

START



Department of Energy

Richland Field Office

P.O. Box 550

Richland, Washington 99352

9305705

93-RPS-287

JUL 27 1993

Ms. Dru Butler, Program Manager
Nuclear and Mixed Waste Program
State of Washington
Department of Ecology
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia, Washington 98504-7600

Mr. Douglas R. Sherwood
Acting Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10
712 Swift Boulevard, Suite #5
Richland, Washington 99352



Dear Ms. Butler and Mr. Sherwood:

RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS TO THE HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION, 222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0, NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY (TSD: TS-2-1)

Enclosed is a notice of deficiency (NOD) response table for the Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, 222-S Laboratory Complex (222-S). The 222-S permit application documentation, Revision 0, was submitted to the State of Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for review on December 21, 1991, in accordance with the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement) Milestone M-20-22. The response table has been prepared to address the second response to NOD comments 10, 15, and 23 identified as "DOE-RL/WHC Response 2:", and the supplemental NOD comments 28 through 32 as transmitted in a letter from Mr. G. A. Anderson, Ecology, to Mr. J. D. Bauer, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (RL), dated April 16, 1993.

32258

Ms. Butler and Mr. Sherwood
93-RPS-287

-2-

JUL 27 1993

9305705

Should you have any questions, please contact Mr. C. E. Clark of the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office on (509) 376-9333 or Mr. R. C. Bowman of the Westinghouse Hanford Company on (509) 376-4876.

Sincerely,

Robert G. Holt

Robert G. Holt, Acting Program Manager
Office of Environmental Assurance,
Permits, and Policy
DOE Richland Operations Office

R. E. Lerch

R. E. Lerch, Deputy Director
Restoration and Remediation
Westinghouse Hanford Company

Enclosure:
NOD Response Table

cc w/encl:

G. A. Anderson, Ecology
B. A. Austin, WHC
M. L. Bell, WHC
D. L. Duncan, EPA
D. C. Nylander, Ecology
R. C. Bowman, WHC, w/o encl.
Administrative Records, H6-08

cc w/o encl:

R. E. Lerch, WHC
S. M. Price, WHC

9305705.1536

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 1 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| 1. | <p><u>Page 1-5, Section 1.4, Line 41.</u> <u>Comment:</u> The acceptable definition of "facility", as used in this application, should be compatible with the definition in the draft site-wide permit.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Delete the present definition of Hanford Facility. Add the following: "The term facility means the contiguous land, structures, appurtenances and improvements on the land used for recycling, reusing, reclaiming, transferring storing, treating, or disposing of dangerous waste. The boundary of this Facility is the legal and physical description of all the land in Benton, Franklin, and Grant Counties included herein." Include the boundary description for all the land in the Hanford Reservation.</p> <p>*DOE-RL/WHC Response: Please note that the Hanford Facility definition has been revised since submittal of the NOD response table on March 11, 1993. The revised Hanford Facility definition is as follows:</p> <p>Hanford Facility--A single RCRA facility identified by the EPA/State Identification Number WA7890008967 that consists of over 60 TSD units conducting dangerous waste management activities. These TSD units are included in the <i>Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Part A Permit Application</i> (DOE-RL 1988b). The Hanford Facility consists of the contiguous portion of the Hanford Site that contains these TSD units and, for the purposes of RCRA, is owned by the U.S. Government and operated by the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (excluding lands north and east of the Columbia River, river islands, lands owned or used by the Bonneville Power Administration, lands leased to the Washington Public Power Supply System, and lands owned by or leased to the state of Washington).</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: The DOE-RL/WHC Response is acceptable until such time as a superseding definition is established in the site-wide permit.</p> | 04/16/93* |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 2 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 2. | <p><u>Page 2-5, Section 2.1.3.3, Line 43.</u> <u>Comment:</u> Although the nitric acid tanks are not regulated, the contents become waste if they leak or are spilled.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Please discuss containment of any spilled nitric acid at either the outside or inside tank.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: The nitric acid tanks are considered to store product and are not required to be regulated under the dangerous waste regulations. Spilled nitric acid will be handled in accordance with WAC 173-303-145.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 3. | <p><u>Page 2-6, Section 2.1.3.3, Line 20:</u> <u>Comment:</u> Suppose the waste in the 207-SL Retention Basin is found to be hazardous, what is its disposition?</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Show what happens when hazardous waste is found in the 207-SL Retention Basin.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be added to include a general discussion of what happens if dangerous waste is detected in the 207-SL Basins.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 4. | <p><u>Page 3-10:</u> <u>Comment:</u> Incompatible wastes are not discussed on this page or in this Section.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Discuss incompatible wastes in this Section.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Incompatible wastes are discussed in Section 4.1.4 (containers) and Section 4.2.8 (tanks).</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 3 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 5. | <p><u>Page 4-25, Section 4.2.5, Line 41:</u> <u>Comment:</u> This sentence does not go far enough. The requirements of WAC 173-303-640 do apply to the 219-S Waste Handling Facility. The requirements of WAC 173-303-640(11) are related to wastes F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, and F027.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Rewrite this sentence to conform to the regulations.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be revised to specifically reference WAC 173-303-640(11).</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 6. | <p><u>Page 6-3, Section 6.2.1:</u> <u>Comment:</u> This Section does not mention the specific requirement of WAC 173-303-395(d) to have the Facility inspected by a fire prevention professional or fire marshal annually.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Change the inspection plan to include fire inspection by professional experts.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be added to Section 6.2 for annual inspection of areas that store ignitable or reactive waste by a professional person familiar with the Uniform Fire Code.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 7. | <p><u>Page 6.4, Section 6.2.1:</u> <u>Comment:</u> This sub-section does not list all the items to be inspected under the requirements of WAC 173-303-640.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Please include a tabulation of all check lists including items checked, type of check (visual, aural, etc.), frequency of inspection, result expected, etc., as an example. The tabulation in the Permit application for the 242-A evaporator is a model for all permit applications.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be modified to add inspection schedule checklists for the 219-S Waste Handling Facility and 222-S Dangerous and Mixed Waste Storage Area.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 4 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 8. | <p><u>Page 11-1, Section 11.0, Line 40:</u> <u>Comment:</u> Action levels for all contaminants of concern are background only, not risk based. State only wastes must be cleaned up to designation levels.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Delete all references to risk based standards unless used in the context of applying the nuclear and mixed waste programs soil cleanup policy.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be modified to include proposed changes to WAC 173-303 on health-based levels for contaminants. State-only waste will be cleaned up to designation levels.</p> <p>ECOLGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 9. | <p><u>Page 11-3, Section 11.1.1, Line 33:</u> <u>Comment:</u> Portland cement concrete always cracks. Either this slab is randomly cracked or it has fabricated joints. These cracks or joints have the capacity to convey hazardous spills to the ground under the slab.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> If there is any record or stain that shows a spill, sampling for hazardous substances must be done.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be modified to include a statement that spill sampling will be done if operating records show any spill(s) of dangerous waste. On page 11-6, Section 11.1.1.2.2, lines 33 through 42, a discussion is provided on visual signs of spillage (stains) and what course of action is to be taken.</p> <p>ECOLGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 10. | <p><u>Page 11-4, Section 11.1.1.2, Line 22:</u> <u>Comment:</u> SW-846 (EPA-1986) is an obsolete document.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Please quote the latest edition or State SW-846, latest edition, or some equivalent citation.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: The SW-846 (EPA 1986) is the correct reference document to use. The November 1990 Final Update I package has not been promulgated by the EPA. The EPA methods hotline has indicated that SW-846, 1986 document, is still an active document.</p> | |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 5 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | <u>Ecology Concurrence</u> |
|-----|------------------|--------------------------------|
|-----|------------------|--------------------------------|

ECOLOGY Response: The Department of Energy requested the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, establish the version of SW-846 applicable to the Hanford Reservation. On August 3, 1992, in a letter to June M Hennig, the EPA replied that the November 1990 was the correct version. Original comment stands.

DOE-RL/WHC Response No. 2: A discussion was held with Ecology (Gary Anderson) and the EPA (Dan Duncan) during the April 21, 1993, Unit Managers' Meeting on whether or not the SW-846 (EPA-1986) third edition, or the November 1990 Final Update I package was to be used. The Manchester Laboratory in Seattle, Washington was contacted to verify what version of SW-846 is used for sample analysis. The Manchester Laboratory is a certified laboratory jointly used by Ecology and the EPA for sample analysis. The Manchester Laboratory has indicated that the SW-846 (EPA 1986) third edition, is the only one that can be used at this time. Mr. Anderson agreed that the 1986 version is acceptable.

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 11. | <u>Page 11-6, Section 11.1.1.2.2, Line 44: Comment:</u> Wipe samples indicate presence or absence of hazardous substances. Background is defined as a volumetric concentration. | 04/16/93 |
|-----|---|----------|

Requirement: How will one be compared to the other?

DOE-RL/WHC Response: The text will be modified to delete the reference to "background levels". Wipe samples will be analyzed using SW-846 analytical methods.

ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.

- | | | |
|-----|--|----------|
| 12. | <u>Page 11-12, Section 11.1.4.4.2, Line 8: Comment:</u> The citation of the "most recent version of SW-846 (EPA-1986)" is incorrect since the latest edition of any reference cannot be dated as the previous edition. | 04/16/93 |
|-----|--|----------|

Requirement: Delete the parenthetical "(EPA-1986)."

DOE-RL/WHC Response: Refer to disposition on comment number 10.

ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
 222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
 NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
 Page 6 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 13. | <p>Page 12-2, Section 12.3, Line 40: <u>Comment</u>: On-site transporter requirements described here are not the same as those described in the proposed site-wide permit.</p> <p><u>Requirement</u>: On-site transporter requirements should be the same as those in the proposed site-wide permit.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: (Hanford Facility Permit comment II.Q) There is no regulatory basis for this condition. This condition has been inappropriately written to impose requirements for onsite waste movement. The regulation in WAC 173-303-180 is applicable to generators who offer waste for transport off the site of generation. The WAC 173-303-370 is applicable to dangerous waste facilities that receive waste from <u>offsite</u>. There are no shipping paper requirements for <u>onsite</u> movements. Tracking mechanisms have been in place for the onsite movement of waste at the Hanford Facility for many years; this documentation is used to ensure that waste destined for further onsite or offsite management units is properly managed. Furthermore, onsite transfers of dangerous waste meet all substantive requirements of 49 CFR Parts 100-177; these regulations are applicable only to offsite transport. Waste handling at the Hanford Facility is consistent with that which is protective of human health and the environment.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Although the tracking mechanisms in place have recently resulted in the misplacement of 2,000 barrels of waste at the site, the DOE-RL/WHC response is acceptable until superseded by the Site Wide Permit.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 14. | <p>Page 14-1, Section 14.0, Line 33: <u>Comment</u>: The Washington Department of Ecology does not recognize the status "Co-operator", here or any other place in the application.</p> <p><u>Requirement</u>: Substitute the word "Operator" or "Permittee" for the word "Co-operator" where used in this context.</p> | 04/16/93 |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 7 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|------------------|------------------------|
|-----|------------------|------------------------|

DOE-RL/WHC Response: (Hanford Facility Permit comment II.H) Ecology's position misinterprets both the law and the relationship between the DOE-RL and its contractors. The DOE-RL is responsible for overall management and operation of the Hanford Facility, including policy, programmatic funding, scheduling decisions, and general oversight of the contractors' performance. The contractors are responsible for certain day-to-day activities such as waste analysis, waste handling, monitoring, container labeling, personnel training, and recordkeeping.

In Ecology's Dangerous Waste Regulations, "operator" is defined as the person responsible for the overall operation of a facility (WAC 173-303-040). The WHC is not responsible for the overall operation of either the Hanford Facility or any individual TSD unit within the Hanford Facility. The parties to the FFACO have agreed therein that the DOE owns and operates the Hanford Facility. The contractors' roles are more limited as specified under their contracts with the DOE-RL and should not be identified as responsible for all activities.

ECOLOGY Response: DOE-RL/WHC response is acceptable until such time as a superseding definition is established in the side wide permit.

15. Appendices 3A and 3B: This office has accepted the *Hanford Site Liquid Effluent Characterization Program, Quality Assurance Program Plan*, WHC-SD WM-QAPP-011, Rev. 2, as the standard procedure for sampling and analysis for characterization at the Hanford Facility.

Requirement: Please be certain that all procedures shown in these Appendices conform to this document. It is understood that this procedure may have to be modified by the conditions imposed by certain sites.

DOE-RL/WHC Response: The *Hanford Site Liquid Effluent Characterization Program, Quality Assurance Program Plan* was written specifically for the sampling of 33 streams identified in the plan. This plan is not a standard procedure for sampling and analysis on the Hanford Facility and not applicable to the 222-S Laboratory Complex. The waste analysis plans for the 219-S Waste Handling Facility and the 222-S Dangerous and Mixed Waste Storage Area are based on the requirements in WAC 173-303-300, WAC 173-303-400, and 40 CFR 265.

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 8 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| | <p>ECOLOGY Response: Since the Hanford Site Liquid Effluent Characterization Program, Quality Assurance Program Plan, WHC-FD WM-QAPP-001, Rev. 2 is in strict accordance with EPA procedures, and has been carefully negotiated between all parties to the Tri-Party Agreement, the writer assumed that it would be adapted for general use for reasons of efficiency and speed of approval. If the permittee wishes to go through the same negotiating process again, the Department of Ecology will do so. Both appendices 3A and 3B will be reviewed by our chemists and referred to the EPA for their review. Further action deferred pending review.</p> | |
| | <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response No. 2: Refer to disposition of comments 28 through 32.</p> | |
| 16. | <p><u>Appendix 3A, Page 2, Section 3.1:</u> <u>Comment:</u> The disposition of the lab packs is not mentioned here.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| | <p><u>Requirement:</u> State the disposition of the lab packs.</p> | |
| | <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: A discussion of the disposition of labpacks is not required in this appendix. The <i>Waste Analysis Plan for the Dangerous and Mixed Waste Storage Area</i> (Appendix 3B) contains this discussion; also Sections 3.1.2.2 and 3.1.2.3 of Chapter 3.0.</p> | |
| | <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | |
| 17. | <p><u>Appendix 3A, Page 11, Sections 4.4 and 5:</u> <u>Comment:</u> Is the "chain of possession" in Section 4.4. the same as the "chain of custody" in Section 5.?</p> | 04/16/93 |
| | <p><u>Requirement:</u> Either explain the difference or make the wording uniform.</p> | |
| | <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be modified to state 'chain-of-custody'.</p> | |
| | <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 9 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 18. | <p><u>Appendix 3B, Page 14, Section 3.6:</u> <u>Comment:</u> The data for entry into the sampling logbook does not include the matrix of the sample (i.e. soil, water, oil and etc.).</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Please include the sample matrix in the data entered into the logbook.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be modified to require identification of the sample matrix in the sampling logbook.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 19. | <p><u>Appendix 3B, Page 17, Section 3.8, Line 9:</u> <u>Comment:</u> This Section says that off-site waste is not accepted at the 222-S Dangerous and Mixed Waste Storage Area. Page 1, Section 3.0., line 37, says that off-site samples are accepted.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Explain the apparent inconsistency.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: The Hanford Site is assigned a single Waste Generator number. Samples taken on the Hanford Site are sent to offsite laboratories for analysis; unused sample portions are sent back to the Hanford Site (222-S Laboratory Complex) under the guidelines in WAC 173-303-071(1)(i)(a). Section 3.1.2.6 discusses the acceptance of returned sample portions.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 20. | <p><u>Appendix 3B, Page 20, Table 3.4., Footnote, and Other Places:</u> <u>Comment:</u> The 1986 edition of SW-846 is quoted.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Please use the latest version of SW-846.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Refer to disposition on comment number 10.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: See comment number 10</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response No. 2: Refer to disposition on comment number 10, DOE-RL/WHC Response No. 2.</p> | |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 10 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| 21. | <p><u>Appendix 4A:</u> <u>Comment:</u> Some of the included drawings are illegible.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Please furnish legible drawings.</p> <p><u>DOE-RL/WHC Response:</u> Legible drawings will be provided.</p> <p><u>ECOLOGY Response:</u> Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 22. | <p><u>Appendices 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D:</u> <u>Comment:</u> These Appendices are not certified by a registered professional engineer. This certification is required by WAC 173-303-806(4)(a)(i).</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Have these items certified by a registered professional engineer.</p> <p><u>DOE-RL/WHC Response:</u> Previous discussions with Ecology have shown that Ecology's interpretation of the language in WAC 173-303-806(4)(a) is that a registered professional engineer's certification is necessary only for those technical data that specifically are identified in WAC 173-303 as requiring such. There is no WAC 173-303 requirement specifically requiring certification of the design drawings in questions. The DOE-RL therefore contends that the interpretation implied in the NOD comment is inconsistent with Ecology's application of this requirement at other facilities.</p> <p><u>ECOLOGY Response:</u> Your point is well taken. In addition, Appendix 4C was certified by a professional engineer. Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 23. | <p><u>Appendices 3A, and 3B:</u> <u>Comment:</u> These Appendices do not mention the document <i>Hanford Site Liquid Effluent Characterization Program Quality Assurance Program Plan</i>, WHC-SD-WM-QAPP-011. This document is currently being negotiated between Ecology, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Energy. When agreed upon, Ecology will regard it as the standard authority for sampling and analysis of liquid samples from all sources at the Hanford Reservation.</p> | |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
 222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
 NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
 Page 11 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| | <p><u>Requirement:</u> The <i>Hanford Site Liquid Effluent Characterization Program Quality Assurance Program Plan</i> should be the primary reference and source for Appendices 3A and 3B.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Refer to disposition on comment number 15.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: See Comment No. 15.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response No. 2: Refer to disposition of comments 28 through 32.</p> | |
| 24. | <p><u>Appendix 7A, Page 13 of 83:</u> <u>Comment:</u> Drawing H-2-5170 is not included in the application, and if it were, it would not be the appropriate place to show the 218-W-7 Dry Waste Burial Ground.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Show this Facility on Dwg. H-13-000006.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Drawing H-13-000006 will be modified to show location of the 218-W-7 Dry Waste Burial Ground (taken out of service in 1976 and is now a CERCLA site).</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 25. | <p><u>Appendix 7A, Page 16 of 83:</u> <u>Comment:</u> This building plan does not show exterior doors, creating the impression the staff will evacuate through the walls.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> The doors in the 222-S Laboratories will be shown with standard architectural symbols.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Figure 1-9 of Appendix 7A will be modified to show egress points.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 12 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 26. | <p><u>Appendix 7A, Page 20 of 83, Section 3.0., First Bullet:</u> <u>Comment:</u> This paragraph directly contradicts the photograph on Page 14 of 14, Part A.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Implement the policy stated and avoid a visit from regulatory inspectors.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: The contradiction stated has been looked into and a determination made that the main body of the permit application and the building emergency plan need to be clarified as to the types and sizes of various approved U.S. Department of Transportation containers used. Text will be updated to state that various sizes of approved U.S. Department of Transportation containers are used and stored at the 222-S Complex.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |
| 27. | <p><u>Appendix 7A, Page 19 of 83:</u> <u>Comment:</u> The Secondary Staging Area shown on this sketch, is directly downwind of the prevailing wind direction at this Facility.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Move the Secondary Staging Area to a spot opposite the least prevailing wind direction.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: The formally designated staging areas are established as the best assembly locations under most anticipated emergency situations. The staging areas are not so fixed as to prohibit deviation. In the event of an actual emergency, the building emergency director will direct evacuation and assembly as the situation warrants.</p> <p>ECOLOGY Response: Ecology concurs with the DOE-RL/WHC response.</p> | 04/16/93 |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 13 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 28. | <p><u>Appendix 3A, Section 3.5.4:</u> Are we to understand from this section that although arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, selenium and silver are discharged in "regulated concentrations", they do <u>not</u> show up in sample results?</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Please explain.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be modified to delete the first sentence and to add a final sentence to Section 3.5 Dangerous Waste Characteristics indicating that process knowledge is used in evaluating the dangerous waste characteristics for the 219-S Waste Handling Facility. Samples of the 219-S Waste Handling System waste are taken before transfer to the Double-Shell Tank (DST) System. Sample results are reviewed to verify the dangerous waste codes identified are applicable for transfer to the DST System.</p> | |
| 29. | <p><u>Appendix 3A, Section 4.4, 3rd paragraph:</u> This section mentions a laboratory procedure, but does not define it.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Please submit the "laboratory approved procedures" for our review. Guidelines are not sufficiently specific.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be modified to revise the waste analysis plan to reference SW-846 (EPA 1986) as the approved methods for sample analysis. A discussion was held with Ecology (Gary Anderson) and the EPA (Dan Duncan) during the May 20, 1993, Unit Managers' Meeting on whether or not laboratory and/or solid waste handling procedures required review and approval. In the meeting, Mr. Anderson stated that his intent was to make sure that the waste analysis plan would be more specific on the method used in a laboratory and/or solid waste handling procedures. Mr. Anderson and Mr. Duncan both agreed that the laboratory and/or solid waste handling procedures are not required to be reviewed or approved by Ecology and the EPA as long as they are referenced to approved methods.</p> | |
| 30. | <p><u>Appendix 3A, Section 4.4, 3rd paragraph, 2nd bullet:</u> The distinction between the "sample identification code" and the "sample code" are not clear.</p> <p><u>Requirement:</u> Please explain.</p> | |

HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION
222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0
NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY RESPONSE TABLE

June 11, 1993
Page 14 of 14

| No. | Comment/Response | Ecology Concurrence |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| | DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be modified to delete "sample code" and insert the term "sample identification number." | |
| 31. | <u>Appendix 3A, Section 4.4, Third paragraph, 3rd bullet, and Section 5.0, 3rd paragraph:</u> Approval of solid waste handling procedures and laboratory procedures are the prerogative of the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the Washington Department of Ecology. The Contractor's approval is insufficient. <u>Requirement:</u> The conditions of approval should require approval by the regulatory agencies. DOE-RL/WHC Response: Refer to disposition on comment number 29. | |
| 32. | <u>Appendix 3B, Section 3.5, 2nd paragraph:</u> Test methods are not found in Table 3.2. <u>Requirement:</u> Please State Environmental Protection Agency Approved Test Methods in Table 3.2. DOE-RL/WHC Response: Text will be modified to correct the table number to Table 3.3. | |

CORRESPONDENCE DISTRIBUTION COVERSHEET

| | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Author | Addressee | Correspondence No. |
| R. G. Holt, RL | D. Butler, Ecology | Incoming 9305705 |
| R. E. Lerch, WHC | D. R. Sherwood, EPA | Xref 9355736D |
| (J. F. Williams Jr., WHC) | | |

Subject: RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS TO THE HANFORD FACILITY DANGEROUS WASTE PERMIT APPLICATION, 222-S LABORATORY COMPLEX, REVISION 0, NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY (TSD: TS-2-1)

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

| Approval | Date | Name | Location | w/att |
|----------|------|-------------------------|----------|-------|
| | | Correspondence Control | A3-01 | X |
| | | B. A. Austin | B2-35 | |
| | | M. L. Bell | T6-16 | |
| | | R. C. Bowman | H6-24 | X |
| | | S. L. Brey | T6-12 | X |
| | | G. D. Carpenter | H6-30 | |
| | | C. K. DiSibio | B3-15 | |
| | | E. M. Greager | H6-30 | |
| | | L. D. Goodwin | T6-12 | |
| | | M. J. Hall | T6-07 | X |
| | | G. W. Jackson, Assignee | H6-21 | |
| | | R. J. Landon | H6-22 | |
| | | J. R. Laws | H6-23 | |
| | | W. D. Leggett, III | T6-07 | |
| | | R. E. Lerch | B3-63 | |
| | | P. J. Mackey | B3-15 | |
| | | H. E. McGuire, Level 1 | B3-63 | |
| | | A. G. Miskho | H6-30 | X |
| | | S. M. Price | H6-23 | X |
| | | F. A. Ruck, III | H6-23 | |
| | | G. J. Warwick | T6-12 | X |
| | | J. F. Williams Jr. | H6-24 | X |
| | | EPIC | H6-08 | X |
| | | JFW File/LB | H6-24 | X |
| | | RCRA File/GHL | H6-23 | X |