| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jump, Christine |
| **To:** | SMITH, MARTIN L; Michael Stephenson |
| **Subject:** | paint can pit letter |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, March 10, 2015 8:51:00 AM |
| **Attachments:** | paint can pit letter.pdf |

---

Chris Jump, L.G.
Waste Remediation and Permitting Branch
US EPA, Region 7
jump.chris@epa.gov
(913) 551-7141

Mailing address: 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, KS 66219

USPCI
A Subsidiary of
Union Pacific Corporation

RECEIVED
NOV 24 1992
PRMT SECTION

November 20, 1992

Mr. Mark Matthews
USEPA Region VII
726 Minnesota Avenue
Kansas City, Kansas 66101

R00001698
RCRA Records Center

Dear Mr. Matthews;

Thank you very much for the time spent with us on October 20, 1992. Bob Apple, Steve Keiter and myself, all representing USPCI, arranged this meeting with you to discuss the previously disclosed discovery of buried paint cans at the Wichita Facility. It is USPCI's desire to pro-actively respond to this solid waste management unit (SWMU) in a manner which is both compliant with CERCLA requirements, and consistent with the corrective action process at permitted facilities.

In our meeting we discussed three topics in detail. Initially, we discussed a possible remedy for the paint can SWMU. It was agreed that although CERCLA allows USPCI to take no action at this time, it would be prudent to voluntarily implement a source control remedy. Our proposal calls for removal of all visibly contaminated soils and debris for proper treatment and/or disposal. As you pointed out, the source may or may not be fully controlled by removing the visible contamination, and subsurface testing would aid in the verification of success or conversely may indicate a need for further excavation. In order to move ahead in this area, we needed first to address the issue of waste classification with EPA Region VII Environmental Engineer, Sandra MacLeod. On November 20, 1992, I had the opportunity to speak with Ms. MacLeod about this topic. The waste in question has been sampled and analyzed and was found to contain both metal and solvent contaminants. A liquid sample was taken by compositing paint poured directly from three paint cans which were removed intact from the excavation. A solid sample was taken from the debris area where paint had apparently contaminated soil. Although the paint contains solvent constituents, there was, to our knowledge, no disposal of spent solvents which would cause the waste to be a listed waste. The waste will, therefore, be managed according to its characteristics of hazardous waste. My review of site history (which includes paint manufacturing), my interviews with site personnel, and my discussions with Ms. MacLeod confirm that characterization is appropriate. It is our intention to pour-up all usable paint for

4200 Pennsylvania • Kansas City, Missouri 64111 • 816/531-6235 • Fax 816/531-1604

introduction into the fuels program, sort out solid debris to the extent practical for direct landfill, and process the remaining soils through stabilization. This disposal plan is contingent upon waste acceptance at a permitted disposal facility. Ms. MacLeod has also recommended that this plan be reviewed with Kansas Department of Health and Environment personnel.

Secondly, we received an update on the RCRA Facility Assessment (RFA) being conducted at the Wichita Facility. The draft plan is finalized, and EPA is unsure (due to contractor issues) as to whether they will proceed with finalization of the report. Once the report is deemed complete, the Corrective Action section of the permit can be forwarded to the State of Kansas for inclusion into the draft permit. At this time, it is the agencies intent to make the permit decision jointly.

Lastly, the RFA update turned into an EPA permitting strategy discussion. As I understand it, the timetable is such that the permit decision could be extended to the third quarter of this fiscal year (the commitment date), however, the final timing is contingent upon many things including the decision as to whether or not to produce a final RFA or proceed from the draft report. Due to the fact that this is a third quarter commitment, other unfinished first and second quarter commitments take precedence over this commitment.

We certainly thank you and Sandra MacLeod for your time, and hope that we have demonstrated to you that although the paint can SWMU predates USPCI's operation of the facility, we intend to manage it in a manner protective of human health and the environment. Although we believe this to constitute a minor release we are preparing to pro-actively and voluntarily minimize the source. This work will be well documented in order to transition this activity into the permit, if necessary. Should you have any questions, or wish to clarify any information provided here, please feel free to call me in the Kansas City Office at (816) 531-6235.

Sincerely,

Russell Zora

Russell Zora
Director of Regulatory Affairs

cc: Sandra MacLeod - USEPA Kansas City
Ron Smith - KDHE Topeka
Steve Broslavick - KDHE Topeka
Bob Apple - USPCI Kansas City
Steve Keiter - USPCI Wichita

USPCI
A Subsidiary of
Union Pacific Corporation

November 20, 1992

Mr. Mark Matthews
USEPA Region VII
726 Minnesota Avenue
Kansas City, Kansas 66101

Dear Mr. Matthews;

Thank you very much for the time spent with us on October 20, 1992. Bob Apple, Steve Keiter and myself, all representing USPCI, arranged this meeting with you to discuss the previously disclosed discovery of buried paint cans at the Wichita Facility. It is USPCI's desire to pro-actively respond to this solid waste management unit (SWMU) in a manner which is both compliant with CERCLA requirements, and consistent with the corrective action process at permitted facilities.

In our meeting we discussed three topics in detail. Initially, we discussed a possible remedy for the paint can SWMU. It was agreed that although CERCLA allows USPCI to take no action at this time, it would be prudent to voluntarily implement a source control remedy. Our proposal calls for removal of all visibly contaminated soils and debris for proper treatment and/or disposal. As you pointed out, the source may or may not be fully controlled by removing the visible contamination, and subsurface testing would aid in the verification of success or conversely may indicate a need for further excavation. In order to move ahead in this area, we needed first to address the issue of waste classification with EPA Region VII Environmental Engineer, Sandra MacLeod. On November 20, 1992, I had the opportunity to speak with Ms. MacLeod about this topic. The waste in question has been sampled and analyzed and was found to contain both metal and solvent contaminants. A liquid sample was taken by compositing paint poured directly from three paint cans which were removed intact from the excavation. A solid sample was taken from the debris area where paint had apparently contaminated soil. Although the paint contains solvent constituents, there was, to our knowledge, no disposal of spent solvents which would cause the waste to be a listed waste. The waste will, therefore, be managed according to its characteristics of hazardous waste. My review of site history (which includes paint manufacturing), my interviews with site personnel, and my discussions with Ms. MacLeod confirm that characterization is appropriate. It is our intention to pour-up all usable paint for