



ENTERED

GE response
to CMS approval.
received 3/25/03
H

March 20, 2003

Mr. Gary Miller
Project Coordinator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region 6
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200
Dallas, Texas 75202-2733

RE: Response to Conditional Approval of *Revised Closure Plan, Final Corrective Measure Study Report, and Preliminary Corrective Measure Implementation Work Plan*
General Electric Apparatus Service Shop
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dear Mr. Miller:

On behalf of General Electric (GE), URS Corporation (URS) has prepared this letter in response to United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) comments on the *Revised Closure Plan, Final Corrective Measure Study Report, and Preliminary Corrective Measure Implementation Work Plan (Report)*, dated August 16, 2002, for GE’s former Apparatus Service Center in Albuquerque, New Mexico. USEPA comments, dated January 10, 2003, were received by GE and provided to URS in a facsimile on February 19, 2003. The USEPA comments incorporated comments by New Mexico Environmental Department (NMED) on the *Report*.

Both the USEPA and NMED conditionally approved the *Report* contingent upon meeting the conditions contained in USEPA’s and NMED’s letters dated January 10, 2003 and September 23, 2003, respectively. Each of the conditions requested by USEPA and NMED are presented below in italics. The manner in which each comment has been incorporated into the *Report* is presented in standard text font following the condition.

In addition, we have attached replacement page changes (both strike out and final) for the portions of the report that have been modified in response to USEPA’s and NMED’s comments, to address changes in project personnel, or correct typographic errors. In cases where text modifications resulted in different page break locations, we have inserted a partial page after the changed page and given the new page the same page number as the preceding page with an “A”



attached. For example, the changes on page 16 led to insertion of page 16A. Page 17 resumes with the text in the original *Report*.

USEPA 1 – Satisfaction of the conditions described in the September 23, 2002, letter from NMED to EPA, enclosed.

The manner in which GE has incorporated each of NMED's conditions is stated below.

NMED 1 – NMED's approval applies only to RCRA constituents and does not apply to the management of remediation of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) at the site. Therefore, NMED's approval of the planned corrective measure activities under RCRA is contingent upon EPA's providing Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA) approval.

GE understands that NMED's approval only applies to RCRA constituents and we have modified page 16 of the *Report* accordingly.

NMED 2 – Completion of the corrective measure activities is required to satisfy conditions of the Consent Decree and comply with 20.4.1.600 NMAC incorporating 40 CFR Part 265. To obtain a clean closure for this site, GEPS must submit a clean closure equivalency demonstration meeting the requirements of 20.4.1.900 NMAC incorporating 40 CFR 270.1(c)(5) and (c)(6).

GE will include a clean closure equivalency demonstration as part of the documentation of the closure and corrective measure activities. We have included the need for a clean closure equivalency demonstration on pages 16 and 45A of the *Report*.

NMED 3 – If verification soil sample results collected at the bottom of the dry well excavations indicated that there is significantly more RCRA-constituent contamination than the low part-per-billion concentrations measured during past investigations, NMED may require groundwater sampling or additional remedial actions. Therefore, the four groundwater monitoring wells shall not be abandoned until it is confirmed by NMED that no threat to groundwater exists.

As stated in the August 16, 2002 *Report*, GE will not abandon the monitoring wells until the post-excavation analytical results have been received and reviewed. We have modified page 45 of the *Report* to state that GE will review the post-excavation results with NMED and USEPA and obtain their concurrence before abandoning the monitoring wells.



NMED 4 – 21.4.1.600 NMAC incorporating 40 CFR 265.112(b)(6) requires that the closure plan include a schedule that will allow tracking of closure progress. Within 30 days of the receipt of this letter, GEPS shall provide NMED and EPA with a corrective measure implementation schedule that contains all remedial activities proposed in the CMS Report, submittal of the Corrective Measure Implementation Report, submittal of closure certification, and all other primary activities leading to final closure.

A corrective measure implementation schedule has been included as Figure 13 and is referenced on pages 46 and 47 of the *Report*.

NMED 5 – Within 30 days of the receipt of the EPA/NMED letter of conditional approval, NMED requires that GEPS submit page changes (both strike-out and final page changes) to the subject document that appropriately reflects the required conditions.

Page changes (both strike-out and final revised pages) are attached to this letter.

USEPA 2 – The Toxic Substances Control Act (“TSCA”) codified at 40 CFR Part 761 does not provide for the issuance of a “TSCA closure certification” (page 10 of the Report) or of a “No Further Action with respect to TSCA” declaration (page 16 of the Report). EPA will provide the termination notification in accordance with Section XXX of the Consent Decree following satisfactory fulfillment of the terms of the Consent Decree.

The references to a “TSCA closure certification” and a “No Further Action with respect to TSCA” have been removed from the *Report*. However, as previously discussed, GE’s consideration and decision to proceed with the closure plan presented in the enclosed document is based on USEPA and NMED statements that GE’s accomplishment of the remedial objectives will result in USEPA and NMED issuing a “RCRA clean closure” for the subject site with no post-remedial monitoring, etc., required.

USEPA 3 – The TSCA regulations do not allow for sampling of stockpiled excavated soils to determine PCB concentrations for disposal purposes. Therefore, excavated soils shall be sent for disposal based on PCB concentrations identified during site characterization. Hazardous waste characterization sampling shall be performed in accordance with the Report (page 44).



GE concurs with your suggestion, however, as discussed in the CMS, we plan to use existing site characterization data and additional data from the delineation program to characterize the PCB concentrations for disposal purposes. However, GE may elect to collect and analyze additional grab samples from stockpiled soils to provide supplemental data to support and ensure proper management and disposal of soils. Pages 19, 34, 44 of the *Report* text and page 20 and 34 of Appendix G have been modified to clarify these procedures.

USEPA 4 – The Report shall provide for compliance with relevant TSCA regulations, including the following:

- (a) Roll-off containers used to store bulk PCB remediation waste shall be dated in accordance with 40 CFR §761.65(c)(8);*
- (b) Liquid wastes shall be stored in accordance with the applicable requirements of 40 CFR §761.65;*
- (c) PCB items and PCB waste shall be marked in accordance with 40 CFR §761.40;*
- (d) Record keeping for PCB wastes sent for disposal shall be in accordance with 40 CFR §761.180;*
- (e) Transporters of PCB wastes shall provide notification of PCB waste activity (EPA Form 7710-53) in accordance with 40 CFR §761.205; and*
- (f) Manifest requirements contained in 40 CFR §761.207 for PCB wastes sent for disposal shall be observed.*

GE will manage PCB-containing wastes in accordance with relevant TSCA regulations in 40 CFR §761.

USEPA 5 – The volatile organic compound (VOC) concentrations in soil shown in Table 2.1 and Table 5.1 (Appendix A) are not consistent with the soil concentrations reported in Table 1 in the main body of the Report. Tables 2.1 and 5.1 shall be corrected to accurately report the maximum detected values for the referenced depth ranges, and the Johnson and Ettinger Model results shall be revised based on the appropriate soil concentration values.

As stated in the *Report* and Appendix A, the VOC concentrations in Tables 2.1 and 5.1 of Appendix A did not include the results of soil samples collected from the dry wells because the risk assessment was based on the presumption that the dry wells (and these impacts) would be removed regardless of other corrective measures at the site. The dry well data are included in Table 1 of the *Report*. In response to this condition, Tables 2.1, 2.4, 5.1, and 5.3 of Appendix A have been revised and the Johnson and Ettinger Model has been rerun to evaluate current pre-



remedial site conditions. Page 11 of the *Report* and pages 7, 9, 19, 21, and 23 of Appendix A have been revised to reflect the changes in modeling.

USEPA 6 – A building indoor air sampling program shall be performed to support the results of the Johnson and Ettinger Model (Appendix A, Section 3.3). The sample shall be analyzed for, at a minimum, tetrachloroethylene and trichloroethylene, in accordance with either EPA Method TO-15 (canister sample) or T-17 (sorbant tube sample).

An indoor air sampling program has been incorporated into the *Report* (see page 28). In addition, a *Quality Assurance Project Plan For Indoor Air Quality Investigation* has been added as Appendix H. The indoor air sampling has been added at the request of USEPA and not in response to any new findings or potential risk identified at the site.

USEPA 7 – Duplicate samples shall be collected at a frequency of one in ten of all field samples (page 22, Appendix G, Quality Assurance Project Plan).

Page 22 of Appendix G and page 40 of the main text have modified to indicate that GE will collect duplicate samples at a frequency of 1 in 10. Matrix spike/matrix spike duplicates and rinse/equipment blanks will be collected at a frequency of 1 in 20, as provided for in the August 16, 2002 *Report*.

oOo

GE and URS appreciate the USEPA's continued assistance with this project. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please call Edward Jamison of GE at (518) 385-7979 or Don Porterfield of URS at (518) 688-0015.

Very truly yours,
URS CORPORATION

Don Porterfield, P.E.
Manager-Clifton Park

cc: Richard Kilbury, NMED
Edward Jamison, GE