

JA-76

02-007

**ENVIRONMENTAL
RESTORATION
PROJECT**

Los Alamos National Laboratory/University of California
Risk Reduction & Environmental Stewardship (RRES)
Environmental Restoration (ER) Project, MS M992
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545
(505) 667-0808/FAX (505) 665-4747



U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Los Alamos Site Operations, MS A316
Environmental Restoration Program
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544
(505) 667-7203/FAX (505) 665-4504

Date: May 13, 2002
Refer to: ER2002-0340

Mr. John Young, Corrective Action Project Leader
Permits Management Program
NMED – Hazardous Waste Bureau
2905 Rodeo Park Drive East
Building 1
Santa Fe, NM 87505-6303




**SUBJECT: SUBMITTAL OF REVISED REQUEST FOR CLASS 1 CLOSURE PLAN
MODIFICATION FOR MATERIAL DISPOSAL AREA (MDA) P
LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY NM0890010515
TASK NO. HWB-LANL-01-030**

Dear Mr. Young:


The purpose of this letter is to provide the Los Alamos National Laboratory's (the Laboratory's) Revised MDA P Request for Class 1 Closure Plan Modification. The Laboratory initially submitted this request to the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) on December 20, 2001. This revision supercedes the previous transmittal and contains information responding to the comments and requests made by NMED in its April 10, 2002 letter to Dr. Browne and Mr. Johansen on the same subject. The Laboratory's submittal includes replacement pages for the MDA P Closure Plan Modification as well as responses to the five items in NMED's April 10, 2002 letter.

If you have any questions, please call Dave McInroy at (505) 667-0819.

Sincerely,


Julie A. Canepa, Program Manager
Environmental Restoration Project
Los Alamos National Laboratory

Sincerely,


Everett Trollinger, Project Manager
Department of Energy
Los Alamos Area Office

6355



JC/ET/NR/am

Enclosures: Certification
Revised Request (ER2002-0331)

Cy (w/enc)

K. Bostick, EES-10, MS M992
B. Criswell, Roy F Weston, MS M992
S. Den-Baars, The IT Group, MS K490
J. Ellvinger, ESH-19, MS K490
D. Hickmott, EES-6, MS D462
N. Riebe, RRES-ER, MS M992
R. Romero, ESH-19, MS K490
P. Schumann, RRES-ER, MS M992
S. Veenis, RRES-WQH, MS M992
E. Louderbough, Legal, MS A187
L. Woodworth, OLASO, MS A316
E. Trollinger, OLASO, MS A316
V. Marinville, NMED-HWB
C. Will, NMED-HWB
J. Davis, NMED-HWB
L. King, US EPA
G. Saums, NMED-SWQB
S. Yanicak, NMED-DOE OB, MS J993
RPF, MS M707
E/ER File, MS M992

Cy (w/o enc):

J. Canepa, RRES-ER, MS M992
M. Kirsch, RRES-ER, M992
D. McInroy, RRES-ER, MS M992
W. Neff, RRES-ER, MS M992
J. Bearzi, NMED-HWB
J. Parker, NMED-OB
IM-5, MS A150

**Response to
Revised Request for Class 1 Closure Plan Modification,
for Material Disposal Area P (MDA P),
Los Alamos National Laboratory NM0890010515,
Task Number HWB-LANL-01-030**

INTRODUCTION

To facilitate review of this response, the New Mexico Environment Department's (NMED's) comments are included verbatim. Los Alamos National Laboratory's (LANL's) responses follow each NMED comment. This document provides responses to comments on the Class 1 Closure Plan Modification MDA-P, dated December 20, 2001.

NMED Comment

1. *The revised closure schedule shall contain dates for completion of all field activities, ecological risk assessment, and site restoration at MDA P. Submittal of the closure report to HWB within 90 days of completion of field activities must be included in the schedule.*

LANL Response

1. The revised closure schedule for fieldwork (ecological risk assessment), the final closure report, and site restoration is enclosed as replacement page 6-10. Fieldwork is expected to end October 31, 2002; the final closure report is expected to be delivered January 31, 2003; and site restoration is expected to be completed November 3, 2004.

NMED Comment

2. *LANL shall correct the bulleted items on page 6-9 of the closure modification to reflect the actual HWB approval process for the sampling and analyses plan (SAP). Corrections shall include dates additional information was submitted to HWB (August 10, 2000 and April 26, 2001) to supplement the SAP prior to approval on June 7, 2001.*

LANL Response

2. The bulleted text on replacement page 6-9 (enclosed) shows that the additional information submittals for the MDA P sampling and analysis plan were made on August 10, 2000; April 26, 2001; and August 2, 2001; and that NMED approved the plan on June 7, 2001.

NMED Comment

3. *Additional soil removal and confirmation sampling has been conducted at MDA P following submittal of the closure modification. HWB is requiring pages 1-8 and 4-3 be revised to reflect the actual amount of media removed from MDA P. Revisions to the removed waste volumes shall be submitted once confirmation sample results indicate additional removal activities will not be required. In addition, Table 4-2, Summary of Samples and Analyses (page 4-17) shall be revised and resubmitted to reflect additional sampling that may have been conducted at the site.*

LANL Response

3. A total of 52,187 cubic yards of media have been excavated from MDA P, and 55,093 cubic yards have been disposed of or recycled. (The difference in volume between excavation and disposal comes from soil bulking during waste segregation and handling.) Replacement pages 1-8 and 4-3 have been revised to include this information. Replacement Table 4-2, Summary of Samples and Analyses, has been revised to reflect additional sampling and is enclosed. As requested, revisions to the removed waste volumes, if any, are required subsequent to the approval of this modification, and will be reported in the final closure report.

NMED Comment

4. *Page 1-2 of the modification request corrects a typographical error in the approved closure plan for MDA P. This page may be resubmitted with the revised closure plan modification.*

LANL Response

4. Enclosed is replacement page 1-2 as well as a map (Figure 1-1).

NMED Comment

5. *HWB recognizes that a closure time frame extension is necessary for compliance with Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Regulation 265.113(c). The December 20, 2001, closure modification submitted to HWB requests an extension of the 90-day and 180-day closure time frames. The extensions, if approved, would extend the closure time frame until October 2002. HWB does not believe the proposed extension would provide LANL sufficient time to complete closure activities at MDA P for the following reasons. The approved closure plan deferred ecological risk assessment until completion of phase II sampling activities at MDA P and confirmatory sampling is currently ongoing. Solid waste management unit (SWMU) 16-006(e), a septic tank and outfall pipe, located in an area directly influenced by waste disposal activities at MDA P, may require additional characterization and/or removal prior to closure of MDA P. SWMU 16-006(e) is identified on page 1-2 of the approved MDA P closure plan as an area that is subject to the requirements outlined in the closure plan. LANL should submit a revised closure schedule (in accordance with 20 NMAC 4.1, Section 265.113[c]).*

LANL Response

5. The schedule for the removal of the septic tank, former SWMU 16-006(e), is included in the revised closure schedule (enclosed as replacement page 6-10) and discussed in LANL's response to NMED comment 1).

As shown on page 6-10, the ecological risk assessment began on June 4, 2001. Activity at MDA P was initiated upon completion of Phase II sampling on April 4, 2002. Removal of the septic tank at former SWMU 16-006(e) was completed, together with confirmatory soil sampling, on April 4, 2002.

REVISÉD REQUEST FOR CLASS 1 CLOSURE PLAN MODIFICATION,
FOR MATERIAL DISPOSAL AREA P (MDA P)
MDA P CLOSURE PLAN REPLACEMENT PAGES
May 2002

accordance with EPA guidance (EPA, 1991a). Appendix C contains photographs of the waste pile and run-on control trench. Appendix D describes vadose-zone observations from 1998 at MDA-P. Appendix E provides historical records associated with TA-16 and MDA-P. Appendix F describes the composition of explosives produced at the Laboratory. Appendix G describes sampling procedures for MDA-P closure. Appendix H presents an evaluation of the 20 NMAC 4.1 Section 261, Appendix VIII (Appendix VIII) hazardous constituents for selection of analytical methods. Appendix I provides site-specific standard operating procedures. Appendix J describes the site geology and hydrology at TA-16, Area P

Compliance with specific regulatory requirements for closure are addressed in Chapter 6.0. The 20 NMAC 4.1 have incorporated, with a few minor exceptions, the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 40, Parts 260 to 266 and 268 to 270 through July 1, 1993. Most regulatory citations in this closure will, therefore, be referenced to 20 NMAC 4.1. Table 1-1 lists the regulations applicable for closure of waste piles and identifies which sections of Chapter 6.0 address compliance with these regulations.

1.1 Closure Strategy

In the past, the disposal site at Area P was referred to as a landfill. However, RCRA regulations do not explicitly provide a clean-closure option for landfills. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has addressed this problem by issuing guidance that allows a landfill, if clean closed under 40 CFR 265 standards, to make an equivalency demonstration under 40 CFR Section 270.1 (c)(5), (6), by redefining the landfill as a waste pile (Lowrance 1989). Therefore, to clean close this unit and make an equivalency demonstration as described above, the Laboratory is referring to the MDA-P landfill as the MDA-P waste pile.

1.1.1 MDA-P and Nearby Potential Contaminated Sites

MDA-P is shown in Figure 1-1 (see enclosed map), which shows the area directly influenced by waste disposal activities and any possible subsequent contamination. The waste and contamination located within this area is specifically subject to the requirements outlined in this Closure Plan. Four other potentially contaminated areas are located in the vicinity of MDA-P; three of these areas (or sites) [former PRSs 16-006(e), 16-010(a), and 16-016(c)] have been consolidated into PRS 16-016(c)-99 (Figure 1-1). The fourth, PRS 16-010(b), is the 387 flash pad. Descriptions as well as regulatory status of these PRSs are briefly outlined below:

1.1.3 Technical Approach

To achieve closure, the entire waste pile, including hazardous and nonhazardous waste and soil, will be removed. A maximum of 60,000* cubic yards (yd³) of debris and contaminated media will be excavated. The primary decontamination technique will be steam cleaning or pressure washing. The waste contained within the pile is very heterogeneous; much of it appears to be structural steel and miscellaneous debris, which cannot be easily sampled or characterized because of the impracticality of drilling through the material and the physical size of the material. Chapter 3.0 of this plan describes what is known about the waste pile, both from process knowledge and from the limited number of samples that have been taken to characterize the waste pile.

During closure, the waste will be characterized during excavation as sections of the pile are removed. For safety reasons, the debris will be decontaminated using hot water to remove potential high explosives (HE) contamination. If the HE materials cannot be effectively removed from the debris, the debris will be flashed at the TA-16 open burn pad. If a significant amount of debris is generated beyond the estimates of this plan, alternate waste treatment methods will be explored. After decontamination and/or flashing, most of the debris is expected to be designated as nonhazardous.

All debris will be steam cleaned or pressure washed prior to off-site management. Steam cleaning or pressure washing meets the alternative treatment standard for hazardous debris; thus, visual inspection will be used to verify that hazardous debris is no longer considered contaminated.

Soil, decontamination wastes (i.e., liquids and sludges), or free liquids (i.e., those liquids found in pockets or containers within the waste pile) that contain HE materials or exceed the regulatory levels for toxicity characteristic (TC) metals (e.g., barium, chromium, lead) may be treated on-site or off-site at a permitted facility. On-site treatment of this waste may include stabilization on a batch basis for metals such as barium, chromium, or lead. The batches of material will be approximately 100 yd³. Treatment that may be conducted on-site will occur inside tanks meeting the requirements of 20 NMAC 4.1, Sections 264.192 through 264.199. This treatment will occur

* 52,187 cubic yards of media have been excavated, and 55,093 cubic yards of waste were submitted for off-site disposal; 21,500 cubic yards of waste were hazardous.

4.1.2 Sampling to Establish Baseline

Before any waste is removed, baseline levels will be established for the soil at the top of the mesa in the approximate location of the closure waste handling/management areas (e.g., staging, decontamination, treatment, storage, and loading areas). Baseline levels will be established by collecting 10 samples from locations distributed over the waste handling/management area. Baseline levels will reflect the possible presence of contaminants derived from nearby Laboratory operations that are not related to MDA-P. Baseline concentrations are represented by the 95% UTL calculated from concentrations of Appendix VIII hazardous constituents and radioactive constituents measured in soil from these areas.

Following the completion of all waste-removal operations and final equipment decontamination, the areas on top of the mesa will be resampled and the sampling data compared with baseline UTL concentrations to determine if any releases occurred during the waste-removal operations.

4.1.3 Sampling of the Waste Pile

During waste-removal operations, the waste pile will be sampled for potential contaminants to characterize the waste for selection of treatment and disposal options. The material to be sampled includes excavated soil and tuff as well as debris within the waste pile. Before and during excavation, this material will be visually inspected and spot-tested for HE to ensure safe handling.

4.1.3.1 Soil and Tuff

One composite sample will be taken from each 100 yd³ of waste soil and tuff. Based on the estimated volume of the waste pile and contaminated media (60,000* yd³), a total of approximately 500 composite samples will be collected. Composite sampling will provide data on the average concentration of contaminants required for selecting treatment and disposal options.

Each composite sample will consist of grab samples collected from 3 to 10 locations within the 100 yd³ of soil and tuff. A larger number of grab samples could result in excessive dilution of contaminant concentrations. Sufficient volume will be collected for each grab sample to ensure adequate composite sample volume for the prescribed analyses. The composite samples will

* 52,187 cubic yards of media have been excavated, and 55,093 cubic yards of waste were submitted for off-site disposal; 21,500 cubic yards of waste were hazardous.

Table 4-2 Summary of Samples and Analyses

Analysis (EPA SW-846 Method except where otherwise noted)	Metals 6020 ^a 1311 ^a	Volatile Organics 8240A ^b T014A	Semi-volatile Organics 3520A, 3540A/ 8270A ^c	Reactive Cyanide/ Sulfide 9010A, 9030A ^{d,k}	Total Cyanide 9011/ 9010A 9012A ^e	High Explosives PETN 8330 ^f	Gamma Spectroscopy	Gross Alpha Gross Beta 9310 ^g	Total U SW 846 6020	ISO-U HASL-300	Asbestos NIOSH Method 7400 ^h	Organo-chlorine Pesticides and PCBs 8080A ^{h,i}	Chlorinated Herbicides 8150B ^{h,i}	pH 9020	Dioxin 8280 ^h	Perchlorates 314
Phase I Number of Samples																
Background Soil and Tuff	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	0	0	20	20	20	20	20	0
Baseline Soil (Staging Areas)	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	0
Waste Pile Soil/Tuff	500	500	500	125	0	500	500	500	52	437	500	125	125	125	125	0
Duplicate ^j	25	25	25	7	0	25	25	25	3	22	25	7	7	7	7	0
Decontamination Water	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	18	14	36	36	36	36	36	6
Matrix Spike ^k	25	25	25	7	0	25	25	25	3	22	25	7	7	7	7	0
Total Samples, Phase I	616	616	616	205	66	616	616	616	76	495	616	205	205	205	205	6

Phase 2 Number of Samples																
Soil/Tuff	296	10	302	2	2	298	2	2	0	4	2	2	2	2	2	52
Boreholes AA SUMMAT	12	10	8	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Baseline Soil (Staging Areas)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	0
Duplicate ^j	34	1	34	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Matrix Spike ^k	17	0	17	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Samples, Phase 2	362	24	364	5	5	364	5	5	0	7	5	5	5	5	5	70

^a Method 3005A and 3050A is digestion for water and soil, 6020 is the analytical method for most total metals. Method 7740 is the analytical method for total selenium. Methods 7470 and 7471 are the analytical methods for total mercury. Other methods may also be used (Method 6010A and 7000A series methods) as described in Section 4.6.1. Method 1311 is the TCLP method.

^b Method 8260 substituted for 8240A for soils. T014A for SUMMA canisters collected in Boreholes 526, 554, 557.

^c Method 3520A and 3540A are extraction methods for water and soil 8270A is the analytical method.

^d Determination of reactive cyanide is described in SW-846, Chapter 7, Section 7.3.3. This determination includes portions of Method 9010A. Determination of reactive sulfide is described in Section 7.3.4. This determination includes portions of Method 9030A.

^e Method 9011 is digestion of soil for cyanide analyses. Methods 9010A and 9012A are the analytical methods for cyanide.

^f Method 8330 modified included analysis for PETN. PETN analysis submitted during Phase I only not Phase 2.

^g Method 9310 is for water samples. Soil samples were field screened using calibrated field instruments.

^h Analyses for asbestos, organochlorine pesticides and PCB, dioxin, and chlorinated herbicides were performed in Phase 2 only if they were detected during Phase I sampling.

ⁱ Soil/tuff samples were collected from every fourth 100 cubic yard pile of waste excavated.

^j Duplicates were collected at a frequency of one per 20 soil or tuff samples for Phase I, and one per 10 water samples. Duplicates were collected at a frequency of one per 10 soil or tuff samples during Phase 2.

^k Matrix spike samples were collected at a frequency of one per sample delivery group per matrix with a maximum of 20 samples per delivery group.

For this project, an extension of the 90-day and 180-day closure time frames will be necessary. Removal of wastes and completion of closure activities as described in Sections 6.2.4, 6.2.5, and 6.2.6 will extend until the end of January 2003. This extended time frame is necessary because the Laboratory was unable to meet the original project schedule for waste removal due to safe operating practices at the site having to be re-evaluated when detonable pieces of HE were observed during excavation. The extended time frame is also necessary because of the following factors:

- The Cerro Grande fire delayed completion of excavation.
- The Phase II sampling and analysis plan was submitted during August 1999; supplemental information was submitted on August 10, 2000 and on April 26, 2001; verbal approval was given on May 30, 2001; written approval was given on June 7, 2001; and deviational changes to the Phase II sampling and analysis plan were submitted on August 2, 2001.
- During Phase II sampling, additional contamination was found and excavated from a small drainage on the eastern edge of the site.

For these reasons, the Laboratory requests that NMED approve the extended project schedule until January 2003 for final closure. The anticipated closure schedule is presented in Section 6.2.7.

6.1.2.2 Time Frame for Demonstrations or Extensions (20 NMAC 4.1, Section 265.113[c])

As indicated in Figure 6-2, removal of wastes and completion of closure activities will need to be extended until January 2003. If completion of final closure activities will take longer than the end of January 2003, the Laboratory will submit a closure plan amendment in accordance with 265.112(c).

6.1.3 Disposal or Decontamination of Equipment, Structures, Debris and Soils (20 NMAC 4.1, Section 265.114)

During the final closure period, all equipment, structures, debris, and soil that are contaminated above acceptable levels must be properly disposed of or decontaminated. Contaminated equipment will be decontaminated in accordance with the procedures described in Section 6.3.1. Contaminated structures and soils will be identified, decontaminated, removed, and disposed of in accordance with the procedures described in Sections 6.2.4, 6.2.5, and 6.2.6. Section 6.3.2 describes how wastes generated during closure will be managed. Section 6.3.3 describes the criteria used to determine when decontamination and closure activities have met the closure performance standard. Section 6.3.4 describes the specific sampling and analysis procedures to be used to verify that all materials remaining on-site after closure meet the closure performance standard.

ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	2H97	1H98	2H98	1H99	2H99	1H00	2H00	1H01	2H01	1H02	2H02	1H03	2H03	1H04	2H04
1	Field Work	1302 days	Wed 11/5/97	Thu 10/31/02															
2	16-006(e) septic tank removal	26 days	Thu 4/4/02	Thu 5/9/02															
3	Eco Risk Assessment	369 days	Mon 6/4/01	Thu 10/31/02															
4	Final Closure Report	240 days	Mon 3/4/02	Fri 1/31/03															
5	Site Restoration	116 days	Wed 5/26/04	Wed 11/3/04															

Figure 6-2:
ESTIMATED PROJECT SCHEDULE
Date: May 2002


Task



Summary



Rolled Up Progress



Split



Rolled Up Task



External Tasks



Progress



Rolled Up Split



Project Summary



Milestone



Rolled Up Milestone



a landfill as required by 20 NMAC 4.1, Section 265.258(b), and an amended closure/postclosure plan will be prepared and submitted to the NMED.

6.2.2 Identification of Maximum Extent of Operation [20 NMAC 4.1, Section 265.112(b)(2)]

The estimated maximum extent of operation of the waste pile is shown in Figure 1-1. The waste pile was operated from the early 1950's to 1984.


6.2.3 Estimate of the Maximum Inventory of Hazardous Waste [20 NMAC 4.1, Section 265.112(b)(3)]

The MDA-P waste pile contains an estimated maximum volume of 60,000 yd³ of waste, debris, and contaminated media. It is estimated that 21,000 yd³ of excavated soil will require treatment and disposal as hazardous waste at a permitted, off-site facility.

6.2.4 Detailed Description of Removal of Waste Inventory [20 NMAC 4.1, Sections 265.112(b)(3) and (4)]

Prior to the excavation of the waste, several activities will occur. A staging area will be set up for the segregation of waste material (see Figure 2-4 in pocket at the end of Chapter 2.0). This staging area will be constructed on a 200-ft by 200-ft, 80-mil high-density polyethylene (HDPE) liner overlain by a protective layer of plywood or steel. Material will be placed at this staging area, inspected, sampled, and segregated based on physical characteristics. Immediately adjacent to this staging area, a decontamination pad will be constructed of concrete covered with an 80-mil HDPE liner. This liner will be overlain by a protective layer of plywood or steel. This decontamination pad will measure approximately 40 ft by 40 ft and will have 6-in. curbing to contain any liquids. During decontamination, plastic splash guards will be placed inside the curb of the decontamination pad to prevent liquids from coming into contact with surrounding soils. This decontamination pad will be placed inside a secondary containment system constructed of 80-mil HDPE. During decontamination, the liquids in the decontamination pad will be pumped out into a container to prevent the liquid from overtopping curb levels.

MDA-P Project Area and Adjacent PRSs



- Area of Contamination
- Boundary, TA
- Contour, 2 foot
- Contour, 10 foot
- PRS Boundary
- Road, Dirt
- Road, Paved
- Burn Pad
- Structure / Temporary Facility
- Structure, Other
- Culvert

6355

Figure 1-1, part of
MDA P closure plan
replacement pages
May 2002
LA-UR-02-2749

University of California
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Earth and Environmental Sciences Division

Cartography by: Marcia Jones
Date: May 08, 2002
GISLab Plot ID: G200140

DISCLAIMER: Neither the United States Government nor the University of California nor any of their employees makes any warranty, express or implied, including the warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

State Plane Coordinate System, New Mexico Central Zone,
1983 North American Datum

Grid provides NM State Plane coordinates in feet.
Grid interval, in feet: 500
Feet per inch on map = 75

SCALE 1:900

DISCLAIMER OF LIABILITY:
Data transferred from the FIMAD carry the following disclaimer of liability: Neither the United States Government nor the University of California nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, including the warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.
Base map Sources: Boundary, structure, and utility data are from Los Alamos National Laboratory Engineering Division and Los Alamos County Utility and Engineering Departments. Contour data is from Los Alamos National Laboratory Environmental Restoration Program aerial survey, September 1991.