

# Draft RCRA Permit Workshop Info for HAB Presenters

RAP meeting – Wednesday, March 7, 2012 – Richland Public Library

## Discussion of Perspectives/Issues of Concerns Pertinent to the Permit:

*NOTE: Liz and Jean prepared this document as a DRAFT. Please share input to modify as needed. This is not a complete or final list.*

The following information is a draft explanation of where information may be found for the presentations proposed during the 12:30-2pm agenda item. Information for these issues may also be found in the fact sheets/statement of basis for each unit which are currently posted on Ecology's website. The idea behind these presentations is to connect HAB concerns and values with the regulation of Hanford cleanup by the RCRA Permit.

- **Groundwater:** Presenter will find information about how groundwater will be dealt with in the Permit by looking at Condition II-F and the Unit Specific Conditions for Groundwater. For Example: In Post-Closure Unit #1 – 300 Area Process Trenches, Ecy intends to use whatever groundwater monitoring or treatment that is chosen for the CERCLA ROD for the 300 Area instead of developing a separate RCRA groundwater monitoring plan. The presenter would find this information by looking at the unit's conditions for groundwater. (We don't know how it will be organized because we haven't seen the Permit – it could be a reference II.F Condition or a CERCLA document. Use of a CERCLA document would indicate that Ecology has chosen to use alternative requirements for groundwater for that unit.)
  - **Value:** The HAB has always said groundwater should be remediated in a timely manner to highest beneficial use. (300-1,000 is not timely)
  
- **Leaving Waste in Place:** Presenter will find information about leaving waste in place by looking at units in Parts 5, and 6. These units are either in closure (Part 5) or post-closure (Part 6). All waste sites should first strive for clean closure under the clean closure regulations. However, the dangerous waste regulations (WAC) allow for a determination that it is impossible to clean close the unit. In this situation, DOE is required to provide Ecology with documentation justifying use of landfill regulations instead. (We don't where this documentation is located. We do not know how the documentation process is conducted. The presenter would look at conditions II-J Closure and Post Closure, II.O Land Disposal Restriction and at the unit specific conditions for closure. The presenter would also look at the WAC which is/should be hyperlinked in the fact sheet/statement of basis.)
  - **Value:** The HAB prefers clean closure to leaving waste in place as a landfill which required monitoring for the foreseeable future, until the groundwater is clean.
  
- **Stringent Cleanup Standards:** The concern is that the substantive requirements of RCRA are not being applied during CERCLA cleanup. ARAR's include RCRA cleanup standards as well as all the other dangerous waste regulations. There is so much RCRA/CERCLA integration in the cleanup of some of the TSD's in the Central Plateau – cribs and trenches – that it is unclear whether the RCRA requirements are being met because it is a hybrid approach. When it is just RCRA the HAB knows that ARAR's apply, when it is both, it is not clear which ones apply. The Presenter won't know if this is an issue until the Permit is issued. They could start by looking at Permit Condition II.Q.

# Draft RCRA Permit Workshop Info for HAB Presenters

RAP meeting – Wednesday, March 7, 2012 – Richland Public Library

- **Value:** The HAB values the application of the most stringent cleanup standards.
- **Institutional Controls:** With RCRA/CERCLA integration, when CERCLA ROD's are handling the groundwater issue, there are often institutional controls used to prevent use of the site while the groundwater is still contaminated above cleanup standards. The Presenter would be researching how Ecology is applying alternative standards/regulations that inadvertently lead to IC's being used, by looking at unit's conditions in Corrective Action Units (Part 4). Other units that may have this concern are, the River Corridor Units such as, 100-N, the 300 Area, and the Central Plateau Units. This information may be found in Permit Condition II.E Cleanup of Released Material and II.L Security.
  - **Value:** The HAB prefers cleanup to Institutional Control and remains concerned about long-term stewardship and monitoring of these sites.
  - **Example of Advice Point:** The HAB advises Ecology to apply RCRA cleanup standards rather than use of alternative requirements for soil cleanup for the following units \_\_\_\_\_.
- **Emergency Management:** Each unit must have an emergency plan and a contingency plan as a condition. The Presenter will find this information for each unit's conditions and Permit Condition II.A Facility Contingency Plan, II.B Preparedness and Prevention, and II.L Security. The will also find information in Attachment #4 of the Permit.
  - **Value:** This is a concern to the HAB because the Hanford Site is next door. It is also an issue for coordination between contractors, agencies and local government and the public.
- **Public Involvement:** The HAB has always strongly advised a process that is transparent, open and in which the public may influence decision making. This would be a more general presentation. However, they could look under condition I.J Annual and Other Reports, I.I Reports, Notifications, Submissions as those reports go out to public to review. The HAB would like clarification about public involvement opportunities when the Permit is modifications.
- **Offsite Waste:** The Presenter could look for information about how the Permit regulates the acceptance of offsite waste in Condition II.M Receipt of Dangerous Wastes Generated Off Site, II.N Manifest System, and II.T Waste Minimization.
  - **Value:** The HAB believes that Hanford has enough waste and should not accept additional waste from other sites.
- **Tank Waste Cleanup:** The Presenter could look for information about how the Permit deals with Tank Waste Cleanup in the unit conditions for units in Part 3, Operating Units, such as the DST's, and the SST's that deal with how tanks are regulated (WAC 640 regulations). The Presenter should also review the RI/FS for the 200 IS1 Operable Unit, which is the underground piping of the Hanford Site. This will discuss how cleanup of underground pipes containing tank waste is going to be dealt with on the Hanford Site. They can also

## Draft RCRA Permit Workshop Info for HAB Presenters

RAP meeting – Wednesday, March 7, 2012 – Richland Public Library

look at Condition II.D Waste Analysis. Related to Tank Waste Cleanup, but not in the RCRA Permit, is the concern about re-classification of tank waste. The reason it is related to the Permit, is that DOE could re-classify tank waste to not be high-level waste, Ecology could then deem that the tank residuals do not need to be cleaned up nor the leaked tank waste contaminating soils under the tanks. If that happens we could be looking at landfill surface barriers over the tank farms. Does that HAB want that? No. This would show up in the permit later, when the tank farms are closed – in 40 years, so we need to pay attention to it now.

- **Value:** The cleanup of Hanford's tank waste is one of the highest issues of concern for the HAB.
  
- **Adequate Supporting Documentation:** *Example:* The Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS should have been issued before the RCRA Permit because the EIS has information supporting the RCRA Permit conditions for the double-shell and single-shell tank closure. By issuing the Permit and Final EIS at the same time, it will be very difficult to change the RCRA Permit. The concern is that a landfill cover will be used and institutional controls put in place instead of RTD. The HAB prefers RTD rather than leaving waste in place. If the final EIS chooses preferred alternatives that leave waste in place, then the Permit is lacking a strong document to justify stringent cleanup standards for the tank farms.
  - **Value:** The HAB wants early input into decision making which requires access to documentation that supports decisions in a timely manner.