

Dreith, June

 ENTERED

From: GARY KOENIG [garykoenig@uswest.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 6:56 PM
To: JDreith@TechLawInc.com
Subject: Triassic Park NOD Review - Landfill

*E-mailed to
S. Kruse from
G. Koenig
10/24/00*



TPNODUnTitles.doc

Please call with any questions or comments. I haven't received a revised (October 2000) version of Permit Application Volume I, Section 2 to which changes were to be made in response to the NOD. If you can send a copy to me I can update the review.

Review Of
Table of Response to Comments from NMED
Triassic Park Facility Permit Application
October 2000

Landfill Sections (NOD Appendix A)

Volume I, Triassic Park Waste Disposal Facility

1. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. The Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response.
2. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. It is not known whether the Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response since a revised Permit Application Section 2 was not available for review.
3. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. It is not known whether the Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response since a revised Permit Application Section 2 was not available for review.
4. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. No text revision proposed or needed.
5. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. It is not known whether the Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response since a revised Permit Application Section 2 was not available for review.
6. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. It is not known whether the Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response since a revised Permit Application Section 2 was not available for review.

Volume III, Engineering Report

7. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. The Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response.
8. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. The Permit Application text has been

- changed as indicated in the Response.
9. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. The Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response.
 10. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. No text revision proposed or needed.
 11. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. No text revision proposed or needed.
 12. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. No text revision proposed or needed.
 13. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. No text revision proposed or needed.
 14. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. No text revision proposed or needed.
 15. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. The Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response.
 16. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. The Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response.
 17. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. The Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response.
 18. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency, stating that text revisions have been made to Volume I, Section 2, and Volume III. It is not known whether the Volume I Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response since a revised Permit Application Section 2 was not available for review. The Volume III Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response.
 19. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. The Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response.
 20. The Response adequately addresses the deficiency. The Permit Application text has been changed as indicated in the Response.

Review Notes

- A. Item numbers 1 through 20 correspond with the Deficiency numbers in the NMED September 6, 2000 Notice of Deficiency (Appendix A). These are referred to in the Response as "Comments" and are correspondingly numbered 2.0-1 through III-20.

B. The cited deficiencies require revisions to both Volume I, "Triassic Park Waste Disposal Facility" and Volume III, "Engineering Report". The revised Volume I was not available for review. Revised (October 2000) Volume III was available for review.