

BACKGROUND DOCUMENT
RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT
SUBTITLE C HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

SECTION 3002

UNIFORM HAZARDOUS WASTE MANIFEST

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region V, Library
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

OFFICE OF SOLID WASTE

March 1984

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

BACKGROUND DOCUMENT
UNIFORM HAZARDOUS WASTE MANIFEST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	TITLE	PAGE
I	Background	I-1
II	Summary	II-1
III	Comments and Rationale	III-1
IV	Conclusions and Final Rule	IV-1

SECTION I - BACKGROUND

A. Introduction

On February 26, 1980, EPA established a manifest system to ensure that hazardous waste designated for delivery to an off-site treatment, storage or disposal (TSD) facility actually reaches its destination. The central element of the system is the "manifest," a control and transport document that accompanies the waste from its point of generation to its point of destination. In developing the initial regulations (see 45 FR 12722 et. seq., February 26, 1980), EPA considered a uniform manifest requirement along with other options. While considering these options, EPA reviewed DOT's hazardous materials regulations and determined that it would be necessary to coordinate EPA's requirements with DOT's regulations by requiring that specific information accompany the waste.

DOT's hazardous materials regulations cover EPA's universe of hazardous wastes (49 CFR 171.3 and 171.8) and require the regulated community to use a shipping paper for the transportation of hazardous waste. DOT's current regulations, 49 CFR 172, allow industry to use a shipping paper format of their choosing for the required information.

Since EPA's manifest information requirements were similar to DOT's shipping paper information requirements, EPA concluded that a shipping paper could be used to satisfy RCRA manifest requirements if additional information required by EPA were included on the shipping paper. By not requiring a specific form, EPA's intent was to allow the regulated community the option of either adapting their existing DOT shipping papers to function as hazardous waste manifests or designing a form to accommodate EPA's manifest information requirements.

B. Manifest Implementation Problems

Following the introduction of the Federal manifest system, February 26, 1980, there has been a proliferation of manifests as various States decided to implement their own forms. At least 22 States require that generators use specific manifest forms for the transport of hazardous waste. This situation has caused three major problems.

First, the lack of uniformity in State manifest forms has created a burden for generators, transporters, and State programs. Currently, a transporter carrying hazardous waste may be required to carry the manifest of each State in which he travels in order to comply with various State manifest requirements. Failure to carry a particular State's manifest may delay or prevent shipments from reaching their destination or subject the transporter to State enforcement action. Under these conditions, a generator may be required to go through the costly and inefficient procedure of filling out several manifest forms with duplicative information in order to ensure that the waste reaches the designated facility.

State programs have been burdened in some cases by the need to adapt their administrative and data processing procedures to handle the varying out-of-State manifests which they receive.

Second, the lack of uniform information requirements prevents generators with sites in more than one State from standardizing manifesting procedures. This situation makes it extremely difficult for multistate generators to implement standardized data management programs for coordinating hazardous waste information.

Third, enforcement activities have been complicated. "Probable cause" to monitor and inspect a vehicle is easier to conduct if the investigators are trained to follow uniform manifest standards.

C. Comments

Nearly 200 comments were received by EPA on the proposed Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest (UHW). This Background Document discusses the comments received by the Agency on this rulemaking by first stating the comment received, followed by the commenter's rationale. For many of these issues, commenters presented suggestions both for and against a given approach, frequently reflecting the different concerns of States on the one hand, and industry on the other. Each issue, with the relevant comments and rationale is followed by the Agency's response. Following is a list of the generic issues raised by commenters. The groups of issues are separated into four areas:

GROUP A: Form Information
GROUP B: Form Design
GROUP C: Form Management
GROUP D: Other

GROUP A Form Information

<u>GROUP</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ISSUE 1	Require or allow additional information to be included on the form.	II.1
ISSUE 2	Allow use of a State manifest document number	III.1
ISSUE 3	Require more detailed waste description information.	III.2
ISSUE 4	Require or allow use of vehicle identification numbers.	III.2
ISSUE 5	Allow States to print addresses of State agencies.	III.3
ISSUE 6	Include addresses and phone numbers of all participants.	III.3

ISSUE 7	Add the site address of the generator if different than the mailing address.	III.4
ISSUE 8	Include a handling code for each waste described on the Manifest.	III.5
ISSUE 9	Require the hazardous waste number on the Manifest.	III.5
ISSUE 10	Allow the use of State identification numbers.	III.6
ISSUE 11	Require waste quantity to be described by weight or volume or allow use of either type of measure.	III.7
ISSUE 12	Include a space for transporter to acknowledge receipt of placards offered by the generator.	III.8
ISSUE 13	Incorporate ICC Bill of Lading information on the Manifest.	III.8
ISSUE 14	Require or allow emergency response telephone numbers and information.	III.9
ISSUE 15	Allow certain information to be pre-printed with check-off boxes.	III.9
ISSUE 16	Provide for information on the physical state of the waste.	III.10
ISSUE 17	Add identification numbers for multiple locations within a generator's site.	III.10
ISSUE 18	Supplement vague DOT proper shipping descriptions with chemical lab analysis information.	III.11
ISSUE 19	Space for an alternate treatment, storage, or disposal facility is needed.	III.11
ISSUE 20	Add information to the Manifest that will encourage or assist in recycling.	III.12
ISSUE 21	Revise the form instructions to include bulk containers and dump trucks.	III.13
GROUP B: Form Design		
ISSUE 22	Bind the form on the top.	III.13
ISSUE 23	Pre-print the word "waste."	III.13
ISSUE 24	Color code columns.	III.14
ISSUE 25	Add date boxes to the Manifest form.	III.14

ISSUE 26	Shade and arrange automated data processing information for easy entry.	III.14
ISSUE 27	Allow "free-form" computer print-outs and use of word processors.	III.15
ISSUE 28	Allow the Manifest document number to be pre-assigned/pre-printed.	III.15
ISSUE 29	Revise instructions for the Proper Shipping Description.	III.17
ISSUE 30	Revise the wording in the generator's certification.	III.17
ISSUE 31	Require that the Manifest have a red border.	III.17
ISSUE 32	The type and number of containers should be entered on the left of the form.	III.18
ISSUE 33	Reduce or eliminate "tick marks."	III.18
ISSUE 4	Color code each sheet of the Manifest.	III.18
ISSUE 35	Use an 8 1/2" x 11" form.	III.19
ISSUE 36	Number the information boxes on the form.	III.19
ISSUE 37	Allow the instructions to be printed on the back.	III.19
ISSUE 38	Correct the Type of Container table to eliminate the confusion caused by dual designations for tank car.	III.20
ISSUE 39	Make Hazard Class a separate column.	III.20
ISSUE 40	May fractions be used in the Total Quantity column?	III.20
ISSUE 41	Add more space for special handling instructions, addresses, etc.	III.21
ISSUE 42	Allow States to print "tick marks" in shaded area.	III.21
GROUP C: <u>Form Management</u>		
ISSUE 43	Allow States, generators and others to print and distribute the form.	III.21
ISSUE 44	Specify copy distribution.	III.22
ISSUE 45	Allow the use of a certified equivalent manifest.	III.22

	<u>COMMENT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ISSUE 46	Federal regulations should apply only to interstate shipments.	III.23
ISSUE 47	The consignment State manifest requirements should have primacy.	III.24
ISSUE 48	Explain the proper shipping description when a non-RCRA waste is shipped.	III.25
ISSUE 49	Allow photocopying of additional copies.	III.25
ISSUE 50	Require that a copy of the Manifest be sent to the States.	III.26
GROUP D: <u>Other</u>		
ISSUE 51	Restrict State program reports to the information required on UHWM.	III.27
ISSUE 52	The Manifest document number should be "unique," not "serially increasing."	III.27
ISSUE 53	Transporter information required on the Manifest should be completed by the transporter and facility information be completed by the facility.	III.28
ISSUE 54	Make provisions for lab-pack shipments.	III.28
ISSUE 55	Clarification for discrepancy indication space is needed since State imposed deadlines may vary.	III.29
ISSUE 56	Make units of measure the same as those presented in the Biennial Report.	III.29
ISSUE 57	Training should be provided in order to ensure successful implementation.	III.29
ISSUE 58	The Agency should establish the number of copies required for each Manifest.	III.30
ISSUE 59	Clarify the EPA's position on "preemptive authority."	III.30
ISSUE 60	Require a quarterly report from the generator if the State does not get a copy of the Manifest.	III.30
ISSUE 61	Preempt State licenses and permitting of transporters.	III.31
ISSUE 62	The effective date of 180 days is acceptable but it should be sooner.	III.31

ISSUE 63

The Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest acknowledges the Canadian manifest as an input of the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest units originating in Canada.

III.3

SECTION II - COMMENTS

The Agency received nearly 400 (100) comment letters representing both industries' and States' concerns with the information, design, management and other issues of the Uniform Hazardous Waste manifest. These letters addressed a large number of specific issues, which EPA has separated into over sixty (60) comment groups (see Section I). More than half of the comment groups were concerned with the form information area, form design and only nine (9) general comment groups addressed form management. The remaining comments fell into a miscellaneous area EPA has designated as "Other."

In general, EPA was attempting to limit the paperwork burden whereas State and industry commenters suggested the addition of specific information which they believed EPA should require on the Manifest. Much of the information they sought was of a programmatic nature and did not meet the primary purposes of the manifest: transportation safety and tracking. As a compromise, EPA has allowed additional spaces for specific information items recommended by State and industry commenters in a shaded area on the form as optional information items.

More than a third of the comment groups dealt with form design. Where these comments could be incorporated into the design of the form, the Agency made every effort to do so (e.g., data processing compatibility). Where incorporation of comments would be conflicting or contrary to the efficient operation of the Manifest, they were rejected (e.g., a separate Hazard Class column). Some of the form design suggestions, although not incorporated specifically, are allowed to be used by the generator or a State (e.g., light dots in the optional information area to facilitate data processing).

As with the form design comments, States and industries recommended various form management alternatives. These, too, were incorporated where possible (e.g., acquisition of the form by generators) while others were rejected (e.g., apply the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest to interstate shipments only). Other suggestions were adopted as federal requirements, but are allowed to be enforced and enforced by the States wherever they would not be inconsistent with federal regulations (e.g., require generator to send copies to the generator's State).

Comments falling under the miscellaneous area of "Other" were diverse. Some comments were outside the jurisdiction of EPA's authority, (e.g., provide for lab-packs). Others affected the coordination of the Manifest with other program elements (e.g., make units of measure codes on the Manifest the same as those used in the Biennial Report). Some of the groups of

comments were concerned about the implementation of the Manifest (e.g., applicability of DOT preemption authority over States with inconsistent laws). All the comments were examined during and after the comment period while the final rule was being drafted. The results of the comment review and the follow-up is discussed more completely in Section III below.

SECTION III - COMMENTS AND RATIONALE

The following section discusses the four basic areas of comments the Agency received during the comment period. Each basic area is subdivided into groups and followed by the Agency's response (see Section I for a list of the comment groups).

GROUP A: Form Information

1. Require or allow additional information to be included on the form.

Comments identified a number of additional information items, and suggested that they be required on the form, allowed to be required by States on the form, or allowed to be included on the form by States or generators at their discretion.

RESPONSE:

EPA considered these comments in light of several concerns applicable to Federal manifest information requirements and to the design of a Federal Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest. EPA manifest requirements must be designed to protect human health and the environment, as provided in Section 3002 of RCRA. The primary purposes of the manifest requirements must, therefore, be to provide for tracking of hazardous waste shipments to ensure that all wastes designated for a treatment, storage, or disposal (TSD) facility reach their destination and to ensure transportation safety. It is also necessary in order to ensure that the manifest system operates efficiently and effectively and achieves these primary purposes to make sure that the Manifest forms are not unnecessarily complex and can be completed easily and quickly, and that the necessary information on the Manifest can be easily identified and understood.

Many of the information items suggested by commenters may be helpful in some cases for management of hazardous waste, but are not necessary for the purposes of transportation safety and tracking of waste shipments. Others were related to transportation safety or tracking, but went beyond the existing requirements that EPA has determined to be adequate for these purposes. Were EPA to attempt to accommodate a significant number of these suggestions, the information items would not all fit on the form and require a form larger than standard size or several pages long. This would impede the convenience and efficiency of handling of forms, and thus impede the effective operation of the Manifest system.

In addition, requiring or providing for a significant number of additional information items would increase the complexity of the form, also interfering with its efficient and effective use.

On the other hand, EPA recognizes the legitimate interest on the part of States to design their own unique tracking and hazardous waste management systems, as long as they are equivalent to and not inconsistent with the federal system. EPA also realized that if no provision were made for information items that States believed to be critical to their programs, States would attempt to require such additional information to be submitted on separate documents, which would also increase the complexity and burden of the system and defeat in part the advantage of a uniform manifest. Although federal regulations would prohibit States from requiring that such additional documents travel with the waste shipments, in most cases States would be able to require separate submission of such documents from generators or treatment, storage, or disposal facility operators. In the proposed rule that appeared in the March 4, 1982, Federal Register, the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest form limited the information to Federally required information. During the comment period, the Agency learned that although many of the industry commenters were in favor of precluding States from requiring additional information on the form, they would support a manifest that provided for certain limited State-required information items if such a compromise would eliminate the need for a separate additional State information report or form.

In light of these considerations, EPA has designed a form that provides for the minimum information items required by federal law, and also provides for certain limited additional information items to be required by States. The Federal information items are limited to those that already are required by EPA's manifest regulations. Additional information that may be required by States is limited to the few items considered most critical by States. In addition, the new Uniform Manifest regulations provide that States or generators may add other information or instructions to the form, either in the margins or on the back of the form. This should provide States and generators with all the information they believe to be critical to their unique manifest handling and tracking systems without the need to provide or require additional documents other than the Uniform Manifest. At the same time, the optional information is sufficiently limited to maintain the simplicity and ease of handling necessary for the effective operation of the Federal manifest system, and has been accommodated within the convenient format of a single sheet of paper of standard size (8 1/2" by 11").

All Federally-required information is clearly indicated on the form. This information must appear on all completed manifests, and compliance with these information requirements will be enforced by federal and State enforcement personnel during the transportation phase of a shipment of hazardous waste.

Additional information that may be required by States ("Optional State information") is indicated on the form by lettered, rather than numbered items, and by shading of these spaces. States may require generators or treatment, storage, or disposal facility operators to submit this information. Such additional information may be voluntarily carried with a shipment by the transporter, but the transporter may not be found in violation if the form fails to include such information.

States may also pre-print additional information or instructions on the form, such as in the margin or on the back of the form, as provided in 40 C.F.R. §271.10(h). However, such preprinting may not require the entry of any additional information by generators, transporters, or TSD facility operators beyond the specifically identified Federally-required information or optional State information. Where neither the generator's State nor the State in which TSD facility is located prints and supplies the manifest, the generator may preprint any information on the form other than the required signatures and dates.

EPA's responses to comments on each specific information item suggested are set forth in the remainder of the issue groups concerning form information. The considerations discussed above should be borne in mind when considering those responses to specific suggestions. Additional discussion of this issue can be found in the preamble to the final Uniform Manifest regulations.

2. Allow use of a State manifest document number:

Several States suggested that the Agency allow them to add a State manifest document number. The States that made this request commented that they currently used document numbers in the management and tracking of manifests in their State and that these numbers were critical to the enforcement of their programs. Some commenters suggested that the EPA manifest document number was too cumbersome for data processing use and that by allowing generators to control the entry of the EPA Manifest document number on the Manifest, a greater margin of error could be expected. Some concern was also expressed regarding the likelihood of intentional manipulation of Manifest document numbers for illegal purposes.

Of those commenters who supported the issuance of State manifest document numbers, most suggested that the States be allowed to preprint manifest document numbers. This would allow States that want total control of manifest issuance, management, and tracking to exercise such control.

RESPONSE:

The Agency believes that the addition of a State manifest document number as a State-required information item is acceptable. States with existing manifests and manifest tracking systems argued that they need to control the tracking of hazardous waste shipments with manifest document numbers which they print on the

manifest. The addition of a State number would ensure that the number was compatible with their automated data processing (ADP) system. Since the addition of this number on the manifest by the State controlling the distribution of the manifest would create no additional burden on industry, the Agency believes that allowing the addition of a State manifest document as a State information item is appropriate.

3. Require more detailed waste description information.

Several States requested that the final rule contain a standard that generators be required to supply more detailed information on the contents of the waste. A few TSD facilities also suggested that a more complete waste description should be part of the final rule. They argued that the additional information would be helpful both for emergency response purposes and for safer management of the waste once it arrived at a TSD facility.

The Agency agrees with the commenters that in some cases this additional information may be useful to the TSD facility operator but believes that such a requirement on each manifest is unnecessary for the limited purposes of the Federal manifest system. The Agency believes detailed information regarding a waste should be in the possession of the facility prior to the arrival of a shipment and that the procedures established in the facility standards are sufficient to protect human health and the environment. Thus, it would be unnecessary to require detailed information on a shipment by shipment basis. EPA recognizes, however, that some States may wish to go beyond the federal manifest system, and believes that a State requirement for a more detailed waste description to be entered on the Uniform Manifest is not inconsistent with Federal requirements as long as it is limited to appropriate spaces on the form. EPA, therefore, allows States or TSD facilities to require additional waste description information either on a shipment by shipment basis from the generator or as a condition of acceptance of a shipment at a facility. The Manifest form has been designed to include spaces labeled "J" and "S" and titled "Additional Descriptions for Materials Listed Above" for States to require this additional information. Generators or TSD facilities may also enter information in this space even if the State does not require entry of such information.

4. Require or allow use of vehicle identification numbers.

Several State commenters in this group suggested that the Agency require the use of vehicle identification numbers for transporters. Their rationale was that enforcement actions would be easier, and tracking of shipments more complete.

RESPONSE:

The vehicle identification number would be a unique number required to be displayed on each vehicle used to transport hazardous

waste, including each separate trailer or tractor-trailer combination. Upon observation of this number on a vehicle, regulatory and enforcement personnel would be able to refer to files of such numbers to identify the transporter and the load he was carrying.

EPA has declined to require inclusion of a vehicle identification number for the following reasons. First, the Federal manifest information requirements already provide for entry of the transporter's EPA identification number. Although this number is a single number for all of a transporter's vehicles, EPA believes that this identification of the transporter is sufficient for tracking and safety purposes. Once Federal or State personnel can determine from the EPA identification number the name, address, and phone number of the transporter, separate identification of the vehicle is not necessary. Second, to the extent that a vehicle identification number system is intended to identify vehicles without reference to the manifest, it is beyond the scope of the Manifest requirements. In addition, other identification numbers already are in use for identification of vehicles, such as license plate numbers and ICC numbers. Third, to the extent that States already require vehicle identification numbers, there may be inconsistencies between the format and requirements among the States, so that requiring a nationally uniform numbering system would disrupt existing State procedures. Fourth, to the extent no requirements for vehicle identification numbers currently are in effect, the imposition of such a system would create a substantial burden on transporters for obtaining and applying to all vehicles the appropriate numbers. DOT particularly shares this concern with EPA, in light of DOT's responsibility to prevent interference with interstate commerce. However, EPA can find no environmental reason to disallow the use of vehicle identification numbers as an optional State information item.

5. Allow State to print State agency's address

Several State commenters suggested that they be allowed to print on the Manifest the name, address, telephone number, and logo of their State.

RESPONSE:

States will be allowed to preprint their State name, agency, address, logo, and appropriate telephone number(s) in the margin or on the back of the form as provided in §271.10(h). The top margin has been expanded to provide space for this information (approximately 3/4").

6. Include addresses and phone numbers of all participants.

The regulations promulgated May 19, 1980, require the name, EPA identification number, mailing address, and telephone number of the generator, the name and EPA identification number of each transporter, and the name, EPA identification number, and site

address of the TSD facility. The March 4, 1982, proposed rule would have added the TSD facility's telephone number to this information. Several commenters suggested that the name, address, and telephone number for each participant in a shipment should be included on the form. Addresses and telephone numbers for transporters were thought to be particularly essential.

RESPONSE:

The group of commenters who suggested the addition of the addresses and telephone numbers of all participants in the management of a hazardous waste thought this information was essential to the proper tracking and safety of each shipment. The Agency does not totally agree. The EPA identification numbers are directly related to the name, address and telephone number of each participant. The Agency agrees that the name, address, and telephone number of the generator is necessary since the facility owner or operator is required to send a signed copy of the Manifest back to the generator and may need to call the generator regarding the waste. The name and address of the TSD facility is also a Federally-required information item. However, only the name of the transporter is a Federally required information item, since EPA believes the address of the transporter is not a useful item of information on the Manifest. Upon investigation, the Agency found that several addresses exist for each transporter such as home office, dispatcher, terminal, etc. Thus, the Agency could not determine which of these addresses was the primary point for tracking and safety purposes. Since the entry of only one of these addresses in many cases would not be sufficient for tracking and safety purposes, and since the relevant addresses can readily be obtained by reference to the EPA identification number, EPA chose not to require an address for the transporter to be entered on the Manifest form. EPA has however, provided spaces in the optional State information area of the form for the telephone number of the transporter(s) and TSD facility.

7. Add the site address of the generator if different than the mailing address.

Comments received by the Agency suggested that EPA add the generator's site address if it is different than the generator's mailing address, which is required. The reasons given for this request was that the site address information would provide information concerning where a shipment actually began.

RESPONSE:

The generator's mailing address on the Manifest is necessary to the TSD owner or operator when he sends the Manifest by mail back to the generator. Many generator sites are not suitable for mailing purposes and many companies prefer to have copies of manifests go to one central company office, which would be

the appropriate address for inclusion on the Manifest. The actual generating site location is, therefore, not needed for compliance with the manifest system. If a facility owner or operator needs to know the site address for the generator, he can call the generator whose telephone number is required on the Manifest. States that wish to know the site address of the generator can determine it from the EPA identification number which is required as part of the Manifest document number. Therefore, the Agency does not agree that the generator's site address is necessary on the Manifest.

8. Include a handling code for each waste described on the Manifest.

Several commenters suggested that the handling code for each waste described on the Manifest should also be included on the Manifest. Most of these commenters believed that this information should be added by the TSD facility after the waste was processed but before the Manifest was sent to the State. A few commenters suggested that the generator should be held accountable for the handling code.

RESPONSE:

State commenters and some industry commenters in this group supported the inclusion of a waste handling code for each waste shipped. Some believed this information should be required while others were not specific. The Agency has allowed for the entry of the waste handling code on the Manifest as a State or other optional information item. The Agency is not concerned with whether the code entered is one of the established EPA Handling Codes found in 40 CFR Parts 264 and 265, since the information is not critical for the transportation safety or tracking of a waste shipment. States may choose to require that the handling code information be a State handling code number. EPA is not concerned over whether the handling code is submitted by the generator or the TSD facility, since the Federal government will not enforce against the inclusion of this information item on the Manifest.

Although the waste handling code is part of the required information for the Biennial Report, the Agency does not believe that it is necessary for either transportation safety or tracking and, therefore, it is not required on the Manifest.

9. Require the hazardous waste number on the Manifest.

The hazardous waste number of each waste was not a required manifest information item in the May 19, 1980, rule and the Agency did not propose to require it for each waste listed on the Manifest in the March 4, 1982, proposed rule. However, a column was provided for the hazardous waste number as an optional information item on the proposed rule which the generator could add at his discretion. Since the Agency did not require the hazardous waste number, there was no requirement for it to be either the EPA hazardous waste number or a State hazardous waste number.

Several commenters suggested that this piece of information be required, not optional, for all hazardous wastes and for all shipments. This comment was directed from some States and TSD facilities that believed the information would be helpful to their data management and reporting functions.

RESPONSE:

Although several commenters from both industry and government suggested that the Agency require handling codes as a mandatory information item, EPA is not convinced that such a requirement is justifiable. Although useful to States and facilities, the handling code is not the type of information that will enhance protection of human health or the environment nor will it improve the tracking of the waste.

The hazardous waste number is intended primarily to aid in determining proper management of the waste for treatment, storage, or disposal purposes, rather than for transportation safety purposes. EPA believes that it is the generator's responsibility to communicate this type of information to the TSD facility operator prior to shipping the waste in order to ensure that the facility can handle the waste. EPA's Manifest regulations already require identification of the waste by reference to DOT material descriptions, and believes that DOT's identification requirements are appropriate and sufficient for transportation purposes. In addition, DOT's Emergency Response Guidebook presents instructions on emergency handling of waste by referring to DOT proper shipping descriptions, not to hazardous waste numbers.

For these reasons, the Agency has decided not to include the hazardous waste number (either the EPA number or any State hazardous waste number) as a required information item. However, space has been provided on the form in the optional State information area for this number.

10. Allow the use of State identification numbers.

Several State commenters suggested that they should be allowed to require generators, transporters, and owners and operators of TSD facilities to use existing State identification numbers. Many of the States with existing manifest systems also have data management systems designed around State issued numbers. In their opinion, continued operation of State systems would continue more efficiently if allowed to use existing State issued numbers.

RESPONSE:

As with other information that States believed was essential to the operation of their programs, EPA cannot justify the State identification number as essential for tracking or transportation safety, since the Federal manifest handling and reporting system does not depend on such State numbers. Thus, this number is not a required information item on the Manifest. In addition, the Agency examined various State identification numbers currently in use and

found that the alphabetical and numeric combination and the number of characters varied considerably among States. It would have been difficult for EPA to have established a federally required State identification number that would have accommodated all the States' concerns. EPA does believe, however, that States may be allowed to require State identification numbers to be entered on the Manifest without interfering with the Federal Manifest system. Therefore, this information item is allowed in the optional State information area, with its format and field to be determined at the discretion of the States.

11. Require waste quantity to be described by weight or by volume or allow use of either type of measure.

Comments addressing the units of measure for the total quantity of each hazardous waste can be separated into three separate sub-groups: those favoring units of weight; those favoring units of volume; and those favoring a choice of either. State comments were divided on this issue. Some States have systems that require units of measure to be reported by volume, while other States have systems that require units of measure to be reported by weight. Industry comments, for the most part, supported the third option which would allow the entry of quantities by either method.

The Agency was asked by one commenter to limit the application of the units of measure for wastes shipped as gallons (or liters) to liquids. Situations existed, according to the commenter, where shipments listed in gallons consisted of dry waste.

RESPONSE:

The Agency reviewed the comments from the States and industry and then consulted with DOT to determine the feasibility of stipulating the quantity of the waste in either weight or volumetric units. DOT's regulations require that the total quantity of the waste appear on the shipping paper (manifest). DOT is not concerned with whether the units are in volume or weight. EPA agrees with this approach. To only require one type of unit would not increase EPA's protection of human health and the environment nor would it improve tracking of the waste. Also, those States that require a particular unit of measure appear to base their need for this information on accounting and fee collection, rather than on safety. The Manifest instructions allow the quantity of waste to be given either in units of volume or units of weight.

The Agency agrees, however, that the units of measure should reflect the nature of the waste. For example, a dry powder or other solid should be shipped as a quantity measured in weight not gallons. This has been indicated in the instructions by noting "liquids only" after the units of measure "liters" and "gallons."

12. Include a space for transporter to acknowledge receipt by transporters of placards offered by the generator.

The comments in this group included a recommendation by generators that the Manifest contain a space for the transporter to acknowledge receipt of placards offered by the generator. Some commenters believed that such a statement on the Manifest would document compliance of the generator standards.

RESPONSE:

The Agency recognizes that some generators may wish to document compliance with the generator standards. One such requirement, placarding, could be substantiated, in some commenters' opinion, by the simple addition of a statement that the transporter would sign or initial. The statement would indicate that the generator had offered the appropriate placards to the transporter, thereby documenting compliance with the generator's placarding requirements. The Agency believes that to include this information item as a federally-required item would be an unjustifiable burden on all generators. For example, generators who transport their own waste would not need this type of statement. From the Agency's point of view, neither of the two Manifest information criteria, protection of human health and the environment or tracking would be enhanced. The Agency believes, however, that generators who desire this kind of documentation on the Manifest can enter it in the Special Handling Information space and require as part of their contract with the transporter.

13. Incorporate ICC Bill of Lading information on the Manifest.

Several industry commenters suggested that the Agency provide space for the Bill of Lading information required by the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC). They believed that inclusion of this information on the Manifest would reduce the amount of paperwork they would be required to carry with each shipment of hazardous waste.

RESPONSE:

Recently, ICC published a notice in the Federal Register (47 FR 29403, July 6, 1982) ruling that ". . . hazardous waste of no economic value destined for disposal (other than nuclear or radioactive waste) do not constitute 'property' within the meaning of 49 U.S.C. 10521. Accordingly, the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the for-hire transportation by motor carriers of such wastes." Therefore, the Agency does not expect that Bill of Lading requirements will apply to hazardous waste shipments destined for treatment, storage or disposal facilities. Consequently, the Agency does not believe that the form should include space dedicated for Bill of Lading use. In the unlikely event the ICC Bill of Lading information is required for a shipment of hazardous waste, the generator may be able to provide the ICC-required information as an attachment or on the back of the Manifest form. If this is

not practical, it may be necessary to carry both the UHWM and a Bill of Lading.

14. Require or allow emergency response telephone numbers and information.

The comments in this group include several recommendations that the UHWM contain an emergency response telephone number. Some commenters believed that the National Response Center's (NRC) number or the Chemtrec telephone number should be required on each Manifest. Some State comments suggested that they be allowed to preprint the telephone number of the State emergency response office while others suggested an all-inclusive list of State emergency response telephone numbers to be included on the back of the Manifest.

RESPONSE:

EPA evaluated the DOT emergency response requirements and decided that the existing DOT requirements for emergency response information were adequate. The development and use of the DOT identification (UN/NA) number for emergencies and DOT requirements for notifying the National Response Center (NRC) by telephone in certain circumstances and file a written report in all instances is sufficient.

DOT regulations (49 CFR 171.15) and EPA regulations (40 CFR 263.30) require transporters to call the NRC under certain emergency circumstances. EPA does not believe that the inclusion of the NRC telephone number on the Manifest is justifiable since there will be spills that will not necessitate a telephone call to the NRC.

Originally, the Agency considered adding emergency response telephone numbers but rejected their mandatory inclusion since it could be construed as an implicit instruction to call in the event of any situation, including those of a non-emergency nature. DOT and EPA regulations presently require transporters to call the National Response Center (NRC) as the result of certain accidents (49 CFR 171.15 and 40 CFR 263.30). For those spills of sufficient threat, EPA and DOT standards require transporters to call the NRC, and EPA believes that transporters already are or should be aware of that requirement and the appropriate number, as well as the proper procedures to follow.

However, EPA will not preclude a State from preprinting such numbers, including State emergency response numbers. The Manifest regulations regarding preprinting, 40 CFR §271.10(h), allow States to print the NRC number, or any other emergency telephone numbers or information, in the margin or on the back of the form, provided they do not conflict with established emergency response procedures.

15. Allow certain information to be preprinted with check-off boxes.

Commenters suggested that the UHWM should be simplified by allowing certain information to be pre-printed in the form of

check-off boxes. For example, if a generator typically sends waste to one of two companies, the UHWM form should have space for the names, addresses and EPA identification numbers of both companies. The generator could then use a check-off box to indicate to which of the two TSD facilities the waste was being sent. Other check-off boxes for other items was suggested.

16. Provide for information on the physical state of the waste.

Both State commenters and some industry commenters suggested the need for additional information regarding the waste description. The industry comments were primarily from TSD facilities. Included in the additional information they suggested was need for the physical state of the waste (e.g., solid, liquid, gas and sludge). Both groups of commenters believed that such information would facilitate improved management by the receiving facility.

RESPONSE:

The Agency considered requiring a more specific waste description for the waste listed on the Manifest. Included in this consideration was the need for the physical state of the waste. EPA is relying on the DOT proper shipping description for identifying each waste, and believes that their nomenclature and format is sufficient to protect human health and the environment during transportation. In many cases, the DOT shipping description contains an indication of the physical state (e.g., Flammable Solid, Corrosive Liquid, etc.) and an additional statement of the physical state would be redundant.

The Agency believes that the TSD facility should know before a waste shipment arrives what it is receiving and that generic information such as the physical state should be transmitted prior to the shipment being made, before the Manifest is prepared. In addition, it would be difficult to identify a standard term for some physical states for easy entry on the Manifest. For example, the physical state of "sludge" as suggested by some of the commenters would be unacceptable since the definition varies considerably between federal and State regulations and industry.

The Agency has, therefore, rejected the physical state of a hazardous waste as a required piece of information for generators to put on the Manifest. States may, however, require the physical state of a waste as part of the information requirements they place on generators or TSD facility owners or operators. It should be entered under "Additional Information for Waste Listed Above."

17. Add identification numbers for multiple locations within a generator's site.

The Agency received comments suggesting that EPA require or allow the use of a second generator identification number when wastes are generated at more than one location within a generator's site. They believed that this would make tracking of the waste

more complete and allow them to determine the exact production line or process stream origin.

RESPONSE:

The Agency does not agree with these commenters since the generator EPA identification number is issued on a site by site basis. To issue two or more numbers per site would be confusing and a burden on State and Federal tracking systems. If, however, a generator wants to keep more specific records that allow him to identify which waste stream came from which process stream, he can do so on the Manifest form in the space titled "Special Handling Instructions and Additional Information." This information could also appear in the margins or on the back of the form.

18. Vague DOT proper shipping descriptions should be supplemented with chemical lab analysis information.

State comments and comments from treatment, storage and disposal facilities indicated a desire for the Manifest to contain additional information that would provide a more specific description with regard to the DOT proper shipping description. Some of the comments suggested that DOT shipping descriptions were vague and that the Agency should include a requirement that the description include chemical lab analysis information.

RESPONSE:

The Agency disagrees with these commenters. EPA has worked with DOT in the development of a transportation and control document that meets both the requirements of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA) and RCRA (Section 3002). As a result, EPA has chosen to supplement the DOT-required information with other information that the Agency believes will help protect human health and the environment and provide for tracking of waste shipments. Although a chemical analysis or a more complete chemical description could be helpful to a State program or to a treatment, storage or disposal facility, it is not sufficiently related to the transportation and tracking functions to warrant a federal requirement that it be included on the Manifest. States or facilities can, on their own, require such information provided it is not a condition of transportation.

19. Space for an alternate treatment, storage, or disposal facility is needed.

The Agency received comments suggesting that a specific space be provided for the alternate TSD facility. Since the regulations allow for a generator to enter an alternate facility, these commenters believed that the Manifest should have a specific space for it.

RESPONSE:

EPA considered providing a specific space for the alternate facility but rejected it based on the belief that it would be used only rarely, and that space on the Manifest should be used for more pertinent information. EPA regulations currently allow generators to identify an alternate facility, but do not require it. In many cases, the limited number of TSD facilities in an area will make it very difficult to identify an alternative facility. In addition, an alternate facility is intended to be used in emergency situations. Providing a space for an alternative facility might give the incorrect impression that use of the alternate facility is left to the discretion of the transporter. Finally, in those few emergency situations in which use of an alternative facility will be necessary, since an alternate facility is to be used only in emergency situations and since these should be relatively few, it is not a significant burden to require the transporter to contact the generator to decide on an alternate.

For those generators who are able to identify an alternate facility and wish to note it on the Manifest, however, the space allotted to generators for "Special Handling Instructions and Additional Information" can be used for the alternate facility. The required information can be entered by the generator at the time of the shipment or by the transporter as provided for in 40 CFR 262.20(d) and 263.21. Therefore, the Agency is not providing a special space for the alternate facility information.

20. Add information to the Manifest that will encourage or assist in recycling.

This group of commenters suggested that any additional information which would facilitate resource recovery should be provided for on the Manifest. They were of the opinion that a more specific waste description would encourage the recycling of wastes. Some commenters thought States could assemble information from the Manifest, compile the data, and make it available to others interested in recycling waste.

RESPONSE:

The Agency agrees with the commenters regarding the need to encourage recycling. However, since the additional data commenters requested do not enhance protection of human health and the environment during transportation or improve tracking of shipments, such information is not appropriate for inclusion on the Manifest. The Agency does encourage generators to explore their recycling opportunities as an alternative to treatment, storage or disposal. If the "Special Handling Instructions and Additional Information" space is useful for this purpose, generators should place the information in this space.

21. Revise the form instructions to include bulk containers and dump trucks.

Several commenters from industry pointed out that the instructions for the Manifest should include a category for dump trucks and other bulk containers. Other comments indicated that "roll-offs" or dumpsters should also be included in the list of types of containers.

RESPONSE:

The commenters were correct in noting that the table in the instructions to the form was incomplete and should have included a category for containers that describe a dump truck. This category has been included as "DT." The Agency does not agree with the commenters who suggested that a separate category for "roll-offs" or dumpsters be included in the table of types of containers. EPA intended that the code for metal boxes, cartons, and cases (CM) be used for "roll-offs" and dumpsters, and has clarified this in the instructions.

GROUP B: Form Design

22. Bind the form on the top.

Some comments suggested that the form copies be bound at the top to be compatible with use on a clip-board.

RESPONSE:

The Agency agrees with the commenters that the form should be bound at the top when used on a clip-board. However, other applications for managing the Manifest in transit may necessitate binding the Manifest on both sides (for computer/word processor printing), on one side for book-type usage, or on the bottom. Therefore, the Agency is not requiring that the copies of the Manifest be bound on any side or bound at all.

23. Pre-print the word "waste."

Industry comments included a recommendation that the word "waste" be preprinted on the Manifest since, in their opinion, all or most of the shipments would begin with the word "waste."

RESPONSE:

It is true that the proper shipping description according to DOT for a large percentage of the hazardous wastes will be preceded by the word "waste." However, there will be some cases where the proper shipping description according to DOT will include the word "waste" as part of the description, where the word "waste" does not precede the description (e.g., Hazardous Waste, liquid, N.O.S., ORM-E, NA 9189). Therefore, the Agency is not requiring that the word "waste" be preprinted on the Manifest. However, it will be permissible for generators to preprint this word and the proper shipping description if they desire.

24. Color code columns.

One industry commenter suggested color-coding the column on the left margin of the form to indicate which information was the responsibility of the generator (red), transporter (green), and facility (blue).

RESPONSE:

EPA does not believe that color coding is necessary to identify the respective portions of the form for completion by generators, transporters, and TSD facility operators. Instead, EPA has designed the form with words in the left margin that identify the appropriate sections for generators, transporters, and TSD facility information. EPA believes that this is an adequate and simpler way to accomplish the same goal.

The Agency also has decided to shade certain areas of the form in order to differentiate between federally-required information and optional State-required information.

25. Add date boxes to the Manifest form.

The Agency received comments suggesting that the form should include boxes into which the required dates should be entered. Since the Agency only provided blank lines, some of the commenters believed that this information would be clearer for everyday use and for entry into data management systems if date boxes were used.

RESPONSE:

The Agency agrees that the data entry may be enhanced by providing specific areas for the dates required on the Manifest. Many of the data entry items are likely to be used in automated data processing (ADP) systems, and EPA is willing to make such entry easier by providing heavy lines and "spacing dots" for certain entries and has designed the form accordingly. These entries include the dates required on the Manifest, container (number and type), total quantity, unit (weight/volume), Manifest document number, and EPA identification numbers.

26. Shade and arrange automated data processing for easy entry.

Commenters addressed the usefulness of the proposed form for automated data processing (ADP) entry purposes. They suggested that spaces where ADP information would be entered should be shaded. This, they believed, would facilitate correct entry of essential data.

RESPONSE:

The Agency has chosen to provide heavy lines around the information that is likely to be useful in automated data processing. As discussed elsewhere in this Background Document, the Agency

agrees that automated data entry may be enhanced by highlighting specific information areas on the Manifest. However, EPA has chosen not to shade areas for simplified data processing use. Instead, as discussed elsewhere, these areas are highlighted by heavy lines. The shaded area on the Manifest is reserved to differentiate Federally required information from optional State required information. Heavy lines do not appear in the shaded area of the forms since different States may have different formats or fields for those data. States printing and supplying the Manifest form may have data entry boxes, spacing dots, lines, etc., printed anywhere on the form. The Agency will consider a form with shaded areas different than those mandated by EPA to be inconsistent with EPA's requirements. Copies with shaded areas different than those specified on the UHWM that are removed prior to shipment (e.g., sent to the State) or otherwise not required to travel with the shipment may be part of a Manifest copy set. This will allow those States that print and distribute the form and who want different areas of the form shaded for automated data processing purposes to receive such copies without affecting the uniformity of the Manifest. Likewise, industries may highlight information on copies of the Manifest they keep other than for Manifest recordkeeping purposes required by regulation.

27. Allow "free-form" computer print-outs and use of word processors.

Comments from industry recommended that the Agency allow them to substitute a computer printed manifest for a standard form. Commenters argued that using a computer print-out would be less burdensome than manually completing manifests. Also, commenters believed that a computer completed manifest would be more accurate, neater, and could contain more information on one page.

RESPONSE:

The Agency agrees that for some generators the use of a computer or word processor could reduce the amount of paperwork. Computers or word processors can be used to print information on the standard form. The Agency also agrees that in such circumstances the Manifest would likely be more accurate, neater, and could contain more information. The Agency, therefore, will allow use of a computer or word processor in the preparation of the UHWM. "Free-form" or other manifest formats not using the UHWM format and design requirements will not be allowed. The Agency believes that the purpose of developing the Uniform Manifest would be negated if forms other than the UHWM form were allowed.

28. Manifest document number should be preassigned/preprinted.

State commenters suggested that the Manifest document number should be preassigned and preprinted to help preclude misnumbering of manifests and to ensure the uniqueness of each manifest number. Examples of errors were given, e.g., as where the same number could be applied to a manifest by two different people at one generator's site if the numbers were not preprinted. State commenters also

indicated that preassigned and preprinted numbers was essential to their specific program and manifest tracking needs.

RESPONSE:

EPA understands the commenters concerns' for simplifying data management. Since EPA is not printing and supplying the form, the Agency cannot preprint a Manifest document number. EPA has, to some extent, preassigned Manifest document numbers by requiring the use of EPA identification numbers as part of the Manifest document number. It would be difficult for the Agency to preassign nationally the remaining five digits required as part of the Manifest document number.

Since RCRA allows for a State program to be more stringent, EPA has provided a space on the Manifest for a State Manifest document number. Although not a federally-required piece of information, the States may require generators to enter such a number, or the States may preprint such a number before distributing the Manifest. Neither of these additions would be inconsistent with the Federal system.

29. Revise instructions for the Proper Shipping Description.

Several commenters suggested revising the instructions for the proper shipping description. One commenter believed that the instructions should include specific language rather than a reference to DOT language. Other comments suggested that the way the form was developed would result in some cases of incorrect entry of the DOT identification (UN/NA) number. Specifically, these commenters suggested that the UN/NA column be incorporated into the Proper Shipping Description.

RESPONSE:

The Agency partially agrees with this group of commenters. EPA's instructions for the proper shipping description reference DOT's regulations for describing a hazardous material in transit. EPA believes that it would be redundant and of little value to persons responsible for completing the Manifest to require them to comply with two nearly identical regulations. Since the Agency has worked closely with DOT and has adopted DOT's system for properly describing a hazardous waste material, EPA regulations are simplified by referencing the DOT regulations for shipping paper requirements. Although EPA does not require that instructions be printed on the backs of the Manifest form, States and industry may do so if they desire.

The Agency does agree with the commenter's concerns that the proposed form did not allow for correct entry of the proper shipping description, including the DOT identification number (UN/NA number). The proposed form provided a separate column for the UN/NA number at the end of the space for the proper shipping description. In some instances, however, the UN/NA number will not be the last entry in the proper shipping description. Under some circumstances,

it must appear before other required information such as "Waste Adipic Acid ORM-E, NA 9077, RQ." Therefore, EPA has eliminated the separate UN/NA column from the form.

30. Revise the wording in the generator's certification.

Comments received by the Agency indicated that some industries believed that the generator certification statement should be revised. Commenters' suggestions on the wording were "material covered by this manifest or herein named," rather than "above-named material." Other commenters suggested similar wording that would take into account the use of a continuation sheet, while others suggested that the generator's certification statement should include an indication that all the proper placards had been offered to the transporter. One commenter indicated that the generator's certification stipulated in the Proposed regulation was not intended for shipments by air or international shipments.

RESPONSE:

EPA's paramount concern with respect to the wording of the certification statement is that it is consistent with the language used by DOT which is based on the transportation of dangerous goods. That language now uses the phrase "contents of this consignment." EPA does not believe, in any case, that this phrasing will create confusion. The Agency is interpreting the certification to include not only the wastes identified on page one of the Manifest (EPA form 8700-22) but also to include any wastes listed on the Manifest Continuation Sheet (EPA form 8700-22A).

With regard to a space or provision in the generator's certification statement for transporters to acknowledge that the generator had offered them the proper placards, the Agency does not agree that such a space or provision is justifiable in all cases. If a generator wished to document that he complied with that standard, he could enter a statement to that effect in the "Special Handling Instructions and Additional Information" space on the form and have the transporter sign or initial the statement. The Agency does not believe that this should be a Federally-required information item for all generators or transporters, since its inclusion does not enhance protection of human health and the environment nor tracking.

31. Require that the Manifest have a red border.

One State commenter suggested that the Manifest have a red border. The rationale for this suggestion indicated that with such an identifiable outline, emergency response personnel would be able to locate the form quickly and more easily.

RESPONSE:

DOT has determined that such a State requirement is inconsistent with the intent of the DOT standards and has preempted such a State requirement (DOT preemptive ruling #4). EPA agrees with this

ruling. The Agency believes that through the establishment of a national standard, the Uniform Manifest form will be easily recognizable from all other forms as it is used in transportation and that a red border is not needed.

32. The type and number of containers should be entered on the left of the form.

Several comments received by the Agency requested that the format of the proposed form be changed. The specific suggestion was that the columns on the proposed form for number and type of containers be moved from the right side of the proper shipping description to the left side of the proper shipping description. The reason given for this suggestion was to accommodate existing procedures of the regulated community. Many forms currently in use have the number and type of container information to the far left of the waste description.

RESPONSE:

EPA proposed placing the Number and Types of Containers column to the right of the waste description but considered moving it to the far left to accommodate industry practice. However, since the industry practice is not universal and since DOT does not specify the location of such information, the Agency has decided that the location will be to the right. This placement lends itself to automated data processing (ADP) input as some commenters suggested.

33. Reduce or eliminate "tick marks."

Comments received by the Agency suggested that the "tick-marks" shown on the Manifest in the proposed rule be reduced in size or line thickness or removed altogether. The rationale presented was that interference with the entry of information could result, particularly with typewriter entry.

RESPONSE:

The Agency agrees with this group of commenters and has revised the form to remove the "tick-marks" and replace them with light "spacing dots" that will serve the same purpose as "tick-marks." Use of light markings will facilitate neat entry and simplify automated data processing, but will not obscure the data entry.

34. Color code each sheet of the Manifest.

Some of the suggestions received indicated that State commenters believed that color coding of the different Manifest copies would simplify recordkeeping and improve compliance.

RESPONSE:

Although the Agency agrees that color coding the copies of the Manifest form could simplify recordkeeping, EPA cannot justify

such a requirement. Different companies or States may already use color coding schemes for other records. For EPA to formulate another scheme would result in an unjustifiable burden on the regulated community. EPA does not specify the color of the Manifest

copies nor limit the number of copies. This determination is left to the States.

35. Use an 8-1/2" x 11" form.

One group of commenters suggested the use of 8-1/2" x 11" paper; while another group of commenters suggested the use of 8-1/2" x 14" paper. The commenters in the former group believed that the smaller paper would facilitate recordkeeping in standard files. The commenters in the second group believed that the information needs of the States could only be met by the additional spaces and, therefore, a longer form.

RESPONSE:

EPA considered requiring a 8-1/2" x 14" UHWM in order to accommodate the additional information sought by the States. After many revisions, the Agency was able to develop a form size that was based primarily on how much information was required by Federal regulation and secondarily on how much was sought by the States. The final version contains all the Federally required information plus spaces for most of the information sought by industry and the States. The result is an 8-1/2" x 11" form which simplifies filing and typewritten entries.

36. Number the information boxes on the form.

One group of commenters suggested that the boxes on the manifest be numbered. The commenters' reasoning was that the numbering of the spaces would correspond with the instructions and make completion of the form easier and communication between generators, transporters, TSD facilities, and regulatory agencies less complicated.

RESPONSE:

The Agency agrees with this group of commenters and has numbered the federally-required information spaces and lettered the State information spaces.

37. Allow the instructions to be printed on the back.

Some commenter indicated that the instruction for completing the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest should be printed on the back of the form. Most of these commenters suggested that the instruction should be augmented by State-specific instructions which should also be with the form. The reason these commenters gave was that by including the instructions with the form, confusion regarding the completion of the form would be reduced.

RESPONSE:

The Agency will allow (but not require) instructions to be printed on the back of the Manifest form. States may include State-specific instructions provided the instructions do not require new, different, or additional information.

38. Correct the "Type of Container" to eliminate the confusion caused by dual designations for tank car.

Several commenters noted an inconsistency in the instructions for the Manifest. In particular, the table for Types of Containers indicated that tank cars could be identified as CT or TC. They suggested that this situation be clarified.

RESPONSE:

The final rule clarifies the Agency's intent for type of container code which is to use the abbreviation "TC." The table has been corrected to eliminate this confusion.

39. Make Hazard Class a separate column.

The Agency received several comments that suggested making the hazard class identification of each waste a separate column on the Manifest. Since each hazardous waste shipped offsite must be properly identified by a DOT hazard class, this group of commenters believed that a separate column on the Manifest that would identify the hazard class of each waste entered would assist in data management and any emergency response necessary for a spill of hazardous waste.

RESPONSE:

The Agency considered making a separate column for the hazard class designation, but DOT's proper shipping description requirements preclude such a column. Some descriptions require the hazard class after the proper shipping name (e.g., Waste sulfuric acid, spent, corrosive material, UN 1832, RQ) while other descriptions contain the hazard class as part of the proper name (e.g., Flammable liquid, N.O.S., UN 1993). Because of this requirement, it would be confusing and sometimes redundant to develop a Hazard Class column.

40. May fractions be used in the Total Quantity column?

Several commenters asked the Agency to clarify the quantity entry on the Manifest. Specifically, this group of commenters asked the Agency to clarify whether fraction or decimal entries would be allowed in the quantity column.

RESPONSE:

EPA does not believe that fractions or decimals should be used for quantity description. The Agency believes that the quantity description should be as accurate as possible without using fractions or decimals. For example, if a shipment contains 18,500 pounds, the correct quantity description would be 18,500 pounds, not 9 tons, nor 9 1/4 tons, nor 9.25 tons.

41. Add more space for special handling instructions, addressees, etc.

Several commenters suggested that the Manifest form provide more space for several items. The most frequently mentioned items in need of additional space were the special handling instructions, the waste description, and the address spaces.

RESPONSE:

The Agency gave full consideration to the information required by RCRA and the space limitations of the form. As discussed elsewhere in this background document, various sizes of paper were considered. Of primary concern was the inclusion of all Federally-required information. Also considered important, however, was the advantage of fitting the form on standard 8 1/2" x 11" paper. Although the 8 1/2" x 11" form allows less space for other items than a larger form would allow, the Agency believes that the 8-1/2" x 11" form design of the final rulemaking satisfies the Agency's primary concerns while allowing space for some State information.

42. Allow States to print "tick marks" in shaded area.

Several State commenters suggested that the Agency allow them to print "tick-marks" in the State information spaces to facilitate automated data processing (ADP).

RESPONSE:

The Agency will allow States to print and distribute the UHWT. (See previous discussion.) Along with the right to print the form is the right to tailor the State information area of the form to some degree as set forth in §271.10 (h). This includes preprinting spacing dots and other organizational marks.

GROUP C: Form Management

43. Allow States, generators and others to print and distribute the form.

States with existing manifests were most concerned with their right to print and distribute copies of the Manifest. Most of their rationale was based on their beliefs that their current systems were working efficiently and provided control of

hazardous waste shipments. Other States commented that their tracking systems were dependent on printing a State manifest document number on the Manifest. It was this number that States use to track shipments. Without the right to print and distribute copies of the Manifest, the States believed they would lose their ability to track each shipment of waste traveling in their State.

RESPONSE:

The Agency agrees with the commenters who suggested that States wanting to preprint a State manifest document number and distribute copies of the Manifest should have the ability to do so. Although the Agency does not believe that a State manifest document number is necessary since EPA requires a Manifest document number based on the generator's EPA identification number, the Agency is allowing States to enter a State manifest document number in the upper right-hand corner of the form (items A and L). This number may also be entered by the generator, if the State law allows.

44. Specify copy distribution.

The Agency received comments that suggested the copy distribution of the Manifest be stipulated on each sheet. Several State commenters believed that the top copy should go to the State, while other specific recommendations were made for copy distribution. One commenter suggested that the last copy be the one the generator keeps initially since the generator would be more likely to make sure that all copies, including the last copy, were legible.

RESPONSE:

The Agency is allowing States that print and distribute the Manifest to stipulate copy distribution. The distribution instructions, however, must appear in the margin or on the back of the form. Compliance with State copy distribution requirements will not be enforced by EPA. EPA will, however, enforce proper handling of the Manifest as required by 40 CFR Parts 262, 263, 264 and 265. The Agency is not concerned with which copy is managed by a particular individual, as long as the information is available.

45. Allow the use of a "certified equivalent" manifest.

Some commenters with existing manifests suggested that the Agency provide for the approval of a different manifest that would be evaluated and approved as equivalent to the Federally required one. These commenters explained that their particular manifesting requirements would be severely affected if they were to be required to use another form. Lack of specific information and the burden of retraining were cited as reasons for the recommendation.

RESPONSE:

The primary purpose of developing the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest is to create national uniformity in the shipping document required for hazardous waste transportation. If the Agency approved other manifests based on existing or new systems, this purpose would be defeated. EPA believes that the information provided for in the final form will allow most, if not all, States and companies with existing manifest systems to obtain the basic information necessary for managing hazardous waste shipments.

The Agency questions whether there could be a significant difference between existing manifests that could be approved as "equivalent" and the UHWM. If an existing manifest form were so similar to the UHWM as to be equivalent, then there would be no real reason to approve a form that was only slightly different. If the information on the form was significantly different, then it could not be approved as "equivalent," and supplemental forms would be necessary to meet the additional information needs of the State or generator.

Training personnel to comply with a new system may be a burden initially, but the long-term problems associated with varying manifests on a national basis will be eliminated by one standard form.

The Agency is not approving manifests other than EPA form 8700-22 and form 8700-22A. EPA believes that there is sufficient flexibility in usage of these forms to meet the information and management needs of the States and regulated community.

46. Federal regulations should apply only to interstate shipments.

Some States, notably California and Texas among others, suggested that EPA allow them to use their existing manifest systems and forms for intrastate shipments. The comment from California, in fact, pointed out that only two percent of the hazardous waste shipments originating within California actually left the State. Other comments indicated that there would be a significant burden in manpower retraining and revision costs to existing State manifest systems and forms if States were required to use a Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest for both inter- and intrastate shipments.

RESPONSE:

The Agency considered making the UHWM provisions applicable only to interstate shipments. This consideration was rejected for several reasons. First, as discussed elsewhere in this background document, one of the primary purposes of creating the UHWM was to provide a national uniform and consistent form for use in hazardous waste transportation. If the UHWM form was not required for both intra- and interstate shipments, confusion enforcement difficulties would result. In addition, DOT's regulations relate to

the nature of the transportation company's business and not to the nature of a particular shipment. EPA and enforcement officials would be confronted with the difficult task of judging compliance with not only the Federal system but with the various State systems if intrastate shipments used different manifests. At the same time, the regulated community would be confronted with the additional burden of proof that their shipment was intrastate rather than interstate.

Second, the Agency understands that some generators may be located in States where adequate facilities are available and, therefore, will not have to ship their waste interstate. However, there are many generators who will have to ship their waste interstate and many generators with facilities they own in several States who will be faced with the problem of understanding the various State hazardous waste laws. The Agency believes the lack of uniformity for these generators will cause a more difficult adjustment and resource burden on the regulated community than would be off-set by the imposition of the UHWM standards on only interstate shipments. Also, the Agency believes that a one-time change to a uniform system will be less burdensome over time than the continued implementation of various State manifest requirements.

Therefore, with the concurrence of DOT, EPA is requiring use of the UHWM in all States regardless of whether the shipments originating in that State are intrastate or interstate.

47. The consignment State manifest requirements should have primacy.

Several recommendations from industry and States suggested a priority system for acquiring copies of the Manifest. One such recommendation suggested that the Manifest for the State to which the waste was being sent (consignment State) should have precedence over other States' manifests. The rationale was that the consignment State had the responsibility for final waste management. A few other comments suggested that generators should obtain the forms from the generator's State rather than the consignment State, if that State prints and supplies the forms.

EPA agrees that it is necessary to specify a hierarchy setting forth the source from which the generator must obtain the Manifest forms. EPA has adopted the following hierarchy:

a.) if the consignment State supplies the Manifest and requires its use, then the generator is obligated to obtain the Manifest from that State;

b.) if the consignment State does not supply the Manifest, but the generator State does supply and require the use of the Manifest, then the generator is obligated to obtain the Manifest from the generator State;

c.) if neither the consignment State nor the generator State supplies the Manifest, then the generator may obtain the Manifest

from any source he chooses.

By adopting this priority scheme, States that want to get additional State information on the Manifest will be able to obtain it more easily and in a format of their choosing. In the event both the generator State and the consignment State want additional information on the Manifest, the generator may find it necessary to coordinate the information entry on the Manifest with both States. The Agency does not, however, intend to enforce the optional State information items, regardless of whether they are required by a generator State and/or a consignment State. The rationale for this hierarchy for acquisition is discussed in greater detail in the preamble to the final Uniform Manifest rule.

48. Explain the proper shipping description when a non-RCRA waste is shipped.

Commenters asked that the Agency explain the proper shipping descriptions for wastes which are identified on a Manifest but not covered by RCRA. The comment was apparently directed at the problem that might occur when regulated and non-regulated waste appeared on the Manifest. An example of this is a generator sending two drums of new cleaning solvent to an incinerator along with a load of spent solvent.

RESPONSE:

The Agency was required by RCRA to establish regulations for the control of hazardous waste. The Department of Transportation, on the other hand, is mandated to regulate the transportation of hazardous materials. EPA does not have the authority under Subtitle C of RCRA to regulate shipments of non-hazardous waste. Therefore, there is no EPA regulation on proper shipping names for wastes regulated by a State and not regulated under RCRA.

RCRA regulated hazardous wastes and non-RCRA regulated waste designated as hazardous (or nonhazardous) by State law may be shipped together and identified on the same manifest. DOT's regulations in 49 CFR 172.201 allow hazardous material (including hazardous waste) to be entered on a shipping paper (manifest) together with non-federally regulated materials/wastes provided the hazardous materials/wastes are entered first, or in a contrasting color, or if the hazardous material/waste is identified by an "X" in a column captioned "HM." Thus, wastes not regulated by RCRA may appear on a Manifest. Since the Agency is not regulating non-hazardous waste under RCRA, it is not specifying the "proper" shipping description for such wastes.

49. Allow photocopying of additional copies.

The Agency received suggestions to allow the photocopying of additional copies of the Manifest. In anticipation of the need for more than a four copy set, viewed by some as the minimum number, several commenters suggested that the Agency allow generators,

transporters and TSD facility owners or operators to make copies of the Manifest for the purposes of recordkeeping and reporting.

Several State commenters suggested that photocopying of the Manifest should not be allowed. Their reasons were that alterations were more difficult to detect.

RESPONSE:

The Agency did not stipulate the number of copies in a Manifest since there would be many different situations requiring multiple copies, e.g., more than one transporter and internal company recordkeeping practices. The Agency believes that it would be impractical to require carbon copies at the expense of legibility. As the number of copies increases, legibility will decrease. If a generator is working with a six copy set, for example, he may find a photocopy of the first page to be more readable than a carbon copy of the last page. Industry commenters suggested that the Agency restrict the information required in the State's periodic reports to the Agency to only that information required on the Manifest. This restriction would allow States to prepare their reports based on the information they received on Manifests alone.

50. Require that a copy of the Manifest be sent to the States.

Some State commenters asked that the Agency require generators and permitted facilities to send copies of the Manifest to the generator State and to the consignment State, respectively.

RESPONSE:

The Agency has not changed its position regarding unnecessary recordkeeping and reporting burdens. The system that EPA established for manifest tracking is adequate to protect human health and the environment. The generator's responsibility is to submit an Exception Report, to the Regional Administrator or State Director within 45 days of when the shipment was made. If he has not received a copy of the UHWM signed by the designated facility indicating delivery. The Agency does not believe that it is justifiable to require generators (or facility owners or operators) to send copies of the Manifest to the State for tracking purposes or any other purpose when the Federal system is adequate to protect human health and the environment.

The Agency will not, however, preempt States from requiring additional manifest reporting. As discussed in the preamble to the final Uniform Manifest regulations, EPA believes States have independent authority to impose such requirements.

AREA D: Other51. Restrict State program reports to the information required on the UHWM.

Industry commenters suggested that the Agency restrict the information required in the States periodic reports to the Agency to only that information required on the Manifest. This restriction would allow States to prepare their reports based on the information they received on the manifests alone.

RESPONSE:

The information the Agency is mandated to require on the Manifest and the information EPA requires in State reports are not the same. The Agency is mandated to create a manifest system that contains information protective of human health and the environment and which will track the waste from "the cradle-to-grave". The State reporting requirements are necessary for hazardous waste management and overview. As a result, the information required on the Manifest and in a State report are mandated for different purposes. Some of the information appropriate for State reports is neither necessary nor appropriate for tracking waste shipments or protecting human health and the environment during transportation. Generators are not precluded from adding such information in the margin, on the back, or as an attachment to their file copy of the Manifest -- thus achieving the same result. Neither are States precluded from requiring generators or owners or operators of TSD facilities to keep any additional information. Consequently, the Agency does not believe that the State reports should be limited to information contained on the Manifest.

52. The Manifest document number should be "unique" not "serially increasing."

Commenters suggested that the definition of "Manifest document number" should be revised to delete any reference to serially increasing numbers since that implies that Manifests must be used in a particular order and to use them out-of-order would be a violation. These same commenters suggested that the Manifest document number should be defined in terms of its uniqueness.

RESPONSE:

The Agency agrees with this group of commenters. The requirement of "serially increasing" was intended simply as a means of ensuring uniqueness, and was not intended to imply that use of Manifest numbers out of order would constitute a violation. EPA has, therefore, changed the definition of "Manifest document number" to be one that is "unique." The "uniqueness" of the Manifest Document Number will be for the generator to control shipments from each generating site during a calendar year. The generator is not responsible for the uniqueness of the Manifest Document

Number assigned to shipments from other sites of generation or from year to year. The EPA identification number and date of acceptance by the transporter can, if necessary, be used to identify different manifests in the unlikely event of duplicate document numbers.

53. Transporter information required on the Manifest should be completed by the transporter and facility information required on the Manifest should be completed by the facility.

EPA received comments from industry suggesting that the transporter information required on the Manifest should be completed by the transporter and information about the TSD facility should be completed by the owner or operator of the facility.

RESPONSE:

The Agency requires the generator to complete most of the Manifest. The Agency is not concerned about who actually writes or types information on the form. The Agency has taken this position because the Agency considers the generator responsible for preparing the form, regardless of who actually completes the form. Thus, EPA will look to the generator for questions on the Manifest preparation. Also, the Agency believes that the generator must have prior knowledge of who the transporters will be and to which TSD facility the waste must be sent. As a result, the manifest system requires the generator to enter the transporter information in the order they will manage the waste shipment and to enter the waste description and TSD facility information.

54. Make provisions for lab-pack shipments.

The Agency received comments from industry suggesting that EPA allow for the use of lab-pack shipments. Lab-packs are shipments of drums which contain similar wastes with different DOT shipping descriptions but the same EPA characteristic. Commenters indicated that single line entries on a Manifest for each laboratory container of hazardous waste packed in vermiculite and placed in a 55-gallon drum would result in a Manifest of several pages. These commenters believed that protection of human health and the environment could be maintained if they were allowed to list generic categories of lab wastes packed in containers as a one line item rather than listing all the containers inside a drum.

RESPONSE:

The Agency has relied on the DOT regulations for shipping description nomenclature. Therefore, comments suggesting changes to DOT's proper shipping description requirements cannot be addressed by EPA. The Agency did consider the problem of paperwork burden for shipments containing many line entries on a Manifest. In an effort to reduce the number of manifests necessary to properly ship multiple wastes, EPA developed and DOT allows the use of a continuation sheet with additional spaces for waste entries. This was done to help reduce the paperwork burden on the regulated

community. If DOT develops new shipping description requirements for lab-pack type shipments, EPA will reconsider the need for the continuation sheet.

55. Clarification for the discrepancy indication space is needed since State imposed deadlines may vary.

One commenter suggested that the discrepancy indication space instructions should be clarified to explain that Discrepancy Reports may be required by States at time intervals other than the fifteen days required by the EPA rules. Also, the commenter suggested that the regulations clarify which State's time deadline would apply.

RESPONSE:

The Agency has included in the instructions to the UHWM a caution to facility owners and operators that authorized States may also require Discrepancy Reports and that they should contact the appropriate State agency for details. Since an authorized State may have shorter time restrictions for the submission of such reports along with other more stringent requirements, the Agency chose not to itemize all the possibilities. Rather, a general statement which cautions all affected facilities was used in the instructions.

56. Units of measure vary from those presented in the Annual Report (now Biennial Report).

One group of commenters pointed out that the units of measure in the Manifest instructions and those used in the Biennial Report (now Annual Report) varied and should be consistent.

RESPONSE:

The Agency agrees with the commenters and the final UHWM rule is consistent with respect to the Annual Report (now Biennial Report) abbreviations for the units of measure.

57. Training should be provided in order to ensure successful implementation.

One group of commenters suggested that EPA provide adequate training during the implementation of the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest. Their belief was that adequate training would improve compliance and thereby protect human health and the environment.

RESPONSE:

The Agency agrees with these commenters and is planning to provide training to Regional and State personnel. When possible, the Agency will assist industry in developing training sessions to improve compliance.

58. The Agency should establish the number of copies required for each Manifest.

Comments recieved by the Agency indicated that EPA should establish the number of copies required for each Manifest. In addition to the minimum of four copies required by the current regulations for every Manifest, some commenters suggested five copies in order to provide a copy to a second transporter. Other commenters suggested providing a copy to a second transporter. While, other commenters suggested other numbers of copies with varying distribution: six copies - standard four plus one each for the generator State and the consignment State; seven copies - standard four plus one each for the second transporter, generator State, and consignment State; five copies - standard four plus one for either the generator State or the consignment State.

RESPONSE:

The Agency cannot justify a required number of copies for a Manifest since varying management practices will dictate the number of copies needed. For the Agency to require the maximum number that might be needed under all circumstances could result in waste when only four were necessary. Variations in industry recordkeeping practices may necessitate additional copies. Therefore, the Agency is not establishing a specific number of copies for each manifest.

59. Clarify EPA's position on "preemption authority."

Several commenters requested that the Agency clarify the preemptive authority of EPA and DOT with regard to the mandatory use of the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest. Some of these commenters questioned the existence of the statutory preemptive authority at all.

RESPONSE:

A full discussion of this issue is presented in the preamble of the final rule.

60. Require a quarterly report from the generator if the State does not get a copy of the Manifest.

This group of State commenters suggested that the Agency require a quarterly report of Manifest information if those generators were not required by EPA to submit copies of each Manifest to the State.

RESPONSE:

The Agency considered Quarterly Reports from generators early in the developing of the generator standards. This option was rejected because of the increased paperwork burden such a requirement would place on generators and because the Agency re-

quirement for developed Exception Reports. The Agency also rejected the suggestion that generators be required to submit a copy of each Manifest to EPA or to the State since information on successful or completed shipments could be obtained from Biennial Reports or on-site inspections. Although the Agency does not require that Manifest copies nor quarterly reports be sent to the State, the Agency has not precluded States from requiring such reports.

61. Preempt State licenses and permitting of transporters.

The Agency received suggestions during the comment period that indicated an industry's concern with State licensing and permitting of transporters. Many of the commenters believed that State permitting and licensing would be an unnecessary and a duplicative burden on the regulated community.

RESPONSE:

Permitting and licensing by States is not a federal requirement. Since Section 3009 of RCRA allows States to be more stringent, it is beyond the scope of the federal system to preempt a State law requiring licensing or permitting of transporters.

62. The effective date of 180 days is acceptable but it should be sooner.

This group of commenters asked the Agency to make the effective date of the regulations as soon as possible. Some industry commenters said that the 180 days was more than sufficient. State commenters believed that an effective date 180 days after publication in the Federal Register was insufficient to allow them to properly implement the rule in their State.

RESPONSE:

The Agency has decided to keep the statutory implementation requirement of six months. In the event that States do not have enough time to implement the UHWM requirements, EPA and DOT will enforce the use of the UHWM. State legislation or laws need not be in place in order for EPA and DOT to enforce the UHWM. The Agency does not believe any additional delays are warranted or justifiable.

63. The United States should acknowledge the Canadian manifest in lieu of the Uniform Manifest for shipments originating in Canada.

Environment Canada suggested that EPA allow the use of Canadian manifests for shipments destined for TSD facility in the United States. In return, Canada would allow the United States Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest to be used for shipments destined for a Canadian treatment, storage or disposal facility. The rationale was that this agreement on trans-boundary shipments would facilitate the free-flow of hazardous waste across the U.S.-Canadian border.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Regulatory Library
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

RESPONSE:

The Agency considered this comment but has explained to the Canadian Government the difficulties its adoption would create. The basic need for the UHWM is to have a standard form that is recognizable and enforceable. The possibility exists that the Canadian national manifest would be significantly different from the U.S. Manifest and that each Province may also develop differing manifest forms. EPA has indicated its willingness to work with the Canadian government to resolve this problem. At present, however, EPA will not recognize any manifest other than the UHWM for shipments of hazardous waste while those shipments are being transported in the United States.

SECTION IV - CONCLUSIONS AND THE FINAL RULE

The final rule for the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest accomplishes the purposes and Congressional mandate it was designed to meet. The UHWM is the primary transportation document that ensures that hazardous waste is destined for and received by permitted treatment, storage and disposal facilities. It ensures the "cradle to grave" concept in hazardous waste movements. The Federally required information is the same as that originally required in the February 26, 1980, rule. In addition, certain information identified by States as essential to the management of their State hazardous waste management programs has been included on the form as State optional informational items. The State optional information items have been lettered and shaded to help delineate the federally required information.

The Agency believes that generators located in States that require optional information to be completed will find the federal UHWM a convenient form on which to include the State information. The inclusion of a State information area on the form (shaded) will eliminate the need for some States to require additional information on a separate form. Thus, this form will eliminate duplication of Federal and State information requirements and multiple manifesting.

States and generators are allowed some flexibility in printing the Manifest. Although a standard base form must be used, States, may pre-print certain information (e.g., State manifest document number, logo) and generators may pre-print certain information required of them, (e.g., their name, address and identification number).

Management of the UHWM which includes the responsibility for completion, copy distribution, and recordkeeping has not changed from the 1980 rule. The generator is responsible for completing most of the form, while transporters must sign and date the UHWM acknowledging acceptance. Treatment, storage or disposal

facility owners or operators must sign and date the Manifest and indicate discrepancies, if any. All three parties are still required to keep a copy for three years and the TSD facility must return a signed copy to the generator. If the generator does not receive a signed copy from the facility within 45 days of shipping the waste, the generator must file an Exception Report.

In order to implement the use of the UHWM form, the Agency has the authority to require its use in States where EPA administers the program. In States seeking final authorization to administer the program, EPA has the authority to require the use of the UHWM as a condition of final authorization. In States with interim authorization, or full authorization, EPA has relied on the authority of DOT to require those States to change their laws and require the use of the Uniform Manifest. Thus, all States will be required to implement the UHWM on the same day, rather than on the effective dates of individual State authorizations.

In summary, the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest will provide for all the information needs of the federally mandated program while also providing for State informational needs. In addition, generators of hazardous waste will have one standard form that will meet both federal and State information needs, thus eliminating duplicative paperwork requirements. Finally, the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest will be the only hazardous waste document required for transportation of shipments regulated under RCRA. This rule preempts the States from requiring that any additional documents accompany the waste shipment while in transportation.

The final rule for the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest (UHWM) accomplishes the purposes and congressional mandate it was designed to meet. The UHWM is the primary transportation document that insures that hazardous waste is destined for and received by permitted treatment, storage and disposal facilities. It insures the "cradle to grave" concept in hazardous waste movements. The federally required information is the same as originally required in the February 26, 1980, rule. In addition, certain information identified by States as essential to the management of their programs has been included on the form. To help delineate the federally required information from the optional State information, the State information section has been shaded.

The Agency believes that generators located in States that require this optional information will find the federal UHWM a convenient form on which to include the State information. The inclusion of a shaded State information section will eliminate the need for some States to require additional information on a separate form. Thus, this form will eliminate duplication of federal and State information requirements and multiple manifesting.