START DON'T START -- Write It!

0029764

DATE: July 29, 1993

TO: Bryan Foley

FROM: Pamela Innis psi

Telephone: 509/376-4919

cc: Department of Ecology, Kennewick
Department of Ecology, Lacey
Administrative Record, Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility

SUBJECT: CAMU Outline Comments

Attached are the combined comments from the EPA Region 10 Headquarters Office and Hanford Project Office on the outline for the CAMU permit modification request/ RI/FS report.

Again, EPA believes that a Record of Decision (ROD) must be written for the facility. The CAMU rule is very specific in noting that the substantive requirements of the rule are ARARs for CERCLA sites and that these ARARs should be incorporated into the CERCLA decisions documents. The additional work required to satisfy the CERCLA requirements would be minimal. We believe that waiting until the first CERCLA clean-up action 1) would be repetitive work already accomplished in the CAMU application, 2) would delay the required action of writing the ROD for use of the CAMU as a CERCLA waste facility, and 3) would delay involvement of the public on the intended use of the facility for CERCLA waste. EPA also believes that, using the CERCLA process, NEPA requirements would be satisfied and that a thorough evaluation of alternatives will be completed.

Also, if any waste sites are present in the preferred location of the facility it is EPA's preference to handle the actions to be taken at these sites in the ROD for the disposal facility.

If you have any questions, please contact me at the above number.

54-3000-101 (9/59) {EF} GEF015
D.S.I.

INTRODUCTION

The Environmental Protection Agency has completed the review of the draft outline for the *Corrective Action Management Unit (CAMU) Permit Modification Request for the ERSDF.* The document was prepared in May 1993 by the U.S. Department of Energy. This document was reviewed to ensure compliance with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit modification application regulations in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR) 270, the CAMU standards in 40 CFR 264.552, Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Reliability Act (CERCLA) requirements and Washington state regulations. General comments provided are followed by specific comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS

In general, the outline adequately addresses the regulatory requirements for RCRA permit modification applications in 40 CFR 270 and the CAMU standards and evaluation criteria contained in 40 CFR 264.552. However, a few concerns need to be addressed. Attachment C uses the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) feasibility study approach to justify design decisions for the Environmental Restoration, Storage, and Disposal Facility (ERSDF). The outline addresses the CAMU evaluation criteria and the CERCLA feasibility study alternative evaluation process as distinct topics. Although this format allows for modularization of the document, it results in repetition of material in some places. For example, the Attachment C outline evaluates the CAMU (ERSDF) alternatives using CERCLA feasibility study criteria; while the Attachment D outline again evaluates the CAMU alternatives using the new 40 CFR 264.552(c) CAMU evaluation criteria. It may be helpful to combine the CERCLA feasibility study criteria and CAMU standards where it would promote clarity.

The permit application outline does not address Washington Administrative Code (WAC) regulations for permit modifications. Although the WAC 173-303-608 regulations parallel

the RCRA requirements for the most part, a few differences exist and should be addressed. The specific provisions are discussed below.

The outline specifies that the disposal facility will handle waste. This should be clarified to state that the disposal facility will handle "Hanford remediation waste". Correct this throughout the outline and carry this over to the application.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

GENERAL OUTLINE

Section I., Subpart A., page 1

To promote clarity, the following information should be added to the description of the permit modification request organization. First, the regulatory background and purpose of the new CAMU regulations should be described. This should include the relationship to the CERCLA/RCRA remediation. Second, the way the CAMU evaluation criteria fit into the decision process should be explained. Third, the way Attachments C and D relate to the overall permit modification application should be identified. The matrix or table format proposed for indicating the locations of textual discussions of specific regulatory provisions would be a helpful way to clearly summarize the main issues of the permit modification application.

Also, this section should include reference to submittal of actual revised pages for insertion in the permit.

Section II., Subpart B., page 1

All pertinent facility and location description requirements in 40 CFR 270.14(b)(11) and WAC 173-303-806(4) must be included. In particular, although 40 CFR 264 Appendix IX does not require facilities in Benton County to submit a seismic report, WAC 173-303-806(4)(a)(xi) requires that all facilities in Washington identify the seismic risk zones in which

they are located. One hundred year flood zone maps for the area should also be included in accordance with 40 CFR 270.14(b)(11)(iii).

Section III., page 3

Information should be included about the waste properties that address handling hazards (e.g., MSDS, etc.), release potential and threats to all pathways (e.g., airborne, direct contact, etc.). This additional information should encompass humans, the ecology and the environment.

This section must identify the required parameters needed for management of the different waste types in the CAMU (e.g., compatibility, segregation, etc.). The management parameters need to be identified before the waste characterization needs can be fully assessed.

Section IV., Subpart B., page 4

In addition to the operation information included in the outline, Part B permit modification applications also require that training programs for operation staff be described. In addition, the corresponding WAC regulations (WAC 173-3-3-806(4)(A)) require descriptions of security procedures, inspection schedules, traffic patterns, and procedures for preventing release and exposure. These requirements should be addressed in the outline.

Section V., Subpart A., page 4

The Washington regulations (WAC 173-303-806(4)(a)(xxi)) require a description of the contingent groundwater protection program, including identification of the range of potential release scenarios and specific actions to be taken if RCRA Appendix IX constituents, dangerous waste constituents, or trigger value concentrations are detected in the monitoring wells. These actions should include the steps to be taken to verify the release. These requirements should be addressed in the outline.

Sections V. and VI., page 4 and 5

The proposed groundwater monitoring program should incorporate elements to accelerate development of the background groundwater quality data base. The program should also address capability to detect DNAPL and LNAPL in the ground water as part of well design and sampling procedures.

Also, Section V. and VI.B. are basically the same. It appears redundant to include the information in both sections.

Section VI., Subpart A, page 4

Federal regulations do not require that federal facilities, such as the ERSDF CAMU, comply with the closure and post closure financial requirements of 40 CFR 270.14(b)(15) and (16). Nevertheless, to evaluate costs of the various ERSDF alternatives, as required for the feasibility study screening of alternatives (Attachment C) and the CAMU evaluation criteria (Attachment D) closure and post closure costs should be considered with the construction and operation costs. For this reason, inclusion of an approximation of the closure and post closure costs in outline topic VI.A. may be helpful.

Section VI, Subpart B

The outline should address the proposed groundwater monitoring program with respect to compliance monitoring and the corrective action process. This would require up front determination of unacceptable levels for constituents which are found statistically significant during the detection monitoring program.

Section VII, Subpart A.4

The demonstration should address benefits to be derived from different types of liner systems (i.e., partial to full extent of the unit) with respect to minimizing future release to the extent practicable.

ATTACHMENT C

Section 1.2, page 10

Identification of ARARs should be included in the purpose of the design study.

Section 2.2, page 12

In addition to a discussion of the remedial action objectives (RAO), a brief discussion of applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements and the way RAOs were developed from them would be helpful in this section.

Section 4.1, page 13, first bullet

The example of disposal technologies should be revised to include "(cap/barrier, and liner)".

Section 4.2, page 14

The reason for using only risk-based modeling as the sole criterion to screen the technical effectiveness of the ERSDF alternatives is unclear. Tasks involved in the modeling and the reason for restricting it to groundwater are also unclear. The purpose of modeling should be provided in the attachment and the rationale for screening criteria provided.

The preliminary screening of alternatives in feasibility studies typically involves evaluating the alternatives for effectiveness, implementability, and cost. Typically, evaluation of risks are not limited to groundwater contamination, but also include evaluation of short-term risks such as dust generation and surface water runoff during construction activities. The outline should either include the three basic screening criteria or explain the reason for only including groundwater protection.

Section 4.2, page 16

Rationale should be provided for selection of the listed constituents (e.g., mobility, toxicity, prevalence in the waste streams, etc.).

Section 6.1, pages 17 and 18

In a letter provided to DOE on January 12, 1993 the Department of Ecology presented an outline of potential ARARs for the disposal facility. These state ARARs and other Federal ARARs should be discussed.

Long-term effectiveness should also evaluate the degree of certainty that the alternative will prove successful.

The discussion on reduction in toxicity, mobility, and volume through treatment should also include "the degree to which treatment reduces the inherent hazards posed by the principle threats at the site".

ATTACHMENT D

Section 1.0, page 21

CAMU evaluation criterion number 1 (40 CFR 264.552(c)(1)) uses the terms "reliable, effective, protective, and cost-effective," but does not define them. The ERSDF outline appears to apply the meanings used in CERCLA feasibility studies. In the absence of other guidance, this application seems reasonable, but the meanings of these terms should be documented in the permit application.

Section 2.0, page 21

CAMU evaluation criteria number 2 includes an evaluation of short-term risks, such as short-term risks associated with remedial activities. Therefore, the evaluation of protectiveness should not be limited to groundwater risks from the completed ERSDF CAMU but should also included an evaluation of the entire remedial action process.