

5938

U-004-305 .43

IDW POLICY

01/06/94

OEPA
4
LETTER

DOE-FN



State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Southwest District Office

40 South Main Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2086
(513) 285-6357
FAX (513) 285-6404

H-1716

5938

AR

George V. Voinovich
Governor

January 6, 1994

RE: U.S. DOE-FEMP
OH6890008976
IDW POLICY

Mr. J. Phil Hamric
U.S. Department of Energy
Fernald Site Office
P.O. Box 398705
Cincinnati, Ohio 45239-8705

Mr. Ken Alkema
FERMCO
U.S. DOE-FEMP
P.O. Box 389704
Cincinnati, Ohio 45239-8704

Dear Sirs:

On December 9, 1993, U.S. DOE-FEMP and FERMCO submitted to the Ohio EPA the (draft) Fernald Environmental Management Project Policy for the Management of CERCLA Investigation-Derived Wastes (IDW). This document has been reviewed by the Ohio EPA Division of Hazardous Waste Management (DHWM) and the Division of Emergency and Remedial Response (DERR).

The Ohio EPA has several concerns regarding this policy. These concerns are outlined as comments or questions in the attachment to this letter. Ohio EPA suggests that DOE-FEMP should not follow this policy until these concerns are addressed.

If there are any questions or comments, do not hesitate to call at (513) 285-6357.

Sincerely,

Phillip C. Harris,
Division of Hazardous
Waste Management

Thomas A. Schneider,
Division of Emergency and
Remedial Response

Attachment

cc: Graham Mitchell, OEPA, SWDO
Paul Pardi, OEPA, SWDO

000001

Mr. J. Phil Hamric, U.S. DOE, and
Mr. Ken Alkema, FERMCO
January 6, 1994
page 2

ATTACHMENT

OEPA COMMENTS REGARDING:

U.S. DOE-FEMP

"POLICY FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF CERCLA INVESTIGATION-DERIVED WASTES"

1. DOE-FEMP has indicated that the strategy for handling IDW will be addressed through a general IDW policy and also in Operable Unit specific plans. OEPA believes this concept can work, however, the general policy must be approvable as a stand-alone document. OEPA cannot assume that issues will be addressed in Operable Unit specific plans.
2. Ohio EPA has significant concerns with the effectiveness of the Removal Action 17 Work Plan. These concerns are based upon the disposition of the solid waste generated during the Nitric Acid Tank Car Closure. Ohio EPA believes that the RA 17 WP must be revised prior to any approval of an IDW policy. RA 17 must be revised to ensure that solid waste disposal does not occur in the future.
3. Section 3.0, REGULATORY BASIS, pg. 2:

This section indicates the FMPC (sic) Drum Management Plan may be modified to address storage of IDW drums within AOC's. In this event, OEPA DHWM will wish to review changes or additions to the Drum Management Plan.
4. Section. 4.1, METHODOLOGY FOR DETERMINING OPTIONS FOR IDW SOILS AND WASTEWATERS, pg. 3:
 - a) Please explain the reference to a "RCRA containment assessment" in regard to IDW expected to be generated.
 - b) What control measures (analytical, operational) are proposed to ensure that IDW waters containing listed hazardous wastes will receive adequate treatment from the Plant 8 GAC treatment unit?
5. Section 4.2.2, DRILL CUTTINGS, pg. 4:
 - a) The section fails to provide definitive criteria for the disposition of wastes (i.e., "materials of significant concern"). Additionally, the section does not address chemical contamination which could result in determinations of mixed,

Mr. J. Phil Hamric, U.S. DOE, and
Mr. Ken Alkema, FERMCO
January 6, 1994
page 3

5938

hazardous or solid wastes. RA 17 allows for the removal of soils from controlled stockpiles to be used as backfill in other locations within the AOC. The options for managing soil listed in Section 4.1 do not include disposal at other locations within the AOC. Ohio EPA is willing to accept consolidation in piles but has significant reservations with regard to removal of the materials from the piles for disposal at other locations.

- b) This section states that cuttings will be managed "in one of the following ways", and then identifies six procedures (a through f). Does this mean that management of IDW cuttings will encompass all six procedures? There needs to be clear decision points for each of these options.
 - c) Paragraph (a) of this section states "all material will be managed in a near surface pit or storage pile in the...AOC". Other than "location", what control measures are proposed to prevent possible cross contamination due to run-on/run-off?
 - d) Please elaborate in regard to those "materials of significant concern for worker safety" mentioned in paragraph (d) of this section.
 - e) Identify criteria for "clean material" vs. "not clean" described in paragraph (e) of this section.
6. Section 4.3, AQUEOUS IDW PRETREATMENT THRESHOLD DEVELOPMENT, pg. 5-8:

Additional information/clarification is necessary with respect to disposition of aqueous VOC contaminated IDW originating from areas of listed hazardous waste management.

- a) The document fails to provide any justification for the geometric designations provided within Figure 2. DOE must provide data to support its position that hazardous waste management unit contaminants are bound to a given area. Previously, DOE has argued that the contamination is so ubiquitous that unit specific determinations could not be made. Figure 2 must be revised to incorporate all RCRA units including Pit 5 and the STP.
 - b) Will the GAC pretreatment system provide adequate treatment for hazardous waste constituents? How will that be determined?
7. Section 4.3.3., BACKGROUND, pg. 6:
- a) DOE-FEMP should provide additional detail here concerning what

000003

Mr. J. Phil Hamric, U.S. DOE, and
Mr. Ken Alkema, FERMC0
January 6, 1994
page 4

number of the 298 wells with VOC detects do not generate potentially hazardous wastes and do not have concentrations greater than 100 ppb (i.e., the number of wells actually proposed for disposal down the general sump).

- b) With regard to potential laboratory contamination, the data validation process should clarify known laboratory contamination via blank analysis.
8. Section 4.3.5, AVAILABLE PRETREATMENT CAPACITY, pg. 10:
- DOE's suggestion that additional treatment capacity would cost approximately \$315,000 is inappropriate. The cost of activated charcoal absorption treatment should not be so extravagant. Ohio EPA believes that DOE could obtain temporary treatment capacity at a much more reasonable cost.
9. Section 4.4, LISTED HWMU DISCUSSION, pg. 13:
- Waste Pits 4 & 5 as well as the Sewage Treatment Plant should be added to this list.
10. Attachment 1:
- a) Additional detail must be provided within the operable unit specific plans. Detail must be at least to the level of that provided for OU3.
 - b) The description for OU1 fails to consider the previously proposed TDAP sampling.
 - c) Stored IDW Wastes should not be dispositioned as proposed until such time as the IDW policy is approved by Ohio EPA.

END COMMENTS