



Department of Energy

Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

90-PPB-002

JUN 22 1990



Mr. Curtis Dahlgreen
State of Washington
Department of Ecology
Mail Stop PV-11
Olympia, Washington 98504

Dear Mr. Dahlgreen:

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE 173-303

Reference: Washington State Register, Issue 90-09, pages 156-170, "Amending WAC 173-303-281 Notice of Intent and 173-303-806 Final Facility Permits; New Section WAC 173-303-355 Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act Title III Coordination; and Repealing WAC 173-303-420 Siting Standards," dated May 16, 1990.

Attached for your consideration are comments from the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office on the referenced proposed rule. Should you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Mr. A. J. Knepp on (509) 376-1471.

Sincerely,

R. D. Izatt, Director
Environmental Restoration Division

ERD:AJK

Attachment:
Comments on Proposed Siting Criteria

cc w/att:
P. T. Day, EPA
R. E. Lerch, WNC



COMMENTS ON PROPOSED SITING CRITERIA AND ADDITIONAL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS
FOR DANGEROUS WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

Revisions To Chapter 173-303 WAC
May 2, 1990, Proposed Rule

1. 281(2) - Decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) of facilities will play a major role in the cleanup efforts at Hanford. We believe that the proposed siting criteria was not intended to specifically address D&D sites or cleanup sites. We recommend you add language that reads, "This section does not apply to owners/operators of facilities or portions of facilities that have been decontaminated and are scheduled to be decommissioned and/or remediated."
2. 282(6) - We can appreciate the Washington State Department of Ecology's (Ecology) desire to have a simplified screening process for siting hazardous waste management facilities. At the same time, there may be situations where site specific conditions should be given strong consideration in the screening process. We urge Ecology to include a process for allowing site specific conditions to be considered. For example, a 50-foot minimum vertical separation may be overly conservative when the hydrogeology and waste characteristics are taken into account.
3. 282(7)(b)(i) - "Dangerous waste management facilities shall not be located within the viewshed of users on wild and scenic rivers designated by the State or Federal government." We suggest that this criteria be based on a case-by-case basis. For example, one of Hanford's options to properly dispose of our reactors after they are decontaminated and decommissioned is to bury them in place. This could result in their being classified as Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (TSD) units. Although they could be seen from the viewshed of the proposed Wild and Scenic reach of the Columbia, they would only appear as mounds and be blended into the natural landscape.
4. 806(4)(a)(xxi) - This section states that the Contingent Ground Water Protection Program may be required for owners/operators of existing land-based facilities. To assist us in anticipating future commitments, we request that you add language which specifies criteria which will be used to determine what existing facilities may be required to comply with this section.
5. 806(4)(a)(xxi) - The idea of a Contingent Ground Water Protection Program for land-based facilities is a good one but the one component missing is the verification and characterization of the extent of contamination before taking remedial action.

As written, the new amendments would require specific remedial actions to be taken upon detection of a contaminant at the point of compliance. Starting a remedial action without sufficiently characterizing the nature and extent of the contamination may lead to ineffective remediations.

We recommend you add language under 806(4)(a)(i)(A), which discusses the need to sufficiently characterize any contamination before a remedial action is started.

In addition, we feel it will be difficult to include specific remedial actions, as required under 806(4)(a)(xxi)(A)(III), in the Contingent Ground Water Monitoring Plan. Trying to determine a specific action without first knowing the nature and extent of the problem may prove to be an impossible task.

