

530D85005

5050

DRAFT GUIDANCE FOR  
FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING

RECEIVED  
JAN 10 1985

July V

Office of Solid Waste  
Office of Waste Programs Enforcement

July, 1985

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region V, Library  
230 South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

DRAFT

## I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF PROCESS

The Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 have a tremendous impact on the RCRA permitting and enforcement programs. More than ever before, enforcement and permitting authorities overlap. In addition, a major side effect of the Amendments is that EPA and the States are now partners in every permitting action and many enforcement actions, even in authorized States. Facility management planning has been developed by the Office of Solid Waste and the Office of Waste Programs Enforcement to facilitate the close cooperation among State and Regional permitting and enforcement staffs that will be crucial for implementation of the Amendments.

The facility management planning process is outlined in the Draft Revised National Permits Strategy (NPS) and the FY 1985 and FY 1986 RCRA Implementation Plans (RIP). As stated in the FY 1986 RIP, this approach requires upfront planning between those responsible for permitting and those responsible for enforcement (both at EPA and in the States) in order to develop facility specific plans leading to compliance with the RCRA requirements.

As described in the revised NPS and the RIPs, facility management planning is a three step process: initial screening, preparation of individual facility plans, and development of multi-year strategies. Individual facility plans will be prepared for all environmentally significant facilities according to schedules described in the RIPs. The plans are flexible, working documents which should be revised as necessary to reflect changing situations.

Development of a plan for a typical facility should require no more than two to four workdays per facility by staff representing Regional and State permitting, enforcement, and other appropriate offices (such as Offices of Regional Counsel or State Attorney General), working jointly to complete the analysis.

### Initial Screening

The initial screening will be conducted to identify facilities for which FMPs must be developed (i.e., environmentally significant facilities). Section II of this guidance, "Initial Screening", elaborates on the criteria to be used to determine whether or not a facility is environmentally significant.

Some facilities do not require facility management plans because it is unlikely that coordination between enforcement and permitting will be necessary. For example, there are

**DRAFT**

facilities that are high priority for permit processing and have only a small likelihood of an enforcement component. These include applications for research, development, and demonstration permits; and applications for new facilities. In addition, some facilities, such as those not seeking or subject to permits, may be dealt with by enforcement without facility management planning.

Facilities that do not require FMPs will be included in the multi-year strategy.

### Facility Management Plans

The second step in the process consists of three parts. First, the individual facility analysis outlines the current regulatory status of the facility and summarizes available information. In addition, the analysis will identify information that is not available but must be obtained or developed. The second part of the planning process is the consideration of prospective solutions to the problems identified in the analysis and of the variety of tools available to EPA and the States to implement the selected options. The final part is the development of an individual plan summary which gives a timetable for key elements of the plan and identifies the lead office for each action.

Section III of this guidance includes a questionnaire which is designed to aid review of the relevant information about a facility. There are also worksheets for evaluating the options available for each facility and a sample format for the plan summary.

### Development of the Multi-Year Strategy

The third step in the facility management planning process is the development of a multi-year Facility Management Strategy. The strategy is a State-by-State summary of projected permitting and enforcement outputs over the next year, incorporating the results of the individual facility plans as well as planned actions for those facilities for which facility management plans were not required.

Strategy development is an iterative process. After the FMPs and other planned solutions are combined into a Strategy certain adjustments will need to be made to accommodate resource and time constraints. The Region and the State will need to make choices among the various options to ensure that the final Strategy can be implemented with available and anticipated resources. When choosing between options, the planning team should take into account relevant guidance, policies, and

**DRAFT**

statutory requirements.

As in the case of the individual facility plan, the Strategies are flexible documents which can and should be revised as necessary to reflect new information, changing priorities, completion of intermediate solutions on which later solutions depend, and individual facility solutions.

#### Relationship of Facility Management Planning to SPMS

The Facility Management Strategy will provide a basis for determining yearly Regional and State commitments for the Strategic Planning and Management System (SPMS). This will be addressed in each year's SPMS commitments and reports. See the revised FY 1985 RIP and the recently issued FY 1986 RIP for priorities for developing FMS and for a complete description of SPMS measures.

#### Use of this Guidance

This guidance is intended to provide assistance to the Regions and the States in implementing the facility management planning process. It offers several sample formats and describes the breadth of scope and depth of coverage which is expected in the facility management process. It should be considered a foundation upon which individual Regions and States may build in addressing their individual facility management planning needs. None of the charts or forms is mandatory. They are offered as examples only, and may be modified as appropriate.

**DRAFT**

## II. INITIAL SCREENING

The purpose of the initial screening is to identify those facilities which are environmentally significant and, therefore, require Facility Management Plans (FMPs). The determination of "environmental significance" rests with the Region and State personnel who are most familiar with the particular facility. However, certain criteria should be applied to provide a nationally consistent definition of environmental significance.

In some instances it is readily obvious, even with incomplete information, that a facility is environmentally significant. However, a conclusion that a facility is not environmentally significant cannot be reached without a reasonably complete picture of the facility. Attachment A is a list of possible sources of information on a facility. These sources can be used to support the initial screening and analysis stages.

As previously stated, the criteria for determining environment significance are the ones listed in the National Permit Strategy. The factors listed below the criteria are offered to assist the reviewers in applying the general criteria to specific facility situations.

Each treatment, storage and disposal facility should be evaluated. The criteria listed below provide a guide. The relative weights of these factors may vary from case to case, subject to the discretion of Regional and State facility planners. Priority considerations are designated by an asterisk (\*). In some instances, a single factor (such as violation of ground-water monitoring requirements (interim status, permit application or permit or actual contamination of ground water) may be sufficient, regardless of the applicability of other factors, to require a FMP for the facility. In these instances, which are expected to predominate at land disposal facilities (landfills, land treatment, surface impoundments for treatment, storage or disposal, waste piles and underground injection wells) the screen should be conducted very quickly, and perhaps by only one member of the planning team. In other cases, while a single criterion may not trigger additional analysis, the presence of several factors may warrant the preparation of a FMP.

- ° Facility is a recipient of wastes from a CERCLA site
- ° Facility may pose a potential public health or environment threat from releases.
- \*- The facility was evaluated as a potential CERCLA site and the evaluation showed evidence of:
  - environmental damage
  - ground-water contamination
  - close proximity to population or drinking water source

# DRAFT

- \*- The facility is or was the subject of a Federal or State CERCLA action
- ° Facility violated environmental standards or disregarded RCRA regulations as evidenced by designation as a Significant noncomplier or High Priority Violator for enforcement action.
  - \*- The facility has failed to properly evaluate facility hydrogeology, to properly install wells or properly monitor.
  - \*- The facility is a significant noncomplier
    - The facility has been known to violate other environmental laws as evidenced by releases to air or surface water.
  - The facility has not closed units properly, has not fully completed post-closure permitting properly, or has closed in accordance with regulations but substantial contamination remains.
- ° Facility is suspected or potential source of ground-water or surface-water contamination (e.g., ground-water quality assessment has identified presence of hazardous waste constituents) or other contamination by prior or continuing releases of hazardous wastes.
  - \*- the facility is known to be contaminating the ground water as evidenced by:
    - initiation of assessment or compliance monitoring
    - physical evidence of contamination.
  - \*- The facility has known or suspected solid waste management units.
    - The facility may have released hazardous constituents into the ground water, surface water, or air, as evidenced by the likelihood of or reports of spills, odors, odd-tasting water, or other unusual occurrence at or near the facility.
- ° Facility poses significant environmental or health risk, determined on the basis of:
  - proximity to population centers and/or aquifers and surface waters,
  - facility size,
  - amount, nature, and complexity of waste handled, and

**DRAFT**

- age of facility.
- ° Degree of public concern about the facility:
  - congressional inquiries
  - organized local citizens groups,
  - high volume of public mail, or
  - local public official concern.
- ° Anticipated financial insolvency or inability to properly close and conduct post-closure monitoring and maintenance.
- \*- The facility has declared financial insolvency as evidenced through:
  - application of modeling against financial test data, and
  - information from institution providing financial assurance.



**DRAFT**

### III. DEVELOPING THE PLAN

#### Part 1 - Evaluating the Facility

The purpose of this part of the planning process is to review the environmental and regulatory status of the facility. The questionnaire format on the following pages is designed to assist the reviewers in systematically addressing all relevant information about the particular facility. The questions center on those areas of concern that will most likely require coordination between Regional and State enforcement and permitting staffs:

- ground-water monitoring at regulated units
- prior and continuing releases from solid waste management units
- the adequacy of a facility's Part B application and/or closure plan, and
- requirements of the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984.

When completing the questionnaire, it is suggested that the reviewers note any additional information which is not specifically covered by the questions and highlight any missing information which is necessary to evaluate the facility. The major problems and missing information will form the basis of the analysis conducted under Part 2.

FACILITY ANALYSIS

DRAFT

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Facility Name \_\_\_\_\_

EPA I.D No: \_\_\_\_\_

Facility Address \_\_\_\_\_

Facility Contact \_\_\_\_\_

Facility Status:	Interim status	Y	N	
	Permitted	Y	N	
	Receiving Waste	Y	Some Units	N
	Closed	Y	Some Units	N
	Commercial	Y	N	
	CERCLA waste	Y	N	
	New unit(s) proposed	Y	N	

FACILITY DESCRIPTION

Process Description (e.g., chemicals produced, production processes) and general description of waste management processes

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

CHRONOLOGY (optional)

Attach chronology or narrative summarizing significant events and information related to the facility that may be used for multiple purposes, including informing other FMP team members of relevant facts.

\*\*\*\*\* UNIT DESCRIPTION \*\*\*\*\*

UNIT IDENTIFIER CODE (keyed to site map)	TYPE OF UNIT	Received waste after:		WASTE TYPE(S)	STATUS*
		11/19/80 Y or N	7/26/82 Y or N		

---

EXAMPLE:

A	landfill	Y	Y	F006	active
B	SWMU	N	N	unknown	closed

---

\*e.g., active, inactive, closed, under construction

**SECRET**

1. Does the facility have regulated units subject to interim status ground-water monitoring (surface impoundments, landfills, or land treatment units)?

- 
- 
- 

a. Reviewed and adequate \_\_\_\_\_  
b. Reviewed and not adequate \_\_\_\_\_  
c. Not reviewed \_\_\_\_\_  
d. Adequacy under dispute \_\_\_\_\_

3. Has the owner/operator performed a detailed site-specific study of the hydrogeology beneath the site including:

- COMMENTS:**

4. Has the hydrogeologic study yielded enough information to make reasoned decisions regarding well placement and depth?

- COMMENTS:

\* Use coding system established on previous page on "Unit Description" chart

DRAFT

5. Does the study provide good hydrogeologic information about areas underlying solid waste management units as well as areas underlying regulated units?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ COMMENTS:

6. Has the owner/operator installed a sufficient number of downgradient wells at adequate locations and depths to immediately detect the migration of hazardous waste from regulated units into the uppermost aquifer (defined as the first saturated hydrogeologic formation that could serve as a potential pathway for contaminant flow)?

\_\_\_ a. Yes at all units  
\_\_\_ b. Yes for some units (list exceptions by code)  
\_\_\_ c. No  
\_\_\_ d. Don't Know

7. Has the owner/operator installed a sufficient number of background wells at adequate locations and depths to characterize the spatial and temporal variation of ground water unaffected by the facility?

a. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b. No \_\_\_\_\_ c. Don't Know \_\_\_\_\_

8. Has the owner/operator established and maintained a ground-water sampling protocol that yields representative samples and maintains the integrity of the sample in light of the chemical parameters to be analyzed (e.g., does the equipment minimize de-gassing)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

9. Has the owner/operator detected leakage from any regulated unit(s)?

a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (list units)  
b) No \_\_\_\_\_  
c) Detected leakage, source unclear \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

10. If not, is the owner/operator's monitoring system technically adequate to detect leakage should it occur?

NOTE: When evaluating adequacy, consider not only inadequacies that would constitute violations of the regulations (e.g. insufficient number of wells), but any problem at the site that may be compromising the ability of the system to detect leakage (e.g., inability of four indicator parameters to detect level and type of contamination suspected at site).

Yes for all units \_\_\_\_\_ Yes for some units \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

11. Do the inadequacies identified in question 10 represent violations of the Part 265 ground-water monitoring regulations? Explain.

12. If leakage has been detected, has the owner/operator assessed the plume(s) for hazardous waste constituents (Appendix VII) using appropriate techniques (at a minimum direct sampling downgradient from the point of leakage)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ Incomplete assessment \_\_\_\_\_ Complete assessment \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

13. Has the owner/operator characterized any plume(s) with respect to all Appendix VIII constituents as required by §270.14(c)(4)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ Incomplete characterization \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

DR-1

14. The owner/operator's permit application includes plans for which of the following Part 264 ground-water monitoring/cleanup program(s)?

- a. Detection monitoring \$270.14(c)(6) \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Compliance monitoring \$270.14(c)(7) \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Corrective action \$270.14(c)(8) \_\_\_\_\_
- d. None of the above \_\_\_\_\_

15. Does the owner/operator's permit application include proposals for any Alternate Concentration Limits (ACLs)?

- a. Yes, all proposals deemed adequate \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Yes, some proposals deemed inadequate \_\_\_\_\_ List:
- c. Yes, all proposals deemed inadequate \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Review not complete \_\_\_\_\_
- e. No \_\_\_\_\_

16. Given the compliance status of the facility's interim status monitoring system and the validity or non-validity of any ACL proposals, has the owner/operator submitted plans for the appropriate Part 264 ground-water program?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Yes
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. No - inadequate Part 265 monitoring may be masking leakage; detection monitoring may not be appropriate program.
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. No - ACL demonstrations inadequate, should have submitted corrective action program
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. No for other reasons (explain)
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Not sure

17. If the answer to 16 is "yes," is the ground-water program that is proposed adequate?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ Partially adequate \_\_\_\_\_ totally inadequate \_\_\_\_\_

Explain deficiencies:

- 104-
18. Identify what actions, if any, EPA or the State has taken to bring the facility into compliance with Part 265 and 270 ground-water monitoring requirements (e.g., NODs, §3008(a) order, etc.)?
19. Identify what actions, if any, EPA or the State has taken regarding releases from regulated units (describe by unit).

#### PRIOR OR CONTINUING RELEASES FROM SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT UNITS

The purpose of the following questions is to determine whether or not there have been or may have been prior or continuing releases of hazardous waste or hazardous constituents from solid waste management units which would require corrective action under Sections 3004(u) or 3008(h) of RCRA as amended by HWSA.

The purpose of the analysis is to determine:

- a) Do such units exist?
- b) Have there been prior or continuing releases of hazardous waste or constituents from such units?
- c) Are releases presenting potential environmental threat that would warrant corrective action?
- d) If the above questions cannot be answered, what additional data, information or investigation is needed to yield clear yes or no answers?



The following sources of information should be consulted before answering questions regarding prior and continuing releases from solid waste management units:

1. Any response to the Solid Waste Management Questionnaire sent to facilities
2. CERCLA §103(c) Notification information
3. CERCLA or RCRA PA/SI information
4. Part A and Part B permit applications
5. Previous inspection reports

(Look especially for: evidence of past waste disposal practices not currently regulated under RCRA such as pile of waste or rubbish, ponds or surface impoundments that might contain waste, active or inactive landfills; evidence of discolored soils or dead vegetation that might be caused by a spill, discharge or disposal of hazardous wastes or constituents; any reference to tanks that are used for waste storage which are located below grade and could possibly leak without being noticed by visual observation.)

1. Are there solid waste management units (SWMUs) at the facility?

- a. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- b. No evidence of units \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Maybe \_\_\_\_\_

2. If the answer to question 1 is "maybe," provide the information that prompts suspicion that there may be SWMUs?

3. Is there any reason to doubt the information which the applicant has submitted on the questionnaire re: the existence of Solid Waste Management Units and the possibility of continuing or prior releases of hazardous wastes or constituents?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Areas of doubt:

DRA

4. If the answer to question 1 is "yes", describe what is known about each SWMU in terms of the wastes present and when the wastes were placed in the unit(s). (State whether a PA and/or SI has been undertaken and when. Reference reports on each where applicable).
5. If there is a ground-water monitoring network installed at the facility (to monitor regulated units), to what extent is the network capable of monitoring releases from each SWMU?

SWMU

CAPABILITY

6. Are the parameters being monitored adequate to detect contamination from each SWMU?
- ☐ a. Yes
  - ☐ b. Yes some units (list units)
  - ☐ c. Don't know enough about wastes
  - ☐ d. No
7. Is the sampling and analysis methodology adequate to detect contamination from each SWMU?
- ☐ a. Yes
  - ☐ b. Yes some units (list units)
  - ☐ c. Don't know enough about wastes
  - ☐ d. No
8. Are there other environmental monitoring systems at the facility (air, surface water, soil, leak detection systems)?
- ☐ a. Yes -----> Describe:
  - ☐ b. No
  - ☐ c. Don't Know

9. Are the existing monitoring systems considered capable of detecting releases from the SWMUs?

- ☐ a. Yes
- ☐ b. Yes some units (list)
- ☐ c. No
- ☐ d. Don't know

10. For those SWMUs known to be present, available information indicates:

LIST BY UNIT COD

- a. Releases of hazardous waste or constituents have occurred \_\_\_\_\_
- b. There is evidence that releases may have occurred \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Releases of hazardous waste or constituents have not occurred \_\_\_\_\_
- d. There is insufficient information to determine whether releases of hazardous waste or hazardous constituents have occurred. \_\_\_\_\_

11. Summarize any release in terms of the extent of release, the media involved (ground water, surface water, soil, air) the constituents of the release, the unit(s) involved, and any other pertinent information.

12. Describe what additional information or testing is needed to determine if the releases suspected in question 10 have indeed occurred (answer may refer to PA and/or SI and/or RI, etc.).

14. Describe the potential threats that facility poses to health or the environment. Describe information needed to assess the significance of these threats.

#### CERCLA/RCRA INTERFACE

1. After reviewing the CERCLA Notification form, the RCRA Part A and Part B applications it appears that:
- ☐ a. The RCRA units and CERCLA units are one and the same
  - ☐ b. The RCRA units and CERCLA units are clearly different units
  - ☐ c. There is overlap between the RCRA and CERCLA units some are the same and some are different
  - ☐ d. Not applicable
2. Is this facility included on the CERCLA National Priorities List?      Y      N
3. Has a CERCLA PA/SI been completed for this site      Y      N

If yes, summarize briefly the findings focusing on environmental contamination, environmental threats and wastes found:

PERMIT AND CLOSURE STATUS, ISSUES AND ACTIONS NEEDED

The purpose of the following questions is to identify the degree to which the applicant's stage in the permit process will affect the type of actions necessary at the facility

1. Key Dates (Future dates may be noted as expected)

- PART B:
- a) Date Part B called \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) Date Part B received \_\_\_\_\_
  - c) Date First NOD sent \_\_\_\_\_
  - d) Date first revised Part B received \_\_\_\_\_
  - e) Date 2nd NOD sent \_\_\_\_\_
  - f) Date of Enforcement Actions for Deficient Part B \_\_\_\_\_
  - g) Date 2nd Revised Part B received \_\_\_\_\_
  - \* h) \_\_\_\_\_
  - \* i) \_\_\_\_\_
  - \* j) \_\_\_\_\_
- CLOSURE:
- a) Date closure plan submitted (by unit) \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) Date comments sent to o/o (by unit) \_\_\_\_\_
  - c) Date revised closure plan submitted (by unit) \_\_\_\_\_
  - d) Date closure plan approved (by unit) \_\_\_\_\_
  - \* e) \_\_\_\_\_
  - \* f) \_\_\_\_\_
- PC PERMIT
- a) Date post-closure permit called \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) Date post-closure permit received \_\_\_\_\_
  - \*c) \_\_\_\_\_
  - \*d) \_\_\_\_\_

\* Fill in further processing/enforcement actions that have taken place

2. Summarize the principal Part B deficiencies or issues that remain unresolved:

3. Summarize the principal closure/post-closure deficiencies/issues that remain unresolved (by unit).

4. Is the facility targeted by the National Permit strategy as a high priority for final permit determination (FY86 priorities include existing commercial incinerators; expansion of facilities to provide alternate treatment or incineration capacity; and research, development, and demonstration permits)

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

5. Is the facility targeted for expanded public participation?

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

6. In light of outstanding permit deficiencies, the presence or absence of solid waste management units with prior or continuing releases, and the priority given this facility in the National Permit strategy, issuance of a permit to this facility (operating or post-closure) is likely to take from     /    /    :  
date

Time	Mo/Yr
a. 0-6 months	_____
b. 6-12 months	_____
c. 12-18 months	_____
d. 18-24 months	_____
e. more than 24 months	_____

7. After referring to the attached chart, summarize the Hazardous and Solid Waste Act Amendments that apply to this facility (note especially the requirements related to: 1) retrofitting surface impoundments by 1988; 2) exposure assessments for landfills and surface impoundments; Corrective action and financial assurance for prior releases.

This provision is not applicable  
to these types of facilities

FACILITY NAME:

**EPA ID #**

- The liners + leachate collection system or demonstration of equivalent protection (\$202)
- Removal of two liners and leachate collection requirement (\$202)
- Retrofit with two liners and leachate collection and CSM within 4 years (\$215)
- Corrective action + financial assurance for prior releases (\$206)
- Submission of Part B within set time or loss of Interim status (\$215)
- Elimination of ground water monitoring well for double-lined and inspectable waste piles (\$203)
- Application of current 264 standards for new wastepiles (\$242)
- Exposure information and health assessments (\$247)
- Waste minimization certificate (for waste facilities only) (\$242(c))
- Part 264 Subpart F requirements (\$242(c))
- Mandatory review of permit after 3 years (\$212)
- Ban on disposal of bulk liquids (\$201)

## TYPES OF UNITS

## LANDFILLS:

[illegible]

### **SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS\*:**

[illegible]

<sup>1</sup> Hearings and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (section numbers for significant provisions are provided in the headings)  
\* includes storage surface improvements



### INFORMATION GAPS

List those pieces of information that were identified as missing from State or EPA files and which are needed to address permitting and enforcement issues at the facility. Describe why it is needed.

## Part 2 - Considering the Solutions to Address the Problems

The purposes of this section are: (a) to provide a means to evaluate the possible solutions to the specific problems raised by the answers under Part 1 and (b) to identify the short-term (FY 1985-1986) and long-term (FY 1987-1992) objectives for the facility.

The chart on the following page is offered as a possible mechanism to use in considering the solutions to the problems. The problems identified in Part 1 would be listed in the first column, grouping them by subject matter. In the second column, the reviewers would list the solutions to the problems. The solutions should be consistent with the SPMS measures. In the third column, the tools available to EPA and/or the State to accomplish these solutions would be listed. Attachment B provides a selection of tools available to EPA which may be used to resolve several of the problems found at facilities. Attachment C is an inventory of federal tools.

The last column is intended to provide a condensed assessment of the pros and cons or related concerns associated with the various tools as they pertain to the particular facility. Issues such as timeliness of the action, resources, and "standard of proof" required for an enforcement action may all be addressed in this section. The discussion under "Comments" should take into account appropriate permit and enforcement guidance issued by EPA Headquarters.

The spaces for short-term and long-term objectives are provided to summarize the expectations for the particular facility. These objectives provide the basis for developing SPMS commitments.

It is suggested that, after consideration of the pros and cons of the various tools, the one chosen to resolve each identified problem be highlighted by underlining or other method to distinguish the selected tool. This will facilitate the transfer of that information onto the plan under Part 3. An example of a completed chart is provided on page 19.

Considering Options for Addressing  
Identified Problems

<u>MAJOR PROBLEM IDENTIFIED</u>	<u>SOLUTION</u>	<u>POTENTIAL TOOLS</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
-------------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	-----------------

SHORT TERM OBJECTIVE:

LONG TERM OBJECTIVE:

**EXAMPLE**  
Considering Options for Addressing  
Identified Problems

<u>MAJOR PROBLEM IDENTIFIED</u>	<u>SOLUTION</u>	<u>POTENTIAL TOOLS</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
1. Facility not in compliance with Part 265 GWM regulations; therefore inadequate Part B	Compel facility to determine whether leakage has occurred and extent of contamination as quickly as possible	a) NOD	<p>PRO: less resource intensive</p> <p>CON: may not compel compliance due to history of non-compliance</p>
		b) \$3008(a)	<p>PRO: can use combined authorities of Parts 265 and 270 to accelerate generation of ground water data needed for permit processing. Can also assess penalties for past violations.</p> <p>CON: may be delayed by administrative hearing process</p>
		c) \$3013	<p>PRO: not bound by ground water monitoring regimen in the regulations. Can compel investigation with greater flexibility in sampling parameters and frequencies</p> <p>CON: may be more difficult to make showing of potential substantial hazard to public health or environment. Cannot assess penalties</p>

**SHORT TERM OBJECTIVE:** Compliance with ground water requirements by 1986

**LONG TERM OBJECTIVE:** Permit issued by FY 88

### Part 3 - Establishing the Plan

The purpose of the individual plan is to summarize the results of the analysis under Parts 1 and 2, to describe the tools chosen to achieve the solutions to selected problems, to establish a timetable for accomplishing the solutions to the problems, and to identify which office is responsible for that action. The plans for all facilities will be combined to make up the core of the Facility Management Strategy.

The chart on the following page is a possible format for the plan. An example of a completed form follows the model format.

When using the chart, the reviewer would list the solutions and the tools to accomplish those solutions agreed upon as a result of the analysis completed in Part 2. The respective lead office would also be identified. This may be accomplished by establishing a code system, as illustrated in the example, or narratively.

The example format provides space for indicating the quarters (for the remainder of the current and upcoming fiscal year) or the years (for subsequent fiscal years) during which the particular solution or tool would be tracked. The time tables should be detailed enough to be used to develop SPMS commitments. Solutions, in most cases, would be indicated by their completion dates. Tools, however, may require start dates, completion dates, or both.

It is important to keep in mind that the statutory deadlines for making final determinations must be observed (i.e., all land disposal facility final determinations must be completed by November 1988). The indications should be as specific as necessary to serve Regional and State planning and scheduling needs.

Finally, the estimated resource cost associated with planned actions should be identified. This will assist in the iterative process of developing a Facility Management Strategy which is consistent with available resources.

FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

Solutions and Tools	Lead Office	FY85				FY86				FY87				FY88				FY89			
		3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th		
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					
Solution:																					
ool:																					

## **FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN**

	FY86	FY87	FY88	FY89
tion: Bring facility SE compliance with Part 160.14(c)(4) GWM elements	I			
: §3008(a)	I			
tion: Develop broader ic participation SP				
: Conduct field ssment I				
: Prepare public lvement work I				
tion: Complete PA/SI E SWMU's	E			
: §3008(h) order	I			
mated urce Cost action	45wd	75wd	5wd	
EPA, RCRA Enforcement EPA Permits EPA CERCLA Enforcement State RCRA Enforcement	SP = State Permits SC = State CERCLA Enforcement I = Initiate solution or tool F = Finish solution or tool			

SOURCES OF DATA FOR  
FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING

Compliance History

- high priority violator
- number of compliance orders
- significant noncompliance
- violations of other laws or regulations
- types of violations

Part B Information

- type of facility
- commercial versus onsite
- releases indicated
- completeness of groundwater monitoring data
- requirement for double liners

Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Log

- types of violations
- enforcement actions

Major Facility Status Sheets

- inadequacy of financial information
- inadequacy of groundwater monitoring systems
- inadequacy of closure or postclosure plans

Other Environmental Permits Which Apply to Facility

- NPDES
- PSD
- State permits (solid or industrial waste)

Results of facility site visit

- number and type of violations
- owner/operator approach to permit process, demonstrated willingness to cooperate
- distance between existing interim status activities and what must be in place for permit



Additional information requested in response to or required by HSWA

- SWMUs present; apparent completeness of data on SWMUs
- releases exist; apparent completeness of data on releases
- corrective measures already underway
- exposure assessment data

Information on ERRIS and other Superfund databases

- PA/SI or RI/FS results
- enforcement actions
- notification under CERCLA §103
- Hazard Ranking System Score
- other data showing population exposure, threats to human health or the environment

State files (depends upon authorization status)

- compliance history
- permitting history
- releases or spills
- state CERCLA actions/information/multi-site cooperative arrangements
- solid waste management unit information
- groundwater information

Personal knowledge of Regional and State staff

A SELECTION OF TOOLS TO ADDRESS PROBLEMS  
RAISED DURING FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING

<u>Problem</u>	<u>Tools</u>
Evidence of release	§3008(h) Order §3013 Order final determination post-closure permit
Suspicion of release	§3013 Order final determination §3008(a) Order if GWM violation §3007 letter or inspection RCRA PA/SI post-closure permit
Imminent hazard	§7003 Order CERCLA §106 Order fund-financed removal action §3008(h) Order
Financial insolvency	§3008(h) §106 Order Fund-financed removal or remedial action
No release	final determination post-closure permit
Incomplete Part B with respect to ground-water information	§3008(a) Order §3013 Order §3008(h) Order comprehensive ground-water inspection post-closure permit. Notice of intent to deny permit
Incomplete Part B with respect to information other than ground water	§3008(a) Order NOD §3007 letter or inspection

INVENTORY OF TOOLS AVAILABLE  
TO ADDRESS IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS

Permit Tools

- additional information request
- Notice of Deficiency
- post closure permit application request
- draft permit
- notice of intent to deny
- notice of availability of closure plans
- preparation of public involvement work plan
- field assessment conducted
- public meetings
- public hearing
- permit issuance
- permit denial
- approval or denial of closure plan

Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Tools

- §3007 information letter
- compliance evaluation inspections (CEI)
- comprehensive ground water evaluation (CME)
- sampling inspection (SI)

- §3008(a) order or civil action issued for a violation of permit or interim status standards
- §3013 order issued to collect additional information
- §7003 order or civil action for imminent hazards
- §3008(h) corrective action order
  - for information gathering
  - to conduct PA/SI
  - to conduct RI
  - to undertake corrective measures
- CERCLA §106 order or civil action for imminent hazards.
- §3008(d), §3008(e) or CERCLA §103(b) criminal action for knowing violations

#### Other Tools

- Preliminary Assessment/Site Investigation (PA/SI)
- RCRA Remedial Investigation (RI)
- CERCLA §104 removal action

DATE DUE

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region V, Library  
230 South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Principles of Facility Management Planning

A Facility Management Plan should be:

- |                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Simple                    | - It should clearly identify the key steps to be undertaken.                                                                                                                                          |
| Flexible                  | - The plan should not be set in concrete, but should be flexible enough to adjust to changes in the facility, in actions taken at the facility, or in the schedule.                                   |
| Built on Existing Systems | - The plan should be developed in the context of existing planning and management structures - not a "new reporting system," but looked on as a way to more comprehensively address existing systems. |
| Detailed                  | - The plan should describe work on a quarterly basis of the current and next fiscal year, but may be less detailed for later years.                                                                   |
| Time-oriented             | - The plan should identify tentative timeframes when the next step depends on completion of a former step.                                                                                            |
| A Cooperative Effort      | - The plan should be developed jointly with region and state - permitting and enforcement personnel. CERCLA staff and other necessary personnel should also be involved as necessary.                 |
| Goal-oriented             | - The plan should identify problems at the facility and the solutions to those problems.                                                                                                              |

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region V, Library  
230 South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60604