Sent via email

October 27, 2023

Andrew Dutton Van Hoert
Physical Scientist, Enforcement Officer

and

Edward Simas
Environmental Engineer
Water Branch NPDES Section
US Environmental Protection Agency- Region III
Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Division
Four Penn Center
1600 JFK Blvd.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2029

RE: MAX Environmental Response to NEIC July 21, 2023 inspection report regarding March 2023 NEIC and EPA inspection of the MAX Yukon facility

Dear Mr. Van Hoert and Mr. Simas

As a follow-up to our October 17, 2023 conference call meeting regarding the July 21, 2023 NEIC inspection report, please see our responses to each of the RCRA and CWA observations made by NEIC in their report. It had been our understanding that these observations were just that: observations. It had been our understanding that EPA had not made any compliance determinations based on these observations. However, on October 22, 2023 we were made aware that EPA noted sixteen alleged RCRA violations at our Yukon facility on the EPA ECHO database, presumably based on the NEIC observations. The EPA ECHO database shows that EPA entered these alleged violations on August 15, 2023. However, as late as October 20, 2023, those alleged violations were not shown on this database. In the conference call meeting, EPA asked us to submit our responses to the NEIC observations so as to be able to make a more informed decision on compliance. It is extremely unfortunate that EPA chose to update its ECHO database with

McCandless Corporate Center, 5700 Corporate Drive, Suite 425, Pittsburgh, PA 15237
Telephone: 412-343-4900 Toll Free: 800-851-7845 Fax: 412-291-1249
www.maxenvironmental.com

alleged violations before any compliance determination was made. We are requesting that these alleged violations be removed from the ECHO database until a compliance determination has been made.

For your information, we were also made aware on October 19, 2023 that PADEP provided a copy of the NEIC inspection report to a third-party environmental activist group.

NEIC inspection report

Initial observations

EPA Region 3 evidently attempted to email the report, with nearly all of its associated attachments to MAX on July 24, 2023. The size of the combined documents is 110.89 MB. It was not until MAX learned, on September 14, 2023, that DEP received the report, that MAX contacted EPA Region 3 via email on September 15, 2023 if MAX could get a copy of the report. EPA Region 3 asked MAX to confirm it had not received a July 24 email with the report and MAX confirmed this. EPA Region 3 then sent MAX a shared file via email on September 15 with the report. The size of the documents prevented them from being emailed as EPA Region 3 originally attempted to do. EPA Region 3 did not contact MAX at any time to see if the July 24 email was received. EPA has not shared Attachment RCRA B – Videos referenced in the inspection report with MAX.

Factual corrections:

- Page 11: note that Impoundment 6 was not closed and its classification as a disposal unit then changed to a landfill.

- Page 12 and table on Page 13: note that mine water is not conveyed to Pump Station 6. Rather, seepage from mine spoil near Landfill 6 does.

- Page 13: note that the recycle water tanks (aka six-pack tanks) in the WWTP and covered by MAX's NPDES permit are hydraulically connected via piping at both the tops and bottoms of the tanks, as opposed to "can be connected".

- Page 15: note that the pH adjustment tank in the WWTP and covered by MAX's NPDES permit was not out of service at the time of inspection. Rather, it was in use to provide secondary solids settlement at the time of the inspection.

- Page 15: the use of the term "bypass valve", in reference to a valve in the WWTP weir box where final pH adjustment is performed before treated wastewater is discharged as authorized in the MAX's NPDES permit, is a misnomer. That valve is activated to recycle the treated wastewater back into the WWTP for additional treatment if there is a pH level problem.

NEIC observations regarding RCRA and CWA compliance:

Observation 1 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that MAX's solid waste treatment system does not ensure compliance with RCRA land disposal restriction standards, based on NEIC grab sampling and testing a small volume of treated hazardous waste in storage and grab sampling and testing a small volume of treated hazardous waste disposed of in Landfill 6. This statement is not supported by a full evaluation of MAX's treatment systems and processes nor a large data population. The treated hazardous waste that we dispose of in Landfill 6 meets RCRA land disposal restriction standards and our disposal criteria and is properly classified as a non-hazardous residual waste when disposed.

MAX provided waste treatment records to NEIC, which were included in the inspection report, which demonstrated that the waste in question was properly treated in accordance with MAX's waste permits and associated regulations. Furthermore, after no follow-up communication from EPA and, with an abundance of caution, MAX decided to remix the treated waste in storage (which EPA samples S06 – S10 were taken from) in our SWSS pits to reconfirm that the waste continued to meet applicable treatment standards before disposing of the waste (which we reconfirmed). Attached are our waste treatment records and associated timeline for this waste. MAX stands by its results. MAX has a DEP-accredited laboratory at its Yukon facility which goes through rigorous evaluations by DEP to maintain its accreditation status. Notwithstanding this position, we have implemented a change in how we manage manufacturing process waste that is hazardous based on cadmium and lead characteristics (the waste at issue) by allowing additional curing time after the waste is treated. Typically, treated hazardous waste is stored for 2-3 days before disposal (after treatment verification). For cadmium-lead manufacturing

process waste, we keep the treated waste in storage for over one week before we test the treated waste so as to allow for the alkalinity in the treated waste to stabilize. This better ensures that the waste meets required standards. We have prepared a new written standard operating procedure (SOP) for this type of waste. See attached SOP.

NEIC's mention of some of their samples not meeting the RCRA land disposal restriction standards for zinc is without merit. Zinc is not a hazardous waste characteristic parameter or a RCRA underlying hazardous characteristic (UHC) parameter, which NEIC acknowledges. Therefore, there is no RCRA treatment standard for zinc and so there was no reason for NEIC to mention that parameter.

Since the NEIC report only contained summaries of the data obtained by NEIC's samples and since there was a 2-month gap between NEIC sample collection to preparation of the samples, we request copies of the actual NEIC laboratory reports for the samples taken.

Observations 2 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that MAX's containment and processing building (CAPB) is not completely enclosed in certain areas and therefore does not meet 40 CFR 264.1100. The areas noted were the exterior walls and doors around CAPB Bays 1 and 2 on the eastern side of Bay 4. Specifically, NEIC has alleged that damage to the exterior walls and around the doors of Bays 1 and 2 and absence of an exterior wall on the eastern side of Bay 4 means that the CAPB is not enclosed as required by the cited regulation. We disagree. That regulation requires containment buildings to be enclosed *to prevent precipitation entering the building and wind dispersal of waste in the building* (emphasis added). There are walls on the side/front of Bays 1 and 2. We acknowledge the deterioration of some sections of the walls and around the doors of Bays 1 and 2 and have been soliciting bids from contractors for necessary repairs. We expect to get an updated proposal from a contractor to make the necessary repairs to the exterior walls around Bays 1 and 2 this fall and also expect to get the repair work started before the end of 2023. NEIC also alleges that there is no barrier whatsoever along the eastern side of Bay 4. We disagree. There is a concrete block barrier along the eastern side of Bay 4 that is open only to the extent needed to allow equipment access into and out of that bay. This barrier, though just about 2 feet tall, is sufficient to contain hazardous waste within that bay. Considering that the prevailing wind (and precipitation when it is raining) is from the west, there is no need to completely enclose the eastern side of Bay 4. The design, construction and operation of the CAPB was approved by PADEP. Bay 4 was in

substantially the same condition and in operation during NEIC's 2011 inspection of our Yukon facility and there was no observation about possible non-compliance,

Although the cited regulation notes the need for walls of a containment building to provide structural support as necessary, none of the deteriorated sections of exterior walls and door areas around Bays 1 and 2 provide structural support and they do not need to.

Observation 3 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that due to holes in the roof of CAPB Bay 4 and a possible leak in the roof of Bay 3 that MAX is not managing the CAPB to prevent precipitation infiltration onto the building. We acknowledge that repairs to the noted sections CAPB are necessary and have been soliciting bids from contractors for necessary repairs. We expect to get an updated proposal from a contractor to make the necessary repairs to building roof this fall. We expect to start making necessary repairs by the end of 2023.We note that any water in sections of the CAPB was being collected and treated.

Observation 4 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that MAX was not conducting leak detection monitoring of the CAPB as prescribed in MAX's hazardous waste permit because access to a leak detection tube (that was supposed to be checked on a weekly basis) was obscured by backfill. As stated by MAX during the NEIC inspection, weekly inspections of the CAPB have been performed to check for leaks but acknowledged that since the leak detection tube could not be found, that leak detection was not being done as specified in the permit. As MAX informed EPA Region 3 on May 15, 2023, after checking with the engineering consultant of record for the construction of the CAPB about the location of the leak detection tube, backfill in the area was removed and the leak detection tube waste located in a catch basin. Since that time, MAX has conducted leak detection of the CAPB as prescribed in its hazardous waste permit.

Observation 5 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that MAX was not conducting weekend inspections of the CAPB when hazardous waste was stored in the building, which is a requirement. In response to this

observation, we have conducted and documented weekend inspections of the CAPB when hazardous waste is being stored in the CAPB. See attached revised facility inspection checklist. NEIC has also alleged that MAX was not documenting annual structural inspections of the CAPB floor and secondary containment system or other structural features of the building. MAX assesses the conduction of the CAPB floor and structural features (such as support beams and columns) periodically throughout each year. It is not possible to visually assess the secondary containment system since it is under the building floor. However, portions of the secondary containment system might be visible if there was sufficient damage to the building floor (which has never been the case). As MAX advised EPA Region 3 on May 15, 2023, annual structural inspections are now being documented (as of April 17, 2023).

Observation 6 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that MAX was not following its approved hazardous waste inspection and maintenance plan because debris was on the floor of the CAPB near the hazardous waste mixing unit in Bay 3. As explained by MAX during the inspection, that unit has not been in operation for several years. The referenced plan has a section on mechanical waste processing units which states in part: "Check that the area around the *operating* equipment is clean and free of debris" (emphasis added). Since the mixer has not been in operation for several years, there is no need to check that the area around it is free of debris. The CAPB is permitted to store waste on the building floor. MAX disagrees that it was not following its approved inspection and maintenance plan. This was more of a housekeeping matter. Nonetheless, MAX advised EPA Region 3 on May 15, 2023 that the debris on the floor near the mixer unit was removed for treatment and disposal (which has been done).

Observation 7 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that five drums of hazardous waste staged in the upper back area of the containment building were open with waste being removed or added. Those drums had been previously emptied but still had residue in them. The drum covers were securely on the drums but the caps and bungholes on the covers were open. They were poly containers that had to be cut open to remove the residue, which has since been done.

Observations 8 and 9 RCRA

NEIC indicated that a small tank used for the accumulation of waste oil may be leaking based on the observation of staining under the tank and adjacent to the tank. This is a double-walled tank owned by Safety-Kleen Corporation. MAX checked the tank, and it is not leaking. We did move the tank aside to clean up any stains from the pavement. NEIC also noted that PADEP regulations require that vessels used for waste oil storage be labeled "waste oil", not "used oil". MAX affixed a "Waste Oil" label on the tank (see attached photo).

Observation 10 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that MAX was storing F039 wastewater treatment plant sludge in excess of 90 days without an extension approved by PADEP. In this observation, NEIC acknowledges that MAX sought an extension from PADEP for storing this waste and that an extension was necessary because the off-site disposal facility requested updated analysis of this waste, further delaying efforts to remove the waste. During the inspection, MAX explained the difficulties in securing transportation for the shipment of this waste off-site. We requested scheduling of transportation of this waste through our F039 waste broker on February 21, 2023 (see attached correspondence), so we did not wait until the last minute to deal with this waste. Earlier in its inspection report, NEIC noted that MAX submitted a RCRA delisting petition to declassify this waste as hazardous to PADEP in 2019. To date, PADEP has not finalized its approval of MAX's delisting petition. A draft approval was issued by PADEP in 2022 but failure of PA's Environmental Quality Board to hold a meeting in 2023 to authorize PADEP to finalize the delisting has caused continued delays in declassifying this waste, which does not exhibit a hazardous waste characteristic. All of these delays are beyond MAX's control. MAX advised EPA Region 3 on May 15, 2023 that this waste was shipped off-site for disposal on May 12, 2023.

Observation 11 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that MAX did immediately "address" a leak from the container of F039 in storage. A small leak formed from an inlet valve on the container (a vacuum box). MAX had repeatedly attempted to tighten the valve on the container to stop the leak and was successful in doing so a day after the NEIC inspectors observed the leaking valve, as acknowledged by NEIC in the report. This effort by MAX complied with 40 CFR 262.17(a)(1)(ii). Securing another vac box or other container of suitable size to hold the

quantity of sludge in the existing vac box and then transferring the sludge to the other container would have taken much more time and likely would have resulted in accidental spillage of the sludge onto the containment pad. Therefore, we do not believe there was a violation of the cited regulation.

Observation 12 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that the containment pad on which the vacuum box of F039 was being staged had "settled" such that any liquid that accumulated on the pad was not draining to a central sump. NEIC cited 40 CFR 264.175(b)(2) which states that "A containment system must be designed and operated as follows: (2) The base must be sloped or the containment system must be otherwise designed and operated to drain and remove liquids resulting from leaks, spills, or precipitation, *unless the containers are elevated or are otherwise protected from contact with accumulated liquids*" (emphasis added).

MAX disagrees with this allegation for two reasons: 1) the containment pad is sloped to promote drainage to a central sump (as evidenced by NEIC RCRA photo number 72) and 2) the vacuum box was clearly elevated so that it was not in contact with any accumulated liquids (NEIC RCRA photos numbers 70 – 72, 74 and 75). The majority of liquids on the pad were accumulated rainfall and although there appeared to be some pooling of liquid in the southeast corner of the pad, there was clear visual evidence of drainage to the pad central sump. Therefore, we do not believe there was a violation of the cited regulation.

Observation 13 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that MAX did not follow its approved waste analysis plan because it was taking grab samples of incoming and treated hazardous waste instead of taking composite samples of the waste, which is what is indicated in that plan. MAX acknowledges that the sampling technique it was using did not completely conform to the technique indicated in its waste analysis plan. However, the method in which MAX was obtaining a "grab" sample of incoming waste and treated hazardous waste in both cases involved using a long reach excavator at its solid waste stabilization and solidification (SWSS) mixing pits, where incoming waste is unloaded and treated, to scoop through the waste to fill the excavator bucket with enough waste to obtain a sample for testing. In doing so, the excavator bucket gathers up more than one discreet area of the waste to get a sample and so in effect gets a mix or composite of the waste. Furthermore, our

laboratory prepares a waste sample to obtain a more homogeneous mixture to better represent the waste. Notwithstanding the above explanation, MAX has revised its waste sampling procedure to conform more accurately to its waste analysis plan and has been taking composite samples of waste (with a scoop) for analysis, which was provided to EPA on May 15, 2023. MAX has no reason to believe that the difference in sampling techniques has negatively compromised the waste testing results.

Observation 14 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that waste was not effectively contained in the SWSS pits, and that waste was on the ground near the SWSS pits. Waste was on the incoming waste unloading pad and treated waste load-out pads: that is what those pads were designed for. We did not observe any waste on the ground. NEIC also noted that waste could have been tracked out of the CAPB. MAX is aware of the possibility of waste tracking out of the CAPB which is why MAX has the necessary equipment (Broom/Loader) for any accidental waste tracking and is maintained after any operations are performed. This has been an approved procedure by PADEP. In the event of any incidental tracking, we promptly clean up waste and impacted soils for treatment and disposal.

Observation 15 RCRA

NEIC has alleged that three roll-off boxes of waste covered with tarps with straps not completely fastened so that the tarps had slipped in places such that the boxes were not covered as required by 40 CFR 264.173. The boxes were covered, as evidenced by the NEIC photos. MAX fastened the tarp straps to correct any slippage. NEIC also indicated that some boxes of waste were not labeled to more clearly differentiate treated vs. untreated hazardous waste. MAX maintains that each box of waste was properly labeled in accordance with its hazardous waste permit and applicable regulations and waste in storage must be differentiated as to treated vs untreated for operational clarification.

Observation 1 CWA

NEIC has alleged that MAX's pH adjustment tank (covered by MAX's NPDES permit) was out of service and by not using this vessel and instead only performing pH adjustment at the weir box just prior to discharge of the treated wastewater that effective

pH adjustment is not being performed and thus contributing to recent exceedances of metals discharge limits. As stated previously, the pH adjustment tank is not out of service. MAX currently uses this tank for secondary solids settlement. MAX disagrees with this assessment and proper pH adjustment is being performed and continuously monitored as required. Further, metals removal is performed prior to this step.

Observation 2 CWA

NEIC has alleged that MAX is bypassing its WWTP neutralization tank when wastewater from the recycle tanks (aka six-pack tanks) is routed back to the flocculation tank for additional treatment thus missing additional hydrogen peroxide treatment for biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and thus contributing to past BOD discharge limit exceedances. MAX is not bypassing any permitted and necessary wastewater treatment steps or processes. When wastewater from the six-pack tanks needs to be returned to the flocculation tanks for additional treatment, it is not because there is a need for BOD control. Hydrogen peroxide would have been previously added to the wastewater as necessary.

Observation 3 CWA

NEIC has alleged that MAX is not sampling "raw" leachate at internal monitoring point (IMP) 201 as required by its NPDES permit because IMP 201 is located at Pump Station No. 7, which pumps wastewater from the million-gallon leachate tank. That tank collects surface leachate from Landfill 6 whereas Pump Station 6 collects Landfill 6 underdrain leachate and conveys it to the smaller "Little Blue" storage tank. MAX disagrees with NEIC's allegation: the IMP 201 is located as approved by PADEP during its permitting process and samples of the wastewater from the million-gallon tank are samples of leachate from Landfill 6. MAX's NPDES permit does not differentiate between Landfill 6 underdrain or surface leachate.

Observation 4 CWA

NEIC has alleged that MAX obtained two grab samples of treated wastewater at NPDES permit Outfall 001(one in 2022 and one in 2023) and did not report the results of those samples as required by its NPDES permit. Grab samples of treated wastewater taken at an outfall need to be compared to any instantaneous discharge limits and reported on monthly discharge monitoring reports. MAX acknowledges this error and will report such

results in the future. MAX had mistakenly viewed such samples as internal process control samples.

Observation 5 CWA

NEIC has alleged that MAX's Pollution, Prevention and Control Plan (the correct name is Preparedness, Prevention and Control Plan), or PPC Plan, did not include a waste and chemical inventory, a tank system plan, or preventive maintenance information and that MAX had not provided annual stormwater training to its Yukon facility employees. In fact, the PPC Plan clearly does contain waste and chemical inventory as well as preventive maintenance information. MAX's tank system plan is a separate document that is part of its hazardous waste permit. When MAX's Yukon facility NPDES permit was renewed at the end of 2021, the new stormwater sampling and BMP conditions of the permit were discussed with pertinent facility employees in early 2022. As MAX advised EPA Region 3 on May 15, 2023, more formal stormwater best management practices training was provided to key employees in April 2023 and documented. MAX will provide similar training on an annual basis.

Observation 6 CWA

NEIC has alleged that the WWTP clarifier is somehow not properly operated or maintained because the weir trough allegedly shows signs of deterioration. MAX disagrees with NEIC's allegation that the clarifier is not being operated or maintained properly. The clarifier itself functions as required by MAX's NPDES permit.

Observation 7 CWA

NEIC has alleged that MAX does not continuously monitor pH at internal monitoring point (IMP) 101, as required by its NPDES permit. MAX does create a composite sample by taking grab samples of flow at IMP 101 to form one sample for analysis. This location is within Pump Station 5 and flow is intermittent since this pump station collects minimal flow from closed Impoundment 5 and collected groundwater previously impacted by Impoundment 5. A continuous sampler would not be drawing any samples most of the time. MAX will discuss the need for a continuous sampler at this location with PADEP.

We trust that this letter provides EPA with sufficient information to make a more informed compliance decision. As discussed during the October 17 call, we understand that EPA will follow a process for making any compliance decision and that process will be based, in part, on the information that we are providing to you. If you have any questions or need additional information, please let us know.

Carl Spadaro
Environmental General Manager
412-445-9789 (Cell)
cspadaro@maxenvironmental.com

Attachments

Batch 032003

-Initially **Treated 3-20-23**

-**Analysis performed 3-21-23, 3-22-23**

-**Approved** by Dr. Funk and Jason Oblack for **Disposal 3-22-23**

-**EPA NEIC sampled 3/23/23**

-**Held Batch Initially** to hear back from EPA NEIC

-**No notification or Communication** received from EPA

-**Remixed and retested batch prior to disposal with a composited sample on 4/14/23**

-Tested **alkalinity on 4/14/23**, **Still within operational target range**

-Decided **Operationally** to Mix batch with additional **minimal Pebble Quick Lime (1.5 Tons)**

-Waste as about **1 month post initial treatment**

-Assigned **new Lab ID #041401** and Re-analyzed for **complete waste treatment record criteria**

-Confirmed **Passing results** again (Similar Alkalinity)

-**Approved for disposal on 4/18/23**

2

original

WASTE TREATMENT RECORD - YUKON PLANT

(For Solid Wastes Disposed Into Impoundment No. 6)

WO32003

Treatment Date/Time: Start: 3-20-23 900 Am Complete: 3-20-23 1:46

Chemicals Used: TSP Grey & white lime

Treatment Personnel: N Shewmin

Generator/Waste Type: Bobess Zinc / Leachate

Location Sampled: Metal LLC / Residue 6484

Sampler Signature: SWSS1

Date/Time Sampled: 3-20-23 1:40

Physical Characteristics: Color: Brown Odor: None

PARAMETER (METHOD)[1]	RESULT[2]	UNITS	LIMIT	DF[3]	QA/QC[4]	ANALYST / DATE	ALLOWABLE
pH (9045D 2004)[5]	12.46 @ 25°C	pH Units			H	KMK 3-21-23 630	8.0 ≤ pH < 12.5
Free Liquids (9095B 2004)[5]	NFL on 100 g SS (604394)					KMK 3-21-23	NFL
Cake Alkalinity[6]	9.11 ± 4 hrs	pH Units				E 3/20/23, 14:01	
ASTM ANALYSIS (D3987-85 1999)[7]							
Hex. Chromium (7196A 1992)[5]							< 5.0 ppm
Chromium (6010D 2018)[5]							
TCLP ANALYSIS (1311 1992)[5,8,9]							
Sample Preparation Method: 3015A						E 3/22/23	
Silver (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.020	ppm	0.020	10		E 3/23/23	≤ 0.14 ppm
Arsenic (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.10		0.10				≤ 5.0 ppm
Barium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.40		0.40				≤ 21 ppm
Beryllium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.10		0.10				≤ 1.22 ppm
Cadmium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.040		0.040				≤ 0.11 ppm
Chromium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.10		0.10				≤ 0.60 ppm
Nickel (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.050		0.050				≤ 11 ppm
Lead (6010D 2018)[5]	0.26		0.20		L(H)		≤ 0.75 ppm
Antimony (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.20		0.20				≤ 1.15 ppm
Selenium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.20		0.20				≤ 1.0 ppm
Thallium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.10		0.10				≤ 0.20 ppm
TCLP ANALYSIS (1311 1992)[5,8,9]							
Sample Preparation Method:							
Mercury (7470A 1994)[5]							≤ 0.025 ppm

512015
S 358
RT4427

NOTES:

1. Perform only those tests required based on Waste Receipt Record and LDR form that accompanied waste
2. Analysis by MAX Environmental Laboratory, 233 MAX Lane, Yukon PA 15698 (PA Lab # 65-01467) unless noted otherwise
3. DF = Dilution Factor
4. QA/QC Data Qualifiers – B = Analyte found in the Preparation Blank, S = Matrix Spike recovery outside the accepted recovery limits (QA/QC result (H)igh or (L)ow), L = Lab Control recovery outside the accepted limits (QA/QC result (H)igh or (L)ow), R = RPD outside accepted limits, H = Holding limit (15 minutes for pH; 24 hours for Cr(VI)) unpreserved, 28 days preserved; 6 months for metals (except Hg); 28 days for Hg).
5. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1987. Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste. SW-846. 3rd Edition. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. Washington. D.C.
6. Internal analysis procedure. See MAX Environmental Laboratory Manual for details
7. ASTM DI Water Extraction D3987-85 1999.
8. Metal Analysis may be performed by other approved EPA SW-846 Methods
9. For Metals Analysis results from 1 sample < 80% of allowable value are required, results from 2 samples < 90% of allowable value are required or results from 3 samples < 100% of allowable values are required
10. Analysis result in NOT an underlying hazardous constituent and must only be treated to the characteristic hazardous limit, not the universal treatment standard

Waste Disposed (Yukon #6): Yes No (Circle One)

Comments: Final TCLP pH 9.05 @ 25°C pH Units

Signature / Title: [signature] Lab Mgr

Approval Date / Time: 3/23/23 14:30

Signature / Title: [signature] Dir of Operations

Approval Date / Time: 3/22/23 345pm

Retreat / Remix

WASTE TREATMENT RECORD - YUKON PLANT

(For Solid Wastes Disposed Into Impoundment No. 6)

WO41401

Treatment Date/Time: Start: 4-13-23 1:00 Complete: 4-13-23 2:00
Chemicals Used: Pebble
Treatment Personnel: N. Showman
Generator/Waste Type: Befesa WO 32003
Location Sampled: SWSS 1
Sampler Signature: [signature]
Date/Time Sampled: 4-13-23 2:00
Physical Characteristics: Color: Brown Odor: None

PARAMETER (METHOD)[1]	RESULT[2]	UNITS	LIMIT	DF[3]	QA/QC[4]	ANALYST / DATE	ALLOWABLE
pH (9045D 2004)[5]	12.42 @ 25°C pH Units					HKnic 4-14-23 8:52	8.0 ≤ pH < 12.5
Free Liquids (9095B 2004)[5]	NFL on 100g (Started 4 hrs)					HKnic 4-14-23	NFL
Cake Alkalinity[6]	9.35 @ 25°C pH Units 4 hrs					HKnic 4-14-23	7.07 mm
ASTM ANALYSIS (D3987-85 1999)[7]							
Hex. Chromium (7196A 1992)[5]							< 5.0 ppm
Chromium (6010D 2018)[5]							
TCLP ANALYSIS (1311 1992)[5,8,9]							
Sample Preparation Method: 3015A						4/17/23	
Silver (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.020	ppm	0.020	10		4/20/23	≤ 0.14 ppm
Arsenic (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.10		0.10				≤ 5.0 ppm
Barium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.40		0.40				≤ 21 ppm
Beryllium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.10		0.10				≤ 1.22 ppm
Cadmium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.040		0.040				≤ 0.11 ppm
Chromium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.10		0.10				≤ 0.60 ppm
Nickel (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.050		0.050				≤ 11 ppm
Lead (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.20		0.20				≤ 0.75 ppm
Antimony (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.20		0.20				≤ 1.15 ppm
Selenium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.20		0.20				≤ 1.0 ppm
Thallium (6010D 2018)[5]	< 0.10		0.10				≤ 0.20 ppm
TCLP ANALYSIS (1311 1992)[5,8,9]							
Sample Preparation Method:							
Mercury (7470A 1994)[5]							≤ 0.025 ppm

NOTES:
1. Perform only those tests required based on Waste Receipt Record and LDR form that accompanied waste
2. Analysis by MAX Environmental Laboratory, 233 MAX Lane, Yukon PA 15698 (PA Lab # 65-01467) unless noted otherwise
3. DF = Dilution Factor
4. QA/QC Data Qualifiers – B = Analyte found in the Preparation Blank, S = Matrix Spike recovery outside the accepted recovery limits (QA/QC result (H)igh or (L)ow), L = Lab Control recovery outside the accepted limits (QA/QC result (H)igh or (L)ow), R = RPD outside accepted limits, H = Holding limit (15 minutes for pH; 24 hours for Cr(VI) unpreserved, 28 days preserved; 6 months for metals (except Hg); 28 days for Hg).
5. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1987. Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste. SW-846. 3rd Edition. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, D.C.
6. Internal analysis procedure. See MAX Environmental Laboratory Manual for details
7. ASTM DI Water Extraction D3987-85 1999.
8. Metal Analysis may be performed by other approved EPA SW-846 Methods
9. For Metals Analysis results from 1 sample < 80% of allowable value are required, results from 2 samples < 90% of allowable value are required or results from 3 samples < 100% of allowable values are required
10. Analysis result in NOT an underlying hazardous constituent and must only be treated to the characteristic hazardous limit, not the universal treatment standard

Waste Disposed (Yukon #6): Yes No (Circle One)

Comments: Final TCLP pH 9.17 @ 25°C pH Units

Signature / Title: [signature] / Lab Tech
Approval Date / Time: 4/17/23, 18:00

Signature / Title: [signature] / Dir of Operations
Approval Date / Time: 4/18/23 11 AM

SOP- 4 (Rev. April 2023)

MAX ENVIRONMENTAL-YUKON FACILITY STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE FOR TREATED WASTE SAMPLE COLLECTION FROM THE SWSS UNITS

PURPOSE: The purpose of this procedure is to ensure proper sampling of the treated waste from the SWSS units conforming to site-specific permit requirements.

PROCEDURE:

I. TREATED WASTE SAMPLE COLLECTION

- When the operator has successfully completed the treatment of a batch of waste, an excavator bucket may be used to collect the composite sample from the SWSS unit. The following guidelines are to be followed for the proper sample collection.
    1. Rinse out a sampling bucket and sampling device several times to eliminate the contamination from another waste source that could affect the results of the batch being sampled. If a new bucket is needed, see a manager or lab personnel for assistance.
    2. Composite samples can be collected by utilizing the excavator bucket to gather the treated material from four (4) separate locations. An aliquot is removed from each excavator bucket using a scoop or shovel and composited into the sampling container. The sample container is then thoroughly mixed. Do not sample from the top of the unit if it would create an unsafe work act to lead to a possible injury.
    3. Bucket should be filled up to about ½ full to obtain sufficient sample for all analysis.
    4. Visually inspect the collected sample to verify it is representative of the majority of the treated waste. If significant debris is present in the sample that is not

representative of the waste, a new sample is to be collected.

5. Once an adequate sample is collected, the operator is to tag the sample container as to the waste type and the specific processing unit (SWSS 1,2, or 3) and deliver the sample to the MAX laboratory.

II. LABORATORY RECEIVING OF TREATED WASTE SAMPLES

- Upon delivery of every treated waste sample to the lab, the operator will sign a waste treatment record provided by the lab personnel to acknowledge the sample collector, date/time of sample, the processing unit, and the specific treated waste.
- Depending on the type of treated waste, the lab personnel will assign a batch # which is the sample ID# in the lab for tracking purposes. For some waste streams, internal testing is needed and no batch # will be given until confirmation of the internal tests are complete.
- This batch # will be recorded on the SWSS tracking form as well as each individual rolloff container of the same batch.
- No waste is to be loaded out of the SWSS units unless a batch # has been assigned or if a manager directs the operator to proceed with loading out. If this occurs, it will be the plant manager's responsibility to ensure that a batch number was assigned and all containers are labeled and tracked accordingly.
- All untreated waste samples should at all times be delivered to the lab prior to the treated sample.
- Also upon receiving of the treated waste sample into the lab, it is the lab personnel's responsibility to report any abnormal observations or characteristics of a sample to the plant manager for determination.

MAX ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
SECURITY GUARD INSPECTION REPORT (revised 3/24/17)
YUKON FACILITY

WEEK OF- _____

		MONDAY				TUESDAY				WEDNESDAY				THURSDAY				FRIDAY			
Location: Pump Station No. 5		Inspection #1		Inspection #2		Inspection #1		Inspection #2		Inspection #1		Inspection #2		Inspection #1		Inspection #2		Inspection #1		Inspection #2	
No.#	Description	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time
	Inspect Pump Station No. 5 location																				
	Verify no alarms are activated																				
	Verify both access gates are closed																				
Location: Pump Station No. 4																					
	Inspect Pump Station No. 4 location																				
	Verify no alarms are activated																				
	Record heigth of #4 tank																				
Location: imp No. 6 and Pump Station No. 6																					
	Visual verification of #6 pump station																				
	Verify no alarms are activated																				
Location: Weir Room an Morris pump station vicinity																					
	Visually verify electricity in on in Weir room building																				
	Verify no alarms are activated																				
	Visual inspection of area																				
Location: Tire cleaning station and main entrance																					
	Visually verify electricity is on																				
	Verify no alarms are activated																				
	Visual inspection of area																				
	Verify main entrance/gate is in good order																				
Location: CAP SWSS (Solid Wastes Stabilization and Solidification), Swamp, and Vicinity																					
	General inspection of topside of CAP area																				
	Inspection of swas area																				
	Inspection of container storage areas																				
	Inspect upper and lower area of Containment building																				
	Visually verify electricity is on																				

Note: A minimum of 2 Inspection required per 8 hour shift

MAX ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
SECURITY GUARD INSPECTION REPORT (revised 3/24/17)
YUKON FACILITY

WEEK OF- _____

		SATURDAY 1ST SHIFT				SATURDAY 2ND SHIFT				SUNDAY 1ST SHIFT				SUNDAY 2ND SHIFT			
Location: Pump Station No. 5		Inspection #1		Inspection #2		Inspection #1		Inspection #2		Inspection #1		Inspection #2		Inspection #1		Inspection #2	
No.#	**Description**	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time	Init.	Time
	Inspect Pump Station No. 5 location																
	Verify no alarms are activated																
	Verify both access gates are closed																
Location: Pump Station No. 4																	
	Inspect Pump Station No. 4 location																
	Verify no alarms are activated																
	Record heigth of #4 tank																
Location: Imp No. 6 and Pump Station No. 6																	
	Visual verification of #6 pump station																
	Verify no alarms are activated																
Location: Weir Room an Morris pump station vicinity																	
	Visually verify electricity in on in Weir room building																
	Verify no alarms are activated																
	Visual inspection of area																
Location: Tire cleaning station and main entrance																	
	Visually verify electricity is on																
	Verify no alarms are activated																
	Visual inspection of area																
	Verify main entrance/gate is in good order																
Location: CAP ,SWSS (Solid Wastes Stabilization and Solidification), Swamp, and Vicinity																	
	General inspection of topside of CAP area																
	inspection of swss area																
	Inspection of container storage areas																
	Inspect upper and lower area of Containment building																
	Visually verify electricity is on																

Note: A minimum of 2 Inspection required per 8 hour shift

Carl Spadaro

From: Carl Spadaro
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2023 2:21 PM
To: Jim Smith – Amerizen Waste Management Svcs.
Cc: Rob Conklin
Subject: Yukon F039 sludge shipment

Jim,

We'd like to have a truck scheduled for a shipment of F039 sludge (in liquid slurry form) from our Yukon facility before March 9, 2023 if possible. Please let us know when this can be scheduled. Thank you.

Carl Spadaro
Environmental General Manager
MAX Environmental Technologies, Inc
McCandless Corporate Center
5700 Corporate Drive, Suite 425
Pittsburgh, PA 15237
412-445-9789 (Cell)
cspadaro@maxenvironmental.com
www.maxenvironmental.com


Waste
Oil