RBT Site
WA 6906
8·31·83
5f

State of Washington
Department of Ecology

# INSPECTION REPORT

To Frank Rick, File

Inspector Egan

Date of Visit Aug. 31, 1983

Permit Number

Name of Entity Pacific Wood Treating

Permit Expires

City Ridgefield County Clark

New Industry

Person Contacted Barthart, Ryf, McQuiggan, Sweet on telephone

Type of Facility Wood Treater

Receiving Water Lake River

Type of Treatment System

USEPA RCRA
3058211

Operation: ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Fair ☐ Unsatisfactory

☐ Does not comply with permit conditions

Describe Met for a meeting to explain comments on the addendum to the draft closure/post closure/groundwater monitoring plan for the Ridgefield Blue Ice site. Highlights of the meeting are as follows: 1) I proposed they take soil core prior to any heavy equipment entering the site, use a hollow stem auger to the upgradient lysimeter position and core down to the cemented gravel. Using a split spoon sample every 2-5 feet and analyze for a background of soil contamination. Install lysimeters then move into the refuse or along immediately (because of buried metal barrels) and bore 2 more holes, and sample as above into the underlying soil again to cemented gravel. Take samples to lab and analyze while heavy equipment

CC

ECY 040-2-116

is dispatched and soil/refuse movement begins. All agreed, but Randy said additionally that when refuse removed, samples of any evident staining should occur. Agreed.

(2) If a ~~swated~~ saturated zone is encountered during previous work, water samples will be collected & analysed. Agreed.

(3) I commented on the usefulness of running EP Tox analysis on pcp and napthalene. Will it yield what we want to know about those 2 compounds? Said I'd check w/ Frank/lab and get back to them on Mon or Tues of next week. Agreed.

(4) Commented on the values Randy chose for "cutoff" values. Are they adequate? Reserved judgement until next week. Agreed.

(5) The distribution box (D box) is a pvc "storm sump" manuf. by Hancor Co. Its capacity will be ~ 10 gallons, leachate will be able to enter but not leave. If leachate is collected (2-5? years from now) a port will be opened to allow it to flow either to a holding tank or the ditch, depending on sampling results.

(6) I asked what analytical method will be used for the leachate analysis. SW 846? Will stipulate in order.

(7) Again, the values Randy presented were questioned. I'll get back to them on limits next week.

(8) Commented that if leachate is a DW (either by RCRA, KW1 → ash → leachate, or 173-303 bioassay or HH) site would be a generation site, need a # & PWT would be a treater if leachate introduced into their WW system. Check out. If leachate is DW, then PWT should notify for that site receive # & ship it to Ore/Ida for disposal under separate manifest from their waste. Could go on same truck, though.

(9) Commented that I prefer steam for cleaning equipment moving the waste. Agreed.

(10) The past closure cost figures listed were, they thought, a 50/50 figure between PWT and Lancks and Sweet/Edwards. Lancks gave them a quote of 212$/sample (15 parameters). Unclear as to whether should require them to submit a cost est. of private only.

(11) Commented background well is 3/4 mile south, not east. Agreed.

(12) Commented that there is to be 3 downgradient wells instead of 2. Agreed. Wells are to be 2, 4 & 5. PWT will get permission to sample #2.

(13) Commented on cleaning filtering apparatus if used. Agreed.

(14) Commented on dedicating an erlenmeyer flask per monitoring site & cleaning in lab. Randy said this would be a glass menagerie. Recommended a transfer blank be taken (distilled rinse of erlenmeyer) and analysed. Agreed.

(15) Commented on definition of "significant" contaminate. Should this be anything above background or an arbitrary/negotiable value. Randy suggested the following for the groundwater:

½ of primary DW standards for metals;
0.025 for pcp; (½) of acute freshwater fish tox.
1.15 for napthalene; (½) ~~human health water consumpt~~
0.5 for copper. (½) secondary DW ~~standards~~.

Said we'd reserve judgement until cleared w/ Frank & for Rick. Agreed.

(16) Commented on placement of NW lysimeter. Rick wanted away from ditch (Randy said ditch was ~6") toward warehouse on 205 line. Myers said he liked it @ original location @ corner of warehouse on 210 line. Randy said he agreed w/ Myers. Decided to move it back to original location on 210 line. Agreed.

(17) Didn't talk about:

inspection frequency
sampling frequency