



00-000-19

STATE OF WASHINGTON  
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY  
3100 Port of Benton Blvd • Richland, WA 99352 • (509) 372-7950

June 12, 2006

Mr. Keith A. Klein  
Richland Operations Office  
United States Department of Energy  
P.O. Box 550, MSIN: A7-50  
Richland, Washington 99352

Mr. Roy J. Schepens  
Office of River Protection  
United States Department of Energy  
P.O. Box 450, MSIN: H6-60  
Richland, Washington 99352

Re: United States Department of Energy Calendar Year (CY) 2005 Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Summary Report, submitted in accordance with M-26-01P

Dear Mr. Klein and Mr. Schepens:

This is in response to your letter and attached CY 2005 LDR Summary Report, submitted April 28, 2006, to Mr. Nicholas Ceto of the United States Environmental Protection Agency and Ms. Jane Hedges of the Department of Ecology.

In accordance with the Hanford Facility Agreement and Consent Order, Milestone M-26-01P, this report was submitted as a primary document which requires the lead regulatory agency to respond within 45 days. This letter and the enclosed comment pages constitute Ecology's response.

If you would like to discuss Ecology's comments on the CY 2005 LDR Summary Report, contact me at 509-372-7929.

Sincerely,

Eric Van Mason  
LDR Report Manager  
Nuclear Waste Program

EVM:pll  
Enclosure  
cc: See next page

RECEIVED  
JUN 21 2006  
EDMC



Mr. Klein and Mr. Schepens  
June 12, 2006  
Page 2

cc w/enc:

Greg Sinton, USDOE-RL  
Woody Russell, USDOE-ORP  
John Guberski, CH2M  
Tony Miskho, FHI  
Harold Tilden, PNNL  
Environmental Portal  
Administrative Record

cc w/o enc:

Stuart Harris, CTUIR  
Gabriel Bohnee, NPT  
Russell Jim, YN  
Todd Martin, HAB  
Ken Niles, ODOE

<b>REVIEW COMMENT RECORD</b>	Date June 12, 2006	Review No.
	Project No.	Page  Page 1 of 3

Document Number(s)/Title(s) Calendar Year 2005 Hanford Site Mixed Waste Land Disposal Restrictions Summary Report	Program/Project/Building Number	Reviewer EJV	Organization/Group WDOE	Location/Phone  509-372-7950
--	---------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------

Comment Submittal Approval:                      Agreement with indicated comment disposition(s)                      Status:

Organization Manager (Optional)                      Reviewer/Point of Contact                      Reviewer/Point of Contact  
Date                      Date                      Author/Originator                      Author/Originator

Item	Page #	Comment (s) (Provide technical justification for the comment and detailed recommendation of the action required to correct/resolve the discrepancy/problem indicated.)	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted.)	Status
1	Page 1-11 Table 1-2 Treatability Group Summary of Storage, Characterization, Treatment, and Disposal Activities  Purgewater	Explain the source of numbers for Purgewater. The projected volume to be treated through 2010 seems particularly low.			
2	Page 1-24 Table 1-4 Potential Mixed waste Table UO <sub>3</sub> facility	PMW table references DOE/RL 98-22 as identifying hazardous material remaining in the facility. DOE/RL 98/22 does not identify what material remains in the 270-W tank but states that the contents remain unknown. If available, additional information should be added to DOE/RL 98-22 or the PMW table. If the contents of 270-W are unknown a storage assessment should be scheduled.			
3	Page 3-3 Table 3-1 Summary of Characterization	Under Additional characterization activities column, table states "Further information may be required" Please provide further explanation.			

# REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date  
June 12, 2006

Review No.

Project No.

Page

Page 2 of 3

	Information				
4	SST Waste Page 5-1 Table 5-1 Storage Volume and Number of Containers for Selected Hanford Locations CWC	Is classified waste stored at CWC captured within the volumes listed?			
5	Table 1-1, p. 1-5, 222-S Laboratory Complex Generation projection 2010 (m <sup>3</sup> )	shows 1 m <sup>3</sup> , rather than 11 in years following. If assumption is made that WTP Lab will be operational by 2010 and need for 222-S will disappear, assumption does not recognize delay in construction/hot start of WTP. Not clear that RL and ORP are integrating planning for use of 222-S.			
6	Sec. 1.2. ¶ 1, sentence 2 Mixed waste managed... are not reported.	TYPO – change are to is.			
7	Table 1-1, p. 1-8, Purgewater Generation projection for 2010	The table does not contain volumes of purgewater that will be generated in 2010. By implication, either sampling efforts will be suspended or purgewater will be collected and taken directly to PSTF or ETF for treatment (Table 1-2). Please clarify the process to treat purgewater after 2009.			
8	Table 1-2 Title "Treatability Group...and Disposal Activities	Title is not accurate. Disposal Activities not included in information. While LDR implies land disposal, paths for individual units are not included.			
9	Table 1-4, p. 1-16, 241-Z Heels, associated	Schedule information states waste to be dispositioned as CERCLA non-time critical removal action, with 241-Z facility transition and dismantlement due by September 30, 2011. FY07 budget request states that dismantlement/demolition of the 241-Z facility will be complete by the end of FY07 (DOE/CF-006, Vol. 5, p. 246). From the			

<b>REVIEW COMMENT RECORD</b>	Date June 12, 2006	Review No.
	Project No.	Page  Page 3 of 3

	<p>pipng, line flushing and sludge cleanout.</p>	<p>information provided, the waste from that dismantlement would appear to be non-mixed in large part. Please confirm.</p>			
10	<p>Table 1-4, p. 1-16, 241-Z-361 Tank containing waste from past practices</p>	<p>Text states that a data gap plan is scheduled for 1<sup>st</sup> Qtr 2007 and remediation is scheduled for 2009 to 2011. That information would appear to be outdated, based on the DOE/CF-006, Vol 5 information, if the USDOE RL intends to complete 241-Z D4 in FY07.</p>			
11	<p>Table 1-4, various locations See the location-specific data sheets for details regarding waste.</p>	<p>Data sheets are not transmitted with the summary. Needs clarification.</p>			
12	<p>General Comment</p>	<p>The 241-U-361 settling tank is not included in the report. If the waste in this tank is not intended for direct disposal at ERDF, it should be included in the report.</p>			