Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

MAY 20 2011

11-AMCP-0098

Ms. J. A. Hedges, Program Manager
Nuclear Waste Program
State of Washington
Department of Ecology
3100 Port off Benton Boulevard
Richland, Washington 99354

Dear Ms. Hedges:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1971 (SEPA) ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLISTS SUPPORTING PREPARATION/ISSUANCE OF THE DRAFT HANFORD FACILITY RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT PERMIT, REVISION 9

This letter transmits the revised SEPA Environmental Checklists supporting the preparation and issuance of the draft Hanford Facility Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Permit (Permit No. WA7890008967, Revision 9) for public comment. The specific checklists are for the B Plant Complex Revision 1, Plutonium-Uranium Extraction (PUREX) Plant and PUREX Storage Tunnels Revision 1, and Hanford Facility Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility Revision 2. Each revision reflects the most current configuration/knowledge associated with the respective facility.

If you have any questions, please contact me, or your staff may contact Jonathan Dowell, Assistant Manager for the Central Plateau, on (509) 373-9971.

Sincerely,

Matt McCormick
Manager

AMCP:MSC

Attachments

cc: See page 2

cc w/attachs:
Administrative Record
Ecology NWP Library
Environmental Portal

cc w/o attachs:
D. G. Black, CHPRC
G. Bohnee, NPT
R. Bond, Ecology
M. J. Brown, Ecology
L. Buck, Wanapum
D. A. Faulk, EPA
S. Harris, CTUIR
M. T. Jansky, CHPRC
R. Jim, YN
S. L. Leckband, HAB
K. Niles, ODOE
R. E. Piippo, MSA
D. Rowland, YN
J. G. Vance, MSA

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

FOR

HANFORD FACILITY
WASTE ENCAPSULATION AND STORAGE FACILITY

REVISION 2

MAY 2011

WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
[WAC 197-11-960]

A. BACKGROUND

1. **Name of proposed project, if applicable:**

   This State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) of 1971 Environmental Checklist is being submitted for continued operation of the Hanford Facility Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF). WESF was constructed and is operated by the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (DOE RL) and its contractors.

2. **Name of applicant:**

   DOE-RL.

3. **Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:**

   U.S. Department of Energy
   Richland Operations Office
   P.O. Box 550
   Richland, WA 99352

   Contact:

   Matthew S. McCormick, Manager
   Richland Operations Office
   509-376-7395.

4. **Date checklist prepared:**

   May 2011

5. **Agency requesting checklist:**

   Washington State Department of Ecology
   Nuclear Waste Program
   3100 Port of Benton Blvd.
   Richland, WA 99354

6. **Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):**

   WESF currently is operating under interim status. This revised SEPA Environmental Checklist supports the preparation and issuance of the draft *Hanford Facility Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Permit* (Permit No. WA7890008967), Revision 9, for public comment.

7. **Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.**

   Yes. A new stack and exhaust system are planned; WESF would continue to operate for miscellaneous storage

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

Revision 0 of the WESF SEPA Environmental Checklist (July 1997) was submitted with the Notice of Intent to submit the Part A permit application for miscellaneous storage at WESF. Revision 1 of the WESF SEPA Environmental Checklist (August 2006) was submitted to Ecology concurrently with the final, certified Part B Permit Application for WESF. (Letter, 06-AMCP-0268, Keith Klein, RL, to Jane Hedges, Ecology, "Submittal of the Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, Revision 0 and Approval of the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) Environmental Checklist, Revision 1 for the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WEF) (TSD: S-2-10," dated August 28, 2006). This revision (Revision 2) of the WESF SEPA Environmental Checklist reflects incorporation of informal comments by Ecology.

NEPA documentation pertaining to WESF includes the following.

- DOE/EIS-0113, *Final Environmental Impact Statement; Disposal of Hanford Defense High-Level, Transuranic and Tank Wastes*, December 1987.
- DOE/EIS-0189F, *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Tank Waste Remediation System, Richland, Washington*, August 1996.
- DOE/EIS-0391, *Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, WA*, October 2009.
- DOE/EA-0942, *Environmental Assessment; Return of Isotope Capsules to the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington*, March 1992.

General information concerning the Hanford Facility environment can be found in the *Hanford Site National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Characterization*, PNNL-6415 (latest revision), and DOE/EIS-0391, *Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington* (October 2009). These documents provide current information concerning climate and meteorology, ecology, history and archeology, socioeconomic, land use and noise levels, and geology and hydrology. These baseline data for the Hanford Site and past activities are useful for evaluating proposed activities and their potential environmental impacts.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

No other permits are pending at this time.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

Ecology is the lead agency authorized to approve the WESF Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application pursuant to the requirements of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-303 Dangerous Waste Regulations, WAC 173-303-800(2).

Construction and operation of the new stack/exhaust system will require approval from the State of Washington Department of Health.

11. Give a brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The proposal is to complete a final status dangerous waste management permit for an existing operation. WESF currently operates the dangerous waste storage facility under interim status conditions. There will be no significant changes to physical structures or the scope of the waste management operations under the final permit.

WESF (225B Building) is located adjacent to the west end of B Plant (221-B Building) in the 200 East Area of the Hanford Site. WESF is a two-story structure 48 m (15 ft) long by 30 m (98 ft) wide by 12 m (39 ft) high at the outside dimensions. The first floor surface area is 1,300 m^2 (13,994 ft^2) and the second floor is 600 m^2 (6,459 ft^2). The ground elevation is about 213 m (699 ft) above sea level and is approximately 79 m (259 ft) above the groundwater table.

The construction of WESF started in 1971 and was completed in 1973. The original mission of WESF was to process, encapsulate, and store the waste generated during the chemical reprocessing of defense fuel on the Hanford Site, thus ensuring isolation of hazardous radioisotopes from the environment. Processing and encapsulation of the cesium and strontium feed materials were completed in 1985. WESF operations include decontamination of equipment and capsules, and surveillance of stored capsules. Capsules are expected to be stored at WESF until final disposition.

The current WESF mission is to store the cesium-137 and strontium-90 capsules in a safe manner and in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations. Two areas within WESF will store capsules that will be managed as waste: (1) Pool Cells 1 through 8 and 12, located within the west side of the 225B Building, which provides underwater storage for radiological protection from the cesium-137 and strontium-90 capsules; and (2) all hot cells. All hot cells are included for permitting purposes; Hot Cells F and G currently are planned cells for providing interim dry storage of capsules.

Pool Cell 1 is 2.7 m (8.9 ft) wide, 6.6 m (21.7 ft) long and 5.5 m (18 ft) deep. Pool Cells 2 through 8 are 1.3 m (4.3 ft) wide, 6.6 m (21.7 ft) long, and 5.5 m (18 ft) deep. Pool Cell 12 is 1 m (3.3 ft) wide by 19.8 m (65 ft) long by 4.7 m (15.4 ft) deep. The south end of Pool Cell 12 contains a cask pit 1.3 m (4.3 ft) wide by 2.3 m (7.5 ft) long by 5.5 m (18 ft) deep. Pool Cells 1 through 8 are connected to Pool Cell 12 by transfer ports. A transfer port is a ball valve that can be opened and closed to transfer capsules or water between each of the pool cells and Pool Cell 12. The transfer port is located approximately 1 m (3.3 ft) above the pool cell floor. All pool cells have liners constructed of 16 gauge type 304L stainless steel at the sides and 14 gauge type 304L stainless steel flooring. Inactive (not storing capsules) Pool Cells 9 through 11 are not equipped for storage of capsules and each have three 76-cm-(30-in.) thick concrete cover blocks installed. Although all pool cells except Pool Cell 12 are designed for cover block installation, cover blocks currently are not placed on active (storing capsules) pool cells to prevent potential damage to the capsules due to a cover block drop.

Hot Cells F and G are located in the south end of the 225B Building and were used for past chemical reprocessing and encapsulation of the cesium-137 and strontium-90 capsules. The maximum inside dimensions of cell F are 2.4 m (7.9 ft) wide by 2.4 m (7.9 ft) long by 4 m (13 ft) high. The rear portion of the cell floor is elevated 56 cm and is 50 cm deep. The floor and lower portion of Hot Cell F walls are lined with stainless steel. The unlined portions originally were coated with white

radiation- and corrosion-resistant paint. Hot Cell F contains some of the equipment used for decontamination of the inner capsules.

The scope of WESF mission currently is focused on maintenance activities and storage and surveillance of capsules. Additionally, capsule inspection and decontamination could be conducted, if necessary.

12. **Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.**

WESF is located north of the city of Richland, Washington, in the 200 East Area of the Hanford Site.

Topographic maps and site plans are included in the *Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility* submittal.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. **Earth**

   a. **General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other . . . . . .**

      Flat.

   b. **What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?**

      The approximate slope of the land is less than 2 percent.

   c. **What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.**

      Soil types consist mainly of eolian and fluvial sands and gravel. More detailed information concerning specific soil classifications can be found in the Hanford Site National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Characterization, PNNL-6415 (latest revision). Farming is not permitted on the Hanford Facility; no agricultural activities are allowed in the Hanford 200 East Area.

   d. **Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.**

      No.

   e. **Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.**

      Site development generally is complete; no substantial filling or grading is expected for the new stack/exhaust system.

   f. **Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.**

      No.

   g. **About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?**

      Approximately 85 percent of WESF is covered with asphalt or structures.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

None.

2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Minor amounts of construction emissions would be generated associated with construction of a new stack/exhaust system. Emissions associated with facility operations include facility ventilation system for all waste handling and storage areas. Minor amounts of exhaust would be generated by vehicles used by personnel to gain access to WESF.

Diffuse and fugitive air emissions originating from operations are controlled and permitted pursuant to conditions set forth in the Hanford Site Air Operating Permit.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

No.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

Good engineering practices would be followed, and actions would comply with onsite procedures designed to protect the environment and personnel safety and health. Administrative control practices and high-efficiency particulate air filters would continue to limit air emissions as well as protect worker health.

3. Water

a. Surface:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

No. The Columbia River is located to the north and east of the 200 Areas; however, WESF is not a land-based disposal facility. WESF is located more than seven km from the Columbia River.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

2) **Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) of the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.**

No.

3) **Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.**

None.

4) **Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

As part of the Hanford Site, WESF uses surface water withdrawn from the Columbia River. The DOE-RL withdraws the water under a federal government water right through an existing water distribution system.

5) **Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.**

No.

6) **Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.**

No.

b. **Ground:**

1) **Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

Yes. Two deep-well pumps are installed which provide emergency pool fill water if required.

2) **Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals...; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.**

None.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

The Hanford Facility receives only 15.2 to 17.8 cm (6 to 7 in.) of annual precipitation. Rainfall and snowmelt runs off the existing buildings and seeps into the soil on and near the buildings. The precipitation does not reach the groundwater or surface waters.

Precipitation would not come into contact with any of the liquid waste treated and/or stored.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

Engineering controls during operational activities will prevent dangerous waste from entering the groundwater.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:

Measures would involve general engineering controls, including routine inspections.

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

_____	deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
_____	evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
_____	shrubs
X	grass
_____	pasture
_____	crop or grain
_____	wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
_____	water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
X	other types of vegetation.

The most common vegetation community in the 200 East Area is sagebrush/cheatgrass or Sandberg's bluegrass. Native vegetation in the immediate vicinity of WESF has been eradicated.

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

None.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

The Hanford Facility contains some federal and state listed threatened and endangered plant and animal species. Additional information on species can be found in *Hanford Site National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Characterization*, PNNL-6415 (latest revision).

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

None.

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: raptors (burrowing owls, ferruginous, redtail, and Swainson's hawks) eagles, songbirds

mammals: deer, elk, coyotes, rabbits, rodents

Additional information on animals can be found in *Hanford Site National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Characterization*, PNNL-6415 (latest revision)

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

The bald eagle, which was removed from the federal threatened status list on July 9, 2007, will be protected under the *Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and Migratory Bird Treaty Act*. The state listed white pelican, sandhill crane, and ferruginous hawk have been observed on or migrate through the Hanford Site. A complete list of federal or Washington State threatened and endangered species on the Hanford Site can be found in PNNL-6415 and DOE/EIS-0391.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

The Hanford Site is part of a broad Pacific Flyway; however WESF is not known as a permanent haven for migratory birds.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

None.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

6. Energy and natural resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Diesel fuel, gasoline, and oil area used for operations equipment.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

No.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

None.

7. Environmental health

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

Yes. See item 2) below.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

The Hanford Site fire department provides continuous response for fires, spills, and personnel injuries at WESF. For security events, the Hanford Patrol coordinates responses. At WESF, emergency response is directed by the Building Emergency Director (BED) until the Incident Commander arrives. The incident command system and staff fulfill the responsibilities of the Emergency Coordinator discussed in WAC 173-303-360 ("Emergencies"). During emergencies, WESF personnel perform their assigned duties under the direction of the BED.

2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

Possible environmental health hazards to personnel could arise from activities at WESF. The hazard could come from exposure to radioactive and/or chemical materials. Stringent administrative controls and engineered barriers will be used to minimize the probability of even a minor incident and/or accident. A radioactive and/or chemical spill, release, fire, or explosion could occur only as a result of a simultaneous

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

breakdown in multiple barriers or a catastrophic natural forces event.

All personnel are trained to follow proper procedures during WESF operations to minimize potential exposure. For example, chemical and radiological safety hazards would be mitigated by preventing direct contact with the residual chemical constituents; and protective clothing, appropriate training, and respiratory protection used by onsite personnel as necessary. As low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) principles would be applied during operations.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

While there is a minor amount of traffic, operation, and equipment noise in the vicinity, there would be minimal affect to personnel at WESF.

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

Minor amounts of noise from traffic and equipment (e.g., truck and forklift; recirculation pumps) are expected during operations, and would not be detectable off of the Hanford Site.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

Noise levels are not substantial or incompatible with activities in the industrial area; noise reduction measures are not necessary. The pool cell area is posted as a hearing protection area (noise from recirculation pumps).

8. Land and shoreline use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

The Hanford Facility is a single RCRA facility identified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/State Identification Number WA7890008967 that consists of over 70 TSD units conducting dangerous waste management activities. These TSD units are included in the Washington State Department of Ecology Dangerous Waste Permit Application Part A Form. The Hanford Facility (including WESF) consists of all contiguous land, and

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

structures, other appurtenances, and improvements on the land, used for recycling, reusing, reclaiming, transferring, storing, treating, or disposing of dangerous waste, which, for the purposes of the RCRA, are owned by the U.S. Government and operated by the DOE-RL (excluding lands north and east of the Columbia River, river islands, lands owned or used by the Bonneville Power Administration, lands leased to Energy Northwest, and lands owned by or leased to Washington State).

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

No portion of the 200 Areas has been used for agricultural purposes since 1943.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

WESF is located in the 200 East Area of the Hanford Site and includes numerous buildings and structures (refer to Section A.11).

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

No.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

According to the Benton County Comprehensive Plan (Plan), issued in 2006 and available at http://www.co.benton.wa.us/pView.aspx?id=1450&catid=45, the Hanford land uses have not been determined at this time and will be addressed and amended in Chapter 13 of the Plan.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The *Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision* (64 FR 61615, November 12, 1999) stated that the Central Plateau (200 Areas) geographic area is designated Industrial-Exclusive. An amended Record of Decision (73 FR 55824) did not change the Industrial-Exclusive land use designation for the 200 Areas.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

Not applicable.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

No.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

i. **Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?**

No people reside at WESF. Approximately 25 people are involved in day-to-day operations of WESF.

j. **Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?**

None.

k. **Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:**

Does not apply.

l. **Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:**

Does not apply (refer to Section B.8.f).

9. **Housing**

a. **Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

Does not apply.

b. **Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

Does not apply.

c. **Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:**

Does not apply.

10. **Aesthetics**

a. **What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?**

No new structures are being proposed. The existing WESF is a one-story, precast concrete structure. The greatest height at any point of the structure occurs on the south side at the truck dock where the height from grade to the top of the wall is 10 m (33 ft). Primary building materials consist of concrete walls and floors with a steel/concrete roof.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

None.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

None.

11. Light and glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

Nighttime lighting provides a continuous operations environment and necessary security requirements.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

No.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

None.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

None.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

None.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

No.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

Not applicable.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

13. Historic and cultural preservation

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe

No places or objects listed on, or proposed for national, state, or local preservation registers are known to be next to WESF. WESF has been determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing property in the Manhattan Project/Cold War Historic District.

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

See response to B.13.a. There are no known archaeological or Native American religious sites in the WESF area.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

Not applicable; see response to B.13.a.

14. Transportation

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

No public streets or highways serve WESF.

b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

The Hanford Site is not accessible to the public or served by public transit. It is approximately 40 km (25 mi) to the city of Richland with the nearest transit stop.

c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

This proposal will not affect the existing parking lot at WESF.

d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

No.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

No.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

This proposal does not increase the peak traffic volumes; the number of vehicular trips would remain at the present rate.

g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

None.

15. Public services

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

No.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

Not applicable.

16. Utilities

a. List utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.

Water is supplied to WESF from the Columbia River via the Hanford Site potable water system. A closed-loop cooling system is operational. The water supply for the pool cells is routed through an ion exchange system.

A septic tank and drain field provide for disposal of sanitary waste from restrooms, change rooms, and showers. The septic system is designed to accommodate 60 persons, with a septic tank of 38,611-L (10,200-gal) capacity.

WESF electrical substation ties to a 13.8 kV electrical line. If electrical power is lost a batter powered lighting system will maintain facility lighting for 90 minutes. An uninterruptible power supply (UPS) will provide batter power for 55 minutes or longer,

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATIONS FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

depending on the load, to electrical and process ventilation monitoring systems. Emergency alarms and communication systems also are powered by the UPS.

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

No new utilities are proposed for WESF. Existing utilities would be modified, as appropriate, to support the new ventilation system.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: 

M. S. McCormick, Manager
U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office

Date Submitted: MAY 20 2011