ARF-025316

REGION 4
ATLANTA, GA 30303

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE &

February 11, 2026

FEB 11 2026

SRNS-OS-2026-00043

AREA COMPLETION PROJECTS

Mr. Matthew Baker, SRS Remedial Project Manager
Remediation and Deactivation & Decommissioning Division
U.S. Department of Energy
Savannah River Operations Office
P.O. Box A
Aiken, South Carolina 29802

EPA Comments: EARLY ACTION STATEMENT OF BASIS/PROPOSED PLAN FOR THE BENEFICIAL REUSE OF SELECT COAL ASH AND COAL FINES AT THE A-AREA ASH PILE (788-A), A-AREA COAL PILE RUNOFF BASIN (788-3A), F-AREA ASH LANDFILL (288-F), H-AREA BASIN (288-H), K-AREA ASH BASIN (188-K), AND L-AREA ASH BASIN (188-L) OPERABLE UNITS (U), SEMS NUMBERS: 61, 62, 88, 90, & 91, SRNS-RP-2025-01221, REVISION 0, OCTOBER 2025

Dear Mr. Baker,

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4 (EPA) has reviewed the Early Action SB/PP for the Beneficial Reuse of Select Coal Ash and Fines at A, F, H, K and L areas. Our comments are attached:

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (404) 431-1340.

Sincerely,

JON RICHARDS

Digitally signed by JON RICHARDS
Date: 2026.02.11 16:23:32 -05'00'

Jon Richards
FFA Remedial Project Manager
Superfund & Emergency Management Division

ec: C.L. Bergren, SRNS-ACP
Susan Fulmer, SCDES

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The SB/PP does not explain the technical terms or concepts used for the risk assessment discussions in Section V (Summary of Site Risks) that are likely to be unfamiliar to the public (i.e., Total Cumulative Risk (TCR] and Hazard Index [HI]). As noted in Section 3.3.5 (Summary of Site Risks) of EPA's *A Guide to Preparing Superfund Proposed Plans, Records of Decision, and Other Remedy Selection Decision Documents* (EPA 540-R-98-031), dated July 1999 (the EPA Decision Guidance), technical terms or concepts should be explained or defined if used in the Proposed Plan. *Please revise SB/PP, Section XII (Glossary) to include the definition of TCR and HI.*

2. It is unclear if a HI value was calculated for the A-area Ash Pile and A-Area Coal Pile Runoff Basin Operable Unit (OU). For example, the risk to the future resident for the F-Area Landfill and H-, K-, and L-Area Ash Basin OUs include both a TCR value and HI value; however, the A-Area Ash Pile and A-Area Coal Pile Runoff Basin OU do not include a HI value. *Please revise the text and include a HI value or discuss why a HI value for the A-area Ash Pile and A-Area Coal Pile Runoff Basin OU was not included.*

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. **Section II, Community Participation, Page 4 of 46:** Although the text states that the lead agency will provide an opportunity for a public meeting during the public comment period, it does not mention the possibility of having a virtual meeting as an option or in addition to a face-to-face meeting. The SB/PP should inform the public of the various options for holding the public meeting. *Please revise the SB/PP to include the possibility of having a virtual meeting as an option or in addition to a face-to-face meeting.*
2. **Section III, Operable Unit Background, A-Area Ash Pile and A-Area Coal Pile Runoff Basin, Page 6 of 46:** The last sentence references the wrong figure. The text states that sampling along transects was conducted to determine the extent of ash outside the boundary of the A-Area Ash Pile and references Figure 3 (A-Area Ash Pile Topography and Ash Observation Transects) and Figure 4 (A-Area Coal Pile Runoff Basin Topography). However, only Figure 3 should be referenced as it demonstrates the transects along the boundary of the A-Area Ash Pile. The text should accurately reference figures pertaining to the A-Area Ash Pile. *Please revise the text to reference only Figure 3.*

Attorney Comments:

General Comments

General Comment #1: EPA recognizes that inclusion of a brief summary of important ARARs in the Proposed Plan is suggested by guidance, but inclusion of an ARARs table is not necessary. See, e.g., the NCP at 40 CFR 300.430(f)(2). EPA Region 4 ORC requests that, going forward, a discission of important ARARs be included in the proposed plan, as the actual ARARs tables are included in the ROD.

General Comment #2: ORC has questions about whether determinations about the nature of the various units in this and associated reports ("coal ash piles," "coal pile runoff basin", "coal ash landfill," and "coal ash basins") have been made. These determinations are necessary in order to determine the applicability or relevance and appropriateness of the Coal Combustion Residuals (CCR) rule, including the rules related to closure and to beneficial reuse. Page 444 of the 2024 R0 *Focused EA/CMS FA for the AAP, ACPRB, FAL, HAB, KAB and LAB OUs* contains a table (*CCR/Ash Basin Strategy – CCR/Ash Waste Units Requiring Closure)* that briefly summarizes how the ash came to be located in the piles,

landfills, and basins (the appendices, which include this table, that were in the R0 were not provided in the R1 version of the FFS, hence ORC references the R0 page number).

A. Based on this summary, it appears that all the ash areas, with perhaps an exception for the A-Area Coal Pile Runoff Basin, 788-3A, are like CCR landfills (A-Area Ash Pile, F-Area Ash Landfill) or CCR surface impoundments (H-Area Ash Basin, K-Area Ash Basin, and L-Area Ash Basin), as defined in the Coal Combustion Residuals rule, at 40 CFR 257.53 and that any rules that could be considered relevant and appropriate would start from this position.
B. Based upon the information in the FFS, it appears that the F-Area Ash Landfill may be like an "existing CCR landfill", despite that it is a permitted Class III solid waste landfill. An "existing CCR landfill" means "a CCR landfill that receives CCR both before and after October 19, 2015." Please clarify whether the F-Area Ash Landfill meets the definition of an existing CCR landfill within the meaning of the regulation.

The comparison of this action to the "early action decision remedial alternative selection document that was prepared for the in-situ decommissioning of the reactor building complexes" (cited report at page ES-4 of ES-8) may not be a good one, if there are not ARARs in that action, similar to the Coal Combustion Residuals rule, that are likely at play here.

General Comment #3: The Proposed Plan primarily addresses the LUCs and introduces the concept of beneficial use, but does not provide any details regarding that scope, performance, cost, etc. of that remedy. In addition, it does not address closure in any detail should the parties determine that beneficial reuse is not going to occur or if CCR is left in place after beneficial reuse has completed. *EPA proposes that DOE consider to issue an IROD for Phase I followed by a final ROD for Phase II. Phase II will include beneficial use and closure of the CCR units (i.e., clean closure after removal of all waste or closure with some waste left in place).*

Specific Comments

Specific Comment #1, Introduction Section, page 2, first paragraph, first sentence: After the first sentence starting with "The preferred remedial alternative for the remaining coal ash and coal fines…", it is recommended to add a reference to the CCR regulation that defines "beneficial use." For example, "The preferred remedial alternative for the remaining coal ash and coal fines OUs is Land Use Controls (LUCs) with Beneficial Reuse of Coal Combustion Residuals (CCR) as defined in 40 CFR 257.53."

Specific Comment #2, Introduction Section, page 2, end of second paragraph: After the sentence, "Following excavation and removal of the coal ash and coal fines in Phase 2 . . .," it is suggested to add the following sentence. "In the event a clean closure is not possible due to the amount of remaining coal ash and coal fines, closure with waste in place will be evaluated by the FFA parties and documented in a final Record of Decision (ROD) that includes the relevant ARARs." See General Comment #3 above.

Specific Comment #3, SRS Compliance History Section, last complete paragraph, page 3: The document states "[s]election of the remedial alternative that will satisfy the FFA requirements will be made by USDOE, in consultation with USEPA and SCDES**.** Revise to "Selection of the remedial alternative that will satisfy the FFA requirements will be made jointly by USDOE and USEPA, in consultation with SCDES. Under CERCLA both EPA and the lead agency select the remedial action, unless the parties are unable to reach an agreement. *See* 42 USC § 9604(e)(4)(A) ("Each Interagency agreement under this subsection shall include . . . [a] review of alternative remedial actions and *selection of a remedial action by the head of the relevant department, agency, or instrumentality and the Administrator* or, if unable to reach agreement on selection of a remedial action, selection by the Administrator." (emphasis added)). The NCP also requires that the remedy be selected by EPA and the lead agency. *See* 40 CFR § 300.430(f)(4)(iii) ("The process for selection of a remedial action at a federal facility on the NPL,

pursuant to CERCLA section 120, shall entail: (A) Joint selection of remedial action by the head of the relevant department, agency, or instrumentality and EPA . . . .").

Specific Comment #4, Community Participation Section, pages 3-4: Please include the name and contact information for the local Community Advisory Group at SRS (i.e. the "Savanna River Site Citizens Advisory Board", https://cab.srs.gov/srs-cab.html, 1-800-249-8155, srscitizensadvisoryboard@srs.gov) in the Community Participation Section. *See* A Guide to Preparing Superfund Proposed Plans, Records of Decision, and Other Remedy Selection Decision Documents, OSWER 9200.1-23P, July 1999 (herein after "ROD Guidance"), at 3-10 ("The following public participation information should be included in the Proposed Plan: . . . [n]ame and contact number of local Community Advisory Group (CAG), if applicable.").

Specific Comment #5, Operable Unit Background Section, page 4, first paragraph: The second sentence states, "As a result of boiler operations, coal ash (coal combustion products) was produced as a waste product." Please revise to use the regulatory term CCR because the coal ash is not a "product" and the coal ash fits the definition of CCR in the CCR regulations. *See* 40 CFR 257.53 ("Coal combustion residuals (CCR) means fly ash, bottom ash, boiler slag, and flue gas desulfurization materials generated from burning coal for the purpose of generating electricity by electric utilities and independent power producers."). Alternatively, you can remove the phrase "coal combustion products."

Specific Comment #6, Operable Unit Background Section, page 5, first complete paragraph: Please add the following sentence at the end of the paragraph after the sentence starting with, "[h]owever, finalization and regulatory approval of the Interim Action...." "CERCLA section 121(d)(2) and the NCP at 40 CFR 300.430(f)(5)(i)(B) require remedial actions to comply with ARARs unless a waiver is justified."

Specific Comment #7, Operable Unit Background Section, Subsection A-Area Ash Pile and A- A-Area Coal Pile Runoff Basin, page 6, first complete paragraph: The document states "The depth to groundwater in this area is ~37 m (~120 ft) bgs." Please indicate if there is ever standing water atop the ACPRB. Given the large rainfall amounts in this region, one would expect there are occasions with standing water and that when the coal ash is removed for beneficial use that de-watering of the coal ash will be needed depending on that beneficial use.

Specific Comment #8, Operable Unit Background Section, Section "F-Area Ash Landfill Operable Unit", page 6, second paragraph: The document states that "the 288-F Class II Ash Landfill will remain a permitted operating landfill until beneficial reuse is initiated (SRNS 2022)." Given that the F-Area Ash Landfill is an active solid waste landfill, one would assume that the permit contains requirements related to current groundwater detection monitoring per R61-107.19 Part IV Section E and submittal of a closure plan once operations cease. Please clarify whether there is a groundwater detection monitoring program for this unit and whether results indicate there are releases of metals and/or radionuclides into the groundwater.

Specific Comment #9, Operable Unit Background Section, Subsection "H-, K-, and L- Area Ash Basin Operable Units", page 7, bottom of first column: The document states "[w]et ash/soils at the southeastern side of the basinare [sic] primarily located/associated with ash deposits outside the basin berm where ash deposits align with the location of a historical Carolina bay that a portion of the HAB OU was partially constructed on top of (Figure 6)." Please clarify whether the Carolina bay was considered one of the waters of the State or a wetland that was filled.

Specific Comment #10, Scope and Role of Operable Unit or Response Action Section, page 8, second paragraph: The document states, "In 2022, the USDOE . . . that includes future beneficial reuse of the ash material (Phase 2) . . . ." Please revise to use the regulatory term CCR because coal ash is not a "material" but rather a solid waste. *See* 40 CFR 257.53 ("Coal combustion residuals (CCR) means fly ash, bottom ash, boiler slag, and flue gas desulfurization materials generated from burning coal for the purpose of generating electricity by electric utilities and independent power producers."). Please revise

accordingly and make conforming changes throughout the document such that "ash material" is replaced with "coal ash waste" or CCR.

Specific Comment #11, Summary of Site Risks Section, page 9: The opening paragraph introduces a term "Refined Constituents of Concern." This term is not used in CERCLA, the NCP, or EPA guidance. Please include a footnote that describes how this term relates to the term used in Superfund cleanups, "Contaminant of Concern." See EPA RI-FS guidance, *Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA*, EPA OSWER 9355.3-01, October 1988, and EPA ROD guidance, *A Guide to Preparing Superfund Proposed Plans, Records of Decision, and Other Remedy Selection Decision Documents*, EPA OSWER 9200.1-2P, July 1999, for discussions of how contaminants of concern are identified and used in the remedial process. Going forward and to avoid confusion, ORC recommends that the SRS remedial process use terms that have been developed in EPA guidance documents or ensure that the remedial documents contain an explanation that cross-references the CERCLA term.

Specific Comment #12, Summary of Human Health Risk Assessment through Problems Warranting Action, pages 9 through 11: These sections begin discussing the contaminants at the sites. Then on page 11, the text contains the conclusion that the radionuclides are naturally-occurring. Please include a short factual summary before the text on page 11 that describes how it was determined that contaminants that pose an unacceptable risk (in this case, radionuclides) are naturally occurring.

Specific Comment #13, Remedial Action Objectives Section, page 12, fourth paragraph: The PP states that "[f]or the HAB OU and LAB OU, the RAO is to protect groundwater resources from migration of contaminants in unit ash/soil that would impact the groundwater above groundwater protection standards." Please revise this RAO to state: "For the HAB OU and LAB OU, the RAO is to protect groundwater (which is classified by South Carolina as a Class GB Ground Water and an underground source of drinking water) from migration of contaminants in unit ash/soil that would impact the groundwater above drinking water standards (i.e., Maximum Contaminant Levels [MCLs], or more stringent SCDES Groundwater Cleanup Target Levels [GCTLs])." This RAO revision is recommended because the U.S. EPA expects to return usable groundwater to its beneficial use wherever practicable, within a timeframe that is reasonable given the particular circumstances of the site. See NCP at 40 CFR 300.430(a)(1)(iii)(F). All South Carolina groundwater is classified as Class GB unless otherwise listed. See S.C. Code § 48-1-10, South Carolina Regulation 61-69.

Specific Comment #14, Summary of Remedial Alternatives Section, page 12: The preferred alternative should be identified at the beginning of the summary of remedial alternatives section. *See* ROD Guidance at 3-5 ("The alternatives that is recommended as the Preferred Alternative should be identified as such at the beginning of this [Summary of Remedial Alternatives] section.").

Specific Comment #15, Summary of Remedial Alternatives Section, Alternative A-2: LUCs with Beneficial Reuse Section, page 13: Please see EPA's earlier comment on the use of the term "beneficial reuse" and please ensure that the term is being used consistent with the CCR regulation terminology. Since some provisions of 40 CFR part 257 are being identified as Action-Specific ARARs, EPA would prefer use of the term "Beneficial Use of CCR" or "Beneficial use." The coal ash and fines in these OUs are solid waste that have been disposed. Phase II would excavate CCR (i.e., coal ash waste) and utilize the CCR for disposal in other areas of the Site which qualifies as "Beneficial Use" as defined in 40 CFR 257.53.

Specific Comment #16, Summary of Remedial Alternatives Section, Alternative A-2: LUCs with Beneficial Reuse Section, page 13, column 2, first paragraph: The document states, "[d]ue to the CM concerns at the HAB and LAB OUs, groundwater monitoring wells would be installed/identified at these two OUs and would be monitored every five years to coincide with the five-year remedy reviews." Monitoring frequency should be decided in the ROD or post-ROD documents approved by EPA. Revise

to state, "would be routinely monitored according to a Plan approved by EPA and SCDES. Groundwater monitoring results will be evaluated in routine reports as well as part of the Five-Year Review process for the selected remedy."

Specific Comment #17, Summary of Remedial Alternatives Section, Alternative A-2: LUCs with Beneficial Reuse Section, page 13, column 2, first paragraph: The document states, "Phase II (excavation and beneficial reuse) of this alternative would involve excavation of ash material in an attempt to achieve unrestricted use levels while providing beneficial reuse of the material." Please see EPA's earlier comments regarding the use of the regulatory term CCR instead of "material" with respect to the CCR. Please revise accordingly to indicate that CCR (or coal ash waste) will be excavated and put to a beneficial use at other areas of the Site as part of Phase II of the remedy.

Specific Comment #18, Summary of Remedial Alternatives Section, Alternative A-3: Class III Cover with LUCs, page 14, first paragraph: The document states that "[a] Class III cover system includes a geosynthetic materials [sic] including a liner and a draining layer to limit infiltration of rainwater through the covered waste." Given the nature of the solid waste and that there are closure performance requirements including requirements for a final cover in 40 CFR 257.102(d) for leaving CCR waste in place, EPA thinks these requirements are "relevant and appropriate requirements." EPA recognizes that the Class III final cover requirements in R61-107.19 Part V Subpart F are similar in terms of material thickness and permeability rating. Consider revising the Alternative Title to "Landfill Cover with Lucs" and including language in the description to include reference to ARARs such as those in 40 CFR 257.102(d).

Specific Comment # 19, Compliance with ARARs section, page 15: EPA agrees that inclusion of a brief summary of important ARARs in the Proposed Plan is recommended by guidance. In contrast, EPA guidance does not recommend including an ARARs table in a proposed plan. And EPA hereby recommends that the ARARs table (Table 2) be removed. EPA recommends that the best approach is that Phase I (i.e., LUCs and groundwater monitoring) be documented in an IROD, followed by a final ROD that includes Phase II (i.e., beneficial use and closure of the CCR units). EPA recognizes that the F-Area Ash Landfill is a regulated solid waste landfill subject to closure requirements under SCDES regulations identified as applicable requirements.

Specific Comment # 20, Compliance with ARARs section, page 15, first paragraph: The document states "Excavation within any wetland area may require restoration upon completion of the excavation." Any unavoidable impacts to wetlands would also need to comply with Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) guidelines, including regulations in Subpart J 40 CFR 230.91 et seq. for compensatory mitigation. Please revise this language to include reference to this regulation.

Specific Comment # 21, Compliance with ARARs section, page 15, first paragraph: The document states "[i]n addition, the characterization, disposal, and transportation of ash generated from Alternative A-2 would be handled in accordance with Federal and State regulations 40 CFR 262.11(b) and SCDES 61-107.5(D)(3)." Please revise the citation to include 40 CFR 262.11(a)-(d).

Specific Comment #22: Evaluation of Alternatives section, Compliance with ARARs, page 15: The first paragraph, next-to-last sentence states that "Coal ash and coal pile runoff are excluded as hazardous, solid waste per 40 CFR 261.4(b)(4)(i) and (ii)." Please revise to remove the word "solid" as this waste is considered solid waste, but not hazardous waste under this section. See the section title, "Solid wastes which are not hazardous wastes" and the following introductory statement, "The following solid wastes are not hazardous wastes . . . ."

Specific Comment #23: Evaluation of Alternatives section, Compliance with ARARs, page 15, last sentence: The document states that "[i]nstallation of monitoring wells will be in accordance with R. 61-71B(2))." Note that the regulations regarding groundwater monitoring are located in R.61-71H. Revise this citation to include R.61-71H. There are also additional specific requirements that would

need to be included in an IROD or ROD, depending on USDOE's acceptance of EPA's recommendation for implementation of Phase I and Phase II. EPA can provide those requirements in a separate table in preparation for the IROD or ROD.

Specific Comment #24: Preferred Alternative Section, page 16, second column, second bullet point: The document states, "[i]nstallation/identification of groundwater monitoring wells for the HAB and LAB OUs, monitored every five years. Groundwater beneath the FAL OU will be monitored semi-annually." Please see EPA's earlier comment. Specification of the monitoring frequency in the Proposed Plan is premature and requires EPA and SCDES approval. Please revise this language accordingly.

Specific Comment #25: Please confirm that the proposed beneficial use as contemplated in Phase II of this action would meet the following conditions of "beneficial use of CCR" in the CCR regulation 40 CFR 257.53 Definitions.

Beneficial use of CCR means the CCR meet all of the following conditions:

(1) The CCR must provide a functional benefit;

(2) The CCR must substitute for the use of a virgin material, conserving natural resources that would otherwise need to be obtained through practices, such as extraction;

(3) The use of the CCR must meet relevant product specifications, regulatory standards or design standards when available, and when such standards are not available, the CCR is not used in excess quantities; and

(4) When unencapsulated use of CCR involving placement on the land of 12,400 tons or more in nonroadway applications, the user must demonstrate and keep records, and provide such documentation upon request, that environmental releases to groundwater, surface water, soil and air are comparable to or lower than those from analogous products made without CCR, or that environmental releases to groundwater, surface water, soil and air will be at or below relevant regulatory and health-based benchmarks for human and ecological receptors during use.

40 CFR 257.53. Please include a discussion of the proposed Phase II beneficial use that provides at least as much detail as is discussed in this regulation to confirm that the proposed beneficial use meets the definition of "beneficial use of CCR."

Specific Comment #26: Table 2, page 33: Please see EPA's General Comment #3 and the earlier comment including EPA's recommendation that ARARs not be included in the Proposed Plan. If USDOE wants to retain an ARAR table despite EPA's recommendation, then the table should be limited to those requirements related to Phase I, specifically groundwater monitoring requirements. Any ARARs for Phase II (i.e., beneficial reuse and closure of CCR units) would be included in the final ROD.

Specific Comment #27: Table 2, page 34: Note that EPA revised the RCRA regulations on waste characterization and that the language in 40 CFR 262.11 is different than what is provided in the Proposed Plan and thus these ARARs need to be revised to be consistent with the regulation in the upcoming ROD. EPA Region 4 can provide the updated language and ARARs for submission in the final ROD.

Specific Comment #28: Table 2, page 36, Section Dewatering of Ash Basin: Note that these ARARs would apply to Phase II if Beneficial Use of CCR occurs. Clarification is needed as to the location of the discharge of the wastewater given the classification of the receiving water, but this detail should be provided in the final ROD.

Specific Comment #29: Table 2, page 36, Section Monitoring Well Installation, Operation, and Abandonment: The groundwater monitoring ARARs that apply during Phase I are more extensive than what is provided in Table 2 of the Proposed Plan. Additionally, in the event that Phase II results in closure of the sites with waste in place as opposed to "beneficial use of CCR", there would be additional ARARs that are required as part of post-closure care which need to be added to any ARARs

table. See earlier comments on content of ARARs tables and EPA's General Comment #3.

Specific Comment #30: Table 2, page 36, Section On-Site Closure/Capping of Ash Basins: Consistent with EPA's earlier comments, no ARARs table is required for inclusion in the proposed plan. In the event USDOE decides to include an ARARs table in this proposed plan, EPA recommends the ARARs be limited to just Phase I (i.e., groundwater monitoring requirements). See earlier comments on content of ARARs tables and EPA's General Comment #3.

Specific Comment #31: Table 2, page 36, Section On-Site Closure/Capping of Ash Basins, entry for action "Closure of CCR Unit", requirements: This entry in Table 2 does not use the correct regulatory language. Consistent with EPA's earlier comments, no ARARs table is required for inclusion in the proposed plan. EPA expects revision of the language consistent with that in 40 CFR 257.102(a) in the ROD ARARs table, as follows:

Closure of a CCR unit must be completed either by leaving the CCR in place and installing a final cover system or through removal of the CCR and decontamination of the CCR unit, as described in paragraphs (b) through (j) of this section. Retrofit of a CCR surface impoundment must be completed in accordance with the requirements in paragraph (k) of this section.

Specific Comment #32: Table 2, page 36, Section On-Site Closure/Capping of Ash Basins, entry for action "Closure of CCR Unit", Citation: Consistent with EPA's earlier comments, no ARARs table is required for inclusion in the proposed plan. Further, there are many more entries for South Carolina solid waste landfill closure and post-closure regulations for the 288-F landfill (Class III) and the other CCR management units that are missing from this table. EPA contends that in the ARARs table for the final ROD including the closure requirements for CCR management units in 40 CFR 257.102(d), but excluding timeframes and notice requirements, would be more appropriate for the CCR units other than the 288-F Landfill than the closure requirements for Class III landfill in SC R. 61-107.19 part V Subpart F, although the final cover requirements are similar. Accordingly, when including these ARARs in the final ROD, the ARARs need to be revised to include those CCR closure requirements.

Specific Comment #33: Table 2, page 38, Section Location Specific ARARs: Consistent with EPA's earlier comments, no ARARs table is required for inclusion in the proposed plan. In the ARARs table for the final ROD, these entries need to be revised to better reflect the language in the regulations. Also, for any unavoidable impacts to aquatic resources such as wetlands, the Clean Water Act section 404(b)(1) requirements for compensatory mitigation need to be added to the Location-specific ARARs table. EPA Region 4 can provide an example table with these requirements during preparation of the R0 of the final ROD.

Specific Question #34: In the Operable Unit Background Section, H-, K-, and L- Area Ash Basin Operable Units Subsection, first paragraph, page 15: The document states that "[a] constructed ditch on the southern side of the basin channels water from the basin to the south-east toward a small permanently pooled water body that flows toward a small tributary of Fourmile Branch at the northwest corner of H Area." Does this ditch capture runoff from the H-Area basin? Has it been tested to check if there are discharges of pollutants from the coal ash in the H-Area basin? Is there an NPDES permit for this outfall? What does it mean that it is an as-built industrial wastewater facility or that that it is receiving rainwater runoff from an above ground pipeline?