



INTERNATIONAL
URANIUM (USA)
CORPORATION

40-2681

Independence Plaza, Suite 950 • 1050 Seventeenth Street • Denver, CO 80265 • 303 628 7798 (main) • 303 389 4125 (fax)

February 7, 2001

VIA FACSIMILE AND OVERNIGHT EXPRESS

Mr. Philip Ting, Chief
Fuel Cycle Licensing Branch
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop T-8A33
2 White Flint North
11545 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852

SUBJECT: DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIAL CONTAINS
LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTE

Dear Mr. Ting:

1. INTRODUCTION

International Uranium (USA) Corporation ("IUSA") has been advised that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC") staff is in the process of evaluating potential approaches which NRC and licensees may apply in determining whether alternate feed materials contain *listed* hazardous waste.

As NRC is aware, IUSA has applied for thirteen and received a total of twelve amendments to its Source Material License (the thirteenth is currently under review by NRC) to permit the receipt and processing of some sixteen alternate feed materials at the White Mesa Uranium Mill (the "Mill"). Alternate feed processing is a critical component of IUSA's business activities, and, therefore, IUSA makes every effort to ensure that the processing is performed safely and consistently with all applicable regulations, including ensuring that the materials IUSA accepts as alternate feeds contain no *listed* hazardous waste.

IUSA has already developed procedures with the State of Utah Department of Environmental Quality ("UDEQ"), the regulatory body with RCRA authority in the State of Utah, where the Mill is located, that should adequately address NRC's concerns regarding *listed* hazardous wastes in alternate feed materials, and it is therefore not necessary for NRC to impose any additional requirements.

Umsso (Public)

In any event, as the uranium mill that has been most active in processing alternate feed materials, and hence has a great deal at stake, IUSA believes that it should be directly involved in any generic approaches or criteria determinations made by NRC on these matters.

2. BACKGROUND

NRC's Final Position and Guidance on the Use of Uranium Mill Feed Material other than Natural Ores (the "Alternate Feed Guidance", or the "Guidance") states that if a proposed feed material contains *listed* waste, as defined under subpart D Section 261.30-33 of 40 CFR (or comparable RCRA authorized state regulations), it could be subject to EPA (or state) regulation under RCRA. Therefore, to avoid the complexities of NRC/EPA dual regulation, feed material containing *listed* hazardous waste, as defined under these regulations, must not be approved for processing at the Mill. The Guidance further notes that if the licensee can show that the proposed feed material does not consist of a *listed* hazardous waste, this issue is resolved. The Guidance also states that feed material exhibiting only a *characteristic* of hazardous waste (ignitable, corrosive, reactive, toxic) would not be regulated as hazardous waste because the materials are being recycled and a valuable product, source material, is being extracted. The Guidance also provides that NRC staff may consult with EPA (or the state) before making a determination on whether the feed material contains *listed* hazardous waste.

IUSA also notes that in a recent decision which upheld the Ashland 2 license amendment (LBP-99-5, 49 NRC 107, 1999), the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Presiding Officer suggested there was a general need for more specific protocols for determining if alternate feed materials contain *listed* hazardous wastes. The Commission, in affirming the Presiding Officer's decision, acknowledged the significance of the issue of the presence of *listed* hazardous waste in alternate feed material. In a Memorandum and Order of February 14, 2000, the Commission concluded that this issue warranted further staff refinement and standardization.

3. LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTE PROTOCOL

With the cooperation of UDEQ, IUSA has expended considerable resources in developing procedures that it believes should adequately address NRC's concerns regarding the potential for *listed* hazardous wastes in alternate feed materials.

IUSA, cognizant of the need for specific protocols to be used in making determinations as to whether or not any alternate feeds considered for processing at the Mill contain *listed* hazardous wastes, has established a "Protocol for Determining Whether Alternate Feed Materials are Listed Hazardous Wastes" (November 22, 1999). This Protocol was developed in conjunction with, and accepted by, UDEQ (Letter of December 7, 1999).

This protocol provides a detailed "road map" to systematically evaluate the potential for various alternate feeds to either be or contain *listed* hazardous waste, using criteria that are both acceptable to the State of Utah and consistent with RCRA regulations. Copies of the Protocol

and UDEQ letter are provided in Attachment 1. The provisions of the protocol can be summarized as follows:

- a) In all cases, the protocol requires that IUSA perform a source investigation to collect information regarding the composition and history of the material, and any existing generator or agency determinations regarding its regulatory status;
- b) The protocol states that if the material is known — by means of chemical data or site history — not to be or contain any *listed* hazardous waste, IUSA and UDEQ will agree that the material is not a *listed* hazardous waste;
- c) If such a direct confirmation is not available, the protocol describes the additional chemical process and material handling historical information that IUSA will collect and evaluate to assess whether the chemical contaminants in the material resulted from *listed* or *non-listed* sources;
- d) The protocol specifies the situations in which ongoing confirmation/acceptance sampling will be used, in addition to the chemical process and handling history, to make a *listed* waste evaluation;
- e) If the results from any of the decision steps indicate that the material or a constituent of the material did result from a RCRA *listed* hazardous waste or RCRA *listed* process, the material is (subject to obtaining a contained-in/contained-out determination from the RCRA authority in the generator's state) rejected; and
- f) The protocol also identifies the types of documentation that IUSA will obtain and maintain on file, to support the assessment for each different decision scenario. It is important to note that the documentation requirements take into consideration the generator as the primary party responsible for making waste determinations.

The above components and conditions of the Protocol are summarized in a decision tree diagram, or logic flow diagram, included in Attachment 1.

As this Listed Hazardous Waste Protocol has been developed with the input and concurrence of UDEQ, the regulatory body with RCRA authority in the State of Utah, IUSA believes that the procedures set out in the Protocol are sufficient to deal with the determination of whether or not a particular feed is or contains *listed* hazardous wastes. IUSA therefore suggests that there is no need for NRC to expend valuable resources attempting to develop a different decisional protocol or to require that additional procedures be performed. If, however, NRC decides that further analysis of this issue, or additional procedures, are required, then, as the uranium mill that has been most active in processing alternate feed materials, and hence with a great deal at stake, IUSA asks that it be given the opportunity to provide input into NRC's determinations.

For example, IUSA understands that NRC is considering requiring, for each alternate feed, a letter from the RCRA authority in the generator's state to the effect that the alternate feed material is not and does not contain RCRA *listed* hazardous waste. This issue was considered in some detail when the Listed Hazardous Waste Protocol was developed. As a review of the Protocol indicates, while such a letter from the RCRA authority in the generator's state may be *sufficient* in some cases to determine that an alternate feed material does not contain *listed* hazardous wastes, it is not a *necessary* requirement for any feed material. This conclusion was reached for the following reasons:


- a) Under RCRA, since it is the responsibility of the generator to classify its waste, it was therefore concluded that many regulators would be reluctant to assume any responsibility in making that determination, and at best any such determinations would likely be non-committal and vague;
- b) In most cases, the regulatory authority would not already have made such a determination, and would be required to review the circumstances of each alternate feed material, *de novo*. It was concluded that many regulatory authorities would likely be reluctant to do so, particularly in light of comments a) above and c) below;
- c) To the extent that a regulatory authority was prepared to make such a determination, this would involve a review process, which could very well be expected to delay the approval beyond what may be commercially acceptable in any given set of circumstances;
- d) There was a concern that a letter prepared by the RCRA authority in a generating state, in the context of the possible removal of RCRA waste from the generating state to the state in which the uranium mill is located, may not be carefully considered by the authority in the generating state, as the material would then cease to be a problem for the generating state and become a potential problem for the receiving state. This is in contrast to a pre-existing letter that may already have been generated by the RCRA authority in the generating state in a different context;
- e) From a commercial point of view, it was recognized that generators of alternate feed materials are generally reluctant to request the involvement of regulatory authorities when it is not necessary, and that requiring such involvement could interfere with a mill's commercial relations, particularly when there is no such requirement in the case of direct disposal of 11e.(2) byproduct material in NRC-licensed disposal facilities, nor for the direct disposal of low level and other radioactive wastes in direct disposal facilities; and

- f) Finally, it was concluded that under the Atomic Energy Act the licensee has the primary responsibility for licensed activities and, therefore, carries the primary burden to satisfy itself and NRC that appropriate rules and policies are satisfied by any proposal to process an alternate feed material.

For these reasons IUSA, with UDEQ's concurrence, has concluded that it is not necessary for IUSA to obtain a letter from the generating state's RCRA authority. As alluded to in paragraph e) above, such a requirement is currently not required for the direct disposal of 11e.(2) byproduct material in NRC approved and regulated 11e.(2) disposal facilities, nor in other low level waste disposal facilities. In the case of IUSA, UDEQ is satisfied that if the Listed Hazardous Waste Protocol is followed, then there has been adequate confirmation that the generator's determination that an alternate feed material is not and does not contain *listed* hazardous wastes has been properly made in accordance with RCRA.

If you have any questions relating to this letter or to our Listed Hazardous Waste Protocol, IUSA would be pleased to address them. If you believe that NRC guidance is required on this issue, IUSA would be pleased to provide input, and we certainly hope that the attached Protocol will be helpful in this regard. I can be reached at (303) 389-4130.

Sincerely,



David C. Frydenlund
Vice President and General Counsel

Attachment

cc: Michelle R. Rehmann
Ron F. Hochstein
William von Till/NR
William J. Sinclair/UDEQ
Don Verbica/UDEQ

ATTACHMENT 1



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
DIVISION OF SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Executive Director

Dennis R. Downs
Director

288 North 1460 West
P.O. Box 144880
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4880
(801) 538-6170
(801) 538-6715 Fax
(801) 536-4414 T.D.D.
www.deq.state.ut.us Web

December 7, 1999

M. Lindsay Ford
Parsons, Behle and Latimer
One Utah Center
201 South Main Street
Suite 1800
Post Office Box 45898
Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0898

RE: Protocol for Determining Whether Alternate Feed Materials are Listed Hazardous Wastes

Dear Mr. Ford:

On November 22, 1999, we received the final protocol to be used by International Uranium Corporation (IUSA) in determining whether alternate feed materials proposed for processing at the White Mesa Mill are listed hazardous wastes. We appreciate the effort that went into preparing this procedure and feel that it will be a useful guide for IUSA in its alternate feed determinations.

As was discussed, please be advised that it is IUSA's responsibility to ensure that the alternate feed materials used are not listed hazardous wastes and that the use of this protocol cannot be used as a defense if listed hazardous waste is somehow processed at the White Mesa Mill.

Thank you again for your corporation. If you have any questions, please contact Don Verbica at 538-6170.

Sincerely,

Dennis R. Downs, Executive Secretary
Utah Solid and Hazardous Waste Control Board

c: Bill Sinclair, Utah Division of Radiation Control



A PROFESSIONAL
LAW CORPORATION

One Utah Center
201 South Main Street
Suite 1800
Post Office Box 45898
Salt Lake City, Utah
84145-0898
Telephone 801 532-1234
Facsimile 801 536-6111

November 22, 1999

Don Verbica
Utah Division of Solid & Hazardous Waste
288 North 1460 West
Salt Lake City, Utah

**Re: Protocol for Determining Whether Alternate Feed Materials are
Listed Hazardous Wastes**

Dear Don:

I am pleased to present the final protocol to be used by International Uranium (USA) Corporation ("IUSA") in determining whether alternate feed materials proposed for processing at the White Mesa Mill are listed hazardous wastes. Also attached is a red-lined version of the protocol reflecting final changes made to the document based on our last discussion with you as well as some minor editorial changes from our final read-through of the document. We appreciate the thoughtful input of you and Scott Anderson in developing this protocol. We understand the Division concurs that materials determined not to be listed wastes pursuant to this protocol are not listed hazardous wastes.


We also recognize the protocol does not address the situation where, after a material has been determined not to be a listed hazardous waste under the protocol, new unrefutable information comes to light that indicates the material is a listed hazardous waste. Should such an eventuality arise, we understand an appropriate response, if any, would need to be worked out on a case-by-case basis.

Don Verbica
Utah Division of Solid & Hazardous Waste
November 22, 1999
Page Two

Thank you again for your cooperation on this matter. Please call me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,


Parsons Behle & Latimer

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lindsay Ford".

M. Lindsay Ford

cc: (with copy of final protocol only)
Dianne Nielson
Fred Nelson
Brent Bradford
Don Ostler
Loren Morton
Bill Sinclair
David Frydenlund
David Bird
Tony Thompson

Protocol for Determining if Alternate Feed Material is a Listed Hazardous Waste



PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES¹

NOVEMBER 16, 1999

1. SOURCE INVESTIGATION.

Perform a good faith investigation (a "Source Investigation" or "SI")² regarding whether any listed hazardous wastes³ are located at the site from which alternate feed material⁴ ("Material") originates (the "Site"). This investigation will be conducted in conformance with EPA guidance⁵ and the extent of information required will vary with the circumstances of each case. Following are examples of investigations that would be considered satisfactory under EPA guidance and this Protocol for some selected situations:

- Where the Material is or has been generated from a known process under the control of the generator: (a) an affidavit, certificate, profile record or similar document from the Generator or Site Manager, to that effect, together with (b) a Material Safety Data Sheet ("MSDS") for the Material, limited profile sampling, or a material composition determined by the generator/operator based on a process material balance.

¹ This Protocol reflects the procedures that will be followed by International Uranium (USA) Corporation ("IUSA") for determining whether alternate feed materials proposed for processing at the White Mesa Mill are (or contain) listed hazardous wastes. It is based on current Utah and EPA rules and EPA guidance under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 6901 et seq. This Protocol will be changed as necessary to reflect any pertinent changes to RCRA rules or EPA guidance.

² This investigation will be performed by IUSA, by the entity responsible for the site from which the Material originates (the "Generator"), or by a combination of the two.

³ Attachment 1 to this Protocol provides a summary of the different classifications of RCRA listed hazardous wastes.

⁴ Alternate feed materials that are primary or intermediate products of the generator of the material (e.g., "green" or "black" salts) are not RCRA "secondary materials" or "solid wastes," as defined in 40 CFR 261, and are not covered by this Protocol.

⁵ EPA guidance identifies the following sources of site- and waste-specific information that may, depending on the circumstances, be considered in such an investigation: hazardous waste manifests, vouchers, bills of lading, sales and inventory records, material safety data sheets, storage records, sampling and analysis reports, accident reports, site investigation reports, interviews with employees/former employees and former owners/operators, spill reports, inspection reports and logs, permits, and enforcement orders. See e.g., 61 Fed. Reg. 18805 (April 29, 1996).

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

- Where specific information exists about the generation process and management of the Material: (a) an affidavit, certificate, profile record or similar document from the Generator or Site Manager, to that effect, together with (b) an MSDS for the Material, limited profile sampling data or a preexisting investigation performed at the Site pursuant to CERCLA, RCRA or other state or federal environmental laws or programs.
- Where potentially listed processes are known to have been conducted at a Site, an investigation considering the following sources of information: site investigation reports prepared under CERCLA, RCRA or other state or federal environmental laws or programs (e.g., an RI/FS, ROD, RFI/CMS, hazardous waste inspection report); interviews with persons possessing knowledge about the Material and/or Site; and review of publicly available documents concerning process activities or the history of waste generation and management at the Site.
- If material from the same source is being or has been accepted for direct disposal as 11e.(2) byproduct material in an NRC-regulated facility in the State of Utah with the consent or acquiescence of the State of Utah, the Source Investigation performed by such facility.

Proceed to Step 2.

2. SPECIFIC INFORMATION OR AGREEMENT/DETERMINATION BY RCRA REGULATORY AUTHORITY THAT MATERIAL IS NOT A LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTE?

- a. Determine whether specific information from the Source Investigation exists about the generation and management of the Material to support a conclusion that the Material is not (and does not contain) any listed hazardous waste. For example, if specific information exists that the Material was not generated by a listed waste source and that the Material has not been mixed with any listed wastes, the Material would not be a listed hazardous waste.
- b. Alternatively, determine whether the appropriate state or federal authority with RCRA jurisdiction over the Site agrees in writing with the generator's determination that the Material is not a listed hazardous waste, has made a "contained-out" determination⁶ with respect to the Material or has concluded the Material or Site is not subject to RCRA.

⁶ EPA explains the "contained-out" (also referred to as "contained-in") principle as follows:

In practice, EPA has applied the contained-in principle to refer to a process where a site-specific determination is made that concentrations of hazardous constituents in any given (footnote continued on next page)

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

If yes to either question, proceed to Step 3.

If no to both questions, proceed to Step 6.

3. PROVIDE INFORMATION TO NRC AND UTAH.

a. If specific information exists to support a conclusion that the Material is not, and does not contain, any listed hazardous waste, IUSA will provide a description of the Source Investigation to NRC and/or the State of Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste (the "State"), together with an affidavit explaining why the Material is not a listed hazardous waste.

b. Alternatively, if the appropriate regulatory authority with RCRA jurisdiction over the Site agrees in writing with the generator's determination that the Material is not a listed hazardous waste, makes a contained-out determination or determines the Material or Site is not subject to RCRA, IUSA will provide documentation of the regulatory authority's determination to NRC and the State. IUSA may rely on such determination provided that the State agrees the conclusions of the regulatory authority were reasonable and made in good faith.

Proceed to Step 4.

4. DOES STATE OF UTAH AGREE THAT ALL PREVIOUS STEPS HAVE BEEN PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS PROTOCOL?

Determine whether the State agrees that this Protocol has been properly followed (including that proper decisions were made at each decision point). The State shall review the information provided by IUSA in Step 3 or 16 with reasonable speed and advise IUSA if it believes IUSA has not properly followed this Protocol in determining

(footnote continued from previous page)

volume of environmental media are low enough to determine that the media does not "contain" hazardous waste. Typically, these so-called "contained-in" [or "contained-out"] determinations do not mean that no hazardous constituents are present in environmental media but simply that the concentrations of hazardous constituents present do not warrant management of the media as hazardous waste. ...

EPA has not, to date, issued definitive guidance to establish the concentrations at which contained-in determinations may be made. As noted above, decisions that media do not or no longer contain hazardous waste are typically made on a case-by-case basis considering the risks posed by the contaminated media.

63 Fed. Reg. 28619, 28621-22 (May 26, 1998) (Phase IV LDR preamble).

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

that the Material is not listed hazardous waste, specifying the particular areas of deficiency.

If this Protocol has not been properly followed by IUSA in making its determination that the Material is not a listed hazardous waste, then IUSA shall redo its analysis in accordance with this Protocol and, if justified, resubmit the information described in Step 3 or 16 explaining why the Material is not a listed hazardous waste. The State shall notify IUSA with reasonable speed if the State still believes this Protocol has not been followed.

If yes, proceed to Step 5.

If no, proceed to Step 1.

5. MATERIAL IS NOT A LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTE.

The Material is not a listed hazardous waste and no further sampling or evaluation is necessary in the following circumstances:

- ◆ Where the Material is determined not to be a listed hazardous waste based on specific information about the generation/management of the Material OR the appropriate RCRA regulatory authority with jurisdiction over the Site agrees with the generator's determination that the Material is not a listed HW, makes a contained-out determination, or concludes the Material or Site is not subject to RCRA (and the State agrees the conclusions of the regulatory authority were reasonable and made in good faith) (Step 2); or
- ◆ Where the Material is determined not to be a listed hazardous waste (in Steps 6 through 11, 13 or 15) and Confirmation/Acceptance Sampling are determined not to be necessary (under Step 17).

6. IS MATERIAL A PROCESS WASTE KNOWN TO BE A LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTE OR TO BE MIXED WITH A LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTE?

Based on the Source Investigation, determine whether the Material is a process waste known to be a listed hazardous waste or to be mixed with a listed hazardous waste. If the Material is a process waste and is from a listed hazardous waste source, it is a listed hazardous waste. Similarly, if the Material is a process waste and has been mixed with a listed hazardous waste, it is a listed hazardous waste under the RCRA "mixture rule." If

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

the Material is an Environmental Medium,⁷ it cannot be a listed hazardous waste by direct listing or under the RCRA "mixture rule."⁸ If the Material is a process waste but is not known to be from a listed source or to be mixed with a listed waste, or if the Material is an Environmental Medium, proceed to Steps 7 through 11 to determine whether it is a listed hazardous waste.

If yes, proceed to Step 12.

If no, proceed to Step 7.

7. DOES MATERIAL CONTAIN ANY POTENTIALLY LISTED HAZARDOUS CONSTITUENTS?

Based on the Source Investigation (and, if applicable, Confirmation and Acceptance Sampling), determine whether the Material contains any hazardous constituents listed in the then most recent version of 40 CFR 261, Appendix VII (which identifies hazardous constituents for which F- and K-listed wastes were listed) or 40 CFR 261.33(e) or (f) (the P and U listed wastes) (collectively "Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents"). If the Material contains such constituents, a source evaluation is necessary (pursuant to Steps 8 through 11). If the Material does not contain any Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents, it is not a listed hazardous waste. The Material also is not a listed hazardous waste if, where applicable, Confirmation and Acceptance Sampling results do not reveal the presence of any "new" Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents (*i.e.*, constituents other than those that have already been identified by the Source Investigation (or previous Confirmation/Acceptance Sampling) and determined not to originate from a listed source).

If yes, proceed to Step 8.

If no, proceed to Step 16.

8. IDENTIFY POTENTIALLY LISTED WASTES.

Identify potentially listed hazardous wastes ("Potentially Listed Wastes") based on Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents detected in the Material, *i.e.*, wastes which are listed for any of the Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents detected in the Material, as

⁷ The term "Environmental Media" means soils, ground or surface water and sediments.

⁸ The "mixture rule" applies only to mixtures of listed hazardous wastes and other "solid wastes." See 40 CFR § 261.3(a)(2)(iv). The mixture rule does not apply to mixtures of listed wastes and Environmental Media, because Environmental Media are not "solid wastes" under RCRA. See 63 Fed. Reg. 28556, 28621 (May 26, 1998).

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

identified in the then most current version of 40 CFR 261 Appendix VII or 40 CFR 261.33(e) or (f).⁹ With respect to Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents identified through Confirmation and/or Acceptance Sampling, a source evaluation (pursuant to Steps 8 through 11) is necessary only for "new" Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents (*i.e.*, constituents other than those that have already been identified by the Source Investigation (or previous Confirmation/Acceptance Sampling) and determined not to originate from a listed source).

Proceed to Step 9.

9. **WERE ANY OF THE POTENTIALLY LISTED WASTES KNOWN TO BE GENERATED OR MANAGED AT SITE?**

Based on information from the Source Investigation, determine whether any of the Potentially Listed Wastes identified in Step 8 are known to have been generated or managed at the Site. This determination involves identifying whether any of the specific or non-specific sources identified in the K- or F-lists has ever been conducted or located at the Site, whether any waste from such processes has been managed at the Site, and whether any of the P- or U-listed commercial chemical products has ever been used, spilled or managed there. In particular, this determination should be based on the following EPA criteria:

Solvent Listings (F001-F005)

Under EPA guidance, "to determine if solvent constituents contaminating a waste are RCRA spent solvent F001-F005 wastes, the [site manager] must know if:

- ♦ The solvents are *spent* and *cannot be reused without reclamation or cleaning*.
- ♦ The solvents were *used exclusively for their solvent properties*.
- ♦ The solvents are *spent mixtures and blends that contained, before use, a total of 10 percent or more (by volume) of the solvents listed in F001, F002, F004, and F005*.

If the solvents contained in the [wastes] are RCRA listed wastes, the [wastes] are RCRA hazardous waste. When the [site manager] does not have guidance information on the use of the solvents and their characteristics before use, the [wastes] cannot be classified as containing a

⁹ For example, if the Material contains tetrachloroethylene, the following would be Potentially Listed Wastes: F001, F002, F024, K019, K020, K150, K151 or U210. See 40 CFR 261 App. VII.

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

listed spent solvent.”¹⁰ The person performing the Source Investigation will make a good faith effort to obtain information on any solvent use at the Site. If solvents were used at the Site, general industry standards for solvent use in effect at the time of use will be considered in determining whether those solvents contained 10 percent or more of the solvents listed in F001, F002, F004 or F005.

K-Listed Wastes and F-Listed Wastes Other Than F001-F005

Under EPA guidance, to determine whether K wastes and F wastes other than F001-F005 are RCRA listed wastes, the generator “must know the *generation process information* (about each waste contained in the RCRA waste) described in the listing. For example, for [wastes] to be identified as containing K001 wastes that are described as ‘bottom sediment sludge from the treatment of wastewaters from wood preserving processes that use creosote and/or pentachlorophenol,’ the [site manager] must know the manufacturing process that generated the wastes (treatment of wastewaters from wood preserving process), feedstocks used in the process (creosote and pentachlorophenol), and the process identification of the wastes (bottom sediment sludge).”¹¹

P- and U-Listed Wastes

EPA guidance provides that “P and U wastes cover only unused and unmixed commercial chemical products, particularly spilled or off-spec products. Not every waste containing a P or U chemical is a hazardous waste. To determine whether a [waste] contains a P or U waste, the [site manager] must have direct evidence of product use. In particular, the [site manager] should ascertain, if possible, whether the chemicals are:

- ◆ Discarded (as described in 40 CFR 261.2(a)(2)).
- ◆ Either off-spec commercial products or a commercially sold grade.
- ◆ Not used (soil contaminated with spilled unused wastes is a P or U waste).

¹⁰ Management of Investigation-Derived Wastes During Site Inspections, EPA/540/G-91/009, May 1991 (emphasis added).

¹¹ Management of Investigation-Derived Wastes During Site Inspections, EPA/540/G-91/009, May 1991 (emphasis added).

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

- ♦ The sole active ingredient in a formulation."¹²

If Potentially Listed Wastes were known to be generated or managed at the Site, further evaluation is necessary to determine whether these wastes were disposed of or commingled with the Material (Steps 10 and possibly 11). If Potentially Listed Wastes were not known to be generated or managed at the Site, then information concerning the source of Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents in the Material will be considered "unavailable or inconclusive" and, under EPA guidance,¹³ the Material will be assumed not to be a listed hazardous waste.

12 Management of Investigation-Derived Wastes During Site Inspections, EPA/540/G-91/009, May 1991.

13 EPA guidance consistently provides that, where information concerning the origin of a waste is unavailable or inconclusive, the waste may be assumed not to be a listed hazardous waste. See e.g., Memorandum from Timothy Fields (Acting Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste & Emergency Response) to RCRA/CERCLA Senior Policy Managers regarding "Management of Remediation Waste Under RCRA," dated October 14, 1998 ("Where a facility owner/operator makes a good faith effort to determine if a material is a listed hazardous waste but cannot make such a determination because documentation regarding a source of contamination, contaminant, or waste is *unavailable or inconclusive*, EPA has stated that one may assume the source, contaminant, or waste is not listed hazardous waste"); NCP Preamble, 55 Fed. Reg. 8758 (March 8, 1990) (Noting that "it is often necessary to know the origin of the waste to determine whether it is a listed waste and that, *if such documentation is lacking, the lead agency may assume it is not a listed waste*"); Preamble to proposed Hazardous Waste Identification Rule, 61 Fed. Reg. 18805 (April 29, 1996) ("Facility owner/operators should make a good faith effort to determine whether media were contaminated by hazardous wastes and ascertain the dates of placement. The Agency believes that by using available site- and waste-specific information ... facility owner/operators would typically be able to make these determinations. However, as discussed earlier in the preamble of today's proposal, *if information is not available or inconclusive, facility owner/operators may generally assume that the material contaminating the media were not hazardous wastes*"); Preamble to LDR Phase IV Rule, 63 Fed. Reg. 28619 (May 26, 1998) ("As discussed in the April 29, 1996 proposal, the Agency continues to believe that, *if information is not available or inconclusive, it is generally reasonable to assume that contaminated soils do not contain untreated hazardous wastes* ..."); and Memorandum from John H. Skinner (Director, EPA Office of Solid Waste) to David Wagoner (Director, EPA Air and Waste Management Division, Region VII) regarding "Soils from Missouri Dioxin Sites," dated January 6, 1984 ("The analyses indicate the presence of a number of toxic compounds in many of the soil samples taken from various sites. However, the presence of these toxicants in the soil does not automatically make the soil a RCRA hazardous waste. The origin of the toxicants must be known in order to determine that they are derived from a listed hazardous waste(s). *If the exact origin of the toxicants is not known, the soils cannot be* (footnote continued on next page)

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

If yes, proceed to Step 10.

If no, proceed to Step 16.

10. WERE LISTED WASTES KNOWN TO BE DISPOSED OF OR COMMINGLED WITH MATERIAL?

If listed wastes identified in Step 9 were known to be generated at the Site, determine whether they were known to be disposed of or commingled with the Material?

If yes, proceed to Step 12.

If no, proceed to Step 11.

11. ARE THERE ONE OR MORE POTENTIAL NON-LISTED SOURCES OF LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTE CONSTITUENTS?

In a situation where Potentially Listed Wastes were known to have been generated/managed at the Site, but the wastes were not known to have been disposed of or commingled with the Material, determine whether there are potential non-listed sources of Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents in the Material. If not, unless the State agrees otherwise, the constituents will be assumed to be from listed sources (proceed to Step 12). If so, the Material will be assumed not to be a listed hazardous waste (proceed to Step 16). Notwithstanding the existence of potential non-listed sources at a Site, the Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents in the Material will be considered to be from the listed source(s) if, based on the relative proximity of the Material to the listed and non-listed source(s) and/or information concerning waste management at the Site, the evidence is compelling that the listed source(s) is the source of Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents in the Material.

If yes, proceed to Step 16.

If no, proceed to Step 12.

12. MATERIAL IS A LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTE.

The Material is a listed hazardous waste under the following circumstances:

(footnote continued from previous page)

considered RCRA hazardous wastes unless they exhibit one or more of the characteristics of hazardous waste ...").

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

- ♦ If the Material is a process waste and is known to be a listed hazardous waste or to be mixed with a listed hazardous waste (Step 6),
- ♦ If Potentially Listed Wastes were known to be generated/managed at the Site and to be disposed of/commingled with the Material (Step 10) (subject to a "contained-out" determination in Step 13), or
- ♦ If Potentially Listed Wastes were known to be generated/managed at the Site, were not known to be disposed of/commingled with the Material but there are not any potential non-listed sources of the Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents detected in the Material (Step 11) (subject to a "contained-out" determination in Step 13).

Proceed to Step 13.

13. HAS STATE OF UTAH MADE A CONTAINED-OUT DETERMINATION.

If the Material is an Environmental Medium, and:

- the level of any listed waste constituents in the Material is "de minimis"; or
- all of the listed waste constituents or classes thereof are already present in the White Mesa Mill's tailings ponds as a result of processing conventional ores or other alternate feed materials in concentrations at least as high as found in the Materials

the State of Utah will consider whether it is appropriate to make a contained-out determination with respect to the Material.

If the State makes a contained-out determination, proceed to Step 16.

If the State does not make a contained-out determination, proceed to Step 14.

14. IS IT POSSIBLE TO SEGREGATE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES FROM OTHER MATERIALS?

Determine whether there is a reasonable way to segregate material that is a listed hazardous waste from alternate feed materials that are not listed hazardous wastes that will be sent to IUSA's White Mesa Mill. For example, it may be possible to isolate material from a certain area of a remediation site and exclude that material from Materials that will be sent to the White Mesa Mill. Alternatively, it may be possible to increase

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

sampling frequency and exclude materials with respect to which the increased sampling identifies constituents which have been attributed to listed hazardous waste.

If yes, proceed to Step 15.

If no, proceed to Step 12.

15. SEPARATE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES FROM MATERIALS.

Based on the method of segregation determined under Step 14, materials that are listed hazardous wastes are separated from Materials that will be sent to the White Mesa Mill.

For materials that are listed hazardous wastes, proceed to Step 12.

For Materials to be sent to the White Mesa Mill, proceed to Step 16.

16. PROVIDE INFORMATION TO NRC AND UTAH.

If the Material does not contain any Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents (as determined in Step 7), where information concerning the source of Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents in the Material is "unavailable or inconclusive" (as determined in Steps 8 through 11), or where the State of Utah has made a contained-out determination with respect to the Material (Step 13), the Material will be assumed not to be (or contain) a listed hazardous waste. In such circumstances, IUSA will submit the following documentation to NRC and the State:

- ◆ A description of the Source Investigation;
- ◆ An explanation of why the Material is not a listed hazardous waste.
- ◆ Where applicable, an explanation of why Confirmation/Acceptance Sampling has been determined not to be necessary in Step 17.
- ◆ If Confirmation/Acceptance Sampling has been determined necessary in Step 17, a copy of IUSA's and the Generator's Sampling and Analysis Plans.
- ◆ A copy of Confirmation and Acceptance Sampling results, if applicable. IUSA will submit these results only if they identify the presence of "new" Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents (as defined in Steps 7 and 8).

Proceed to Step 17.

17. ARE SAMPLING RESULTS OR DATA REPRESENTATIVE?

Determine whether the sampling results or data from the Source Investigation (or, where applicable, Confirmation/Acceptance Sampling results) are representative. The purpose of this step) is to determine whether Confirmation and Acceptance Sampling (or

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

continued Confirmation and Acceptance Sampling) are necessary. If the sampling results or data are representative of all Material destined for the White Mesa Mill, based on the extent of sampling conducted, the nature of the Material and/or the nature of the Site (e.g., whether chemical operations or waste disposal were known to be conducted at the Site), future Confirmation/Acceptance Sampling will not be necessary. If the sampling results are not representative of all Material destined for the White Mesa Mill, then additional Confirmation/Acceptance sampling may be appropriate. Confirmation and Acceptance Sampling will be required only where it is reasonable to expect that additional sampling will detect additional contaminants not already detected. For example:

- Where the Material is segregated from Environmental Media, e.g., the Material is containerized, there is a high probability the sampling results or data from the Source Investigation are representative of the Material and Confirmation/Acceptance Sampling would not be required.
- Where IUSA will be accepting Material from a discrete portion of a Site, e.g., a storage pile or other defined area, and adequate sampling characterized the area of concern for radioactive and chemical contaminants, the sampling for that area would be considered representative and Confirmation/Acceptance sampling would not be required.
- Where Material will be received from a wide area of a Site and the Site has been carefully characterized for radioactive contaminants, but not chemical contaminants, Confirmation/Acceptance sampling would be required.
- Where the Site was not used for industrial activity or disposal before or after uranium material disposal, and the Site has been adequately characterized for radioactive and chemical contaminants, the existing sampling would be considered sufficient and Confirmation/Acceptance sampling would not be required.
- Where listed wastes were known to be disposed of on the Site and the limits of the area where listed wastes were managed is not known, Confirmation/Acceptance sampling would be required to ensure that listed wastes are not shipped to IUSA (see Step 14).

If yes, proceed to Step 4.

If no, proceed to Step 18.

18. DOES STATE OF UTAH AGREE THAT ALL PREVIOUS STEPS HAVE BEEN PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS PROTOCOL?

Determine whether the State agrees that this Protocol has been properly followed (including that proper decisions were made at each decision point). The State shall

PROTOCOL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER ALTERNATE FEED MATERIALS ARE LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTES

review the information provided by IUSA in Step 16 with reasonable speed and advise IUSA if it believes IUSA has not properly followed this Protocol in determining that the Material is not listed hazardous waste, specifying the particular areas of deficiency.

If this Protocol has not been properly followed by IUSA in making its determination that the Material is not a listed hazardous waste, then IUSA shall redo its analysis in accordance with this Protocol and, if justified, resubmit the information described in Step 16 explaining why the Material is not a listed hazardous waste. The State shall notify IUSA with reasonable speed if the State still believes this Protocol has not been followed.

If yes, proceed to Step 19.

If no, proceed to Step 1.

**19. MATERIAL IS NOT A LISTED HAZARDOUS WASTE, BUT
CONFIRMATION AND ACCEPTANCE SAMPLING ARE REQUIRED.**

The Material is not a listed hazardous waste, but Confirmation and Acceptance Sampling are required, as determined necessary under Step 17.

Proceed to Step 20.

**20. CONDUCT ONGOING CONFIRMATION AND ACCEPTANCE
SAMPLING.**

Confirmation and Acceptance Sampling will continue until determined no longer necessary under Step 17. Such sampling will be conducted pursuant to a Sampling and Analysis Plan ("SAP") that specifies the frequency and type of sampling required. If such sampling does not reveal any "new" Potentially Listed Hazardous Constituents (as defined in Steps 7 and 8), further evaluation is not necessary (as indicated in Step 7). If such sampling reveals the presence of "new" constituents, Potentially Listed Wastes must be identified (Step 8) and evaluated (Steps 9 through 11) to determine whether the new constituent is from a listed hazardous waste source. Generally, in each case, the SAP will specify sampling comparable to the level and frequency of sampling performed by other facilities in the State of Utah that dispose of 11e.(2) byproduct material, either directly or that results from processing alternate feed materials.

Proceed to Step 7.

Attachment 1

Summary of RCRA Listed Hazardous Wastes

There are three different categories of listed hazardous waste under RCRA:

- *F-listed wastes from non-specific sources (40 CFR § 261.31(a))*: These wastes include spent solvents (F001-F005), specified wastes from electroplating operations (F006-F009), specified wastes from metal heat treating operations (F010-F012), specified wastes from chemical conversion coating of aluminum (F019), wastes from the production/manufacturing of specified chlorophenols, chlorobenzenes, and chlorinated aliphatic hydrocarbons (F019-F028), specified wastes from wood preserving processes (F032-F035), specified wastes from petroleum refinery primary and secondary oil/water/solids separation sludge (F037-F038), and leachate resulting from the disposal of more than one listed hazardous waste (F039).
- *K-listed wastes from specific sources (40 CFR § 261.32)*: These include specified wastes from wood preservation, inorganic pigment production, organic chemical production, chlorine production, pesticide production, petroleum refining, iron and steel production, copper production, primary and secondary lead smelting, primary zinc production, primary aluminum reduction, ferroalloy production, veterinary pharmaceutical production, ink formulation and coking.
- *P- and U-listed commercial chemical products (40 CFR § 261.33)*: These include commercial chemical products, or manufacturing chemical intermediates having the generic name listed in the "P" or "U" list of wastes, container residues, and residues in soil or debris resulting from a spill of these materials.¹ "The phrase 'commercial chemical product or manufacturing chemical intermediate ...' refers to a chemical substance which is manufactured or formulated for commercial or manufacturing use which consists of the commercially pure grade of the chemical, any technical grades of the chemical that are produced or marketed, and all formulations in which the chemical is the sole active ingredient. It does not refer to a material, such as a manufacturing process waste, that contains any of the [P- or U-listed substances]."²

Appendix VII to 40 CFR part 261 identifies the hazardous constituents for which the F- and K-listed wastes were listed.

¹ P-listed wastes are identified as "acutely hazardous wastes" and are subject to additional management controls under RCRA. 40 CFR § 261.33(e) (1997). U-listed wastes are identified as "toxic wastes." *Id.* § 261.33(f).

² 40 CFR § 261.33(d) note (1997).