

Attachment 4

Excerpts from Reissued RCRA Permit (reissued in October 2001 and again effective December 7, 2007) (“CD-Permit”)



SDMS DocID

280170

GE Hazardous
19.5
280170

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
EPA NEW ENGLAND

PERMIT UNDER THE RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT (RCRA)
AS AMENDED (42 U.S.C. SECTION 6901 ET SEQ.)

General Electric Company
159 Plastics Avenue
Pittsfield, Massachusetts 01201
EPA I.D. No. MAD002084093

The Permittee is required to conduct certain activities at areas affected by releases of hazardous waste and/or hazardous constituents from the General Electric Facility located in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in accordance with Sections 3004(u), 3004(v), and 3005(c) of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA), as specified in the conditions set forth herein.

This Reissued Permit of 2007 ("2007 Permit") has been prepared for RCRA Corrective Action activities to be performed by General Electric pursuant to a final Consent Decree. The Consent Decree has been entered in U.S. District Court, United States, et al. v. General Electric Company (D. Mass.) ("Consent Decree"). The Consent Decree memorializes an agreement to address releases of hazardous waste and/or hazardous constituents from the General Electric Company's facility in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, including, but not limited to, the releases of hazardous waste and/or hazardous constituents addressed in this 2007 Permit. This 2007 Permit, upon the effective date set forth below, replaces the HSWA Permit previously issued to the Permittee, which became effective upon entry of the Consent Decree on October 27, 2000 ("2000 Permit"). Upon the effective date of the 2007 Permit, the 2000 Permit hereby is revoked.

Dated and Effective as of:

12-5-07

Signed:


Robert W. Varney

Regional Administrator

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA New England

One Congress Street, Suite 1100

Boston, Massachusetts 02114-2023

EPA solicited public comments on the proposed reissued Permit from September 17, 2007 through November 16, 2007. In response to the public comment solicitation, EPA received no

F. Corrective Measures Study Proposal Approval

After the Permittee submits the CMS Proposal, EPA will either approve, conditionally approve or disapprove the Proposal. If EPA approves or conditionally approves the Proposal, the Permittee shall carry out the evaluation of corrective measures and develop the CMS Report (see Special Condition II.G below) in accordance with the approved or conditionally approved CMS Proposal. In addition to requiring additional CMS work, a conditional approval or disapproval may include a requirement to conduct additional RFI work if such work is necessary to implement the CMS.

If EPA disapproves the Proposal, EPA shall, within its discretion, either: (1) specify the deficiencies and establish a time frame within which the Permittee shall submit a modified Proposal; or (2) make such modifications as EPA deems necessary to satisfy the requirements in Special Condition II.E above. If EPA modifies the proposal, the Permittee shall carry out the evaluation of corrective measures and develop the CMS Report (see Special Condition II.G below) in accordance with the modified Proposal.

G. Corrective Measures Study Report

In accordance with the compliance schedule set out in Attachment B, the Permittee shall submit a CMS Report. At a minimum, the Permittee shall provide the following information for each corrective measure approved for evaluation in the CMS Proposal (taking into consideration that the corrective measures ultimately selected will be implemented as a remedial action pursuant to CERCLA and the Consent Decree, as provided in Special Condition II.J):

1. General Standards for Corrective Measures

- a. Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment -- How each alternative or combination of alternatives would provide human health and environmental protection, taking into account EPA's Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessments.
- b. Control of Sources of Releases -- How each alternative or combination of alternatives would reduce or minimize possible further releases, including (but not limited to) the extent to which each alternative would mitigate the effects of a flood that could cause contaminated sediments to become available for human or ecological exposure.

- c. **Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Federal and State Requirements --** How each alternative or combination of alternatives would meet such requirements or, when such a requirement would not be met, the basis for a waiver under CERCLA and the National Contingency Plan ("NCP").

2. **Selection Decision Factors**

a. **Long-Term Reliability and Effectiveness;**

- (1) **Magnitude of residual risk, including (but not limited to) the extent to which each alternative would mitigate long-term potential exposure to residual contamination, and the extent to which and time over which each alternative would reduce the level of exposure to contaminants;**
- (2) **Adequacy and reliability of each alternative or combination of alternatives, including (i) operation, monitoring, and maintenance requirements; (ii) availability of labor and materials needed for operation, monitoring, and maintenance; (iii) whether the technologies have been used under analogous conditions; and (iv) whether the combination of technologies (if any) have been used together effectively; and**
- (3) **Any potential long-term adverse impacts of each alternative or combination of alternatives on human health or the environment, including (but not limited to) potential exposure routes and potentially affected populations, any impacts of dewatering and disposal facilities on human health or the environment, any impacts on wetlands or other environmentally sensitive areas, and any measures that may be employed to mitigate such impacts.**

- b. **Attainment of Interim Media Protection Goals --** The ability of each alternative or combination of alternatives to achieve the Interim Media Protection Goals approved by EPA in accordance with Special Condition II.D, including (if applicable) the time period in which each alternative would result in the attainment of the IMPGs and an evaluation of whether and the extent to which each alternative would accelerate such attainment compared to natural processes.

c. **Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume of Wastes.**

- (1) If applicable, treatment process used and materials treated;
- (2) If applicable, amount of hazardous materials destroyed or treated;
- (3) If applicable, degree of expected reductions in toxicity, mobility, or volume;
- (4) If applicable, degree to which treatment is irreversible; and
- (5) If applicable, type and quantity of residuals remaining after treatment.

d. **Short-Term Effectiveness -- Impacts to nearby communities, workers, or the environment during implementation of each alternative, including (but not limited to) risks associated with excavation, transportation, dewatering, disposal, or containment of sediments, soils, or other materials containing hazardous constituents.**

e. **Implementability**

- (1) Ability to construct and operate the technology, taking into account any relevant site characteristics;
- (2) Reliability of the technology;
- (3) Regulatory and zoning restrictions;
- (4) Ease of undertaking additional corrective measures if necessary;
- (5) Ability to monitor effectiveness of remedy;
- (6) Coordination with other agencies;
- (7) Availability of suitable on-site or off-site treatment, storage and disposal facilities and specialists; and
- (8) Availability of prospective technologies.

f. Cost

- (1) Capital costs;
- (2) Operating and maintenance costs; and
- (3) Present worth costs.

3. Recommendation

The Permittee shall conclude the CMS Report with a recommendation as to which corrective measure or combination of corrective measures, in the Permittee's opinion, is best suited to meet the general standards outlined in Special Condition II.G.1 above in consideration of the decision factors in Special Condition II.G.2 above, including a balancing of those factors against one another.

H. Corrective Measures Study Report Approval

After the Permittee submits the CMS Report, EPA will either approve, conditionally approve or disapprove the Report. In addition to requiring additional CMS work, a conditional approval or disapproval may include a requirement to conduct additional RFI work if such work is necessary to complete the CMS.

If EPA disapproves the Report, EPA shall, within its discretion, either (1) specify the deficiencies and establish a time frame within which the Permittee shall submit a modified Report; or (2) make such modifications as EPA deems necessary to meet the requirements in Special Condition II.G above.

I. Project Coordinators

1. Pursuant to the Consent Decree, EPA and the Permittee have each designated a Project Coordinator and an Alternate Project Coordinator.
2. EPA and the Permittee shall provide at least five (5) working days' written notice prior to changing Project Coordinators or Alternate Project Coordinators, unless impracticable but in no event later than the actual day the change is made.
3. The absence of EPA's Project Coordinator shall not be cause for stoppage of work by the Permittee.

J. Permit Modification To Select Corrective Measures and Right to Appeal

Based on the information that the Permittee submits pursuant to this Permit and any other relevant information in the Administrative Record for the modification of this Permit, EPA will propose Performance Standards, and the appropriate corrective measures necessary to meet the Performance Standards, to address PCBs and any other hazardous waste and/or hazardous constituents that have migrated from the GE Facility to the surface waters, sediments, and floodplain soils in the Rest of River area. This proposal will also include a proposed identification of the applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements ("ARARs") under federal and state law that must be met by such corrective measures, and where EPA proposes to waive any such ARARs, the basis for such waiver under CERCLA and the NCP. EPA will propose these Performance Standards, corrective measures, and ARARs as a draft modification to this Permit in accordance with 40 C.F.R. §§ 124.5-124.12 and 270.41 and Paragraph 22.n of the Consent Decree.

In considering public comment, EPA may require the Permittee to conduct additional RFI, CMS or other work that is necessary for EPA to make a final decision. Such work shall be conducted in accordance with an implementation schedule established by EPA.

EPA will notify the Permittee of its intended final decision on the proposed Permit modification in accordance with Paragraph 22.o of the Consent Decree, and the Permittee shall have the right to seek administrative dispute resolution with respect to that notification in accordance with Paragraphs 22.o and 141.b(i) of the Consent Decree. Upon completion of that dispute resolution process (if invoked), or after the expiration of 30 days following EPA's notification (if the Permittee does not invoke such dispute resolution), EPA will issue a modification of this Permit, which will set forth the selected Performance Standards and corrective measures for the Rest of River area, along with the associated ARARs and the basis for waiver of any ARARs under CERCLA and the NCP.

That Permit modification will be subject to review by the EPA Environmental Appeals Board and the United States Court of Appeals in accordance with Paragraphs 22.q through 22.v, 22.bb, 22.cc, and 141.b of the Consent Decree and subject to the stays described in those paragraphs. In accordance with and as provided in Paragraphs 22.q through 22.cc of the Consent Decree, the Permittee shall implement the selected corrective measures as a remedial action pursuant to CERCLA and the Consent Decree. As further provided in Paragraph 22.z of the Consent Decree, the modification of this Permit to select