State of New Mexico
ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT
Harold Runnels Building
1190 St. Francis Drive, P.O. Box 26110
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502
(505) 827-2850

BRUCE KING
GOVERNOR

JUDITH M. ESPINOSA
SECRETARY

RON CURRY
DEPUTY SECRETARY

FFCO

copy of original sent to Kathleen.
CN

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Kathleen Sisneros, Director, W&WM Div.

THRU: Benito Garcia, Chief, HRMB
Ed Horst, RCRA Program Manager

FROM: Coby Muckelroy, Insp./Enf. Supr.

DATE: June 22, 1992

SUBJECT: LANL visit with Nick Stone concerning FFCA

This memo is to brief you on what was observed and discussed during the three days of Nick Stone's visit to LANL concerning mixed waste issues and the pending Federal Facilities Compliance Agreement (FFCA). This site visit was designed to introduce Nick Stone, who works in the EPA Region VI RCRA Enforcement Program, to the mixed waste storage areas. The visit lasted from 6/17-19/92. Benito (except Friday) and I accompanied Nick during the visit. Jon Mack and Jack Ellvinger represented DOE. Jim White and Juan Corpion represented LANL. This visit was not an inspection.

On the first day we visited TA 54 Area G. Juan Corpion explained that when mixed waste became subject to RCRA in 1986, all of it was then stored instead of disposed, hence the storage of mixed waste in storage pads #1, 2, and 4. As you probably know, these storage pads do not meet RCRA storage standards. We toured pads #1, 2, and 4 and Dome 48 and 49. A portion of Pad #2 is uncovered and the drums visible. Some are corroded. The drums in this pad are stacked 4 deep and are generally six years old. Drums in Pad #4 date from 1983 to Jan. 1991. Drums in Pad #4 allegedly contain no free liquids, although some contain semi-solids (e.g., cemented dewatered sludge). For the drums in Pad #1, there are apparently no records on the hazardous waste components, but records on where the mixed waste came from and the radioactive components are available. So, LANL personnel feel that based on that available data that knowledge of process can be used to detemine the hazardous component of the drums.

On the second day Nick, Benito, Jon Mack, and I met with Jerry Bellows for a few minutes. We discussed the FFCA in general, and Nick explained the general thrust of it. Mr. Bellows commented that if the state would allow WIPP to open that the mixed waste

1644

problems at LANL would be greatly diminished. Benito explained how the state will address non-compliance at Area G. He emphasized that the state will take action separate from EPA if the state feels that any FFCA does not adequately address compliance. Also on the second day we visited TA 54 Area L, which is partly for storage of liquid mixed waste (as opposed to "solid" mixed waste storage at Area G). Nick made a significant comment concerning the gas cylinder storage area. He said that DOE's contention that all of the gas cylinders are mixed waste may not be accurate. He said that EPA's concern is that DOE is categorizing all of them as mixed waste may be a way of escaping treating them under LDR storage limits. We then toured the TA 50-37 Controlled Air Incinerator (the one subject to the permit appeal). We also toured the radioactive wastewater treatment plant at TA 50, and the plutonium processing facility at TA 55, concentrating our visit at the basement where numerous drums of TRU mixed waste are stored.

On the third day we toured the mixed wastes stored at TA 3-29 (CMR building), which has mixed wastes generated there and also from TA 55. Afterwards, the rest of our time was spent discussing the FFCA in more detail. Nick emphasized that the FFCA is exclusively for mixed waste under the Land Disposal Restriction (LDR) regulations. LANL's first step should be to develop an introduction for the FFCA as to what LANL will do to come into compliance, as well as identify what regulations they are violating. Consequently, Nick expects LANL to present a narrative on what they plan to do, prior to finalizing a FFCA. Jon Mack said that since DOE does not know what NMED will expect and require from LANL for compliance, DOE does not know what LANL should propose at this point. Nick said that he realized that LANL cannot make many moves until the state develops its requirements for achieving compliance. However, Nick emphasized that EPA will defer to the state as far as compliance requirements, but EPA will not allow LANL to stall in taking corrective measures.

Nick explained that one of the things EPA will want to know is the dates that drums in question entered storage and what they contain. LANL claims to know what most of the low level mixed waste is, but does not fully know what the TRU mixed waste is that was buried, prior to 1986 especially. As a result, Nick said, a proposal for waste characterization will be required in the FFCA Introduction.

Nick said that EPA is concerned about thunderstorms at Area G and what environmental harm could be caused. EPA is also concerned that corrosion on the TRU mixed waste storage pads is a potential threat, especially since they are un-inspectable. Nick stated that EPA cannot fully identify what it expects from LANL until the extent of the problem is determined and until LANL comes up with some recommendations for compliance.

A final important statement made is that LANL personnel said that the TA 53 mixed waste lagoons are not covered by LDR because the waste is below the applicable treatment standards. LANL personnel stated that sampling for F-solvent constituents was conducted last month.