotoxins, and poisons such as arsenic, cadmium, hexavalent chromium, lead, mercury, and thallium. When CCR is dumped without proper safeguards, hazardous chemicals are released to groundwater, surface water, soil, and air, and nearby communities and ecosystems are harmed. There is ample evidence that CCR regulatory oversight by state agencies has failed to prevent contamination of Oklahoma’s fresh groundwater and stop CCR from blowing into and harming Oklahoma communities.

a. Toxic Effects of Coal Ash Pollutants

Coal ash contains a toxic stew of metals and other chemicals that are harmful, and sometimes deadly, to people, wildlife, and aquatic life. While exposure to individual coal ash pollutants can cause devastating damage, concurrent exposure to multiple contaminants may intensify the effects of individual contaminants, or may give rise to interactions and synergies that create new effects. Where several coal ash contaminants share a common mechanism of toxicity or affect the same bodily organ or organ system, exposure to several contaminants concurrently produces a greater chance of increased risk to health. Effects of some of the pollutants frequently found in coal ash include:

- *Arsenic* is a known carcinogen that causes multiple forms of cancer in humans. It is also a toxic pollutant, 40 C.F.R. § 401.15, and a priority pollutant, 40 C.F.R. Part 423 App. A. Arsenic is associated with non-cancer health effects of the skin and the nervous system.
- *Lead* is a very potent neurotoxicant that is highly damaging to the nervous system. Health effects associated with exposure to lead include, but are not limited to, neurotoxicity, developmental delays, hypertension, impaired hearing acuity, impaired hemoglobin synthesis, and male reproductive impairment. Importantly, many of lead's health effects may occur without overt signs of toxicity. Lead is also classified by the EPA as a "probable human carcinogen." Lead is a toxic pollutant, 40 C.F.R. § 401.15, and a priority pollutant, 40 C.F.R. Part 423, App. A.
- *Cadmium* is a toxic pollutant, 40 C.F.R. § 401.15, and a priority pollutant, 40 C.F.R. Part 423, App. A. Chronic exposure to cadmium can result in kidney disease and obstructive lung diseases such as emphysema. Cadmium may also be related to increased blood pressure (hypertension) and is a possible lung carcinogen. Cadmium affects calcium metabolism and can result in bone mineral loss and associated bone loss, osteoporosis, and bone fractures.
- *Chromium*, in its hexavalent form – the form that nearly all chromium in coal ash takes – is a potent carcinogen.¹ Chromium is a toxic pollutant, 40 C.F.R. § 401.15, and a priority pollutant, 40 C.F.R. Part 423, App. A.
- *Selenium* is a toxic pollutant, 40 C.F.R. § 401.15, and a priority pollutant, 40 C.F.R. Part 423, App. A, and excess exposure can cause a chemical-specific condition known as selenosis, with symptoms that include hair and nail loss.
- *Antimony* may damage the liver and kidneys and may affect the heart. Chronic exposure to antimony can cause an ulcer or a hole in the septum dividing the inner nose, sometimes with bleeding or discharge. Repeated exposure can affect the lungs, cause an abnormal

¹ See, e.g., Earthjustice, "EPA's Blind Spot: Hexavalent Chromium in Coal Ash, Coal ash may be the secret source of cancer-causing chromium in your drinking water," Feb. 1, 2011, available at <https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/CoalAshChromeReport.pdf>.

chest x-ray to develop, and lead to permanent lung damage. Antimony is a toxic pollutant, 40 C.F.R. § 401.15, and a priority pollutant, 40 C.F.R. Part 423, App. A.

- *Nickel* is a probable carcinogen. Nickel can cause headache, dizziness, nausea and vomiting, and may also cause scarring of the lungs and affect the kidneys. Nickel is a toxic pollutant, 40 C.F.R. § 401.15, and a priority pollutant, 40 C.F.R. Part 423, App. A.
- *Vanadium*, according to the U.S. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (“ATSDR”), can cause nausea, diarrhea, and stomach cramps. And the International Agency for Research on Cancer (“IARC”) has determined that vanadium is possibly carcinogenic to humans.
- *Barium* can cause gastrointestinal disturbances and muscular weakness. Ingesting large amounts, dissolved in water, can change heart rhythm and cause paralysis and possibly death. Barium can also cause increased blood pressure.
- *Molybdenum* has been linked to gout (joint pain, fatigue), high blood pressure, liver disease, and potential adverse impacts on the reproductive system.²
- *Manganese* is known to be toxic to the nervous system. Manganese concentrations greater than .05 mg/L render water unusable by discoloring the water, giving it a metallic taste, and causing black staining. Exposure to high levels can affect the nervous system; very high levels may impair brain development in children.
- *Total Dissolved Solids* (“TDS”), in high concentrations, can make drinking water unpalatable and can cause scale buildup in pipes, valves and filters, reducing performance and adding to system maintenance costs.
- *Sulfate*, at high concentrations (greater than 500 mg/L – found in sampling results at several Oklahoma CCR units) can result in a mild laxative response.

b. Toxic Coal Ash Pollution in Oklahoma

In the words of the Oklahoma Supreme Court, “[n]o commodity affects and concerns the citizens of Oklahoma more than fresh groundwater.” *DuLaney v. Okla. State Dep’t of Health*, 1993 OK 113, 868 P.2d 676, 684 (Ok. 1993). Increasing evidence shows that coal ash is significantly damaging groundwater, surface water and air quality at coal ash disposal sites in Oklahoma. Coal ash dumps at American Electric Power’s (“AEP”) Northeastern plant in Oologah, for example, have been shown to be releasing poisons into groundwater since

² Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, “Toxicological Profile for Molybdenum: Draft for Public Comment, April 2017,” at pp. 9-10, available at <https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxprofiles/tp212.pdf>.

monitoring began there in 2008.³ The plant has a bottom ash impoundment and a landfill, both unlined,⁴ located near the banks of the Verdigris River and Oologah Lake.

Protection of the fresh groundwater in and around Oologah Lake and the Verdigris River is important for protecting public health and the environment. Oologah Lake and its tailwaters are stocked with millions of fish, including sand bass, catfish, hybrid striped bass, crappie, and walleye. The lake is also a camping destination, with eleven U.S. Army Corps of Engineers parks that include showers, overnight camping pads, electric hookups, and grills. People are invited to participate in fishing, water skiing, sailing, canoeing, and swimming on or around Oologah Lake. Fourteen boat launching ramps are located around the lake and two designated swimming beaches have been developed in Hawthorn Bluff and Spencer Creek.⁵ The portion of the Verdigris River adjacent to the Northeastern plant's CCR units has been designated as "critical habitat" for two mussel species listed under the Endangered Species Act ("ESA").

A 2010 report notes that groundwater tested near the coal ash landfill at the Northeastern coal plant contained selenium up to 37 times EPA's standard for safe drinking water (the "MCL"), arsenic up to six times the MCL, lead up to 13 times the EPA's "action level," and barium up to four times the MCL.⁶ Chromium and thallium (once used as rat poison) also exceeded MCLs, while vanadium was nine times state standards.⁷

Recent testing conducted by AEP pursuant to the federal CCR rule shows that groundwater at the site continues to be highly polluted by coal ash contaminants. Testing revealed:⁸

³ See Earthjustice and Environmental Integrity Project, "In Harm's Way: Lack of Federal Coal Ash Regulations Endangers Americans and Their Environment," Aug. 26, 2010, at 149-54 [hereinafter "In Harm's Way"], available at <https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/files/report-in-harms-way.pdf>.

⁴ See American Electric Power Service Corporation, "Northeastern Plant Bottom Ash Pond Professional Engineer's Liner Certification," Aug. 5, 2016, available at <https://www.aep.com/about/codeofconduct/CCRRule/docs/2016/NE-BAP-LinerCert-081516.pdf> and American Electric Power Service Corporation, "Report 1 – Groundwater Monitoring Network for CCR Compliance, Northeastern Station 3 & 4, Landfill," October 2017, available at <http://www.aep.com/about/codeofconduct/CCRRule/docs/2017/GroundWater/NE-LF-GWMN-101717.pdf> at 2 ("[A] geosynthetic intermediate liner and a leachate collection system have been installed above existing waste in the landfill.").

⁵ Oologah Lake Recreation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, <http://www.swt.usace.army.mil/Locations/Tulsa-District-Lakes/Oklahoma/Oologah-Lake/Oologah-Lake-Recreation/> (last visited Mar. 19, 2018).

⁶ See In Harm's Way at 149-54.

⁷ *Id.* A map of the site, is available at <https://ashtracker.org/facility/49/northeastern-power-station> (last visited Mar. 19, 2018).

⁸ See American Electric Power Service Corporation, "Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Northeastern 3 & 4 Power Station, Landfill CCR Management Unit," January 2018 [hereinafter "AEP GW Report, Landfill"], available at <http://www.aep.com/about/codeofconduct/CCRRule/docs/2018/CCR-Mar2/NE-LF-AnnGWMonRept-013118.pdf>; American Electric Power Service Corporation, "Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Northeastern 3 & 4 Power Station, Bottom Ash Pond CCR Management Unit," January 2018 (hereafter "AEP GW Report, Bottom Ash Pond"), available at <http://www.aep.com/about/codeofconduct/CCRRule/docs/2018/CCR-Mar2/NE-BAP-AnnGWMonRept-013118.pdf>.

- Arsenic at concentrations 33% greater than the MCL;
- Antimony at concentrations nearly double the MCL;
- Barium at concentrations nearly four times the MCL;
- Beryllium at concentrations 37.5% greater than the MCL;
- Cadmium at concentrations 65% greater than the MCL;
- Chromium at concentrations 10% greater than the MCL; and
- Radium – the indicator for radioactivity – in concentrations over five times the MCL;

Other harmful metals – specifically, cobalt, lithium and molybdenum – were found in concentrations multiple times greater than the Regional Screening Levels for tap water that EPA uses to determine when a Superfund site likely requires cleanup.⁹ Chloride, fluoride, sulfate and total dissolved solids (“TDS”) – all indicators of coal ash pollution – were also found in elevated concentrations in the groundwater.¹⁰ Other recent groundwater testing that AEP submitted to Oklahoma’s Department of Environmental Quality (“DEQ”) confirm the problem, showing high concentrations of arsenic, lead, mercury, nickel, selenium, and vanadium.

Coal ash at the Grand River Dam Authority’s (“GRDA”) “Grand River Energy Center” coal plant – near Choteau, Oklahoma, just northwest of the Neosho River – is spread across 47 acres in an unlined landfill. Groundwater testing at the site has repeatedly revealed arsenic concentrations above the MCL since arsenic testing began in 2007, including at concentrations more than six times the MCL.¹¹ Recent groundwater testing performed by GRDA consultants at the site shows that other harmful pollutants, including boron, chloride, and sulfate, are also leaching into groundwater at the site at concentrations far in excess of applicable EPA standards.¹²

Recent groundwater testing near a coal ash landfill and two adjacent coal ash impoundments at the Western Farmers’ Electric Cooperative’s Hugo coal plant in Choctaw County, Oklahoma, has revealed coal ash contamination at unsafe levels at that site as well. The testing, conducted by Western Farmers’ consultant, found boron, sulfate, thallium, TDS, and molybdenum at levels exceeding applicable federal health advisories and MCLs.¹³ The coal ash landfill and

⁹ See AEP GW Report, Landfill; AEP GW Report, Bottom Ash Pond; USEPA, Summary Table, RSLs, Nov. 2017, available at <https://sempub.epa.gov/work/HQ/197025.pdf>; EPA, “Regional Screening Levels, Frequent Questions,” Qs 1-2, available at <https://www.epa.gov/risk/regional-screening-levels-frequent-questions-november-2017#FQ1> (last visited Mar. 19, 2018).

¹⁰ See AEP GW Report, Landfill and AEP GW Report, Bottom Ash Pond.

¹¹ See “Annual Groundwater Monitoring and Corrective Action Report for Calendar 2017, Grand River Dam Authority, Grand River Energy Center,” results for monitoring well MW 93-2 (tbls. 1, 1a, 2, 2a), available at <http://www.grda.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Annual-GW-Monitoring-and-Corrective-Action-Report-2017.pdf>.

¹² *Id.*

¹³ See “Initial Annual Groundwater and Corrective Action Report, Western Farmers Electric Cooperative, Hugo Power Station,” data for monitoring well MW-19S, available at <http://2015website2.wixsite.com/wfec-ccr/groundwater-monitoring---corrective-act--y70x6>; U.S. E.P.A., “2012 Edition of the Drinking Water Standards and Health Advisories,” at 8, available at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/dwstandards2012.pdf>; U.S. EPA,

impoundments are located approximately 1 mile from the Hugo Lake and the Hugo Lake State Park, as well as the Raymond Gary State Park. These are popular sites for fishing, swimming, and other types of recreation.¹⁴ The Kiamichi River flows south of the Hugo plant property before flowing into the Red River a short distance to the southeast.

Groundwater testing performed in 2016 and 2017 at the “Big Fork Ranch” coal ash landfill in Noble County, Oklahoma, also revealed elevated concentrations of pollutants associated with coal ash, including boron, manganese, and sulfate in concentrations exceeding EPA’s health advisories for drinking water, and chloride and TDS in excess of EPA’s secondary drinking water standards.¹⁵ The Arkansas River flows just north of the Big Fork Ranch site.

Finally, a vast coal ash dump in Bokoshe, Oklahoma – the “Thumb’s Up Ranch” dump, operated by a company formerly known as “Making Money Having Fun LLC”¹⁶ – is known to be causing severe air pollution in the town, where rates of respiratory ailments and other maladies are reportedly very high. In a 2016 report on the ash dump, NPR noted that “[f]or years, people in Bokoshe saw the gray dust from the [coal ash dump] coat almost every surface in town. Gardens withered and crops died, residents say. Cows grew sick; calves were stillborn. Residents say ailments among their neighbors — from migraines to nosebleeds, heart conditions and respiratory problems — seemed to become commonplace.”¹⁷

Although this dump is not regulated under the federal coal ash rule, it could, and should – along with all other coal ash minefill – be regulated under Oklahoma’s CCR program. Oklahoma’s failure to propose that such coal ash minefills be covered by that program underscores the state’s negligent inattention to the critical pollution problems the dump in Bokoshe has created. Bokoshe provides a powerful example of how inadequate protections from coal ash contamination – and inadequate attention from DEQ to that pollution – can, and have, put Oklahomans in harm’s way.¹⁸ If EPA were to approve Oklahoma’s highly flawed Application, allowing DEQ to take over administration and enforcement of CCR regulations in the state, that harm would surely continue.

“Secondary Drinking Water Standards: Guidance for Nuisance Chemicals,” *available at* <https://www.epa.gov/dwstandardsregulations/secondary-drinking-water-standards-guidance-nuisance-chemicals#table>.

¹⁴ See, for example, Hugo Lake State Park – Hugo Lake Fishing, <http://www.hugolakestatepark.com/Fishing.html> (last visited Mar. 19, 2018).

¹⁵ See Evans and Associates, “Groundwater Monitoring 2016,” *available at* <http://evansandassociatesconstructioncompany.com/Docs/Ground%20Water%20Monitoring%20Report%202016.pdf>, and Evans and Associates, “Groundwater Monitoring 2017,” *available at* <http://evansandassociatesconstructioncompany.com/Docs/Ground%20Water%20Monitoring%20Report%202017.pdf>.

¹⁶ See, e.g., <https://earthjustice.org/blog/2011-march/tr-ash-talk-making-money-having-fun>.

¹⁷ See NPR, “Coal Ash Bedevils Oklahoma Town, Revealing Weakness of EPA Rule,” June 30, 2016, *available at* <https://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2016/06/30/coal-ash-bedevils-oklahoma-town-revealing-weakness-of-epa-rule/>.

¹⁸ See Think Progress, “Pruitt’s EPA wants to let states handle coal ash. Oklahoma shows why that’s so dangerous,” Jan. 18, 2018, *available at* <https://thinkprogress.org/oklahoma-state-coal-ash-epa-333e6061fc7d/>.

II. EPA May Not Approve Oklahoma’s Application Unless and Until It Complies with Its ESA Obligation to Consult with the FWS On Potential Impacts to Listed Species.

Prior to issuing a final decision on Oklahoma’s Application, EPA must consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service (“FWS”) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (“NMFS”) under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (“ESA”) regarding the effects of approving Oklahoma Application on threatened and endangered species.

Under the ESA, federal agencies must, in consultation with FWS and/or NMFS, insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by the agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2). An agency proposing an action must first determine whether the action “may affect” species listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA. 50 C.F.R. § 402.14. “The ‘may affect’ threshold for triggering the consultation duty under section 7(a)(2) is low.” *Nat’l Parks Conservation Ass’n v. Jewell*, 62 F. Supp. 3d 7, 12-13 (D.D.C. 2014); *see also Karuk Tribe of Cal. v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 681 F.3d 1006, 1027 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc) (“[A]ctions that have any chance of affecting listed species or critical habitat—even if it is later determined that the actions are ‘not likely’ to do so—require at least some consultation under the ESA.”).

If the action “may affect” listed species or designated critical habitat, the action agency must pursue either formal or informal consultation. Informal consultation is “an optional process that includes all discussions, correspondence, etc., between the Service and the Federal agency . . . designed to assist the [action agency] in determining whether formal consultation . . . is required.” 50 C.F.R. § 402.13(a). “If during informal consultation it is determined by the [action agency], with the written concurrence of the Service, that the action is not likely to adversely affect listed species or critical habitat, the consultation process is terminated, and no further action is necessary.” *Id. Am. Bird Conservancy, Inc. v. FCC*, 516 F.3d 1027, 1034 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (“If an agency determines that an action “may affect” endangered or threatened species or critical habitats, the agency must initiate formal consultation with the [FWS], at least unless preparation of a biological assessment or participation in informal consultation indicates that a proposed action is ‘not likely’ to have an adverse affect.”).

If an action agency chooses to forego informal consultation, or the informal consultation concludes that the proposed action is likely to adversely affect listed species or critical habitat, the agency must participate in “formal consultation.” 50 C.F.R. § 402.14. Formal consultation entails the formulation of a Biological Opinion (“BiOp”) by either FWS or NMFS. In a BiOp, the FWS or NMFS determines whether the proposed action, taken together with all other relevant impacts on the species – including both those included in the environmental baseline as well as cumulative impacts – is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. *Id.* § 402.14(h)(3).

If the BiOp determines that the proposed actions are likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or critical habitats, the FWS or NMFS may not approve them. 16 U.S.C. §§ 1536(a)(2), (b)(4); *see also Sierra Club v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs*, 803 F.3d 31, 41

(D.C. Cir. 2015). Alternatively, if the BiOp concludes that an action will likely result in at most a limited take that is incidental to the project, FWS or NMFS prepares an Incidental Take Statement ("ITS") identifying reasonable and prudent measures that are necessary or appropriate to minimize the impact on species likely to be incidentally affected. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(4); 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(i), (iv).¹⁹ Notably, if the action agency were then to authorize take of protected species by way of incorporating the ITS's terms and conditions into that authorization, such authorization constitutes "federal action" triggering NEPA review. *Sierra Club*, 803 F.3d at 45; *see* 40 C.F.R. § 1508.18(b)(4).

Here, EPA's approval of Oklahoma's CCR program may affect three mussel species listed under the ESA, the Neosho mucket, rabbitsfoot, and scaleshell. Critical habitat for Neosho mucket and rabbitsfoot mussels includes the portion of the Verdigris River adjacent to the CCR units at AEP's Northeastern Plant in Oologah, Oklahoma.²⁰ One of the few places the scaleshell mussel is still known to exist is the Kiamichi River in southeast Oklahoma,²¹ in which watershed the Hugo coal plant's CCR impoundments are located.²² EPA has acknowledged that many pollutants present in coal ash wastewaters can harm, and even kill, fish and other wildlife. *See, e.g.,* EPA, Benefit and Cost Analysis for the Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Steam Electric Power Generating Point Source Category, Doc. No. EPA-821-R-15-005, Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OW-2009-0819-5856, at 5-1 ("Final Benefit & Cost Analysis"). In light of DEQ's longstanding failure to adequately enforce Oklahoma's environmental standards, including, in particular, standards governing CCR units – discussed in detail below – approval of Oklahoma's Application may result in increased water pollution from those units than if the federal CCR rule continued to govern CCR units in the state.

In sum, EPA's proposal to approve Oklahoma's Application creates a significant risk that CCR units in the state would pollute water more than if EPA did not approve that Application, and thus the proposed action may affect listed species within the meaning of 50 C.F.R. § 402.14. As a result, EPA must initiate consultation with FWS and NMFS under ESA Section 7 prior to making a final determination as to whether to approve or deny Oklahoma's Application. *See generally Nat'l Parks Conservation Ass'n v. Jewell*, 62 F. Supp. 3d at 17 (finding that a 2008 rule revising standards for coal mining near streams may affect listed species where there was "clear evidence that habitats within stream buffer zones are home to threatened and endangered species and that mining operations affect the environment, water quality, and all living biota").

¹⁹ If FWS or NMFS issues an ITS, the choice falls to the action agency that consulted with FWS/NMFS under Section 7 to determine whether and how to proceed with the proposed action (including permitting private activity) in light of the ITS issued by the Service--but the action agency and private party (if any) must comply with the terms of the ITS if they wish to be insulated from ESA liability for any (otherwise unlawful) take of protected species incidental to the carrying out of the proposed action. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(4); 50 C.F.R. § 402.15(a).

²⁰ *See* US Fish & Wildlife Service, "Neosho Mucket and Rabbitsfoot, Frequently Asked Questions, Proposed Critical Habitat Rule for the Neosho Mucket and Rabbitsfoot," *available at* https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/clams/neoshomucket/QAsNEMU_RABBproposedCHMay2014.html (last visited Mar. 19, 2018).

²¹ *See* FWS, "Scaleshell Mussel Recovery Plan," at 94, Feb. 2010, *available at* https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/100407_v2.pdf.

²² *See* Western Farmers Electric Cooperative, "Hugo Coal Plant History of Construction," at 1-4, Oct. 14, 2016, *available at* http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/7d5e0d_d03cbb01d99045739f2d53817ea38840.pdf.

III. EPA Must Reject Oklahoma’s CCR Program Because It Does Not Meet the Requirements of the WIIN Act.

a. Oklahoma’s CCR Program Does Not Provide for “Prior Approval” of Key Site-Specific Conditions, in Contravention of the WIIN Act.

Oklahoma’s Application may not be approved because its CCR program does not provide for “prior approval” of key documents required to ensure compliance with provisions at least as protective as the federal CCR rule, as required by the WIIN Act. The WIIN Act directs EPA to approve “a permit program or *other system of prior approval* and conditions ... if ... the program or other system requires each [CCR] unit located in the State to achieve compliance with” the federal CCR rule²³ or State provisions that are “at least as protective as” the federal CCR rule, 42 U.S.C. § 6945(d)(1)(B) (emphasis added), making clear that regardless of whether a State proposes a permit program or other system, the State must provide for “prior approval” of CCR units’ proposals to comply with the substantive requirements for CCR units. Oklahoma’s CCR program fails to ensure such prior approval.

First, Oklahoma’s CCR program fails to ensure prior approval of key compliance proposals and compliance demonstrations for new CCR units, lateral extensions of existing CCR units, and existing CCR impoundments without a state permit. Oklahoma’s CCR program is a permitting program. *See, e.g.*, OAC 252:517-1-7(a) (“All CCR units must be permitted in accordance with the rules of this Chapter.”). The primary, and in many cases first, opportunity for DEQ to review and, if appropriate, approve a CCR unit’s proposals for compliance with the federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma requirements is when reviewing the CCR unit’s permit application.²⁴

Oklahoma’s CCR program, however, does not require CCR permit applicants to submit many essential documents proposing how the CCR unit will comply with the requirements of the federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma rules as part of their permit applications. Thus, DEQ neither reviews nor approves those documents in the permitting process. The contents of permit applications for new CCR units and existing impoundments without a state permit are set forth at OAC 252:517-3-6(a). Permit applications are to include information about the location of the unit; a description of the unit; maps and drawings of the unit; documents demonstrating compliance with location restrictions for CCR units; plans for complying with operational requirements, storm water management requirements and aesthetic enhancement requirements; the unit’s closure plan; and establishment of financial assurance for the unit. OAC 252:517-3-6(a)(1) – (12). Neither OAC 252:517-3-6(a) nor any other Oklahoma provision, however,

²³ EPA, “Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities,” 80 Fed. Reg. 21,302 (April 17, 2015), codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 257, Subpart D.

²⁴ *See* OAC 252:517-3-3(a) (providing that all permit applications are subject to the Oklahoma Uniform Environmental Permitting); Ok. Stat. 27A, § 2-14-103(9) (defining as “Tier I” the “basic process of permitting which includes application ... and [DEQ] review”); Ok. Stat. 27A, § 2-14-302(A) (providing that DEQ “shall prepare a draft denial or draft permit” for Tier II or III permits “[u]pon conclusion of its technical review of a Tier II or III application.”); OAC 252:4-7-15(a).

clearly requires a CCR permit applicant to submit, as part of its permit application, any of the following essential information:

- (a) The applicant's groundwater monitoring plan, setting forth how the CCR unit will comply with groundwater monitoring system design requirements set out in the federal CCR rule and Oklahoma CCR program;
- (b) its groundwater monitoring program, setting out how it will comply with the sampling and analysis requirements of the federal CCR rule and its Oklahoma counterpart;
- (c) any proposal for an alternative groundwater monitoring frequency, pursuant to OAC 252:517-9-5(d);
- (d) any plans or specifications demonstrating that the CCR unit will meet many of the critical design requirements for CCR units, including hazard potential assessments, structural stability assessments, safety factor assessments, and emergency action plans;
- (e) the CCR unit's retrofit plan, setting forth its proposal for complying with retrofit requirements in the federal CCR rule and its Oklahoma counterpart; or
- (f) the CCR unit's post-closure care plan, setting out how it intends to comply with the federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma mandates for safeguarding against pollution once the CCR unit is closed.

See OAC 252:517-3-6(a) (setting forth permit application contents for new CCR units).

Nor does Oklahoma's CCR program ever require that DEQ pre-approve these key compliance demonstration documents subsequent to the permitting process. The State's regulations provide that CCR units are to submit their groundwater monitoring plan; their groundwater sampling and analysis plan; the unit's retrofit plan; the post-closure plan, and documents demonstrating compliance with design requirements to DEQ.²⁵ But those regulations require only *submission* of those plans to DEQ; they do not require DEQ to approve, disapprove, or even review those plans,²⁶ nor do they prohibit CCR units from moving forward with those plans unless and until they receive DEQ's approval. In short, contrary to the WIIN Act, Oklahoma's CCR program fails to require prior approval of CCR units' plans for compliance with those critical requirements.

Oklahoma also does not require prior approval of other key compliance demonstrations that may not be available at the time of a CCR unit's permit application. For example, if groundwater monitoring conducted pursuant to the federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma regulations reveals concentrations of certain coal ash pollutants that are "statistically significant" increases over background concentrations of those pollutants, the owner/ operator of the CCR unit is required to begin monitoring for an additional set of contaminants associated

²⁵ See OAC 252:517-9-2(g), OAC 252:517-9-4(a), 252:517-15-7(k)(2)(E), 252:517-15-9(d)(5) (requiring CCR unit owners/operators to submit to DEQ their groundwater monitoring plan, groundwater sampling and analysis plan, retrofit plan and post-closure care plan); OAC 252:517-11-4(a)(2)(C), (3)(E), (d)(4), (e)(3) (requiring CCR units to submit to DEQ their initial and periodic hazard potential assessments; Emergency Action Plans, if applicable; structural stability assessments; and safety factor assessments).

²⁶ Several of these provisions contain, in their title, the words "DEQ approval required," and several state that owners/operators of CCR units are to submit those plans or assessments to "DEQ for approval." However, nowhere in the language of the provisions is review or approval by DEQ required.

with coal ash (Appendix IV or, under Oklahoma’s program, Appendix B contaminants) unless the owner/operator provides an adequate “alternative cause demonstration” showing that the contamination comes from elsewhere. *See* OAC 252:517-9-5(e). If sampling reveals elevated levels of those Appendix IV/Appendix B pollutants and the owner/operator does not demonstrate that the pollutants are coming from a different source, the owner/operator must assess corrective measures and select a remedy to bring the pollution down to safe levels, or, if the CCR unit at issue is an unlined impoundment, retrofit or close the unit. *See* 40 CFR 257.97(a); OAC 252:517-9-6(g)(3)(B)); OAC 252:517-9-7(a); OAC 252:517-9-7(d); OAC 252:517-9-8(a); OAC 252:517-9-6(g)(5). Yet Oklahoma’s CCR program does not require that DEQ review or approve *any* alternative cause demonstration or selected remedy for contamination. Instead, the State’s regulations direct the owner/operator of the CCR unit to implement the corrective action remedy within 90 days of selecting that remedy, with no mention of any need for the owner/operator to receive approval from DEQ before doing so. OAC 252:517-9-9(a)(2).

The same is true of the critical periodic structural stability analyses that are performed after the permitting process is complete. Owners/operators of CCR impoundments are required to conduct safety factor analyses, hazard potential analyses, and structural stability assessments every five years to ensure that changing conditions and pressures on CCR impoundments have not rendered the impoundments unsafe. Notwithstanding the important analysis that these documents contain – and the serious threat to health and safety that CCR units may pose if these analyses are done incorrectly – Oklahoma’s CCR program does not require that DEQ review or approve them. *See* OAC 252:517-11-4(a)(2)(C), (d)(4) and (e)(3).

Oklahoma’s CCR program also fails to ensure prior approval of key compliance demonstration documents at existing CCR units that already have a state permit. Pursuant to OAC 252:517-1-7(b)(2), existing CCR landfills need only apply for a modification to their permit, rather than apply for a new permit. The same appears to be true for existing CCR impoundments with a state permit. *See* OAC 252:517-1-7(c) (“[e]xisting CCR impoundments permitted under OAC 252:616 must be permitted in accordance with the rules of this Chapter upon expiration of the existing permit or no later than Oct. 19, 2018, whichever occurs first”); OAC 252:517-3-6(a) (including “existing surface impoundment[s] *without* a solid waste permit” in the description of CCR units requiring a new CCR permit application) (emphasis added).

But Oklahoma’s mandates for what must be included in applications to modify a permit for existing CCR units are extremely vague. The State’s CCR provisions state only that “[a]n applicant requesting a modification to an existing permit shall submit information identified in this Part related to the proposed modification.” OAC 252:517-3-6(c). Maps and detailed drawings of the unit, including design drawing showing liner design, groundwater levels, and flood plains, are required only for permit modifications for which “the data originally submitted would be made ambiguous, inaccurate, or out of date by the proposed modification.” OAC 252:517-3-31(a)(4). In sum, Oklahoma’s CCR program largely delegates to the owner/operator of the CCR unit the determination of which documents are “related” to the permit modification it seeks, thereby failing to make sure that all plans and assessments necessary to ensure compliance with the federal CCR rule and its Oklahoma counterpart are submitted to, reviewed, or pre-approved by DEQ.

These are not minor omissions. The structural stability documents that Oklahoma's program fails to require be pre-approved are essential to demonstrating compliance with stability requirements, while providing critical information about the threats posed by CCR impoundments. If a safety factor analysis is flawed, for instance, an impoundment that should have been closed may be left in dangerous conditions, teetering on the edge of collapse. Groundwater monitoring plans are likewise critical: monitoring is the prerequisite for cleaning up – and, for existing unlined CCR impoundments – closing CCR units that are polluting Oklahoma's waters. As EPA stated in the preamble to the proposed federal CCR rule, “groundwater monitoring is the single most critical set of protective measures on which EPA is relying to protect human health and the environment.”²⁷ If the owner/operator of a CCR unit has selected inappropriate or insufficient monitoring wells, or claimed, without sufficient basis, that an alternative source is causing contamination found in those wells, those deficiencies can lead to severe pollution continuing to threaten the health and safety of Oklahoma's residents and wildlife for decades, and possibly centuries, to come. The same is true for post-closure care plans: if post-closure groundwater monitoring is done incorrectly or with insufficient wells, contamination may continue to escape, undetected, from closed CCR units for decades.

Oklahoma's failure to ensure pre-approval of key documents by DEQ not only contravenes the WIIN Act's clear terms, but also is contrary to a significant body of jurisprudence holding that the failure of agencies to review and, if appropriate, approve site-specific proposals for compliance with applicable law constitutes impermissible “self-regulation” and an improper abdication of agencies' duties. *See, e.g., Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc. v. U.S. E.P.A.*, 399 F.3d 486, 498-502 (2d Cir 2005) (EPA's Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (“CAFO”) rule violated the Clean Water Act's mandate to ensure compliance with applicable requirements when it failed to require permitting authorities to review CAFOs' nutrient management plans); *Env'tl. Def. Center, Inc. v. U.S. E.P.A.*, 344 F.3d 832, 855-56 (9th Cir. 2003) (holding that EPA's rule for storm water management violated the Clean Water Act when it failed to require permitting authorities to review operators' site-specific “minimum measures” to reduce storm water discharges, and concluding that “programs that are designed by regulated parties must, in every instance, be subject to meaningful review by an appropriate regulating entity to ensure that each such program reduces the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable”).

Unlike the federal CCR rule, state CCR programs may not, under the plain terms of the WIIN Act, be self-implementing. Rather, the state permitting agency must review and pre-approve – or if appropriate, deny – regulated entities' proposals to comply with applicable requirements to ensure that they achieve compliance with the mandatory safeguards. 42 U.S.C. § 6945(d)(1)(B). Oklahoma's CCR program could provide for prior approval by requiring that all compliance proposals and demonstrations available at the time of permit application be submitted as part of that application, and by mandating that all compliance proposals and demonstrations completed after the initial permitting process be included as part of an application for permit renewal, permit modification, or re-opener, subject to DEQ review and pre-approval. But Oklahoma's program does not so provide. Because Oklahoma's CCR program does not ensure prior approval of these critical compliance documents, EPA must deny Oklahoma's Application.

²⁷ EPA, “Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Special Wastes; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities,” Proposed Rule, 75 Fed. Reg. 35,128, 35,205 (June 21, 2010).

b. Oklahoma’s CCR Program Does Not Ensure that Each CCR Unit Complies with Standards “At Least As Protective As” the Federal CCR Rule.

i. The Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality Is Unwilling and/or Unable to Enforce Its CCR Program.

Oklahoma’s application may not be approved because Oklahoma has failed to show that it is able and willing to enforce its environmental regulations. The state’s inability and unwillingness to enforce its environmental regulations – including CCR regulations – renders approval of Oklahoma’s CCR program unacceptable under the WIIN Act. Under that Act, EPA may only approve a state CCR program if it “requires each [CCR] unit located in the State to achieve compliance with” the federal CCR rule or State provisions that are “at least as protective as” the federal CCR rule. 42 U.S.C. § 6945(d)(1)(B). This is a continuing obligation: EPA must withdraw approval of a state CCR program if, upon review, EPA finds that the state program does not “continue[] to ensure that each [CCR] unit located in the state achieves compliance” with requirements at least as protective as those in the federal CCR rule. *Id.* §§ 6945(D)(i)(II), (D)(ii)(I), and (E).

Oklahoma’s failure to demonstrate that it can ensure that CCR units comply with the state’s CCR regulations likewise warrants denial of its application under the 40 C.F.R. Part 239 regulations that EPA looked to in evaluating the adequacy of the program.²⁸ *See, e.g.*, 83 Fed. Reg. at 2102 (stating that “EPA is therefore relying in large measure on the existing regulations in 40 CFR part 239,” among other provisions, in evaluating the adequacy of Oklahoma’s CCR program); 40 C.F.R. § 239.4 (“The description of a state’s program must include: ... (e) A discussion of staff resources available to carry out and enforce the relevant state permit program.”); EPA, “Subtitle D Regulated Facilities; State/Tribal Permit Program Determination of Adequacy; State/Tribal Implementation Rule (STIR),” 61 Fed. Reg. 2584, 2594 (Jan. 26, 1996) [hereinafter, “STIR”] (interpreting 40 C.F.R. Part 239 and concluding that “in certain cases (e.g., where EPA determines that State... resources clearly are insufficient), this information may be used to make a determination of inadequacy.”).

There is *no information whatsoever* in Oklahoma’s application, EPA’s proposal to grant Oklahoma’s application, or supporting documents, about “the staff resources available to carry out and enforce” Oklahoma’s CCR program. Neither DEQ nor EPA bothered to address the critical question of available resources, contrary to the WIIN Act’s mandates and the explicit instruction of 40 C.F.R. § 239.4(e). Oklahoma’s failure to provide the information specified in 40 C.F.R. § 239.4(e) is, alone, sufficient grounds for EPA to deny the state’s application. *See* STIR, 61 Fed. Reg. 2584.

Oklahoma may have avoided providing the information mandated by 40 C.F.R. § 239.4 because it simply cannot demonstrate adequate resources to ensure CCR units comply with the applicable protections. The state is in the throes of a severe financial crisis. On February 8, 2018, National Public Radio reported that Oklahoma’s budget crisis is so dire that around a fifth

²⁸ As discussed in *infra* note 65, the regulations set out at 40 C.F.R. Part 239 do not apply to EPA’s approval of state CCR programs. If they did apply, Oklahoma’s CCR program would fail to meet their mandates, as explained herein.

of Oklahoma's schools "now hold classes just four days a week," and in 2017, "Highway Patrol officers were given a mileage limit because the state couldn't afford to put gas in their tanks."²⁹ Oklahoma news channel KFOR reported on February 20, 2018, that a bill to raise revenue failed to pass, and the state is now cutting costs left and right.³⁰

State agencies are being hit hard by Oklahoma's financial crisis,³¹ and DEQ is no exception. DEQ "ha[s] seen sharp budget cuts in recent years, which have forced the agenc[y] to cut back on staff."³² One of the areas hit hardest by those cuts is protection of Oklahoma's waters. Think Progress explained in January 2018:³³

[O]versight of [Oklahoma] waterways and water pollution is funded by state dollars, not federal funds, meaning budget cuts will likely have a direct impact on the state's ability to monitor potential water contamination from coal ash disposal. Years of budget cuts have already caused the state Department of Environmental Quality to close 17 of its field offices, leaving it with just 22 around the state. It has also seen its force of inspectors shrink from 89 to 58.

The impact of funding cuts was reiterated by DEQ Deputy Director Jimmy Givens, who told NPR in 2016 that cuts in state funding "disproportionately affect DEQ programs that make sure local water supplies are safe to drink, and that wastewater discharged from municipal and industrial sources isn't polluting the environment."³⁴ Indeed, funding cuts to DEQ have already forced the agency to abandon plans to clean up open dumps and work to protect drinking water.³⁵ DEQ's most recent annual report notes that several positions have gone unfilled due to the

²⁹ Rachel Hubbard, "Tax Cuts Put Oklahoma In A Bind. Now Gov. Fallin Wants To Raise Taxes," NPR, Feb. 8, 2018, available at <https://www.npr.org/2018/02/08/584064306/tax-cuts-put-oklahoma-in-a-bind-now-gov-fallin-wants-to-raise-taxes>.

³⁰ Bill Miston, "House passes funding bill for last year's budget, cutting \$44M in agency appropriations," KFOR, Feb. 20, 2018, available at <http://kfor.com/2018/02/20/house-passes-funding-bill-for-last-years-budget-cutting-44m-in-agency-appropriations/>.

³¹ See *id.* (reporting that Oklahoma legislators are slashing funding for state agencies "by roughly \$44.6 million for the final three months of the FY 2018 budget") and Sean Murphy, "Oklahoma plans across-the-board cuts to close budget hole," Feb. 15, 2018, available at <https://www.seattletimes.com/nation-world/oklahoma-plans-across-the-board-cuts-to-close-budget-hole/> (reporting that the \$44.6 million chopped from state agency budgets results from across-the-board cuts of approximately two percent per state agency).

³² Think Progress, "Pruitt's EPA wants to let states handle coal ash. Oklahoma shows why that's so dangerous," Jan. 18, 2018, available at <https://thinkprogress.org/oklahoma-state-coal-ash-epa-333e6061fc7d/>.

³³ NPR, "State Budget Agreement Brings Sharp Funding Cuts to Agencies Overseeing Oklahoma's Environment," May 16, 2016, available at <https://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2016/05/26/state-budget-agreement-brings-sharp-funding-cuts-to-agencies-overseeing-oklahomas-environment/>.

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ See, e.g., OK Energy Today, "DEQ Wonders How Budget Cuts Will Affect Its Abilities," June 1, 2017, available at <http://www.okenergytoday.com/2017/06/deq-wonders-budget-cuts-will-affect-abilities/>; Koco News 5, "State budget crisis forces DEQ to delay cleanup projects," July 7, 2016, available at <http://www.koco.com/article/state-budget-crisis-forces-deq-to-delay-cleanup-projects/4310550>; The Journal Record, "Cut in DEQ budget means fewer cleanup projects," June 20, 2014, available at <http://journalrecord.com/2014/06/20/cut-in-deq-budget-means-fewer-cleanup-projects-capitol/>.

funding shortages and states that, “Should state or federal funding substantially decrease, DEQ would have to further reduce activities and/or secure additional fee funding.”³⁶ A law further cutting DEQ’s budget – and that of other state agencies – was enacted on February 27, 2018.³⁷

Even if DEQ had adequate funding, it is far from clear that the agency would fully enforce Oklahoma’s CCR program. DEQ has long been derelict in protecting Oklahomans against coal ash pollution, as shown by its inaction at the Bokoshe “Thumb’s Up” coal ash landfill and by its failure to take effective action to stop the contamination at AEP’s Northeastern plant in Oologah. As discussed above, testing of groundwater at that site starting ten years ago revealed dangerous concentrations of arsenic, lead, barium, chromium, selenium, thallium, and other coal ash pollutants.³⁸ And, though AEP built a “slurry wall” and “grout curtain” along one side of the CCR landfill in 2012-2013,³⁹ those barriers clearly have not stopped the escape of pollution. The 2017 testing of groundwater monitoring wells located just beyond the grout curtain show unsafe levels of arsenic, boron, molybdenum, and radium, and high concentrations of coal ash constituents cobalt, fluoride, sulfate, and TDS.⁴⁰ Yet DEQ has not required AEP to do anything more to halt the flow of these dangerous pollutants out of its coal ash dumps.

In fact, DEQ is already failing to enforce its CCR regulations. GRDA, owner of a CCR landfill at the Grand River Energy Center, was required by both the federal CCR rule and Oklahoma regulations to collect and analyze eight independent samples from each background and down-gradient monitoring well of all contaminants listed in Appendices III and IV of the federal CCR rule (Appendices A and B of the Oklahoma regulations) by October 17, 2017. 40 C.F.R. § 257.94(b); OAC 252:517-9-5(b). GRDA’s annual groundwater monitoring report⁴¹ makes clear that it failed to do so.⁴² GRDA did not hide this failure; rather, GRDA made it clear to DEQ that it had not collected and analyzed the required eight independent samples for

³⁶ DEQ Annual Report 2017, at 18, *available at* <http://www.deq.state.ok.us/mainlinks/reports/2017AnnualReport/2017%20DEQ%20Annual%20Report.pdf>.

³⁷ Sean Murphy, “Governor signs bill imposing cuts to Oklahoma agencies,” Feb. 27, 2018, *available at* <https://www.seattletimes.com/nation-world/governor-signs-bill-imposing-cuts-to-oklahoma-agencies/>.

³⁸ *See* In Harm’s Way at 149-54.

³⁹ *See* Terrecon Consultants, “Report 1 - Groundwater Monitoring Network for CCR Compliance, Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Northeastern 3 & 4 Power Station,” October 2017, at 2, *available at* <http://www.aep.com/about/codeofconduct/CCRRule/docs/2017/GroundWater/NE-LF-GWMN-101717.pdf>.

⁴⁰ *See* AEP GW Report, Landfill and AEP GW Report, Bottom Ash Pond.

⁴¹ A&M Engineering, “Annual Groundwater Monitoring and Corrective Action Report (Calendar Year 2017), for Grand River Dam Authority Landfill, Grand River Energy Center, Mayes County, Oklahoma,” Jan. 31, 2018 [hereinafter, “GRDA Annual GW Monitoring Report”], *available at* <http://www.grda.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Annual-GW-Monitoring-and-Corrective-Action-Report-2017.pdf>.

⁴² For example, none of the sampling included in GRDA’s Annual GW Monitoring Report – which notes semi-annual results from 2004 through 2017 – includes testing for calcium or TDS, both of which are Appendix III constituents, from downgradient monitoring wells 03-1 or MW 03-2. And while two samples were collected and analyzed for calcium and TDS from the remaining two downgradient monitoring wells in 2017, nothing in the report shows compliance with the requirement that eight independent samples be taken by Oct. 2017.

Appendix IV (Appendix B) constituents. *See, e.g.*, GRDA Annual GW Monitoring Report at 6. Yet DEQ did not sanction GRDA for this clear violation of groundwater monitoring requirements that could lead to delayed cleanup of polluted groundwater at the site. Instead, DEQ gave GRDA a pass, granting the company an extension of *more than a year* to complete that crucial initial sampling.⁴³

GRDA's plan to evaluate whether any statistically significant increases of coal ash contamination are found over background levels at the GREC landfill site is likewise entirely deficient under both the federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma rules. Instead of evaluating whether concentrations of coal ash pollution in down-gradient wells are statistically significantly higher than concentrations of those same pollutants in background wells, as those rules require,⁴⁴ GRDA intends to base its determination of whether a "statistically significant increase" has occurred by evaluating whether concentrations of a pollutant in *same* well are increasing over time.⁴⁵ That is plainly not what the federal CCR rule or corresponding Oklahoma rules require. *See* 40 C.F.R. §§ 257.93(d), (h)(1); OAC 252:517-9-4(d), (h)(1). Again, GRDA did not hide this violation of the state and federal rule in its severely flawed plan for statistical analysis; it sent the plan to DEQ, which failed to identify *any* deficiency whatsoever with that plan. *See* Letter from DEQ to GRDA regarding Oct. 18, 2017 GRDA Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Plan, dated Nov. 29, 2017, attached hereto as Exhibit 1. The letter shows that DEQ cannot be relied upon to recognize and correct a significant violation of its own rules.

Moreover, it appears that GRDA may not meet the requirement that its background groundwater monitoring well "[a]ccurately represent[s] the quality of background groundwater that has not been affected by leakage from a CCR unit." 40 C.F.R. § 257.91(a)(1); OAC 252:517-9-2(a)(1). The well, MW 93-1, which GRDA is using as its background well, is located right on the perimeter of the CCR landfill, and historic groundwater sampling from that well has consistently resulted in sulfate concentrations greater than EPA's secondary MCL and boron concentrations above .341 mg/L.⁴⁶ GRDA identified MW 93-1 as its background well in filings

⁴³ *See* GRDA Annual GW Monitoring Report at 6 ("In addition, *and at the request of DEQ*, a schedule had been prepared and submitted for the collection and analysis of groundwater samples for OAC 252:517 Appendix B constituents. The additional sampling and analysis would be conducted to gather eight background samples necessary for statistical evaluation of the Appendix B constituents should evaluation become necessary. The schedule prepared and submitted requested an accelerated period (over 6 months rather than quarterly) for the sampling and analysis. Approval for the accelerated schedule is pending. It is anticipated that this activity will be initiated and completed during the upcoming 2018 calendar year.") (emphasis added).

⁴⁴ *See* 40 C.F.R. §§ 257.93(d), (h)(1); OAC 252:517-9-4(d), (h)(1).

⁴⁵ *See* A&M Engineering, "Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Program for Grand River Dam Authority Landfill, Grand River Energy Center, Mayes County, Oklahoma," Oct. 16, 2017, at 12 [hereinafter, "GRDA GW Sampling & Analysis Program"], available at http://www.grda.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2017_10_16-GRDA-GW-Sampling-and-Analysis-Program.pdf ("In the event that inter-well statistical evaluation indicates the presence of an elevated parameter in the downgradient wells compared to historical data of the upgradient or background wells, an Intra-well Prediction Limit Interval test will also be conducted on the specific well or wells of interest. These intra-well comparisons will then be utilized to determine whether a significant increase had occurred within a specific well in question....").

⁴⁶ GRDA GW Sampling & Analysis Program.

with DEQ. Yet again, DEQ identified no concerns with this likely violation of state and federal rules. *See* Ex. 1.

Documents obtained from DEQ indicate that the agency also would have let AEP off easily for failing to collect and analyze eight independent samples of the Appendix III and IV constituents (Appendix A and B constituents) at CCR units at its Northeastern coal plant by the October 17, 2017 deadline.⁴⁷ *See* Letter from DEQ to AEP, dated January 16, 2018, attached hereto as Exhibit 2, at 2 (“In accordance with OAC 252:517-9-5(b), a minimum of eight independent samples from each background and downgradient well must be collected and analyzed for the constituents listed in Appendix A and B of OAC 252:517 no later than October 17, 2017. Please submit a schedule for collecting the samples and establishing background for those constituents for which background has not already been established under the current monitoring program.”).

Finally, DEQ has apparently not required Evans & Associates, the owners of the Big Fork Ranch landfill, to perform groundwater monitoring that comes anywhere close to meeting the requirements of the federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma rules. In the “clarification” to its Application, Oklahoma told EPA that Big Fork Ranch has been under DEQ jurisdiction since November 1, 2016, meaning it has been subject to DEQ’s rules for CCR units, in addition to the requirements of the federal CCR rule, since that time. Both the federal CCR rule and Oklahoma’s CCR regulations require that eight samples of both Appendix A and B (federal CCR rule Appendix III and IV) constituents be taken from each upgradient and downgradient monitoring well at CCR units by October 17, 2017. *See* OAC 252:517-9-5(b); 40 C.F.R. § 257.94(b). Annual groundwater monitoring reports containing the results of that sampling were required to be posted on each CCR unit’s coal ash compliance website by March 2, 2018. *See* OAC 252:517-9-1(e); 252:517-19-1(h); 252:517-19-3(d), (h)(1); 40 C.F.R. §§ 257.90(e), 257.105(h)(1), 257.107(d), (h)(1).

But Evans and Associates have posted no such Annual Report, and the groundwater monitoring results that are provided on the company’s website reveal that the monitoring the company has done is highly deficient. First, the company has provided no groundwater monitoring plan, so it is not clear that it has selected both background and downgradient wells, as required by the federal and Oklahoma rules, nor whether it is – as required – sampling from all such wells. *See* OAC 252:517-9-2(a); 252:517-9-5(b); 40 C.F.R. §§ 257.91(a) and 257.94(b). Second, it has not tested for all required constituents, and even where it has tested for those constituents, it has not taken the mandated eight samples. The only testing done at the site in 2017 was for Appendix A/Appendix III (“detection monitoring”) constituents, and samples were only taken twice.⁴⁸ No testing of Appendix B/Appendix IV constituents was conducted. In 2016, the company tested the groundwater for Appendix A/Appendix III constituents twice, in

⁴⁷ With the exception of Appendix IV constituent Combined Radium, which was only sampled twice in one monitoring well (MW 9D) down-gradient from the coal ash landfill at the Northeastern plant, AEP appears to have taken 8 independent samples of each of the Appendix III and Appendix IV constituents. *See* AEP GW Report, Landfill.

⁴⁸ *See* Evans and Associates, “Groundwater Monitoring 2017,” *available at* <http://evansandassociatesconstructioncompany.com/Docs/Ground%20Water%20Monitoring%20Report%202017.pdf>.

February and September, but only tested for some of the Appendix B/Appendix IV constituents (arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, lead, and selenium) once, in February 2016.⁴⁹ When Evans and Associates did sample for those pollutants, the lab to which the company sent them used detection limits far higher than safe drinking water standards for those pollutants (for example, the detection limit for arsenic was .05 mg/L, while the MCL for arsenic is .01 mg/L), making it impossible to determine if unsafe concentrations were found in the water.⁵⁰ At no time in the 2016 or 2017 did Evans and Associates test for the remaining Appendix B/Appendix IV constituents, namely antimony, beryllium, cobalt, lithium, mercury, molybdenum, or thallium.⁵¹ Evans and Associates have also failed to post on their CCR website a number of other key compliance plans and analyses required by the federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma regulations, including its run-on/run-off control system plan, its closure plan, and its post-closure care plan. *See* 40 C.F.R. §§ 257.81, 257.102(b), and 257.104(c).

DEQ's manifest failure to enforce Oklahoma's CCR regulations is consistent with its stated purpose in proposing those regulations. DEQ explicitly told the state's Environmental Quality Board that protecting industry from citizen enforcement was a primary aim in proposing to adopt the state's CCR regulations.⁵² When the agency charged with administering and enforcing Oklahoma's environmental standards is actively attempting to protect industry from citizen suits, it is hardly surprising that the agency itself is failing to hold industry to those standards.

DEQ's failure to enforce Oklahoma's CCR regulations is not out of character. Failure to enforce environmental protections has been routine for DEQ in recent years. Examples abound. For instance, the Sooner Generating Station in Red Rock, Oklahoma, has been releasing unlawful amounts of harmful particulate matter into the air, and DEQ has imposed no fines whatsoever on the coal-fired power plant despite years of noncompliance.⁵³ Similarly, during every quarter over the last three years, the Jupiter Sulphur, LLC, fertilizer manufacturer in Ponca City, Oklahoma, has been a "high priority violator" of the CAA for releasing unlawful amounts of sulfur dioxide and hydrogen sulfide.⁵⁴ No enforcement actions, formal or informal, have been taken by DEQ against the facility. *Id.* Finally, the Wynnewood Refinery in Wynnewood, Oklahoma, has been a "significant noncomplier" with RCRA during every single quarter for

⁴⁹ *See* Evans and Associates, "Groundwater Monitoring 2016," available at <http://evansandassociatesconstructioncompany.com/Docs/Ground%20Water%20Monitoring%20Report%202016.pdf>.

⁵⁰ *See id.*

⁵¹ *Id.*

⁵² *See* Minutes, Environmental Quality Board, Feb. 19, 2016, DEQ, at 23, available at <http://www.deq.state.ok.us/mainlinks/eqbinfo/Approved%20EQB%20minutes%202%2019%2016%20on%209%2013%2016.pdf> (DEQ official Jeffrey Shepherd reporting that DEQ decided to promulgate the state coal ash regulations "after internal discussions and stakeholder meetings revealed clear reasons for doing so. The reasons include: ... [t]he DEQ has been told by industry that complying with the state rules may offer some protection from citizen suits....").

⁵³ *See* EPA, Detailed Facility Report: Sooner Generating Station, available at <https://echo.epa.gov/detailed-facility-report?fid=110000598611> (last visited Mar. 19, 2018).

⁵⁴ *See* EPA, Detailed Facility Report: Jupiter Sulfur LLC, available at <https://echo.epa.gov/detailed-facility-report?fid=110000455757> (last visited Mar. 19, 2018).

three years, yet, since 2015, DEQ has let them get away with nothing more than informal requests to comply with critical protections against pollution from waste.⁵⁵

In sum, Oklahoma has neither the means nor, it appears, the will to enforce its CCR program. Its Application fails to ensure compliance with requirements “at least as protective as” the federal CCR rule and fails to demonstrate that the state has the resources or the intent to adequately protect Oklahoma communities against polluting, unsafe CCR sites. Accordingly, because it fails to comply with the WIIN Act and is inconsistent with 40 C.F.R. Part 239, Oklahoma’s Application must be denied.

ii. Oklahoma’s Failure to Require Pre-Approval of Key Compliance Plans Means Oklahoma Will Not Ensure that Each CCR Unit Complies with Applicable Standards.

One major consequence of Oklahoma’s failure to require prior review and approval by DEQ of many key compliance demonstration documents for CCR units is that, contrary to the WIIN Act and 40 C.F.R. Part 239,⁵⁶ the State’s CCR program does not ensure compliance with the safeguards of the federal CCR rule or its state counterpart. 42 U.S.C. §§ 6945(D)(i), (D)(ii)(I), (E); 40 C.F.R. § 239.4(b) (directing states to explain how they “will ensure that existing and new facilities are permitted or otherwise approved and in compliance with the relevant Subtitle D federal revised criteria”).

Failure to require DEQ to review and pre-approve key compliance proposals means that owners/operators of CCR units are, in effect, self-regulating. Allowing regulated entities to decide for themselves whether they are complying with the safeguards mandated by the federal CCR rule and its Oklahoma counterpart leaves the fox guarding the henhouse.⁵⁷ The protections of the CCR rule are highly site-specific, requiring complex analyses of hydrogeology and engineering, among other specialties, to show whether and how a CCR unit will comply with them. Technical expertise is needed not only to perform those analyses but also to evaluate whether they’ve been done correctly. Although the federal CCR rule and Oklahoma counterpart appropriately require that professional engineers certify a number of the rule’s assessments and compliance proposals, the State still must review and pre-approve those proposals to make sure the health and safety of local residents are properly safeguarded. As EPA itself has recognized, “relying upon third party certifications is not the same as relying upon the state regulatory authority, and will likely not provide the same level of ‘independence.’ For example, although not an employee, the [certifying] engineer will still have been hired by the utility.” 75 Fed. Reg. at 35,194; *see also* preamble to final federal CCR rule, 80 Fed. Reg. at 21,405 (explaining that EPA did not allow alternative groundwater protection standards in the final federal CCR rule

⁵⁵ See EPA, Detailed Facility Report: Wynnewood Refining Co., available at <https://echo.epa.gov/detailed-facility-report?fid=110000453697> (last visited Mar. 19, 2018).

⁵⁶ As discussed in *infra* note 65, the regulations set out at 40 C.F.R. Part 239 do not apply to EPA’s approval of state CCR programs. If they did apply, Oklahoma’s CCR program would fail to meet their mandates, as explained herein.

⁵⁷ As noted above, protecting industry against enforcement was one of the express aims of DEQ in proposing to adopt Oklahoma’s CCR regulations. *See supra* note 52.

because, despite being certified by an “independent registered professional engineer,” such alternative standards were “too susceptible to potential abuse”).

Oklahoma’s failure to require DEQ review and prior-approval of critical compliance proposals – together with its far-too-limited public participation opportunities, discussed below – means that incorrectly or inadequately conducted analyses will go unchecked, exposing Oklahoma residents to the unnecessary risk of harm. In sum, Oklahoma is abdicating its responsibility to its residents, as well as its duty under the WIIN Act, by failing to ensure that DEQ review and pre-approve or, if appropriate, deny – key compliance analyses and proposals that show how a facility will comply with its federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma requirements. Accordingly, Oklahoma’s application must be rejected. *See, e.g., Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc.*, 399 F.3d at 498-502; *Sierra Club Mackinac Chapter v. Dep’t of Env’tl. Quality*, 277 Mich. App. 531, 551-52, 747 N.W.2d 321 (2008) (holding that the failure of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality to “conduct a meaningful review” of nutrient management plans violated the Clean Water Act even though a “Certified CNMP Provider” is required to approve the plan, when those plans were part of the facility’s CWA permit).

iii. Oklahoma’s Failure to Clearly Incorporate Key Compliance Plans into the Permit as Permit Conditions Means Oklahoma Will Not Ensure that Each CCR Unit Complies with Applicable Standards.

Oklahoma’s CCR program does not clearly provide that key site-specific compliance proposals and demonstrations – including but not limited to closure plans, post-closure plans, groundwater monitoring plans, and corrective action plans – are to be incorporated into a CCR unit’s permit. Those documents set out critical site-specific measures necessary for each CCR unit to comply with the CCR regulations; as such, they must – once reviewed and approved by DEQ – be incorporated into the permit as site-specific conditions. *See Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc.*, 399 F.3d at 503; *Env’tl. Def. Center*, 344 F.3d at 855; *Sierra Club Mackinac Chapter*, 277 Mich.App. at 533-34. If Oklahoma does not ensure that these critical, site-specific compliance proposals are incorporated as enforceable permit conditions, CCR unit owners/ operators may argue that they need not follow those plans, which are the basis for compliance with both federal and Oklahoma CCR requirements. As such, under the WIIN Act, EPA may not approve Oklahoma’s Application until it modifies its regulations to clearly, explicitly provide that CCR units’ compliance plans and demonstrations – once pre-approved by DEQ after opportunity for public participation – become conditions of the CCR units’ permits.

iv. Granting CCR Units a “Permit for Life” Contravenes the WIIN Act’s Mandate that Each CCR Unit Achieve Compliance with Standards “at Least as Protective as” EPA’s CCR Rule.

The crux of the WIIN Act is that State CCR programs must be “at least as protective as” federal CCR standards. This holds true even after a State CCR program has been approved. If EPA revises the federal CCR standards, as it is now proposing to do, the WIIN Act directs the agency to review approved State programs within three years of those revisions to evaluate whether the state program “continues to ensure that each [CCR] unit located in the state” is complying with requirements at least as protective as those set forth in the revised federal CCR

standards. 42 U.S.C. §§ 6945(D)(i)(II), 6945(D)(ii)(I). If EPA finds that the state program does not do so, EPA is to withdraw approval of the State program, which is not to be restored unless and until the State has “corrected the deficiencies” in its program. *Id.* § 6945(E).

Oklahoma’s CCR program grants “permits for life.” OAC 252:517-3-1(a) (“Permits shall be issued for the life of the CCR unit, subject to the limitations of (b) of this Section [providing that “DEQ may specify timelines within permits for commencement of construction and operation of new CCR units.”]). This grant of a permit for life is not permissible under the WIIN Act. Permits must include provisions allowing them to be re-opened, or expire and be renewed, to incorporate any changes to the state program necessary to ensure that the CCR unit “continues to achieve compliance” with standards “at least as protective as” those in any revised federal CCR standards. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 6945(D)(i)(II), (D)(ii)(I), (E).

This is not a hypothetical concern. In a status report filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in November 2017, EPA informed the court that it plans to propose revisions to the federal CCR standards in March and September 2018. On March 1, 2018, EPA posted on its coal ash website a pre-publication version of proposed changes to the federal CCR rule, which include, *inter alia*, the addition of boron to the federal CCR rule’s Appendix IV. That proposal, which EPA calls “Phase One,” was published in the Federal Register on March 15. 83 Fed. Reg. 11,584 (Mar. 15, 2018). Therein, EPA reiterates that it plans to finalize the Phase One changes to the federal CCR rule by June 2019 and plans to propose further, “Phase Two” changes to the rule by September 2018, to be finalized by December 2019. *Id.* at 11,587.

Looking forward, additional revisions to the federal CCR standards should be expected. RCRA directs EPA to “review[] and, where necessary, revise[]” all regulations implementing the statute every three years. 42 U.S.C. § 6912(b); *see also id.* § 6907(a) (directing EPA to publish suggested guidelines for solid waste management “from time to time,” including guidelines setting forth what constitutes open dumping). Congress intended regulations implementing RCRA to reflect updates to technology and science that improve environmental protection.⁵⁸ As such, the federal CCR standards will need further revision going forward to incorporate advances in science and technology that lessen CCR’s impact on the environment. *See Appalachian Voices v. McCarthy*, 989 F. Supp. 2d 30, 45 (D.D.C. 2013) (concluding that RCRA § 2002(b) imposes “a continuing obligation on the EPA to review and revise its regulations”).

In sum, because a “permit for life” is inconsistent with the WIIN Act’s mandate that state CCR programs ensure that CCR units located therein meet standards “at least as protective as” changing federal CCR standards, and Oklahoma’s program grants CCR units permits for life,

⁵⁸ *See, e.g.*, 42 U.S.C. § 6902(a)(9)-(10) (declaring that the objectives of RCRA “are to promote the protection of health and the environment and to conserve valuable material and energy resources by ...promoting a national research and development program for ... new and improved methods of ...environmentally safe disposal of nonrecoverable residues” and by “promoting the demonstration, construction, and application of solid waste management ... systems which preserve and enhance the quality of air, water, and land resources”); *Id.* § 6907(a)(1) (mandating that guidelines for solid waste management are to “provide a technical and economic description of the level of performance that can be attained by various *available* solid waste management practices ... which provide for the protection of public health and the environment.”) (emphasis added).

EPA must deny Oklahoma's Application. Oklahoma must modify its CCR program to provide that permits for CCR units be re-opened, or expire and be renewed, to incorporate any changes to the state program necessary to ensure that the CCR unit continues to achieve compliance with standards at least as protective as those in any revised federal CCR standards.

IV. EPA Should Deny Oklahoma's Application Because Granting CCR Units a Permit for Life Is Inconsistent with Federal and State Environmental Policies.

EPA must reject Oklahoma's CCR program because its proposal to grant a "permit for life" to CCR units runs contrary to fundamental principles enshrined in many federal and state environmental laws, not to mention common sense. Granting a permit for life is nearly unheard of for environmental permits: air permits, water discharge permits, and hazardous waste permits all expire and must be renewed.⁵⁹ There is good reason for that: our nation's environmental laws – and in particular, RCRA – require that standards be periodically updated to reflect our changing understanding of pollution's health impacts and changing technologies that reduce damage to the environment,⁶⁰ and those updates would have little effect if the permits governing polluting facilities were not adjusted accordingly. Indeed, EPA regulations consistently require that environmental permits be updated to incorporate revised standards.⁶¹ This is true of waste permits just as it is for air and water permits. For example, permits for hazardous waste facilities must be reviewed every five years and are to be modified⁶² if, among other reasons, "the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by statute, through promulgation of new or amended standards or regulations, or by judicial decision after the permit was issued." 40 C.F.R. § 270.41(a)(3).

⁵⁹ See, e.g., 40 C.F.R. § 70.6(a)(2) (limiting the term of Clean Air Act ("CAA") operating permits to five years, except for solid waste incineration units, for which the term may not exceed 12 years); *id.* § 72.69(b)(1) (limiting the term of CAA Acid Rain permits to five years); *id.* § 122.46(a) (limiting the terms of Clean Water Act ("CWA") National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits to five years); *id.* § 270.50(a) (limiting the term of RCRA hazardous waste permits to ten years).

⁶⁰ See, e.g., 42 U.S.C. § 7409 (requiring EPA to review and, if necessary to protect public health or welfare, revise National Ambient Air Quality Standards ("NAAQS") every five years, in consultation with a committee of scientific experts); *id.* § 7411(g)(4) (requiring EPA to revise New Source Performance Standards ("NSPS") setting the technological floor for pollution controls if a governor identifies a demonstrated technology and shows that the existing NSPS does not reflect the pollution control that technology can achieve); 33 U.S.C. § 1313(c) (requiring states to review and, if appropriate, revise water quality standards at least every three years to ensure those standards protect the public health and enhance water quality).

⁶¹ See, e.g., 40 C.F.R. § 70.1(b) (requiring all sources subject to CAA Title V operating permits to "have a permit to operate that assures compliance by the source with all applicable requirements"); *id.* § 70.2 (defining "applicable requirement" to mean, *inter alia*, any periodically updated NSPS that sets a technological floor for air pollution controls for particular pollutants and facilities; any periodically updated standard setting emission limits for facilities releasing hazardous air pollution under Section 112 of the CAA; and any periodically updated NAAQS limiting the concentration of particular air pollutants that may be in the air in a given area); *id.* § 122.44(l)(2)(ii) (providing that reissued NPDES permits under the CWA may not "be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain an effluent limitation which is less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time the permit is renewed, reissued, or modified").

⁶² *Id.* § 270.50(d) (providing that a RCRA permit for a hazardous waste facility is to be reviewed five years after issuance and modified "as necessary" consistent with 40 C.F.R. § 270.41); *Id.* § 270.41(a)(3).

RCRA's directives that standards be updated to reflect advances in science and technology, and that documents governing waste management be revised to incorporate those updated standards, also apply to solid waste. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 6944(a) (allowing solid waste disposal sites to be classified as sanitary landfills and not open dumps "only if there is no reasonable probability of adverse effects on health or the environment from disposal of solid waste at such facility;"); RCRA § 2002(b), 42 U.S.C. § 6912(b) (directing EPA to "review[] and, where necessary, revise[]" *all* RCRA implementing regulations every three years); RCRA § 1008, 42 U.S.C. § 6907 (stating that, "from time to time," EPA is to publish guidelines for solid waste management that "provide a technical and economic description of the level of performance that can be attained by various *available* solid waste management practices ... which provide for the protection of public health and the environment" and "provide minimum criteria to be used by the States to define those solid waste management practices which constitute the open dumping of solid waste...."); (emphasis added); *Appalachian Voices*, 989 F. Supp. 2d at 55 (holding that RCRA §§ 1008 and 2002(b) both apply to RCRA standards for solid waste, including CCR); 40 C.F.R. § 256.03(d)-(e) (providing that state Solid Waste Management Plans ("SWMPs") are to be reviewed and, if necessary, revised by the state at least every three years, and that an SWMP must be revised when it "is not in compliance with the requirements of these guidelines;"); *id.* § 256.01(b)(2) (requiring state SWMPs to require "that all solid waste ... shall be ... disposed of in sanitary landfills ... or otherwise disposed of in an environmentally sound manner.").

Consistent with that principle, EPA regulations governing solid waste management indicate that EPA neither contemplated nor intended that permits for solid waste facilities would not expire. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 256.63(a) (directing states to hold a public hearing "[b]efore approving a permit application (or *renewal* of a permit)" for solid waste facilities) (emphasis added); 40 C.F.R. § 256.06 (defining permit as "an entitlement to commence and continue operation of a facility as long as both procedural and performance standards are met."); 40 C.F.R. § 239.04(b) (requiring state permit programs for MSWLFs to include "[a]n explanation of how the state will ensure that existing and new facilities are permitted or otherwise approved and in compliance with the relevant Subtitle D federal revised criteria;"); 40 C.F.R. § 258.74(a)(2) (requiring that, if operators of MSWLFs rely on a trust fund for financial assurance, payments into the trust fund be made each year "over the term of the *initial* permit"). (emphasis added). Oklahoma's proposal to grant permits for life to CCR units contravenes the fundamental principle underlying our nation's environmental laws, including RCRA, that permits for polluting facilities must be revised to incorporate updated standards reflecting scientific and technological advances that reduce harm to public health and the environment.

A requirement that permits be periodically renewed is also critical to ensure compliance with applicable requirements, in that it directs the state regulatory agency, as well as the public, to review the facility's compliance record and other management issues. Periodic evaluation of the facility is required to ensure that facilities are in compliance with their permits, and have adequately conducted monitoring, maintenance, remediation, reporting, closure activities, as well as posted adequate bonds. The permit reissuance process presents a critical opportunity for state regulators and the public to examine issues essential to the safe operation of the facility. During this process, the facility must be required to provide current information on its operations and compliance. Since a permit is the critical instrument ensuring the facility's compliance with environmental laws, all permits must have fixed terms in order to reflect updated conditions and

remain tailored to a facility's individual operations. During regular permit reissuance, regulators and the public have the necessary opportunity to evaluate past performance and raise issues that may lead to permit modification or revocation. Permit review and reissuance is recognized by EPA as an essential function of the RCRA permit system.⁶³

Requiring permits to be periodically renewed is also just plain common sense. Facilities for the disposal of coal ash commonly operate for more than half a century. Decades of active coal ash disposal is followed by a 30-year minimum post-closure maintenance period. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 257.104(c). In light of the long-term nature of the disposal and maintenance activities at these sites, it is essential that state regulators periodically ascertain that the facility is in compliance with the permit, that the permit conditions adequately reflect the nature and scope of the disposal activities, and that the permit requires compliance with all updated safeguards.⁶⁴ For example, coal ash disposal at GRDA's Grand River Energy Center landfill added nearly five and a half thousand tons to the landfill in 2017 alone. Conditions after a decade of such disposal, following the dumping of approximately 55,000 additional tons of toxic waste, may be very different than the conditions that existed when the permit was issued. Therefore, to ensure the protection of public health and the environment, review and reissuance of permits are essential functions of the state permit program.

In addition to its inconsistency with fundamental principles of RCRA, the CAA, and the CWA, as well as basic common sense, the "permit for life" Oklahoma proposes also appears not to conform to Oklahoma's own laws, at least with regard to CCR surface impoundments. *See* 27A Okla.St. Ann. § 2-6-501(C) ("A permit for activities specified in paragraph A of this section shall be issued by the Executive Director for no more than five (5) years and may be renewed pursuant to rules of the Board"); 27A Okla.St. Ann. § 2-6-501(A)(1) ("The construction, installation, operation and closure of any industrial surface impoundment, industrial septic tank or treatment system, or the use of any existing unpermitted surface impoundment, septic tank or treatment system that is within the jurisdiction of the Department and which is proposed to be used for the containment or treatment of industrial wastewater or sludge."); OAC 252:616-1-2 (defining "surface impoundment" as "a native soil or lined basin either below or above ground level which is designed, maintained and/or operated to store, recycle, treat and/or dispose of industrial wastewater or stormwater, and shall include but is not limited to lagoons, excavations, basins, diked areas, and pits.").

⁶³ *See, e.g.*, EPA Memo, "EPA Controls Over RCRA Permit Renewals Report No. E1DSF9-11-0002-9100115," Mar. 30, 1999, available at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/9100115.pdf>; EPA, "Permit Modifications Report: Safeguarding the Environment in the Face of Changing Business Needs," Jan. 2016 [hereinafter "EPA Permit Modifications Report"], available at https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-01/documents/permit_mod_report_final_508.pdf.

⁶⁴ *See, e.g.*, EPA Permit Modifications Report at 41 ("It is important to have current safety and emergency response information available and related equipment ready in the event there is a fire, spill, or other emergency at a permitted facility. There are permit modifications that owners and operators of permitted facilities must propose when certain changes are made at the facility. These changes include things such as updated emergency/contingency plans, emergency contacts, and emergency equipment.")

In short, Oklahoma’s proposal to grant CCR units permits for life contravenes fundamental principles of our nation’s bedrock environmental laws, including RCRA, as well as Oklahoma law and common sense. EPA should deny Oklahoma’s Application.

V. EPA Must Reject Oklahoma’s CCR Program Because It Fails to Provide Adequate Opportunities for Public Participation.

EPA must reject Oklahoma’s application because its CCR program fails to provide adequate opportunities for public participation in the development, revision, implementation, and enforcement of its CCR regulations. Specifically, Oklahoma’s provisions for public participation in permitting, key post-permitting compliance determinations, and enforcement all fall short of the mandates set out in RCRA § 7004(b)(1) and implementing regulations codified at 40 C.F.R. Parts 25, 239, and 256.⁶⁵ Moreover, contrary to the WIIN Act, Oklahoma’s CCR

⁶⁵The regulations set out at 40 C.F.R. Parts 25, 239, and 256 do not apply to EPA’s approval of state CCR programs. Part 25 applies to certain enumerated activities set out in *id.* § 25.2(a), including the process for EPA approval of state administration of the State Hazardous Waste Program under RCRA, and state implementation of that program once approved. *See* 40 C.F.R § 25.2(a)(6)-(7), (e), and (f). EPA approval of, and state implementation of, state CCR programs are not included among those activities.

Part 239 likewise does not apply to state CCR programs or EPA approval thereof. Rather, it sets out the standards for state municipal solid waste landfill programs and for EPA approval of those programs. *See id.* § 239.1(a) (“This part specifies the requirements that state permit programs must meet to determined adequate by the EPA under [RCRA § 4005(c)(1)(C)] and the procedures EPA will follow in determining the adequacy of state Subtitle D permit programs or other systems of prior approval and conditions required to be adopted and implemented by states under RCRA [§] 4005(c)(1)(B).”); RCRA § 4005(c)(1)(B), 42 U.S.C. § 6945(c)(1)(B) (directing states to adopt permit programs...to assure that each solid waste management facility which may receive hazardous household waste or hazardous waste due to the provision of section 6921(d) of this title for small quantity generators... will comply with the criteria revised under section 6944(a) and 6907(a)(3) of this title.”); RCRA § 4005(c)(1)(C), 42 U.S.C. § 6945(c)(1)(C) (directing EPA to determine the adequacy of state programs “under this paragraph”). CCR units are not units that “may receive hazardous household waste or hazardous waste due to the provision of [42 U.S.C. § 6921(d)] for small quantity generators....” As such, they are not governed by 40 C.F.R. Part 239.

Finally, 40 C.F.R. Part 256, which sets forth minimum requirements for state Solid Waste Management Plans, also does not apply to state CCR programs or EPA approval thereof. *See* 40 C.F.R § 256.01(a) (“The purpose of these guidelines is to assist in the development and implementation of State solid waste management plans, in accordance with section 4002(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6942(b))....”). Indeed, EPA takes pains to differentiate between state CCR programs and state Solid Waste Management Plans governed by 40 C.F.R. Part 256: in its guidance document for approval of state CCR programs, EPA include a chart laying out the differences between CCR programs and Solid Waste Management Plans. *See* EPA, “Coal Combustion Residuals State Permit Program Guidance Document, Interim Final,” August 2017, at 1-12 [hereinafter “State CCR Guidance”], *available at* <https://www.epa.gov/coalash/guidance-coal-combustion-residuals-state-permit-programs>.

Notably, EPA has not claimed that 40 C.F.R. Parts 25, 239 or 256 apply to state CCR programs or EPA’s approval thereof. EPA states that it looked to the regulations codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 239 in evaluating the adequacy of Oklahoma’s program. *See* 83 Fed. Reg. at 2102. Although EPA states in the State CCR Guidance at page 2-1 that it “reviewed the requirements in 40 CFR parts 239, 256 and 258 as potential models for determining whether the statutory criteria have been met and has used these as a

program fails to provide public participation opportunities “at least as protective as” the few that are set out in the federal CCR rule. Accordingly, Oklahoma’s application must be rejected.

a. Oklahoma’s CCR Program Fails to Provide Adequate Opportunities for Public Participation in Permitting.

Oklahoma’s CCR program fails to provide even the minimum public participation opportunities in solid waste facility permitting mandated by 42 U.S.C. § 6974(b)(1) and RCRA’s implementing regulations, codified at 40 C.F.R. Parts 239, 256, and 25. First, as discussed above, Oklahoma’s CCR program fails to require new CCR units to submit numerous key compliance proposals and compliance demonstrations in their CCR permit applications. Because these key compliance proposals and demonstrations are excluded from the permit application, the public is not provided an opportunity to review and comment on those documents during the permitting process. Second, for existing CCR units, Oklahoma is entirely depriving the public of any opportunity to review and comment on permit applications, associated supporting documents, and even the CCR unit’s permit itself prior to issuance of that permit. Third, even when Oklahoma provides for public review and comment on certain key compliance demonstration documents in the permitting process, it fails to ensure that that public participation is meaningful. These deficiencies require EPA to reject Oklahoma’s application.

i. Background: Oklahoma’s Permitting Scheme

In Oklahoma, environmental permits are governed by the Oklahoma Uniform Environmental Permitting Act (“UEPA”), 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-101 et seq., and implementing regulations codified in Subchapter 7 of OAC 252:4. Applications for permits for CCR units are governed by the UEPA. OAC 252:517-3-3(a) (“All permit applications are subject to the Oklahoma Uniform Environmental Permitting Act as well as the requirements of this Subchapter.”). The UEPA establishes three “tiers” of environmental permits, “each with varying opportunities for public participation, and every permit application submitted to the Department falls within one of these 3 categories.” ODEQ Application at 5. The tiers are codified at OAC 252:4-7-58 through 60.

Tier 1 permits include “[m]odification to any solid waste permit to make minor changes;” “[m]odification of plans for closure and/or post-closure;” “[a]dministrative modification of all permits and other authorizations;” “[m]odification of an existing land disposal permit for a lateral expansion within permitted boundaries [for both on-site and off-site land disposal facilities];” “[t]he modification of a solid waste permit. . . involving a request for less than twenty-five percent (25%) increase in permitted capacity for storage. . . or disposal when the request is for equivalent methods, units or appurtenances as those permitted and which does not involve expansions of permitted boundaries;” and “[t]he approval of new and when applicable, modified or renewed. . . ; [p]ermit transfers; [n]on-hazardous industrial solid waste disposal plans;

basis for this guidance,” EPA does not purport to rely on regulations codified at 40 C.F.R. Parts 25 or 256 in evaluating Oklahoma’s program. *See* 83 Fed. Reg. 2100.

If any of the regulations codified at 40 C.F.R. Parts 25, 239 or 256 do apply to state CCR programs or EPA approval thereof, however, neither Oklahoma’s CCR program nor EPA’s procedures in proposing to approve that program meet their mandates, as explained further herein.

[t]echnical plans; ... [and] [a]ll other administrative approvals required by solid waste rules.” OAC 252:4-7-58(2) – (3).

There are *no opportunities* for public participation for Tier I permits, with the exception of requiring notice to the landowner. *See* 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-103(9) (defining “Tier I” as “a basic process of permitting which includes application, notice to the landowner and Department review....”); OAC 252:4-7-2 (“Tier I is the category for those things that are basically administrative decisions which can be made by a technical supervisor with no public participation except for the landowner.”).

Tier II permits include new permits for “on-site” solid waste disposal sites, meaning sites where waste is disposed at the facility at which it is generated; “[a]ny modification of an on-site solid waste permit, except as listed under Tier I;” and modifications of off-site solid waste permits requesting a “more than 25% but less than 50% increase in permitted capacity for disposal...except those listed under Tier I.” OAC 252:4-7-59(2)(B)-(C). Tier II will apply, per Oklahoma’s Application, to new permits for onsite CCR disposal units and to permit modifications as described in OAC 252:4-7-59.

In contrast to the provisions for Tier I permits, Oklahoma does provide some opportunities for public participation for Tier II permits. Those include:

- notice published in a local newspaper of permit applications and draft permits or draft denials, 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-302(A); OAC 252:4-7-13(c) – (d), as well as, for landfills, “notice by certified mail, return receipt requested, to owners of mineral interests and to adjacent landowners whose property may be substantially affected by installation of a landfill site.” OAC 252:4-7-13(f)(3);
- the opportunity to review and submit comments on permit applications, draft permits or draft permit denials, with a minimum of 30 days to comment; 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-302; 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-303(4); OAC 252:4-7-4(b);
- the opportunity to request a public meeting, which DEQ “shall” hold if it “receives written timely request...and determines there is a significant degree of public interest in the draft denial or draft permit,” which “shall be held at a location convenient to and near the proposed new site or existing facility...;” 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-303;
- notice at least 30 days in advance of that meeting, if held; 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-303(1); and
- a mandate that DEQ provide a response to comments. 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-304.⁶⁶

Notably, there is no opportunity for administrative (quasi-judicial) hearing on Tier II permits, which appears to preclude judicial review of the permit under Oklahoma’s Administrative Procedure Act. *See* 75 Okla. Stat. 250.3 (defining “Individual proceeding” as “the formal process employed by an agency having jurisdiction by law to resolve issues of law or fact

⁶⁶ In addition, if a Tier II permit applicant requests “significant corrections” – *i.e.*, a “correction” that “significantly alters a facility’s permitted size, capacity or limits,” OAC 252:4-7-18(c) – prior to issuance of a final permit, the applicant must publish notice of that correction and DEQ “may” open a public comment period and/or reconvene a public meeting ... on the proposed correction(s).” OAC 252:4-7-18(c)(1).

between parties and which results in the exercise of discretion of a judicial nature”); 75 Okla. Stat. 318 (“Any party aggrieved by a final agency order in an individual proceeding is entitled to certain, speedy, adequate and complete judicial review thereof pursuant to the provisions of this section and Sections 319, 320, 321, 322 and 323 of this title.”).⁶⁷

Finally, Tier III permits include new permits for off-site solid waste land disposal site; modifications of permits seeking a greater than 50% increase in permitted capacity for disposal; “Modification of an off-site solid waste land disposal permit for an expansion of permitted boundaries;” “Modification of an off-site solid waste permit in which the request involves different methods, units or appurtenances than those permitted, except those listed under Tier I;” and all variances. See OAC 252:4-7-60. Tier III will apply, per Oklahoma’s Application, to new permits for offsite CCR disposal units and “certain significant modifications” to offsite disposal units. OAC 252:4-7-60.

Oklahoma’s process for Tier III permits includes public notice of applications, draft permits, and proposed permits; two comment periods; opportunity for a public meeting; response to comments; and opportunity for a quasi-judicial administrative hearing (“individual proceeding”). As described by DEQ in Oklahoma’s Application, Tier III permits include the Tier II process plus (1) opportunity for a public meeting concerning the notice of application; (2) publication of a “notice of availability of proposed permit” and a response to comments, along with a proposed permit; (3) the opportunity to request an administrative permit hearing; (4) the permit is issued/denied by the Executive Director of DEQ; and (5) DEQ publishes notice of final permit decision and “availability” of Response to Comments.

ii. Oklahoma’s CCR Program Fails to Provide the Opportunities for Public Participation in Permitting Required by RCRA § 7004(b)(1)

In RCRA § 7004(b)(1), Congress made an unambiguous declaration that the public must be afforded opportunities to participate in all aspects of RCRA programs:

Public participation in the development, revision, implementation, and enforcement of any regulation, guideline, information, or program under this chapter shall be provided for, encouraged, and assisted by the Administrator and the States. The Administrator, in cooperation with the States, shall develop and publish minimum guidelines for public participation in such processes.

⁶⁷ The failure to provide for quasi-judicial hearings (“individual proceedings”) for Tier II permits may violate due process requirements of the Oklahoma Constitution for certain permits, including for landfills. See *DuLaney*, 868 P.2d at 681 n.16 (holding that, even where statute then in effect did not guarantee formal adjudicatory hearing, a formal hearing was still required: “Because the necessity of notice and an opportunity for a hearing is based on constitutionally protected property rights, an individual proceeding would remain necessary under the 1992 amendment.”); see also *Daffin v. State ex rel. Okla. Dep’t of Mines*, 2011 OK 22, ¶ 6, 251 P.3d 741 (holding that federal and Oklahoma Constitutional due process provisions required landowner who lived just over a mile from a proposed mine, but within the floodplain of a “high hazard” dam threatened by the mine, to be given formal notice of proposed mine, right to participate in a “conference,” and opportunity to comment on the mine proposal in that conference).

42 U.S.C. § 6974(b)(1). Courts have interpreted the nearly identical provision of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1251(e), as a clear, broad mandate for public participation, and have held that 33 U.S.C. § 1251(e) requires meaningful public participation in the context of permitting. *See Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc.*, 399 F.3d at 503 (reasoning that, as manifested by 33 U.S.C. § 1251(e), “Congress clearly intended to guarantee the public a meaningful role in the implementation of the Clean Water Act.”).

In *Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc.*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit held that EPA violated 33 U.S.C.A. § 1251(e) in adopting a rule that “effectively shield[ed]” site-specific permit conditions set out in nutrient management plans “from public scrutiny and comment...” 399 F.3d at 503. The court explained that the rule “prevents the public from calling for a hearing about—and then meaningfully commenting on—NPDES permits before they issue.” *Id.* The rule also violated 33 U.S.C. § 1251(e), the court explained, by failing to provide for public participation in the development and enforcement of those nutrient management plans because those plans “embody all the relevant ‘site specific nutrient management practices,’ [and thus] are a *sine qua non* of the ‘regulation, standard, plan, or program’ ... established to regulate land application discharges.” *Id.* at 504; *see also Sierra Club Mackinac Chapter*, 277 Mich.App. at 533-34 (same). In short, the public participation mandate of the Clean Water Act – and therefore the nearly-identical mandate of RCRA § 7004(b)(1) – demands that documents detailing site-specific practices required to comply with the statute or implementing regulations be made available for public review and comment before the associated permit issues.

Oklahoma’s CCR program fails to meet that demand. The state’s CCR program provides little and, in some cases, no opportunity for the public to review and comment on key documents setting out site-specific practices that the CCR unit must undertake to comply with the federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma requirements. As discussed above, under Oklahoma’s CCR program, applicants for permits for new CCR units and existing impoundments that do not already have a permit need not include in their permit applications many key compliance proposals and demonstrations, including the groundwater monitoring and sampling plans, the post-closure plan, structural stability assessments and the retrofit plan. *See* OAC 252:517-3-6(a). Oklahoma’s program grants these CCR units a “permit for life” without providing the public any opportunity to review and comment on those critical site-specific compliance documents before the permitting decision is made.

Moreover, Oklahoma’s CCR program does not appear to mandate that those site-specific compliance proposals and demonstrations – including but not limited to closure plans, post-closure plans, groundwater monitoring plans, and corrective action plans – be incorporated into a CCR unit’s permit. Those documents set out critical site-specific measures necessary for each CCR unit to comply with the CCR regulations; as such, they must – once reviewed and approved by DEQ – be incorporated into the permit as site-specific conditions. *See Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc.*, 399 F.3d at 503; *Env’tl. Def. Center*, 344 F.3d at 855; *Sierra Club Mackinac Chapter*, 277 Mich.App. at 533-34. And because those site-specific compliance proposals and demonstrations must be part of the permit, those that are available at the time of the permit application must be made available for public review and comment prior to issuance of that permit. *Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc.*, 399 F.3d at 503; *Env’tl. Def. Center*, 344 F.3d at 855; *Sierra Club Mackinac Chapter*, 277 Mich.App. at 533-34. Those compliance plans and demonstrations that are only

available after the initial permit is issued – including but not limited to alternative cause demonstrations, selection of corrective action remedies, and periodic structural stability assessments – should be included as part of applications required for permit re-openings or renewals which also must be made available for public review and comment.

The situation is even more problematic for existing CCR units, which under Oklahoma’s CCR program are only required to modify their existing permits. *See* OAC 252:517-1-7(b)-(c). Oklahoma represented to EPA in its state program application that “only CCR unit applications for *minor* modifications, lateral expansions within the permit boundary below a certain capacity, and approval of technical plans fall within the Tier I category.” Application at 6 (emphasis added). DEQ’s regulations setting forth which solid waste permits fall into Tier I likewise make clear that the lengthy and comprehensive permit modifications necessary to ensure permittees comply with federal CCR rules and their Oklahoma counterpart should not be classified as Tier I.⁶⁸ Nonetheless, it appears that DEQ is improperly classifying permit modification applications for existing CCR units – the permit modifications to obtain permits mandating compliance with the Oklahoma counterparts to the federal CCR rule – as “Tier 1” applications, meaning that there is *no opportunity whatsoever* for public review or comment of those permit applications or the associated “permits for life” that DEQ issues to these facilities prior to the permit’s issuance. *See* 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-103(9); OAC 252:4-7-2.

For example, GRDA submitted a permit modification application for the CCR landfill at the Grand River Energy Center, classifying it as “Tier I,” and DEQ made no indication that the application was improperly classified. *See* GRDA Tier I Permit Modification Application, March 14, 2017, attached hereto as Exhibit 3; Letter from DEQ to GRDA, June 23, 2017, attached hereto as Exhibit 4. There is nothing “minor” about that modification application: it includes numerous critical assessments necessary to determine compliance with the CCR program, including GRDA’s closure plan, post-closure plan, initial run-on/run-off control plan, and initial fugitive dust control plan, among other documents. *See* Ex. 3. DEQ went ahead and approved all of those plans with no public participation whatsoever. *See* Ex. 4. Entirely depriving the public of any opportunity to review and comment on the many critical compliance proposals submitted in permit applications, as well as on the permits themselves, prior to permit issuance may be in violation of the Oklahoma Constitution,⁶⁹ and is contrary to the broad directive of RCRA § 7004(b)(1). *See Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc.*, 399 F.3d at 503.

Finally, even when Oklahoma’s CCR program does provide for public review and comment in the permitting process, it fails to ensure that that public participation is meaningful. This problem is particularly acute for CCR unit closure plans. Oklahoma requires the owner/operator

⁶⁸ None of the categories DEQ sets out for Tier I permit applications come close to covering the complicated and lengthy modifications required to establish compliance with CCR requirements. *See* OAC 252:4-7-58(2) – (3).

⁶⁹ The opinion of the Oklahoma Supreme Court in *DuLaney*, 868 P.2d 676 indicates that due process protections of the Oklahoma and US Constitutions apply to property owners that may be impacted by any solid waste management disposal facility. *See DuLaney*, 868 P.2d at 685 (concluding that “[b]oth mineral interest owners and property owners whose residences may be affected by a solid waste management disposal facility have legally protected rights sufficient to require the application of due process privileges guaranteed by the United States and Oklahoma Constitutions.”).

of a new CCR unit to submit a closure plan for the unit as part of its permit application, OAC 252:517-3-6(a)(11)(D), thus making the closure plan subject to public review and comment prior to permit issuance if Oklahoma stays true to its word in its Application that new CCR units will be permitted as Tier II or III. *See* Application at 7; 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-302; OAC 252:4-7-59; OAC 252:4-7-60. But owners/operators may modify their closure plans at any time, OAC 252-517-15-7(b)(3)(a), and Oklahoma’s regulations treat modifications to closure plans as Tier I permits, which provide no public participation opportunities. *See* OAC 252:4-7-2 (“Tier I is the category ... with no public participation except for the landowner”); OAC 252:4-7-58(2)(A)(iii) (Tier I includes “[m]odifications of plans for closure”). The public, then, could provide extensive input on a CCR unit’s closure plan during the Tier II or III permitting process, only to have the CCR unit modify that closure plan – potentially only days after receiving its permit – wholly behind closed doors. This creates the possibility for bait-and-switch that deprives the public of meaningful opportunity to comment on closure plans – plans which, if inadequately protective, could subject Oklahoma communities to dangerous pollution for generations.

In sum, Oklahoma’s CCR program fails to afford the public participation opportunities in permitting required by 42 U.S.C. § 6974(b)(1). Oklahoma must revise its permitting program to ensure that the public is afforded a meaningful opportunity to review and comment on all critical compliance proposals, potentially by specifying that all CCR permit applications (whether new applications or permit modifications) fall into Tiers II or III of its permit classification system, and that all compliance proposals must be submitted as part of permit applications. Unless and until it makes the necessary changes to ensure its program conforms to RCRA § 7004(b)(1), EPA may not approve Oklahoma’s Application.

iii. Oklahoma’s CCR Program Fails to Provide the Opportunities for Public Participation in Permitting Called For in 40 C.F.R. Part 239

Oklahoma’s CCR program also fails to meet the mandates for public participation in permitting set out in 40 C.F.R. Part 239.⁷⁰ Under 40 C.F.R. § 239.6(a)(1), state programs must ensure that “[d]ocuments for permit determinations are made available for public review and comment.” In turn, 40 C.F.R. § 239.2 defines “permit or prior approval and conditions” as “any authorization, license, or equivalent control document issued under the authority of the state regulating the location, design, operation, ground-water monitoring, closure, post-closure care, corrective action, and financial assurance of Subtitle D regulated facilities” and “permit documents” as “permit applications, draft and final permits, or other documents that include applicable design and management conditions in accordance with the Subtitle D federal revised criteria ... and the technical and administrative information used to explain the basis of permit conditions.”

In short, Part 239 mandates that all documents necessary to meaningfully evaluate and ensure compliance with applicable standards be made available for public review and comment. *See, e.g., STIR*, 61 Fed Reg. 2595 (interpreting 40 C.F.R. Part 239.6 and stating: “The Agency recognizes public involvement in permit decisions as an essential component of an effective

⁷⁰ As discussed in *supra* note 65, the regulations set out at 40 C.F.R. Part 239 do not apply to EPA’s approval of state CCR programs. If they did apply, Oklahoma’s CCR program would fail to meet their mandates, as explained herein.

permit program. In light of the recognized importance of public participation, EPA is requiring that *the permit application process must provide for public review of and input to permit documents containing the applicable site-specific design and operating conditions* and must provide for consideration of comments received and notification to the public of the final permit decision.”).

Oklahoma’s CCR program stands in stark contrast. As explained herein, the state’s CCR program provides little and, in some cases, no opportunity for the public to review and comment on key documents setting out site-specific practices that the CCR unit must undertake to comply with the federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma requirements. Under Oklahoma’s CCR program, applicants for permits for new CCR units need not include in their permit applications many key compliance proposals and demonstrations, including the groundwater monitoring and sampling plans, the post-closure plan, structural stability assessments and the retrofit plan. *See* OAC 252:517-3-6(a). Oklahoma’s program grants these CCR units a “permit for life” without providing the public any opportunity to review and comment on those critical site-specific compliance documents before the permitting decision is made.

Moreover, as described above, the public is deprived of its rightful public participation opportunities to an even greater extent in the context of permit modifications for existing CCR units in Oklahoma. DEQ has already classified permit modification applications for existing CCR units as “Tier 1” applications, leaving the public with no opportunity whatsoever to review or comment on any documents setting out conditions for, or purporting to show compliance with, requirements of the federal CCR rule and corresponding Oklahoma regulations at those existing CCR units. This wholesale shutting-out of the public in permitting decisions for existing CCR units is plainly contrary to the mandates of 40 C.F.R. Part 239.6. *See, e.g.*, 40 C.F.R. § 239.6(a)(1); STIR, 61 Fed Reg. 2595. Oklahoma’s Application, as such, must be denied.

iv. Oklahoma’s CCR Program Fails to Provide the Opportunities for Public Participation in Permitting Called for in 40 C.F.R. Part 256

Oklahoma’s CCR program also does not provide the opportunities for public participation in permitting called for by 40 C.F.R. Part 256.⁷¹ For one, 40 C.F.R. § 256.03(c) provides that state plans shall be “developed in accord in public participation procedures required by Subpart G of this part.” Subpart G includes 40 C.F.R. § 256.63, which states that “(a) Before approving a permit application (or renewal of a permit) for a . . . solid waste disposal facility the State shall hold a public hearing to solicit public reaction and recommendations on the proposed permit application if the State determines there is a significant degree of public interest in the proposed permit. (b) This hearing shall be held in accord with 40 CFR 25.5.”

In turn, 40 C.F.R. § 25.5 sets out a number of important provisions to ensure meaningful access to, and participation in, public hearings. That section provides that public hearings are to be “held at times and places which, to the maximum extent feasible, facilitate attendance by the public. Accessibility of public transportation, and use of evening and weekend hearings, should

⁷¹ As discussed in *supra* note 65, the regulations set out at 40 C.F.R. Part 256 do not apply to EPA’s approval of state CCR programs. If they did apply, Oklahoma’s CCR program would fail to meet their mandates, as explained herein.

be considered.” 40 C.F.R. § 25.5(c). It further calls for 45-day advanced notice to the public of the hearing except in emergency situations or “where EPA determines that there are no substantial documents which must be reviewed for effective hearing participation and that there are no complex or controversial matters to be addressed by the hearing,” in which case “the notice requirement may be reduced to no less than 30 days.” 40 C.F.R. § 25.5(b). In addition, it calls for the advanced notice to be mailed to “appropriate portions” of a list that the notifying agency is required to develop of “persons and organizations who have expressed an interest in or may, by the nature of their purposes, activities or members, be affected by or have an interest in any covered activity.” *Id.*; 40 C.F.R. § 25.4(b)(5).

Oklahoma’s CCR program falls far short of providing the public participation opportunities set forth in 40 C.F.R. § 256.63. As discussed above, for “Tier I” permits – which DEQ is apparently considering an appropriate classification for modifications of permits for existing CCR units – there is no opportunity for public hearing whatsoever. *See* 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-103(9); OAC 252:4-7-2. And, although there are some provisions for a “public meeting” for Tier II and Tier III permits, those provisions do not include certain critical components for public participation contained in 40 C.F.R. § 256.63.

Oklahoma’s process for Tier II and III permits includes some provisions for public participation, but those fall short of the safeguards for meaningful public participation included in 40 C.F.R. § 256.63. To begin with, it appears that the “public meeting” Oklahoma provides for Tier II and III permits may not qualify as a “public hearing,” as referenced in 40 C.F.R. §§ 256.63 and 25.5, incorporated therein. Under 40 C.F.R. § 25.5(e), the agency holding the public hearing “shall inform the audience of the issues involved in the decision to be made, the considerations the agency will take into account, the agency’s tentative determinations (if any), and the information which is particularly solicited from the public.” Nothing in Oklahoma’s Application or in Oklahoma’s statutory and regulatory mandates for public meetings on Tier II and III permits requires DEQ to provide such information at the public meeting. *See* 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-303.

Oklahoma also does not require that a list of interested and affected persons and organizations be kept, and appropriate portions of that list notified of a public hearing. Nowhere in its Application does Oklahoma indicate that, as called for in 40 C.F.R. Part 256, the state will develop, maintain, and mail notification of public meeting to a list of “persons and organizations who have expressed an interest in or may, by the nature of their purposes, activities or members, be affected by or have an interest in” permitting of CCR units. No statutory or regulatory provisions that DEQ cited or provided in its Application mandate that DEQ develop, maintain, and mail notification of the public meeting to such a list.

Oklahoma’s provisions for public meetings on Tier II and III permits also fail to include the time and location mandates included by incorporation in 40 C.F.R. § 256.63. DEQ regulations state that a public meeting on a Tier II or III permit “shall be held at a location convenient to and near the proposed new site or existing facility.” 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-14-303(2). Nowhere, however, in Oklahoma’s Application, or in the statutory and regulatory provisions on which it relies, is there a mandate that the public meeting be “held at times and places which, to the maximum extent feasible, facilitate attendance by the public,” or that “[a]ccessibility of public

transportation, and use of evening and weekend hearings, should be considered,” as set forth in 40 C.F.R. § 25.5(c). Moreover, nothing in Oklahoma’s Application or the statutes or regulations it cites to provide for 45-day advanced notice of public meetings on Tier II and III permit applications, as provided by 40 C.F.R. § 25.5(b). The exception in that provision allowing for 30-day advanced notice where the permitting agency “determines that there are no substantial documents which must be reviewed for effective hearing participation and that there are no complex or controversial matters to be addressed by the hearing” is clearly not applicable for CCR unit permits, where the nature of the regulations, and the documentation submitted with permit applications purporting to show how a CCR unit will comply with those regulations, is highly technical, voluminous, and complex.⁷²

The omission of these mandates to facilitate public participation has a real-world impact. Many people cannot attend a public hearing during daytime hours on a weekday, for example, and others may not have the time or money to get to locations far from their homes or that are not easily accessible by public transportation. An additional two weeks of notice prior to the hearing provides the public more time to prepare for that hearing, and thus provide more meaningful and studied input; for some, the additional time will make it possible for them to attend the hearing. Finally, the failure to develop, maintain and notify a list of interested or affected persons or organizations means that – as occurred when Oklahoma first adopted its CCR regulations in 2016 – many interested and affected Oklahomans will never know that a CCR unit near their homes, water wells, or waterways they love is seeking a permit that could allow it to continue poisoning their waters for decades or longer. Oklahoma’s Application should be denied.

v. Oklahoma’s CCR Program Fails to Provide the Opportunities for Public Participation in Permitting Called for in 40 C.F.R. Part 25

Oklahoma’s CCR program also fails to provide the opportunities for public participation in permitting called for in 40 C.F.R. Part 25.⁷³ As discussed immediately above, Oklahoma’s CCR program provides no public hearing at all for Tier I permits, and, for Tier II and III permits, does not include a mandate that (1) notice of the public hearing be provided 45 days in advance of the hearing; (2) that DEQ inform attendees “of the issues involved in the decision to be made, the considerations the agency will take into account, the agency’s tentative determinations (if any), and the information which is particularly solicited from the public;” (3) that DEQ develop, maintain and notify, via mail, a list of persons and organizations potentially interested in or affected by the permitting of CCR units; and (4) that public hearings be held at times and locations which facilitate public participation. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 25.5(b), (c) and (e).

Even if the “public meetings” Oklahoma offers for Tier II and III permits need not be public hearings, Oklahoma’s CCR program is still inconsistent with the public participation provisions of 40 C.F.R. Part 25. Section 25.6 of that Part states that “[t]he requirements of §25.5 (b) and (c)

⁷² The permitting documentation that must be reviewed for effective hearing participation is highly technical, voluminous and complex notwithstanding the significant omissions in Oklahoma’s content requirements for CCR unit permit applications discussed herein.

⁷³ As discussed in *supra* note 65, the regulations set out at 40 C.F.R. Part 25 do not apply to EPA’s approval of state CCR programs. If they did apply, Oklahoma’s CCR program would fail to meet their mandates, as explained herein.

are applicable to public meetings, except that the agency holding the meeting may reduce the notice to not less than 30 days if there is good reason that longer notice cannot be provided.” Oklahoma has provided no “good reason” why the 45-day notice cannot be provided. Thus, because Oklahoma’s CCR program does not include the public participation provisions set out in 40 C.F.R. § 25.5 (b)-(c) for public hearings, it likewise falls short of provisions for public meetings set forth in 40 C.F.R. § 25.6.

Finally, Oklahoma’s CCR program falls short of 40 C.F.R. Part 25’s provisions with regard to provision of information to the public. 40 C.F.R. § 25.4 states that “[p]roviding information to the public is a necessary prerequisite to meaningful, active public involvement. Agencies shall design informational activities to encourage and facilitate the public’s participation in all significant decisions covered by §25.2(a)” 40 C.F.R. § 25.4(b)(1). It further states: “Each agency shall provide the public with continuing policy, program, and technical information and assistance beginning at the earliest practicable time Fact sheets, news releases, newsletters, and other similar publications may be used to provide notice that materials are available and to facilitate public understanding of more complex documents, but *shall not be a substitute for public access to the full documents.*” 40 C.F.R. § 25.4(b)(2) (emphasis added).

As discussed at length above, Oklahoma fails to require numerous key compliance proposals and demonstrations to be made part of the permitting record available for public review because it does not require CCR permit applicants to submit them as part of their permit applications, even though the requirements they purport to demonstrate compliance with are part of the permits. *See* OAC 252:517-1-7(a). By depriving the public of access to those critical compliance documents, Oklahoma is failing to provide “public access to the full documents” necessary to allow meaningful public participation in permitting decisions. As such, it falls short of the provisions contained in 40 C.F.R. Part 25, and its Application should be denied.

b. Oklahoma’s CCR Program Fails to Provide Adequate Opportunities for Public Participation in Key Post-Permitting Decisions.

Contrary to RCRA § 7004(b)(1) and the regulations EPA looked to in evaluating Oklahoma’s Application, *see* 40 C.F.R. Part 239, Oklahoma’s CCR program deprives the public of the opportunity to review and comment on key documents informing critical post-permitting decisions. EPA has made clear that:

[O]pportunities for public review of and input to key post-permit decisions (e.g., significant permit modifications) is essential to an effective public participation program. ...While some States/Tribes may distinguish between minor permit actions... and major permit actions (e.g., selecting a corrective action a remedy), *the public should be involved in key decisions which affect their health and their community.* For example, public notice of remedial actions and opportunity to comment on the selection of remedies is recommended.

STIR, 61 Fed. Reg. at 2595 (Interpreting 40 C.F.R. Part 239) (emphasis added); *see also* EPA, “Alaska: Tentative Determination and Final Determination of Full Program Adequacy of the State of Alaska’s Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Permit Program,” 65 Fed. Reg. 453, 457 (Jan. 5, 2000) (evaluating Alaska’s state MSWLP program under 40 C.F.R. Part 239 and basing

approval of that program, in part, on Alaska’s representation in its state program application that it will “provide additional public participation opportunities after a permit is issued, including at the time of permit renewals and major modifications or variances ...”).

As discussed above, many key site-specific compliance proposals are developed subsequent to the permitting process, including “alternative cause demonstrations,” selection of corrective measures to halt and clean up groundwater pollution, and periodic structural stability assessments that determine, in some cases, whether an impoundment must be immediately closed. *See* OAC 252:517-9-6; OAC 252:517-9-7; OAC 252:517-9-8; OAC 252:517-11-4(a), (d), (e) and (f). Other key decisions may be made post-permitting; for example, owners/operators may modify their closure plans at any time. OAC 252-517-15-7(b)(3)(a).

Oklahoma’s CCR program provides no opportunity for public review and comment on these critical post-permitting compliance proposals. Because CCR unit permittees are required by their permit to submit these documents to DEQ, *see* OAC 252:517-1-7(a), there is no indication that these post-permit submissions will be treated as separate permit applications. And even if they were, the only “tier” of Oklahoma’s tiered permitting system that appears to encompass these compliance documents is Tier I, which provides no public participation whatsoever in the permitting process.⁷⁴ Because Oklahoma’s CCR program fails to provide the post-permitting opportunities for public participation contained in 40 C.F.R. Part 239, Oklahoma’s Application must be denied.

c. Oklahoma Fails to Show That It Provides the Required Minimum Public Participation Opportunities for Enforcement.

Oklahoma failed to show that its CCR program affords the public participation opportunities in enforcement required by RCRA § 7004(b)(1) and set forth in 40 C.F.R. Part 239.⁷⁵ Specifically, the state has not shown that it provides for citizen intervention in civil enforcement proceedings.

In order to satisfy the public participation directive of 33 U.S.C. § 1251(e) – the CWA provision that is nearly identical to RCRA § 7004(b)(1)) – a state permitting program must provide an opportunity for citizen intervention in civil enforcement proceedings. *Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc. v. U.S. E.P.A.*, 859 F.2d 156, 177-78 (D.C. Cir. 1988). That opportunity may be via intervention by right or permissive intervention, as long as state law provided for permissive intervention and the state agrees not to oppose citizens’ requests to intervene. *Id.*; *see also Citizens for a Better Env’t v. EPA*, 596 F.2d 720, 726 & 726 n.2 (7th Cir.1979) (holding that a provision directing the state agency to “develop internal procedures for receiving and ensuring

⁷⁴ *See* OAC 252:4-7-2 (“Tier I is the category for those things that are basically administrative decisions which can be made by a technical supervisor with no public participation except for the landowner.”); OAC 252:4-7-58(2)(A)(iii) (Tier I includes “[m]odifications of plans for closure and/or post-closure”); OAC 252:4-7-58(3)(D) (Tier I includes “The approval of new or when applicable, modified or renewed... Technical plans”).

⁷⁵ As discussed in *supra* note 65, the regulations set out at 40 C.F.R. Part 239 do not apply to EPA’s approval of state CCR programs. If they did apply, Oklahoma’s CCR program would fail to meet their mandates, as explained herein.

proper consideration of information and evidence submitted by citizens” and “promptly investigate[alleged violations]” failed to satisfy the mandate of 33 U.S.C.A. § 1251(e) because it “is no more than a legalistic articulation of a common courtesy and hardly can be cited as satisfaction of the EPA's statutory duty to issue regulations promoting public participation in state enforcement.”)

40 C.F.R. § 239.9 includes precisely that provision. It states that, to be approved, state programs must:

- (a) allow[] intervention, as a right, in any civil action to obtain remedies specified in §239.8 by any citizen having an interest that is or may be adversely affected; or
- (b) [provide] [a]ssurance by the appropriate state agency that: (1) It will provide notice and opportunity for public involvement in all proposed settlements of civil enforcement actions (except where immediate action is necessary to adequately protect human health and the environment); and (2) It will investigate and provide responses to citizen complaints about violations; and (3) It will not oppose citizen intervention when permissive intervention is allowed by statute, rule, or regulation.

These requirements are mirrored in EPA’s State CCR Guidance.⁷⁶

Oklahoma’s Application fails to establish that it meets either prong of 40 C.F.R. § 239.9. The state makes clear that it cannot meet the second option – providing for permissive intervention under 40 C.F.R. § 239.9(b) – because it does not provide public notice of proposed settlements of civil enforcement actions. Specifically, Oklahoma admits that it cannot meet 40 C.F.R. § 239.9(b)(1) because it “has no statutory or regulatory process for public notice in the event that a civil enforcement action is settled in District Court.” Application at 9. Tellingly, Oklahoma never even argued that it meets 40 C.F.R. § 239.9(a)’s requirement that a state provide intervention as of right in civil enforcement actions. Although EPA cites to a provision of the Oklahoma code providing intervention as of right in certain situations, Oklahoma never brought that up in its application, much less provided examples of that provision being relied on to allow intervention as of right in civil enforcement proceedings. Oklahoma has, in contrast, clearly demonstrated its intent to provide a right to intervene in similar contexts, such as in 27A Okla. Stat., § 2-6-206(B), regarding discharge permits. That provision states:

Any person having any interest connected with the geographic area or waters or water system affected, including but not limited to any aesthetic, recreational,

⁷⁶ In the State CCR Guidance, EPA states: “Using the existing regulations and the criteria used to approve Municipal Solid Waste Programs as a model, EPA believes that a State seeking approval should demonstrate that intervention in the State civil enforcement process is possible by providing either: (a) Authority that allows intervention, as a right, in any civil action to obtain remedies specified in Q & A (6) by any citizen having an interest that is or may be adversely affected; or, (b) Assurance by the appropriate State agency that: (1) It will provide notice and opportunity for public involvement in all proposed settlements of civil enforcement actions (except where immediate action is necessary to adequately protect human health and the environment); and, (2) It will investigate and provide responses to citizen complaints about violations; and, (3) It will not oppose citizen intervention when permissive intervention is allowed by statute, rule, or regulation.” State CCR Guidance at 2-5.

health, environmental, pecuniary or property interest, which interest is or may be adversely affected, shall have the right to intervene as a party in any administrative proceeding before the Department, or in any civil proceeding, relating to violations of the Oklahoma Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Act or rules, permits or orders issued hereunder.

Unless and until Oklahoma is willing to provide similar, explicit statutory language ensuring intervention as of right in civil enforcement actions pertaining to its CCR program, EPA should find that it fails to meet its burden to ensure citizen participation in enforcement, and deny Oklahoma's Application. *See Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 859 F.2d at 178; *Citizens for a Better Env't*, 596 F.2d at 726; *Cf. Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chem. and Energy Workers Int'l Union ("PACE") v. Continental Carbon Co.*, No. CIV 02-1677 R, 2003 WL 24206367, *5 (W.D. Okla. June 23, 2003) (holding that Oklahoma's public participation provisions were comparable to those of the CWA due to intervention as of right provided in 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-6-206(B), and concluding that "if a state law permits intervention as of right by a citizen having an interest which is or may be adversely affected, the minimum standard for public participation in the enforcement of any program established by a state under the CWA is met").

d. Oklahoma's CCR Program Does Not Ensure Public Participation in Modifications to State Programs.

Contrary to RCRA § 7004(b)(1) and inconsistent with 40 C.F.R. Parts 239 and 256, Oklahoma's CCR program does not ensure public participation in the modification of the state's CCR program. 40 C.F.R. § 239.12(d) directs states to notify EPA "of all permit program modifications," while 40 C.F.R. § 239.12(g) provides that, for most "revised [state] applications,"⁷⁷ and "all amended applications in the case of partially approved programs," public participation is required. 40 C.F.R. Part 256, in turn, provides that a state plan "shall contain procedures for revision," and "shall be revised by the State, after *notice and public hearings*, when" EPA or the State determines that the existing state plan is inadequate, inconsistent with 40 C.F.R. Part 256, or otherwise requires modification. 40 C.F.R. § 256.03(d) (emphasis added).

Neither Oklahoma's CCR regulations nor its Application contain any "procedures for revision," as called for by 40 C.F.R. § 256.03(d), nor provide any information whatsoever about what procedures DEQ will employ if and when the state modifies its CCR program. This gaping hole leaves many key questions unanswered. Will Oklahoma notify EPA of all permit program modifications, as called for by 40 C.F.R. Part 239? Are there any types of modifications to the state program that Oklahoma proposes not to submit to EPA for approval? If so, what are they? How soon does Oklahoma propose to notify EPA in the instance of a change to its state CCR program? In general, what procedures will be used for modification of the state program, and what public participation opportunities will be offered? Without clarity as to the procedures for when and whether modifications to the state program would be submitted to EPA for approval, or other clear provisions affording public participation in such modifications, Oklahomans are

⁷⁷ Only modified state programs that "incorporate permit programs for additional classifications of Subtitle D regulated facilities" may not require public participation. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 239.12(g).

left wondering if and when they will be provided the required opportunity to weigh in on the operations of CCR units that have longstanding, harmful impacts to health and environment.

This concern is underscored by the fact that EPA is already in the process of proposing revisions to the federal CCR rule. As noted above, the WIIN Act requires state CCR programs to be “as protective as” any revised CCR Rule and directs EPA to withdraw approval of a state’s CCR program if it fails to meet that standard. 42 U.S.C. §§ 6945(D)(i)(II), (D)(ii)(I), and (E). Because EPA is now proposing to revise the federal CCR rule, it is foreseeable that Oklahoma may decide to modify its CCR program in response to those revisions. Without procedures in place for public participation if and when that likely modification to Oklahoma’s CCR program takes place, Oklahomans may be left without adequate opportunity for input into changes into that plan, with serious implications for their health, safety and environment.

Oklahoma’s failure to clearly set out the procedures for modification of its CCR program and the public participation opportunities to be afforded with any such modification renders the state program inconsistent with 40 C.F.R. Parts 239 and 256 and RCRA § 7004(b)(1). Accordingly, EPA must reject Oklahoma’s Application.

e. Oklahoma’s CCR Program Fails to Provide Public Participation Opportunities “At Least As Protective As” Those in the Federal CCR Rule.

- i. Oklahoma’s CCR Program does not ensure that “interested and affected parties” are notified of a public meeting on the assessment of corrective measures at polluting CCR units.

Oklahoma’s CCR program does not ensure that all “interested and affected parties” will be notified of a public meeting on the assessment of corrective measures at polluting CCR units, and therefore is not “at least as protective as” the federal CCR rule. When groundwater pollution has been found at a CCR unit, the federal CCR rule requires the owner/operator of such unit to assess corrective measures and to “discuss the results of the corrective measures assessment at least 30 days prior to the selection of remedy, in a public meeting with interested and affected parties.” 40 C.F.R. § 257.96(e). Oklahoma added notice requirements to its state provisions concerning this public meeting, directing the owner or operator to notify, via certified mail, “all persons who own the land or minerals or who reside on the land that directly overlies any part of the plume of contamination and within one year time of travel if contaminants have migrated off-site,” and “boards of County Commissioners, incorporated municipalities, rural water districts and conservation districts within a three-mile radius of the facility.” OAC 252:517-9-7(e). Oklahoma also mandates that “[l]egal notice of the public meeting shall be published at least 10 calendar days prior to the date of the meeting in accordance with forms and instructions provided by the DEQ,” *id.*, but provides no further clarity as to what “instructions” or “forms” DEQ may provide for publication of such notice.

Oklahoma’s requirements fail to ensure that all “interested and affected” parties receive notice of the meeting and thus have the opportunity to participate in it. Numerous community members and residents who do not live on land “directly overl[ying]” the plume, or where the plume is predicted to travel within one year, may be interested or affected by pollution from the

CCR unit. For example, drinking water wells or surface water intakes may be located just further than where the plume is predicted to travel within one year; private or community water wells may draw from an aquifer that intersects with the plume. Residents who drink such water would potentially be “interested or affected” by the pollution from the CCR unit but, under Oklahoma’s program, would not receive direct notice of the meeting. Nor is it clear that notice would be published in news outlets local to such residents and communities, since Oklahoma’s CCR program does not specify where publication of such notice would be required. Failing to notify these “interested and affected” parties could result in a corrective measures assessment that does not take into account important water or geological features, local uses, or other important considerations that could affect the success of measures taken to abate pollution. This failure renders Oklahoma’s CCR program not “at least as protective as” the federal CCR rule; the state’s application must, therefore, be denied.

ii. Oklahoma’s CCR Program Provides Insufficient Notification to Tribes.

Oklahoma’s CCR program is not “at least as protective as” the federal CCR rule because it fails to incorporate 40 C.F.R. § 257.106(b). That provision requires notification to tribes concerning the availability of a variety of compliance demonstration documents – including analyses showing compliance with location restrictions and design restrictions, among others – when a CCR unit is located in part on Tribal land. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 257.106(b), OAC 252:517-19-2. EPA pointed out this deficiency and asked Oklahoma to clarify. Oklahoma responded that if a CCR unit were located in part on Tribal land, it would aim to “work cooperatively with” EPA to issue a joint permit for that CCR unit. *See* DEQ, CCR Permit Program Application, Response to EPA request for Clarification, dated Oct. 18, 2017, Docket No. EPA-HQ-OLEM-2017-0613-0004, at 6. Oklahoma did not offer to modify, nor did it modify, its CCR program to require that notification to tribes be provided in that circumstance.

Although Oklahoma represents that there are currently no CCR units located partially in Oklahoma and partially in Tribal territory, its program covers new CCR units as well as existing ones and a CCR unit might in the future be built in such a location. Failing to require CCR units located partially in Tribal territory to notify Tribal governments of compliance demonstration documents may result in less notice to Native Americans of these critical documents, which, in turn, decreases the likelihood of citizen enforcement if those compliance assessments are deficient. By omitting this requirement, Oklahoma is giving polluters an opportunity to slip by unnoticed when and if they soil Oklahoma’s and Tribal waters – which, as discussed above, is exactly what industry sought in asking DEQ to adopt the state’s CCR program. This must not be tolerated. A program that limits opportunities for Tribal residents residing within the state’s borders to ensure that CCR requirements are fully complied with is not “at least as protective as” the federal CCR rule and may not be approved under the WIIN Act.

VI. EPA Must Not Approve Oklahoma’s CCR Program Unless and Until It Adopts Guidelines for Adequate Public Participation in State CCR Programs and Provides the Public with Adequate Opportunity for Meaningful Review and Comment.

a. EPA Must Not Approve Oklahoma’s CCR Program Unless and Until It Adopts Guidelines for Public Participation in State CCR Programs Pursuant to RCRA Section 7004(b).

EPA may not proceed with final approval of Oklahoma’s CCR program – and should not have tentatively approved the state’s CCR program – unless and until it promulgates formal guidelines specifying the public participation opportunities that states must afford in order for EPA to approve a state CCR program. As discussed above, RCRA § 7004(b)(1) provides that:

Public participation in the development, revision, implementation, and enforcement of any regulation, guideline, information, or program under this chapter shall be provided for, encouraged, and assisted by the Administrator and the States. The Administrator, in cooperation with the States, *shall develop and publish minimum guidelines for public participation* in such processes.

RCRA § 7004(b)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 6974(b)(1) (emphasis added). This provision sets forth a clear Congressional directive to EPA to promulgate regulations containing minimum guidelines for public participation in any RCRA program, which includes state CCR programs. *See, e.g., City of Dover v. U.S. E.P.A.*, 956 F.Supp.2d 272 (D.D.C. 2013) (holding that 33 U.S.C. § 1251(e)⁷⁸ establishes a non-discretionary duty for EPA to promulgate regulations setting forth public participation guidelines); *Citizens for a Better Env’t*, 596 F.2d at 722 (holding that 33 U.S.C. § 1251(e) establishes a non-discretionary duty for EPA to promulgate regulations setting forth public participation guidelines in state NPDES programs); *E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Train*, 430 U.S. 112, 116 (1977) (holding that a statute requiring an agency to “develop and publish” guidelines directs the agency to promulgate those guidelines).

The fact that EPA has promulgated guidelines setting forth public minimum public participation requirements for other RCRA programs does not satisfy RCRA § 7004(b)(1). *See Citizens for a Better Env’t*, 596 F.2d at 722-23 (holding that EPA’s prior adoption of public participation regulations for NPDES permits, but not for state NPDES program enforcement, did not satisfy 33 U.S.C.A. § 1251(e)). Aspects of state CCR programs for which EPA must promulgate public participation guidelines include, but are not limited to, permitting; post-permitting, including modification of the state program; and enforcement. *See id.*; *Nat. Res. Def. Council*, 859 F.2d at 178; *Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc.*, 399 F.3d at 503; *Env’tl. Def. Center, Inc.*, 344 F.3d at 855; *Sierra Club Mackinac Chapter*, 277 Mich.App. at 533-34; *see also* EPA, “Final

⁷⁸ 33 U.S.C. § 1251(e) is nearly identical to 42 U.S.C. § 6974(b)(1). It states:

Public participation in the development, revision, and enforcement of any regulation, standard, effluent limitation, plan, or program established by the Administrator or any State under this chapter shall be provided for, encouraged, and assisted by the Administrator and the States. The Administrator, in cooperation with the States, shall develop and publish regulations specifying minimum guidelines for public participation in such processes.

Rule: Subtitle D Regulated Facilities; State Permit Program Determination of Adequacy; State Implementation Rule,” 63 Fed. Reg. 57,026, 57,034 (Oct. 23, 1998) (asserting that, by requiring approved states to have public participation procedures for permit issuance and post-permit action [including modification of state programs] and to provide for public intervention in civil enforcement proceedings,” EPA “encourage[d] public participation as prescribed under RCRA section 7004(b).”).

Moreover, it is not enough to promulgate minimum public participation guidelines after approving a state program. That puts the cart before the horse, rendering judicial review of EPA’s approval of state programs infeasible. As the Seventh Circuit explains in *Citizens for a Better Environment*:

Congress did not intend reviewing courts to make ad hoc determinations about the adequacy of the citizen participation components of state programs without the benefit of regulations duly promulgated by the EPA. The only way to prevent such unguided judicial judgments is to require the EPA to... issu[e] public participation regulations prior to the ratification of a state NPDES program.

Id. at 724.

Here, EPA has not promulgated any public participation guidelines that clearly apply to its approval of state CCR programs. EPA did publish its “Interim-Final” State CCR Guidance in August 2017; however, that document purports to be mere interpretive guidance, as opposed to enforceable regulation. State CCR Guidance at ii (“The information and procedures set forth here are intended as a technical resource to States.... This Guidance does not constitute rulemaking by the Agency, and cannot be relied on to create a substantive or procedural right enforceable by any party in litigation with the United States.”).

Even if EPA were to change its mind and claim that the State CCR Guidance does set out enforceable requirements for approval of state CCR programs, the State CCR Guidance does not meet the requirements for rulemaking under the APA. Specifically, the process EPA followed in publishing the State CCR Guidance does not meet APA notice-and-comment requirements for agency rulemaking. EPA initially offered a 30-day comment period on the State CCR Guidance, subsequently agreed to a 30-day extension, and then reneged on that promise just a few hours before the comment deadline.⁷⁹ In doing so, EPA failed to provide the meaningful opportunity for comments the APA mandates and therefore does not meet its requirements. *See Fla. Power & Light Co. v. United States*, 846 F.2d 765, 771 (D.C. Cir. 1988) (explaining that the APA requires agencies to provide “a reasonable opportunity to participate in the rulemaking process” and therefore notice of rulemaking that must “give adequate time for comments”); *NRDC v. Thomas*, 838 F.2d 1224, 1243 (D.C.Cir.1988) (finding rulemaking barely acceptable under the APA when EPA provided notice that it had changed its position just two weeks before the final rule, “severely press[ing]” commenters, who had “a limited opportunity” to submit comments on that changed position). Moreover, EPA never responded to significant comments on the State

⁷⁹ See Letter to EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt from Lisa Evans, Earthjustice, Sept. 14, 2017, attached hereto as Exhibit 5.

CCR Guidance, as required by the APA. *See, e.g., Action on Smoking & Health v. CAB*, 699 F.2d 1209, 1216 (D.C.Cir.1983).

Because EPA has not, as required by RCRA § 7004(b)(1), “develop[ed] and publish[ed] minimum guidelines for public participation” in state CCR programs prior to its evaluation and tentative approval of Oklahoma’s Application, it must halt the process, deny Oklahoma’s Application, and immediately propose regulations setting forth public participation requirements for state CCR programs before approving Oklahoma’s – or any other state’s – CCR program.

b. EPA Should Not Approve Oklahoma’s CCR Program Because It Provided the Public Inadequate Opportunity for Meaningful Review and Comment on Its Proposal to Approve Oklahoma’s Application.

The opportunities that EPA has provided for public participation in its proposed approval of Oklahoma’s Application fall short of those called for in EPA’s own regulations codified at 40 C.F.R. Parts 239 and 25.⁸⁰

First, public notice and scheduling of the public hearing on EPA’s proposal to approve Oklahoma’s Application do not pass muster. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 25.5, public hearings “must be held at times and places which, to the maximum extent feasible, facilitate attendance by the public,” and “use of evening and weekend hearings[], should be considered.” *Id.* Here, in contrast, EPA provided only a single public hearing – held on a weekday (Tuesday, Feb. 13) beginning at 9am.

Moreover, EPA provided far less than the 45-day advanced notice of public hearings called for in 40 C.F.R. Part 239 and 40 C.F.R. § 25.5(b). Part 239 regulations provide that:

After receipt and review of a complete application, the [EPA] will make a tentative determination on the adequacy of the state program. [EPA] shall publish the tentative determination on the adequacy of the state program in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Notice of the tentative determination must ... [i]ndicate that a public hearing will be held by EPA if sufficient public interest is expressed during the comment period If held, the public hearing will be scheduled *at least 45 days from public notice of such hearing.*

40 C.F.R. § 239.10 (emphasis added). 40 C.F.R. § 25.5(b) likewise provides that notice of a public hearing is to be published 45 days prior to the hearing.

EPA did not provide that important advanced notice here. The Federal Register notice containing EPA’s proposal to approve Oklahoma’s Application, which stated that a public hearing, if any were held, would be on February 13, 2018, was published on January 16, 2018 – just 28 days before the hearing. Even the pre-publication version of the Federal Register notice was not provided adequately in advance; that pre-publication version was posted on EPA’s coal

⁸⁰ As discussed in *supra* note 65, the regulations set out at 40 C.F.R. Parts 25 and 239 do not apply to EPA’s approval of state CCR programs. If they did apply, Oklahoma’s CCR program would fail to meet their mandates, as explained herein.

ash website on approximately January 9, 2018 – just 35 days prior to the public hearing. And EPA confirmed that the hearing would take place just one week before the hearing date, leaving the public scrambling to finalize plans to attend or, due to the short notice, unable to do so.

Finally, even with a limited extension of the comment deadline, EPA provided a comment period of just 62 days, an inadequate timeframe for regulations with this level of technical complexity, import, and impact on public health and the environment.

EPA cannot justify failing to act according to public participation regulatory provisions in proposing to approve the very first state CCR program, in a state with demonstrated damage from coal ash and a lot to lose if – as is the case – Oklahoma’s program fails to meet statutory and regulatory standards for protection of health and the environment. Before EPA makes a final decision on whether to approve or deny Oklahoma’s Application, EPA must promulgate regulations specifying the public participation opportunities required both for approval of, and that must be included in, state CCR programs, or at absolute minimum comply with the regulations it has already adopted at 40 C.F.R Parts 239 and 25.

VII. Conclusion

Wherefore, for all the reasons discussed herein, EPA should deny Oklahoma’s Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Cassel
Earthjustice
jcassel@earthjustice.org

Earl Hatley
Grand Riverkeeper
LEAD Agency, Inc.
ehatley@neok.com

Rebecca Jim
LEAD Agency, Inc.
Tar Creekkeeper
rjim@neok.com
leadagency@att.net

Matthew Miller
Sierra Club
matthew.miller@sierraclub.org

Johnson Bridgwater
Sierra Club, Oklahoma Chapter
johnson.bridgwater@sierraclub.org

Larissa Liebmann
Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc.
LLiebmann@waterkeeper.org

cc: David Cates, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality