



0074132

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

Reissue

SEP 28 2007

07-AMCP-0290

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

Mr. N. Ceto, Program Manager  
Office of Environmental Cleanup  
Hanford Project Office  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
309 Bradley Blvd., Suite 115  
Richland, Washington 99352

**RECEIVED**  
OCT 16 2007

**EDMC**

Addressees:

200-SW-1 NONRADIOACTIVE LANDFILLS AND DUMPS GROUP OPERABLE UNIT  
AND 200-SW-2 RADIOACTIVE LANDFILLS AND DUMPS GROUP OPERABLE UNIT  
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY WORK PLAN, DOE/RL-2004-60,  
DRAFT B AND TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT INTERIM MILESTONE M-13-07-03 CHANGE  
PACKAGE

The purpose of this letter is to transmit the 200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan, DOE/RL-2004-60, Draft B for your review and approval. The U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (RL) previously transmitted Draft A of this work plan to the State of Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) on December 20, 2004, by letter (05-AMCP-0092).

This work plan completes Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-013-28, "Submit a revised work plan for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-1 Operable Units to Ecology to identify likely response scenarios and potentially applicable technologies, identify the need for treatability study investigations and include sampling and analysis plans." In accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement, please provide comments to RL by close of business on November 29, 2007.

Also attached is the Tri-Party Agreement Interim Milestone M-13-07-03 change package pertaining to the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units Work Plan as required by Section 11.6 of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan.

Addressees  
07-AMCP-0290

-2-

SEP 28 2007

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

Sincerely,

  
David A. Brockman  
Manager

AMCP:FMR

Attachments

cc w/attachs:

D. B. Bartus, EPA

G. Bohnee, NPT

F. W. Bond, Ecology

L. Buck, Wanapum

S. Harris, CTUIR

R. Jim, YN

S. L. Leckband, HAB

K. Niles, ODOE

Administrative Record

Environmental Portal

*200-SW-1*  
*200-SW-2*  
*M-013-28A*


cc w/o attachs:

B. A. Austin, FHI

S. L. Pedersen, FHI

R. E. Piippo, FHI

J. G. Vance, FFS

<b>Change Number</b> M-13-07-03	<b>Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order</b>  <b>Change Control Form</b> Do not use blue ink. Type or print using black ink.	<b>Date</b> 9/11/2007
<b>Originator</b> B. Charboneau	<b>Phone</b> (509) 373-6137	
<b>Class of Change</b> <input type="checkbox"/> I – Signatories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> II – Executive Manager <input type="checkbox"/> III – Project Manager		
<b>Change Title</b> Establishment of <u>Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order</u> (Agreement) M-13 Interim Milestone for the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units.		
<b>Description/Justification of Change</b>  Approval of this change package authorizes the establishment of one interim milestone for the initiation of small-diameter direct push technology characterization, passive-organic vapor sampling, and surface geophysics within 90 days of receiving approval of the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 RI/FS Work Plan (Rev 0).  As specified in the Tri-Party Agreement, Section 11.6, work plans must specify interim milestones for the OU that identify completion dates for major tasks and deliverables specified in the work plans. The 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Work Plan includes a project schedule with target project milestones. Based on this work plan schedule, the following interim milestone is proposed under the Tri-Party Agreement to implement the activities for the RI/FS process for the operable units.		
<b>Impact of Change</b> This change package adds one new interim milestone that does not adversely impact worker safety or the environment.		
<b>Affected Documents</b> The <u>Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order</u> , as amended and Hanford Site internal planning management, and budget documents (e.g., Baseline Change Control documents; related work authorizations and directives).		
<b>Approvals</b>		
_____	_____	_____ Approved _____ Disapproved
Ecology	Date	
	9/25/07	X Approved _____ Disapproved
DOE-RL	Date	
_____	_____	_____ Approved _____ Disapproved
EPA	Date	

(modifications to existing Tri-Party Agreement milestones are denoted with ~~strikeout~~; new milestone/text are denoted with **bolding**) :

<u>Milestone</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Date</u>
	<b>Initiate Small Diameter Direct Push Technology Characterization, Passive Organic Vapor Sampling, and Surface Geophysics within 90 Days of Receiving Approval of the 200-SW-1/2 RI/FS Work Plan (Rev 0)</b>	TBD

# **200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial Investigation/ Feasibility Study Work Plan**

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy  
Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management



**United States  
Department of Energy**  
P.O. Box 550  
Richland, Washington 99352

Approved for Public Release:  
Further Dissemination Unlimited

# 200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial Investigation/ Feasibility Study Work Plan

Date Published  
September 2007

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy  
Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management



**United States  
Department of Energy**  
P.O. Box 550  
Richland, Washington 99352

*A. D. Aardal*  
Release Approval      Date *09/11/2007*

**Approved for Public Release:**  
Further Dissemination Unlimited

**TRADEMARK DISCLAIMER**

Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof or its contractors or subcontractors.

This report has been reproduced from the best available copy.  
Available in paper copy.

Printed in the United States of America

**PREFACE**

1  
2 *The remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) process*  
3 *represents the methodology that the Superfund program has*  
4 *established for characterizing the nature and extent of risks posed*  
5 *by uncontrolled hazardous waste sites and for evaluating potential*  
6 *remedial options. This approach should be viewed as a dynamic,*  
7 *flexible process that can and should be tailored to specific*  
8 *circumstances of individual sites: it is not a rigid step-by-step*  
9 *approach that must be conducted identically at every site. The*  
10 *project manager's central responsibility is to determine how best*  
11 *to use the flexibility built into the process to conduct an efficient*  
12 *and effective RI/FS that achieves high quality results in a timely*  
13 *and cost-effective manner. A significant challenge project*  
14 *managers face in effectively managing an RI/FS is the inherent*  
15 *uncertainties associated with the remediation of uncontrolled*  
16 *hazardous waste sites. These uncertainties can be numerous,*  
17 *ranging from potential unknowns regarding site hydrogeology and*  
18 *the actual extent of contamination, to the performance of treatment*  
19 *and engineering controls being considered as part of the remedial*  
20 *strategy. While these uncertainties foster a natural desire to want*  
21 *to know more, this desire competes with the Superfund program's*  
22 *mandate to perform cleanups within designated schedules.*

23 *The objective of the RI/FS process is not the unobtainable goal of*  
24 *removing all uncertainty, but rather to gather information*  
25 *sufficient to support an informed risk management decision*  
26 *regarding which remedy appears most appropriate for a given site.*  
27 *The appropriate level of analysis to meet this objective can only be*  
28 *reached through constant strategic thinking and careful planning*  
29 *concerning the essential data needed to reach a remedy selection*  
30 *decision. As hypotheses are tested and either rejected or*  
31 *confirmed, adjustments or choices as to the appropriate course for*  
32 *further investigations and analyses are required. These choices,*  
33 *like the remedy selection itself, involve the balancing of a wide*  
34 *variety of factors and the exercise of best professional judgment.*

35 *Source: EPA/540/G-89/004, Guidance for Conducting*  
36 *Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies under*  
37 *CERCLA, (Interim Final), OSWER 9355.3-01.*

This page intentionally left blank.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1

2 This remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) work plan supports the *Comprehensive*  
3 *Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980*<sup>1</sup> (CERCLA) RI/FS activities  
4 for the 200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit (OU) and  
5 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group OU. This RI/FS work plan also integrates  
6 the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*<sup>2</sup> (RCRA) treatment, storage, and/or  
7 disposal (TSD) unit landfill-closure requirements for specific sites within the OUs. The process  
8 outlined in the RI/FS work plan follows the CERCLA format with modifications, as appropriate,  
9 to concurrently satisfy RCRA requirements. The application of these processes in the 200 Areas  
10 is described in DOE/RL-98-28, *200 Areas Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study*  
11 *Implementation Plan – Environmental Restoration Program* (Implementation Plan)<sup>3</sup>.

12 This work plan has been prepared to satisfy Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-013-028, “*Submit*  
13 *a revised work plan for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-1 OUs to Ecology to identify likely response*  
14 *scenarios and potentially applicable technologies, identify the need for treatability study*  
15 *investigations and include sampling and analysis plans (due September 30, 2007).”*

16 **Scope** -- The scope of this work plan primarily is concerned with 26 solid-waste landfills that are  
17 located on the Hanford Site Central Plateau (12 landfills are in the 200 West Area, 12 landfills  
18 are in the 200 East Area, and 2 landfills are in the 600 Area). Collectively, these landfills have  
19 received nearly 500,000 m<sup>3</sup> of a heterogeneous mixture of solid waste during various operating  
20 periods that began in the mid-1940s. All waste included within the scope of the 200-SW-1 and  
21 200-SW-2 OUs has been buried in unlined trenches that were designed and constructed to  
22 varying lengths, widths, and depths. These landfills cover a cumulative area of nearly 300 ha  
23 (740 ac), and the cumulative length of burial trenches exceeds 80 km (50 mi). The quantity and  
24 quality of burial records and/or relevant historical information varies greatly; information  
25 generally is sparse for the earlier years and more substantive for waste buried after the late

---

<sup>1</sup> *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980*, 42 USC 9601, et seq.

<sup>2</sup> *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*, 42 USC 6901, et seq.

<sup>3</sup> DOE/RL-98-28, 1999, *200 Areas Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Implementation Plan – Environmental Restoration Program*, Rev. 0, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.

1 1960s. About 60 percent of the waste buried in these landfills was from the Hanford Site  
 2 200 Areas processing facilities; some waste came from the 100 and 300 Areas, and a smaller  
 3 fraction came from other Hanford Site areas and from various off-site generators. The waste  
 4 form, waste packaging, and in-trench waste emplacement varied over time. Certain landfills  
 5 were dedicated to smaller waste items, while some landfills were dedicated to large/industrial  
 6 equipment, and others received primarily construction and/or demolition-related waste.



7  
 8 **Work Plan History** -- An earlier version of this RI/FS work plan (DOE/RL-2004-60,  
 9 *200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit and*  
 10 *200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial Investigation/*  
 11 *Feasibility Study Work Plan, Draft A*)<sup>4</sup> was developed and transmitted by the U.S. Department of  
 12 Energy (DOE), Richland Operations Office (RL) to the Washington State Department of  
 13 Ecology (Ecology) in December 2004. In early 2005, RL and Ecology participated in a series of  
 14 facilitated workshops to achieve better alignment of the parties' interests and objectives. These  
 15 workshops resulted in a path forward, as documented in Ecology and DOE, 2005, *200-SW-1 and*  
 16 *200-SW-2 Collaborative Workshops, Agreement Completion Matrix, and Supporting*  
 17 *Documentation, Final Product*<sup>5</sup>. Among other initiatives, the parties agreed to conduct remedial  
 18 characterization in a phased manner and to suspend revision of the Draft A edition of the  
 19 RI/FS work plan while the first phase of remedial characterization was completed. The parties  
 20 then participated in a collaborative data quality objectives process as described in D&D-27257,

---

<sup>4</sup> DOE/RL-2004-60, 2004, *200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan, Draft A*, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.

<sup>5</sup> Ecology and DOE, 2005, *200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Collaborative Workshops, Agreement, Completion Matrix, and Supporting Documentation, Final Product*, (Correspondence Control No. 0064527), Washington State Department of Ecology and U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington, April 18.

1 *Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for Nonintrusive Characterization of Bin 3A and*  
2 *Bin 3B Waste Sites in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-1 Operable Unit*<sup>6</sup>, and issued sampling  
3 instructions as described in D&D-28283, *Sampling and Analysis Instruction for Nonintrusive*  
4 *Characterization of Bin 3A and Bin 3B Waste Sites in the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit*<sup>7</sup>. This first  
5 phase (Phase I-A) of characterization has been completed. The Phase I-A scope involved an  
6 extensive review, collection, reporting, and organization of the historical information (including  
7 hundreds of technical reports and over 147,000 burial records) as well as the completion of an  
8 extensive suite of surface geophysical surveys, passive organic-vapor surveys, and  
9 surface-radiation surveys. The results from the Phase I-A sampling were used to update the OU  
10 conceptual site models (CSM).

11 ***New Agreement on a Multi-Phased Remedial Investigation Approach*** -- Based on information  
12 gained from the Phase I-A characterization, an additional data quality objectives process was  
13 initiated in 2006. Because of the complexity in scope and issues associated with the 200-SW-1  
14 and 200-SW-2 OUs, alignment meetings were held with Ecology and RL, resulting in another  
15 collaborative agreement (CCN 0073214, *Path Forward – 200-SW-1/2 RI/FS Work Plan*  
16 *Development, May 15, 2007*<sup>8</sup>) between RL and Ecology. This 2007 agreement embraced the  
17 concept that the RI/FS work plan and RI/FS approach should be structured in a manner that  
18 further implements a phased approach. Accordingly, this agreed-upon approach now involves  
19 multiple phases of characterization and future revisions to this RI/FS work plan and/or sampling  
20 and analysis plan after substantive portions of the next phase(s) of remedial investigation are  
21 completed.

22 ***Next Phase of Remedial Investigation (Phase I-B)*** -- This version of the RI/FS work plan is  
23 primarily focused on the next phase of characterization (hereinafter called Phase I-B). The  
24 Phase I-B remedial investigation consists of both nonintrusive and intrusive characterization.

---

<sup>6</sup> D&D-27257, 2006, *Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for Nonintrusive Characterization of Bin 3A and Bin 3B Waste Sites in the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit*, Rev. 0 Reissue, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.

<sup>7</sup> D&D-28283, 2006, *Sampling and Analysis Instruction for Nonintrusive Characterization of Bin 3A and Bin 3B Waste Sites in the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit*, Rev. 0 Reissue, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.

<sup>8</sup> CCN 0073214, 2007, *Path Forward – 200-SW-1/2 RI/FS Work Plan Development, May 15, 2007*, (agreement signed by Matthew S. McCormick, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, and John B. Price, Washington State Department of Ecology, Kennewick, Washington), at Richland, Washington.

1 The Phase I-B investigations allow for the collection of essential data and information that are  
2 needed for focusing the more costly vadose-zone soil sampling activities planned for Phases II  
3 and III. Phase II characterization activities will be defined in a future version of this RI/FS work  
4 plan and sampling and analysis plan, and will consist of focused intrusive investigations of the  
5 targeted items/locations resulting from characterization of Phase I-A and Phase I-B. It is  
6 assumed that additional characterization beyond Phase II (i.e., Phase III) will be required,  
7 stemming from the information and data as well as the results of modeling that will evaluate the  
8 human-health and ecological risk and migration to groundwater following the CERCLA RI/FS  
9 process. Scope in Phase III also may be needed to address areas that require particular caution to  
10 worker safety concerns (e.g., landfills, trenches containing elevated levels of plutonium).

11 The Phase I-B remedial investigation scope, as presented in this RI/FS work plan, includes the  
12 following activities:

- 13 • *Accelerated Closure of 200-SW-1 Landfills* – Closure plans have been written for the  
14 only two sites currently remaining in the 200-SW-1 OU (i.e., the Nonradioactive  
15 Dangerous Waste Landfill and the 600 Area Central Landfill). However, both of these  
16 closure plans are out of date. This RI/FS work plan includes activities to rewrite/reissue  
17 the plans for regulatory agency review/comment and approval. This RI/FS work plan  
18 describes a path forward that supports accelerated landfill-closure decisions and the  
19 integration of barrier designs for these two landfills.
- 20 • *Early Closure of Unused Landfill Areas* – Three of the seven RCRA TSD unit landfills in  
21 the 200-SW-2 OU (i.e., 218-W-4C, 218-E-10, and 218-E-12B Landfills) contain large  
22 areas that once were intended for buried waste but that are believed never to have been  
23 used. Collectively, these three areas account for over 40 ha (100 ac), or roughly  
24 15 percent of the overall footprint of 200-SW-2 OU landfills. This RI/FS work plan  
25 outlines activities for gathering and presenting the necessary historical records and  
26 performing field activities to possibly support early decisions pursuant to  
27 Ecology et al., 1989b, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order Action*

1 *Plan*, Section 6.3.3, Procedural Closure.<sup>9</sup> This process, if successful, should eliminate  
2 the need for allocating additional RI/FS resources to these areas.

- 3 • *Surface Geophysical Investigations* – Geophysical investigation methods  
4 (e.g., ground-penetrating radar, electromagnetic-induction, and total magnetic-field  
5 techniques) will be deployed to locate a variety of features including burial trench  
6 ends/edges and centerlines, location of buried waste or other significant  
7 features/anomalies, differentiation of waste types, and depth of soil cover. These  
8 investigation methods have been applied successfully to 13 of the 17 older landfills that  
9 generally lacked detailed burial records. Application of these methods to the 218-W-4A,  
10 218-E-2, 218-E-4, and 218-E-9 Landfills will complete the geophysical-survey coverage  
11 for the entire suite of 17 past-practice landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU.
  
- 12 • *Passive Organic-Vapor Sampling* – Passive organic soil-vapor surveys will be performed  
13 to screen for the presence of buried volatile organic compounds. Results will be used to  
14 determine the locations of waste packages that may contain liquid organics and have  
15 breached their containment. Results from this nonintrusive sampling also will help  
16 determine locations for the more active soil-vapor sampling during the future Phase II  
17 intrusive sampling. This RI/FS work plan targets 293 specific locations for Phase I-B  
18 passive organic-vapor sampling. Most (207) sample locations are based on targeting  
19 23 areas where volatile organic compounds were detected at a single location during the  
20 earlier (Phase I-A) passive soil-vapor surveys that were performed in the TSD unit  
21 landfills. The other individual sampling locations (86 total) are based on where buried  
22 metallic objects were identified during geophysical investigations that were conducted  
23 during the Phase I-A characterization.
  
- 24 • *Intrusive Geophysical Investigations* – Down-hole geophysical surveys will be performed  
25 using spectral-gamma and neutron-moisture logging systems. The spectral-gamma  
26 system can provide cost-effective information on the vertical and lateral distribution of  
27 gamma-emitting radionuclides. The neutron-moisture logging system will be used to

---

<sup>9</sup> Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1989b, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order Action Plan*, Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington.

1 measure continuous vertical moisture in the vadose zone. Information from both logging  
2 systems will aid in geological interpretation of the subsurface stratigraphy and potential  
3 contaminant migration. The spectral-gamma and neutron-moisture logging systems will  
4 be deployed in existing accessible wells that are located near the 200-SW-2 OU landfill  
5 sites as well as in newly created, small-diameter direct-push technique holes that are  
6 targeted for installation near centers of each of the 24 200-SW-2 OU landfills. The target  
7 locations for direct pushes will be between trenches, so that the buried waste is not  
8 directly penetrated. Information resulting from these investigations will support  
9 refinement of the sites' CSMs and help to more effectively target the depths of future  
10 (Phase II and/or Phase III) and more costly soil sampling and analyses.

- 11 • *Remote Inspection of Potentially Unused Caissons* – Based on historical records, up to  
12 four caissons in the 218-W-4A Landfill and one caisson in the 218-W-4B Landfill may  
13 be empty. Phase I-B investigation activities will include surveys to locate these buried  
14 caissons, assessing methods for remote access, and deployment of radiation  
15 detection/monitoring and remote-visualization methods for assessing caisson contents.  
16 While Hanford Site drawings do include coordinates for potential caisson locations, the  
17 location of many of the caissons not evident from the ground surface and the burial  
18 records for actual caisson contents (if any) have not been located.
- 19 • *Treatability Investigations* – Treatability and other focused investigations will be  
20 conducted during Phase I-B (and future remedial investigation phases) to fill data gaps  
21 with information, to reduce uncertainties and to support better decision making and more  
22 cost-effective site remediation. The current listing of subjects that warrant focused  
23 investigations includes the location of large burial boxes and the potential for surface  
24 subsidence; cost of waste retrieval versus barrier construction; caisson characterization  
25 and remedial techniques; retrieval of spent fuel; assessment of acid-soaked material  
26 trenches; vadose-zone characterization and monitoring techniques; waste-trench  
27 compaction methods; in situ detection of transuranics; and soil-vacuum removal methods.

28 ***Coordination with other Groundwater Operable Units*** -- The groundwater OUs related to this  
29 RI/FS work plan are primarily the 200-ZP-1 and 200-BP-5 Groundwater OUs, and (to a lesser  
30 extent) the 200-PO-1 and 200-UP-1 Groundwater OUs. The scope of this RI/FS work plan does

1 not include groundwater sampling; however, the integration of source, vadose zone, and  
2 groundwater information/data and field activities is recognized, and will be performed  
3 throughout the life cycle of this project.

4 ***Coordination with other Waste Retrieval Projects*** -- The 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs project  
5 team also acknowledges the importance of exchanging technical information and lessons learned  
6 with other related projects at the Hanford Site and at other DOE sites. Such local projects  
7 include those supporting Ecology et al., 1989a, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and*  
8 *Consent Order*<sup>10</sup>, Milestone M-091-40 for the retrieval of post-1970 transuranic waste in the  
9 200 West and 200 East Area landfills, the retrieval of buried waste from 100 Area and 300 Area  
10 landfills, and the upcoming remediation activities at the 618-10 and 618-11 Burial Ground sites.

11 ***No Presumed Remedies*** -- This work plan does not presume a remedy for the 200-SW-2 OU  
12 landfills. The CERCLA RI/FS process will be followed, and data/information will be gathered  
13 to support the evaluation of multiple remedial measures. In accordance with the agreements  
14 reached between RL and Ecology in 2005 and 2007, the likely response scenarios to be  
15 considered for these landfills will include the following:

- 16 • Excavation, treatment (as necessary), and disposal of waste from within individual burial  
17 grounds
- 18 • Excavation, treatment (as necessary), and disposal of waste from selected sections of  
19 individual burial grounds
- 20 • Capping of individual burial grounds
- 21 • In situ treatment (e.g., vitrification or grouting) of portions of individual burial grounds
- 22 • Some combination of the above
- 23 • No action, with continued monitoring.

---

<sup>10</sup> Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1989a, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*, 2 vols., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington, as amended.

- 1 **Organization of this Document** -- The enclosed RI/FS work plan is organized as follows:
- 2 • **Chapter 1.0, Introduction**, presents the RI/FS work plan scope and objectives, and  
3 project assumptions.
  - 4 • **Chapter 2.0, Background and Setting**, presents the physical setting for the 200-SW-1  
5 and 200-SW-2 OUs, including information on geology and groundwater. This chapter  
6 also provides detailed descriptions of each of the 26 landfills within the scope of this  
7 work plan.
  - 8 • **Chapter 3.0, Initial Evaluation of Landfills**, presents known and suspected  
9 contamination for the in-scope landfills, the preliminary CSMs for each landfill group (or  
10 “bin”), information on groundwater monitoring, potential impacts to human health and  
11 the environment, and the contaminants of potential concern.
  - 12 • **Chapter 4.0, Work Plan Approach and Rationale**, presents a summary of the data  
13 quality objectives process, the characterization approach for each bin (or grouping of  
14 waste sites), and a description of the phased characterization approach.
  - 15 • **Chapter 5.0, Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Process**, presents a summary of  
16 the regulatory paths forward for the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs, a discussion of  
17 treatability investigations, a summary of cost-estimating processes that will be used in the  
18 feasibility study, and a description of the proposed plan and RCRA permit-modification  
19 process and the post-record-of-decision activities.
  - 20 • **Chapter 6.0, Project Schedule**, presents a schedule for completion of the 200-SW-2 OU  
21 RI/FS process (including TSD closure/postclosure care), as well as a schedule for closure  
22 activities associated with the 200-SW-1 OU landfills.
  - 23 • **Chapter 7.0, References**, provides the complete citation of documents referenced in this  
24 RI/FS work plan.
  - 25 • **Appendix A, Sampling and Analysis Plan for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills**  
26 (Phase I-B)

- 1 • *Appendix B*, Summary Descriptions and Figures of Waste Sites in the 200-SW-1 and
- 2 200-SW-2 Nonradioactive and Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Operable Units
  
- 3 • *Appendix C*, Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix Status
  
- 4 • *Appendix D*, Data Collected to Support Characterization of Landfills in the
- 5 200-SW-2 Operable Unit
  
- 6 • *Appendix E*, Initial Conceptual Site Models for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills.

7 Readers of this document should find it helpful to first spend a few minutes reviewing the figures  
8 located in the main body of the document, and then review the CSMs in Appendix E to gain  
9 some initial familiarity with the six groupings (or “bins”) that have been developed for the  
10 200-SW-2 OU landfills. Appendix E also includes CSM descriptions and site-specific graphics  
11 for each of the 24 landfills.

This page intentionally left blank.

## CONTENTS

2	1.0	INTRODUCTION .....	1-1
3	1.1	SUMMARY DESCRIPTIONS OF THE 200-SW-1 AND 200-SW-2	
4		OPERABLE UNITS .....	1-7
5	1.1.1	Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group – 200-SW-1	
6		Operable Unit .....	1-7
7	1.1.2	Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group – 200-SW-2 Operable	
8		Unit .....	1-7
9	1.2	SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES FOR THIS RI/FS WORK PLAN .....	1-9
10	1.2.1	Coordinated Regulatory Approach .....	1-10
11	1.2.2	Regulatory Approach for Closure of the Nonradioactive	
12		Dangerous Waste Landfill and the 600 Area Central Landfill .....	1-10
13	1.2.3	Phased Characterization Approach for the 200-SW-2 Operable	
14		Unit Landfills .....	1-11
15	1.3	EXCLUSIONS FROM SCOPE OF WORK PLAN .....	1-11
16	1.3.1	Suspect Transuranic Waste .....	1-11
17	1.3.2	Unused Portions of Treatment, Storage, and Disposal-Unit	
18		Landfills .....	1-12
19	1.3.3	Operating Trenches .....	1-12
20	1.4	200 AREAS IMPLEMENTATION PLAN .....	1-13
21	1.5	PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS .....	1-14
22	1.6	CHANGE MANAGEMENT .....	1-16
23	2.0	BACKGROUND AND SETTING .....	2-1
24	2.1	DESCRIPTIONS OF WASTE SITES .....	2-1
25	2.1.1	600 Area Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and 600	
26		Area Central Landfill .....	2-1
27	2.1.2	200-SW-2 Operable Unit Treatment, Storage, and/or Disposal	
28		Unit Landfills .....	2-4
29	2.1.3	200-SW-2 Operable Unit Past-Practice Landfills .....	2-13
30	2.2	PHYSICAL SETTING .....	2-23
31	2.2.1	Topography .....	2-23
32	2.2.2	Geology .....	2-25
33	2.2.3	Groundwater Operable Units .....	2-28
34	2.2.4	History of Facilities Generating Solid Waste .....	2-46
35	2.2.5	Overview of Solid-Waste Operations .....	2-49
36	2.2.6	Historical Disposal Practices and Facilities .....	2-53
37	2.2.7	Caissons .....	2-61
38	2.2.8	Drag-Off Boxes .....	2-66
39	2.2.9	Liquid Wastes .....	2-66
40	2.2.10	High-Radiation Dose-Rate Waste .....	2-66
41	2.2.11	Current Disposal Practices .....	2-67
42	3.0	INITIAL EVALUATION OF LANDFILLS .....	3-1
43	3.1	KNOWN AND SUSPECTED CONTAMINATION .....	3-1

1	3.1.1	Nonradioactive Landfills – 200-SW-1 Operable Unit .....	3-2
2	3.1.2	Radioactive Landfills – 200-SW-2 Operable Unit.....	3-2
3	3.2	HISTORY OF THE RI/FS WORK PLAN.....	3-3
4	3.2.1	Waste Sites in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units.....	3-3
5	3.2.2	Waste-Site Binning .....	3-14
6	3.3	NATURE AND EXTENT OF CONTAMINATION.....	3-16
7	3.3.1	200-SW-1 Operable Unit (Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and 600 Area Central Landfill) .....	3-18
8	3.3.2	200-SW-2 Operable Unit .....	3-19
9	3.4	ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING.....	3-34
10	3.4.1	Ecological Evaluation Report and Terrestrial Ecological Risk Assessment.....	3-35
11	3.4.2	200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit-Specific Environmental Information .....	3-38
12	3.5	RCRA TREATMENT, STORAGE, AND DISPOSAL UNIT GROUNDWATER MONITORING.....	3-41
13	3.5.1	Overview of RCRA Monitoring .....	3-42
14	3.5.2	218-E-10 Landfill (LLWMA-1) Groundwater Monitoring .....	3-43
15	3.5.3	218-E-12B Landfill (LLWMA-2) Groundwater Monitoring.....	3-45
16	3.5.4	218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, and 218-W-5 Landfills (LLWMA-3) Groundwater Monitoring .....	3-45
17	3.5.5	218-W-4B and 218-W-4C Landfills (LLWMA-4) Groundwater Monitoring .....	3-47
18	3.5.6	Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill Groundwater Monitoring .....	3-49
19	3.6	POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO HUMAN HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT .....	3-51
20	3.6.1	Contaminant Sources and Release Mechanisms.....	3-53
21	3.6.2	Development of Contaminants of Potential Concern .....	3-53
22	3.6.3	Conceptual Site Models .....	3-55
23	4.0	WORK PLAN APPROACH AND RATIONALE.....	4-1
24	4.1	SUMMARY OF DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVE PROCESS.....	4-1
25	4.1.1	Data Uses .....	4-2
26	4.1.2	Data Needs .....	4-5
27	4.1.3	Data Quality .....	4-6
28	4.1.4	Data Quantity .....	4-6
29	4.2	CHARACTERIZATION APPROACH .....	4-7
30	4.3	INVESTIGATION TECHNIQUES .....	4-10
31	4.3.1	Surface Geophysical Surveys.....	4-10
32	4.3.2	Detection of Organic Vapors .....	4-11
33	4.3.3	Evaluation of Vadose-Zone Soils .....	4-11
34	4.3.4	Inspection and Survey of Unused Caisson Interiors .....	4-13
35	4.4	ITEMS OF INTEREST .....	4-14
36	4.5	OTHER SOURCES OF CHARACTERIZATION DATA .....	4-21
37	4.5.1	TRU Waste Retrieval .....	4-25
38	4.5.2	200-PW-1 Operable Unit .....	4-25

1	4.5.3	Ecological Risk Assessment Sampling .....	4-26
2	5.0	REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY PROCESS.....	5-1
3	5.1	COORDINATED REGULATORY PROCESS FOR THE 200-SW-2	
4		OPERABLE UNIT .....	5-3
5	5.1.1	Regulatory and Tri-Party Agreement Drivers for Closure of	
6		TSD-Unit Landfills .....	5-4
7	5.1.2	Characterization Data Requirements for TSD-Unit Landfill	
8		Closure .....	5-6
9	5.1.3	Regulatory and Tri-Party Agreement Drivers for Remediation	
10		of RCRA Past-Practice Landfills .....	5-7
11	5.1.4	Characterization Data Requirements for RCRA Past-Practice	
12		Remediation .....	5-8
13	5.1.5	Regulatory Requirements for Pre-1970 Buried Waste.....	5-9
14	5.1.6	Regulatory Requirements for Mixed Waste Disposed of After	
15		August 19, 1987 .....	5-9
16	5.1.7	Summary Assessment of Commitments in the Collaborative	
17		Agreement .....	5-10
18	5.2	CLOSURE OF THE NONRADIOACTIVE DANGEROUS WASTE	
19		LANDFILL AND THE 600 AREA CENTRAL LANDFILL.....	5-10
20	5.2.1	Regulatory Basis for Closure Decisions .....	5-11
21	5.3	PHASED CHARACTERIZATION APPROACH.....	5-13
22	5.4	COMMUNITY RELATIONS.....	5-13
23	5.5	REMEDIAL-INVESTIGATION ACTIVITIES .....	5-14
24	5.5.1	Historical Information Review.....	5-14
25	5.5.2	Planning .....	5-30
26	5.5.3	Field Investigation.....	5-31
27	5.6	EVALUATION OF PHASE I-A AND PHASE I-B DATA .....	5-32
28	5.7	REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT .....	5-32
29	5.7.1	Data Quality Assessment .....	5-33
30	5.7.2	Data Evaluation and Conceptual-Model Refinement .....	5-33
31	5.7.3	Baseline Human-Health Risk Assessment.....	5-33
32	5.7.4	Ecological Evaluation and Risk Assessment .....	5-36
33	5.8	FEASIBILITY STUDY/RCRA TREATMENT, STORAGE, AND/OR	
34		DISPOSAL UNIT CLOSURE PLAN .....	5-37
35	5.8.1	Remedial-Action Alternatives.....	5-37
36	5.8.2	Remedial Alternatives, Performance Standards, and Selection	
37		Criteria.....	5-40
38	5.8.3	Treatability Investigations.....	5-42
39	5.8.4	Feasibility Study Cost Estimating.....	5-46
40	5.8.5	Information and Data Management .....	5-48
41	5.9	PROPOSED PLAN AND PROPOSED RCRA-PERMIT	
42		MODIFICATION .....	5-50
43	5.9.1	High-Risk Waste Sites Identified for Early Action.....	5-51
44	5.9.2	Regional Site Closure.....	5-51
45	5.9.3	Waste-Site Grouping by Characteristics or Hazards.....	5-51



1	Figure 2-5. Hanford Site Groundwater Operable Units and Areas of Interest .....	2-29
2	Figure 2-6. 200 East and 200 West Area Groundwater Contamination Plumes. ....	2-31
3	Figure 2-7. Hanford Site Water Table Map for April 2006.....	2-34
4	Figure 2-8. Schematic Hydrogeologic Cross Section Passing West-to-East Beneath the	
5	Northern 200 West Area and Vicinity (PNNL-13858). ....	2-37
6	Figure 2-9. Schematic Hydrogeologic Cross Section Passing West-to-East Beneath the	
7	Southern 200 West Area and Vicinity (PNNL-13858). ....	2-38
8	Figure 2-10. Schematic Hydrogeologic Cross Section Passing West-to-East Beneath the	
9	Northwestern 200 East Area and Vicinity (PNNL-12261). ....	2-40
10	Figure 2-11. Schematic Hydrogeologic Cross Section Passing Northwest-to-Southeast	
11	Beneath the Northern 200 East Area and Vicinity (PNNL-12261).....	2-41
12	Figure 2-12. Schematic Hydrogeologic Cross Section Passing North-to-South Beneath	
13	the Eastern 200 East Area (PNNL-12261). ....	2-43
14	Figure 2-13. Stratigraphic Column at the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and	
15	600 Area Central Landfill (PNNL-12227). ....	2-45
16	Figure 2-14. Timeline Illustrating Operations Periods for Landfills with Key Milestones.....	2-51
17	Figure 2-15. Diagram of a Typical Solid-Waste Burial Trench. ....	2-54
18	Figure 2-16. Diagram of Vertical Pipe Unit. ....	2-62
19	Figure 2-17. Diagram of Caisson with Blower.....	2-64
20	Figure 2-18. Diagram of Caisson.....	2-65
21	Figure 3-1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Two-Tier, Eight-Step Ecological	
22	Risk-Assessment Process (adapted From EPA/540/R-97/006).....	3-36
23	Figure 3-2. Phased Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment.....	3-39
24	Figure 3-3. Groundwater Monitoring Wells at the 218-E-10 Landfill (LLWMA-1)	
25	(PNNL-16346).....	3-44
26	Figure 3-4. Groundwater Monitoring Wells at the 218-E-12B Landfill (LLWMA-2)	
27	(PNNL-16346).....	3-46
28	Figure 3-5. Groundwater Monitoring Wells at the 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, and 218-W-5	
29	Landfills (LLWMA-3) (PNNL-16346). ....	3-48

1 Figure 3-6. Groundwater Monitoring Wells at the 218-W-4B and 218-W-4C Landfills  
 2 (LLWMA-4) (PNNL-16346). ..... 3-50

3 Figure 3-7. Groundwater Monitoring Wells at the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste  
 4 Landfill and 600 Area Central Landfill (Solid Waste Landfill) (PNNL-  
 5 16346)..... 3-52

6 Figure 5-1. Coordinated Regulatory Process for RCRA Past-Practice, and RCRA  
 7 Treatment, Storage, and/or Disposal Unit Closure..... 5-2

8 Figure 5-2. Phased Characterization Strategy for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. .... 5-15

9 Figure 6-1. Project Schedule for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit RI/FS and 200-SW-1  
 10 Operable Unit Closure Process..... 6-2

11 Figure 6-2. Schedule for Closure Activities at the 200-SW-1 Operable Unit ..... 6-3

12

13 **TABLES**

14 Table 1-1. Summary Information for the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit  
 15 Landfills..... 1-6

16 Table 2-1. Liquid- and Animal-Waste Packaging Practices..... 2-53

17 Table 3-1. 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Waste Sites Crosswalk..... 3-4

18 Table 3-2. Accepted Sites Migrated out of the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units..... 3-7

19 Table 3-3. No-Action, Rejected, or Consolidated Sites..... 3-9

20 Table 3-4. Unplanned Release Sites Consolidated within 200-SW-2 Operable Unit  
 21 Landfills..... 3-10

22 Table 3-5. Accepted Sites in the Scope of the RI/FS Work Plan/ Site Binning Approach. .... 3-12

23 Table 3-6. 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Phase I-B Contaminants of Potential Concern List. .... 3-54

24 Table 3-7. Summary of Contaminants, Sources, Receptors, and Exposure Mechanisms  
 25 for the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units. .... 3-54

26 Table 4-1. Data-Gap Analysis for Ecology’s Items of Interest. .... 4-15

27 Table 4-2. Potentially Appropriate Analytical Measurement Methods. .... 4-21

28 Table 5-1. Summary of Key Regulatory and Tri-Party Agreement Requirements ..... 5-5

1 Table 5-2. Documentation Required to Close the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste  
2 Landfill and the 600 Area Central Landfill..... 5-12

3 Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit..... 5-18

4 Table 5-4. Likely Response Scenarios..... 5-44

5 Table 5-5. Comparative Summary of the Three Tiers. .... 5-47

6 Table 5-6. Crosswalk Between RCRA Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Closure Plan  
7 Requirements and Supporting Documentation..... 5-52

8

This page intentionally left blank.

## TERMS

1		
2	600 CL	600 Area Central Landfill
3	AEC	U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
4	amsl	above mean sea level
5	ALARA	as low as reasonably achievable
6	ARAR	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement
7	CERCLA	<i>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and</i>
8		<i>Liability Act of 1980</i>
9	CFR	<i>Code of Federal Regulations</i>
10	COPC	contaminant of potential concern
11	CSM	conceptual site model
12	DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
13	DPT	direct-push technique
14	DQO	data quality objective
15	Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
16	EMI	electromagnetic induction
17	EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
18	ERAG	Ecological Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund
19	ERT	electrical-resistance technology
20	FS	feasibility study
21	FUSRAP	Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program
22	GPR	ground-penetrating radar
23	HAB	Hanford Advisory Board
24	Hanford Facility RCRA Permit	WA7890008967, <i>Hanford Facility Resource Conservation</i>
25		<i>and Recovery Act Permit, Dangerous Waste Portion, Revision 8,</i>
26		<i>for the Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of Dangerous Waste</i>
27	HASP	health and safety plan
28	HEIS	<i>Hanford Environmental Information System</i> database
29	HEPA	high-efficiency particulate air
30	HPGe	high-purity germanium
31	IDW	investigation-derived waste
32	Implementation Plan	<i>200 Areas Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study</i>
33		<i>Implementation Plan - Environmental Restoration Program</i>
34		(DOE/RL-98-28)
35	LLBG	low-level burial ground
36	LLMW	low-level mixed waste
37	LLW	low-level waste
38	LLWMA	Low-Level Waste Management Area
39	MESC	maintain existing soil cover
40	MFP	mixed fission product
41	MLLW	mixed low-level waste
42	MNA	monitored natural attenuation
43	MSCM	Mobile Surface Contamination Monitor
44	N/A	not applicable
45	NEPA	<i>National Environmental Policy Act of 1969</i>
46	NRDWL	Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill

1	OU	operable unit
2	PNNL	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
3	PRG	preliminary remediation goal
4	PUREX	Plutonium-Uranium Extraction
5	RAO	remedial action objective
6	RCRA	<i>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976</i>
7	RECUPLEX	Recovery of Uranium and Plutonium by Extraction
8	REDOX	Reduction-Oxidation
9	RESRAD	RESidual RADioactivity (dose model)
10	RI	remedial investigation
11	RI/FS	remedial investigation/feasibility study
12	RL	U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
13	ROD	record of decision
14	RSW	retrievably stored waste
15	RTD	removal, treatment, and disposal
16	SALDS	State-Approved Land Disposal Site
17	SAP	sampling and analysis plan
18	SLERA	screening-level ecological risk assessment
19	SVE	soil-vapor extraction
20	SWITS	<i>Solid Waste Information and Tracking System</i> database
21	TMF	total magnetic field
22	Tri-Parties	DOE, EPA, and Ecology
23	Tri-Party Agreement	<i>Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order</i>
24	TRU	transuranic
25	TRUM	TRU mixed waste
26	TSD	treatment, storage, and/or disposal (unit)
27	UNI	United Nuclear Industries (obsolete)
28	VOC	volatile organic compound
29	VPU	vertical pipe unit
30	WAC	<i>Washington Administrative Code</i>
31	WIDS	<i>Waste Information Data System</i> database

1

## GLOSSARY

2 **Contact-Handled Waste** – Packaged waste whose external surface dose rate does not exceed  
 3 200 mrem/h and does not create a high radiation area (>100 mrem/h at 30 cm). A few waste  
 4 burials (~2 dozen) are designated as contact handled but have dose rates higher than 200 mrem/h.  
 5 This may be caused by errors in the burial records.

6 **Dangerous Waste** – Solid waste designated in WAC 173-303-070 through WAC 173-303-100<sup>11</sup>  
 7 as dangerous or extremely hazardous waste, or mixed waste. Wastes disposed of before  
 8 August 19, 1987, are not designated as dangerous waste per the *Washington Administrative*  
 9 *Code*, regardless of their current regulatory status.

10 **Disposal** – As used in this document, placement of waste with no intent of future retrieval;  
 11 statutory or regulatory definitions may differ.

12 **Dump** – As used in this document, a dump is a disposal area not pre-planned, designed, and  
 13 constructed as a solid waste disposal facility, but rather a disposal area in which refuse has been  
 14 buried. (Such “dump” sites (or suspected dump sites) that once were included in the 200-SW-1  
 15 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units for remedial investigation (RI) now reside within the  
 16 200-MG-1 Operable Unit.)

17 **Hazardous Waste** – Solid waste that contains chemically hazardous constituents regulated  
 18 under Subtitle C of the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA)*<sup>12</sup>, as  
 19 amended (40 CFR 261, “Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste”<sup>13</sup>), and regulated as a  
 20 hazardous waste and/or mixed waste by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Also may  
 21 include solid waste designated by Washington State as dangerous waste. Hazardous constituents  
 22 were not regulated until August 19, 1987, and they are not designated as hazardous waste unless  
 23 they were disposed of after that date.

24 **Landfill** – A landfill is a disposal area designated for permanent burial of solid waste. Landfills,  
 25 as described in this document, are planned, designed, and constructed in a manner intended to  
 26 minimize effects on the environment. Refuse typically is compacted and covered with soil in  
 27 landfills. Under today’s regulations, landfills must be constructed with liners and leachate  
 28 collection systems and must meet other standards.

29 **Low-Level (Radioactive) Waste** – Radioactive waste that is not high-level waste, spent nuclear  
 30 fuel, TRU waste, byproduct material (as defined in Section 11e(2) of the *Atomic Energy Act of*  
 31 *1954*,<sup>14</sup> as amended), or naturally occurring radioactive material.

---

<sup>11</sup>WAC 173-303-070 through 173-303-100, “Dangerous Waste Regulations,” “Designation of Dangerous Waste,” *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.

<sup>12</sup>*Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*, 42 USC 6901, et seq.

<sup>13</sup>40 CFR 261, “Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste,” Title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 261.

<sup>14</sup>*Atomic Energy Act of 1954*, 42 USC 2011, et seq.

- 1 **Mixed Low-Level Waste** – Waste that meets the definition of low-level waste, and that also  
 2 contains a hazardous component subject to the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*  
 3 (RCRA), as amended, or Washington State Dangerous Waste Regulations. Mixed low-level  
 4 waste is considered to be only waste that was disposed of after August 19, 1987.
- 5 **Radioactive Waste** – Waste that is managed for its radioactive content. Waste material that  
 6 contains source, special nuclear, or byproduct material is subject to regulation as radioactive  
 7 waste under the *Atomic Energy Act of 1954*.
- 8 **Remedial Action** – Activities conducted under CERCLA authority to reduce potential risks to  
 9 people and/or harm to the environment from radioactive and/or hazardous substance (including  
 10 radionuclide) contamination.
- 11 **Remote-Handled Waste** – Packaged radioactive waste for which the external dose rate exceeds  
 12 that defined for contact-handled waste (generally 200 mrem/h at the container surface). These  
 13 wastes require handling using remotely controlled equipment or placement in shielded containers  
 14 to reduce the human exposures during routine waste management activities. About 1,000 burials  
 15 are designated as remote handled but have dose rates much lower than 200 mrem/h. The great  
 16 majority of these exceptions is caisson waste, which always was remotely handled.
- 17 **Retrievably Stored Waste** – Waste packaged and stored in a manner that allows retrieval at a  
 18 future time. Transuranic waste was not retrievably stored until May 1970; to distinguish between  
 19 retrievably stored TRU and pre-1970 transuranically contaminated material.
- 20 **Transuranic Isotope** – An isotope of any element having an atomic number greater than 92 (the  
 21 atomic number of uranium).
- 22 **Transuranic (TRU) Waste** – Radioactive waste containing more than 100 nCi (3,700 Bq) of  
 23 alpha-emitting transuranic isotopes per gram of waste with half-lives greater than 20 years,  
 24 except for the following:
- 25 • High-level radioactive waste
  - 26 • Waste that the Secretary of Energy has determined, with the concurrence of the  
 27 Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, does not need the degree of  
 28 isolation required by the disposal regulations in 40 CFR 191, “Environmental Radiation  
 29 Protection Standards for Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level  
 30 and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes”<sup>15</sup>
  - 31 • Waste that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has approved for disposal on a  
 32 case-by-case basis in accordance with 10 CFR 61, “Licensing Requirements for Land  
 33 Disposal of Radioactive Waste”<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup>40 CFR 191, “Environmental Radiation Protection Standards for Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes,” Title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 191. Definition is found in DOE G 435.1-1, *Implementation Guide for Use with DOE M 435.1-1*, Chapter 3.

<sup>16</sup>10 CFR 61, “Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste,” Title 10, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 61.

- 1       • TRU waste includes radioactive waste as defined in DOE G 435.1-1, *Implementation*  
2        *Guide for Use with DOE M 435.1-1*. TRU waste also may include hazardous  
3        constituents, in which case it may be referred to as mixed TRU waste or TRUM. TRUM  
4        has mixed-waste components disposed of after August 19, 1987.

5       **Treatment, Storage, and Disposal landfill** – A landfill where dangerous waste is placed in or  
6        on the land, as defined in WAC 173-303, “Dangerous Waste Regulations.”

7

1

## METRIC CONVERSION CHART

Into Metric Units			Out of Metric Units		
<i>If you know</i>	<i>Multiply by</i>	<i>To get</i>	<i>If you know</i>	<i>Multiply by</i>	<i>To get</i>
<b>Length</b>			<b>Length</b>		
Inches	25.40	millimeters	millimeters	0.0394	inches
Inches	2.54	centimeters	centimeters	0.394	inches
Feet	0.305	meters	meters	3.281	feet
Yards	0.914	meters	meters	1.094	yards
miles (statute)	1.609	kilometers	kilometers	0.621	miles (statute)
<b>Area</b>			<b>Area</b>		
sq. inches	6.452	sq. centimeters	sq. centimeters	0.155	sq. inches
sq. feet	0.0929	sq. meters	sq. meters	10.764	sq. feet
sq. yards	0.836	sq. meters	sq. meters	1.196	sq. yards
sq. miles <sup>a</sup>	2.591	sq. kilometers	sq. kilometers	0.386	sq. miles
Ac	0.405	hectares	hectares	2.471	ac
<b>Mass (weight)</b>			<b>Mass (weight)</b>		
ounces (avoir)	28.349	grams	grams	0.0353	ounces (avoir)
Pounds	0.454	kilograms	kilograms	2.205	pounds (avoir)
tons (short)	0.907	ton (metric)	ton (metric)	1.102	tons (short)
<b>Volume</b>			<b>Volume</b>		
Teaspoons	5	milliliters	milliliters	0.034	ounces (U.S., liquid)
Tablespoons	15	milliliters	liters	2.113	pints
ounces (U.S., liquid)	29.573	milliliters	liters	1.057	quarts (U.S., liquid)
Cups	0.24	liters	liters	0.264	gallons (U.S., liquid)
Pints	0.473	liters	cubic meters	35.315	cubic feet
quarts (U.S., liquid)	0.946	liters	cubic meters	1.308	cubic yards
gallons (U.S., liquid)	3.785	liters			
cubic feet	0.0283	cubic meters			
cubic yards	0.764	cubic meters			
<b>Temperature</b>			<b>Temperature</b>		
Fahrenheit	$(^{\circ}\text{F}-32)*5/9$	Centigrade	Centigrade	$(^{\circ}\text{C}*9/5)+32$	Fahrenheit
<b>Radioactivity</b>			<b>Radioactivity</b>		
Picocurie	37	millibecquerel	millibecquerel	0.027	picocurie

<sup>a</sup>One square mile = 640 ac.

2

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1  
2 The 200-SW-1 Operable Unit (OU) includes two landfills located in the Hanford Site 600 Area,  
3 and the 200-SW-2 OU consist of 24 landfills located in Hanford Site 200 East and 200 West  
4 Areas. The 200 Areas are located near the center of the Hanford Site in south-central  
5 Washington State and are within one of three areas on the Hanford Site that are on the  
6 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Priorities List (40 CFR 300, "National  
7 Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan," Appendix B, "National Priorities  
8 List") under the *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of*  
9 *1980* (CERCLA). Figures 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, and 1-4 depict the location of the Hanford Site, the  
10 specific 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU landfill locations within the 200 East Area and 200 West  
11 Areas, and the specific 200-SW-1 OU locations within the 600 Area, respectively. Table 1-1  
12 provides a summary listing of the 26 landfills included in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs.  
13 Additional detail on each of these landfills is provided in Chapter 2.0.

14 The *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order* (Tri-Party Agreement)  
15 (Ecology et al., 1989a, as amended) identifies 800+ soil waste sites (and associated structures)  
16 resulting from the discharge of liquids and solids to the ground from 200 Areas processing  
17 facilities. These 800+ sites have been arranged into separate waste groups (or operable units)  
18 that are identified as either CERCLA past-practice OUs or *Resource Conservation and Recovery*  
19 *Act of 1976* (RCRA) past-practice OUs addressed through RCRA corrective-action authorities.  
20 Some OUs include RCRA treatment, storage, and/or disposal (TSD) units that will be closed in  
21 conjunction with OU activities.


22 In accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement, this remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS)  
23 work plan has been prepared to present information on how the RI/FS process will be conducted  
24 and eventually will lead to proposed remedies for the waste sites in an OU. In accordance with  
25 the Tri-Party Agreement, the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) has been  
26 designated as the lead regulatory agency for the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs. This RI/FS  
27 work plan follows the CERCLA documentation process, with modifications to concurrently  
28 satisfy RCRA corrective-action and TSD-unit closure requirements as described in  
29 DOE/RL-98-28, *200 Areas Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Implementation Plan –*  
30 *Environmental Restoration Program*, (hereinafter referred to as the Implementation Plan). The  
31 Implementation Plan is summarized further in Section 1.3 of this RI/FS work plan.

32 This RI/FS work plan summarizes the CERCLA RI/FS and RCRA TSD-unit landfill closure  
33 activities for two of the Hanford Site's OUs, namely the 200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and  
34 Dumps Group OU and the 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group OU (hereinafter  
35 referred to as the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs).

36 The majority of the waste disposed to the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU landfills originated from  
37 the processing facilities located in the 200 East and 200 West Areas of the Hanford Site. The  
38 200-SW-2 OU landfills also contain some wastes that originated from the Hanford Site's 100 and  
39 300 Areas, as well as from offsite sources. Both of the OUs contain RCRA TSD units, which are  
40 discussed further in Chapter 5.0.

1

Figure 1-1. Location of the Hanford Site.




2

E9803090.4

1  
2


Figure 1-2. Location of 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills in the 200 East Area.



3

1  
2  
3


Figure 1-3. Location of 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills in the 200 West Area.



4

1

Figure 1-4. Location of 200-SW-1 Operable Unit Landfills in the 600 Area.



2

1

Table 1-1. Summary Information for the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills.

Landfill	Number of Trenches	Total Length of Trenches (Cumulative)		Volume <sup>a</sup> of Buried Waste		Area <sup>a</sup>	
		km	mi	m <sup>3</sup>	ft <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>2</sup>	ac
<b>200-SW-1 Operable Unit (2 Landfills)</b>							
600 CL	75	12.61	7.84	596,000	21,047,541	241,262	59.60
NRDWL <sup>b</sup>	16	2.02	1.26	141,000 (kg)	310,851 (lb)	37,506	9.26
<b>Total</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>14.63</b>	<b>9.10</b>	<b>596,000</b>	<b>21,047,541</b>	<b>278,768</b>	<b>68.86</b>
<b>200-SW-2 Operable Unit (24 Landfills)</b>							
218-C-9	1	0.44	0.27	7,573	267,421	18,060	4.46
218-E-1	15	0.91	0.57	3,030	106,999	9,601	2.37
218-E-10 <sup>b</sup>	14	5.26	3.27	26,900	646,964	228,895	56.56
218-E-12A	28	7.76	4.82	15,400	543,845	121,298	29.97
218-E-12B <sup>b</sup>	39	11.90	7.40	65,086	2,298,453	735,362	181.71
218-E-2	8	0.72	0.45	9,033	318,996	20,476	5.10
218-E-2A	1	0.10	0.06	--	--	3,714	0.92
218-E-4	--	--	--	1,586	55,999	13,810	3.41
218-E-5	2	0.21	0.13	3,172	112,018	10,893	2.69
218-E-5A	1	0.04	0.02	6,173	218,000	4,440	1.10
218-E-8	1	0.12	0.08	2,265	79,999	4,440	1.10
218-E-9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
218-W-1	15	1.24	0.77	7,164	252,997	33,148	8.19
218-W-11	2 <sup>c</sup>	0.12	0.08	1,160	40,949	14,279	3.53
218-W-1A	12	0.54	0.33	13,700	483,810	48,605	12.01
218-W-2	20	2.85	1.77	8,240	290,996	34,455	8.51
218-W-2A	27	4.15	2.58	26,000	918,181	164,849	40.74
218-W-3	20	2.83	1.76	12,400	437,901	39,690	9.81
218-W-3A <sup>b</sup>	61	14.25	8.86	97,528	3,444,086	219,201	54.17
218-W-3AE <sup>b</sup>	8	2.91	1.81	34,240	1,209,150	229,193	56.63
218-W-4A	30	5.01	3.11	16,886	596,323	72,811	17.99
218-W-4B <sup>b</sup>	27	2.46	1.53	7,213	254,724	40,704	10.06
218-W-4C <sup>b</sup>	16	2.96	1.84	15,211	537,174	227,326	56.17
218-W-5	13	3.90	2.42	70,961	2,505,908	385,625	95.29
<b>Total</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>69.96</b>	<b>43.47</b>	<b>450,921</b>	<b>15,620,893</b>	<b>2,680,875</b>	<b>657.90</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>84.59</b>	<b>52.57</b>	<b>1,046,921</b>	<b>15,620,893</b>	<b>2,959,643</b>	<b>726.76</b>

<sup>a</sup>All numbers are estimates based on historical information and include only the used portions of the landfills.

<sup>b</sup>Landfill is a permitted treatment, storage, and disposal landfill under the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*.

<sup>c</sup>Recent geophysical investigations suggest that there is only one trench. See Section 3.3.4.3 for details.

NRDWL = Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill.

600 CL = 600 Area Central Landfill.

2

## 1.1 SUMMARY DESCRIPTIONS OF THE 200-SW-1 AND 200-SW-2 OPERABLE UNITS

The following discussion provides an overview of the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs. These summaries are provided in the context of the preceding information to assist the reader in understanding the basis for their binning (Section 1.4).

### 1.1.1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group – 200-SW-1 Operable Unit

The 200-SW-1 OU originally included a number of nonradioactive landfills and dump sites that were created during the construction and operation of the 200 Areas facilities. Although a few sites were excavated engineered structures, which were operated in a manner to contain waste releases, most sites were accumulation points for materials not regarded at the time to be potentially hazardous (DOE/RL-96-81, *Waste Site Grouping for 200 Areas Soil Investigations*). The majority of these waste sites were transferred to the 200-MG-1 or 200-MG-2 OUs. The two remaining landfills included in this operable unit are the 600 Area Central Landfill (600 CL), and the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill (NRDWL). Both are inactive and are located southeast of the 200 Areas.

### 1.1.2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group – 200-SW-2 Operable Unit

Most of the 200 Areas landfills are inactive (units) and have been backfilled, surface stabilized with at least 0.6 m (2 ft) of clean dirt, and seeded with grasses. Before 1960, detailed inventory records were not maintained; specific information about the early landfills often is not available (DOE/RL-96-81). Logbook records exist for some burials that took place in the 200 West Area in the early 1960s. Before the 1970s, landfills and structures within the scope of this project in the 200 Areas generally were divided into the following four categories. These categories formed the basis for grouping the 24 landfills into the current bins. A discussion of the six bins in the scope of this RI/FS work plan is presented in Section 3.2.1:

- Dry-Waste Landfills – received radioactive waste packaged primarily in fiberboard boxes. All types of miscellaneous wastes, ranging from contaminated soils and potentially contaminated rags, paper, and wood to gloveboxes containing multigram quantities of plutonium, have been placed in these facilities
- Industrial Landfills – received radioactive waste that usually was packaged in large wooden or concrete boxes, containing large quantities of fission products. For the most part, these sites were restricted to burial of large pieces of failed or obsolete equipment from the chemical processing facilities, although some items came from the 100 Areas
- Construction Landfills – mainly limited to burial of low-activity wastes resulting from construction work on existing facilities

- 1 • Caissons or Vertical Pipe Units – used for disposal of hot-cell waste or high-dose rate  
2 plutonium waste in the 218-W-4A and 218-W-4B Landfills. The caissons in the  
3 218-W-4A Landfills were made of welded 208.2 L (55-gal) drums or corrugated pipe and  
4 concrete (WHC-EP-0912, *The History of the 200 Area Burial Ground Facilities*; Hanford  
5 Site Drawing H-2-33692, *Dry Waste Disposal Caisson in 218-W4 Site*); the caissons in  
6 the 218-W-4B Landfill were made of corrugated metal and concrete (WHC-EP-0912).

7 All of the radioactive-waste landfills are located inside the 200 East and 200 West Area fenced  
8 boundaries. Each landfill consists of one or more trenches; sizes of landfills range from less than  
9 0.4 to 70 ha (1 to 173 ac).

10 Chapters 1.0 through 6.0 comprise the main body of the RI/FS work plan and provide its  
11 essential elements. Contents of each of the chapters and appendices are briefly described here.

- 12 • **Chapter 1.0, Introduction**, presents the RI/FS work plan scope and objectives,  
13 background information, and project assumptions.
- 14 • **Chapter 2.0, Background and Setting**, presents the physical setting for the 200-SW-1  
15 and 200-SW-2 OUs, including information on geology and groundwater. This chapter  
16 also provides detailed descriptions of each of the 26 landfills within the scope of this  
17 RI/FS work plan.
- 18 • **Chapter 3.0, Initial Evaluation of Landfills**, presents known and suspected  
19 contamination for the in-scope landfills, the preliminary conceptual site models for each  
20 landfill group (or “bin”), information on groundwater monitoring, potential impacts to  
21 human health and the environment, and the contaminants of potential concern (COPC).
- 22 • **Chapter 4.0, Work Plan Approach and Rationale**, presents a summary of the data  
23 quality objectives (DQO) process, the characterization approach for each bin, and a  
24 description of the phased characterization approach.
- 25 • **Chapter 5.0, Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Process**, presents a summary of  
26 the regulatory paths forward for the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs, a discussion of  
27 treatability investigations, a summary of cost-estimating processes that will be used in the  
28 feasibility study (FS), and a description of the proposed plan and RCRA permit  
29 modification process and the post-record-of-decision (ROD) activities.
- 30 • **Chapter 6.0, Project Schedule**, presents a schedule for completion of the 200-SW-2 OU  
31 RI/FS process (including TSD closure/postclosure care), as well as a schedule for closure  
32 activities associated with the 200-SW-1 OU landfills.
- 33 • **Chapter 7.0, References**, provides the complete citation of all documents referenced in  
34 this RI/FS work plan.

35 Appendices to this RI/FS work plan are listed below.

- 36 • **Appendix A**, Sampling and Analysis Plan for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills

- 1 • *Appendix B*, Summary Descriptions and Figures of Waste Sites in the 200-SW-1 and  
2 200-SW-2 Nonradioactive and Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Operable Units
- 3 • *Appendix C*, Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix Status
- 4 • *Appendix D*, Data Collected to Support Characterization of Landfills in the  
5 200-SW-2 Operable Unit
- 6 • *Appendix E*, Initial Conceptual Site Models for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills.

## 7 **1.2 SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES FOR THIS RI/FS** 8 **WORK PLAN**

9 This RI/FS work plan presents 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU-specific details, including  
10 background information on the waste sites, existing data regarding contamination at the  
11 past-practice landfills and TSD-unit landfills, and the approach that will be used to investigate,  
12 characterize, and evaluate the landfills to support remedy selection and TSD closure/postclosure.  
13 A discussion of the remedial investigation (RI) planning and execution process is included, along  
14 with a schedule for the characterization work. Likely response scenarios that are to be  
15 considered for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills are identified in Chapter 4.0 of this RI/FS work plan.  
16 These likely response scenarios will be developed further and agreed to in the FS and  
17 eventual ROD(s).

18 A Phase I-A (D&D-27257, *Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for Nonintrusive*  
19 *Characterization of Bin 3A and Bin 3B Waste Sites in the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit*) process was  
20 completed in 2006. A follow-on Phase I-B DQO process (SGW-33253, *Data Quality Objectives*  
21 *Summary Report for Landfills in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units*) was conducted to  
22 define the radioactive and nonradioactive constituents to be characterized and to specify the  
23 number, type, and location of samples to be collected at sites within the 200-SW-2 OU. The  
24 results of this DQO processes form the basis for the RI/FS work plan and the associated  
25 sampling and analysis plan (SAP) (Appendix A). The SAP includes a specific quality-assurance  
26 project plan and a field-sampling plan for implementing the field-characterization activities for  
27 the 200-SW-2 OU. A multiphased characterization approach will be employed to collect data to  
28 support remedial-action decision making. The phased characterization approach will require  
29 future revisions to this work plan and revised and/or additional SAPs. This phased approach is  
30 discussed in further detail in Section 5.3.

31 After all phases of characterization data have been collected for the landfills, results will be  
32 presented in an RI report. The RI report will include an evaluation of the characterization data  
33 for the TSD-unit landfills and past-practice units, including an assessment of the accuracy of the  
34 conceptual exposure model and refinement of the contaminant distribution model. During the  
35 FS, site-remediation alternatives will be evaluated against the nine CERCLA evaluation criteria  
36 (overall protection of human health and environment, applicable or relevant and appropriate  
37 requirements (ARAR) compliance, long-term effectiveness/permanence, reduction of  
38 toxicity/mobility/volume through treatment, short-term effectiveness, implementability, cost,  
39 state acceptance, and community acceptance). The RI report will support the evaluation of  
40 remedial alternatives that will be included in the FS or combined into a single RI/FS document.

1 The FS will use the existing and newly collected data to evaluate a range of remedial actions for  
2 the sites evaluated in the RI and for the remaining sites in the OUs that fall within the  
3 contaminant distribution model. As data are being collected and analyzed, work will proceed on  
4 the identification or development of suitable models to evaluate the cost and exposure (as-low-  
5 as-reasonably-achievable [ALARA]) aspects of the various remedial alternatives. Remedial  
6 alternatives may be applied at any or all of the past-practice units in the OUs, and different  
7 alternatives may be applied to different waste sites, depending on site characteristics. The FS  
8 ultimately will support a proposed plan leading to a ROD (with a closure/postclosure section) for  
9 of all the waste sites in the OU. The ROD will be reviewed, and a permit modification to  
10 WA7890008967, *Hanford Facility Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Permit, Dangerous*  
11 *Waste Portion, Revision 8, for the Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of Dangerous Waste*  
12 (Hanford Facility RCRA Permit), will be proposed for the TSD unit (Low-Level Burial Grounds  
13 [LLBG]). Chapter 6.0 presents the schedule for assessment activities at the 200-SW-2 OU.

14 The information provided in this work plan reflects the most current, defensible data available at  
15 the time that it was prepared.

#### 16 **1.2.1 Coordinated Regulatory Approach**

17 The RI/FS process will be used to reach a decision that will meet requirements for both National  
18 Priorities List cleanup and RCRA corrective action. TSD closure/postclosure for TSD-unit  
19 landfills within the boundaries of the 200-SW-2 OU will be coordinated with the RI/FS process.  
20 In addition, information from Ecology and DOE, 2005, *200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Collaborative*  
21 *Workshops, Agreement, Completion Matrix, and Supporting Documentation, Final Product*  
22 (Collaborative Agreement) will be considered in formulating the regulatory strategy for the  
23 200-SW-2 OU. The coordinated regulatory process for characterization and remediation of the  
24 200-SW-2 OU will use this RI/FS work plan in combination with the Implementation Plan  
25 (DOE/RL-98-28) to satisfy the requirements for both an RI/FS work plan and a RCRA  
26 field-investigation/corrective-measures study work plan. General facility background  
27 information, potential ARARs, preliminary remedial-action objectives (RAO), and preliminary  
28 remedial technologies developed in the Implementation Plan are incorporated by reference into  
29 this RI/FS work plan. Further detail regarding the coordinated regulatory approach can be found  
30 in Chapter 5.0.

#### 31 **1.2.2 Regulatory Approach for Closure of the** 32 **Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and** 33 **the 600 Area Central Landfill**

34 NRDWL and 600 CL are nonradioactive landfills that were operating at the time that the  
35 National Priorities List was developed for the 200 Areas. Therefore, these landfills were not  
36 originally included as waste sites that needed a CERCLA response action. However, because  
37 operations have ceased for the 600 CL, the landfill was included in Appendix C of  
38 Ecology et al., 1989b, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order Action Plan,*  
39 (Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan). NRDWL was added to Appendix C to allow for the closure  
40 to be coordinated with the CERCLA RI/FS process. NRDWL and the 600 CL will have to be  
41 closed under WAC 173-303-610, "Closure and Post-Closure," and WAC 173-304-407,

1 “Minimum Functional Standards for Solid Waste Handling,” “General Closure and Post-Closure  
2 Requirements,” respectively. Further detail regarding the regulatory approach for closure of the  
3 200-SW-1 OU landfills can be found in Chapter 5.0.

#### 4 **1.2.3 Phased Characterization Approach for the** 5 **200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills**

6 Because of the complexity of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills, a phased characterization approach  
7 will be employed to aid in remedial-action decision making. This approach was approved by the  
8 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Richland Operations Office (RL) and Ecology and  
9 documented in CCN 0073214, *Path Forward – 200-SW-1/2 RI/FS Work Plan Development*,  
10 *May 15, 2007*.

11 A preliminary investigation began in 2004 to perform a comprehensive review of existing  
12 documentation associated with the 200-SW-2 OU waste sites. In 2005, a collaborative  
13 negotiations process was held with DOE, EPA, and Ecology (the Tri-Parties). This process  
14 rescoped the focus of the DQO to follow. This DQO process (Phase I-A) focused on  
15 nonintrusive investigations of these waste sites, including geophysical, radiological, and  
16 organic-vapor surveys.

17 After Phase I-A field characterization activities were performed in mid-2006, a Phase I-B DQO  
18 process was performed to support development of this RI/FS work plan. The Phase I-B DQO  
19 process focused on 24 landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU. Additionally, two landfills in the  
20 200-SW-1 OU were included in the DQO, as well as in this RI/FS work plan; however, it is  
21 proposed that these landfills be closed outside of the CERCLA process, and they are included in  
22 this documentation for information purposes only. The Phase I-B DQO and SAP (Appendix A)  
23 focus on additional nonintrusive characterization as well as intrusive characterization techniques.

24 Additional DQO processes (Phases II and III) will be held following completion of the Phase I-B  
25 field-characterization activities, as required. These future-phase DQO processes will further aid  
26 in characterizing the landfills and will focus on progressively more intrusive characterization  
27 techniques, as required. Further detail regarding the phased characterization approach for the  
28 200-SW-2 OU landfills can be found in Chapter 5.0.

### 29 **1.3 EXCLUSIONS FROM SCOPE OF WORK** 30 **PLAN**

#### 31 **1.3.1 Suspect Transuranic Waste**

32 Before 1970, low-level waste (LLW) was disposed to the same landfill trenches as waste that  
33 would have contained transuranic elements and/or mixed fission products (MFP). After 1970,  
34 waste that was designated as TRU waste was segregated in either specified low-level burial  
35 ground (LLBG) trenches or underground concrete caissons in the LLBGs for future retrieval.

1 Several of the LLBG sites contain retrievably stored suspect TRU wastes. Retrieval of these  
2 wastes is out of the scope of this RI/FS work plan; this material will be retrieved in accordance  
3 with Tri-Party Agreement Milestones M-091-40 and M-091-41 (Ecology et al., 1989a).

4 Retrievably stored suspect TRU waste is located in specific locations within the 218-E-12B,  
5 218-W-3A, 218-W-4B, and 218-W-4C Landfills. This includes four caissons in the  
6 218-W-4B Landfill (218-W-4B-CA1, 218-W-4B-CA2, 218-W-4B-CA3, and 218-W-4B-CA4)  
7 that contain suspect TRU wastes only. A fifth caisson (218-W-4B-CA5) is believed to be empty,  
8 based on historical records; this will be confirmed through this RI/FS work plan.

9 Outside the scope of this RI/FS work plan, the suspect TRU retrieval program has developed  
10 separate DQOs and SAPs for substrate sampling at each of these four landfills in the LLBG, in  
11 accordance with Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-091-40. The substrate sampling will occur  
12 in each trench segment following retrieval of the suspect TRU waste in that landfill. Retrieval of  
13 waste in accordance with Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-091-40 is scheduled to be  
14 completed in 2010. As a result of this schedule, data generated from some of the substrate  
15 sampling may be available to evaluate the need for interim remedial measures before the RI/FS  
16 process for the 200-SW-2 OU is completed in 2011. However, some substrate sampling also  
17 will be conducted after the RI/FS process has been completed.

18 Data in this RI/FS work plan (e.g., waste volumes, contaminant inventories, trench lengths) may  
19 or may not include information related to retrievably stored TRU waste, depending on the  
20 context. Data presented, therefore, have been labeled with clarifications as to whether TRU  
21 waste or TRU waste-containing trenches are included in the data. None of the data presented in  
22 this report includes information related to the trenches currently used for disposal  
23 (218-E-12B-T94, 218-W-5-T31, and 218-W-5-T34).

### 24 **1.3.2 Unused Portions of Treatment, Storage, and** 25 **Disposal-Unit Landfills**

26 The 218-W-6 Landfill was reserved for future use and never has received waste; it will not be  
27 evaluated during this investigative activity, because it was transferred in 2007 to the  
28 200-MG-1 OU. Other portions of the LLBG sites that never have received waste also will not be  
29 evaluated. The unused portions of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills will be walked down, and  
30 geophysical surveys may be conducted to verify that they were never used.

### 31 **1.3.3 Operating Trenches**

32 Trench 94 in the 218-E-12B Landfill (within the LLBG TSD unit) is out of the scope of this  
33 RI/FS work plan, because the trench will be in use for disposal of U.S. Navy vessel reactor  
34 compartments beyond the timeframe (2024) that the Tri-Party Agreement specifies for  
35 remediation of the 200-SW-2 OU.

36 Trenches 31 and 34 in the 218-W-5 Landfill also are out of the scope of this RI/FS work plan,  
37 because these trenches are expected to receive waste beyond the timeframe when the FS and  
38 proposed plan for the 200-SW-2 OU are planned to be completed.

#### 1 1.4 200 AREAS IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

2 The Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28) outlines the framework for implementing assessment  
3 activities and the evaluation of remedial alternatives in the 200 Areas to ensure consistency in  
4 the documentation, the level of characterization, and decision making. A regulatory framework  
5 is established in the Implementation Plan to integrate the requirements of RCRA (for corrective  
6 actions and TSD units), CERCLA, Federal facility regulations, and the Tri-Party Agreement into  
7 one standard approach for cleanup activities in the 200 Areas. Special emphasis is given to  
8 Hanford Site-specific application of RCRA and CERCLA as specified in the Tri-Party  
9 Agreement, local policy and programmatic requirements, and the basis for integrating these  
10 requirements in the 200 Areas. This approach establishes use of the CERCLA process as the  
11 basis for assessment and remediation activities in the 200 Areas, with modification as necessary  
12 to concurrently satisfy requirements specific to RCRA corrective action for RCRA past-practice  
13 sites and RCRA closure of TSD units.

14 The Implementation Plan consolidates much of the information normally found in an  
15 OU-specific work plan to ensure consistency and avoid duplication of this information in each of  
16 the OU work plans for the 200 Areas. The Implementation Plan also lists potential ARARs and  
17 preliminary RAOs and contains a discussion of potentially feasible remedial technologies that  
18 may be employed in the 200 Areas. This RI/FS work plan references the Implementation Plan  
19 for further details on several topics, such as general information on the physical setting of the  
20 areas under consideration, the operational history of 200 Areas facilities, potential ARARs and  
21 RAOs, and post-work-plan activities.

22 The Implementation Plan addresses the more than 800 waste sites that were assigned to the  
23 process-based OUs, which in turn were grouped into major waste categories (e.g., process waste,  
24 landfills, cooling water). This categorization facilitates the use of streamlining approaches,  
25 which was a fundamental concept under the Implementation Plan. The 200-SW-1 and  
26 200-SW-2 OUs fell within the Landfills and Dumps waste category. This category contains  
27 landfill sites and was subdivided into the following groups based on the radionuclide inventory.

- 28 • **Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group (200-SW-1 OU).** This group covers two  
29 landfills, the NRDWL and the 600 CL. These landfills contain nonradioactive unused  
30 laboratory and plant chemicals, as well as sanitary waste and construction and demolition  
31 debris. Trenches in the 600 CL also received bulk liquid and sludge for disposal.
- 32 • **Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group (200-SW-2 OU).** Sites included in this group  
33 primarily consist of constructed (e.g., vertical pipe units, caissons) or excavated sites  
34 (landfills) that received either LLW or mixed LLW (MLLW). The sites also were used for  
35 the storage of suspect and retrievably stored TRU wastes. Large landfills, each made up of  
36 a number of trenches, were used in the 200 East and 200 West Areas. While storage and  
37 retrieval activities are ongoing in multiple trenches, only three trenches continue to be used  
38 for disposal – the lined Trenches 31 and 34 in the 218-W-5 Landfill and Trench 94 in the  
39 218-E-12B Landfill. The landfills received wastes such as contaminated equipment, solid  
40 laboratory or process waste, clothing, or tightly packed/sealed liquid wastes in radiological  
41 vessels. Before 1970, LLW was disposed to the same landfill trenches as waste that would  
42 have contained transuranic elements and/or MFPs. After 1970, waste that was designated

1 as TRU waste was segregated in either specified LLBG trenches or underground concrete  
2 caissons in the LLBGs. Additional information regarding TRU waste can be found in  
3 Section 2.2.2. Wastes were largely solid materials and mostly from on site; but offsite and  
4 liquid wastes (tightly packed and sealed in drums) are known to have been placed in the  
5 landfills. The LLBG landfills are among the largest waste sites at the Hanford Site, and  
6 some cover many ac. Unlike many highly contaminated waste sites at the Hanford Site,  
7 large amounts of bulk liquids are not expected to be present to drive contamination  
8 throughout the soil column, although some volatile contaminants are capable of migrating  
9 through the soil without a driving force.

10 Subsequent to publication of DOE/RL-2004-60, *200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps*  
11 *Group Operable Unit and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit*  
12 *Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan*, Draft A, a number of smaller waste sites  
13 that once resided in the 200-SW-2 OU were moved to the 200-MG-1 OU per Tri-Party  
14 Agreement change requests. This migration of waste sites primarily affected Bin 1 and Bin 2, as  
15 described in the Draft A work plan. Based on a reassessment of the 24 landfills that now remain  
16 in the 200-SW-2 OU, a new set of groupings or "bins" has been established for this version of  
17 the work plan. This new set of bins was established based on factors such as waste volume,  
18 waste type, waste form, disposal practices, periods of landfill operations, homogeneity of waste,  
19 and potential risk, among others. The new bins have been named as follows and will be  
20 identified as such throughout this document:

- 21 • *Bin 1 – TSD-Unit Landfills*
- 22 • *Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills*
- 23 • *Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills*
- 24 • *Bin 4 – Dry Waste Landfills*
- 25 • *Bin 5 – Construction Landfills*
- 26 • *Bin 6 – Caissons.*

## 27 1.5 PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS

28 Project assumptions for this RI/FS work plan include the following.

- 29 • Some of the waste materials in the 200-SW-2 OU landfills originated from offsite  
30 generators. The disposal records from the offsite generators are not complete. However,  
31 because of the wide variety of process activities at the Hanford Site, it is assumed that the  
32 constituents present in the offsite materials are adequately represented by the  
33 contaminants associated with onsite generation.
- 34 • The contaminants in the 200-SW-2 OU are expected to be located within 3 to 10 m (10 to  
35 33 ft) of the ground surface, and at or near the bottom of the disposal unit (trench). There  
36 may be exceptions to this contaminant distribution model that require the use of multiple  
37 conceptual site models. For example, several sites (218-W-3A, 218-W-4B, and  
38 218-W-4C Landfills) are reported to have been briefly "flooded" because of rapid  
39 snowmelt conditions after burials were made to the sites. One trench in the  
40 218-E-12B Landfill (before waste disposal) was found to have been saturated from water  
41 seeping into the area from a nearby, breached ditch that transferred cooling water to the

1 200 Areas B Pond system. Portions of three additional sites (the 218-C-9, 218-W-2A,  
2 and 218-W-3AE Landfills) were used as cooling-water disposal sites (i.e., 216-C-9 and  
3 216-T-4 Ponds) before burials were made. Potential contamination originating from the  
4 216-C-9 Pond is being examined under the 200-MG-1 OU. Potential contamination  
5 originating from the 216-T-4 Pond system (216-T-4-1D Ditch, 216-T-4-2 Ditch,  
6 216-T-4A Pond, and 216-T-4B Pond) will be investigated by the 200-CW-1 and  
7 200-MG-2 OUs.

- 8 • The land use for the 200 Areas selected by the DOE through the NEPA process  
9 (DOE/EIS-0222-F, *Final Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan Environmental Impact*  
10 *Statement*) and documented in 64 FR 61615, "Record of Decision: Hanford  
11 *Comprehensive Land-Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement (CLUP EIS)*" is  
12 industrial (exclusive). Most of the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU landfills are located  
13 within the 200 Areas Central Plateau Core Zone boundary. Therefore, based on the  
14 land-use decision for the 200 Areas, potential impacts from the landfill contaminants  
15 within the 200 Areas would be to current and future site workers and to terrestrial biota  
16 using the sites. The land use for the sites outside the Core Zone boundary focuses on  
17 preservation, recreation, conservation, fill material, grazing, or industrial uses, depending  
18 on the location (DOE/EIS-0222-F).
- 19 • This RI/FS work plan will address likely response scenarios, including no action,  
20 removal, treatment, and disposal (RTD) of waste from within portions of individual  
21 landfills, capping of individual landfills, in situ treatment/stabilization  
22 (e.g., vitrification/grouting) of portions of individual landfills, maintain existing soil  
23 cover (MESC), monitored natural attenuation (MNA), or some combination of the above.
- 24 • The seven *Bin 1 – TSD-Unit Landfills* will be closed using an integrated  
25 RCRA/CERCLA/ *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969* (NEPA) process to avoid  
26 duplication of effort as outlined in the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 5.5  
27 (Ecology et al., 1989b). A crosswalk (Chapter 5.0, Table 5-6) of CERCLA and RCRA  
28 substantive requirements for the 200-SW-2 OU has been prepared to facilitate this  
29 coordination. Ecology will issue a draft permit modification for closure of the LLBG  
30 TSD units that will be separate from the CERCLA proposed plan. Ecology's proposed  
31 permit modification for the closure activities for the LLBG TSDs will be based on  
32 the closure documentation presented in the 200-SW-2 OU CERCLA FS and  
33 administrative record. The DOE will structure each CERCLA document "such that  
34 RCRA closure requirements can be readily identified for a separate review/approval  
35 process" in accordance with Section 5.5 of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan  
36 (Ecology et al., 1989b). The closure will be accomplished in accordance with  
37 WAC 173-303, "Dangerous Waste Regulations." Coordination of the closure activities  
38 with the CERCLA actions will optimize timing and efficiency. RCRA-CERCLA  
39 integration is consistent with the provisions contained in the Tri-Party Agreement. To the  
40 extent that there are similarities in design and construction requirements for the CERCLA  
41 remedy and the LLBG TSD closure, Ecology proposes to implement closure activities for  
42 the LLBG TSD units by using the remedial design/remedial action work plan for the  
43 CERCLA remedies.

- 1 • The seven landfills in *Bin 1 – TSD-Unit Landfills* and the 17 landfills in Bins 2 through 5  
2 and the caissons in Bin 6 (see Section 3.2.2 for a discussion of the bins) are of the highest  
3 interest to Ecology and Stakeholders because of the following:
- 4 – Large volume of waste
  - 5 – Transuranic materials
  - 6 – Dates of disposal
  - 7 – High dose rate of some waste.
- 8 • The 200-SW-2 OU is a source OU. Issues related to groundwater characterization,  
9 monitoring, and remediation are not within the scope of this RI/FS work plan and will be  
10 addressed in the respective groundwater OUs and through the TSD permitting process.  
11 There are no indications that the landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU have impacted  
12 groundwater.
- 13 • The RI/FS work plan will focus on determining whether highly mobile contaminants or  
14 other contaminants with a potential to reach groundwater have migrated into the vadose  
15 zone beneath the buried waste.
- 16 • The anticipated land use for the Central Plateau will be DOE industrial-exclusive use for  
17 at least 50 years and industrial use afterwards for the foreseeable future.
- 18 • Data may be collected through this RI/FS work plan to evaluate the option of leaving  
19 high-dose rate waste in place, because the natural decay of the high-activity radionuclides  
20 will have subsided to levels of minor risk, based on anticipated land use.
- 21 • Retrievably stored waste (RSW) will be handled in the M-091 Program (outside of the  
22 200-SW-2 OU). All other solid waste in the 200 Areas landfills (with the exception of  
23 Trenches 31 and 34 in the 218-W-5 Landfill and Trench 94 in the 218-E-12B Landfill) is  
24 within the scope of this RI/FS work plan.

## 25 1.6 CHANGE MANAGEMENT

26 Following finalization and issuance of this 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs RI/FS work plan,  
27 Ecology or the DOE may seek to modify the document. Such modifications may require  
28 additional field work, pilot studies, computer modeling, or other supporting technical work. This  
29 normally results from a determination that the requested modification is necessary based on new  
30 information (i.e., information that became available or conditions that became known after the  
31 report was finalized). The requesting party may seek such a modification by submitting a  
32 concise written request to the appropriate project manager(s). In the event that a consensus on  
33 the need for a modification is not reached by the project managers, either the DOE or Ecology  
34 may invoke dispute resolution, in accordance with the provisions of the Tri-Party Agreement, to  
35 determine if such modification shall be made. Modification of this RI/FS work plan will be  
36 required only upon a showing that the requested modification could be of significant assistance  
37 in evaluating impacts on the public health or the environment, in evaluating the selection of  
38 remedial alternatives, or in protecting human health and the environment.

1 Nothing in this section is intended to alter Ecology's ability to request the performance of  
2 additional work in accordance with the provisions of the Tri-Party Agreement. If the additional  
3 work results in a modification to a final document, the review and comment process will be the  
4 same as for the original document. Minor changes to the approved RI/FS work plan that do not  
5 qualify as minor field changes can be made through use of a change notice. Minor field changes  
6 can be made by the person in charge of the particular activity in the field. Minor field changes  
7 are those that have no adverse effect on the technical adequacy of the job or the work schedule.  
8 Such changes will be documented in the daily log books that are maintained in the field.

9 The change notice will not be used to modify schedules contained within this work plan. Such  
10 schedule changes will be made in accordance with Section 12.0, Changes to the Agreement, of  
11 the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan.

12 Minor changes include specific additions, deletions, or modifications to the scope and/or  
13 requirements that do not affect the overall intent of this RI/FS work plan or associated schedule  
14 (Chapter 6.0). Ecology will evaluate the need to revise this RI/FS work plan. If a revision is  
15 determined to be necessary, then Ecology will decide whether it can be accomplished through  
16 use of the change notice or if a full revision to the plan is required.

17 The change notice will be prepared by the DOE project manager and approved by the assigned  
18 project manager from Ecology. The approved change notice will be distributed as part of the  
19 next issuance of the project managers' meeting minutes. The change notice thereby will become  
20 part of the Administrative Record. The change notice form shall, as a minimum, include the  
21 following:

- 22 • Number and title of document affected
- 23 • Date document last issued
- 24 • Date of this change notice
- 25 • Change notice number
- 26 • Description of change
- 27 • Justification and impact of change (to include effect on completed or ongoing activities)
- 28 • Signature blocks for the DOE and Ecology project managers.

29

This page intentionally left blank.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND AND SETTING

This chapter describes the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Nonradioactive and Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group OUs. It summarizes waste-site information and the hydrogeologic framework associated with these OUs to provide a fundamental understanding of the physical setting and potential impacts on the environment. Background and setting information includes the landfill descriptions and history, physical setting, and waste-generating processes.

To streamline this RI/FS work plan, much of the summary information for these OUs is included by reference to other documents. Section 2.2.10 of this document describes the individual landfills within the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs.

All disposal areas in the Hanford Site 200 Areas that are within the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU scope have been designated with the "218" number prefix. Hanford Site disposal areas with the 218 number prefix typically are landfills that have been pre-planned, designed, constructed, and operated with the intention of long-term and permanent disposal of solid waste. While some of the disposal areas within the scope of the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs have had variety of alias names (e.g., *Burial Garden No. 1, Equipment Burial Ground #10, 200 East Minor Construction No.4, 200 East Construction Burial Grounds, 200 East Dry Waste No. 12A, Dry Waste No 003, and Burial Grounds*), this work plan uses the term "landfill" to more generically refer to these locations that have the "218" prefix. All of the waste in the 218-prefixed landfills within the scope of the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs has been disposed to unlined trenches that have been pre-planned, designed, constructed, and operated under site operating procedures. Furthermore, and as discussed in Sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, the landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU fall into two categories of RCRA TSD-unit landfills (7 total), and past-practice landfills (17 total).

Figures 1-2, 1-3, and 1-4 show the locations of the landfills in the 200 East, 200 West, and 600 Area, respectively.

### 2.1 DESCRIPTIONS OF WASTE SITES

The following sections provide a description of the 26 landfills in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs.

In addition to the following sections, Table B-1 in Appendix B presents brief summaries for all 24 landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU and the two additional landfills in the 200-SW-1 OU.

Appendix B, Table B-2 presents brief summaries for 15 unplanned releases associated with these sites.

#### 2.1.1 600 Area Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and 600 Area Central Landfill

The NRDWL is an inactive TSD-unit landfill. Although a NRDWL site closure plan was written in 1990, the closure plan has not been approved. Therefore, NRDWL is classified as "Active" in

1 the *Waste Information Data System* (WIDS) database. The landfill provided a site for disposal of  
2 dangerous waste generated from process operations, research and development laboratories,  
3 maintenance activities, and transportation functions throughout the Hanford Site (WIDS).  
4 Figure 2-1 illustrates the present configuration of the trenches in the NRDWL, trench  
5 identification numbers, trench types, and operational dates.

6 The NRDWL is located about 5.6 km (2.5 mi) southeast of the 200 East Area on Army Loop  
7 Road, southwest of the Route 4 intersection and southeast of the 200 East Area. It began  
8 operation in 1975 and has an area of 4.5 hectares (11 ac). It consists of 19 parallel trenches, each  
9 122 m (400 ft) long, 4.9 m (18 ft) wide at the base, and 4.6 m (15 ft) deep. A triangular column  
10 of undisturbed soil with approximately 1:1 side slopes separated the trenches as they were  
11 constructed. The final profile of the trench varied depending on the type of waste received.

12 The trenches typically were backfilled and covered with 2 to 3 m (6 to 10 ft) of soil at the end of  
13 each operating day. Beginning in 1975, chemical waste was disposed of in six trenches, asbestos  
14 in nine trenches, nonhazardous solid waste in one trench, and three were unused. The last receipt  
15 of dangerous waste was in May 1985; the last receipt of asbestos occurred in May 1988.

16 A permanent 2.4 m (8-ft-) high fence with lockable gates surrounds the NRDWL.


17 The 600 CL is a non-RCRA solid-waste landfill adjacent to NRDWL on the south side. It is a  
18 larger facility (27 ha [67 ac]) that received principally solid waste, including paper, construction  
19 debris, asbestos, and lunchroom waste. It also received up to 5,000,000 L (1,320,000 gal) of  
20 sewage and 380,000 L (100,000 gal) of garage wash water. The liquid waste was discharged to  
21 east-west oriented trenches at the perimeter of the main solid-waste area, along the northeast and  
22 northwest boundaries of the 600 CL. The 600 CL is not a RCRA landfill; rather this landfill is  
23 regulated by WAC 173-304, "Minimum Functional Standards for Solid Waste Handling." It is  
24 included in this section because of its collocation with the NRDWL.

25 The two landfills (NRDWL and 600 CL) were operated as a single landfill, originally known as  
26 the Central Landfill. Because of the presence of dangerous waste in the chemical trenches, the  
27 19 northernmost trenches (1N, 2N, 18N, 19N, and 20-34) were designated as the NRDWL under  
28 the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit (WA7890008967). The southern two-thirds of the area later  
29 was designated as the Solid Waste Landfill or 600 CL, which is not a TSD unit. The boundary  
30 line separating the NRDWL from the SWL is located halfway between the trench designated as  
31 "JA Jones" and the southern border of NRDWL (DOE/RL-90-17, *Nonradioactive Dangerous*  
32 *Waste Landfill Closure/Postclosure Plan*).

33 A geophysical survey of the NRDWL was conducted in 2000. It was noted that some of the  
34 trench centers vary significantly from previous documentation and, in some locations, the buried  
35 debris is covered by only 0.6 m (2 ft) of fill. Unused portions of Trenches 19N and 26 have  
36 remained open since 1985.

37

Figure 2-1. Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and Solid Waste Landfill.



2-3

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

1 Trenches 18N, 24, and 32 were not used for disposal. Trenches 19N, 26, 28, 31, 33, and  
2 34 received an unknown volume of liquid waste consisting of laboratory chemicals, bulk organic  
3 waste, solvent waste, paints, paint thinners, waste oils, and empty containers. The chemical  
4 trenches were constructed with an access ramp to the bottom of the trench to allow transfer  
5 vehicles to access the working face. A 20 to 30.5 cm (8- to 12-in.) layer of gravel and cobble  
6 was placed over the bottom of the trench to form a temporary roadbed. The containerized  
7 chemical waste was off-loaded from transport trucks that had backed down the access ramp and  
8 up to the working face of the trench. Placement of the waste was supervised by a landfill  
9 operator. Containers (the majority of which were 208.2 L [55-gal] lab packs) were arranged in  
10 rows, standing end-to-end in the bottom of the trenches. Containers normally were placed in a  
11 single layer along the bottom of the trench; however, when a large shipment of drums was  
12 received, drums were stacked two high. At the end of the day, a portion of the spoil pile was  
13 pushed over the waste containers with a crawler/tractor to form the operational cover. Typically,  
14 the operational cover for the chemical trenches was approximately 3 m (10 ft) thick. When  
15 drums were stacked two high, the cover was reduced to approximately 2 m (6 ft)  
16 (DOE/RL-90-17).

17 Trenches 2N, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, and 30 received friable and nonfriable asbestos solid  
18 waste from building demolitions/renovations. Miscellaneous trash and debris from offices,  
19 lunchrooms, and construction/demolition activities were disposed of in Trench 1N, and  
20 approximately 5,300 L (1,400 gal) of nondangerous/nonradioactive septic-tank sludge was  
21 disposed to Trench 34. Waste at the asbestos and sanitary-waste trenches was unloaded at the  
22 base of the working face (as was done with the chemical trenches) or at the top edge of the  
23 working face. When waste was unloaded at the top edge, a tractor was used to push the waste  
24 into the trench to the desired height. In both cases, at the end of a day of operation, a portion of  
25 the spoil pile was pushed over the refuse to form an operational cover. The cover typically was  
26 1.2 m (4 ft) thick, but varied from about 1.2 to 2 m (4 to 6 ft), depending on the thickness of the  
27 waste layer (DOE/RL-90-17).

28 Reportedly, no bulk liquids or free liquids (other than lab packs packed with absorbents) have  
29 been allowed into this landfill. All dangerous wastes were containerized, with the exception of  
30 asbestos and sanitary solid wastes, before going to disposal (WIDS).

### 31 **2.1.2 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Treatment, Storage,** 32 **and/or Disposal Unit Landfills**

33 One RCRA TSD unit is associated with the 200-SW-2 OU. The RCRA TSD unit (consisting of  
34 seven radioactive landfills and one unused landfill), as noted in Chapter 1.0, is called the LLBG  
35 TSD unit. This unit includes the 218-E-10, 218-E-12B, 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B,  
36 218-W-4C, and 218-W-5 Landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU, and the 218-W-6 Landfill in the  
37 200-MG-1 OU. The unit is described in detail in the following sections. Copies of the most  
38 recently approved Part A Permit applications for the TSD unit are contained in DOE/RL-91-28,  
39 *Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application*, Rev. 7. Publicly available portions of  
40 this document are available on the DOE Richland Operations Office website,  
41 [http://www.hanford.gov/docs/rl-91-28/rl91-28chp\\_02.htm#2.2.1.2](http://www.hanford.gov/docs/rl-91-28/rl91-28chp_02.htm#2.2.1.2).

### 2.1.2.1 218-E-10 Landfill

This landfill began service in 1955, covers 36.5 ha (90 ac), and contains remote-handled and contact-handled unsegregated waste and LLW. These dimensions include an unused annex of this landfill. The total area of this landfill that has been used for disposal of waste is 23 ha (57 ac). Most of the waste buried before 1990 is in concrete boxes, while waste buried later mainly was direct-dumped from trucks (*Solid Waste Information and Tracking System* [SWITS] database). One source (HNF-SD-WM-ISB-002, *Solid Waste Burial Grounds Interim Safety Basis*) reports that this landfill contains one concrete box of suspect post-1970 remote-handled TRU waste (Trench 4). There is no retrievably stored waste under Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-091-40 in the 218-E-10 Landfill.

The 218-E-10 Landfill is located approximately 610 m (2,000 ft) northwest of the B Plant and directly west of the 218-E-5A Landfill. The 218-E-10 Landfill consists of 13 trenches running north to south and one trench running east to west. Trench 1 is 7.3 m (24 ft) deep with surface dimensions of 430 m (1,420 ft) long by 18 m (60 ft) wide. Trenches 2 through 9, 11, 12, 14, and 16 are 4.6 m (15 ft) deep, 18 m (60 ft) wide at the surface, and vary in length from 264 to 433 m (865 to 1,420 ft). The backfilled trench running east-west has surface dimensions of 165 m (540 ft) long by 17 m (55 ft) wide (WIDS).

As of September 2005, the 218-E-10 Landfill, also known as 200 East Industrial Waste No. 10, had received approximately 26,900 m<sup>3</sup> (35,200 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste, mostly from the Plutonium-Uranium Extraction (PUREX) Plant, B Plant, T Plant, offsite (mainly Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] waste), and the 100 Area (mainly N Reactor waste). Waste forms include failed equipment and mixed industrial wastes (e.g., concrete-canyon cover blocks, centrifuge blocks, tubing bundles, jumper vessels, pumps, columns, filters). The trenches contain low-level radiological waste, MLLW, and unsegregated remote-handled waste. Trench 9 currently is identified as containing MLLW disposed of after the effective date of mixed-waste regulation, August 19, 1987. The disposal of MLLW to Trench 9 will be confirmed; it is believed that some of the waste so identified may no longer be regulated, because it is contaminated only with lead shielding and dioctyl phthalate (used for testing efficiencies of high-efficiency particulate air [HEPA] filters).

In 1960, a partially covered burial box containing PUREX tube bundles caused an airborne contamination spread (UPR-200-E-23, UPR-200-E-24). In 1961, a wooden burial box containing process jumpers collapsed as it was covered with soil (UPR-200-E-30, previously assigned to the 218-E-12A Landfill but now known to have occurred in the 218-E-10 Landfill). An already remediated unplanned release site (UPR-200-E-61) is located at the railroad right-of-way within the 218-E-10 Landfill. It is contamination found after a concrete burial box was off-loaded from railroad cars to landfills in 1981. The site was decontaminated within a few days after discovery. The southeastern section of the 218-E-10 Landfill (Trenches 1 through 5) was backfilled, surface stabilized, and revegetated with grasses in 1980. The northern annex portion of this landfill never has been used for waste disposal (WIDS).

These landfill trenches are contained within the proposed groundwater-monitoring system for the low-level landfills. Airborne-radionuclide monitoring is performed routinely, and a perimeter radiological survey is performed annually (WIDS).

1 Hanford Site Drawings that describe this landfill include H-2-92004, *Industrial Burial Ground*  
2 *218-E-10 Site Plan and Details* (site plan), and H-2-821555, Sheet 4, *Subsidence Drawing Burial*  
3 *Ground 218-W-3AE* (stabilization).

#### 4 **2.1.2.2 218-E-12B Landfill**

5 This landfill began service in 1967 (WIDS), covers 73.7 ha (182 ac), and contains unsegregated  
6 waste, LLW, three trenches of suspect retrievably stored TRU, and defueled U.S. Navy vessel  
7 reactor compartments in Trench 94 (DOE REG-0271, *Low-Level Burial Grounds Fact Sheet*).  
8 This landfill is located approximately 305 m (1,000 ft) north of the C Tank Farm.

9 The 218-E-12B Landfill, Trench 94, is currently receiving defueled U.S. Navy vessel reactor  
10 compartments as an active RCRA TSD unit (DOE/RL-98-28). Trench 94 is not addressed in this  
11 document, because operations are expected to continue beyond the beginning of the scheduled  
12 time period for remedial actions in the 200-SW-2 OU.

13 The original landfill was designed to have 29 trenches. An expansion to the north and west  
14 enlarged this landfill to include the potential for 138 trenches oriented in a north-south direction.  
15 Only 36 trenches were filled completely, and an additional two were partially filled.

16 The in-scope trenches vary in length from 288 to 381 m (944 to 1,250 ft). The first six trenches  
17 (1A-1D, 3, and 7) are 0.9 m (3 ft) wide and 1.2 m (4 ft) deep. The rest of the trenches were  
18 designed to be 4.8 m (16 ft) deep and 11 m (37 ft) wide at the surface. The landfill is marked  
19 and radiologically posted (WIDS).

20 As of September 2005, the 218-E-12B Landfill, not including Trench 94, had received 65,086 m<sup>3</sup>  
21 (85,129 yd<sup>3</sup>) of solid unsegregated waste and LLW generated mostly from facilities located in  
22 the 200 East Area, including tank farms, B Plant, and PUREX general trash, failed equipment,  
23 vent risers, filter boxes, liquid-level risers from the 216-B-14 Crib, and Sr-90 contaminated soil  
24 dredged from the 216-B-63 Crib after UPR-200-E-138 occurred (DOE/RL-92-05, *B Plant*  
25 *Source Aggregate Area Management Study Report*). Most of the in-scope waste in this site was  
26 direct-dumped from trucks or buried in cardboard cartons (SWITS). This waste volume does not  
27 include post-1970 retrievably stored TRU, which is out of the scope of this work plan. The  
28 218-E-12B Landfill is the second landfill of four in priority under Tri-Party Agreement  
29 Milestone M-091-40 that are scheduled to have the stored retrievable TRU waste removed.

30 The southeastern portion of this landfill (Trenches 1 to 17) was interim-stabilized in 1981 with  
31 46 to 61 cm (18 to 24 in.) of uncontaminated soil. Surveillance and maintenance of the  
32 stabilized portion are performed periodically. In January 2000, two contaminated tumbleweeds  
33 were removed from the landfill. The source of contamination likely was plant-root uptake of  
34 contamination from the buried waste. The tumbleweeds read from 29,000 to 59,000 d/min per  
35 100 cm<sup>2</sup> beta/gamma and less than 20 d/min alpha. In addition, 13 tumbleweed fragments read  
36 from 2,500 to 399,000 d/min per 100 cm<sup>2</sup> beta/gamma.

37 Hanford Site Drawings that describe this landfill include H-2-821555, Sheet 2, *Subsidence*  
38 *Drawing Burial Ground 218-W-3A* (subsidence), and H-2-96660, *East Area Dry Waste Burial*  
39 *Ground* (site plan).

### 1 2.1.2.3 218-W-3A Landfill

2 This landfill was placed in service in 1970, covers 22 ha (54 ac), and contains unsegregated  
3 waste, LLW, MLLW, TRU, and TRU mixed waste (TRUM) (SWITS).

4 The 218-W-3A Landfill is an active TSD unit located on Dayton Avenue and 27th Street,  
5 immediately southeast of their intersection. It is west of the 221-T Building and immediately  
6 north of the 218-W-3 Landfill. The landfill is 380 m (1,250 ft) long and of irregular shape  
7 (H-2-34880, *Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-3A*).

8 This landfill was designed to contain 61 dry- and industrial-waste trenches running in an  
9 east-west direction. However, four trenches never were constructed, and the unit presently  
10 consists of 57 trenches of varying sizes ranging from 127 m to 284 m (417 to 930 ft) long.  
11 The side slopes are 1:1 or as required to match the natural angle of repose. Trench depths range  
12 from 3.7 to 5.8 m (12 to 19 ft) (BHI-00175, *Z Plant Aggregate Area Management Study*  
13 *Technical Baseline Report*).

14 As of September 2005, this landfill contained approximately 97,500 m<sup>3</sup> (127,500 yd<sup>3</sup>) of  
15 unsegregated waste, post-1987 MLLW, and LLW. Trenches 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 15, 17, 23, 30, 32,  
16 34, 6S, and 9S contain post-1970 retrievably stored TRU, which is out of the scope of this work  
17 plan. The 218-W-3A Landfill is the third landfill of four in priority under Tri-Party Agreement  
18 Milestone M-091-40 that are scheduled to have the retrievable stored TRU waste removed. Most  
19 of the post-1970 TRU-containing trenches also contain unsegregated wastes and/or LLW.

20 Trenches 3S, 6S, and 19 currently are identified as containing the MLLW disposed of after the  
21 effective date of mixed-waste regulation at the Hanford Site (August 19, 1987).

22 Most of the in-scope waste in this unit is from the 100 Area (21 percent by volume), various  
23 facilities in the 200 West Area (34 percent), the 300 Area (23 percent), and the tank farms  
24 (14 percent). Less than 3 percent by volume is from offsite facilities, and the remaining  
25 5 percent is from Hanford Site facilities in the 200 East Area and other miscellaneous site  
26 locations. Trench 7 contains waste from the clean-up at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Plant.  
27 Trench 14 contains 10 large concrete burial boxes of radioactive soil from the S Tank Farm that  
28 was generated from a salt-waste spill from Tank 241-S-102 transfer piping in 1973. Dose rates  
29 at the site of the spill before the contaminated soil was removed ranged to a maximum of 9 R/h  
30 (WIDS).

31 This landfill was flooded in the winter of 1979 - 1980, when several inches of snow on top of  
32 solidly frozen ground were followed by a quick warming and rapid snow melt. The landfill was  
33 covered with standing water that was almost continuous from the dirt road on the east side to the  
34 asphalt road on the west side of the landfill.

35 On January 21, 1997, a radiological control technician discovered contamination levels (in a  
36 posted Underground Radioactive Material Area) to 60,000 d/min beta-gamma (no alpha) per  
37 100 cm<sup>2</sup> in pieces of wind-blown tumbleweed at Trench 26. Two unplanned releases have been  
38 consolidated (WIDS) to this landfill. First, UPR-200-W-84 reported that in July 1980 a liquid  
39 spill occurred in the 218-W-3A Landfill during burial operations of a pump. This spill resulted  
40 in contamination of the truck transporting the pump and the ground around the truck. Second,

1 UPR-200-W-134 reported in October 1975 that an improper burial occurred in the 218-W-3A  
2 Landfill of a waste drum labeled "Transuranic" (Grubb and Lust, 1975, *Hanford Engineering*  
3 *Development Laboratory Unusual Occurrence Report 38-75*). The drum contained plutonium,  
4 uranium, and fissile materials. Applicable standards were not met for the handling and safe  
5 storage of this waste drum from the 325 Building. The trench section where it was buried was  
6 redesignated as transuranic and will be dispositioned by the M-091 Program.

7 Hanford Site Drawings that describe this landfill include H-2-34880, Sheets 1 and 2 (site plan);  
8 and H-2-821555 (stabilization).

#### 9 **2.1.2.4 218-W-3AE Landfill**

10 This landfill covers approximately 23 ha (57 ac) and began receiving waste in 1983. It contains  
11 MLLW and LLW including large equipment.

12 The 218-W-3AE Landfill is located directly east of and adjacent to the 218-W-3A Landfill in the  
13 200 West Area. The landfill has received 34,300 m<sup>3</sup> (44,900 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste as of  
14 September 2005. The waste is mainly from the 100 Area (23 percent by volume), 200 East and  
15 West Areas (13 percent), 300 Area (16 percent), and other miscellaneous Hanford Site areas and  
16 facilities such as the tank farms and the 1100 Area (22 percent). The remaining 26 percent is  
17 from offsite generators, the major contributors being Energy Systems Group, Argonne National  
18 Laboratory, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, and Battelle Columbus.

19 The irregularly shaped unit consists of eight trenches of varying sizes. Each trench location is  
20 identified by a concrete post with a brass name plate (BHI-00175).

21 This landfill includes Trenches 5 and 8, which are wide-bottom stacking trenches and contain  
22 large equipment such as portions of rail cars, and Trench 26, which was dug with a wide bottom  
23 to dispose of large tanks. The landfill has been receiving miscellaneous wastes such as rags,  
24 paper, rubber gloves, disposable supplies, and broken tools, and industrial waste such as failed  
25 equipment, tanks, pumps, ovens, agitators, heaters, hoods, jumpers, and accessories. All  
26 trenches have received remote-handled LLW.

27 The location designated as the 218-W-3AE Landfill includes an area that previously had been the  
28 216-T-4B seepage ponds for T Plant condensate effluent. The pond area often was dry, because  
29 the majority of the effluent was absorbed in the 216-T-4-2 Ditch.

30 In the summer of 2000, contaminated tumbleweeds were found growing in the 216-T-4B seepage  
31 pond area. As of 2007, no burial trenches have been excavated into this portion of the  
32 designated landfill property, nor are any planned.

33 Trenches 5 and 8 have received MLLW disposed of after the effective date of mixed waste  
34 regulation at the Hanford Site (August 19, 1987). The disposal of MLLW to Trenches 5 and 8  
35 will be confirmed. There is no retrievably stored TRU waste in the 218-W-3AE Landfill, under  
36 Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-091-40. A small amount of remote-handled TRU is stored at  
37 this landfill; it will be removed and repackaged for disposal by the M-091 Program. Hanford  
38 Site Drawings that describe this landfill include H-2-75351, Sheets 1, 2, and 3, *Dry Waste Burial*

1 *Ground 218-W-3AE* (site plan), and H-2-821555 (subsidence). Typical trench cross sections are  
2 described on H-2-75351, Sheet 2.

### 3 **2.1.2.5 218-W-4B Landfill**

4 This landfill began receiving wastes in 1970. It covers 4 ha (10 ac) and contains unsegregated  
5 waste, LLW, and TRU (SWITS).

6 The 218-W-4B Landfill is located in the central portion of the 200 West Area, about 150 m  
7 (500 ft) northwest of the 234-5Z Building, directly west of the 231-Z Building. It consists of  
8 14 trenches (one containing 12 caissons, of which 4 caissons contain suspect TRU waste). The  
9 trenches are approximately 177 m (580 ft) long and 3.1 to 3.7 m (10 to 12 ft) deep (H-2-33055,  
10 *Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-4B*).

11 The landfill received miscellaneous radioactive waste from the 100, 200, and 300 Areas as well  
12 as offsite shipments from 1967 to 1990. As of September 2005, the landfill had received  
13 10,500 m<sup>3</sup> (13,700 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste, of which 7,220 m<sup>3</sup> (9,440 yd<sup>3</sup>) is waste in the scope of this  
14 work plan. Solid waste disposed of at the landfill consists of rags, paper, cardboard, plastic,  
15 pumps, tanks, process equipment, and other miscellaneous high-dose-rate and TRU dry waste  
16 (BHI-00175). The waste within the scope of this project mainly is from the 200 West Area  
17 (53 percent by volume) and the 300 Area (35 percent). The remaining 12 percent is from the  
18 100 Area (3 percent), offsite generators (4 percent), and the tank farms (5 percent).

19 This landfill also contains 3,240 m<sup>3</sup> (4,240 yd<sup>3</sup>) of retrievable (post-1970) TRU waste (SWITS).  
20 No trenches in this landfill contain MLLW or TRUM that was disposed of after the effective date  
21 of mixed-waste regulation at the Hanford Site (August 19, 1987). The 218-W-4B Landfill is the  
22 fourth landfill of four in priority under Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-091-40 that is  
23 scheduled to have the retrievably stored TRU waste removed.

24 A series of documents published around 1980 describes the number of trenches and the number  
25 and contents of the caissons, but not consistently. A 1980 Rockwell Hanford Operations internal  
26 letter report (RHO-65463-80-126, "Inconsistencies in 218-W-4B Site Data") addresses the  
27 inconsistencies and indicates that to the author's best knowledge the 218-W-4B Landfill is  
28 composed of 13 trenches and one row (Trench 14) of 12 caissons. All of the trenches in this  
29 landfill are covered with earth (DOE/EIS-0286F, *Final Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and*  
30 *Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement, Richland, Washington*).

31 Trench 6 contains LLW only. Trenches 7 and 11 and the four alpha caissons in Trench 14  
32 contain post-1970 suspect TRU waste. Trenches 1 to 5 and 8 to 12 contain unsegregated waste.  
33 Of these, Trenches 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, and 13 contain some packages of waste that are suspected  
34 to contain over 100 nCi/g of pre-1970 transuranics (SWITS).

35 A small volume of liquid was disposed of in the form of tritium contained in metal cylinders, or  
36 plutonium liquid. Known quantities of liquid are noted in RHO-65462-80-035, "Description of  
37 Waste Buried in Site 218-W-4B." This document contains an inventory of caisson and trench  
38 contents for the period between May 1, 1968, through May 1, 1970.

1 Trench 14 contains 12 caissons that are underground storage structures for the disposal of 3.8 to  
2 18.9 L (1 to 5 gal) cans of remote-handled waste (DOE/EIS-0286F). The caisson wastes were  
3 received from 200 Areas facilities, the 300 Area, and the 100-N Area (DOE/RL-96-81).  
4 Caissons C1, C2, C3, and C4 contain some packages of waste that are suspected to contain over  
5 100 nCi/g of pre-1970 transuranics (SWITS). As noted above, the four filled alpha caissons  
6 contain post-1970 suspect TRU wastes.

7 This landfill was flooded in the winter of 1979 to 1980. Several inches of snow, followed by  
8 quick warming and rapid snow melt, caused the landfills to flood (WHC-EP-0912).

9 Trenches 1 through 6 were backfilled and surface stabilized with clean fill in 1983. The surface  
10 was revegetated with grass. Trench 7 is covered with a 1.2 m (4 ft) soil mound. The remaining  
11 trenches were backfilled after use and stabilized with clean gravel in 1995. Stabilization of  
12 surfaces with clean gravel (rather than revegetation with grasses) has been shown to increase  
13 natural recharge to up to 80 percent of the annual precipitation because of a lack of moisture  
14 removal by evaporation and plant transpiration. Trenches stabilized with clean gravel would be  
15 a good location for initial investigations of subsurface moisture distributions with direct pushes.  
16 This landfill is monitored for surface contamination and for subsidence. The caissons are  
17 monitored for airborne radionuclides. A radiological survey is performed annually.

18 This landfill appears today as a fenced field with an apparently undisturbed surface. It has been  
19 seeded with field grass, and some rabbit brush growth has occurred. No unplanned releases are  
20 known to have occurred at this landfill. The fenced area includes the 218-W-1, 218-W-2,  
21 218-W-4A, 218-W-4B, and 218-W-11 Landfills (BHI-00175).

22 Hanford Site Drawing H-2-33055 describes the trench layout; H-2-74640, *Installation – Filtered*  
23 *& Shielded Caisson Covers – Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-4B*, describes caisson  
24 installation; and H-2-821555 describes stabilization.

#### 25 **2.1.2.6 218-W-4C Landfill**

26 The 218-W-4C Landfill started receiving waste in 1978. It covers approximately 23 ha (56 ac)  
27 and contains TRU (some combustible) and test-reactor-fuel waste (DOE REG-0271).

28 The largest portion of the 218-W-4C Landfill is located west and southwest of the Plutonium  
29 Finishing Plant, east of Dayton Avenue. A smaller section is located directly south of the plant,  
30 and north of 16th Street. The unit was designed to contain up to 65 trenches. Forty-eight  
31 trenches run east-west. Twenty-four of these are 184 m (602 ft) long, 19 are 220 m (719 ft) long,  
32 4 are 180 m (594 ft) long, and 1 trench is 91 m (300 ft) long. Seventeen trenches run  
33 north-south. Of these, 14 trenches are 200 m (665 ft) long, and 3 trenches are 155 m (508 ft)  
34 long. Only 15 trenches ranging from 91 to 219 m (300 to 719 ft) long have been used for waste  
35 storage and/or disposal.

36 The 218-W-4C Landfill began accepting packaged waste materials from 200 West Area  
37 operations, other Hanford Site areas, and from offsite sources in 1974 (WIDS). According to  
38 burial records, the 218-W-4C Landfill currently contains approximately 21,916 m<sup>3</sup> (28,665 yd<sup>3</sup>)  
39 of low-level, TRU, and mixed waste. TRU waste has been segregated from other landfill waste  
40 since 1970 and placed in separate burial trenches and/or areas of burial trenches where the

1 packages are retrievably stored. The volume of waste within scope of this RI/FS work plan is  
2 15,200 m<sup>3</sup> (19,881 yd<sup>3</sup>).

3 Trenches 1, 4, 7, 20, 29, and the east end of Trench 24 contain retrievably stored suspect TRU  
4 waste. Trenches NC, 14, 19, 23, 28, 33, 48, 53, and 58, and the remainder of Trench 24 received  
5 buried LLW. In addition, some wastes in Trenches NC, 14, and 58 currently are identified as  
6 MLLW disposed after the effective date of mixed-waste regulation at the Hanford Site  
7 (August 19, 1987).

8 The northernmost trench (Trench NC) contains a number of core barrels originating from  
9 the U.S. Department of the Navy. Trench 1 contains drums generated from mining the  
10 216-Z-9 Crib/Trench and approximately 500 cans of ash received in the early 1980s. The ash  
11 was generated by the 232-Z Waste Incinerator Facility, which incinerated miscellaneous waste  
12 (e.g., rubber gloves, rags, paper, spent solvent, cutting oils).

13 Trench 7 is at the location of a former waste site. The Z Plant Burning Pit was a disposal site for  
14 combustible nonradioactive construction, office, and nonhazardous laboratory waste, including  
15 unnamed chemicals. The burning pit is reported to have received 2,000 m<sup>3</sup> (2,600 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste  
16 for burning, including less than 1,000 m<sup>3</sup> (1,300 yd<sup>3</sup>) of laboratory chemicals. The burning pit  
17 was 15 m (50 ft) long, 12 m (40 ft) wide, and 3 m (10 ft) deep. The burning pit was used from  
18 1950 to 1960 (WIDS; BHI-00175). UPR-200-W-37 has been consolidated (WIDS) with this  
19 landfill. UPR-200-W-37 reported that in June 1955 contamination resulted when three boxes  
20 containing high-activity dry waste were mistakenly placed in a burn pit in the 200 West Area.  
21 When the mistake was rectified, it was noted that one of the boxes had released contamination at  
22 levels of 100 mR/h as a result of being broken open during placement, while the other two boxes  
23 had remained sealed. The boxes were removed and the pit was decontaminated. Through  
24 historical research, this pit where the incident occurred was identified as the Z Plant Burning Pit.

25 The waste in the 218-W-4C Landfill that is within the scope of this project is mainly from the  
26 200 West Area (24 percent by volume), the 100 Area (12 percent), the 300 Area (9 percent) and  
27 offsite generators (47 percent). The remaining 8 percent is from miscellaneous Hanford Site  
28 areas and the tank farms. The eastern annex portion of this unit never has received waste.

29 During the latter part of calendar year 1979 and the early part of 1980, a heavy snowfall and  
30 rapid melting caused flooding within some of the 218-W-4C Landfill trenches. Transuranic  
31 drums were observed to be floating in the landfill. Workers retrieved the drums undamaged  
32 (WHC-EP-0912, WHC-EP-0225, *Contact-Handled Transuranic Waste Characterization Based*  
33 *on Existing Records*). Despite the volume of water observed during the flood, there has been no  
34 impact on groundwater, as shown in the groundwater monitoring data presented in  
35 Section 3.4.4.4. Perched water was detected beneath the 218-W-4C Landfill in 1991. The  
36 perched water was no longer detected in 1994. The source of the water was not identified.

37 Areas of the TRU-retrievable-waste trenches are known to have subsided, or to have the  
38 potential to subside, after placement of the waste containers. The condition of the waste  
39 containers in these subsidence areas is unknown. Interface has been established with the M-091  
40 Program to better understand the condition of waste containers in subsidence areas as they are  
41 retrieved for processing; including opportunistic sampling, as appropriate.

1 These units are contained within the proposed groundwater monitoring system for LLBGs.  
2 Routine airborne radionuclide monitoring is performed. Radiological surveys of the perimeter  
3 site boundaries also are performed annually.

4 No unplanned releases are associated with this landfill. Hanford Site Drawings that describe this  
5 landfill include H-2-37437, Sheets 1 through 4, *Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-4C*, and  
6 H-2-821555 (stabilization).

#### 7 **2.1.2.7 218-W-5 Landfill**

8 In 1979, a large area adjacent to the northwest corner of the 200 West Area was annexed and  
9 designated the Central Waste Complex and the 218-W-5 Landfill. The annexed area extended  
10 north from 16th Street to 27th Street and westward to coordinates E564176/N137630. Within  
11 the large annex, 34 ha (84 ac) currently are permitted as low-level waste landfills. Original plans  
12 called for the area to contain 18 LLW trenches and 4 MLLW trenches. The landfill was  
13 expanded by annexing land to the west and north and was designed to contain 56 trenches, all  
14 oriented east-west. Of these, 11 unlined trenches have been constructed and have had wastes  
15 placed in them, and an additional two lined trenches (out of scope of this RI/FS work plan) were  
16 constructed.

17 The landfill is at the southwest corner of the intersection of 27th Street and Dayton Avenue.  
18 This landfill began receiving waste on August 29, 1986. It covers 38.5 ha (95 ac). Two trenches  
19 (Trenches 31 and 34), which are large rectangular excavations in the southwest corner of the  
20 218-W-5 Landfill, currently are operated as disposal units for MLLW. The trenches are  
21 constructed with polyethylene liners and leachate collection system. These active trenches are  
22 described in detail in Section 2.2.4. Operations at Trenches 31 and 34 are expected to end before  
23 the time that CERCLA remedial actions are scheduled to begin.

24 The trenches (other than the currently active MLLW trenches) range from 4.6 m (15 ft) to 12 m  
25 (40 ft) wide at the bottom and from 5.2 to 6.1 m (17 to 20 ft) deep. The length of the trenches  
26 varies from 350 m (1,160 ft) to 130 m (430 ft) long. The volume of waste within scope of this  
27 RI/FS work plan is 71,000 m<sup>3</sup> (92,865 yd<sup>3</sup>).

28 A reported 204 kg (450 lb) of lead is buried in Trench 21, and 1,684 kg (3,710 lb) in Trench 9  
29 (BHI-00175). An unused expansion area is located in the northwest section (BHI-00175).

30 The 218-W-5 Landfill is contained within the proposed groundwater-monitoring system for  
31 LLBGs. Routine airborne-radionuclide monitoring is performed.

32 No unplanned releases are associated with this landfill.

33 Trench 22 currently is identified as containing MLLW disposed of after the effective date of  
34 mixed-waste regulation at the Hanford Site (August 19, 1987). The disposal of MLLW to  
35 Trench 22 will be confirmed.

36 Hanford Site Drawings that describe this landfill include H-2-94677, *Dry Waste Burial Ground*  
37 *218-W-5* (site plan), and H-2-821555 (stabilization).

### 1 2.1.2.8 218-W-6 Landfill

2 The 218-W-6 Landfill, although included in the LLBG Part A Permit (DOE/RL-88-20, *Hanford*  
3 *Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, Low-Level Burial Grounds*), never has received  
4 waste. It is located east of and across the railway tracks from the 218-W-3AE Landfill. This  
5 landfill is roughly triangular in shape, with outside dimensions of 420 m north to south and  
6 768 m east to west (1,376 by 2,519 ft). The Hanford Site Drawing that describes this landfill is  
7 H-2-99933, *Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-6*. Because the 218-W-6 Landfill never has  
8 received waste, it was moved to the 200-MG-1 OU and, therefore, no longer is in the scope of  
9 this investigation.

### 10 2.1.3 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Past-Practice Landfills

11 Seventeen radioactive past-practice landfills are within the scope of this project. They are the  
12 218-C-9, 218-E-1, 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, 218-E-8, 218-E-9,  
13 218-E-12A, 218-W-1, 218-W-1A, 218-W-2, 218-W-2A, 218-W-3, 218-W-4A, and  
14 218-W-11 Landfills. All of the waste in these landfills is within the scope of this work plan.  
15 These landfills are described in detail in the following sections.

#### 16 2.1.3.1 218-C-9 Landfill

17 The 218-C-9 Landfill is a past-practice construction landfill located north of 7th Street and north  
18 of the C Plant/Hot Semiworks Plant. The landfill's reported dimensions have varied widely from  
19 source to source over time. Dimensions based on SWITS data and paper burial records,  
20 corrected for obvious errors such as transposed burial coordinates, are 108 by 337 m (353 by  
21 1109 ft). Dimensions based on WIDS data show an area of only 76 by 66 m (250 by 217 ft).  
22 Photographs of the landfill as it looked when it was stabilized show a smaller disturbed area  
23 (about 76 by 66 m) and a larger disturbed area (about 108 by 337 m) to the north.

24 Waste volume in the 218-E-1 Landfill is approximately 3,030 m<sup>3</sup> (3,963 yd<sup>3</sup>). The landfill  
25 covers approximately 0.96 ha (2.4 ac).

26 Before its use as a landfill, the location was the foundation excavation for a planned plutonium  
27 separations building, 221-C, whose construction never was completed. Next the excavation for  
28 the 221-C foundation was used as a liquid-waste disposal site, designated as the 216-C-9 Pond.  
29 For 30 years (1953 to 1983) it received approximately one billion liters (264 Mgal) of mildly  
30 radioactive steam-condensate liquid discharge from source facilities, the 209-E Critical Mass  
31 Laboratory and the Hot Semiworks (201-C). Two years after liquid discharges to the site had  
32 ceased, solid wastes were disposed to this previously used pond area for a four-year period  
33 (1985 to 1989). This included 7,580 m<sup>3</sup> (9,920 yd<sup>3</sup>) of miscellaneous debris and soil (SWITS).  
34 A large portion of the 216-C-9 Pond area was assigned the facility designation of "218-C-9" to  
35 signify its use as a solid-waste landfill. Debris at the landfill consists of radiologically  
36 contaminated concrete rubble, large equipment, roofing material, metal scrap, and other Hot  
37 Semiworks demolition wastes. Contaminated soil from UPR-200-E-37 and UPR-200-E-98 also  
38 was placed in the 218-C-9 Landfill. If vadose-zone contamination exists, it likely will be as a  
39 result of pond operations over 3 decades. This landfill is not a typical dry-waste landfill, because  
40 it received a large volume of mildly radioactively contaminated liquids (as a pond). Site

1 remediation decisions likely will be driven by its prior use as a pond rather than its limited use as  
2 a solid-waste landfill, possibly making the remedial action "atypical" for solid-waste landfills.  
3 Disposition of the soil contaminated as a result of past pond use will be coordinated with the  
4 appropriate OU for ponds.

5 The entire 218-C-9 Landfill has been backfilled and surface stabilized with fly ash from the  
6 284-E Powerhouse Ash Pit. While fly ash is an effective medium to control plant intrusion, it  
7 was difficult to conduct geophysical surveys of the site in support of nonintrusive investigations.  
8 A routine radiological survey is performed annually.

9 No Hanford Site Drawings have been found that describe the 218-C-9 Landfill. Drawings that  
10 show the location of the landfill and describe the former 216-C-9 Pond include H-2-4010,  
11 *Strontium Semiworks & Vicinity Outside Lines Key Map*, and H-2-4606, *216-C-9 Pond*  
12 *Modifications*.

### 13 **2.1.3.2 218-E-1 Landfill**

14 The 218-E-1 Landfill is a past-practice landfill that originally was called the Dry Waste Burial  
15 Garden #1. This landfill received packaged waste materials from the B Plant complex from 1945  
16 to March 1953. It is located approximately 150 m (500 ft) west of PUREX. Although some  
17 literature sources report 21 trenches (e.g., RHO-CD-673, *Handbook 200 Areas Waste Sites*), both  
18 a 1982 Rockwell Hanford Operations letter (RHO-72710-82-167, "Final Report: 218-E-1 Dry  
19 Waste Burial Ground Characterization Survey") and a more recent geophysics survey performed  
20 in 2006 (D&D-30708, *Geophysical Investigations Summary Report; 200 Areas Burial Grounds:*  
21 *218-E-1, 218-E-2A, 218-E-8, 218-E-12A, 218-W-1, 218-W-2, 218-W-3, and 218-W-11*) show  
22 15 trenches running north-south, approximately 60 m (200 ft) long, consistent with the site  
23 reference drawings. Waste trenches were filled to ground level with cinders from the nearby  
24 284-E Powerhouse Ash Disposal Pile (cinder pile). The cinders make a comparatively sterile  
25 seed bed, which acts as a deterrent against plant growth that could take up some of the  
26 radioactivity through the roots. Gravel-covered surfaces that are denuded of vegetation induce  
27 recharge (up to 80 percent of annual precipitation based on Hanford Site studies), increasing the  
28 possibility of mobile-contaminant migration in the vadose zone. Planned direct pushes in this  
29 landfill are expected to provide data on moisture contents at depth. The surface of the cinders  
30 was covered with coarse gravel to guard against wind erosion, and a dry moat was bladed around  
31 the zone perimeter inside the post line to discourage vehicle travel over the surface of the landfill  
32 (WHC-EP-0912). The landfill was surface stabilized in 1981 with 0.5 m (1.5 ft) of clean fill,  
33 revegetated, and load tested. UPR-200-E-53 has been consolidated (WIDS) with this landfill.  
34 UPR-200-E-53 reported that in October 1978 contamination was spread by a bulldozer when  
35 shallow-buried contaminated waste was unearthed during backfilling activities. The area of  
36 UPR-200-E-53 is approximately 15 by 46 m (50 ft by 150 ft) and is located at the south end of  
37 the 218-E-1 Landfill.

38 The site plan reference drawing for this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-00124,  
39 *218-E-1 Dry Waste Burial Ground*.

### 1 2.1.3.3 218-E-2 Landfill

2 The 218-E-2 Landfill is a past-practice site. The service dates are 1945 to 1953 (WIDS). The  
3 landfill consists of 8 industrial trenches. The trench lengths vary from 27 to 142 m (90 to  
4 465 ft). The landfill received unsegregated material contaminated with mixed-fission product  
5 (WIDS), uranium, and plutonium (SWITS). The landfill contains approximately 9,000 m<sup>3</sup>  
6 (11,772 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste and covers approximately 2 ha (5 ac). The landfill is collocated with the  
7 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-9 Landfills. The unit was surface stabilized  
8 in 1979 with 0.3 m (1 ft) of clean backfill material and vegetated with wheat grass (WIDS).

9 The reference drawing for this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534, *218-E2, E2A, E4,*  
10 *E5, E5A, & E9 Industrial Burial Ground Plan & Details.*

### 11 2.1.3.4 218-E-2A Landfill

12 The 218-E-2A Landfill is a past-practice site that originally was called the Regulated Equipment  
13 Storage Site #2A. This landfill was used for the aboveground storage of equipment that since  
14 has been removed. Service dates are not known, but are estimated as 1955 to 1965, with the  
15 landfill definitely retired by 1975 (WHC-EP-0845, *Solid Waste Management History of the*  
16 *Hanford Site*). The landfill is located directly south of the 218-E-2 Landfill, across the railroad  
17 tracks, north of the B Plant. The drawings conflict slightly in their depictions of trench location.  
18 The trench is about 14 m (46 ft) wide. No records or burial inventories are available to indicate  
19 that this landfill ever was used as a disposal facility, and waste volumes are not known. On  
20 February 21, 1978, an inspection of the burial trench disclosed a number of sink holes along the  
21 center line of the trench, indicating that the trench had been dug and used for dry-waste burials.  
22 In the summer of 1979, at least 0.3 m (1 ft) dirt was used to fill the burial trench to ground level  
23 (WHC-EP-0912).

24 The 218-E-2A Landfill is associated with UPR-200-E-95, a railroad spur located south of the  
25 218-E-2 and 218-E-5 Landfills and north of the 218-E-2A Landfill, north of the B Plant. The  
26 contaminated area was established as an unplanned release site in September of 1980. It became  
27 contaminated over time as a result of contaminated equipment (mainly from the B Plant and  
28 PUREX) being stored on railroad flat cars on the spur. The contamination likely is the  
29 accumulation of many small releases over time. In 1998, the tracks were covered with gravel  
30 and posted as an Underground Radioactive Material Area. The site is approximately 250 by 5 m  
31 (820 by 16 ft). A 1996 perimeter survey report reported less-than-detectable levels of  
32 contamination. A 1991 survey reported general rail contamination of 3,000 to 6,000 d/min beta,  
33 with a maximum of 350,000 d/min beta in one spot (WIDS). This unplanned release has been  
34 transferred to the 200-MG-1 OU and, therefore, is out of the scope of this investigation.

35 The reference drawing for this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534.

### 36 2.1.3.5 218-E-4 Landfill

37 The 218-E-4 Landfill is a past-practice landfill that historically has been called 200 East Minor  
38 Construction No. 4 and Equipment Landfill #4. The landfill received repair and construction  
39 waste from the 221-B modifications. The landfill is collocated with the 218-E-2, 218-E-2A,  
40 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-9 Landfills.

1 The service dates are estimated as 1955 to 1956. The landfill is a wedge-shaped polygon located  
2 between two railroad tracks and north of B Plant. The exact number of trenches remains  
3 unknown. It is believed that two trenches run parallel to the railroad tracks (HW-28471,  
4 *Unconfined Underground Radioactive Waste and Contamination in the 200 Areas*). 1,586 m<sup>3</sup>  
5 (2,074 yd<sup>3</sup>) of mainly construction debris is buried at the landfill, which covers an area of 1.4 ha  
6 (3.4 ac). All waste is unsegregated.

7 The 218-E-4 Landfill was affected by UPR-200-E-23. In June 1960, this unplanned release  
8 occurred in the 218-E-10 Landfill; some of the contamination drifted into the 218-E-4 Landfill  
9 and contaminated the area to a maximum reading of 1 rad/h one year after the incident (WIDS).

10 The landfill was surface stabilized in 1980 and is posted as an Underground Radioactive Material  
11 Area. A radioactive survey is performed annually.

12 The reference drawing for this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534.

### 13 **2.1.3.6 218-E-5 Landfill**

14 The 218-E-5 Landfill is a past-practice landfill originally called Industrial Burial Garden #5.  
15 This landfill received miscellaneous contaminated equipment from the tank farm Uranium  
16 Recovery Process and PUREX. The landfill was used from 1954 to 1957 and now is inactive.  
17 It is contiguous with the western boundary of the 218-E-2 Landfill, north of the B Plant.

18 Extensive research was conducted during 1979 to determine the location of all of the burial  
19 trenches within the bounds of the 218-E-2, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-9 Landfills. This  
20 research was performed to support interim site stabilization. The research included viewing  
21 aerial photographs and construction drawings, analyzing plant growth patterns, and load testing  
22 the ground surface. Four previously unrecorded trenches were identified; these trenches are now  
23 numbered 1, 2, 4, and 5 on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534. The trenches in the 218-E-2,  
24 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-9 Landfills were stabilized with the addition of 0.3 m (1 ft) of  
25 soil (WHC-EP-0912). The 218-E-5 Landfill covers 0.4 ha (1.1 ac) and contains 6,173 m<sup>3</sup>  
26 (8,074 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste.

27 The reference drawing for this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534. Source literature  
28 (RHO-CD-673) indicates that trench locations for this landfill may not be accurately represented  
29 on the drawing. Geophysics data collected in 2006 (D&D-28379, *Geophysical Investigations*  
30 *Summary Report; 200 Area Burial Grounds: 218-C-9, 218-E-2A, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, 218-E-8,*  
31 *218-W-1A, 218-W-2A, and 218-W-11*) suggest that the trench locations are slightly different than  
32 depicted on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534.

### 33 **2.1.3.7 218-E-5A Landfill**

34 The 218-E-5A Landfill is a past-practice site that originally was called Industrial Burial Garden  
35 #5A. This landfill received failed equipment and industrial waste that consisted of three or four  
36 very large (15 by 4.6 by 5.5 m, or 50 by 15 by 18 ft) wooden burial boxes containing a PUREX  
37 K-2 column package, a PUREX L cell package, and a PUREX J-2 pulse column package. The  
38 boxes were partially buried in 1958 and backfilled in 1961. Most literature sources indicate that  
39 this landfill was used from 1956 to 1959.

1 The landfill is located contiguous with the western boundary of the 218-E-5 Landfill, north of the  
2 B Plant. The landfill reference drawing is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534. Exact trench  
3 locations are not known, although the large-box burial locations are well documented and  
4 photographed. The photographs show foaming used during the backfilling operation to contain  
5 contamination because of a box collapse.

6 In 1979, the landfill was stabilized with 0.3 m (1 ft) of dirt and load tested with 40 tons. The  
7 burial location is a 30 by 37 m (100 by 120-ft) rectangular area.

#### 8 **2.1.3.8 218-E-8 Landfill**

9 The 218-E-8 Landfill is a past-practice site once known as the Construction Burial Garden  
10 (originally no number was assigned to it). This landfill received contaminated equipment and  
11 material in 1958-1959 during construction of the 293-A PUREX Dissolver Offgas Building, and  
12 removal of the PUREX temporary ventilation barrier during the PUREX second crane addition.  
13 The 218-E-8 Landfill is located at the northwest edge of the 200 East Area Burn Pit, north of  
14 PUREX. The location and number of trenches in this landfill are not known. Older source  
15 literature (HW-60807, *Unconfined Underground Radioactive Waste and Contamination In The*  
16 *200 Areas – 1959*) shows a different size and location for the landfill than do current site maps  
17 (for example, Hanford Site Drawing H-2-821555, Sheet 5) and WIDS. Recent geophysical  
18 surveys (D&D-28379 and D&D-30708) suggest that the location of the landfill per current site  
19 drawings may closely border other burials in the nearby 200 East Area Burn Pit, a nonradioactive  
20 waste site. There is no known explanation for the discrepancy in the literature sources or the  
21 geophysical data.

22 This landfill covers 0.4 ha (1.1 ac) and contains 2,265 m<sup>3</sup> (2,963 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste.

23 On February 21, 1979, residue from tumbleweed fragments blown in along the west boundary  
24 line of this landfill was found to be reading greater than 100,000 c/min beta-gamma activity  
25 (WHC-EP-0912). In 1979, the landfill was stabilized with at least 0.5 m (1.5 ft) of backfill.  
26 There are no known individual drawings of the landfill; however, drawings of the  
27 218-E-12B Landfill (for example, Hanford Site Drawing H-2-821555, Sheet 5) often show the  
28 218-E-8 Landfill, which is in the southeast corner of the 218-E-12B Landfill.

#### 29 **2.1.3.9 218-E-9 Landfill**

30 The 218-E-9 Landfill is a past-practice landfill originally known as East Regulated Equipment  
31 Storage Site No. 009. The landfill was used from 1953 to 1958 and now is inactive. It was used  
32 as an aboveground storage site for fission-product equipment that became contaminated in the  
33 Uranium Recovery Process operations at the tank farms. It is not certain that it ever was used for  
34 burials; sinkholes were noticed in the landfill in the late 1970s, indicating the likelihood that it  
35 had been. The landfill is collocated with the 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, and  
36 218-E-5A Landfills and was stabilized in 1980. The landfill was restabilized in 1991 when  
37 contaminated vegetation was found. The landfill is approximately 130 by 30 m (427 by 100 ft).

38 The landfill reference drawing is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534.

### 1 2.1.3.10 218-E-12A Landfill

2 The 218-E-12A Landfill is a past-practice landfill originally known as Dry Waste Burial Garden  
3 #12. This landfill was active from 1953 to 1967. Unpublished logbooks from the 1960s suggest  
4 that much of the waste at this landfill consists of bulk trash from PUREX, placed in fiberboard  
5 boxes or direct-dumped from trucks. Other recorded items buried include tank farm pumps,  
6 animal carcasses from the 108-F Biology Laboratory, metal drums of depleted uranium from  
7 offsite generators, and miscellaneous construction waste. This landfill contains 28 trenches  
8 137 to 311 m (450 to 1020 ft) long. Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32560, *As-Built Dry Waste*  
9 *Burial Site #218-E-12A*, indicates that trenches 4-11, 15-16, and 26-28 contain acid-soaked  
10 material, but little is understood about the nature of this material. However, interviews with  
11 former PUREX workers indicate that this waste is likely to be rags that were once saturated with  
12 a nitric acid solution and used to decontaminate equipment in the PUREX facility. These  
13 acid-soaked material trenches are narrower (1.5 to 3.7 m or 5 to 12 ft wide) and presumably  
14 shallower than other trenches (9.2 m [30 ft] wide) in this landfill. UPR-200-E-30 has been  
15 consolidated (WIDS) with this landfill. UPR-200-E-30 reported contamination being released in  
16 April 1961, when a large wooden drag-off box collapsed as it was being backfilled in place in the  
17 218-E-12A Landfill. The majority of the contamination was located within the landfill.

18 The landfill is located north of the B Plant, approximately 30 m (100 ft) northwest of the C Tank  
19 Farm. In 1979-1980, and again in 1994, the landfill was stabilized with 0.5 to 0.6 m (1.5 to  
20 2.0 ft) of backfill.

21 The drawing that best describes this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32560.

### 22 2.1.3.11 218-W-1 Landfill

23 The 218-W-1 Landfill is a past-practice landfill containing pre-1970 transuranic and solid  
24 wastes. It is located on the east side of Dayton Avenue, approximately west of the TX Tank  
25 Farm. It is about 460 m (1500 ft) northwest of the 234-5Z Building and lies between the  
26 218-W-2 and 218-W-11 Landfills.

27 The 218-W-1 Landfill operated from 1944 until 1953 to receive more than 7,000 m<sup>3</sup> (9,200 yd<sup>3</sup>)  
28 of miscellaneous dry wastes. Photographic evidence suggests that the landfill received wastes  
29 packaged mainly in small wooden boxes or fiberboard containers or wrapped in heavy brown  
30 paper. Property disposal records from the 1940s and 1950s indicate that wastes disposed to this  
31 landfill include small- to medium-sized equipment -- items such as dip tubes, lab-sample cups,  
32 and laundry machines. It also may contain tools, air filters, and protective clothing such as  
33 masks. Wastes with dose rates of up to 35 rem/h at the container surface were reported in early  
34 source literature (HW-28471).

35 The landfill is 3.3 ha (8.2 ac), contains 7,164 m<sup>3</sup> (9,370 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste, and consists of 15 trenches  
36 that run east to west. Twelve of these are 2.4 m (8 ft) deep and 73 m (240 ft) long. The other  
37 three are 2.7 m (9 ft) deep and 149 m (488 ft) long. It appears as a fenced field with an  
38 apparently undisturbed flat surface. It has been seeded with field grass. A small area near the  
39 center of the landfill once contained contaminated mulch with a maximum reading of  
40 12,000 d/min. Evidence exists that waste boxes once were buried less than 1.2 m (4 ft) from the  
41 surface. The landfill is fully fenced with chain-link fencing and is marked with permanent

1 concrete posts and brass name plates (BHI-00175). Two unplanned releases have been  
2 consolidated (WIDS) with this landfill; the noted unplanned releases are UPR-200-W-11 and  
3 UPR-200-W-16 (WIDS). UPR-200-W-16 is a duplicate number for the occurrence reported in  
4 UPR-200-W-11. UPR-200-W-11 reported a 1952 fire that occurred in the waste boxes,  
5 spreading plutonium (alpha) contamination to the north and south sides of the trench and outside  
6 of the 218-W-1 Landfill. UPR-200-W-11 location was reported incorrectly in the Z Plant  
7 Technical Baseline Report (BHI-00175). The correct location for the UPR-200-W-11 /  
8 UPR-200-W-16 site was confirmed by the map in HW-54636, *Summary of Environmental*  
9 *Contamination Incidents at Hanford 1952-1957*.

10 The landfill was surface stabilized in 1983. Trench arrangement and dimensions are shown in  
11 detail on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-75149, *Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-1*.

#### 12 **2.1.3.12 218-W-1A Landfill**

13 The 218-W-1A Landfill is a past-practice site originally called Industrial Burial Garden #1 and  
14 Industrial Waste No. 1. The landfill contains 13,700 m<sup>3</sup> (17,919 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste and covers 4.9 ha  
15 (12 ac). In addition to process equipment and process waste buried in 10 trenches, pieces of  
16 equipment were stored above ground that later were removed. This landfill was the first  
17 large-equipment burial site in the 200 West Area. Literature indicates burials of  
18 Reduction-Oxidation Plant (REDOX) pots, silver reactors, condensers (HW-30372,  
19 *Manufacturing Dept Radiation Incident Investigation Class I No 94*), tank samplers from  
20 Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and general trash from chemical separations plants in the  
21 200 West Area.

22 Most of the equipment was buried in wooden boxes with a double liner of waterproof paper  
23 (HW-30372). The boxes tended to collapse and cause settling of the ground surface. Most of  
24 the sink holes were filled with dirt in 1975, but a number of deep sink holes remained, north of  
25 the railroad tracks (WIDS). HW-28471 discusses a 1949 contamination spread averaging  
26 7 mrem/h (ARH-780, *Chronological Record of Significant Events in Chemical Separations*  
27 *Operations*), with spots of up to 100 mrem/h (HW-28471) from T Plant to the  
28 218-W-1A Landfill during discard of a burial box. ARH-780 discusses the 1953 burial of a  
29 failed H-4 oxidizer from REDOX with a high dose rate, during burial, of 250 mrem/h at 152 m  
30 (500 ft).

31 A large number of 2 m (6-ft-) thick concrete cell blocks were stored above ground south of the  
32 railroad tracks, but eventually they were disposed of. Nearly all of the surface radioactive  
33 contamination that was on the blocks when they were stored in the landfill has since decayed  
34 (WHC-EP-0912). The ground surface is currently free of contamination (WIDS).

35 This landfill was active from 1944 to March 1954. It is located 600 m (2,000 ft) northwest of  
36 T Plant. A railroad spur passed through the central portion of this landfill. UPR-200-W-26 has  
37 been consolidated (WIDS) with this landfill. UPR-200-W-26 reported that in November 1953,  
38 the wind dispersed contamination while a box of used connectors was being unloaded from a  
39 flatcar. Contamination spread onto the flatcar and onto the surrounding ground.

40 The drawing that best describes this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-02516, *Industrial*  
41 *Burial Ground 218-W-1A*.

### 1 2.1.3.13 218-W-2 Landfill

2 The 218-W-2 Landfill is a past-practice landfill originally called Dry Waste Burial Garden #2.  
3 The landfill covers 3.4 ha (8.5 ac) and contains 8,240 m<sup>3</sup> (10,778 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste. This landfill  
4 received packaged waste materials from the 200 West Area. No material was stored above  
5 ground. This landfill was active from January 1953 to December 1956. It is contiguous with the  
6 south boundary of the 218-W-1 Landfill. Early literature sources do not distinguish between the  
7 218-W-1 and 218-W-2 Landfills; for example, HW-28471 refers to the 218-W-1 and  
8 218-W-2 Landfills as "Solid Waste Landfill," and indicates a total of 18 trenches as of the time  
9 of publication (1953). HW-41535, *Unconfined Underground Radioactive Waste and*  
10 *Contamination in the 200 Areas* (1956) indicates a total of 24 trenches. The wastes disposed to  
11 the 218-W-2 Landfill likely are similar to those in the 218-W-1 Landfill. Wastes of up to  
12 35 rem/h at the container surface are reported (HW-28471).

13 Some of the trenches at this landfill did not receive the required 1.2 m (4 ft) of overfill before  
14 stabilization, when waste boxes were observed to be within 0.5 m (18 in.) of the ground surface.  
15 Routine radiation surveys of the surface of the trenches have found that contaminated Russian  
16 thistle grows mostly along the edges of the trenches. Sink holes were filled in 1974  
17 (WHC-EP-0912).

18 The drawing that best describes this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-02503, *218-W-2 Dry*  
19 *Waste Burial Ground*.

### 20 2.1.3.14 218-W-2A Landfill

21 The 218-W-2A Landfill is a past-practice site originally called Industrial Burial Garden #2. The  
22 landfill covers 16.5 ha (40.7 ac) and contains 26,000 m<sup>3</sup> (34,007 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste. This landfill was  
23 active from March 1957 to 1985. It is located northeast of the corner of 23rd Street and Dayton  
24 Avenue. Interim-stabilization activities were initiated in the landfill during the summer and fall  
25 of 1979 and completed in 1980. The purpose of the work was to eliminate the hazards of  
26 subterranean voids, reduce wind-surface erosion, remove ground-surface contamination, and  
27 establish deterrents against the growth of undesirable vegetation.

28 Records suggest that most of the waste in this landfill was direct-dumped to the trenches via  
29 dump truck or was packaged in concrete or wooden boxes.

30 This landfill received contaminated soil, debris, and process equipment including laboratory  
31 equipment and waste from the 300 Area, some with dose rates up to 500 R/h, failed REDOX  
32 equipment, contaminated rails, a 1951 International Harvester panel truck used in solid-waste  
33 operations, filters from B Plant, and tube bundles from PUREX. Based on logbook records and  
34 SWITS, much of the waste in this landfill – at least 20 percent by volume – is contaminated soil  
35 from remediation of the 216-T-4 Ditch and Pond (Trench 27), U Tank Farm, and the  
36 216-U-14 Laundry Ditch. Cell cover blocks, 2 m (6 ft) thick, were buried in the 218-W-2A  
37 Landfill along the west side of the railroad tracks in Trenches 12-15 (ARH-2757, *Radioactive*  
38 *Contamination In Unplanned Releases To Ground Within the Chemical Separations Area*  
39 *Control Zone Through 1972 (Exclusive of Liquid Waste Storage Tank Farms)*).

1 Historical records (e.g., HW-41535) indicate that in 1954, two sections of railroad track  
2 contaminated during the fall of 1954 to maximum dose rates of 350 mrem/h were buried in  
3 Trench 16, which is located outside and across the railroad tracks from the 218-W-2A Landfill.  
4 ARH-2015, *Radioactive Contamination in Unplanned Releases to Ground Within the Chemical*  
5 *Separations Area Control Zone through 1970*, Part 4, Appendix A, indicates that the rails were  
6 removed in 1971. Geophysics survey results in 2006 (D&D-28379), which did not indicate the  
7 presence of rails in Trench 16, corroborate this.

8 Trenches 17, 18, 19, 25, and 26 never were excavated or used.

9 UPR-200-W-53 has been consolidated (WIDS) with this landfill. UPR-200-W-53 reported that  
10 in January 1959 a collapse of a burial box that contained REDOX cell jumpers in the  
11 218-W-2A Landfill occurred during backfilling operations, releasing fission-product  
12 contamination.

13 The best drawing that describes this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32095,  
14 *218-W-2A Industrial Burial Ground & 218-W-3 Dry Waste Burial Ground*.

#### 15 **2.1.3.15 218-W-3 Landfill**

16 The 218-W-3 Landfill is a past-practice landfill originally called Dry Waste Burial Garden #3.  
17 This landfill covers 4 ha (9.8 ac) and contains 12,400 m<sup>3</sup> (16,219 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste. This landfill was  
18 active from January 1957 to July 1961. It is located northeast of the corner of 23rd Street and  
19 Dayton Avenue. It is west of the 218-W-2A Landfill. According to the current Hanford Site  
20 Drawing (H-2-32095, Sheet 1), the landfill is composed of 20 trenches running east to west.  
21 Trenches 1 through 3 are 120 m (400 ft) in length. Trenches 4 through 20 are approximately  
22 145 m (475 ft) in length. However, trench configurations as depicted on the current site drawing  
23 (H-2-32095, Sheet 1) are based on field observations of sink holes made during stabilization  
24 work in the early 1980s. Geophysics data collected in 2006 (D&D-30708) and unpublished  
25 logbook notations suggest that the trench locations, lengths, orientations, and numbering systems  
26 are different than those indicated on the drawing.

27 Logbooks suggest that much of the waste in this landfill is packaged in fiberboard containers and  
28 that the sources of the waste include the Plutonium Finishing Plant (about 50 percent by volume)  
29 and other 200 West facilities (38 percent), the 108-F Biology Laboratory (5 percent), the  
30 300 Area (5 percent), and offsite generators (2 percent). Known items buried at the landfill  
31 include miscellaneous small to medium equipment, process hoods, tools, contaminated laundry,  
32 a 1951 International Harvester panel truck once used for transporting waste within the landfills,  
33 metal drums of depleted uranium from offsite generators, and building debris such as ductwork  
34 and lumber.

35 Wastes from the Plutonium Finishing Plant that are heavily contaminated with plutonium and  
36 organics may be disposed of at this landfill. HW-59645, *Disposition of Plutonium to Burial*,  
37 describes 149 cardboard boxes (approximately 0.112 m<sup>3</sup> or 4 ft<sup>3</sup> per box) disposed to burial. The  
38 burial location is not specified, but from the source facility location (200 West Area), time period  
39 (1959), and type of waste (dry waste), the burial location may be surmised as the 218-W-3  
40 Landfill. The waste is described as rubber gloves, plastic, and paper cartons that may have been  
41 damp with carbon tetrachloride and/or tributyl phosphate and, to a lesser extent, with nitric and

1 hydrofluoric acid. The boxes initially were stored at the Plutonium Finishing Plant and at Gable  
2 Mountain, where they decomposed. Upon discovery of the decomposition, the boxes were  
3 wrapped in plastic and disposed of. The boxes were estimated to contain a total of 795 g  
4 plutonium with a counting error of plus or minus 50 percent. It is not known if the plutonium in  
5 these boxes is accounted for in the current site total reported in SWITS.

6 This landfill did not show evidence of radioactivity by plant-root penetration (WHC-EP-0912).  
7 The landfill was stabilized in 1983; the north end was restabilized with fill and gravel in 2001.

8 The drawing that best describes this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32095, Sheet 1.  
9 However, as noted above, trench configurations shown in current drawings probably do not  
10 correspond to their actual locations.

#### 11 **2.1.3.16 218-W-4A Landfill**

12 The 218-W-4A Landfill is a past-practice landfill located southeast of the intersection of 23rd  
13 Street and Dayton Avenue. The site covers 7.3 ha (18 ac) and contains 16,900 m<sup>3</sup> (22,104 yd<sup>3</sup>)  
14 of waste. Source facilities include uranium drums from offsite sources; equipment from 231-Z,  
15 234-5Z, the facility for Recovery of Uranium and Plutonium by Extraction (RECUPLEX),  
16 REDOX, 222-U, and the 300 Area Laboratories. The landfill contains miscellaneous waste,  
17 including 500 drums of depleted uranium, failed equipment, and plutonium-contaminated  
18 laboratory waste. It received waste from 1961 to 1968 (WIDS). This landfill contains  
19 21 miscellaneous dry-waste trenches oriented east to west and 6 or 8 vertical pipe units or  
20 drywells. The landfill also contains an unnumbered burial trench oriented north-south. It is near  
21 the east end of Trench 11 and contains a REDOX column (H-2-32487). The landfill also  
22 contains an unnumbered burial trench oriented north-south. It is near the east end of Trench 11  
23 and contains a REDOX column (H-2-32487, *218-W-4A Dry Waste Burial Site*). All trenches are  
24 9 m (30 ft) wide and range in length from 149 to 295 m (490 to 696 ft). The site covers 1.4 ha  
25 (3.5 ac) and contains 1,160 m<sup>3</sup> (1,517 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste.

26 Burial records suggest that about two-thirds of the waste in this landfill is packaged in fiberboard  
27 containers. Trenches 16 and 20 received high-level plutonium wastes from the Plutonium  
28 Finishing Plant. Trench 19 is marked as RECUPLEX on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32487.  
29 In July 1952, a fire in the landfill spread contamination and is recorded as UPR-200-W-16.  
30 Small areas of contamination were released during operations in November 1953  
31 (UPR-200-W-26). In January 1959, a box containing REDOX cell jumpers collapsed  
32 (UPR-200-W-53), and in October 1975, a release of previously buried waste occurred  
33 (UPR-200-W-72). UPR-200-W-72 has been consolidated (WIDS) with this landfill. The landfill  
34 was stabilized in 1983 (WIDS).

35 Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32487 describes this landfill and lists the trench contents in detail.

#### 36 **2.1.3.17 218-W-11 Landfill**

37 The 218-W-11 Landfill is a past-practice site originally used as an aboveground regulated  
38 storage area for low-level contaminated equipment. The stored materials have been removed  
39 from the landfills. The landfill was used as an aboveground storage site before burials took  
40 place. It is located between the 218-W-1 and 218-W-4A Landfills.

1 Literature sources conflict regarding the number and length of trenches. Geophysics data  
2 (D&D-30708) suggest that one burial trench in the landfill runs 45 m (150 ft) east and west and  
3 corresponds approximately in location with the northernmost trench in Hanford Site Drawing  
4 H-2-94250, *Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-11*. There also may be a burial pit to the east of  
5 this trench (D&D-30708). The trench was used in 1960 for burial of low-level contaminated  
6 sluicing equipment that had been used in the Uranium Recovery Process. Some of the  
7 equipment later was removed from the trench and was used in the Strontium-Cesium Recovery  
8 Process (WHC-EP-0912).

9 The drawing that best describes this landfill is Hanford Site Drawing H-2-94250; however, as  
10 noted above, this drawing likely is not accurate.

## 11 **2.2 PHYSICAL SETTING**

12 This section summarizes the hydrogeology for the 26 landfills in the 200-SW-1 and  
13 200-SW-2 OUs. The section begins with a description of site topography and geologic units  
14 present beneath the central Hanford Site. Subsequent sections describe the stratigraphy, vadose  
15 zone, uppermost aquifer, groundwater flow, and contaminant plumes beneath the landfills.  
16 Primary references for this section were PNNL-12261, *Revised Hydrogeology for the*  
17 *Suprabasalt Aquifer System 200-East Area and Vicinity, Hanford Site, Washington*;  
18 PNNL-13858, *Revised Hydrogeology for the Suprabasalt Aquifer System, 200-West Area and*  
19 *Vicinity, Hanford Site, Washington*; and the annual groundwater-monitoring reports for the  
20 Hanford Site (e.g., PNNL-16346, *Hanford Site Groundwater Monitoring for Fiscal Year 2006*).  
21 Additional references are cited as appropriate. Depth to the water table and estimates of aquifer  
22 thickness for the 200 Areas landfills are based on well logs from RCRA monitoring wells and  
23 water levels measured in the fall of 2006 or January 2007.


### 24 **2.2.1 Topography**

25 The 200 Areas, which contain all of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills, are located in the Pasco Basin  
26 of the Columbia Plateau. The 200 Areas Plateau is the term commonly used to describe the Cold  
27 Creek flood bar that was formed during the last cataclysmic flood from glacial Lake Missoula,  
28 about 13,000 years ago (Figures 2-2 and 2-3). The cataclysmic flood waters that deposited  
29 sediments of the Hanford formation also locally reshaped the topography of the Pasco Basin.  
30 The flood waters deposited the thick sand and gravel deposits of the Cold Creek flood bar and  
31 also eroded a channel between the 200 Areas and Gable Mountain. The northern half of the  
32 200 East Area is located within this ancient flood channel. The southern half of the 200 East  
33 Area and most of the 200 West Area are situated on the Cold Creek Bar. A secondary flood  
34 channel runs south from the main channel and bisects the 200 West Area.

35 The 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU landfills are located in or near the 200 East and 200 West  
36 Areas on the plateau. Surface elevations of the landfills in the 200 West Area range from 200 to  
37 214 m (656 to 702 ft) above mean sea level (amsl). Landfills surface elevations in the 200 East  
38 Area range from approximately 180 m (590 ft) amsl in the northeast part to 210 m (689 ft) in the  
39 western part.


1

Figure 2-2. Topographic Map of the Hanford Site.



System\Projects\OperableUnits\200CS\1031203\_Webb\_Remedial\_Investigation\Maps\040106\_Topo\_Plateau\_2N\_ap.mxd Rev. 0 dhf 1/6/04

1 Figure 2-3. Topographic Illustration of Pleistocene Flood Channels in the Central Hanford Site  
 2 (modified from PNNL-13858).



31 The NRDWL and 600 CL (200-SW-1) are located in the 600 Area southeast of the 200 Areas.  
 32 Surface elevations at this landfill range from about 162 to 165 m (531 to 541 ft) amsl.

### 33 2.2.2 Geology


34 The 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs are located in the Pasco Basin, one of several structural and  
 35 topographic basins of the Columbia Plateau. A sequence of sediments and basalts of the  
 36 Columbia River Basalt Group underlie the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU landfills. From  
 37 shallowest to deepest, the units are surficial deposits, the Hanford formation, the Cold Creek  
 38 unit, the Ringold Formation, and the Elephant Mountain Member of the Columbia River Basalt  
 39 Group. Figure 2-4 depicts the generalized stratigraphic column for the Hanford Site.  
 40 Figure 2-13 in Section 2.2.3.6 depicts a stratigraphic column for the location of the NRDWL  
 41 and 600 CL.

42 The following paragraphs briefly describe the geologic units, the overlying surficial deposits, and  
 43 the underlying basalt.

1

2

Figure 2-4. Generalized Stratigraphic Column for the Hanford Site.



3

1 **Surficial deposits.** Surficial deposits include Holocene eolian sheets of sand that form a thin  
 2 veneer over the Hanford formation across the site, except in localized areas where the deposits  
 3 are absent. Surficial deposits consist of very fine- to medium-grained sand to occasionally silty  
 4 sand. Fill material was placed in and over various landfills as cover and for contamination  
 5 control. The fill consists of reworked Hanford formation sediments and/or surficial sand and silt.

6 **Hanford formation.** The Hanford formation is the informal stratigraphic name used to describe  
 7 the Pleistocene cataclysmic flood deposits within the Pasco Basin. The Hanford formation  
 8 predominantly consists of unconsolidated sediments that range from boulder-size gravel to sand,  
 9 silty sand, and silt. The sorting ranges from poorly sorted (for gravel facies) to well sorted (for  
 10 fine sand and silt facies). The Hanford formation is divided into three main lithofacies:  
 11 interbedded sand- to silt-dominated (formerly Touchet beds or slackwater facies);  
 12 sand-dominated (formerly sand-dominated flood facies); and gravel-dominated (formerly Pasco  
 13 gravels), which have been further subdivided into 11 textural-structural lithofacies  
 14 (DOE/RL-2002-39, *Standardized Stratigraphic Nomenclature for Post-Ringold Formation*  
 15 *Sediments Within the Central Pasco Basin*). The gravel-dominated facies are cross-stratified,  
 16 coarse-grained sand and granule-to-boulder gravel. The gravel is uncemented and matrix-poor.  
 17 The sand-dominated facies are well-stratified fine- to coarse-grained sand and granule gravel.  
 18 Silt in these facies is variable and may be interbedded with the sand. Where the silt content is  
 19 low, an open-framework texture is common. Clastic dikes are common in the Hanford formation  
 20 but rare in the Ringold Formation (DOE/RL-2002-39). They appear as vertical to subvertical  
 21 sediment-filled structures, especially within sand- and silt-dominated units.

22 **Cold Creek unit.** This unit includes several post-Ringold Formation and pre-Hanford formation  
 23 units present within the central Pasco Basin (DOE/RL-2002-39). The Cold Creek unit includes  
 24 the units formerly referred to as the Plio-Pleistocene unit, caliche, early Palouse soil,  
 25 pre-Missoula gravels, and sidestream alluvial facies described in previous site reports. The Cold  
 26 Creek unit has been divided into five lithofacies: fine-grained, laminated to massive  
 27 (fluvial-overbank and/or eolian deposits, formerly the early Palouse soil); fine- to coarse-grained,  
 28 calcium-carbonate cemented (calic paleosol, formerly the caliche); coarse-grained, multilithic  
 29 (mainstream alluvium, formerly the pre-Missoula gravels); coarse-grained, angular, basaltic  
 30 (colluvium); and coarse-grained, rounded, basaltic (sidestream alluvium, formerly sidestream  
 31 alluvial facies) (DOE/RL-2002-39). The Cold Creek unit present beneath the 200 West Area  
 32 waste sites and the 600 Area waste sites west and south of the 200 West Area includes the  
 33 overbank/eolian, calic paleosol, and sidestream alluvial facies. The Cold Creek unit present  
 34 beneath part of the 200 East Area, and the 600 Area landfills southeast of the 200 East Area is  
 35 the mainstream alluvium (DOE/RL-2002-39).

36 **Ringold Formation.** The Ringold Formation comprises an interstratified fluvial-lacustrine  
 37 sequence of unconsolidated to semiconsolidated clay, silt, sand, and granule-to-cobble gravel  
 38 deposited by the ancestral Columbia River. These sediments consist of four major lithofacies  
 39 (from shallowest to deepest; see Figure 2-4):

- 40 • **Upper fines:** lacustrine mud; silty over-bank deposits and fluvial sand
- 41 • **Upper coarse:** fluvial sand and gravel; silty-sandy gravel with secondary lenses and  
 42 interbeds of gravelly sand, sand, and muddy sand to silt and clay

- 1 • **Lower mud:** buried soil horizons, overbank, and lake deposits; mainly silt and clay
- 2 • **Basal coarse:** fluvial gravel and sand; silty-sandy gravel with secondary lenses and
- 3 interbeds of gravelly sand, sand, and muddy sand to silt and clay.

4 **Elephant Mountain Member.** The Elephant Mountain Member is the uppermost basalt unit  
5 (i.e., bedrock) in the majority of the OU areas. Except for the Gable Gap area (between Gable  
6 Butte and Gable Mountain) where it has been eroded away, the Elephant Mountain Member is  
7 laterally continuous throughout the OUs.

### 8 **2.2.3 Groundwater Operable Units**

9 The Hanford Site is divided into 12 separate groundwater OUs, as depicted in Figure 2-5. The  
10 two 200-SW-1 OU landfills overlie the 200-PO-1 Groundwater OU. Depending on location, the  
11 twenty-four 200-SW-2 OU landfills overlie one of four groundwater OUs, including 200-ZP-1,  
12 200-UP-1, 200-BP-5, and 200-PO-1. Groundwater contaminant plumes are attributed primarily  
13 to past operations of land-based liquid-waste disposal facilities (e.g., ponds, ditches, cribs) and  
14 other liquid-waste management facilities (e.g., reverse wells, leaking underground storage tanks).  
15 The solid-waste landfills primarily received dry waste and are not expected to have impacted the  
16 groundwater.

#### 17 **2.2.3.1 200 West Area**


18 The 200-ZP-1 Groundwater OU includes the northern and central parts of the 200 West Area and  
19 the western 600 Area. Groundwater is monitored to assess the performance of an interim-action  
20 pump-and-treat system for carbon tetrachloride contamination, to track other contaminant  
21 plumes, and to support RCRA TSD units and the State-Approved Land Disposal Site (SALDS).  
22 Data from facility-specific monitoring also are integrated into CERCLA groundwater  
23 investigations. The groundwater contamination plumes of interest in this area include carbon  
24 tetrachloride, chloroform, trichloroethene, nitrate, chromium, fluoride, tritium, I-129, Tc-99, and  
25 uranium.

26 Twelve solid-waste landfills overlie the 200-ZP-1 Groundwater OU. These include the  
27 218-W-1, 218-W-1A, 218-W-2, 218-W-2A, 218-W-3, 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4A, and  
28 218-W-4B Landfills, all but the southeast corner of the 218-W-4C Landfill, and the 218-W-5 and  
29 218-W-11 Landfills.

30 A pump-and-treat system is operating in the 200-ZP-1 Groundwater OU to contain and capture  
31 the high-concentration portion of the carbon tetrachloride plume located north of the Plutonium  
32 Finishing Plant. The plume originated from discharges to the 216-Z-9 Trench, 216-Z-1A Tile  
33 Field, and 216-Z-18 Crib and has moved north and east of the waste sites. The pump-and-treat  
34 system was implemented as an interim remedial measure in three phases starting in 1996. The  
35 RAOs for the pump-and-treat system are to capture the high-concentration area of the carbon  
36 tetrachloride plume at the water table, to reduce contaminant mass, and to gather information to  
37 support future RI/FS decisions. The high-concentration plume is defined by the 2,000 to  
38 3,000 µg/L plume contour, which initially was centered beneath the Plutonium Finishing Plant  
39 and related waste sites. In 2005, concentrations of carbon tetrachloride exceeding the 2,000 µg/L

1 remedial action goal were reported at wells west of the TX and TY Tank Farms. Four  
 2 monitoring wells were converted to extraction wells and connected to the 200-ZP-1 Groundwater  
 3 OU pump-and-treat system. Pumping began there in late July 2005 and continued through fiscal  
 4 year 2006.

5 Figure 2-5. Hanford Site Groundwater Operable Units and Areas of Interest.



1 Since the pump-and-treat system was started in August 1996, over 10,197 kg of carbon  
2 tetrachloride have been removed from almost 3.19 billion liters of groundwater.

3 The 200-UP-1 Groundwater OU interest area addresses groundwater contaminant plumes  
4 beneath the southern third of the 200 West Area and adjacent portions of the surrounding  
5 600 Area. Technetium-99, uranium, tritium, I-129, nitrate, and carbon tetrachloride are the  
6 contaminants of greatest significance in groundwater and form extensive plumes within the  
7 region. Only the southeast corner of the 218-W-4C Landfill overlies the 200-UP-1  
8 Groundwater OU. Contaminant plumes underlying the 200 West Area are depicted in  
9 Figure 2-6.

10 An interim remedial-action pump-and-treat system operated in the central part of the 216-U-1  
11 and 216-U-2 Cribs plumes from 1994 until early 2005. Operation of this system caused the  
12 plume to bifurcate into a high-concentration portion captured by the pump-and-treat system and  
13 a lower concentration portion outside the capture zone that has continued to migrate into the  
14 600 Area. The remediation was successful in reducing concentrations below the remedial action  
15 goal of 9,000 pCi/L. During January 2005, groundwater extraction was terminated and a  
16 rebound study was initiated. Monthly sampling was performed to assess plume response to the  
17 termination of pumping. The rebound study concluded in January 2006, and Tc-99  
18 concentrations at all monitoring wells were below the remedial action goal throughout fiscal  
19 year 2006.

20 Because the treatment system did not operate in fiscal year 2006, additional groundwater was not  
21 extracted from the 200-UP-1 Groundwater OU plume area, and no contaminant mass was  
22 removed from the aquifer. Over 853 million liters have been treated since startup of remediation  
23 activities in fiscal year 1994. A total of 118.8 g of Tc-99, 211.8 kg of uranium, 34.6 kg of  
24 carbon tetrachloride, and 34,716 kg of nitrate have been removed from the aquifer.


### 25 **2.2.3.2 200 East Area**

26 The 200-BP-5 Groundwater OU interest area addresses groundwater contaminant plumes  
27 beneath the northern half of the 200 East Area and adjacent portions of the surrounding  
28 600 Area. This OU includes several RCRA units and CERCLA past-practice sites in the north  
29 part of the 200 East Area and extends north to Gable Gap. Technetium-99 is the contaminant of  
30 greatest concern in the 200-BP-5 Groundwater OU, because of its mobility and broad areal  
31 extent. Uranium, though more limited in terms of areal distribution, also has been recognized  
32 recently as an important COPC. Groundwater is monitored in this OU to define the regional  
33 extent of Tc-99, uranium, and other significant contaminants across the OU, as well as the local  
34 extent of contamination associated with specific RCRA TSD units in the area.

35 Eleven solid waste landfills overlie the 200-BP-5 Groundwater OU. These include the 218-E-2,  
36 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, 218-E-8, 218-E-9, 218-E-10, 218-E-12A, 218-E-12B,  
37 and 218-C-9 Landfills.

38

Figure 2-6. 200 East and 200 West Area Groundwater Contamination Plumes.



1  
2

3

1 The 200-PO-1 Groundwater OU interest area addresses groundwater contaminant plumes  
2 beneath the southern portion of the 200 East Area and a large triangle-shaped portion of the  
3 Hanford Site extending to the Hanford townsite. Tritium, nitrate, and I-129 are the contaminants  
4 with the largest plumes in groundwater. Other COPCs in more localized areas include Sr-90 and  
5 Tc-99. COPCs also include arsenic, chromium, manganese, vanadium, Co-60, cyanide, and  
6 uranium. Only one solid waste landfill, the 218-E-1 Landfill, overlies the 200-PO-1  
7 Groundwater OU. Contaminant plumes underlying the 200 East Area are depicted in Figure 2-6.

### 8 **2.2.3.3 Groundwater Flow**


9 Moisture in the vadose zone typically is concentrated along high-contrast bed interfaces, as well  
10 as along finer grained layers. Precipitation and waste-water discharges may migrate downward  
11 along discordant features such as clastic dikes, or spread laterally, sometimes in a stair-step  
12 fashion, along overlapping series of anisotropic, discontinuous strata (Bjornstad et al., 2003,  
13 "Hydrogeology of the Hanford Site Vadose Zone").

14 Groundwater in the unconfined aquifer flows from areas where the water table is higher (west of  
15 the Hanford Site) to areas where it is lower (toward the Columbia River) (Figure 2-7). In  
16 general, groundwater flows eastward through the 200 Areas Plateau, from the 200 West Area to  
17 the 200 East Area; from there it flows east to southeast through the 600 Area to discharge into the  
18 Columbia River.

19 Groundwater generally flows from west to east beneath the 200 West Area. Past effluent  
20 discharges at the former U Pond and other liquid-waste disposal facilities caused a groundwater  
21 mound to form beneath the 200 West Area that significantly affected regional flow patterns in  
22 the past. These discharges largely ceased by the mid-1990s, but a remnant mound remains,  
23 which is apparent from the shape of the water-table contours passing through the 200 West Area.  
24 Currently, the water table elevation is ~12 m above the estimated water-table elevation from  
25 before the start of Hanford Site operations. The water table beneath the 200 West Area is locally  
26 perturbed by discharges from the SALDS, as well as by operation of a groundwater  
27 pump-and-treat remediation system at the 200-ZP-1 Groundwater OU.

28 Groundwater flow in the central portion of the Hanford Site, encompassing the 200 East Area,  
29 may be affected by the presence of one or more buried flood channels, which trend northwest to  
30 southeast (see Figure 2-3). The water table in this area is very flat because of the high  
31 permeability of the Hanford formation. The hydraulic gradient is approximately  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  (i.e., the  
32 top of the water table drops one unit of vertical distance for every 100,000 equivalent units of  
33 horizontal distance). The Hanford formation fills the ancient flood channels (see Section 2.2.2)  
34 and forms the upper portion of the unconfined aquifer. Groundwater flow in this region is  
35 affected significantly by the presence of low permeability sediment of the Ringold Formation at  
36 the water table east and northeast of the 200 East Area, as well as basalt above the water table.  
37 These features constitute barriers to groundwater flow.

1 Figure 2-7. Hanford Site Water Table Map for April 2006 (PNNL-16346).



1 The extent of the basalt units above the water table continues to increase slowly because of the  
2 declining water table, resulting in an even greater effect on groundwater flow in this area. In the  
3 past, liquid discharges to the former 216-B-3 Pond (1945 to 1997) created a large water table  
4 mound and reversed groundwater flow directions. The mound has dissipated, but the water table  
5 beneath the 200 East Area remains ~2 m higher than the estimated pre-Hanford Site conditions.  
6 Simulations of equilibrium conditions after site closure suggest that the water table in the  
7 200 East Area will be near its pre-Hanford Site elevation (PNNL-14753, *Groundwater Data*  
8 *Package for Hanford Assessments*).

9 The flat nature of the water table (i.e., very low hydraulic gradient) in the 200 East Area and  
10 vicinity makes determination of the flow direction difficult. This is because the uncertainty in  
11 the water-level elevation measurements is greater than the actual relief present on the water  
12 table. Therefore, determining the groundwater flow direction based on these data is problematic,  
13 so other evidence is used to infer flow directions. Water enters the 200 East Area and vicinity  
14 from the west and southwest, as well as from beneath the mud units to the east and from the  
15 underlying aquifers where the confining units have been removed or thinned by erosion. The  
16 flow of water divides, with some migrating to the north through Gable Gap and some moving  
17 southeast toward the central part of the Site. The specific location of the groundwater flow  
18 divide currently is not known. It is known that groundwater flows north through Gable Gap,  
19 because the hydraulic gradient is steep enough to be determined using water-level-elevation data  
20 (the gradient averages  $1.5 \times 10^{-4}$  along a north flow direction). Groundwater is known to flow  
21 southeast within the region between the 200 East Area and the Central Landfill, because the  
22 average water-level elevation at the landfill (121.96 m NAVD88, *North American Vertical*  
23 *Datum of 1988*, for May 2006) is ~0.13 m less than the average elevation in the 200 East Area  
24 (122.09 m NAVD88 for April 2006). This yields a regional hydraulic gradient ranging from  
25  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $2 \times 10^{-5}$ .

26 The Hanford Site has a semiarid climate with annual precipitation of approximately 15 cm  
27 (6 in.). Estimates of recharge from precipitation range from 0 to 10 cm/yr (0 to 4 in./yr) and  
28 largely are dependent on soil texture and the type and density of vegetation. Recharge also can  
29 be affected by seasonal variations and associated changes in the amount of precipitation, and  
30 recycling of that precipitation to the atmosphere by evaporation and plant transpiration.  
31 Artificial recharge occurred when effluent such as cooling water and liquid wastes from Hanford  
32 Site process operations were disposed to the ground via ponds, ditches, and cribs. Most sources  
33 of artificial recharge have been halted.

34 Sections 2.2.3.4 through 2.2.3.5 discuss site-specific groundwater flow.

#### 35 **2.2.3.4 200 West Area Hydrogeology**

36 This section describes the stratigraphy, vadose zone, uppermost aquifer, groundwater flow, and  
37 contaminant plumes beneath the landfills located in the 200 West Area. The sections first  
38 discuss the hydrogeology of the landfills in the northwest, then in the southwest. PNNL-14058,  
39 *Prototype Database and User's Guide of Saturated Zone Hydraulic Properties for the Hanford*  
40 *Site*, compiles estimates of hydraulic properties based on aquifer testing of wells near these  
41 landfills.

1 **2.2.3.4.1 218-W-1A, 218-W-2A, 218-W-3, 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4A, and**  
2 **218-W-5 Landfills**

3 These landfills are located in the northwestern part of the 200 West Area. The following  
4 summary is from the investigations and groundwater monitoring conducted at the 218-W-3A,  
5 218-W-3AE, and 218-W-5 Landfills, also known as Low-Level Waste Management Area 3  
6 (LLWMA-3).

7 Figure 2-8 is a west-east cross section passing through the northern part of the 200 West Area.  
8 LLWMA-3 would be just west of well 299-W6-3 in the cross section. These landfills are  
9 underlain by the Hanford formation, the Cold Creek unit, and the Ringold Formation. The depth  
10 to the water table is ~69 to 78 m (~227 to 255 ft) below ground surface, and the aquifer thickness  
11 ranges from ~60 to ~73 m (~197 to ~240 ft) thick. The unconfined aquifer is entirely within the  
12 upper coarse gravels of the Ringold Formation. The base of the aquifer is the Ringold Formation  
13 lower mud, except where this unit is not present in the northern portions of LLWMA-3; there the  
14 aquifer base is the top of basalt.

15 The groundwater flow beneath LLWMA-3 is toward the east-northeast, with a calculated  
16 gradient<sup>17</sup> of 0.0018 in April 2006. The flow direction is returning to the pre-Hanford Site  
17 conditions and will continue to change until the direction is predominately west to east.

18 Regional groundwater-contaminant plumes of carbon tetrachloride and nitrate underlie portions  
19 of LLWMA-3 at levels exceeding their drinking water standards. Trichloroethene and  
20 chloroform also are elevated, but do not exceed standards. Radionuclide concentrations are low  
21 or undetectable. There is no evidence to suggest that the LLWMA-3 landfills have contributed  
22 to the regional groundwater-contaminant plumes.

23 **2.2.3.4.2 218-W-1, 218-W-2, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, and 218-W-11 Landfills**

24 These landfills are located in the west-central part of the 200 West Area. The following  
25 summary is from the investigations and groundwater monitoring conducted at the 218-W-4B and  
26 218-W-4C Landfills, also known as LLWMA-4.

27 Figure 2-9 is a west-east cross section passing through the southern part of the 200 West Area.  
28 Well 299-W18-1 in the cross section represents LLWMA-4. These landfills are underlain by the  
29 Hanford formation, the Cold Creek unit, and the Ringold Formation. The depth to the water  
30 table is ~67 to 76 m (~219 to 249 ft) below ground surface, and the aquifer thickness ranges from  
31 ~64 to ~69 m (~210 to ~226 ft) thick. The unconfined aquifer is entirely within the upper  
32 coarse gravels of the Ringold Formation, and the base of the aquifer is the Ringold Formation  
33 lower mud.


34  

---

<sup>17</sup> Gradient, or hydraulic gradient, is essentially the slope of the water table and is calculated between two wells in a monitoring network as the difference in elevation of the water levels divided by the distance between the wells.

Figure 2-8. Schematic Hydrogeologic Cross Section Passing West-to-East Beneath the Northern 200 West Area and Vicinity (PNNL-13858).


The horizon labeled "Plio-Pleistocene" is the Cold Creek unit. LLWMA-3 lies just west of well 299-W6-3.



2-37

Figure 2-9. Schematic Hydrogeologic Cross Section Passing West-to-East Beneath the Southern 200 West Area and Vicinity (PNNL-13858).

The horizon labeled "Plio-Pleistocene" is the Cold Creek unit. Well 299-W18-1 represents LLWMA-4.



2-38

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

1 The groundwater flow beneath these landfills is generally to the east, with a gradient of  
2 0.004 in July/August 2006. The groundwater flow is affected to a large degree by the  
3 200-ZP-1 Groundwater OU pump-and-treat system, which has extraction wells to the east  
4 and injection wells to the west of these landfills.

5 Regional contaminant plumes of carbon tetrachloride and nitrate underlie portions of LLWMA-4  
6 at levels exceeding their drinking water standards. Trichloroethene and chloroform also are  
7 elevated, but do not exceed standards. Uranium concentrations are elevated and increasing in a  
8 well in the southwest corner of LLWMA-4 (upgradient). In fiscal year 2006 levels remained  
9 below the drinking water standard. All of these contaminants appear to have sources at  
10 liquid-waste disposal sites in the 200 West Area.

11 Perched water historically has been documented above the Cold Creek unit at locations in the  
12 200 West Area. While the liquid-waste disposal facilities were operating, many localized areas  
13 of saturation or near saturation were created in the soil column. One former monitoring well at  
14 the 218-W-4C landfill monitored a perched zone above the Cold Creek unit from 1991 to 1994,  
15 when it went dry.

#### 16 **2.2.3.5 200 East Area Hydrogeology**

17 This section describes the stratigraphy, vadose zone, uppermost aquifer, groundwater flow, and  
18 contaminant plumes beneath the landfills located in the 200 East Area. The sections separately  
19 discuss the hydrogeology of three portions of the 200 East Area: northwest, northeast, and  
20 east-central. PNNL-14058 compiles estimates of hydraulic properties based on aquifer testing of  
21 wells near these landfills.

##### 22 **2.2.3.5.1 218-E-2A, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-10 Landfills**

23 These landfills are located in the northwestern corner of the 200 East Area. The following  
24 summary is from the investigations and groundwater monitoring conducted at the 218-E-10  
25 Landfill, also known as LLWMA-1. Wells 299-E28-26 and 299-E33-29 shown in Figure 2-10  
26 and 299-E33-34 in Figure 2-11 represent LLWMA 1.

27 These sites are underlain by the Hanford formation. The depth to the water table ranges between  
28 71 and 88 m (233 and 289 ft) below ground surface, and the unconfined aquifer is 2.0 to ~11.6 m  
29 (~6.6 to ~38 ft) thick. The thin, unconfined aquifer is contained in the sand and gravel of the  
30 Hanford formation, which directly overlies the basalt.

31 Groundwater flow is believed to be toward the north (PNNL-16346), but considerable  
32 uncertainty remains, because differences in water level elevation are within the range of  
33 measurement error.


34 Regional contaminant plumes underlie portions of LLWMA-1. Uranium and Tc-99 exceed their  
35 drinking water standard in the northeast corner of the site. Iodine-129 exceeds its standard  
36 beneath the north and east portions of LLWMA 1, and tritium is elevated but below the drinking  
37 water standard. Nitrate also exceeds its drinking water standard. All of these contaminants  
38 appear to have sources at liquid-waste disposal sites in the 200 East Area.

Figure 2-10. Schematic Hydrogeologic Cross Section Passing West-to-East Beneath the Northwestern 200 East Area and Vicinity (PNNL-12261).

Wells 299-E33-29 and 299-E33-43 represent LLWMA-1, and well 299-E34-11 represents LLWMA-2.

2-40

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B




2007/DCL/200E HGS/002 (08/21)

4

Figure 2-11. Schematic Hydrogeologic Cross Section Passing Northwest-to-Southeast Beneath the Northern 200 East Area and Vicinity (PNNL-12261).

Well 299-E33-34 represents LLWMA-1, and well 299-E27-11 represents LLWMA-2.



2-41

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

1

2 **2.2.3.5.2 218-E-8, 218-E-12A, and 218-E-12B Landfills**

3 These landfills are located in the northeastern corner of the 200 East Area. The following  
4 summary is from the investigations and groundwater monitoring conducted at the  
5 218-E-12B Landfill, also known as LLWMA-2. Wells 299-E34-11 in Figure 2-10 and  
6 299-E27-11 in Figure 2-11 represent LLWMA-2.

7 These landfills are underlain by the Hanford formation. The Ringold Formation is absent  
8 beneath the landfills but is present west and east of the 200 East Area (see Figures 2-8 and 2-9).  
9 The depth to the water table is 74 to 69 m (226 to 243 ft) below ground surface, and the aquifer  
10 thickness ranges from 0 to ~3 m (0 to ~10 ft) thick at the 218-E-12B Landfill (LLWMA-2).  
11 Wells in the north portion of LLWMA-2 are all dry, and the water table has dropped below the  
12 top of the basalt.

13 Where present, the unconfined aquifer is contained in the sand and gravel of the Hanford  
14 formation, which directly overlies the basalt.

15 The groundwater gradient in this part of the 200 East Area is almost flat, making the  
16 determination of groundwater-flow direction difficult. Groundwater appears to flow generally to  
17 the west or southwest. The presence of basalt above the water table in the north portion of  
18 LLWMA-2 restricts groundwater flow.

19 Regional groundwater-contaminant plumes of I-129 and nitrate exceed drinking water standards  
20 in wells monitoring LLWMA-2. There is no evidence to suggest that the LLWMA-2 landfills  
21 have contributed to the groundwater-contaminant plumes.

22 **2.2.3.5.3 218-C-9 and 218-E-1 Landfills**


23 These landfills are located south of LLWMA-2, where the aquifer is thicker. Interpretations in  
24 this section are primarily from PNNL-12261. Figure 2-12 is a cross-section showing the geology  
25 beneath these sites. Wells 299-E24-8 and 299-E27-1 represent the 218-C-9 Landfill and well  
26 299-E24-7 and approximate the conditions beneath the 218-E-1 Landfill.

27 The uppermost aquifer beneath the 218-C-9 Landfill is in the sand and gravel of the Hanford  
28 formation. The base of the aquifer is either a fine-grained portion of Ringold basal coarse or the  
29 basalt surface (see Figure 2-12), at an elevation of ~100 m (305 ft) amsl. Hydraulic head was  
30 ~122 m (400 ft) amsl in March 2007, so the aquifer is ~22 m (72 ft) thick. Flow direction is  
31 difficult to determine because of the flat water table. At nearby Waste Management Area C,  
32 flow direction is interpreted to be toward the southwest (PNNL-16346).

33 The uppermost aquifer beneath the 218-E-1 Landfill is in the sand and gravel of the Hanford  
34 formation and perhaps Ringold basal coarse (see Figure 2-12). The base of the aquifer is  
35 inferred to be a fine-grained portion of Ringold basal coarse at an elevation of ~88 m (290 ft)  
36 amsl. Hydraulic head is ~122 m (400 ft) amsl at this location (PNNL-16346), so the aquifer is  
37 34 m (112 ft) thick. Flow direction is difficult to determine because of the flat water table. At  
38 the nearby Integrated Disposal Facility, flow direction is interpreted to be toward the east or  
39 southeast (PNNL-16346).

Figure 2-12. Schematic Hydrogeologic Cross Section Passing North-to-South Beneath the Eastern 200 East Area (PNNL-12261).

Well 299-E24-7 represents the 218-E-1 Landfill, and wells 299-E24-8 and 299-E27-1 represent the 218-C-9 Landfill.



1 Regional groundwater-contaminant plumes in the east-central 200 East Area at levels above  
2 drinking water standards include I-129, tritium, and nitrate. There is no evidence to suggest that  
3 the LLWMA-2 landfills have contributed to the groundwater-contaminant plumes.

#### 4 **2.2.3.6 Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and 600 Area Central Landfill** 5 **Hydrogeology**

6 The NRDWL and 600 CL (also called the Solid Waste Landfill) are located in the central part of  
7 the Hanford Site about 5.5 km (3.4 mi) southeast of the 200 East Area. These landfills are  
8 underlain by the Hanford formation and the Ringold Formation (Figure 2-13). The uppermost  
9 unconfined aquifer is within the Hanford formation and the upper fines of the Ringold  
10 Formation. The base of the uppermost unconfined aquifer is a 1 to 4 m (3 to 13 ft) thick clayey  
11 silt layer in the Ringold Formation upper fines, at an elevation of ~100 m amsl (PNNL-12227,  
12 *Groundwater Monitoring Plan for the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill*). The depth to  
13 the water table is ~41 m (~135 ft) below ground surface, and the uppermost aquifer is ~22 m  
14 (72 ft) thick (May 2006 data).


15 The direction of groundwater flow is difficult to determine from water-table maps because of the  
16 extremely low hydraulic gradient. The best indicators of flow direction are the major plumes of  
17 I-129, nitrate, and tritium that originated from liquid-waste disposal sites in the 200 Areas.  
18 These plumes flow to the southeast in the vicinity of the landfills. Regional plumes of I-129,  
19 tritium, and nitrate exceed drinking water standards in wells monitoring these landfills.

20 In addition to the 24 landfills considered in the Phase I-B DQO process, historical information  
21 for an additional 15 unplanned release waste sites was evaluated, because the sites were  
22 contained within or near the in-scope 200-SW-2 OU landfills. None of the unplanned release  
23 sites are/were within the 200-SW-1 OU landfills. In 13 cases (i.e., UPR-200-E-24,  
24 UPR-200-E-30, UPR-200-E-53, UPR-200-W-11, UPR-200-W-37, UPR-200-W-134,  
25 UPR-200-E-23, UPR-200-W-16, UPR-200-W-26, UPR-200-W-53, UPR-200-W-72,  
26 UPR-200-W-84, and Z PLANT BP), the unplanned release site has been classified as  
27 “Consolidated”<sup>18</sup> in WIDS, because either it was a duplicate of another unplanned release or it  
28 was considered to be contained within the footprint of one of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills and will  
29 be addressed via the RI/FS process for the landfill.

---

<sup>18</sup> According to RL-TPA-90-0001, *Tri-Party Agreement Handbook Management Procedures*, Guideline Number TPA-MP-14, “Maintenance of the Waste Information Data System (WIDS),” Rev. 1, p. 1, 01/18/07, consolidated means “a reclassification status indicating a WIDS site is a duplicate of, physically located within, or adjacent to another WIDS site and will be dispositioned as part of that other WIDS site.”

1  
2  
Figure 2-13. Stratigraphic Column at the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and 600 Area Central Landfill (PNNL-12227).



1 In one case, the waste site (UPR-200-W-45) was reclassified in WIDS as a “No-Action” site.  
 2 The other unplanned release waste site (UPR-200-E-61) has been reclassified as “Rejected.”<sup>19</sup>  
 3 Note that although sites may be classified as “No-Action” or “Consolidated,” these sites must be  
 4 carried through completion of the RI/FS process. “No-Action” sites need to be included in the  
 5 RI/FS documentation with an explanation included as to why the sites do not require action.  
 6 “Consolidated” sites need to be included in the RI/FS documentation and need to be taken into  
 7 consideration during the selection of the preferred alternative, remedial decision, or action. Only  
 8 the “Rejected” sites do not require further documentation.

9 A listing and brief summary description of the 24 landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU, as well as site  
 10 descriptions of the two 200-SW-1 OU landfills (i.e., NRDWL and 600 CL) are provided in  
 11 Appendix B, Table B-1. Brief summary descriptions for the 15 unplanned release waste sites are  
 12 presented in Appendix B, Table B-2.

### 13 **2.2.4 History of Facilities Generating Solid Waste**

14 The sources of wastes (both Hanford Site and offsite operations) that contributed to the inventory  
 15 of the landfills varied over time. The following section provides an overview of the various  
 16 process activities that contributed waste to the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU landfills.

#### 17 **2.2.4.1 200 Areas History**

18 The process history of the 200 Areas facilities changed over time; consequently the chemical and  
 19 radionuclide waste streams produced by the specific facilities changed. Three chemical  
 20 extraction methods were used to recover plutonium during 45+ years of process operations:

- 21 • The bismuth phosphate batch process at the 221/224-B and -T Plants
- 22 • The REDOX continuous solvent-extraction process at the 202-S Plant
- 23 • The PUREX continuous solvent-extraction process at the 202-A Plant.

24 All processes were characterized by the initial dissolution of the fuel rod jackets: (1) sodium  
 25 hydroxide was used for aluminum-clad fuels; (2) ammonium nitrate/ammonium fluoride was  
 26 used for zirconium-clad fuels; and (3) the plutonium-bearing uranium fuel rods were dissolved  
 27 using concentrated nitric acid.

28 The chemical extraction of plutonium from the fuel rod solution then proceeded on either a batch  
 29 or continuous basis, depending on the plant. Multiple steps usually were required to separate

---

<sup>19</sup> Per RL-TPA-01-0001, Guideline Number TPA-MP-14, no action means “a reclassification status indicating a waste site does not require any further remedial action under RCRA Corrective Action, CERCLA, or other cleanup standards based on an assessment of quantitative data collected for the waste site.” Rejected means “a reclassification status indicating a waste site does not require remediation under RCRA Corrective Action, CERCLA, or other cleanup standards based on qualitative information such as a review of historical records, photographs, drawings, walkdowns, ground penetrating radar scans, and shallow test pits. Such investigations do not include quantitative measurements.”

1 plutonium from the associated uranium and fission products (DOE/RL-98-28). Fuel decladding  
2 wastes were processed and routed to underground tank storage. A detailed discussion of the  
3 200 Areas processing operations may be found in Appendix H of the Implementation Plan  
4 (DOE/RL-98-28).

5 About 65 percent (by waste volume) of the waste burials in the 200 Areas trenches in the scope  
6 of this project originated in the 200 Areas (SWITS). Types of solid waste varied greatly and  
7 included the following materials:

- 8 • Large contaminated vehicles, debris, and equipment (such as railway cars, pipes or ducts,  
9 tanks, ovens, pumps, columns, and other failed or outdated processing equipment)
- 10 • Small contaminated wastes such as filters, rags, small tools, paint cans, rubber gloves,  
11 and clothing
- 12 • Metals and dry chemicals such as depleted uranium and lead
- 13 • Contaminated soil and vegetation from cleanups of unplanned releases and contamination  
14 found during routine surveys
- 15 • Small amounts of liquid wastes (usually sealed in drums with stabilizers and/or  
16 absorbents) such as liquid plutonium or tritium solutions
- 17 • Small amounts of highly radioactive wastes packaged in 3.9 and 18.9 L (1-and 5-gal)  
18 cans (usually from laboratory operations) and stored in caissons.

#### 19 **2.2.4.2 100 Areas History**

20 Nine graphite-moderated, light-water-cooled reactors were constructed near the Columbia River  
21 in the Hanford Site 100 Areas over a period of 20 years, commencing in 1943. The reactors  
22 were used to produce plutonium by irradiating metallic uranium fuel elements with neutrons  
23 during the fission reaction in the reactor core. The first eight reactors at the Hanford Site,  
24 designated 105-B, -C, -D, -DR, -F, -H, -KW, and -KE, were similar in design, using a  
25 once-through light-water cooling system. The ninth reactor, 105-N, used a closed-loop light  
26 water cooling system. In addition to the reactors, a radiobiology facility, the 108-F Biology  
27 Laboratory, in the 100 Areas, sent a small amount of biological wastes to be buried in the  
28 200 Areas.

29 Although 100 Area wastes typically were disposed to trenches and landfills in the 100 Area until  
30 the mid-1970s, about 10 percent by volume of the waste burials in 200 Areas trenches within the  
31 scope of this project originated in the 100 Area (SWITS). They include fuel spacers and  
32 canisters; ion-exchange columns and modules; dummy slugs; asbestos insulation removed from  
33 pipes; equipment such as ladders, tools, and muffle furnaces; HEPA filters; gloveboxes; boron  
34 balls; miscellaneous demolition waste such as ductwork, concrete, telephone poles, and soil;  
35 groundwater slurries solidified with absorbents; concrete powder; steel shot; tanker trailers and  
36 rail cars; a cement mixer; lead shielding; and depleted uranium (SWITS).

1 More detailed histories, including descriptions of facilities and waste sites in the 100 Areas, may  
2 be found in technical baseline reports that were written for the 100-B, 100-D, 100-H, 100-K, and  
3 100-N Areas. The reports (BHI-00127, *100-H Area Technical Baseline Report*;  
4 WHC-SD-EN-TI-181, *100-D Area Technical Baseline Report*; WHC-SD-EN-TI-220,  
5 *100-B Area Technical Baseline Report*; WHC-SD-EN-TI-239, *100-K Area Technical Baseline*  
6 *Report*; and WHC-SD-EN-TI-251, *100-N Area Technical Baseline Report*) are listed in the  
7 reference section of this work plan.

#### 8 **2.2.4.3 300 Area History**

9 The 300 Area contains facilities, particularly laboratories, that placed solid wastes in  
10 200-SW-2 OU landfills. These facilities include the 308, 309, 324, 325, 326, 327, and  
11 329 Buildings. The missions that these facilities supported varied. A summary of the types of  
12 operations that were ongoing when solid wastes from the 300 Area facilities were sent to waste  
13 sites may be found in DOE/RL-2001-66, *Chemical Laboratory Waste Group Operable Units*  
14 *RI/FS Work Plan, Includes: 200-LW-1 and 200-LW-2 Operable Units*. A small amount of  
15 300 Area wastes were disposed to the 200 Areas in the 1940s through 1960s. Radioactive waste  
16 burials were stopped in the 300 Area in 1972; since then 300 Area wastes have been disposed to  
17 the 200 Areas.

18 About 10 percent by volume of the waste burials in 200 Areas trenches within the scope of this  
19 project originated in the 300 Area (SWITS). Burials from all time periods include laboratory  
20 wastes such as hot-cell and airlock wastes, laboratory furnishings such as cabinets, Plutonium  
21 Recycle Test Reactor wastes, ion-exchange columns, HEPA filters, tools and equipment,  
22 depleted uranium, tritium waste, water tower pieces, construction and demolition wastes,  
23 solidified liquid wastes, contaminated equipment and clothing, and miscellaneous trash  
24 (SWITS).

#### 25 **2.2.4.4 Offsite Sources**

26 The amount of wastes accepted by the Hanford Site from offsite generators is about 10 percent  
27 by volume of the waste burials in trenches within the scope of this project. These generators  
28 include a variety of government processes and programs. The majority of offsite waste is from  
29 FUSRAP and from other DOE complex sites such as Argonne National Laboratory and the  
30 Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory.

31 A detailed discussion of offsite wastes, their source, location, volume, type, and history may be  
32 found in WHC-EP-0912, WHC-EP-0845, and WHC-EP-0225.

#### 33 **2.2.4.5 Other Hanford Site Sources**

34 The amount of waste burials in trenches within the scope of this project from Hanford Site  
35 sources other than those discussed above (100, 200, and 300 Areas and offsite sources) is about  
36 5 percent by volume. These sources include effluent and water-treatment facilities and  
37 miscellaneous structures on the Hanford site. The wastes include dewatered sludge, well  
38 casings, and soil (SWITS).

## 1 2.2.5 Overview of Solid-Waste Operations

2 Hanford Site production processes and support activities used and disposed of a large variety of  
3 chemical and/or radioactively contaminated waste (WHC-SA-2772-FP, *History of Solid Waste*  
4 *Packaging at the Hanford Site*). When the Hanford Site began operations, each of the  
5 operational areas (100, 200 East, 200 West, and 300 Areas) had its own disposal facilities. With  
6 the exception of the 300 Area, each had landfills within or in the proximity of their perimeter  
7 fence. The 300 Area facilities were as far away as the current location of the Energy Northwest  
8 generating plant and close to the 400 Area.

### 9 2.2.5.1 Transuranic Waste

10 From 1944 to 1970, waste was not segregated (and is referred to as unsegregated waste in this  
11 RI/FS work plan). Unsegregated radioactive wastes were disposed of through shallow land  
12 burial, including some alpha-contaminated wastes. Records and inventories of waste-disposal  
13 practices from this period are incomplete. The records that exist indicate the general types of  
14 wastes disposed, an estimate of uranium and plutonium inventories, and a very general indication  
15 of some of the types of currently regulated materials that potentially may have been disposed to a  
16 particular site, such as silver, boron, nitrate, uranium, and lead. The disposal site was considered  
17 to be the location for final disposition of solid wastes. Packaging was designed for transport,  
18 with little regard for long-term integrity; early radiological waste, including most early  
19 alpha-contaminated waste, was wrapped in burlap or paper or contained in wooden or cardboard  
20 boxes. Early industrial wastes with high dose rates such as process tubes and jumpers often were  
21 packaged in concrete boxes or large concrete tombs to mitigate dose to workers. Some smaller,  
22 lower dose rate wastes were direct-dumped from trucks into trenches with no packaging. Early  
23 wastes were more rarely packaged in 208.2 L (55-gal) drums or steel boxes and cans; the  
24 practice of using durable containers rather than cardboard or wooden boxes became more  
25 common over time. The use of cardboard boxes for disposal to the landfills was discontinued in  
26 1984 (WHC-EP-0912). The waste was considered dry waste and did not contain significant  
27 volumes of liquid (see, e.g., HW-77274, *Burial of Hanford Radioactive Wastes*). There were  
28 numerous alternatives for disposal of large volumes of liquid (e.g., cribs, trenches, ditches,  
29 underground storage tanks, reverse wells); therefore, it is unlikely that the early landfills were  
30 used for disposal of bulk liquids. Occasionally, small volumes of bottled, highly contaminated  
31 liquids were placed inside a 208.2 L (55-gal) drum, and the drum was filled with concrete to  
32 provide shielding and to stabilize the liquid waste (DOE/RL-96-81). These wastes often were  
33 covered with less than 1.2 m (4 ft) of soil cover.

34 After 1967, all alpha-contaminated wastes from the 105-N Reactor and the 300 Area were sent to  
35 the 200 Areas for disposal (DOE/RL-96-81). In the early 1970s, increasing attention to reducing  
36 potential contamination to groundwater led to a decision to send all LLW from all Hanford Site  
37 facilities for burial within the 200 Areas, 60 to 90 m (200 to 300 ft) above ground water. The  
38 last 300 Area landfill (the 618-7 Burial Ground) was closed in 1972. The last 100 Area landfill  
39 closed in 1973 (WHC-EP-0912). Figure 2-14 shows a timeline illustrating the operational  
40 periods for the various landfills and processes, as well as key regulatory milestones.

1 In 1970, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) defined TRU waste (waste with known or  
2 detectable contamination of transuranium nuclides) as a separate waste category and declared  
3 that it must be stored in a retrievable form in contamination-free packages designed to last for  
4 20 years, pending a decision on permanent disposal (AEC Immediate Action Directive 0511-21,  
5 *Policy Statement Regarding Solid Waste Burial*). The TRU waste category created in 1970  
6 designated 10 nCi/g as the lower limit for TRU. AEC Manual Chapter 0511, *Radioactive Waste*  
7 *Management*, issued in 1973, established the segregation limit for TRU waste at 10 nCi/g.  
8 Waste with TRU content greater than that limit was stored as retrievable TRU waste, and waste  
9 with TRU content less than that limit was buried as LLW in the Hanford Site landfills.  
10 Subsequent to 1970, procedures were developed for recording waste generation, form,  
11 packaging, and placement to ensure that TRU waste could be located and retrieved. The data  
12 were entered into what is now the SWITS database via parent (shipment) records. In 1982, the  
13 TRU limit was revised upward to the present value of 100 nCi/g. The equipment required to  
14 assay waste against the 100 nCi/g limit was not installed in the TRU Storage and Assay Facility  
15 until 1985. Thus, a portion of the waste stored between 1970 and 1985 was not assayed and is  
16 believed to be LLW and not TRU waste, because of the different criteria that were applied  
17 initially and the lack of assay equipment. Retrievable stored TRU waste that is removed from  
18 the landfills will be assayed to determine if it is LLW or TRU.


#### 19 **2.2.5.2 RCRA Waste**

20 At the time that many of the Hanford Site's wastes were generated, however, there were no  
21 definitions or regulations governing the chemical constituents. In the early 1980s, low-level  
22 liquid organic waste was banned from land disposal at the Hanford Site landfills  
23 (WHC-EP-0912). Although many of these constituents subsequently have been classified as  
24 hazardous or dangerous wastes by the EPA and Ecology, only waste disposed of after RCRA  
25 regulations went into effect is subject to active management as mixed, hazardous, or dangerous.  
26 Where regulated chemical and radioactive constituents are combined in a waste form, waste  
27 disposed of (after RCRA regulations went into effect) is subject to management as "mixed  
28 waste." Ecology has regulated mixed waste since August 19, 1987, the date that  
29 RCW 70.105.109, "Regulation of Wastes with Radioactive and Hazardous Components," went  
30 into effect.

31 In 1987, the DOE issued the so-called byproduct rule, which clarified its position on the  
32 hazardous components of mixed waste to be regulated by RCRA (10 CFR 962, "Byproduct  
33 Material," and 52 FR 15937, "Radioactive Waste, Byproducts Material Final Rule"). On  
34 November 23, 1987, the EPA authorized Ecology to regulate the hazardous constituents of  
35 mixed wastes at the Hanford Site (52 FR 35556, "Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste  
36 Management Program; Washington"). In 2003, the DOE and Ecology signed a tentative  
37 agreement (04-RCA-0037, "Notification of Completion of Hanford Federal Facility Agreement  
38 and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement) Settlement and Tentative Agreement Interim  
39 Milestone M-091-40, Requirement for DOE to "Initiate Retrieval at Its Burial Ground 218-W-4C  
40 No Later Than November 15 2003" ") that retrievably stored waste containing suspect TRU  
41 elements would be retrieved, repackaged, and ultimately shipped offsite for disposal. Tri-Party  
42 Agreement Milestone M-091 subsequently was established to formally document this agreement.

43

Figure 2-14. Timeline Illustrating Operations Periods for Landfills with Key Milestones.



1 Retrieved waste found not to meet the current definition of TRU will be appropriately disposed  
 2 of within the Hanford Site. TRU waste containing hazardous components (TRUM) may require  
 3 treatment before shipment offsite). As of August 31, 2007, 6,226 m<sup>3</sup> of post-1970 suspect-TRU  
 4 waste has been retrieved. Most of this waste was retrieved from the 218-W-4C Landfill, and a  
 5 smaller fraction was from the 218-W-4B Landfill. As of August 2007, 53 percent of the 208.2 L  
 6 (55-gal) drums and 68 percent of the non-drum containers retrieved have been determined to be  
 7 TRU waste. As older containers are retrieved from the 218-W-4B, 218-W-3A, and  
 8 218-E-12B Landfills, the percentages of containers designating as TRU waste is likely to be  
 9 lower because of the historical changes in the definition of TRU waste since 1970. Retrieval  
 10 activity in the 218-W-3A and 218-E-12B Landfills is expected to begin in 2008.

11 Management practices have changed over the years, as shown in Table 2-1. Since the late 1960s,  
 12 the contents of landfills have been tracked on databases, culminating in the current SWITS.  
 13

Table 2-1. Liquid- and Animal-Waste Packaging Practices.


Date	Packaging Procedures
1967	Liquid waste was accepted when absorbed by an inert absorbent material. Deceased laboratory animals or other materials attractive as food for wildlife had to be sealed in plastic and packaged in wooden or metal containers that prevented retrieval of the buried material by wildlife.
1974	Battelle-Northwest packaged carcasses in a waterproof inner container with sufficient inert absorbent material to completely absorb the liquid as the carcasses decayed. Additionally, the waste was treated with a material such as unslaked lime, to suppress gas generation during decay, thus ensuring that the integrity of the approved outer container was maintained.
1977	Damp and wet waste was permitted only when vaporization would not pressurize or corrode the container. Containers had to withstand the credible internal pressures generated by the waste or be fitted with pressure modifying devices. Animal carcasses, since they contained liquid organics, were considered organic liquid waste and were not accepted.
1980	Liquid organic waste (flashpoint greater than 150 °F) was acceptable for retrievably stored waste if properly packaged. Liquid organic waste was to be placed unabsorbed into a seal-tight container (preferably 19 to 38 L [5 to 10 gal]). The inner container was overpacked into a 208.2 L (55-gal) drum with a rigid 4 mil polyethylene liner. The drum was filled to the top with acceptable absorbent necessary to completely absorb the liquid if the inner container was breached.
1982	To meet specifications, no more than 1.7 L of organic waste were transferred to a polybottle. The polybottle was vented and contained two absorbent pads. The filled polybottles were sealed into vented and filtered polyethylene bags. The bagged polybottles then were packaged for 20-year retrievable storage.
1987	A volume of diatomaceous earth was added equaling 4 times the estimated volume of a liquid.

## 14 2.2.6 Historical Disposal Practices and Facilities

15 Landfills were used at the Hanford Site beginning in 1944. They generally consist of one or  
 16 more types of burial trench(es) and/or solid-waste disposal facilities such as caissons (discussed  
 17 below). From 1944 to August 19, 1987 (effective date of mixed waste regulation), it was  
 18 common practice for solid LLW and waste containing components that currently are regulated  
 19 under WAC 173-303 to be disposed of in unlined burial trenches in the 200 Areas landfills. In  
 20 the mid-1990s disposal of MLLW took place in TSD-unit landfills in the 200 West Area, while  
 21 LLW continued to be disposed of in unlined burial trenches. Retrievable TRU wastes originally  
 22 were (from 1970) stored in retrievable storage units in unlined trenches until 1998, when they  
 23 began to be sent directly to the Waste Receiving and Processing Facility for repackaging to be  
 24 sent to an offsite disposal facility.

1 Before construction of TSD-unit landfills in the 1990s, most of the wastes sent to the 200 Areas  
 2 Landfills were disposed of, or retrievably stored, in trenches. A typical solid-waste burial trench  
 3 is shown in Figure 2-15. Non-TRU waste (LLW, waste containing components that currently  
 4 are regulated under WAC 173-303, nonradioactive waste) typically was disposed to unlined  
 5 earthen trenches approximately 4 to 5 m (12 to 16 ft) deep; some TRU trenches are up to 7.6 m  
 6 (25 ft) deep.

7 Figure 2-15. Diagram of a Typical Solid-Waste Burial Trench.



8

9

10 The Hanford Site soil, which consists largely of gravel and sand, sloughs off to an angle of  
 11 repose of about 45 degrees during excavation. This required the movement of significant  
 12 volumes of earth for the preparation and backfilling of waste trenches. The wide top and  
 13 relatively narrow bottom of the resulting trench, coupled with the practice of covering all  
 14 radioactive wastes by the end of the day, has resulted in a low ratio of waste volume to land area  
 15 (BHI-00175). Volumes of radioactive buried waste (200-SW-2 OU) recorded in SWITS,  
 16 compared with trench volumes, suggest that an average of 21 percent of the trench volume is  
 17 waste packages; the remainder is backfill.

18 Burial trench locations are marked only by external survey marker monuments every 7.6 m  
 19 (25 ft) around the perimeter; markers are about 4.9 m (16 ft) above the trench floor  
 20 (WHC-EP-0225).

1 Records were not kept on the amount and types of radionuclides buried as solid waste in the  
2 early days of the Hanford Site project. BHI-00175 indicates that only a few incomplete records  
3 on waste disposal activities from the 1950s and 1960s still exist. A few handwritten logbook  
4 records have been found, dating from the early 1960s, showing details of some burials in the  
5 200 West Area. Since the late 1960s, routine reports of radioactive waste disposal in the 100 and  
6 200 Areas have been more complete, including the land area, the volume of waste, the number of  
7 curies of the specific radionuclides, and the coordinates of the burial sites. Studies have been  
8 made that estimate volume and radioactivity of previously unrecorded waste buried in the 100  
9 and 200 Areas, based on the ratio of the various radionuclides present in the fuel elements and on  
10 other known and deduced waste-generation and -disposal information. Inventories of plutonium  
11 and uranium have been kept on the SWITS database and its predecessors since the late 1960s.  
12 The best available records suggest that as of 2005, the 200 Areas landfills contained a total of  
13 513 kg of plutonium in approximately 458,000 m<sup>3</sup> (599,000 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste. The  
14 200-SW-2 landfill trenches in the scope of this work plan are estimated to contain 366 kg of  
15 plutonium in 443,000 m<sup>3</sup> (580,000 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste. The 15,000 m<sup>3</sup> difference in waste volume and  
16 differences in plutonium quantity primarily represent the post-1970 TRU and suspect TRU waste  
17 that is being retrieved in support of the Tri-Party Agreement M-091-40 and M-091-41  
18 milestones. Errors in accountability procedures suggest that as much as an additional 200 kg of  
19 plutonium may have been disposed of in the 200-Area landfills (RHO-CD-194, *A Study of the*  
20 *234-5 Building Inventory Difference for the Years 1956 through 1966*).

#### 21 2.2.6.1 Hanford Site Waste-Acceptance Criteria

22 In the late 1960s, the first waste-acceptance criteria documents were written for the 200 and  
23 300 Areas. These documents provided specifications and standards for industrial wastes, as well  
24 as for chemical-hazards control with respect to the landfills. Waste generators were required to  
25 segregate their waste according to compatibility and content. During this time, small materials  
26 were packaged in fiber drums, liquid wastes were acceptable only if absorbed by an inert  
27 absorbent material, and organic matter had to be sealed in plastic and packaged in wooden or  
28 metal containers. Equipment was buried in wooden boxes when available and, if a wooden box  
29 could not be provided, the equipment was buried without a protective covering. If it was  
30 determined that the equipment had levels of contamination and/or radiation dose too high to bury  
31 without confinement, the equipment was wrapped in plastic before it was placed in a burial box  
32 for disposal. Equipment also was placed in concrete boxes for disposal.

33 In 1970, a new specifications and standards document, ARH-1842, *Specifications and Standards*  
34 *for the Burial of ARHCO Solid Wastes*, was released shortly after the AEC directed the  
35 segregation of TRU wastes. This document stated that generators and operators must segregate  
36 and package waste materials containing or suspected of containing plutonium or other TRU  
37 radionuclides for containment and retrievability.

38 ARH-3032, *Specifications and Standards for the Packaging, Storage, and Disposal of Richland*  
39 *Operations Solid Waste*, which was released in 1974, superseded the earlier document,  
40 ARH-1842. This document classified wastes into four different segregation groups:  
41 nonradioactive, nonhazardous, combustible wastes; low-level, non-TRU wastes; TRU wastes;  
42 and high-dose-rate wastes. Packages that contained less than 200 c/min of beta/gamma and less  
43 than 500 d/min of alpha contamination were classified as nonradioactive and disposed of in the

1 Central Landfill Facility. Solid wastes containing less than 10 nCi/g of plutonium and/or other  
2 transuranic radionuclides were considered LLW and were further divided into combustible and  
3 noncombustible wastes, which were packaged separately. Solid wastes containing or suspected  
4 of containing greater than 10 nCi/g plutonium and/or other transuranic radionuclides were  
5 considered to be TRU waste. Today, the standard is greater than 100 nCi/g of plutonium and/or  
6 other transuranic radionuclides that are considered to be TRU waste. Failed equipment and large  
7 items contaminated with transuranic radionuclides also were included in this category.

8 The five revisions of RHO-MA-222, *Hanford Radioactive Solid Waste Packaging, Storage, and*  
9 *Disposal Requirements*, issued between 1980 to 1988, established new definitions for waste  
10 classes, placed restrictions on waste contents, provided new specifications for container designs,  
11 and included other key elements that directly impacted the waste classification system and  
12 segregation requirements.

13 Before the late 1960s, there were no state or Federal regulations on segregation requirements for  
14 packaging waste for burial at the Hanford Site. There were attempts to package waste to  
15 minimize personnel exposure and prevent the spread of uncontained radioactivity to the  
16 environment; however, these were not set guidelines and were done at the discretion of the  
17 generator.

#### 18 2.2.6.1.1 Low-Level Waste

19 In the 1960s, LLWs that were small in size were placed in plastic-lined cardboard boxes or  
20 wrapped in grease-proof paper and placed in cardboard boxes. Large waste items were wrapped  
21 in plastic shrouds. Grossly contaminated MFPs were packaged in high-integrity containers. The  
22 most common method of depositing wastes in trenches during the 1960s was to dump boxes of  
23 solid waste directly into the burial trenches. Wood or concrete boxes that contained bulky or  
24 highly contaminated materials were dragged from railroad cars into the trench by bulldozers  
25 using long cables. Before 1970, the primary concerns during burial operations were to ensure  
26 confinement of contaminated materials during transport, minimize exposure to operating  
27 personnel, confine radioactive or chemical materials to prevent releases to the environment, and  
28 protect public health.

29 The packaging of waste materials was designed to maintain safety until the material was securely  
30 buried; once buried, the containers were considered permanently disposed of. Because of the  
31 favorable hydrological conditions, concern was not given to whether the containers remained  
32 intact after burial. Until the mid-1970s, there were no requirements for venting burial containers  
33 to allow for the release of built-up pressure. If waste materials were known to generate gases,  
34 they were placed within containers constructed of a material known to collapse under the weight  
35 of backfilling. Once the integrity of the container was no longer intact, it was considered vented.

36 Beginning in 1970, in addition to fiber drums and metal containers that were used to containerize  
37 waste, iron or galvanized steel drums and boxes constructed of fiber-reinforced polyester,  
38 plywood, or concrete were used for packaging small waste items. ARH-CD-353, *Design*  
39 *Criteria for Transuranic Dry Waste Steel and Reinforced Concrete Burial Containers*, released  
40 in 1976, stated that burial containers were provided with vents if there was a requirement that  
41 they be protected against variations in internal pressure. With the initial release of  
42 RHO-MA-222 in 1980, each container was required to be capable of being fitted with an air or

1 vacuum hose or a gaseous diffusion vent. Wood, steel, and/or concrete boxes continued to be  
2 used for the burial of process equipment during this timeframe. It also was around 1980 that the  
3 U.S. Department of Transportation-compliant 208.2 L (55-gal) galvanized drums were declared  
4 to be the required packaging for TRU waste. The nongalvanized drums were used for non-TRU  
5 waste shipments.

#### 6 **2.2.6.1.2 TRU Waste**

7 To indicate the segregation of TRU waste from LLW, some facilities used painted drums; for a  
8 period, yellow drums were used to package LLWs, and black drums contained TRU waste. At  
9 the 200 Areas, color-coding of drum lids was done to indicate the segregation of hood waste  
10 from room waste. Hood wastes were wastes generated inside processing hoods and were  
11 considered highly contaminated with plutonium. Room wastes were wastes generated from  
12 operations outside the processing hoods and were considered potentially contaminated with  
13 plutonium. Solid wastes were segregated into combustible hood waste, combustible room waste,  
14 and noncombustible room and hood waste. Combustible hood waste was composed of material  
15 such as plastic, rubber, rags, and cardboard. Combustible hood waste was placed in drums with  
16 yellow lids, combustible room waste was stored in drums topped with silver domes, and  
17 noncombustible hood and room waste was collected in drums topped with red domes.

18 For safe storage, TRU wastes were segregated into combustible and noncombustible. Small  
19 TRU items were segregated from larger TRU items or equipment pieces. Separate storage  
20 facilities and burial trenches were designed for TRU waste storage. Solid TRU waste was  
21 packaged, stacked, and stored in trenches with an earth, gravel, plywood, or asphalt pad  
22 foundation. Small items were stored on asphalt pads, in underground trenches, or in caissons,  
23 whereas larger items were stored primarily in burial trenches. The TRU wastes that were  
24 unsuitable for asphalt pad or caisson storage because of size, chemical composition, security  
25 requirements, or surface radiation were packaged in reinforced wood, concrete, or metal boxes.  
26 High-dose-rate solid wastes were defined as wastes that emitted high levels of beta and gamma  
27 radiation. This waste did not contain TRU radionuclides and typically included failed equipment  
28 from B Plant, tank farm operations, and other activities. Small high-dose-rate items were  
29 transported to the caissons or burial trenches, while large items or failed equipment were buried  
30 in the industrial waste trenches.

31 In the late 1970s, more-specific packaging-procedure requirements were introduced. Multiple  
32 containment barriers were required in the packaging of waste. In addition, more concern was  
33 given to void spaces left in waste packages and the increased used of filler materials. As time  
34 passed, the regulations became more focused, and the disposal of waste followed more rigorous  
35 standards.

#### 36 **2.2.6.2 Containment Barriers**

37 In the early years, waste at the Hanford Site was disposed of in the landfills using only a single  
38 containment barrier. This barrier was the package in which the waste was placed. Typical  
39 packages were concrete boxes, cardboard boxes, plywood boxes, or drums. As time passed, it  
40 was observed that some waste was escaping the single-containment barrier. This could lead to  
41 harmful effects for the environment and decreased personnel safety. Therefore, requirements for  
42 the number of containment barriers increased, as listed below.

- 1 • In 1968, wastes containing contamination that was easily airborne were contained by an  
2 inner container (e.g., sheet plastic).
- 3 • In 1978, a second polyethylene drum liner was placed inside the first polyethylene drum  
4 liner.
- 5 • In 1979, 208.2 L (55-gal) barrels used at Z Plant to store radioactive wastes were lined  
6 with a polyethylene drum liner, 99 x 137 cm and 4 mil thick.
- 7 • In 1980, solid radioactive waste containing asbestos had to be packaged within at least  
8 one layer of 6-mil polyethylene film. TRU solid waste was packaged inside at least two  
9 containment barriers, the storage container and an inner sealed liner.
- 10 • In 1981, it was stated that polyethylene liners were to be "horsetailed"<sup>20</sup> and then taped  
11 shut before the drum lid was installed.
- 12 • In 1985, all LLW determined to be radioactive mixed waste was packaged with at least  
13 three containment barriers.
- 14 • In 1993, Pacific Northwest Laboratory determined that a 90-mil high density  
15 polyethylene inner liner was required for liquid remote-handled waste to be stored at the  
16 Central Waste Complex. A 10-mil nylon reinforced plastic liner was required for solid  
17 remote-handled waste. For liquid radioactive mixed waste, inner containers were almost  
18 always glass, with a capacity of 18.9 L or less.

### 19 2.2.6.3 Filler Materials

20 Filler materials became important around the early 1980s. At this time attention was focused on  
21 the void space left inside some packages and the benefits obtained by reducing this volume. The  
22 addition of nonradioactive materials to radioactive waste resulted in improved heat transfer,  
23 radionuclide immobilization, and increased physical support. The following list gives an  
24 overview of the void-space limitations.

- 25 • From 1978 to 1984, waste package contents were not to exceed 80 percent of the active  
26 volume of the waste container.
- 27 • In 1984, it was stated that to prevent subsidence in Hanford Site landfills, interior void  
28 spaces in non-TRU packages were to be minimized. However, void spaces did not need  
29 to be filled in containers that were to be expected to collapse during the initial backfilling  
30 process (e.g., plastic-wrapped equipment).
- 31 • From 1985 to 1986, interior void spaces for LLW were not to exceed 20 percent of the  
32 active volume of the waste container.
- 33 • In 1987, the list was expanded of items that were exempt from being filled. Items that  
34 were not to be filled were HEPA filters, which posed hazards to personnel during filling,

---

<sup>20</sup> Horsetailed refers to twisting the ends of the liner and tying them off to form a seal.

1 waste packages with a total internal void space less than 0.042 m<sup>3</sup> (1.5 ft<sup>3</sup>), and any  
 2 specially designed reinforced-concrete burial boxes with a design life in excess of  
 3 300 years under burial conditions expected in the Hanford Site landfills. All low-level  
 4 mixed waste (LLMW) packages accepted for storage were exempt from requirements for  
 5 filling void spaces.

6 Before 1990, no specific list was provided for approved filler materials. The following list  
 7 contains materials that were approved for use as void-space filler in 1990:

- 8 • Diatomaceous earth
- 9 • Soil, sand, lava rock
- 10 • Tightly packed cellulose matter
- 11 • Clay
- 12 • Concrete, cement, grout
- 13 • Gravel.

#### 14 **2.2.6.4 Specific Waste-Packaging Practices**

15 With an increased knowledge about certain types of waste, new, more specific packaging  
 16 practices were developed for these waste types.

##### 17 **2.2.6.4.1 Process Equipment**

18 Process equipment consisted of equipment used by several of the large plants at the Hanford Site.  
 19 Disposal of the equipment proved problematic. Because of the large size and odd shape of the  
 20 majority of the process equipment, special measures had to be taken for burial. In the early  
 21 years, the equipment was buried in wooden boxes. Sometimes a wooden box could not be  
 22 provided, and the equipment was buried with no protective covering. When it was determined  
 23 that the equipment was too hazardous to bury without confinement, the equipment was wrapped  
 24 in plastic before it was buried.

25 In addition, large pieces of process equipment were cut into smaller sections and packaged  
 26 before it was buried. Following are different packaging techniques for process equipment.

- 27 • Failed process equipment generally was packaged in concrete boxes, however, large  
 28 wooden boxes also were used. Process equipment from the PUREX Plant that was too  
 29 large to bury was stored in special railroad tunnels adjoining the plant.
- 30 • Metal containers were used to bury failed equipment from the PUREX Plant and the  
 31 Plutonium Finishing Plant. Some items of failed equipment, such as 12 to 15 m (39 to  
 32 49-ft-) long pumps used to transfer wastes from underground storage tanks, were flushed  
 33 and packaged in plastic before they were buried.
- 34 • Large radioactive waste items from the PUREX Canyon Building were packaged in  
 35 burial boxes of precast, reinforced concrete slabs with a concrete slab lid held in place by  
 36 its own weight. A steel-liner box sometimes was inserted, depending on the waste being  
 37 packaged. Box configurations varied depending on the waste being packaged, but the  
 38 most commonly used size had a void volume of 50 m<sup>3</sup>.

- 1 • Old glove boxes were packaged in intact burial boxes or other packages. For a brief  
2 period of time they were sent to the 231-Z Facility to be cut up into smaller pieces. The  
3 pieces then were packaged in steel culverts, steel boxes, and plywood boxes, and some of  
4 the smaller pieces were placed in 208.2 L (55-gal) drums.
- 5 • A large number of fiberglass-reinforced polyester boxes also were used for packaging  
6 gloveboxes and other equipment.

#### 7 **2.2.6.4.2 Class B Poisons**

8 Class B poisons were a main focus of disposal because of the effects the poisons had on the  
9 environment and personnel safety. Solid waste containing Class B poisons was packaged in  
10 double containment. Small quantities were placed in small containers, which then were placed in  
11 storage or disposal containers, and the small containers were fixed or surrounded by concrete on  
12 all sides. In 1980, it was determined that packaging for larger quantities would be approved on a  
13 case-by-case basis. In the mid-1980s mercury, a specific Class B poison was confined in a  
14 concrete culvert, and the culvert then was placed in a drum. It was common to fill the space  
15 around the culverts with bagged polybottles and other items. In 1992, Pacific Northwest  
16 Laboratory packaged liquid metallic mercury in a polyethylene or glass container with a  
17 screw-type lid.

#### 18 **2.2.6.4.3 Sodium and Alkali Metals**

19 Before 1977, there were no documented packaging requirements for sodium and alkali metals.  
20 Beginning in 1977, special approval was required of any waste package containing sodium or  
21 other alkali metal. Unreacted alkali metal in solid waste was not accepted for disposal. The  
22 shipper had to specify quantities, concentrations, and contamination levels of each alkali metal to  
23 ensure that the appropriate methods of handling, storage, and/or disposal were used. The  
24 requirements established in 1977 are being observed today.

#### 25 **2.2.6.4.4 Oxidizing and Corrosive Materials**

26 Oxidizing and corrosive materials are of special interest, because they break down the integrity  
27 of the container in which they are packaged. In addition, during the breakdown of the  
28 containers, gases are generated. It was not until the late 1960s that oxidizing material was  
29 prohibited from being packaged with combustible wastes or in combustible containers. Rags  
30 used to clean up oxidizing materials had to be well rinsed to remove all oxidizing materials  
31 before they were discarded. Beginning in 1984, wastes containing corrosives were to be treated  
32 to eliminate their corrosive properties and to form a chemically stable compound, or they were  
33 packaged such that the storage container was not exposed to the corrosive agent during its  
34 25-year design life. To enhance the corrosive protection, the interior and exterior of the waste  
35 containers were galvanized or painted with a two-component epoxy-polyamide paint system or  
36 functionally equivalent paint.

#### 37 **2.2.6.4.5 Tritiated Waste**

38 Beginning in the early 1980s, procedures were introduced for packaging tritium wastes.  
39 Tritiated waste, including tritium oxide in liquid form, was to be packaged in steel or concrete

1 containers. Waste containing tritium or tritium oxide was absorbed on silica gel, packaged in  
2 leak-tight 3.8 L (1-gal) metal cans, surrounded by asphalt, and packaged in 208.2 L (55-gal)  
3 drums. Waste packages with heat output greater than  $3.53 \text{ W/m}^3$  required a special thermal  
4 analysis to determine whether special separation distances were required for the waste in the  
5 landfill trench. In 1993, the tritium waste was defined as waste containing greater than 20 mCi  
6 of tritium/ $\text{m}^3$  of waste and its disposal requirements changed as follows.

- 7 • Tritiated waste with less than 100 Ci tritium/ $\text{m}^3$  in either absorbed liquids or solids was to  
8 be sealed in one layer of 4-mil (nominal) or thicker polyethylene and disposed of in a  
9 steel or concrete package.
- 10 • Tritiated waste with greater than 100 Ci tritium/ $\text{m}^3$  in either absorbed liquids or solids  
11 was to be sealed in one layer of 4-mil (nominal) or thicker polyethylene and disposed of  
12 in a steel or concrete package. Containment systems for tritiated waste with greater than  
13 or equal to 100 Ci tritium/ $\text{m}^3$  were to be documented in the storage/disposal approval  
14 record.

#### 15 **2.2.6.4.6 Liquid and Animal Wastes**

16 Because of the increased knowledge about the waste and the better packaging techniques, the  
17 guidelines for liquid and animal wastes have changed throughout time. Table 2-1 summarizes  
18 the changes in packaging since 1967.

#### 19 **2.2.7 Caissons**


20 Caissons typically were designed to receive remote-handled high-dose-rate and TRU wastes.  
21 However, in practice, many items in the caissons have relatively low dose rates; approximately  
22 750 of the 1,000 or so items in the non-TRU caissons have dose rates of less than 200 mrem/h  
23 (SWITS). Several types of caissons historically were used in the 200 Areas at the Hanford Site.

- 24 • Alpha and MFP caissons received wastes that were transported to the caisson in a  
25 truck-mounted cask that was shielded. The waste generally was packaged in 19 L (5-gal)  
26 paint cans. Caissons consisted of concrete/steel chambers set below ground surface, with  
27 an associated off-set steel riser pipe through which waste packages were dropped into the  
28 caisson. Caissons typically are ventilated to reduce exposures to the personnel depositing  
29 the waste packages. The off-set steel riser pipes also provided protection from direct  
30 radiation exposure from the waste below.
- 31 • A type of caisson called a vertical pipe unit was configured in one of two ways: as a  
32 14.6 m (48-ft-) below grade, 76 cm (2.5-ft-) diameter vertical steel casing (e.g., those in  
33 the 218-W-4A Landfill, near the end of Trench 18) or by welding together two to five  
34 open-ended 208.2 L (55-gal) drums end-to-end and setting them vertically in the ground  
35 (e.g., those in the 218-W-4A Landfill, Trench 16) (BHI-00175).

1 **2.2.7.1 Vertical Pipe Units in the 218-W-4A Landfill**

2 The 218-W-4A landfill contains 21 miscellaneous dry-waste trenches oriented east to west and  
3 6 or 8 vertical pipe units or caissons. The vertical pipe units were installed near the east end of  
4 Trench 16 and consist of two to five 208.2 L (55-gal) drums welded together with the lids and  
5 bottoms removed. They were placed 4.6 m (15 ft) below ground surface. Two deeper caissons  
6 may be located between Trenches 17, 18, and 19. Figure 2-16 depicts a typical vertical pipe unit  
7 configuration.

8 Figure 2-16. Diagram of Vertical Pipe Unit.



9  
10

### 1 2.2.7.2 Caissons in the 218-W-4B Landfill

2 The caissons in the 218-W-4B Landfill were used for the disposal of alpha- and MFP-containing  
3 waste. These caissons are further detailed in the following paragraphs. This information is  
4 judged (RHO-65463-80-126) to be the most accurate at the current time, based on the available  
5 information.

- 6 • Six general caissons (also called dry waste or MFP caissons), 218-W-4B-C1 through  
7 218-W-4B-C6 in the 218-W-4B Landfill that contains LLW, were filled from 1968 to  
8 1979. Dry waste or MFP-type caissons are 2.4 m (8 ft) in diameter and 3.1 m (10 ft)  
9 high. According to the WIDS database, two of these caissons were constructed the same  
10 way as the alpha caissons, but with corrugated metal instead of steel and concrete. The  
11 last shipment of caisson waste to the 218-W-4B Landfill was deposited into MFP  
12 Caisson #6 in 1990 (Figure 2-17).
- 13 • Caissons 218-W-4B-CA1 through 218-W-4B-CA5 (also called alpha caissons) were  
14 planned for TRU waste. From 1970 to 1988, retrievably stored TRU waste was placed in  
15 four of the five. The caissons have been isolated; one caisson (Alpha #5) never has been  
16 used. The five alpha caissons are approximately 2.7 to 3 m (8.75- to 10-ft-) diameter,  
17 3 m (10-ft-) high concrete-and-steel covered vaults with steel lifting lugs and a 0.9 m  
18 (3-ft-) diameter access chute. The alpha caissons weigh approximately 11,800 kg  
19 (26,000 lb) (Figure 2-18)
- 20 • One caisson, 218-W-4B-CU1, is referred to in the literature as a United Nuclear  
21 Industries (UNI) below-grade silo-type caisson, used for high activity N Reactor waste.  
22 The UNI silo-type caisson is 3 m (10 ft) in diameter and 9 m (30 ft) tall with corrugated  
23 pipe containers placed on a concrete foundation with a top concrete shielding slab. It has  
24 a 1.1 m (3.5-ft-) diameter access chute. Waste is placed beneath a concrete slab 4.6 m  
25 (15 ft) below grade. The chute of this caisson was plugged shortly after it began  
26 receiving waste; it was taken out of service after the plugging event occurred, and it  
27 contains only two waste packages (SWITS; WHC-EP-0912) (not pictured).

28 All three caisson types in the 218-W-4B Landfill are equipped with air-filter systems  
29 (Figures 2-17, 2-18, and the UNI caisson, which is not pictured).


30 Starting from the southeast corner of the landfill, the caissons in order are: 218-W-4B-C1,  
31 218-W-4B-C2, 218-W-4B-CU1, 218-W-4B-C6, 218-W-4B-CA3, 218-W-4B-C5, 218-W-4B-C3,  
32 218-W-4B-CA4, 218-W-4B-CA2, 218-W-4B-CA5, 218-W-4B-CA4, and 218-W-4B-CA1  
33 (DOE/EIS-0286F). Although sources conflict on the placement of the caissons, this order is  
34 based on the literature consensus. No additional waste placement is planned for any of these  
35 caissons.

36

1


2

Figure 2-17. Diagram of Caisson with Blower.



1  
2

Figure 2-18. Diagram of Caisson.



3

### 1    **2.2.8 Drag-Off Boxes**

2    Drag-off boxes were used from the earliest days at the Hanford Site. The first boxes were made  
3    of wood, placed in the trench, and covered with soil. Drag-off disposals were performed in  
4    landfills next to railroad tracks. A cable was connected to a box at the location where the waste  
5    was generated and stretched along spacer cars, which were used to keep the train crew at a safe  
6    distance from the radioactive box. When the train reached the burial site, a tractor in the landfill  
7    dragged the box to the end of a trench.

8    The early wooden boxes often collapsed after disposal. In cases where a large radiation field  
9    was present, this occurrence could overexpose workers. Some drag-off boxes failed while they  
10   were being pulled to the end of the trench, also potentially overexposing workers. The boxes  
11   were redesigned and eventually upgraded to the concrete burial box that became standard  
12   (WHC-EP-0912). The concrete boxes were not designed for retrieval, but were intended to be  
13   the final repository for the waste (WHC-EP-0645, *Performance Assessment for the Disposal of*  
14   *Low-Level Waste in the 200 West Area Burial Grounds*).

### 15   **2.2.9 Liquid Wastes**

16   For the 200-SW-2 OU landfills, a review of historical records (WIDS, SWITS) has shown that  
17   bulk disposal of liquid waste was not a significant contributor to the waste loading at sites  
18   receiving LLW (see also HW-77274). Most landfills do not have detailed records. However, a  
19   Rockwell Hanford Operations internal letter (RHO-65462-80-035) documents disposal activities  
20   over a 3-year period (1968-1970) at the 218-W-4B Landfill, including the disposal of minimal  
21   volumes of liquid wastes in drums.

22   The liquid waste consisted mostly of the following:

- 23       • Tritium contained in metal cylinders
- 24       • Lithium co-product (tritium) target elements
- 25       • Plutonium liquids in cartons.

26   A total volume of about 6 m<sup>3</sup> (including the solid material associated with the liquids) was  
27   recorded. In all known cases, the volumes of liquid historically were small, because until 1973  
28   bulk liquids could be disposed more conveniently to cribs, trenches, and underground  
29   storage tanks.

### 30   **2.2.10 High-Radiation Dose-Rate Waste**

31   The term “high-radiation dose rate” has been defined consistently by the DOE and its  
32   predecessor agencies, the Energy Research and Development Administration and the AEC, and  
33   its sister agency the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Agency, since 1957. As currently stated  
34   (10 CFR 835.2[a], “Occupational Radiation Protection,” “Definitions”), “High radiation area  
35   means any area, accessible to individuals, in which radiation levels could result in an individual  
36   receiving a deep dose equivalent in excess of 0.1 rem (0.001 sievert) in 1 hour at 30 centimeters  
37   from the radiation source or from any surface that the radiation penetrates.”

1 Over time, the LLBG and past-practice sites have accepted high-radiation dose-rate items. Of  
2 the approximately 117,000 non-TRU waste records (covering 1944 to the present) available for  
3 the 24 radioactive landfills covered by this RI/FS work plan, about 7,500 records (~6 percent)  
4 indicate waste with a dose rate greater than 100 mrem/h at burial. The waste-acceptance criteria  
5 have varied over time but in general have been defined as follows (WHC-EP-0845).

- 6 • Before 1980, dry-waste landfills generally were restricted from receiving waste with  
7 surface dose rates over 100 mrem/h. However, packages were evaluated on an individual  
8 basis, depending on container integrity and method of handling, and some surface dose  
9 rates are considerably higher. Industrial-waste landfills typically received waste with  
10 surface dose rates over 100 mrem/h.
- 11 • Since 1980, limits for surface dose rates of non-TRU contact-handled waste in the  
12 landfills varied from 200 to 500 mrem/h (the limit varied over time and was dependent on  
13 the container type and size).
- 14 • Since 1980, limits for surface dose rates of non-TRU remote-handled waste in the  
15 landfills varied from 3,000 to 5,000 mrem/h (the limit was dependent on the transport  
16 vehicle).

17 Current waste-acceptance criteria (HNF-EP-0063, *Hanford Site Solid Waste Acceptance*  
18 *Criteria*) for the LLBG states that containers with dose rates less than or equal to 200 mrem/h at  
19 contact and less than 100 mrem/h at 0.3 m (1 ft) are acceptable at the LLBG. Contact-handled  
20 containers (see definitions below) exceeding these limits require container-specific review and  
21 approval.

22 Remote-handled waste is acceptable at the LLBG if approved through both a waste stream  
23 profile sheet and a container-specific shipment. Remote-handled waste must meet the applicable  
24 dose-rate restrictions of the U.S. Department of Transportation or an approved package-specific  
25 safety document for transport. Remote-handled waste must be configured for unloading such  
26 that personnel exposures are maintained ALARA. The definitions for contact-handled and  
27 remote-handled waste from HNF-EP-0063 are as follows.

- 28 • Contact-handled waste. Packaged waste whose external surface dose rate does not  
29 exceed 200 mrem/h, except that packages larger than 208.2 L (55 gal) could have a  
30 marked point on the bottom or side with a surface dose rate up to 1,000 mrem/h.
- 31 • Remote-handled waste. Packaged waste whose external surface dose rate exceeds the  
32 limits for contact-handled waste.

### 33 2.2.11 Current Disposal Practices

34 In 1987, the State of Washington, through WAC 173-303, began enforcing the EPA's  
35 hazardous-waste program for mixed waste at the Hanford Site. Before this time, some burial  
36 records contained information on some nonradiological constituents, but these records are  
37 incomplete. Records after 1987 included a list of regulated constituents; the record quality  
38 steadily improved from 1987 to the present so that recently (from the mid-1990s onward) the

1 records included inventories (amounts) of these constituents as well as other (nonregulated)  
2 constituents and more complete descriptions of the waste burials.

3 No landfill trenches currently are operating within the scope of the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU  
4 landfills. However, as noted earlier in Section 1.4, and in the following two paragraphs, three  
5 trenches within two 200-SW-2 OU landfills currently are in operation but considered as “out of  
6 scope” for this RI/FS work plan, because they will continue to operate for a period of time  
7 extending beyond the RI/FS process.

8 While storage and retrieval activities are ongoing in multiple trenches, only three trenches  
9 continue to be used for disposal. The RL operates the lined MLLW disposal trenches as RCRA  
10 Subtitle C land-disposal units. These two trenches (Trench 31 and Trench 34) are located at the  
11 southern end of the 218-W-5 Landfill in the 200 West Area and are permitted for both storage  
12 and disposal activities. Permitted treatment activities in these two trenches are being considered.  
13 These trenches are constructed with double liners and a leachate-collection system. In  
14 September 1999, storage ended and disposal began of MLLW (predominantly  
15 macroencapsulated debris) in Trench 34, constituting the first disposal of Hanford Site-generated  
16 MLLW at the Hanford Site (McDonald et al., 2001, “Hanford Site Mixed Waste Disposal”).  
17 These two trenches are outside the scope of this work plan.

18 In addition, RL operates Trench 94, an MLLW disposal trench, which accepts defueled  
19 U.S. Navy vessel reactor compartments. The trench is located at the northeastern end of the  
20 218-E-12B Landfill in the 200 East Area. Trench 94 is part of a TSD unit landfill and is out of  
21 the scope of this RI/FS work plan, because the trench will be used beyond the timeframe (2024)  
22 that the Tri-Party Agreement specifies for remediation of the 200-SW-2 OU.

23

### 3.0 INITIAL EVALUATION OF LANDFILLS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary of existing knowledge and the results of previous characterization activities at the landfills in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs and to provide an understanding of conditions at the landfills. The contaminant inventories, waste volumes, and current understanding of the distribution of contamination are discussed for each of the past-practice and TSD-unit landfills.

#### 3.1 KNOWN AND SUSPECTED CONTAMINATION

As discussed in Chapter 2.0, landfills in these OUs received solid waste (bulk quantities of trash, construction debris, soiled clothing, failed equipment, and laboratory and process waste) placed in designated burial trenches and covered with soil. Wastes in burial trenches were either placed directly in the landfills or packaged in cardboard, wooden, or fiber-reinforced polyester boxes, steel drums, concrete burial vaults, or other containers. Some wastes were contaminated with radionuclides, organics, and/or inorganic chemicals from various facilities, mainly from the Hanford Site 200 Areas. Relatively small amounts of wastes from the 100 and 300 Areas and from offsite sources also were placed in some of the landfills, particularly the LLBG TSD unit. The estimated inventory of the main radionuclides and chemicals that were disposed in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU landfills was obtained primarily from the following sources:

- *Hanford Environmental Information System (HEIS) database*
- SWITS database
- WIDS database
- *ARH-2762, Input and Decayed Values of Radioactive Solid Wastes Buried in the 200 Areas Through 1971*
- *BHI-01115, Evaluation of the Soil-Gas Survey at the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill*
- DOE/RL-96-81
- *RHO-CD-78, Assessment of Hanford Burial Grounds and Interim TRU Storage*
- RHO-CD-673
- *WHC-EP-0125-1, Summary of Radioactive Solid Waste Received in the 200 Areas During Calendar Year 1988*
- WHC-EP-0912.

The following sections provide an overview of the potential contaminants.

### 3.1.1 Nonradioactive Landfills – 200-SW-1 Operable Unit

Only two landfills remain in this OU, the 600 CL and the NRDWL. These landfills received nonradioactive waste. Waste disposal practices having the potential for contamination at these sites are summarized in the following paragraphs.

The 600 CL, which was active until 1996, has an estimated inventory of approximately 596,000 m<sup>3</sup> (779,539 yd<sup>3</sup>) of solid waste. In addition, up to 5,000,000 L (1,320,000 gal) of sewage and an estimated 380,000 L (100,000 gal) of wastewater from 1100 Area vehicle maintenance catch tanks were disposed to the liquid-waste trenches.

The NRDWL is adjacent to the 600 CL and received primarily dangerous waste materials from laboratories and asbestos. The NRDWL received approximately 141,000 kg (310,851 lb) of waste. Records indicate that the site received liquid wastes packed in 208.2 L (55-gal) drums and laboratory packs filled with absorbents.

### 3.1.2 Radioactive Landfills – 200-SW-2 Operable Unit

Sources of information on contaminant inventory vary widely among the different landfills. The number of available reference sources containing inventory information, and the amount and type of information in each source, vary. Since 2004, an ongoing attempt is being made to reconcile and combine sources of data to obtain data based on the best knowledge available.

Computer inventory records of waste were not maintained before 1968. Handwritten logbook records exist for some sites for the early 1960s. Other data on early burials exist in various documents, many of them unpublished. Burial data, particularly hand-written and early computer records, often contained only limited information on waste descriptions and contaminants. Later burial records tended to contain more detailed information. Of the approximately 117,000 records of individual containers that are within the scope of this project, nearly 100 percent contain estimated or known plutonium and uranium inventories, 42 percent contain a list of other radiological contaminants, 43 percent contain a general description of the waste components (e.g., plastic, wood, paper), and 36 percent contain a detailed description of the waste (such as “failed dissolver from REDOX” or “drums of depleted uranium”). In addition, approximately 12 percent of the in-scope individual records list nonradiological contaminants that currently are, or once were, regulated. One reason for this smaller percentage is that most waste packages with good records do not contain regulated constituents. Additionally, although a variety of chemical wastes may have been disposed to these landfills, chemical inventories were not consistently maintained until the mid-1980s.

Before 1970, wastes were designated as either dry or industrial wastes; there generally was no segregation of materials within either of these major categories. Industrial waste trenches received large items, often packaged in drag-off boxes. Drag-off boxes routinely had a dose associated with their waste of up to 200 mrem/h at 61 m (200 ft). Records indicate that a box was disposed of with a reading of 250 mrem/h at 152 m (500 ft) on October 21, 1953; another box in 1975 read 4 R/h at about 21 m (70 ft); and a third showed 2.8 R/h at 15 m (50 ft). Dry wastes have been disposed in trenches both in containers (e.g., cardboard boxes, drums) and

1 unpackaged. Many of these trenches contain wastes that could result in ALARA concerns;  
2 wastes with dose rates over 1,000 R/h at contact have been disposed to these trenches (SWITS).

3 Cover requirements for landfill wastes varied over the years. Because of shallow burial in the  
4 earlier landfills, some wastes were exposed by wind erosion. There are a number of recorded  
5 incidents of burial boxes collapsing and dispersing radioactive contamination across wide areas  
6 of the site. In addition, shallow burial resulted in uptake from plants whose roots penetrated into  
7 the waste packages. Most of these issues have been resolved through compaction of soils at  
8 landfills, removal of deep-rooted vegetation over some landfills, and, for other landfills, the  
9 addition of soil with shallow-rooted vegetation cover to stabilize existing soils. Site maintenance  
10 programs also include the application of selective and nonselective herbicides, by licensed  
11 applicators, to control deep-rooted plant growth on stabilized burial grounds.

## 12 **3.2 HISTORY OF THE RI/FS WORK PLAN**

### 13 **3.2.1 Waste Sites in the 200-SW-1 and** 14 **200-SW-2 Operable Units**

15 The 200-SW-1 OU once consisted of 69 sites. The Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28)  
16 originally described 37 sites. Then, as a result of reassignments and additions before the RI/FS  
17 process, 32 sites were added to the 200-SW-1 OU. The 69 waste sites were updated further in  
18 accordance with guideline RL-TPA-90-0001 for reclassification of sites to "Rejected"<sup>21</sup> or "No  
19 Action"<sup>12</sup> status.

20 Historical information indicated that 30 of the sites in the 200-SW-1 OU were not  
21 waste-management units. The majority of the 30 sites that were not waste-management units  
22 had involved locations where the records indicated no history of disposal of waste that requires  
23 remediation. If a small volume was released, the affected media were cleaned up immediately.  
24 Other sites were removed from the list of waste-management units because they were duplicated  
25 by, or consolidated with, another waste site. The reclassification of these sites resulted in  
26 39 sites in the 200-SW-1 OU remaining for consideration through the RI/FS process. However,  
27 with the creation of the new Model Group OUs, all but two sites have been migrated to either the  
28 200-MG-1 or the 200-MG-2 OU in 2007. Currently, only the NRDWL and 600 CL remain in  
29 the 200-SW-1 OU. Table 3-1 provides a list of all of the original site classifications when this  
30 RI/FS work plan was drafted in 2004, as well as the OU in which each waste site now resides.

31 The 200-SW-2 OU consisted of 50 sites in the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28). Eight  
32 sites were reassigned or added before the RI/FS process, totaling 58 sites as listed in WIDS.  
33 Twenty-three sites were reclassified (Table 3-1), as described above, leaving 35 sites in the  
34 200-SW-2 OU for evaluation. A combined total of 74 sites in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs  
35 were evaluated in Draft A of this RI/FS work plan. However, with the creation of the new  
36 Model Group OUs, all but 24 sites have been migrated to either the 200-MG-1 or 200-MG-2 OU.  
37 The 200-MG-1 and 200-MG-2 OUs both contain waste sites that are expected to have generally

---

<sup>21</sup> See footnote number 10.

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

1 shallow contaminants. The lead regulatory agency for the 200-MG-1 OU is Ecology, while the  
 2 lead regulatory agency for the 200-MG-2 OU is the EPA. Table 3-1 provides a list of all of the  
 3 original site classifications from when this RI/FS work plan was drafted in 2004, as well as  
 4 where each waste site now resides.

Table 3-1. 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Waste Sites Crosswalk. (4 Pages)

Site Code	Site Name	Operable Unit, Draft A Work Plan (2004) <sup>a</sup>	Operable Unit, Draft B Work Plan (2007) <sup>b</sup>	WIDS Reclassification Status <sup>c</sup>
200 CP	200 Area Construction Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-E BP	200-E Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-E PAP	200-E Powerhouse Ash Pit and Ash Disposal Pile	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action
200-E-1	284-E Landfill	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-E-10	Paint/Solvent Dump South of Sub Trenches	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action
200-E-12	Sand Piles from RCRA General Inspection 200E FY 95 Item #5	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-E-122	Construction Forces Bullpen	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action
200-E-13	Rubble Piles	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-E-2	Soil Stains at the 2101M SW Parking Lot, MO-234 Parking Lot	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-E-20	218-E-10 Borrow Pit	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-E-21	218-E-12A and 218-E-12B Borrow Pit	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-E-3	Toluene Dump Site	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Consolidated (200-E-10)
200-E-46	Solid Debris	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-E-47	RCRA Permit General Inspection #200E FY 96 Item #7	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-E-48	RCRA Permit General Inspection #200E FY 96 Item #15	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-E-52	200 East Powerhouse Coal Pile	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action
200-N-3	200-N-3 Ballast Pits	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W ADB	200-W Ash Disposal Basin	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W BP	200-W Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W CSLA	200-W Construction Surface Laydown Area	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-W PAP	200-W Powerhouse Ash Pit	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-1	REDOX Mud Pit West	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W-10	Item 10 (RCRA General Inspection) Grout Wall Test	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-101	Contaminated Material W of 216-S-12 Crib	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W-103	201-W Concrete Silo	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-W-11	S-Farm Concrete Foundation	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W-12	201-W Soil Mound and Plastic Pipe	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W-17	S-Plant Project W087 Aluminum Silicate Discovery	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-W-18	S-Plant Project W087 Aluminum Oxide Discovery	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-W-2	REDOX Berms West	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W-3	2713-W North Parking Lot, 220-W-1	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W-30	218-W-1A Borrow Pit	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-W-31	218-W-2A Borrow Pit	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-W-32	216-Z-19 Borrow Pit	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-W-33	Solid Waste Dumping Area	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W-35	Various Sites North of 201-W	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-4	U-Farm Landfill	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-41	200-W-41, Abandoned Drums, Drums found East of T Plant	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table 3-1. 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Waste Sites Crosswalk. (4 Pages)

Site Code	Site Name	Operable Unit, Draft A Work Plan (2004) <sup>a</sup>	Operable Unit, Draft B Work Plan (2007) <sup>b</sup>	WIDS Reclassification Status <sup>c</sup>
200-W-5	Landfill/Burning Pit, U Plant Burning Pit, UPR-200-W-8	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-W-55	Dump N of 231Z	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W-6	200-W Painter shop paint solvent disposal area	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
200-W-62	200 West Powerhouse Coal Pile	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-68	RCRA General Inspection Report 200W FY 99 Item #3, Historic Disposal Site	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-W-70	Old Burn Pit Southeast of Z-Plant, 200 West Original Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-W-75	Rad Logging System Silos	200-SW-2	200-MG-2	Accepted
200-W-92	Soil Mound W of TY Farm	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Accepted
218-C-9	Dry Waste & 216-C-9 Pond	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-1	Dry Waste #1	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-10	Equip Burial #10	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-12A	Dry Waste #12A	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-12B	Dry Waste #12B	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-2	Equip Burial #2	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-2A	Regulated Equip Storage	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-3	Construction Scrap Pit	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-4	Equip Burial #4	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-5	Equip Burial #5	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-5A	Equip Burial #5A	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-6	B Stack Shack Burning Pit	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	No Action
218-E-7	222B Vaults	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Accepted
218-E-8	200E Construction Burial	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-E-9	200E Regulated Equipment Storage Site No. 009, Burial Vault (Hanford Inactive Site Survey)	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-1	Solid Waste Burial #1	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-11	Regulated Storage Site	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-1A	Equip Burial #1	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-2	Dry Waste #2	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-2A	Equip Burial #2	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-3	Dry Waste #3	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-3A	Dry Waste #3A	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-3AE	Dry Waste #3AE	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-4A	Dry Waste #4A	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-4B	Dry Waste #4B	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-4C	Dry Waste #4C	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-5	Low Level Radioactive Mixed Waste Landfill	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Accepted
218-W-6	218-W-6 Landfill	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
218-W-7	222S Vaults	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Accepted
218-W-8	222T Vaults	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Accepted
218-W-9	Dry Waste Burial #9	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Accepted
291-C-1	291C Stack Burial Trench	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Accepted
600 BPHWSA	600 Area Batch Plant HWSA, Hazardous Waste Storage Area	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
600 CL	600 Area Central Landfill	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Accepted
600 ESHWSA	600 Area Exploratory Shaft Hazardous Waste Storage Area	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
600 NRDWL	600 Area Non Radioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Accepted

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table 3-1. 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Waste Sites Crosswalk. (4 Pages)

Site Code	Site Name	Operable Unit, Draft A Work Plan (2004) <sup>a</sup>	Operable Unit, Draft B Work Plan (2007) <sup>b</sup>	WIDS Reclassification Status <sup>c</sup>
600 OCL	600 Original Central Landfill	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-146	Steel Structure NW of Gable Mt	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-218	H-61 Anti-Aircraft Dump	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-220	H-51 Anti-Aircraft Dump	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-222	H-60 Gun Site	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-223	Military Camp South of 200 W, H-50 Gun Site Pit	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
600-226	H-42 Gun Site	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-228	H-40 Gun Site	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-236	Soil Cell 607 Site, Petroleum Contaminated Soil, Bioremediation Site	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
600-25 <sup>d</sup>	Susie Junction	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Rejected
600-266	Trash Dump West of Gate 117-A	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
600-268	200 East Pipe Yard Drum Accumulation Area	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Rejected
600-281	Scattered Debris South of Army Loop Road	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-36	Ethel Railroad Siding Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-38	Susie Junction	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-40	W of W Lake Dumping Area	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-51	Chemical Dump	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-65	607 Batch Plant Drum Site	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-66	607 Batch Plant Orphan Drums	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-70	Solid Waste Management Unit #2	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
600-71	607 Batch Plant Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
622-1	Construction and Demolition Debris	200-SW-1	200-SW-1	Rejected
628-2	100 Fire Station Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
OCSA	Old Central Shop Area	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
UPR-200-E-106	Contamination at a Burning Ground, UN-200-E-106	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Consolidated (200-E-BP)
UPR-200-E-23	Burial Box Collapse at 218-E-10, UPR-200-W-158	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-E-10)
UPR-200-E-24	Contamination Plume from the 218-E-10 Landfill, UN-200-E-24	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-E-10)
UPR-200-E-30	Contamination within 218-E-10, UN-200-E-20	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-E-10)
UPR-200-E-35	Buried Pipe, Contaminated	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Accepted
UPR-200-E-53	Contamination at 218-E-1	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-E-1)
UPR-200-E-61	Radioactive Contamination from Railroad Burial Cars	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Rejected
UPR-200-E-95	Ground Contamination on Railroad Spur Between 218-E-2A and 218-E-5	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Accepted
UPR-200-W-11	218-W-1 Landfill Fire	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-1)
UPR-200-W-134	Improper Drum Burial at 218-E-3A	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-3A)
UPR-200-W-137	218-W-7, UN-200-W-137	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Consolidated (218-W-7)
UPR-200-W-16	Fire at 218-W-1 Landfill	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-1)
UPR-200-W-26	Contamination Spread During Burial Operations	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-1A)
UPR-200-W-37	Contaminated Boxes found in a Burn Pit (Z-Plant Burn Pit)	200-SW-1	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-4C)

Table 3-1. 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Waste Sites Crosswalk. (4 Pages)

Site Code	Site Name	Operable Unit, Draft A Work Plan (2004) <sup>a</sup>	Operable Unit, Draft B Work Plan (2007) <sup>b</sup>	WIDS Reclassification Status <sup>c</sup>
UPR-200-W-45	Burial Box Collapse	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	No Action
UPR-200-W-53	Burial Box Collapse	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-2A)
UPR-200-W-63	Contamination S. Shoulder 23 <sup>rd</sup> St.	200-SW-2	200-MG-1	Accepted
UPR-200-W-70	Contamination Found at the 200 West Burning Ground East of Beloit Ave.	200-SW-1	200-MG-1	Accepted
UPR-200-W-72	Contamination at 218-W-4A	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-4A)
UPR-200-W-84	Ground Contamination During Burial Operation at 218-W-3A	200-SW-2	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-3A)
Z PLANT BP	Z-Plant Burning Pit	200-SW-1	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-4C)

<sup>a</sup> DOE/RL-2004-60, 200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan, Draft A.

<sup>b</sup> DOE/RL-2004-60, 200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan, Draft B.

<sup>c</sup> The site codes in parentheses represent consolidated sites (i.e., the consolidated site is within the footprint of the listed site; see footnote number 9).

<sup>d</sup> 600-25 is a duplicate of 600-38 and has therefore been reclassified as 'rejected.'

600 OCL = 600 Area Original Central Landfill. WIDS = Waste Information Data System database.

1 Table 3-2 further summarizes those sites from Table 3-1 that have the 'Accepted' classification  
 2 in WIDS and have migrated to either the 200-MG-1 or 200-MG-2 OU. Table 3-3 summarizes  
 3 those sites within the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs from Table 3-1 that have the 'No Action,  
 4 'Rejected', or 'Consolidated' classification in WIDS. The 'No Action' and 'Rejected' sites  
 5 require no further action and are listed here only for completeness. Those sites that have the  
 6 'Consolidated' classification are contained within the footprint of some of the 200-SW-2 OU  
 7 landfills. Because they are within the footprint of the landfills, it is assumed that the remedial  
 8 action for the landfill also will remediate the 'Consolidated' waste site. A description of those  
 9 sites that are consolidated within 200-SW-2 OU landfills is presented in Table 3-4.

10 Table 3-5 summarizes those sites from Table 3-1 that are within the scope of this investigation.  
 11 This table also lists the proposed bin (Section 3.2.1) for each site. The NRDWL and 600 CL are  
 12 listed in this table for completeness; it is proposed that these sites undergo closure outside of the  
 13 CERCLA process and this RI/FS work plan.

Table 3-2. Accepted Sites Migrated out of the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units. (3 Pages).

Site Code	Site Name	Former Operable Unit	Current Operable Unit
200 CP	200 Area Construction Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-E BP	200-E Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-E-1	284-E Landfill	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-E-13	Rubble Piles	200-SW-1	200-MG-1

Table 3-2. Accepted Sites Migrated out of the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units. (3 Pages).

Site Code	Site Name	Former Operable Unit	Current Operable Unit
200-E-2	Soil Stains at the 2101M SW Parking Lot, MO-234 Parking Lot	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-E-46	Solid Debris	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-N-3	200-N-3 Ballast Pits	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W ADB	200-W Ash Disposal Basin	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W BP	200-W Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W-1	REDOX Mud Pit West	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W-101	Contaminated Material W of 216-S-12 Crib	200-SW-2	200-MG-1
200-W-11	S-Farm Concrete Foundation	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W-12	201-W Soil Mound and Plastic Pipe	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W-2	REDOX Berms West	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W-3	2713-W North Parking Lot, 220-W-1	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W-33	Solid Waste Dumping Area	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W-55	Dump N of 231Z	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W-6	200-W Painter shop paint solvent disposal area	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
200-W-75	Rad Logging System Silos	200-SW-2	200-MG-2
200-W-92	Soil Mound W of TY Farm	200-SW-2	200-MG-1
218-E-7	222B Vaults	200-SW-2	200-MG-1
218-W-6	218-W-6 Landfill	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
218-W-7	222S Vaults	200-SW-2	200-MG-1
218-W-8	222T Vaults	200-SW-2	200-MG-1
218-W-9	Dry Waste Burial #9	200-SW-2	200-MG-1
291-C-1	291C Stack Burial Trench	200-SW-2	200-MG-1
600 OCL	600 Original Central Landfill	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-146	Steel Structure NW of Gable Mt	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-218	H-61 Anti-Aircraft Dump	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-220	H-51 Anti-Aircraft Dump	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-222	H-60 Gun Site	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-226	H-42 Gun Site	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-228	H-40 Gun Site	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-281	Scattered Debris South of Army Loop Road	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-36	Ethel Railroad Siding Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-38	Susie Junction	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-40	W of W Lake Dumping Area	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-51	Chemical Dump	200-SW-1	200-MG-1

Table 3-2. Accepted Sites Migrated out of the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units. (3 Pages).

Site Code	Site Name	Former Operable Unit	Current Operable Unit
600-65	607 Batch Plant Drum Site	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-66	607 Batch Plant Orphan Drums	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-70	Solid Waste Management Unit #2	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
600-71	607 Batch Plant Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
628-2	100 Fire Station Burn Pit	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
OCSA	Old Central Shop Area	200-SW-1	200-MG-1
UPR-200-E-35	Buried Pipe, Contaminated	200-SW-2	200-MG-1
UPR-200-E-95	Ground Contamination on Railroad Spur Between 218-E-2A and 218-E-5	200-SW-2	200-MG-1
UPR-200-W-63	Contamination S. Shoulder 23 <sup>rd</sup> St.	200-SW-2	200-MG-1
UPR-200-W-70	Contamination Found at the 200 West Burning Ground East of Beloit Ave.	200-SW-1	200-MG-1

1  
2

Table 3-3. No-Action, Rejected, or Consolidated Sites. (2 Pages).

Site Code	Site Name	Current Operable Unit	WIDS Reclassification Status
200-E PAP	200-E Powerhouse Ash Pit and Ash Disposal Pile	200-SW-1	No Action
200-E-10	Paint/Solvent Dump South of Sub Trenches	200-SW-1	No Action
200-E-12	Sand Piles from RCRA General Inspection 200E FY 95 Item #5	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-E-122	Construction Forces Bullpen	200-SW-1	No Action
200-E-20	218-E-10 Borrow Pit	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-E-21	218-E-12A and 218-E-12B Borrow Pit	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-E-3	Toluene Dump Site	200-SW-1	Consolidated (200-E-10)
200-E-47	RCRA Permit General Inspection #200E FY 96 Item #7	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-E-48	RCRA Permit General Inspection #200E FY 96 Item #15	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-E-52	200 East Powerhouse Coal Pile	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W CSLA	200-W Construction Surface Laydown Area	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-W PAP	200-W Powerhouse Ash Pit	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-10	Item 10 (RCRA General Inspection) Grout Wall Test	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-103	201-W Concrete Silo	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-W-17	S-Plant Project W087 Aluminum Silicate Discovery	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-W-18	S-Plant Project W087 Aluminum Oxide Discovery	200-SW-1	Rejected
200-W-30	218-W-1A Borrow Pit	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-W-31	218-W-2A Borrow Pit	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-W-32	216-Z-19 Borrow Pit	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-W-35	Various Sites North of 201-W	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-4	U-Farm Landfill	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-41	200-W-41, Abandoned Drums, Drums found East of T Plant	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-5	Landfill/Burning Pit, U Plant Burning Pit, UPR-200-W-8	200-SW-2	Rejected
200-W-62	200 West Powerhouse Coal Pile	200-SW-1	No Action
200-W-68	RCRA General Inspection Report 200W FY 99 Item #3, Historic Disposal Site	200-SW-1	Rejected

Table 3-3. No-Action, Rejected, or Consolidated Sites. (2 Pages).

Site Code	Site Name	Current Operable Unit	WIDS Reclassification Status
200-W-70	Old Burn Pit Southeast of Z-Plant, 200 West Original Burn Pit	200-SW-1	Rejected
218-E-6	B Stack Shack Burning Pit	200-SW-1	No Action
600 BPHWSA	600 Area Batch Plant HWSA, Hazardous Waste Storage Area	200-SW-1	Rejected
600 ESHWSA	600 Area Exploratory Shaft Hazardous Waste Storage Area	200-SW-1	Rejected
600-223	Military Camp South of 200 W, H-50 Gun Site Pit	200-SW-1	Rejected
600-236	Soil Cell 607 Site, Petroleum Contaminated Soil, Bioremediation Site	200-SW-1	Rejected
600-25	Susie Junction	200-SW-2	Rejected
600-266	Trash Dump West of Gate 117-A	200-SW-1	Rejected
600-268	200 East Pipe Yard Drum Accumulation Area	200-SW-2	Rejected
622-1	Construction and Demolition Debris	200-SW-1	Rejected
UPR-200-E-106	Contamination at a Burning Ground, UN-200-E-106	200-MG-1	Consolidated (200-E-BP)
UPR-200-E-23	Burial Box Collapse at 218-E-10, UPR-200-W-158	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-E-10)
UPR-200-E-24	Contamination Plume from the 218-E-10 Landfill, UN-200-E-24	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-E-10)
UPR-200-E-30	Contamination within 218-E-10, UN-200-E-20	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-E-10)
UPR-200-E-53	Contamination at 218-E-1	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-E-1)
UPR-200-E-61	Radioactive Contamination from Railroad Burial Cars	200-SW-2	Rejected
UPR-200-W-11	218-W-1 Landfill Fire	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-1)
UPR-200-W-134	Improper Drum Burial at 218-E-3A	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-3A)
UPR-200-W-137	218-W-7, UN-200-W-137	200-MG-1	Consolidated (218-W-7)
UPR-200-W-16	Fire at 218-W-1 Landfill	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-1)
UPR-200-W-26	Contamination Spread During Burial Operations	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-1A)
UPR-200-W-37	Contaminated Boxes found in a Burn Pit (Z-Plant Burn Pit)	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-4C)
UPR-200-W-45	Burial Box Collapse	200-SW-2	No Action
UPR-200-W-53	Burial Box Collapse	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-2A)
UPR-200-W-72	Contamination at 218-W-4A	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-4A)
UPR-200-W-84	Ground Contamination During Burial Operation at 218-W-3A	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-3A)
Z PLANT BP	Z-Plant Burning Pit	200-SW-2	Consolidated (218-W-4C)

WIDS = Waste Information Data System database.

1

Table 3-4. Unplanned Release Sites Consolidated within 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (3 Pages)

WIDS Site Code	Site Name(s)	Site Description	Landfill with Consolidated Site
UPR-200-E-53	UPR-200-E-53, UN-200-E-53, Contamination in	Contamination spread by bulldozer when shallow buried contaminated waste was unearthed during backfilling activities. The area is approximately 15 meters by 46 meters and is located at the south end of 218-E-1.	218-E-1

Table 3-4. Unplanned Release Sites Consolidated within 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (3 Pages)

WIDS Site Code	Site Name(s)	Site Description	Landfill with Consolidated Site
	218-E-1	Contamination at levels of up to 150 mR/hr was recorded at this site. Status: Inactive	
UPR-200-E-23	UPR-200-E-23, UPR-200-W-158, Burial Box Collapse at 218-E-10	Airborne contamination spread over the 218-E-10 Landfill when a burial box containing two PUREX process steam tube bundles collapsed during backfill operations. Three days after partially backfilling, the landfill was found generally contaminated with levels ranging from 10 to 60 mR/hr. Initially, this site was in WIDS under the alias UPR-200-W-158 before being determined the event took place in 200 East. Status: Inactive	218-E-10
UPR-200-E-24	UPR-200-E-24, UN-200-E-24, Contamination Plume from the 218-E-10 Landfill	This site is associated with UPR-200-E-23 due to the same incident occurring but documents the large plume of contamination that resulted. Airborne contamination was generated due to a burial box containing two PUREX process steam tube bundles collapsing during backfill operations within the 218-E-10 Landfill. Status: Inactive	218-E-10
UPR-200-E-30	UPR-200-E-30, UN-200-E-30, Contamination within 218-E-10	Contamination occurred when a large wooden drag-off box collapsed as it was being backfilled in place within the 218-E-10 Landfill. The majority of contamination was located within the landfill. Contamination was spread over 400,000 sq/ft at a maximum of 500 mR/hr. Status: Inactive	218-E-10
UPR-200-W-16	UPR-200-W-16, Fire at 218-W-1 Landfill	This is a duplicate of the occurrence described in UPR-200-W-11. It was incorrectly reported in the Z-Plant Technical Baseline Report (BHI-00175). The correct location (UPR-200-W-16) was confirmed by the map in Selby and Soldat (1958). A fire occurred within the waste boxes spreading plutonium (alpha) contamination. Maximum contamination levels were found to be 20,000 disintegrations within the 218-W-1 Landfill and 30,000 disintegrations outside of the landfill. Contamination outside of the landfill boundaries is not within the scope of this RI/FS work plan. Status: Inactive	218-W-1
UPR-200-W-11	UPR-200-W-11, UN-200-W-11, UPR-200-W-16, 218-W-1 Landfill Fire	This is a duplicate of the occurrence described in UPR-200-W-16. The correct location (UPR-200-W-16) was confirmed by the map in Selby and Soldat (1958). A fire occurred within the waste boxes spreading plutonium (alpha) contamination. Maximum contamination levels were found to be 20,000 disintegrations within the 218-W-1 Landfill and 30,000 disintegrations outside of the landfill. Status: Inactive	218-W-1
UPR-200-W-26	UPR-200-W-26, Contamination Spread During Burial Operation	Wind dispersed contamination while a box of used connectors was being unloaded from a flatcar. Contamination spread onto the flatcar and onto the surrounding ground. This release is probably associated with the 218-W-1A Landfill, near T Plant. Radiation Incident Investigation at the time did not report any recommendations for reducing contamination at the landfill. Status: Inactive	218-W-1A
UPR-200-W-53	UPR-200-W-53, Burial Box Collapse	Collapse of a burial box in 218-W-2A containing REDOX cell jumpers occurred during backfilling operations releasing fission product contamination. Contamination levels ranged from 50 mR/hr at the landfill to 60,000 cpm at T Plant. Status: Inactive	218-W-2A
UPR-200-W-84	UPR-200-W-84, Ground Contamination During Burial Operation at 218-W-3A	A liquid spill occurred in the 218-W-3A Landfill during burial operations of a pump. This spill resulted in contamination of the truck transporting the pump and the ground around the truck. Some confusion has occurred in other documents associating this event with the 218-W-1 Landfill. The occurrence report for this incident did not take place at the same time 218-W-1 was in operation. Status: Inactive	218-W-3A
UPR-200-W-134	UPR-200-W-134, Improper Drum Burial at 218-W-3A	Occurrence Report 38-75 documented improper burial in the 218-W-3A Landfill of a waste drum labeled "TRANSURANIC." The drum contained plutonium, uranium and fissile materials. Applicable standards were not met for the handling and safe storage of this waste drum from the 325 Building.	218-W-3A

Table 3-4. Unplanned Release Sites Consolidated within  
200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (3 Pages)

WIDS Site Code	Site Name(s)	Site Description	Landfill with Consolidated Site
		Status: Inactive	
UPR-200-W-72	UPR-200-W-72, Contamination at 218-W-4A	Soil erosion occurred in the 218-W-4A Landfill resulting in contaminated laboratory waste, with gross alpha and mixed fission product contamination to be released to the surrounding ground surface. Speculation that disposal depth requirements were not met resulted in waste exposure. Status: Inactive	218-W-4A
UPR-200-W-37	UPR-200-W-37, Contaminated Boxes Found in a Burn Pit (Z Plant Burn Pit)	Contamination resulted when three boxes containing high-level dry waste were mistakenly placed in a burn pit in the 200 West Area. When the mistake was rectified it was noted that one of the boxes had released contamination levels of 100 mR/hr due to being broken open during placement while the other two boxes had remained sealed. Upon removal of the boxes the pit was decontaminated. Through historical research this pit where the incident occurred was identified as the Z Plant Burning Pit. The Z Plant Burning Pit is located within the boundary of the 218-W-4C Landfill. Status: Inactive	218-W-4C
Z PLANT BP	Z PLANT BP, Z Plant Burning Pit, Z Plant Burn Pit	A burn pit in the 200 West Area used as a disposal site for combustible nonradioactive construction, office and non-hazardous lab waste, including unnamed chemicals. An estimated 2000 cubic meters of waste was burned which included less than 1000 cubic meters of lab chemicals. Located in the 218-W-4C Landfill, this site was exhumed during the excavation of Trench 7. Status: Inactive	218-W-4C

WIDS = Waste Information Data System database.

1

Table 3-5. Accepted Sites in the Scope of the RI/FS Work Plan/  
Site Binning Approach. (2 Pages)

Site Code	Site Name	Operable Unit	Bin ID
600 CL	600 Area Central Landfill	200-SW-1	N/A
600 NRDWL	600 Area Non Radioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill	200-SW-1	N/A
218-C-9	Dry Waste & 216-C-9 Pond	200-SW-2	Bin 5 – Construction Landfills
218-E-1	Dry Waste #1	200-SW-2	Bin 4 – Dry Waste Landfills
218-E-10	Equip Burial #10	200-SW-2	Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills
218-E-12A	Dry Waste #12A	200-SW-2	Bin 4 – Dry Waste Landfills
218-E-12B	Dry Waste #12B	200-SW-2	Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills
218-E-2	Equip Burial #2	200-SW-2	Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills
218-E-2A	Regulated Equip Storage	200-SW-2	Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills
218-E-4	Equip Burial #4	200-SW-2	Bin 5 – Construction Landfills
218-E-5	Equip Burial #5	200-SW-2	Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills
218-E-5A	Equip Burial #5A	200-SW-2	Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills
218-E-8	200E Construction Burial	200-SW-2	Bin 5 – Construction Landfills
218-E-9	200E Regulated Equipment Storage Site No. 009, Burial Vault (Hanford Inactive Site Survey)	200-SW-2	Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills
218-W-1	Solid Waste Burial #1	200-SW-2	Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills
218-W-11	Regulated Storage Site	200-SW-2	Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills
218-W-1A	Equip Burial #1	200-SW-2	Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills
218-W-2	Dry Waste #2	200-SW-2	Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills
218-W-2A	Equip Burial #2	200-SW-2	Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills
218-W-3	Dry Waste #3	200-SW-2	Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills
218-W-3A	Dry Waste #3A	200-SW-2	Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills
218-W-3AE	Dry Waste #3AE	200-SW-2	Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills
218-W-4A	Dry Waste #4A	200-SW-2	Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills

Table 3-5. Accepted Sites in the Scope of the RI/FS Work Plan/  
Site Binning Approach. (2 Pages)

Site Code	Site Name	Operable Unit	Bin ID
(includes caissons)	Caissons: W-4A-C1, W-4A-C2, W-4A-C3 and W-4A-C5	200-SW-2	Bin 6 – Caissons
	Unused Caissons: W-4A-C4, W-4A-C6, W-4A-C7, W-4A-C8	200-SW-2	Bin 6 – Caissons Unused
218-W-4B (includes caissons)	Dry Waste #4B	200-SW-2	Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills
	Caissons: W-4B-C1, W-4B-C2, W-4B-C3, W-4B-C4, W-4B-C5, W-4B-C6 and W-4B-CU1	200-SW-2	Bin 6 – Caissons
	Unused Caisson: W-4B-CA5	200-SW-2	Bin 6 – Caissons Unused
218-W-4C	Dry Waste #4C	200-SW-2	Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills
218-W-5	Low Level Radioactive Mixed Waste Landfill	200-SW-2	Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills

N/A – these sites are proposed to be closed independent of this RI/FS work plan.

- 1 Copies of the most recently approved Part A Permit applications for the two TSD units are  
2 contained in DOE/RL-91-28, Rev. 7.
- 3 In 2005, when the Phase I-A DQO (D&D-27257) was prepared, the original focus was on the  
4 22 waste sites from Bins 3A and 3B, as established from the collaborative discussions held with  
5 DOE, EPA, and Ecology (the Tri-Parties) in early 2005. A total of 22 waste sites were included  
6 in the 200-SW-2 OU scope.
- 7 For the Phase I-B DQO (SGW-33253) and this document, the scope was changed to include  
8 26 landfills from the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs combined. The scope now includes  
9 24 landfills from the 200-SW-2 OU and 2 landfills from the 200-SW-1 OU.
- 10 In December 2006, a Tri-Party Agreement change package was submitted to migrate the  
11 majority of the 200-SW-1 OU waste sites to the newly created 200-MG-1 and 200-MG-2 OUs.  
12 Table 3-3 indicates the waste sites that have been moved out of 200-SW-1 OU and into the  
13 200-MG-1 and 200-MG-2 OUs. Currently, two sites remain in the 200-SW-1 OU, the 600 CL,  
14 and NRDWL.
- 15 In addition, the 24 landfills have been re-binned based on current knowledge and similarity of  
16 waste types, locations, and burial configurations. The binning splits the original 200-SW-2 OU  
17 Bins 3A and 3B, from the Phase I-A DQO, into six new bins. These new bins are presented in  
18 Table 3-5 and are described below in Section 3.2.2.
- 19 The binning approach provides the basis for RIs. A SAP has been prepared (Appendix A) based  
20 on the sampling design developed through the Phase I-B DQO process. The sampling design  
21 specifies the field investigation techniques for each bin, including the following:
- 22 • Sampling and analyses required for characterization
  - 23 • Methods to support the observational approach.
- 24 The criteria for placement of sites in different bins are discussed in Section 4.2.

### 1 3.2.2 Waste-Site Binning

2 The DQO process for the 200-SW-2 OU established a binning procedure to group the sites into  
3 categories for remediation, based on the current state of knowledge for these sites. The  
4 following subsections describe each of the remediation bins and a brief description of the known  
5 information associated with each of the bins.

6 The inventory information for the landfills receiving waste after 1968 is more complete than the  
7 information from earlier, handwritten records. However, even for computerized records,  
8 obtaining inventory information becomes more difficult with the increasing age of the operating  
9 period of the landfills. In some cases, although records are kept of the landfill contents, a  
10 detailed inventory of contaminants is unavailable. In other cases, even the landfill contents are  
11 not known with certainty. Plutonium, uranium, and total beta-gamma inventories for the older  
12 landfills were estimated based on historical records. Appendix B contains estimated areas and  
13 radionuclide inventories for 200-SW-2 OU landfills. Data were taken from SWITS and  
14 supplemented with information from WIDS.

15 Site-specific inventories were developed for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills, based on records found  
16 in SWITS and WIDS. Records in SWITS and WIDS may or may not reflect the complete record  
17 of wastes at a given site. When it was possible to verify the original inventory information  
18 source (as cited in WIDS, and often on file in the WIDS library), it has been referenced in this  
19 RI/FS work plan.

20 Chemical inventories are presented in Appendix B for landfills for which this information could  
21 be located.

22 The summaries provided in Section 3.2 reflect the information that is readily available for the  
23 200-SW-2 OU landfills, including data collected as a result of the Phase I-A DQO process.  
24 Inventories are given for some Bin 2 through 6 sites for which good information exists, and for  
25 all Bin 1 sites, because they have the most complete records. As noted in Section 2.2.2 and as  
26 shown in the timeline bar diagram (Figure 2-14), only limited records were maintained for  
27 wastes placed in the older landfills. Therefore, although wastes containing nonradioactive  
28 contaminants would have been placed at these sites, records documenting the nonradionuclide  
29 inventories are incomplete or, in some cases, unavailable. The inventories presented are for the  
30 landfills only; monitoring data for the groundwater beneath the sites are presented in Section 3.5,  
31 although there is no indication that solid-waste landfills have impacted the groundwater.

32 Because of the wide variety of waste sites in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs, the initial  
33 scoping for Draft A of this RI/FS work plan included an assessment of the possible remedial  
34 approaches that could be applied to the different waste-site configurations. The waste sites were  
35 sorted into categories/bins to align the waste sites with anticipated, appropriate remedial paths,  
36 based primarily on the results of the FS and evaluation of candidate remedial alternatives against  
37 the nine CERCLA criteria (i.e., overall protection of human health and environment, ARAR  
38 compliance, long-term effectiveness/permanence, reduction in toxicity/mobility/volume through  
39 treatment, short-term effectiveness, implementability, cost, state acceptance, and community  
40 acceptance. The categories/bins identified in Draft A of this RI/FS work plan included Bins 1, 2,  
41 3A, and 3B.

1 Since Draft A of this RI/FS work plan was submitted, all of the original Bin 1 and Bin 2 waste  
2 sites have been migrated to other OUs (Table 3-1). The 24 remaining landfills in the  
3 200-SW-2 OU were sorted into five main categories/bins based on similar characteristics. This  
4 sorting is anticipated to aid in choosing appropriate remedial paths, based primarily on the results  
5 of the FS and evaluation of candidate remedial alternatives against the nine CERCLA criteria.  
6 Because of their uniqueness, a sixth main category/bin was added to address caissons. The six  
7 main categories/bins included in the scope of this RI/FS work plan are described in the following  
8 subsections and summarized in Table 3-5.

### 9 3.2.2.1 Bin 1 Sites

- 10 • **Bin 1 -- TSD Unit Landfills** – This bin includes landfills that are permitted as RCRA  
11 TSD units and are included in the LLBG Part A (DOE/RL-88-20). This bin coincides  
12 with the original Bin 3A grouping from the Phase I-A DQO. The majority of available  
13 historical documentation is associated with these sites (approximately 110,000 of 147,000  
14 total documents); the sites, therefore, are considered the best documented sites in the  
15 scope of this RI/FS work plan. Sites in this bin include the 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE,  
16 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, 218-W-5, 218-E-10, and 218-E-12B Landfills. These are sites for  
17 which available historical documentation indicates that no burials have been made and  
18 there is a low potential for contamination, but some questions remain. Sites in this bin  
19 include annexes of the 218-W-4C and 218-E-10 Landfills and unused portions of the  
20 218-E-12B Landfill.

### 21 3.2.2.2 Bin 2 through 5 Sites

- 22 • **Bin 2 -- Industrial Landfills** – This bin includes past-practice landfills that received  
23 radioactive waste that was usually packaged in large wooden or concrete boxes,  
24 containing large quantities of fission products. For the most part, these sites were  
25 restricted to burial of large pieces of failed or obsolete equipment from the chemical  
26 processing facilities, although some items came from the 100 Areas. Many of these sites  
27 contain burials made over 50 years ago. Historical burial documentation is good for the  
28 218-W-2A and 218-E-5A Landfills; however, historical burial documentation for the  
29 remaining sites (218-E-2, 218-E-5, 218-E-9, 218-W-1A, and 218-W-11 Landfills) is at a  
30 minimum. Sites in this bin include the 218-W-2A, 218-E-5A, 218-E-2, 218-E-2A,  
31 218-E-5, 218-E-9, 218-W-1A, and 218-W-11 Landfills.
- 32 • **Bin 3 -- Dry Waste Alpha Landfills** – This bin includes past-practice landfills that  
33 received radioactive waste packaged primarily in fiberboard or small wooden boxes,  
34 wrapped in heavy brown paper or burlap, or placed in the trench without packaging. A  
35 small proportion of the waste is packaged in metal drums. All types of miscellaneous  
36 wastes, including contaminated soils and potentially contaminated rags, paper, wood, and  
37 small pieces of equipment such as tools, have been placed in these sites. Some larger  
38 equipment (e.g., motor vehicles, large canyon-processing equipment) is known to have  
39 been disposed to these sites. Available historical documentation indicates that these sites  
40 contain at least 90 percent of the 200 Areas landfill pre-1970 alpha inventory. Available  
41 historical documentation for the older landfills (the 218-W-1 and 218-W-2 Landfills) in  
42 this bin generally is poor, because these landfills received waste in the 1940s and 1950s.

1 Available historical documents for the newer landfills (the 218-W-3 and  
2 218-W-4A Landfills) in this bin are more numerous, because these landfills received  
3 waste in the mid-1950s to 1960s.

- 4 • **Bin 4 -- Dry Waste Landfills** – This bin includes past-practice landfills that received  
5 radioactive waste packaged primarily in fiberboard or small wooden boxes, wrapped in  
6 heavy brown paper or burlap, or placed in the trench without packaging. A small  
7 proportion of the waste is packaged in metal drums. All types of miscellaneous wastes,  
8 including contaminated soils and potentially contaminated rags, paper, and wood have  
9 been placed in these sites. These sites also contain a few pieces of large equipment such  
10 as tank farm pumps. Available historical documentation for these sites generally is poor.  
11 Sites in this bin include the 218-E-1 and 218-E-12A Landfills.
- 12 • **Bin 5 -- Construction Landfills** – This bin includes past-practice landfills that mainly  
13 were limited to burial of wastes resulting from construction work on existing facilities or  
14 demolition of surplus facilities. Wastes in these sites are believed to contain very little  
15 alpha contamination; beta-gamma contamination likely also is at a minimum.  
16 Documentation for the 218-C-9 Landfill is believed to be nearly complete; however,  
17 available historical documents for the 218-E-8 and 218-E-4 Landfills are few.

### 18 3.2.2.3 Bin 6 Sites

- 19 • **Bin 6 -- Caissons** – This bin includes caissons and vertical pipe units used for disposal of  
20 hot-cell waste or high plutonium concentration waste in the 218-W-4A and  
21 218-W-4B Landfills. The vertical pipe units in the 218-W-4A Landfill were made of  
22 welded 208.2 L (55-gal) drums or corrugated pipe and concrete; the caissons in the  
23 218-W-4B Landfill were made of metal and/or concrete. Documentation for the caissons  
24 in the 218-W-4A Landfill generally is poor, while the documentation for the caissons in  
25 the 218-W-4B Landfill generally is more numerous (150 to 250 documents per caisson).  
26 Caissons located in this bin include the 218-W-4B-C1, 218-W-4B-C2, 218-W-4B-C3,  
27 218-W-4B-C4, 218-W-4B-C5, 218-W-4B-C6, 218-W-4B-CU1, 218-W-4A-C1,  
28 218-W-4A-C2, 218-W-4A-C3, and 218-W-4A-C5 Caissons. This bin also includes  
29 caissons in the 218-W-4A and 218-W-4B Landfills that are believed to be empty/unused,  
30 according to available historical documentation. These include the 218-W-4A-C4,  
31 218-W-4A-C6, 218-W-4A-C7, and 218-W-4A-C8 Caissons. Additional caissons exist;  
32 however, these caissons contain RSW and will be dispositioned by the M-091 Program.

## 33 3.3 NATURE AND EXTENT OF 34 CONTAMINATION

35 The following discussion provides a summary of known contamination at the Bins 1 through 6  
36 sites, based on existing records and the results of Phase I-A field-sampling activities. The Bin 1  
37 sites (TSD-unit landfills), which have been characterized to a greater extent than the Bin 2  
38 through 6 sites, are discussed in this section. Because few investigations have been conducted  
39 for the Bin 2 through 6 sites, little or no data are available to describe existing contamination for  
40 these sites.

1 Because the nature of the material disposed of in the solid-waste burial grounds was  
2 predominantly dry, or was sorbed onto media to reduce mobility, or was activated metal, the  
3 likelihood of contaminant migration below the trenches is expected to be low. Consideration of  
4 low annual precipitation and recharge rates further reduces the likelihood for contaminant  
5 migration, because infiltration is the driving mechanism. The four burial grounds where larger  
6 volumes of water were present because of episodic events (i.e., rapid snow melt/ponding and  
7 drainage ditch seepage) and gravel-covered landfill surfaces denuded of vegetation may have  
8 experienced contaminant migration caused by the increased possible driving force. This is the  
9 premise embodied in the direct-push characterization strategy and the number and location of  
10 boreholes planned.

11 Groundwater well monitoring results are discussed in Section 3.5. Groundwater wells installed  
12 at landfills after approximately 1990 generally are not sampled for specific contaminants but are  
13 sampled for contaminant indicators such as conductivity and total organic carbon. Also, little  
14 information from gamma logging or soil samples is available for these sites. Monitoring wells  
15 installed since about 1990 typically were sampled during installation only for moisture content  
16 and particle size, not contaminants. Fine-grained sediments with high moisture contents would  
17 be a good place to look for mobile radionuclides and chemicals. Most of the more recent well  
18 installations were for monitoring conditions beneath tank farms, not landfills.

19 A few of the historical reference sources present information on geophysical results or sediments  
20 obtained during installation of wells and are briefly summarized as follows.

- 21 • PNL-6820, *Hydrogeology of the 200 Areas Low-Level Burial Grounds – An Interim*  
22 *Report*, presents groundwater and geophysical results from samples collected during the  
23 installation of some monitoring wells in the 200 Areas. This information is suitable for  
24 the records review process in conjunction with site characterization as discussed in  
25 Section 4.2.
- 26 • WHC-MR-0204, *200-East and 200-West Areas Low-Level Burial Grounds Borehole*  
27 *Summary Report*, summarizes the results of 11 wells drilled in the 200 East and 200 West  
28 Areas in fiscal year 1989. Selected sediment samples from the installation of these  
29 11 wells were tested for physical and hydrogeologic properties. The sediment samples  
30 also were analyzed for contaminant indicator parameters (total organic carbon, anions,  
31 low-energy alpha emission, and beta emission). In addition, the sediment samples were  
32 analyzed for volatile organic compounds. Samples were collected at each location from  
33 surface to groundwater, which was at about 75 m (240 ft); the samples were collected at  
34 roughly 6 m (20-ft) intervals. Of the anions analyzed, the highest concentration detected  
35 was sulfate at 130 mg/kg in well 299-W7-7 (at the north border of the  
36 218-W-3AE Landfill) at a depth of 12.2 m (40 ft). All other anions either were not  
37 detected or were detected at values below 130 mg/kg. The most significant beta count  
38 was 29.1 pCi/g at well 299-W7-8 (at the northeast corner of the 218-W-3AE Landfill), at  
39 a depth of 9.3 m (30.5 ft). Alpha readings all were below 15.4 pCi/g. Total organic  
40 carbon analyses detected a concentration of 85 mg/kg at well 299-W7-7 at a depth of  
41 24.4 m (80 ft). Other concentrations of total organic carbon were below this value in all  
42 samples collected. The volatile organic compound concentrations were similarly low in  
43 all samples collected. Carbon tetrachloride was detected in well 299-W15-19 (at the

1 north border of the 218-W-4B Landfill) at a concentration of 8.1 µg/kg at a depth of 75 m  
2 (240 ft). Details of the physical and hydrogeologic properties of the samples collected  
3 can be found in Appendix C of WHC-MR-0204.

- 4 • WHC-MR-0205, *Borehole Completion Data Package for Low-Level Burial Grounds –*  
5 *1990*, summarizes the installation of six new monitoring wells in the 200 East and  
6 200 West Areas in fiscal year 1990. Selected sediment samples were collected during  
7 installation of each well and analyzed for volatile organics, anions, total organic carbon,  
8 and gross alpha, and gross beta. Physical properties analysis results also were obtained.  
9 Chemical and radionuclide data can be found in Appendix B of WHC-MR-0205.  
10 Samples were collected from each well in zones that had one or more of the following:  
11 (1) higher than background photoionizer readings during drilling, (2) higher than  
12 background radiation readings during drilling, (3) zones of higher moisture content,  
13 (4) located within 12.2 m (40 ft) of the water table (3 from each well), and (5) high silt  
14 and clay content. The results from analysis of these samples were substantially similar to  
15 those results presented in WHC-MR-0204. All results for all constituents were at least  
16 two orders of magnitude below the potential preliminary remediation goals (PRG)  
17 established in the DQO.
- 18 • WHC-SD-EN-TI-290, *Geologic Setting of the Low-Level Burial Grounds*, describes  
19 regional and site-specific geology for the LLBGs. It incorporates data from boreholes  
20 across the entire 200 Areas, integrating the geology of this area into a single framework.  
21 Geologic cross-sections, isopach maps, and structure contour maps of all major geologic  
22 units are presented. The physical properties and characteristics of the major suprabasalt  
23 sedimentary units are described.

### 24 **3.3.1 200-SW-1 Operable Unit (Nonradioactive** 25 **Dangerous Waste Landfill and 600 Area** 26 **Central Landfill)**

27 This subsection summarizes the known information regarding the nature and extent of  
28 contamination in the 200-SW-1 OU landfills.

29 BHI-01115 reports volatile organics in low concentrations in soil-gas samples collected in  
30 1993 and 1997. Concentrations reported in Appendix D are the maximum reported at shallow  
31 and deep concentrations for each sampling event and are reported in parts per million by volume.

32 WHC-SD-EN-DP-064, *Data Package for Geophysical Investigation of Nonradioactive Solid*  
33 *Waste Landfill (NRDWL)*, contains survey data obtained with electromagnetic induction (EMI)  
34 instruments and ground-penetrating radar (GPR).

35 FS0419, *Data Package Summary, Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas and*  
36 *Methane Monitoring Round 1 Sampling, June 25, 2001*, summarizes quarterly volatile organic  
37 analyses from samples collected at the 600 CL, adjacent to the NRDWL. All reported values are  
38 at or below 1.0 ppmv.

1 FS0438, *Data Package Summary, Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas and*  
2 *Methane Monitoring Round 1 Sampling, October 18, 2001*, and FS0473, *Data Package Summary*  
3 *Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas and Methane Monitoring Round 1*  
4 *Sampling, March 4, 2001*, summarize quarterly soil-gas and methane monitoring conducted at  
5 the 600 CL. All values reported in this survey are at or below 1.02 ppmv for all constituents  
6 monitored.

7 FS0508, *Data Package Summary Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas and*  
8 *Methane Monitoring Round 1 Sampling, July 8, 2002*, and FS0529, *Data Package Summary,*  
9 *Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas and Methane Monitoring Round 1*  
10 *Sampling, July 10, 2002*, summarize quarterly soil-gas and methane monitoring conducted at the  
11 600 CL. All values reported in this survey are at or below 1.0 ppmv for all constituents  
12 monitored.

13 FP0015, *Data Package Summary, Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas and*  
14 *Methane Monitoring Sampling, September 17, 2002*, summarizes quarterly soil gas and methane  
15 monitoring conducted at the 600 CL. All values reported in this survey are at or below  
16 1.09 ppmv for all constituents monitored. The various references differ on their interpretation of  
17 contaminant sources. DOE/RL-96-81 indicates that volatile organic contamination primarily is  
18 attributed to the 1100 Area vehicle maintenance catch-tank liquids disposed to liquid trenches in  
19 the 600 CL. BHI-01115 associates contaminants with the chemical trenches in the eastern half  
20 of NRDWL.

### 21 **3.3.2 200-SW-2 Operable Unit**

22 The following subsections summarize the known information regarding the nature and extent of  
23 contamination in the 200-SW-2 OU landfills. This information resulted from field-sampling  
24 activities that took place as part of the Phase I-A DQO process, as well as other projects  
25 including the TRU waste-retrieval project, characterization of the 200-PW-1 OU, and the Central  
26 Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment. Much of the sampling activities were guided by the  
27 historical records review that occurred before and during the Phase I-A DQO process. The  
28 field-sampling activities in Phase I-A employed nonintrusive sampling and surveying techniques.  
29 The detailed results of these investigations are provided in Appendix D of this RI/FS work plan.

30 Additional field-sampling activities are planned, as part of the TRU retrieval project, after trench  
31 segments are emptied of waste. "Opportunistic" sampling also will be conducted, as appropriate,  
32 in cooperation with the TRU retrieval project, to obtain insights into wastes adjacent to the waste  
33 being retrieved. As sample data become available, the data will be collected and incorporated  
34 into future revisions to this RI/FS work plan and the RI report.

#### 35 **3.3.2.1 Organic-Vapor Sampling**

36 The organic-vapor sampling presented in this section applies to out-of-scope TRU waste that will  
37 be retrieved as part of the Tri-Party Agreement M-091 Program. However, as requested by  
38 Ecology, these data will be integrated into this RI/FS work plan and the RI report and will be  
39 evaluated during the FS process to determine their applicability to the overall characterization of  
40 the 200-SW-2 OU landfills.

1 Sampling for organic vapors has been performed in landfills containing vent risers that extend  
2 from just above the bottom of the landfill trench to above the landfill surface. Vent-riser  
3 sampling has been performed in the 218-W-3A, 218-W-4B, and 218-W-4C Landfills.

4 Additional organic-vapor sampling was conducted by the 200-PW-1 OU team to characterize the  
5 dispersed CCl<sub>4</sub> vadose-zone plume and the M-091 Program to characterize soil vapors  
6 potentially generated from buried retrievably stored waste. A few reference sources present  
7 information on analytical results from characterization of the dispersed CCl<sub>4</sub> vadose plume and  
8 M-091 Program characterization activities. These characterization activities include vent-riser  
9 sampling, passive soil-vapor sampling, soil-vapor sampling in the vadose zone, and soil-vapor  
10 extraction (SVE) sampling. These references are briefly summarized as follows.

- 11 • SGW-33829, *200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step II Sampling and Analysis of the*  
12 *Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose-Zone Plume*, summarizes the sampling  
13 methodology and the analytical results from the Step II RI of the 200-PW-1 OU dispersed  
14 CCl<sub>4</sub> vadose-zone plume. The Step II RI was conducted between August 2003 and  
15 October 2006. Characterization was performed in accordance with Appendix D of  
16 DOE/RL-2001-01, *Plutonium/Organic-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group*  
17 *Operable Unit RI/FS Work Plan: Includes the 200-PW-1, 200-PW-3, and*  
18 *200-PW-6 Operable Units*. The Step II investigation of the 218-W-3A Landfill included  
19 a passive soil-vapor survey of two trenches and vapor sampling of all existing vent risers  
20 in engineered trenches in the landfill. The most recent sampling events are summarized  
21 in the following sections. Analytical data can be found in Appendix D of this RI/FS  
22 work plan.
- 23 • In the 218-W-4C Landfill vent riser, sampling was initiated on October 15, 2003, by the  
24 M-091 Program, in accordance with DOE/RL-2003-48, *218-W-4C Burial Ground*  
25 *Sampling and Analysis Plan*. Eighty-nine vapor samples were collected in Tedlar<sup>22</sup> bags  
26 or SUMMA<sup>23</sup> canisters between October 15 and October 22, 2003. The vapor samples in  
27 Tedlar bags were analyzed for CCl<sub>4</sub> using field-screening instruments.
- 28 • An SVE system was operated at Trench 4 from November 2003 through April 2004. The  
29 SVE system was operated to remove CCl<sub>4</sub> from the landfill trench to minimize release to  
30 the environment. Sample results associated with the SVE system are documented in  
31 WMP-26178, *Performance Evaluation Report for Soil Vapor Extraction Operations at*  
32 *the 200-PW-1 Carbon Tetrachloride Site, Fiscal Year 2004*.
- 33 • CP-13514, *200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step I Sampling and Analysis of the*  
34 *Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose Zone Plume*, summarizes the results of the  
35 Step I investigation for the 200-PW-1 OU, located in the 200 West Area. The results of  
36 the 200-PW-1 OU RI are summarized in DOE/RL-2006-51, *Remedial Investigation*  
37 *Report for the Plutonium/Organic-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group*  
38 *Operable Unit: Includes the 200-PW-1, 200-PW-3, and 200-PW-6 Operable Units*.

---

<sup>22</sup> Tedlar is a registered trademark of E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, Wilmington, Delaware.

<sup>23</sup> SUMMA is a trademark of Moletrics, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

1 Soil-vapor sampling and analysis was used to explore the upper vadose zone in the  
2 vicinity of the Plutonium Finishing Plant. Relatively high concentrations of CCl<sub>4</sub>  
3 (maximum 1,760 ppmv) were detected within the east end of Trench 4 in the  
4 218-W-4C Landfill in May 2002. Further detail of sampling events are summarized in  
5 Subsection 3.3.3.3. Analytical data can be found in Appendix D of this RI/FS work plan.

#### 6 **3.3.2.1.1 218-W-3A Landfill**

7 In 2005, the vent risers in the 218-W-3A Landfill were sampled in accordance with  
8 DOE/RL-2001-01, Appendix D, Table D-1, for concentrations of volatile organic compounds, as  
9 part of Step II of the RI of the CCl<sub>4</sub> vadose-zone plume. The 2005 vent-riser samples were  
10 collected near the base of the trench, which typically is approximately 5 m (16 ft) below the  
11 engineered surface overlying the trench. Vapor samples from the 17 vent risers present in  
12 portions of trenches 9S, 3S, 05, and 08 were collected and analyzed using field-screening  
13 instruments. All of the vent risers in trenches 9S (1 riser), 3S (3 risers), and 05 (6 risers) were  
14 sampled in August 2005, and all of the vent risers in trench 08 (7 risers) were sampled in  
15 September 2005. A sample location number (trench and riser) was established and recorded for  
16 each vent riser. The vent risers in each trench were numbered sequentially from west to east.  
17 The only concentrations of CCl<sub>4</sub> (5 to 36 ppmv) were detected in the western part of trench 08  
18 (SGW-33829). Trench 08 also had elevated levels of tetrachloroethene (PCE) (20 to 460 ppmv),  
19 1,1,1-trichloroethane (1.4 to 18.8 ppmv), and methyl chloride (21 to 186 ppmv).

20 Sampling of the vent risers in portions of the 218-W-3A Landfill trenches containing retrievably  
21 stored waste was required by DOE/RL-2004-71, *218-W-3A Burial Ground Sampling and*  
22 *Analysis Plan*. Nine of the 17 vent risers (2 in Trench 05 and 7 in Trench 08) also were sampled  
23 for the 218-W-3A Landfill environmental release investigation. DOE/RL-2004-71 required field  
24 screening plus additional analysis of vapor samples in the laboratory. All of the vent risers were  
25 sampled once for field screening during the sampling for the 200-PW-1 OU RI. For the risers  
26 covered by DOE/RL-2004-71, additional sampling was conducted for laboratory analysis  
27 (SGW-33829).

28 SUMMA canister samples for laboratory analysis were collected from vent risers T-05-02,  
29 T-08-03, and T-08-05 in September 2005. A duplicate SUMMA canister sample was collected  
30 from vent riser T-08-05. Based on the field screening, the vapor samples from vent risers  
31 T-05-02 and T-08-03 contained the highest volatile organic compound concentrations in  
32 trenches 05 and 08, respectively. An additional SUMMA canister sample and a duplicate sample  
33 were collected from vent riser T-08-05. The additional and duplicate SUMMA canister samples  
34 were collected from a vent riser with slightly lower volatile organic compound concentrations to  
35 reduce the potential that the highest volatile organic compound concentrations would exceed  
36 calibration standards and make the duplicate analysis of little value. Based on the laboratory  
37 analysis, the sample from vent riser T-08-03 contained the highest concentration of  
38 perchloroethylene. During field screening, the highest concentration of perchloroethylene also  
39 was detected in the sample from vent riser T-08-03 (SGW-33829).

40 Field-screening and SUMMA-canister laboratory results (SGW-33829) for the vapor samples  
41 collected through the vent risers in the 218-W-3A Landfill trenches are provided in Appendix D.  
42 These results also are entered in HEIS.

### 1 3.3.2.1.2 218-W-4B Landfill

2 In 2006, the vent risers in trench 07 were sampled in accordance with DOE/RL-2004-70,  
3 *218-W-4B Burial Ground Sampling and Analysis Plan*, for concentrations of volatile organic  
4 compounds, as part of the environmental release investigation in support of Tri-Party Agreement  
5 Milestone M-091-40. The vent risers sampled in 2006 were collected near the base of the trench,  
6 which typically is approximately 5 m (16 ft) below the engineered surface overlying the trench.  
7 Based on field screening, the highest concentrations were detected in the western portion of  
8 trench 7. Seventeen vent risers are present in trench 7 in the 218-W-4B Landfill. Vapor samples  
9 were collected from 14 of these vent risers. The other three vent risers could not be sampled in  
10 September 2006 because of health and safety risks to workers, based on elevated vapor levels.  
11 However, supplemental vapor samples were collected through the three additional existing vent  
12 risers in trench 7 and the vertical duct at the west end of trench V7 in November 2006.

13 SUMMA canister samples for laboratory analysis were collected from vent risers T-07-4 and  
14 T-07-6 in September 2006. A duplicate SUMMA canister sample was collected from vent riser  
15 T-07-6. Vapor samples from vent riser T-07-4 contained the highest volatile organic compound  
16 concentrations, based on field screening, in trench 7. The additional SUMMA canister sample  
17 and the duplicate sample were collected from vent riser T-07-6, which had slightly lower volatile  
18 organic compound concentrations, to reduce the potential that the highest volatile organic  
19 compound concentrations would exceed calibration standards and make the duplicate analysis of  
20 little value. A summary of the analytical results (SGW-33829) for vent-riser samples collected  
21 in 2006 is provided in Appendix D, Table D-2. These results also are entered in HEIS.

### 22 3.3.2.1.3 218-W-4C Landfill

23 Numerous studies have been conducted at the 218-W-4C Landfill in support of volatile-organics  
24 characterization, resulting in a multitude of data sets presented in this section. Information on  
25 contamination in the 218-W-4C Landfill is summarized below from CP-16886, *Data Quality*  
26 *Objectives Summary Report for the 218-W-4C Burial Ground Contaminant Release*  
27 *Investigation*, written to develop a sampling design to determine whether contaminants have  
28 been released to the vadose zone from retrievably stored waste in the unit.

29 Groundwater monitoring wells have been installed on the eastern and western perimeters of the  
30 218-W-4C Landfill to comply with RCRA groundwater monitoring requirements. During well  
31 drilling along the western perimeter in 1990, CCl<sub>4</sub> was detected in soil and soil-vapor samples  
32 (DOE/RL-91-32, *Expedited Response Action Proposal (EE/CA & EA) for 200 West Area Carbon*  
33 *Tetrachloride Plume*).

34 Vent risers in trenches 1, 4, 7, and 20 were sampled in 1996 for concentrations of volatile  
35 organic compounds. All of the vent risers sampled in 1996 showed elevated amounts of several  
36 chlorinated volatile organic vapors including CCl<sub>4</sub> and degradation products, trichloroethylene  
37 and degradation products, and chlorofluorocarbons. Alcohols, ketones, and aromatic compounds  
38 also were detected, but at much lower concentrations (HNF-SD-WM-RPT-309, *Report on*  
39 *Sampling and Analysis of Air at Trenches 218-W-4C and 218-W-5 #31 of the Low-Level Burial*  
40 *Grounds*).

1 Vent risers in trenches 1, 4, and 7 also were sampled in 2002 for concentrations of CCl<sub>4</sub> to  
2 support the 200-PW-1 OU RI (DOE/RL-2001-01). The vent risers sampled for chloroform and  
3 CCl<sub>4</sub> in 2002 were collected near the base of the trench, which typically is approximately 5 m  
4 (16 ft) below the engineered surface overlying the trench. Carbon tetrachloride was detected at  
5 all but one of the 27 vent risers sampled. Most of the detections were less than 10 ppmv, but a  
6 distinct "hot spot" (maximum concentration of 1,760 ppmv) was detected at the east end of  
7 trench 4. The sample results do not indicate the source of the carbon tetrachloride. The source  
8 may be the buried waste or may be the vadose-zone plume in this area. A summary of the CCl<sub>4</sub>  
9 and chloroform analytical results (CP-13514) for vent-riser samples collected in 2002 is provided  
10 in Appendix D, Table D-3.

11 Soil-vapor samples for chloroform and CCl<sub>4</sub> were collected from the vadose zone adjacent to  
12 trenches 1, 4, and 7 and analyzed for CCl<sub>4</sub> in 2002 as part of the 200-PW-1 OU investigation  
13 (CP-13514). The analytical results are provided in Appendix D, Table D-5. Carbon  
14 tetrachloride was detected in soil-vapor samples collected along the east end of trench 4, near the  
15 location of vent risers at which elevated concentrations of CCl<sub>4</sub> were detected in 2002  
16 (CP-13514). Three temporary soil-gas probes were installed near trench 4 and sampled between  
17 2002 and 2004 to confirm the 2002 results. A summary of the CCl<sub>4</sub> and chloroform analytical  
18 results (SGW-33829) for the three samples taken between 2002 and 2004 is provided in  
19 Appendix D, Table D-4.

20 The presence of volatile organic compounds in vapor samples collected inside the trenches  
21 through vent risers suggests that organic contaminants, in a liquid and/or vapor phase, are able to  
22 migrate outside of the waste containers. The CCl<sub>4</sub> in soil-vapor samples collected adjacent to  
23 trench 4 appears to have resulted from release of CCl<sub>4</sub> from the waste containers (CP-13514).  
24 Specifically, the range of CCl<sub>4</sub> and chloroform detected in soil gas for this landfill from vadose-  
25 zone samples reported in CP-13514 for August 2002 is provided in Appendix D.

26 In 2003, the vent risers were sampled again in trenches 1, 4, 7, 20, and 29 for concentrations of  
27 volatile organic compounds, in addition to CCl<sub>4</sub> and chloroform, as part of the environmental  
28 release investigation in support of M-091-40 (DOE/RL-2003-48). This sampling included  
29 samples for field screening and samples in SUMMA canisters for laboratory analysis.  
30 A summary of the volatile organic compound analytical results for vent-riser samples collected  
31 in 2003 is provided in Appendix D, Table D-6 (04-AMCP-0321, "Transmittal of the Burial  
32 Ground Sampling and Analysis Results for January – March 2004"). Additional results were  
33 collected in 2006 (07-AMCP-0166, "Burial Ground Sampling and Analysis Results for  
34 October – December 2006"). These results are entered in HEIS.

35 Passive soil-vapor sampling also was performed in the unused annex of the 218-W-4C Landfill  
36 in support of the Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment. Artificial animal burrows were  
37 created in twelve locations in the unused annex of this landfill. Passive soil-vapor samplers were  
38 placed in the artificial burrows. The artificial burrows were sampled using SUMMA canisters  
39 (D&D-32015, *Sampling and Analysis Instruction for Artificial Animal Burrows, in Support of the*  
40 *Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment*).

### 1 3.3.2.2 Phase I-A Field-Sampling Activities

2 The Phase I-A DQO summary report (D&D-27257), and sampling and analysis instruction  
3 (D&D-28283, *Sampling and Analysis Instruction for Nonintrusive Characterization of Bin 3A*  
4 *and Bin 3B Waste Sites in the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit*) were prepared in response to  
5 agreements made during collaborative discussions that were held between the RL and Ecology in  
6 February and March 2005 (Ecology and DOE, 2005) concerning this RI/FS work plan, Draft A.  
7 In the collaborative discussions, Ecology and RL agreed to a phased characterization approach  
8 with an initial phase focused on additional records research, nonintrusive sampling, and  
9 waste-site boundary definition. Nonintrusive sampling techniques used included  
10 surface-radiation surveys, passive soil-vapor samples for organic liquids, and geophysical  
11 surveys. The following subsections provide a summary-level of detail regarding this sampling.

12 In contrast to the organic-vapor sampling that was described in Section 3.3.3, the organic-vapor  
13 sampling described in Section 3.3.2.2.1 directly applies to in-scope trenches.

#### 14 3.3.2.2.1 Passive Organic-Vapor Sampling

15 This section presents descriptions and results of the passive organic-vapor sampling that was  
16 performed during the months of June and July 2006 in support of the 200-SW-2 OU  
17 characterization. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the organic-vapor  
18 sampling process and present a summary of the laboratory results. Sampling results are  
19 presented in Appendix D, Tables D-7 through D-11.

20 Information on the passive organic-vapor sampling conducted in support of the 200-SW-2 OU  
21 characterization is provided in SGW-32683, *Results from Passive Organic Vapor Sampling,*  
22 *Performed in Selected 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills (218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B,*  
23 *218-W-4C, and 218-W-5) in June-July 2006.* SGW-32683 summarizes the sampling  
24 methodology and the organic-vapor sampling process and presents a summary of the laboratory  
25 results. The rationale for selection of the specific sampling locations is more fully described in,  
26 and driven by, D&D-28283.

27 More than 150 passive organic-vapor samples were collected from selected segments of burial  
28 trenches in the 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, and 218-W-5 Landfills, located  
29 in the Hanford Site 200 West Area. In accordance with the approved sampling and analysis  
30 instruction (D&D-28283), the sampling locations either were target/individual spots above a  
31 single/known burial in a given trench or were placed at targeted locations within a specific  
32 segment in a given trench. Survey coordinates were preestablished for each isolated sample  
33 location and each location within a trench segment. Sample coordinates were established along  
34 the centerline of a given trench; samples coordinates within a trench segment were established at  
35 a distance not to exceed approximately 10 m (30 ft). The specific sampling locations were  
36 chosen based on detailed reviews of engineering drawings, historical documents, and  
37 waste-burial-record information located in the SWITS database. Specific trench locations were  
38 sampled if the historical records indicated a presence of liquid organic wastes or liquids that  
39 might be organic (but that did not include enough information to conclude whether a liquid was  
40 or was not an organic liquid). Samples were analyzed for the presence of 28 organic compounds  
41 identified to be COPCs.

1 Laboratory data revealed that 14 of the 28 compounds were detected at levels above the  
2 laboratory's practical quantitation limit (25 ng per sample). One or more of the 28 organic  
3 COPCs were noted at 59 of the 151 total sample locations at levels greater than 25 ng per  
4 sample.

5 Organic compounds with elevated readings include CCl<sub>4</sub> maximum of 87,204 ng;  
6 tetrachlorethene maximum of 145,911 ng; trichlorethene maximum of 846 ng;  
7 1,1,1-trichlorethane maximum of 21,153 ng; 1,1-dichlorethane maximum of 4,025 ng;  
8 1,1-dichlorethane maximum of 2,712 ng; 1,2-dichlorethane maximum of 1,980 ng; chloroform  
9 maximum of 9,370 ng; and 1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane maximum of 13,788 ng.

#### 10 **3.3.2.2.2 Radiological Surveys**

11 This section summarizes the results of nonintrusive radiological soil measurements performed on  
12 a small area that straddles the 218-E-2 and 218-E-5 Landfills in the 200 East Area. The  
13 radiological soil measurements performed were used to evaluate landfill conditions and to  
14 support conceptual site models for the 200-SW-2 OU. In addition, this section briefly discusses  
15 the Mobile Surface Contamination Monitor (MSCM) technique used annually in the  
16 past-practice landfills to detect surface contamination.

17 Information on the nonintrusive radiological soil measurements performed in support of the  
18 200-SW-2 OU characterization is presented in PNNL-00157, *Soil Measurements at 218-E-2 and*  
19 *E-5 Burial Grounds*. PNNL-00157 summarizes sampling methodology, sample locations, and  
20 results of the soil measurements in the 218-E-2 and 218-E-5 Landfills. In addition, this report  
21 includes measurement data, spectrum analysis results, and other supplemental information. The  
22 most recent sampling events are summarized in this section. Survey data can be found in  
23 Appendix D, Table D-12.

24 In September 2006, radiological soil measurements at the 218-E-2 and 218-E-5 Landfills were  
25 performed in support of the 200-SW-2 OU nonintrusive characterization. Eight survey locations  
26 (hot spots) were selected for further radiological soil measurements in and around the two  
27 landfills, based on previously collected MSCM data. The MSCM, consists of an array of plastic  
28 gamma scintillators with an electronics package that is combined with a differential corrected  
29 Global Positioning System and a computerized Geographic Information System/data storage  
30 package mounted on a large tractor.

31 With the results of the MSCM surveys, each of the eight (hot-spot) locations was staked in the  
32 field. Areas around and within an approximate 1.8 m (6 ft) radius of each stake were surveyed  
33 with a micro-rem and Geiger-Müller<sup>24</sup> counter to determine whether any of the eight hot-spot  
34 targets should be repositioned to represent a location of even higher gamma signal. No variation  
35 in strength was detected. Also, no surface contamination was found. Results of the surveys are  
36 presented in Appendix D.

---

<sup>24</sup> Geiger-Müller is not a trademark.

#### 1 3.3.2.2.1 Field Measurements

2 The actual field measurements were conducted on September 13, 2006. Measurements  
3 30 minutes long were performed at all eight locations marked with stakes. Measurements at all  
4 locations were performed under the same conditions. In addition to the predetermined eight  
5 locations, a few additional measurements were performed in other impromptu-selected locations.  
6 One extra 30-minute-long measurement was performed for verification purposes right after the  
7 measurement at location 1 showed lower radiation intensity, because it was expected to be the  
8 hottest spot. Three 10-minute-long measurements anticipated to be used as "background" were  
9 conducted in addition to the eight 30-minute-long measurements and one extra 30-minute-long  
10 measurement.

#### 11 3.3.2.2.2 Results

12 All gamma spectra collected showed a presence of various-intensity Cs-137 peaks, accompanied  
13 with multiple peaks originated from prominent naturally occurring radionuclides. Considering  
14 uniform distribution of the naturally occurring nuclides in the soil, the analysis of the gamma  
15 spectra to estimate their concentrations was performed separately from that of Cs-137 activity.  
16 The analysis results showed that the gamma-spectra concentration appears to be the same in all  
17 measurement locations.

18 Although no data are available on Cs-137 contamination distribution in soil, the historical  
19 records indicate that a large contamination incident was associated with these two landfills or  
20 neighboring landfills in April 1961 (UPR-200-E-30). Also, it is reasonable to assume that  
21 animal intrusion is a possible cause of contamination spread in the general area. Further, it is  
22 known that the area was covered with 0.3 m (1 ft) of clean soil in 1979/80.

23 Transmission of Cs-137 gammas of 661.6 keV through a 0.3 m (1-ft-) thick layer of soil with a  
24 density of 1.7 g/cm<sup>3</sup> is less than 2 percent of the total amount of gamma present. It may be  
25 assumed that the cesium contamination is very close to the surface. Therefore, the following  
26 models were accepted to generate detector efficiency curves and quantify the Cs-137  
27 concentration.

- 28 • First Model: The contamination layer was assumed to be 15 cm (6 in.) thick, lying 0.3 m  
29 (1 ft) deep under clean uncontaminated soil.
- 30 • Second Model: The contamination layer 15 cm (6 in.) thick is right on the top.

31 As the results indicate, a consideration of 0.3 m (1 ft) of soil as an absorber results in the increase  
32 in concentration values of approximately two orders of magnitude. In addition, measurement  
33 results (Appendix D) indicated that locations 1 and 4 show the lowest concentration values that  
34 are independent on the model used for analysis, in contrast to what was expected based on  
35 MSCM data. Also, Cs-137 concentration value for location 9 is statistically the same as that  
36 determined for location 1. Both of these facts may imply that "hot spots" identified by MSCM  
37 data might not be located at the staked locations. Thus, two conclusions can be derived from the  
38 measurement results.

- 1 • Because anticipated hot spots, identified based on MSCM data, contradict the relative  
2 results obtained during these measurements, no correlation can be applied to characterize  
3 the whole area.
- 4 • Cesium contamination appears to be close to the surface and probably not directly related  
5 to the landfills. It may be caused by some radiological accident and/or related animal  
6 intrusions. There is no information about the contamination distribution, and therefore it  
7 is difficult to model and quantify the measurements.

### 8 **3.3.2.2.3 Geophysical Investigations**

9 This section summarizes the results of two geophysical investigations that were conducted as  
10 part of the Phase I-A DQO process for the 200-SW-2 OU. Results of the investigations also are  
11 depicted in the initial conceptual site models (CSM) in Appendix E of this RI/FS work plan.

12 The following two references present information on the geophysical investigations performed in  
13 support of the 200-SW-2 OU characterization and are briefly summarized.

- 14 • D&D-28379 documents the first phase of geophysical investigations performed at eight  
15 landfills in August and September 2005. Data from the first phase of geophysical  
16 investigations indicated that three of the eight landfills investigated (the 218-E-2A,  
17 218-E-8, and 218-W-11 Landfills) may have areas where the burial trenches extend  
18 beyond the areas initially surveyed.
- 19 • D&D-30708 documents the second phase of geophysical investigations performed in  
20 June 2006 at eight landfills. The second phase of geophysical investigations was  
21 designed to resolve the potential trench boundary discrepancies identified in the first  
22 phase (D&D-28379). In addition, new geophysical investigations were performed at five  
23 older/inactive landfills the 218-E-1, 218-E-12A, 218-W-1, 218-W-2, and  
24 218-W-3 Landfills).

25 The most recent sampling events for the 2005 and 2006 geophysical investigations are  
26 summarized in the following subsections. The geophysical surveys for both investigations were  
27 reconnaissance-type surveys that were aimed at defining the following characteristics:

- 28 • Locations of landfill trench edges, ends, and centerlines
- 29 • Locations of buried waste or other significant features/anomalies
- 30 • Presence and extent of voids within a given trench
- 31 • Definition of most likely waste-container type (for example, wood, metal boxes, metal  
32 drums, cardboard, and/or waste item)
- 33 • Differentiation between different types of waste containers within a given trench

- 1 • Depth of soil cover above waste items
- 2 • Depth to trench bottom (where possible).

3 Graphical depictions of the geophysical surveys are presented in Appendix D of this work plan.

#### 4 **3.3.2.2.3.1 Geophysical Methods**

5 The geophysical techniques used in the 2005 and 2006 investigations were EMI, total magnetic  
6 field (magnetic) methods, and GPR. These methods were selected because they are cost  
7 effective and nonintrusive and have been successful in similar waste-characterization projects  
8 conducted at the Hanford Site.

9 The selected geophysical-survey methods are capable of recording accurate and precise  
10 quantitative measurements when used in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations and  
11 procedures. However, the final results are based on the subjective interpretation and  
12 understanding of the data by trained and qualified geophysicists. The ultimate test of accuracy  
13 can be validated through excavation/drilling or surveys of sites with known contents and  
14 locations. Future phases of geophysical surveys may address portions of landfill trenches with  
15 good burial records and provide a degree of "ground truthing" and calibration under Hanford Site  
16 conditions. Furthermore, a geophysical-survey instrument-calibration facility exists at the  
17 Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Facility and can be used to perform  
18 instrument calibrations, as necessary.

19 Several factors can affect the reliability of the interpretations. These factors generally fall into  
20 two groups. One group is independent of the geophysicist and includes soil conditions,  
21 topography, accuracy of existing site drawings, and "cultural" interferences from metallic objects  
22 not intended for detection (e.g., fences, buried pipelines, buried electrical cable). The second  
23 group of factors is more dependent on the geophysicist and project goals and includes skill of the  
24 data interpreter, experience in the survey area, and density of the data.

25 The following summarizes each of the geophysical techniques.

#### 26 **3.3.2.2.3.1.1 Frequency-Domain Electromagnetic Induction**

27 The frequency-domain EMI instrument used is designed to measure the apparent electrical  
28 conductivity of soil and to detect ferrous and nonferrous metal objects to a depth of  
29 approximately 3 to 4 m (in ideal situations).

#### 30 **3.3.2.2.3.1.2 Total Magnetic Field / Vertical Gradient**

31 A magnetometer measures the intensity of the earth's magnetic field. The presence of ferrous  
32 material, man-made or natural, creates local variations in the strength of the earth's overall  
33 magnetic field.

#### 34 **3.3.2.2.3.1.3 Ground-Penetrating Radar**

35 GPR uses a transducer to transmit frequency modulation electromagnetic energy into the ground.  
36 Interfaces in the ground, defined by contrasts in dielectric constants, magnetic susceptibility, and,

1 to some extent, electrical conductivity, reflect the transmitted energy. The GPR system then  
 2 measures the travel time between transmitted pulses and the arrival of reflected energy. Buried  
 3 objects (such as pipes, barrels, foundations, wires) can cause all or a portion of the transmitted  
 4 energy to be reflected back toward a receiving antenna.

### 5 **3.3.2.2.3.2 Geophysical Investigation Results – August and September 2005**

6 Eight landfills (listed below) were surveyed in August and September 2005. The geophysical  
 7 survey results are summarized in the following subsections:

- 8 • 218-W-1A Landfill
- 9 • 218-W-2A Landfill
- 10 • 218-W-11 Landfill
- 11 • 218-C-9 Landfill
- 12 • 218-E-2A Landfill
- 13 • 218-E-5 Landfill
- 14 • 218-E-5A Landfill
- 15 • 218-E-8 Landfill.

#### 16 **3.3.2.2.3.2.1 218-W-1A Landfill**

17 This landfill contains a large number of small, scattered shallow anomalies that confound the  
 18 interpretation of distinct burial trenches in the GPR data. For this reason, concentrations of  
 19 buried debris are inferred primarily from EMI and magnetic data. Although no distinct trench  
 20 boundaries are evident in the geophysical data, the pattern of anomalies in the EMI and magnetic  
 21 data agree somewhat with the locations and orientations of trenches/pits shown on Hanford Site  
 22 Drawing H-2-2516. No geophysical evidence was detected for one trench (5A) shown on this  
 23 drawing. Additional trenches/pits were detected that were not on the drawing.

#### 24 **3.3.2.2.3.2.2 218-W-2A Landfill**

25 The geophysical data indicate that there are burial trenches at most of the locations shown for  
 26 trenches on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32095. There is no geophysical evidence for buried  
 27 waste at some of the trench locations shown on the drawing. One burial trench was interpreted  
 28 in the geophysical data at a location that was not indicated on the drawing (Trench A, see  
 29 below). Most of the debris or objects in the trenches have a ferrous metal content; some have a  
 30 significant ferrous content. More specific details are listed below for the trenches as depicted on  
 31 Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32095:

- 32 • **Trench 1** – A northwest-southeast trending trench that is located in southwest corner of  
 33 the landfill. The trench location correlates well with its location shown on site drawings
- 34 • **Trenches 2, 9, 25, and 26** – There was no geophysical evidence of a trench in this  
 35 location
- 36 • **Trench 3** – This is the southern-most east-west trending trench that was identified in the  
 37 investigation. The trench location correlates well with its location shown on site  
 38 drawings

- 1 • **Trenches 4 - 10, and 20 - 24** – These are east-west trending trenches that correlate well  
2 with their locations shown on site drawings
- 3 • **Trenches 11 - 15** – Parallel the west side of the railroad tracks. The geophysical data  
4 indicate that buried debris extends roughly 100 m further to the south than shown on site  
5 drawings
- 6 • **Trench 16** – The only trench documented as being located on the eastern half of the  
7 railroad tracks
- 8 • **Trench 17 - 19** – No trenches with these numbers are shown on site drawings
- 9 • **Trench 27** – At this trench location, GPR data indicate a relatively short, irregular  
10 excavation at the eastern end, and another section on the western edge of the landfill that  
11 does not line up with the first section
- 12 • **Trench A** – An undocumented trench that parallels the west side of the railroad tracks in  
13 the southeast corner of the landfill.

#### 14 **3.3.2.2.3.2.3 218-W-11 Landfill**

15 The geophysical data indicate that the investigation area contains two concentrations of buried  
16 debris or objects. The locations of the interpreted trenches/pits coincide reasonably well with the  
17 location of the northernmost of the two trenches shown on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-94250.  
18 There is no geophysical evidence of the other trench shown in the drawing. A small amount of  
19 data was collected immediately north of the investigation area that indicates that multiple burial  
20 trenches/pits are located in this area. However, the buried debris within this area was not fully  
21 mapped or characterized. Additional geophysical surveys were performed on this area and are  
22 discussed in Section 3.4.2.3.21.

#### 23 **3.3.2.2.3.2.4 218-C-9 Landfill**

24 The geophysical data indicate that this landfill does not appear to contain large, continuous  
25 concentrations of buried objects or debris in well-defined trenches or pits. Several large metallic  
26 objects or concentrations of smaller metallic debris are buried in several somewhat-discrete  
27 locations across the landfill, primarily through the center and southwestern portion of the  
28 landfill. No Hanford Site drawing was located for the 218-C-9 Landfill.

#### 29 **3.3.2.2.3.2.5 218-E-2A Landfill**

30 The geophysical data indicate that there is a single burial trench at this landfill with a series of  
31 isolated objects and/or a number of groups of smaller objects with relatively clean fill in  
32 between. GPR data were not successful at detecting all of the buried debris/objects whose  
33 presence is interpreted from the EMI and magnetic data.

#### 1 **3.3.2.2.3.2.6 218-E-5 and 218-E-5A Landfills**

2 The 218-E-5 and 218-E-5A Landfills are contiguous and were investigated as a single landfill.  
3 The data indicate that there are two trenches in the 218-E-5 Landfill and one in the  
4 218-E-5A Landfill, which is consistent with Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534. The following is  
5 a discussion of each of these landfills.

6 Two trenches are documented in the 218-E-5 Landfill, as shown on Hanford Site Drawing  
7 H-2-55534. The geophysical data show a trench that is roughly the same length and width as  
8 trench 2 shown on the drawing. However, the center of the trench appears to be roughly 20 m to  
9 the west of its documented location. In the eastern half of the landfill, a second trench was  
10 detected that correlates well with the documented location of trench 3 shown on Hanford Site  
11 Drawing H-2-55534.

12 The geophysical data for the 218-E-5A Landfill indicate that it is an oblong-shape trench or pit  
13 containing a significant amount of metallic debris or objects. The location correlate well with  
14 the location shown on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534.

#### 15 **3.3.2.2.3.2.7 218-E-8 Landfill**

16 The geophysical data for this landfill show no clear indications of any distinct trenches or large  
17 concentrations of buried debris. Most of the landfill shows a scattering of anomalies of variable  
18 concentrations. Most anomalies appear to be from buried debris, but some may represent  
19 changes in the character of the soil.

#### 20 **3.3.2.2.3.3 Geophysical Investigation Results - June 2006**

21 Eight landfills were surveyed in June 2006. The geophysical survey results are summarized in  
22 the following subsections:

- 23 • 218-E-1
- 24 • 218-E-2A
- 25 • 218-E-8
- 26 • 218-E-12A
- 27 • 218-W-1
- 28 • 218-W-2
- 29 • 218-W-3
- 30 • 218-W-11.

#### 31 **3.3.2.2.3.3.1 218-E-1 Landfill**

32 The geophysical data indicate that the 218-E-1 Landfill contains 15 trenches, with variable  
33 amounts of metallic material contained in each. The buried material does not appear to be  
34 continuous throughout the entire length of most trenches. Based on Hanford Site Drawing  
35 H-2-00124, the original landfill includes 15 trenches, which correlates with the geophysical data.

#### 1    **3.3.2.2.3.3.2    218-E-2A Landfill**

2    The investigation conducted in the 218-E-2A Landfill was an expansion of the area covered in  
 3    the first phase of geophysical investigations (D&D-28379). Results of the previous investigation  
 4    appeared to show anomalies extending beyond the edge of the landfill boundary to the west. The  
 5    newly collected EMI and magnetic data show no anomalies of significance west of the western  
 6    boundary of the landfill. Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534 indicates one east-west-oriented  
 7    trench in the 218-E-2A Landfill. The geophysical data indicate a large buried object that is  
 8    located just inside the landfill boundary. This caused the anomaly that appears to extend beyond  
 9    the western edge of the landfill. No buried debris or objects are interpreted to be west of the  
 10   landfill boundary.

#### 11   **3.3.2.2.3.3.3    218-E-8 Landfill**

12   The investigation conducted in the 218-E-8 Landfill was an expansion of the area covered in the  
 13   first phase of geophysical investigations (D&D-28379). The geophysical data collected in the  
 14   expansion area, immediately east of the 218-E-8 Landfill boundary, indicate that there are buried  
 15   objects and/or debris outside of the marked landfill. Near the landfill boundary is one buried  
 16   object (or concentration of smaller objects) that may be associated with the landfill.

17   A significant pit of buried debris, not fully characterized by this investigation, was located  
 18   approximately 60 m east of the landfill. In addition, EMI data strongly indicate a buried utility  
 19   along the northern boundary of the investigation area, although this was not corroborated by any  
 20   other method or on any engineering drawings.

#### 21   **3.3.2.2.3.3.4    218-E-12A Landfill**

22   The ability to locate and map trenches at the 218-E-12A Landfill in the 200 East Area was  
 23   heavily influenced by the width of the trench, the type of waste that is buried in the trench, and  
 24   the changing soil conditions. Fifteen trenches were documented as containing dry waste in  
 25   Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32095. Pockets of debris were located and mapped in each of the  
 26   dry-waste trenches. In all of the dry-waste trenches, concentrations of metallic waste were  
 27   identified. Because of the depth of burial of the debris in trenches and the marginally favorable  
 28   soil conditions, it is assumed that there is more debris in the trenches than was detected in the  
 29   data. Each of the following trenches was identified and mapped with the geophysical data:

- 30       • Dry Waste Trenches - 1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25.

31   The remaining 13 trenches are documented as containing acid-soaked material and are shown on  
 32   Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32560. All of the acid-soaked material trenches are documented as  
 33   being in the eastern half of the landfill, where the soil conditions are least favorable to GPR.  
 34   There are a few pockets of anomalies; they may fall within a trench but also might be scattered  
 35   surface debris that is unrelated to a trench. This suggests that most of the debris in these  
 36   apparently narrow, shallow acid-soaked material trenches is nonmetallic. Each of the following  
 37   trenches was identified and mapped with the geophysical data:

- 38       • Acid-Soaked Material Trenches - 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 26, 27, and 28.

**3.3.2.2.3.3.5 218-W-1 Landfill**

The geophysical data for the 218-W-1 Landfill indicates pockets of debris in each of the identified trenches. Discrete concentrations of metallic waste were identified in most of the trenches. Nonmetallic waste is interpreted to be mixed with the metallic waste. Most of the trenches were clearly evident in the data, with the exception of Trenches 1, 1A, 4A, and 6. Based on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-75149, and given the proximity of the trenches in the 1 through 6 series, it is quite possible that a trench could have been constructed and not be apparent in the geophysical data.

Three east-west-oriented trenches were identified that are not shown on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-75149. They are north of the northernmost trench shown on the drawing (Trench 9) and south of the 218-W-11 Landfill. They have a character similar to that of the other trenches in the 218-W-1 Landfill. Additionally, two pit-like areas not shown on the drawing also were identified in this northern area; one of the pits has significant metallic content.

**3.3.2.2.3.3.6 218-W-2 Landfill**

All 20 of the trenches shown on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-02503 for the 218-W-2 Landfill were clearly evident in the geophysical data. The geophysical data indicate that pockets/zones of debris are located and mapped in each of the identified trenches. Discrete concentrations of metallic waste were identified in most of the trenches.

**3.3.2.2.3.3.7 218-W-3 Landfill**

Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32095 shows 20 regularly spaced trenches at this landfill, although a note on the drawing states that centerlines and locations were based on ground indications and judgment after the trenches were filled and covered. In contrast, the geophysical data for the 218-W-3 Landfill indicate that there are approximately 14 east-west-oriented trenches containing varying amounts of metallic debris. In addition, one north-south-oriented trench was interpreted along the eastern edge of the site, although this may be an artifact in the data caused by the gravel road located there. Other than the two southernmost trenches, the interpreted trench locations do not correlate with the locations shown on the drawing. Also, historical logbooks have different trench numbers than the numbers indicated on the drawing.

**3.3.2.2.3.3.8 218-W-11 Landfill**

As reported in the 2005 geophysical investigation, one trench and one "pit" about 18 m east of the trench, make up the 218-W-11 Landfill. The trench location correlates very well with the trench location identified in Hanford Site Drawing H-2-31268, *Solid Waste Burial Grounds Plot Plan*, and with the northernmost trench depicted in Hanford Site Drawing H-2-94250, which shows two east-west-oriented trenches. The pit is not depicted on any available drawings. Given the quality of the geophysical data at this site, it is believed that the southern trench shown in Hanford Site Drawing H-2-94250 does not exist and that the older Hanford Site Drawing H-2-31268, which shows only one trench at this landfill, is more accurate, although it does not depict the pit.

1 The 2006 geophysical investigation was an expansion of the area covered in the first phase of  
2 geophysical investigations (D&D-28379); the investigation resurveyed the area covered in the  
3 2005 investigation and continued to the area just north of the 218-W-11 Landfill (i.e., toward the  
4 southern portion of the 218-W-4A Landfill). The only anomalies located were five trenches that  
5 align with those in the southern part of the 218-W-4A Landfill. This second geophysical  
6 investigation confirmed the results from the original investigation; the 218-W-11 Landfill most  
7 likely contains only one trench and one pit (contrary to the most recent Hanford Site drawing).

### 8 3.4 ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING

9 This section discusses current environmental monitoring at the Hanford Site Central Plateau.  
10 The Central Plateau includes the 200 East Area, 200 West Area, and 200 North (industrial) Area  
11 and portions of the largely undisturbed 600 Area. This section also summarizes existing  
12 OU-specific environmental information.

13 Environmental monitoring at the Hanford Site consists of effluent monitoring, environmental  
14 surveillance, groundwater monitoring, investigative sampling, and select characterization within  
15 the vadose zone. Investigative sampling of air, external radiation, soil, vegetation, and biota is  
16 conducted in the 200 Areas as part of the Hanford Site near-facility and environmental  
17 monitoring programs. The purpose of the investigative sampling is to confirm the absence or  
18 presence of radioactive and/or hazardous contaminants where known or suspected contaminants  
19 are present or to verify radiological conditions at specific project sites. Media sampled include  
20 air, surface water and sediment, drinking water, food and farm products, external radiation, soil,  
21 vegetation, nests (bird, wasp, ant), mammal feces (rabbit, coyote), mammals (mice, bats), and  
22 insects (fruit flies). Investigative wildlife samples are used to monitor and track the effectiveness  
23 of measures designed to deter animal intrusion. Wildlife-related materials, including nests,  
24 carcasses, and feces, are collected as part of the integrated pest-management program or when  
25 encountered during a radiological survey. Samples are analyzed for radionuclides and/or other  
26 hazardous substances, with disposal contingent on the level of contamination present. Results of  
27 investigative sampling are reported in the annual Hanford Site Environmental Surveillance Data  
28 Report. The most recent of these annual reports is PNNL-15892, Appendix 1, *Hanford Site*  
29 *Environmental Surveillance Data Report for Calendar Year 2005*. PNNL-15892 covers the  
30 entire Hanford Site, including those areas not associated with operations (such as the 600 Area).

31 Groundwater also is routinely monitored sitewide. More than 600 monitoring wells are sampled  
32 annually to characterize groundwater flow, groundwater contamination by metals, radionuclides  
33 and chemical constituents, and the area of contamination. Groundwater remediation, ingestion  
34 risk, and dose also are assessed. Results of groundwater monitoring and remediation are  
35 presented in an annual report, the most recent of which is PNNL-16346.

36 For purposes of groundwater monitoring, the LLBGs are grouped into four LLWMAs:  
37 (LLWMA-1, LLWMA-2, LLWMA-3, and LLWMA-4), described further in Section 3.5.  
38 Groundwater monitoring is performed at or near the LLWMAs for past-practice purposes or  
39 CERCLA. LLWMA-1 and LLWMA-2, in the 200 East Area, fall within the  
40 200-BP-5 Groundwater OU. LLWMA-3 and LLWMA-4, in the 200 West Area, fall within

1 the 200-ZP-1 Groundwater OU (a small part of LLWMA-4 is technically within the 200-UP-  
2 1 Groundwater OU).

3 PNNL-14859, *Interim Status Groundwater Monitoring Plan for Low-Level Waste Management*  
4 *Areas 1 to 4, RCRA Facilities, Hanford, Washington*, describes the monitoring required under  
5 the RCRA as implemented by the State of Washington dangerous waste regulations  
6 (WAC 173-303). The plan is revised periodically to reflect the current groundwater-monitoring-  
7 well network. Final status monitoring is expected to replace this plan upon incorporation of the  
8 LLBGs into the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit (WA7890008967).

9 Wells are sampled semiannually for indicators of groundwater contamination including pH,  
10 specific conductance, total organic carbon, and total organic halides (total organic halogen) as  
11 required by 40 CFR 265.92, "Sampling and Analysis." Wells are sampled semiannually for  
12 groundwater-quality parameters including chloride, iron, manganese, sodium, and sulfate, and  
13 annually for phenols. Annual analysis is the minimum required for these parameters under  
14 40 CFR 265.92. The monitoring frequency for alkalinity, lead, mercury, and polychlorinated  
15 biphenyls has been reduced. Dissolved oxygen has been added as a field measurement to  
16 provide an indication of oxidation state in the aquifer.

17 The groundwater beneath LLWMA-1 is impacted by regional contamination. The most  
18 significant chemical contaminants identified are nitrate and cyanide from the vicinity of the  
19 BY Cribs to the east (and may include some contamination from the B-BX-BY Tank Farms and  
20 other nearby cribs). Relatively few regional chemical-contaminant plumes affect the  
21 groundwater beneath LLWMA-2. Nitrate contamination is found at levels below the  
22 drinking-water standard in several locations and at levels above the drinking-water standard in  
23 several upgradient wells. The groundwater beneath much of LLWMA-3 is impacted by  
24 contamination from upgradient sources. This contamination includes carbon tetrachloride,  
25 chloroform, trichloroethene, and nitrate. LLWMA-4 is affected by regional volatile  
26 organic-compound contamination, and the northern part is within the capture zone of the  
27 200-ZP-1 Groundwater OU interim-action pump-and-treat remediation system. Carbon  
28 tetrachloride is the major contaminant in the plume, but chloroform, trichloroethene, and  
29 tetrachloroethene also are present, along with nitrate contamination.


30 Detection monitoring at the LLWMAs is hindered by gaps in the well network. Many of the  
31 wells previously monitored as part of the RCRA monitoring systems at LLWMA-2, LLWMA-3,  
32 and LLWMA-4 have gone dry because of regional declines in water levels. These declines are  
33 related to elimination of liquid-waste discharges to the soil column through ponds, ditches, and  
34 cribs, and associated reductions in artificial recharge mounds. At LLWMA-2, the water table  
35 has declined below the top of the basalt, so replacement wells are not practical. The schedule for  
36 installation of new monitoring wells across the site is under the purview of Tri-Party Agreement  
37 Milestone M-024. This milestone is reassessed annually.

### 38 **3.4.1 Ecological Evaluation Report and Terrestrial** 39 **Ecological Risk Assessment**

40 DOE/RL-2001-54, *Central Plateau Ecological Evaluation*, was prepared to support ecological  
41 evaluations under the RI/FS process for Central Plateau waste sites. DOE/RL-2001-54

1 completes a screening-level ecological risk assessment (SLERA) for the Central Plateau in  
 2 accordance with the eight-step EPA ecological risk-assessment process presented in  
 3 EPA 540/R-97/006, *Ecological Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Process for Designing*  
 4 *and Conducting Ecological Risk Assessments (Interim Final)*. The first two steps of the process  
 5 (the screening-level assessment), are shown in Figure 3-1.

6 Figure 3-1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Two-Tier, Eight-Step Ecological  
 7 Risk-Assessment Process (adapted From EPA/540/R-97/006).



1 The Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment complements several others being performed  
 2 on the Hanford Site to ensure that human health and ecological risks are properly evaluated in  
 3 support of remedial-action decision-making. Although originally focused on CERCLA waste  
 4 sites, the scope of the Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment expanded to include the  
 5 contiguous Central Plateau in the four-phased activity described below:

6 1. Phase I - Central Plateau CERCLA waste sites (fiscal year 2004)

- 7 - Ecological risk-assessment guidance for Superfund (ERAGS) DQO process for
- 8 Phase I CERCLA waste sites
- 9 - Sampling and analysis plan development
- 10 - Radiological and Global Positioning System surveys of the Phase I waste sites
- 11 - Soil and biota sample collection and analysis
- 12 - Assessment of West Lake characterization data and additional data quality
- 13 requirements

14 2. Phase II - Tank Farms, West Lake, US Ecology Site, and BC Controlled Area  
 15 (fiscal year 2005)

- 16 - ERAGS DQO process for Phase II waste sites (ultimately focused on the
- 17 BC Controlled Area)
- 18 - Sampling and analysis plan development
- 19 - Radiological and Global Positioning System surveys of 3-hectare plots in the
- 20 BC Controlled Area
- 21 - Soil and biota sample collection and analysis

22 3. Phase III - Nonoperational habitat around the 200 East and 200 West Areas  
 23 (fiscal year 2006)

- 24 - Validate Phase I and Phase II characterization data
- 25 - Data quality assessment of Phase I and Phase II characterization data
- 26 - ERAGS DQO process for Phase III habitat areas and evaluation of additional data
- 27 needs for the Phase I and Phase II waste sites
- 28 - Completion of the West Lake DQO
- 29 - Evaluation of the ecological impacts of the 200 West Area dispersed CCl<sub>4</sub> vapor
- 30 plume on burrowing animals
- 31 - Sampling and analysis plan development
- 32 - Radiological and Global Positioning System surveys of soil sampling areas
- 33 - Soil, water, vapor, and biota sample collection and analysis

34 4. Phase IV - Final Ecological Risk Assessment (fiscal years 2007-2008)

- 35 - Validate Phase III data
- 36 - Perform data quality assessment on Phase III characterization data
- 37 - Develop final risk-assessment report, including
- 38 - Problem formulation including assessment endpoints
- 39 - Analysis of phase results: exposure and effects information
- 40 - Risk characterization: discuss weight of evidence for each assessment endpoint

- 1           – Data quality assessment for the Phase I/II/III data and other relevant studies
- 2           – Develop ecological PRGs for the Central Plateau.

3 The document contains a compilation and evaluation of ecological sampling data that have been  
4 collected over many years from undisturbed and disturbed habitats on the Central Plateau.

5 The document describes the habitats on the Central Plateau, including sensitive habitats and the  
6 plants and animals that inhabit them. It identifies potential species of concern, including  
7 threatened and endangered species and new-to-science species. A detailed survey of the Central  
8 Plateau performed in 2000 and 2001 is incorporated into DOE/RL-2001-54, which provides a  
9 current, detailed description of the ecological setting of the Central Plateau and augments the  
10 ecological information presented in this RI/FS work plan.

11 DOE/RL-2001-54 helps answer questions about Central Plateau ecological resources that are  
12 important to preserve and protect. The document also identifies ecological data needs that can be  
13 addressed in future ecological sampling activities on the Central Plateau.

14 The SLERA in DOE/RL-2001-54 is a conservative evaluation of risk to the ecological receptors  
15 that are unique to the Central Plateau from stressors—in this case, introduction of contaminants  
16 and habitat elimination. The SLERA identifies pathways for ecological receptors to be exposed  
17 to the contamination and evaluates potential risk from those exposures.

18 This leads to the problem formulation stage of a baseline ecological risk assessment. During  
19 problem formulation, the risk managers and others consider the toxicity evaluation, conceptual  
20 model exposure pathways, and assessment endpoints to support cleanup decisions. As a result,  
21 they are able to better define the initial risks and to determine direction for the DQO process, if  
22 needed.

23 The SLERA in DOE/RL-2001-54 concluded that there were indications of potential risk and  
24 uncertainty for several contaminants on the Central Plateau that justified performance of a  
25 baseline ecological risk assessment, which would complete the ERAGS process beyond the  
26 screening level. This conclusion was supported by RL, the EPA, Ecology, the Hanford Advisory  
27 Board, the Hanford Natural Resource Trustees, and public participants, resulting in the Central  
28 Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment, which began in July 2003.

29 The final ecological risk assessment report will support the RI/FS process for the Central Plateau  
30 OU FSs with an assessment of the ecological risks and PRGs to be applied to the Central Plateau  
31 waste sites. The ecological risk assessment process for the Central Plateau is depicted  
32 graphically in Figure 3-2.


### 33 **3.4.2 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit-Specific** 34 **Environmental Information**

35 A summary of ecological resources for the 200 Areas is provided in Chapter 8.0 of Appendix F  
36 of the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28). Available information pertaining to sampling of  
37 vegetation and biota within the 200 East and 200 West Areas is presented in this section to  
38 summarize existing ecological data and as input to Section 3.5 on potential impacts to human  
39 health and the environment.

1

2

Figure 3-2. Phased Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment.



3

1 Eighty-five environmental monitoring records of wildlife and vegetation at the 200 East and  
2 200 West Areas, collected since 1965, were reviewed and summarized in WHC-MR-0418,  
3 *Historical Records of Radioactive Contamination in Biota at the 200 Areas of the Hanford Site*.  
4 The report indicates that areas in the vicinity of the LLBG sites were sampled between 1965 and  
5 1993. About 4,500 individual cases of monitoring for radionuclide uptake or transport in biota in  
6 the 200 Areas environs were included in the documents reviewed in WHC-MR-0418.  
7 Approximately 2,400 samples were collected from near the operations areas, and only about  
8 120 samples (i.e., approximately 5 percent) exceeded radionuclide concentrations of 10 pCi/g.  
9 Roughly 2,100 biotic samples were collected during special investigations at known or suspected  
10 contaminated sites, and about 1,800 (i.e., approximately 86 percent) exceeded concentrations of  
11 10 pCi/g, indicating that radionuclide contamination has remained relatively localized even  
12 though it has spread beyond the intended landfill boundaries. WHC-MR-0418 further states that  
13 the routine monitoring is targeted to detect potential radioactive contamination at nuclear  
14 facilities and landfills, and the special investigative samples usually are targeted at known  
15 incidents of biotic uptake and transport. Therefore, both results are biased toward detection of  
16 radioactivity. These radionuclide transport or uptake cases were distributed among 45 species of  
17 animals (mostly small mammals), feces, and 30 species of vegetation.

18 Wildlife species most commonly associated with uptake of radioactive contamination in the  
19 200 Areas historically have been house mice and deer mice, but other animals such as birds  
20 (including waterfowl), coyotes, cottontail rabbits, mule deer, and elk have been sampled  
21 (WHC-MR-0418; PNNL-15892, Appendix 2, *Hanford Site Near-Facility Environmental*  
22 *Monitoring Data Report for Calendar Year 2005*). Deer, elk, and rabbits are monitored routinely  
23 outside the fence in the vicinity of the 200 East and 200 West Areas as part of the Surface  
24 Environmental Surveillance program identified in DOE/RL-91-50, *Environmental Monitoring*  
25 *Plan United States Department of Energy Richland Operations Office*.

26 Plant species potentially may be exposed to contaminated soils and/or groundwater present in the  
27 vadose-zone soil. Plants live in direct contact with the soil and can take up contaminants through  
28 physical and biological processes. Exposure is a function of the plant species, root depth,  
29 physical nature of the contamination, and the contaminant concentrations and distributions in the  
30 soil. Plants generally are tolerant of ionizing radiation (IAEA 332, *Effects of Ionizing Radiation*  
31 *on Plants and Animals at Levels Implied by Current Radiation Protection Standards*), but  
32 potentially present a contaminant pathway to wildlife through the consumption of contaminated  
33 seeds, leaves, roots, or stalks. Radionuclide uptake by plants within the 200 Areas was  
34 demonstrated in WHC-MR-0418. The vegetative species most commonly associated with the  
35 contamination was the Russian thistle.

36 In a 2001 sampling described in PNNL-13910, *Hanford Site Environmental Report for Calendar*  
37 *Year 2001*, 57 soil samples and 49 vegetation samples were collected in the 200/600 Areas. Soil  
38 samples consisted of a composite of five plugs of soil, each 2.5 cm (1 in.) deep, and 10 cm (4 in.)  
39 in diameter, from each sampling location. Two sites in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs were  
40 sampled for soil contamination in 2000 and 2001. Perennial vegetation samples consisted of the  
41 current year's growth of leaves, stems, and new branches collected from sagebrush and  
42 rabbitbrush. Vegetation from two locations in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs were sampled  
43 in 2000 and 2001. Surveillance of perennial vegetation in 1998 generally confirmed  
44 observations of past sampling. Radionuclide analysis indicated that Sr-90, Cs-134, Cs-137, and

1 uranium were detectable in soil; Sr-90 and uranium were detectable in vegetation. Fission  
2 products were most common in the 200 Areas. Thirty-one sitewide investigative vegetation  
3 samples were analyzed for radionuclides in 2001. Of the samples analyzed, 27 showed  
4 measurable levels of activity. Eight tumbleweed fragments showed elevated field readings, with  
5 five of the eight samples originating from the 218-E-12B Landfill (part of the 200-SW-2 OU) in  
6 the 200 East Area (PNNL-13910).

7 Investigative wildlife sampling was used to monitor and track the effectiveness of measures  
8 designed to deter animal intrusion. Wildlife-related materials, including nests, carcasses, and  
9 feces, were collected as part of the integrated pest-management program or when encountered  
10 during a radiological survey. Samples were analyzed for radionuclides and/or other hazardous  
11 substances, with disposal contingent on the level of contamination present. In 2001, five wildlife  
12 samples were submitted for analysis. The maximum radionuclide activities in 2001 were in  
13 mouse feces collected near the 241-TX-155 Diversion Box (part of the 200-IS-1 OU) in the  
14 200 East Area. Contaminants included Sr-89/90, Cs-137, Eu-154, Pu-238, and Pu-239/240  
15 (PNNL-13910). The number of animals found to be contaminated with radioactivity, their  
16 radioactivity levels, and the range of radionuclide activities were within historical levels  
17 (PNNL-13910).

18 As described in WHC-MR-0418, a sample of mouse feces collected at the 218-E-12A Landfill  
19 (part of the 200-SW-2 OU) in 1985 had a Sr-90 concentration of 400 million pCi/g; the  
20 218-E-12A Landfill was interim stabilized in 1994. Noticeable improvements in reducing the  
21 uptake and transport of radionuclide contaminants by biota have been observed in areas where  
22 interim-stabilization activities have taken place (WHC-MR-0418).

23 Biological transport of contamination by ants is a source of concern on the Hanford Site.  
24 Harvester ants, which are present on the disturbed soils associated with landfills, have shown  
25 extreme resistance to radioactive sources (Gano, 1980, "Mortality of the Harvester Ant  
26 (*Pogonomyrmex owyheeii*) After Exposure to <sup>137</sup>Cs Gamma Radiation"). In a contamination  
27 area, ants are capable of bringing radioactive materials to the surface, where they potentially  
28 could become available to other means of transport by wind, plant uptake, birds, or mammals.  
29 The biological transport of contamination by harvester ants was noted during an annual  
30 radiological survey at UPR-200-E-64 in 1985. The source of contamination was assumed to be a  
31 small-diameter pipe visible on the west side of the 216-B-64 Retention Basin, near the  
32 270-E-1 Neutralization Tank. In 1985, the pipe had a dose rate of 30 mrad/h. Surrounding  
33 contamination was transported to the surface by harvester ants and further spread by wind. The  
34 size of the area of contamination in 1995 was approximately 8,100 m<sup>2</sup> (2 ac), and it currently is  
35 posted as a soil contamination area. Additional contaminated soil and ant hills were identified  
36 both north and south of 7<sup>th</sup> Street and around the 241-ER-151 Diversion Box in September 1998.

### 37 **3.5 RCRA TREATMENT, STORAGE, AND** 38 **DISPOSAL UNIT GROUNDWATER** 39 **MONITORING**

40 This section describes groundwater monitoring at the RCRA TSD units in the 200-SW-1 and  
41 200-SW-2 OUs. The purpose of this section is to present current groundwater monitoring

1 information that can be referenced or included in FS/closure/postclosure plans developed for  
2 each of the TSD units. Subsections for each TSD or waste-management area provide a brief  
3 history of RCRA monitoring, a description of the monitoring network and well design, and  
4 recent results of monitoring. Section 2.1 provides aquifer identification for each site.

### 5 3.5.1 Overview of RCRA Monitoring

6 RCRA groundwater monitoring is required by WAC 173-303-400, "Interim Status Facility  
7 Standards," and 40 CFR 265, "Interim Status Standards for Owners and Operators of Hazardous  
8 Waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities," Subpart F, "Ground-Water Monitoring."  
9 Following are the current RCRA groundwater monitoring plans for the applicable 200-SW-1 and  
10 200-SW-2 Landfills:

- 11 • PNNL-14859-ICN-2, *Interim Status Groundwater Monitoring Plan for Low-Level Waste*  
12 *Management Areas 1 to 4, RCRA Facilities, Hanford, Washington, Interim Change*  
13 *Notice*
- 14 • PNNL-12227, *Groundwater Monitoring Plan for the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste*  
15 *Landfill.*

16 In addition to the RCRA monitoring, DOE O 435.1, *Radioactive Waste Management*, requires  
17 performance-assessment monitoring at LLWMAs 1 through 4 (DOE/RL-2000-72, *Performance*  
18 *Assessment Monitoring Plan for the Hanford Site Low-Level Burial Grounds*). This program  
19 uses the same monitoring networks that the RCRA program does, but monitors for radionuclides,  
20 which are excluded under RCRA.

21 The 600 CL is adjacent to the NRDWL and is regulated under WAC 173-304. PNNL-13014,  
22 *Groundwater Monitoring Plan for the Solid Waste Landfill*, describes the monitoring program.

23 The LLBG RCRA Part B Permit Application first was submitted to Ecology in December 1989  
24 (DOE/RL-88-20) to meet Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-020-06. DOE submitted the most  
25 recent version of the Part B Permit Application to Ecology in June 2002. Chapter 5 of the Part B  
26 Permit Application contains groundwater monitoring requirements. Notice of Deficiency  
27 workshops are continuing to refine the groundwater information needs. Results of the Notice of  
28 Deficiency workshops will be appropriately considered and used to determine remedial actions  
29 under this work plan.

30 DOE submitted the NRDWL closure/postclosure plan in August 1990 (DOE/RL-90-17) to meet  
31 Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-020-07. The Notice of Deficiency process was not completed  
32 for this closure/postclosure plan. DOE will use activities under the 200-SW-1 OU CERCLA  
33 process to develop groundwater information data to support the NRDWL closure/postclosure  
34 plan.

35 DOE has prepared quarterly RCRA groundwater monitoring reports since 1986  
36 (e.g., SGW-33492, *Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Data for the Period October through*  
37 *December 2006*). RCRA annual reports commenced in 1988. The RCRA annual reports have

1 been integrated with Hanford Site groundwater monitoring reports since 1997  
2 (e.g., PNNL-16346).

3 The RCRA interim-status regulations require semiannual comparisons of upgradient and  
4 downgradient groundwater results to determine whether the TSD units have adversely impacted  
5 groundwater quality. The comparisons are conducted for four contaminant-indicator parameters:  
6 pH, specific conductance, total organic carbon, and total organic halides.

### 7 **3.5.2 218-E-10 Landfill (LLWMA-1) Groundwater** 8 **Monitoring**

9 The 218-E-10 Landfill comprises LLWMA-1, located in the northwestern corner of the  
10 200 East Area.

#### 11 **3.5.2.1 History**

12 The monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant-indicator parameters,  
13 groundwater-quality parameters, drinking-water parameters, and site-specific parameters as  
14 required by WAC 173-303-400(3), "Interim Status Facility Standards," "Standards," which  
15 incorporates by reference 40 CFR 265, Subpart F.

#### 16 **3.5.2.2 Well Locations and Design**

17 The original RCRA monitoring plan for LLWMA-1 (WHC-SD-EN-AP-015, *Revised*  
18 *Ground-Water Monitoring Plan for the 200 Areas Low-Level Burial Grounds*) included four  
19 upgradient wells and nine downgradient wells. Because the unconfined aquifer is thin in this  
20 region (see Section 2.1), all of the wells monitor the top of the unconfined aquifer, and several  
21 are screened across the entire aquifer thickness. Casings and screens are stainless steel, and  
22 annular spaces are sealed with bentonite.

23 The monitoring-well network in 2007 includes 7 upgradient wells and 10 downgradient wells.  
24 No new wells for LLWMA-1 are included in recent versions of Tri-Party Agreement  
25 Milestone M-024. The groundwater monitoring well network at this landfill is shown in  
26 Figure 3-3.


#### 27 **3.5.2.3 Results of Groundwater Monitoring**

28 Specific conductance of groundwater has increased in some LLWMA-1 wells since 1998 and  
29 exceeded the upgradient/downgradient comparison value in downgradient well 299-E33-34 in  
30 fiscal year 2006 (PNNL-16346). Specific conductance has exceeded the comparison value in  
31 another downgradient well, 299-E32-10, in the past. The exceedances are related to a regional  
32 nitrate plume and not LLWMA-1. Other indicator parameters were below comparison values in  
33 fiscal year 2006.

34

1  
2  
3

Figure 3-3. Groundwater Monitoring Wells at the 218-E-10 Landfill (LLWMA-1) (PNNL-16346).



4

1 **3.5.3 218-E-12B Landfill (LLWMA-2) Groundwater**  
2 **Monitoring**

3 The 218-E-12B Landfill comprises LLWMA-2, located in the northeastern corner of the  
4 200 East Area.

5 **3.5.3.1 History**

6 The monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant-indicator parameters,  
7 groundwater-quality parameters, drinking-water parameters, and site-specific parameters as  
8 required by WAC 173-303-400(3), which incorporates by reference 40 CFR 265, Subpart F.

9 **3.5.3.2 Well Location and Design**

10 The original monitoring plan for LLWMA-2 (WHC-SD-EN-AP-015) included four upgradient  
11 wells and eight downgradient wells. The monitoring network was subsequently expanded to  
12 include 16 wells, but as of fiscal year 2007, seven of these wells had gone dry. The water table  
13 has declined below the top of the basalt surface in the north half of LLWMA-2, leaving no  
14 unconfined aquifer (Section 2.1). Consequently, no replacement wells are proposed. Deeper  
15 aquifers are isolated from this landfill by the low-permeability basalts.

16 Because the unconfined aquifer is thin in this region, monitoring wells are screened across the  
17 entire aquifer thickness. Casings and screens are stainless steel, and annular spaces are sealed  
18 with bentonite. The groundwater monitoring-well network at this landfill is shown in Figure 3-4.

19 **3.5.3.3 Results of Groundwater Monitoring**


20 Indicator parameters did not exceed comparison values in fiscal year 2006 (PNNL-16346).  
21 Specific conductance has been increasing for several years in wells monitoring the southeast  
22 portion of the site. Groundwater in these wells has elevated sulfate, chloride, nitrate, and  
23 calcium. Similar chemistry was seen in former upgradient well 299-E34-7, which went dry in  
24 2006. The source of this chemistry is not clear, but may be caused by leaching or infiltration  
25 processes within the vadose zone. Total organic carbon and total organic halides also are  
26 elevated in the southeast wells, although levels were below the upgradient/downgradient  
27 comparison value. Because these constituents also were elevated in the former upgradient well,  
28 the source does not appear to be LLWMA-2.

29 **3.5.4 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, and 218-W-5 Landfills**  
30 **(LLWMA-3) Groundwater Monitoring**

31 The 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, and 218-W-5 Landfills, located in the north-central part of the  
32 200 West Area, comprise LLWMA-3.

33

Figure 3-4. Groundwater Monitoring Wells at the 218-E-12B Landfill (LLWMA-2) (PNNL-16346).



3-46

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

#### 1 **3.5.4.1 History**

2 The monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant-indicator parameters,  
3 groundwater-quality parameters, drinking-water parameters, and site-specific parameters as  
4 required by WAC 173-303-400(3), "Standards," which incorporates by reference 40 CFR 265,  
5 Subpart F.

#### 6 **3.5.4.2 Well Location and Design**

7 The original RCRA monitoring plan for LLWMA-3 (WHC-SD-EN-AP-015) included 2 shallow  
8 upgradient wells, 11 shallow downgradient wells, and 2 deep monitoring wells (one upgradient  
9 and one downgradient). The shallow wells were designed to monitor the top portion of the  
10 unconfined aquifer and were completed with 6.1 m (20-ft) screens that extended approximately  
11 4.6 m (15 ft) below and 1.5 m (5 ft) above the water table. The deep wells were installed with  
12 6 m (20-ft) screened intervals at the bottom of the unconfined aquifer. Well casings and screens  
13 are stainless steel, and annular spaces are sealed with bentonite. The monitoring-well network  
14 subsequently was expanded to include 20 wells, but 16 of the shallow wells went dry as a result  
15 of declining water table levels from reduced artificial recharge associated with elimination of  
16 liquid-waste discharges to the soil column.

17 DOE installed three downgradient wells in 2006. These newer wells are completed with 10.8 m  
18 (35-ft) screens to extend their useful lives as the water table declines. New upgradient wells and  
19 additional downgradient wells have been proposed and are included in the Tri-Party Agreement  
20 M-024 Milestone priority list. The groundwater monitoring-well network at the LLWMA-3  
21 landfills is shown in Figure 3-5.

#### 22 **3.5.4.3 Results of Groundwater Monitoring**

23 Currently there are no monitoring wells on the upgradient (west) side of LLWMA-3. For this  
24 reason, statistical upgradient/downgradient comparisons have been suspended until new  
25 upgradient wells are installed and background statistics are reestablished (PNNL-16346).

### 26 **3.5.5 218-W-4B and 218-W-4C Landfills (LLWMA-4)** 27 **Groundwater Monitoring**

28 The 218-W-4B and 218-W-4C Landfills, located in the south-central part of the 200 West Area,  
29 comprise LLWMA-4.


#### 30 **3.5.5.1 History**

31 The monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant-indicator parameters,  
32 groundwater-quality parameters, drinking-water parameters, and site-specific parameters as  
33 required by WAC 173-303-400(3), which incorporates by reference 40 CFR 265, Subpart F

34

1  
2  
3

Figure 3-5. Groundwater Monitoring Wells at the 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, and 218-W-5 Landfills (LLWMA-3) (PNNL-16346).



4

### 1 **3.5.5.2 Well Location and Design**

2 The original monitoring plan for LLWMA-4 (WHC-SD-EN-AP-015) included three shallow  
3 upgradient wells, nine shallow downgradient wells, and two deep monitoring wells (one  
4 upgradient and one downgradient). The shallow wells were designed to monitor the top portion  
5 of the unconfined aquifer and were completed with 9.1 m (30-ft) screens that extended  
6 approximately 7.6 m (25 ft) below and 1.5 m (5 ft) above the water table. The deep wells were  
7 installed with 3 to 9.1 m (10- to 30-ft) screened intervals at or near the bottom of the aquifer.  
8 Well casings and screens are stainless steel, and annular spaces are sealed with bentonite.

9 The network was expanded to 19 wells, but 12 of them went dry because of declining water table  
10 levels. DOE installed four wells in 2005 and 2006. These newer wells are completed with  
11 10.7 m (35-ft) screens to extend their useful lives as the water table declines. Additional  
12 locations for new wells have been identified and prioritized under Tri-Party Agreement M-024  
13 Milestone. The current groundwater monitoring network at the LLWMA-4 Landfills is shown in  
14 Figure 3-6.

### 15 **3.5.5.3 Results of Groundwater Monitoring**

16 RCRA monitoring provides no evidence that LLWMA-4 has contaminated the groundwater.  
17 In fiscal year 2006, several downgradient wells exceeded the critical mean for total organic  
18 halides, a continuation of previous exceedances (PNNL-16346). The elevated total organic  
19 halides are attributed to CCl<sub>4</sub>. Concentrations of CCl<sub>4</sub> in LLWMA-4 wells are consistent with  
20 the regional plume that originated from other 200 West Area liquid-waste disposal sites.  
21 However, air sampling of vent risers from trenches in LLWMA-4 indicated the presence of CCl<sub>4</sub>  
22 in 2002. Subsequent soil-gas sampling was performed to determine if CCl<sub>4</sub> contamination is  
23 present in the vadose zone (CP-13514).

### 24 **3.5.6 Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill** 25 **Groundwater Monitoring**

26 The NRDWL is located in the central part of the Hanford Site about 5.5 km (3.4 mi) southeast of  
27 the 200 East Area.

#### 28 **3.5.6.1 History**

29 The monitoring wells have been sampled since 1986 for contaminant-indicator parameters,  
30 groundwater-quality parameters, drinking-water parameters, and site-specific parameters as  
31 required by WAC 173-303-400(3), which incorporates by reference 40 CFR 265, Subpart F.

32



### 1 **3.5.6.2 Well Location and Design**

2 The revised monitoring plan for the NRDWL (PNNL-12227) included two shallow upgradient  
3 wells, five shallow downgradient wells, and two deeper monitoring wells (one upgradient and  
4 one downgradient) that are screened at the base of the uppermost unconfined aquifer. The  
5 shallow wells were designed to monitor the top portion of the unconfined aquifer and were  
6 completed with 6 to 12 m (20- to 40-ft) screened intervals. The deeper wells were installed with  
7 3 m (10-ft) screened intervals. Well casings and screens are stainless steel, and annular spaces  
8 are sealed with bentonite. The groundwater monitoring well network at the NRDWL is shown in  
9 Figure 3-7.

### 10 **3.5.6.3 Results of Groundwater Monitoring**

11 The values for RCRA indicator parameters at the NRDWL did not exceed their  
12 upgradient/downgradient comparison values in fiscal year 2006 for three of the indicator  
13 parameters: pH, total organic carbon, and total organic halides. However, specific conductance  
14 exceeded its comparison value in four downgradient wells, a continuation of previous  
15 exceedances (PNNL-16346). The increased specific conductance most likely is caused by  
16 increases in the concentrations of nonhazardous constituents (bicarbonate, calcium, manganese,  
17 and sulfate) from the adjacent 600 CL (Figure 3-7) to the south.


## 18 **3.6 POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO HUMAN** 19 **HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

20 This section presents and discusses the conceptual exposure model developed to identify  
21 potential impacts to human health and the environment from landfills in the 200-SW-1 and  
22 200-SW-2 OUs. Existing information pertaining to contaminant sources, release mechanisms,  
23 transport media, exposure routes, and receptors is discussed to develop a preliminary conceptual  
24 understanding of potential risks and exposure pathways. This information will be used to  
25 support further evaluation of potential human-health and environmental risk, based on the RI  
26 results, as part of the RI/FS documents for the 200-SW-2 OU. Landfills in the 200-SW-1 OU  
27 will be closed independently of the RI/FS process.

28

1 Figure 3-7. Groundwater Monitoring Wells at the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste  
2 Landfill and 600 Area Central Landfill (Solid Waste Landfill) (PNNL-16346).

3



4

### 1 3.6.1 Contaminant Sources and Release Mechanisms

2 As mentioned in Section 2.2.1, the primary sources of contaminants at the 200-SW-1 and  
 3 200-SW-2 OU landfills were the major facilities (e.g., T Plant, 222-S Laboratory, tank farms,  
 4 U Plant, REDOX, PUREX, B Plant, Hot Semiworks Plant) and support operations in the  
 5 200 East and 200 West Areas. Many of the pieces of equipment from these facilities have a high  
 6 dose rate associated with them (see, e.g., HW-63703, *Disposition of Contaminated Processing*  
 7 *Equipment at Hanford Atomic Products Information 1958 - 1959*). The packaged waste from  
 8 operations also contains significant radionuclide activity from the cesium and strontium  
 9 components of the waste (ARH-2762). Releases of contaminants from the 200-SW-1 and  
 10 200-SW-2 OU sites can occur through infiltration (movement of wastewater through the soil),  
 11 resuspension of contaminated soil (erosion or mechanical disturbances), volatilization  
 12 (movement of organic chemicals through the soil and into the air), biotic uptake (plant uptake or  
 13 animal ingestion), leaching (contaminant release from rain or snowmelt exposure), and external  
 14 radiation (gamma). The dominant mechanism of vertical contaminant transport in the 200-SW-1  
 15 and 200-SW-2 OUs is from infiltration and leaching, with rainwater or snowmelt as driving  
 16 forces, because the volumes of liquids discharged at the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU sites were  
 17 very small. It is not likely that groundwater has been impacted from these landfills.

### 18 3.6.2 Development of Contaminants of Potential 19 Concern

20 A set of radiological and organic COPCs that may be present in the 200-SW-2 OU waste sites is  
 21 currently under development for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills, independent of the Phase I-B DQO  
 22 process. This set of COPCs will be based on the following:

- 23 • 200 Areas plant operations as identified in various DQO documents for the 200 Areas  
 24 OUs, including the 200-CW-1, 200-CS-1, 200-CW-5, 200-LW-1, 200-LW-2, 200-MW-1,  
 25 200-PW-1, 200-PW-2, 200-PW-4, 200-TW-1, and 200-TW-2 OUs
- 26 • The ecological risk-assessment DQOs for the 200 Areas (WMP-20570, *Central Plateau*  
 27 *Terrestrial Ecological Risk Assessment Data Quality Objectives Summary Report –*  
 28 *Phase I*; WMP-25493, *Central Plateau Terrestrial Ecological Risk Assessment Data*  
 29 *Quality Objectives Summary Report – Phase II*); WMP-29253, *Central Plateau*  
 30 *Terrestrial Ecological Risk Assessment Data Quality Objectives Summary Report –*  
 31 *Phase III*
- 32 • As outlined in the 200 Areas Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28).

33 Because this Phase I-B DQO process is focused on application of historical records and  
 34 nonintrusive survey techniques (no soil samples will be collected during Phase I-B), the standard  
 35 COPC development process and exclusion rationale do not apply at this time. Instead, the COPC  
 36 list is limited to contaminants that are readily detectable via nonintrusive survey techniques.  
 37 Nevertheless, a comprehensive list of COPCs for the 200-SW-2 OU will be documented during  
 38 the Phase II DQO process to support intrusive characterization. Table 3-6 lists the COPCs  
 39 identified for the characterization techniques to be used during Phase I-B.

1

Table 3-6. 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Phase I-B Contaminants of Potential Concern List.

Contaminants of Potential Concern	Rationale for Inclusion
<i>Radioactive Constituents</i>	
Cesium-137 Cobalt-60 Europium-152 Europium-154	Gamma-emitting isotopes with high energy emissions that may be detected from within caissons by nonintrusive radiological detection methods.
<i>Volatile Organics</i>	
Volatile organics listed in Appendix A of this RI/FS work plan.	Analytical results and measurements in various trenches in the 200-SW-2 OU landfills have detected numerous different volatile organic compounds in soil-vapor samples. Volatile organics release vapors that may be detected in the soil by nonintrusive techniques.

### 2 3.6.2.1 Potential Human and Ecological Receptors

3 Potential receptors (human and ecological) may be exposed to the affected media through several  
4 exposure pathways, including the following:

- 5 • Ingestion of contaminated soils, sediments, or biota
- 6 • Inhalation of contaminant dusts, vapors, or gases
- 7 • Dermal contact with contaminated soils or sediments
- 8 • Direct exposure to external gamma radiation in site soils and sediments or exposed waste.

9 Potential human receptors include site workers (current and future) and site visitors (occasional  
10 users), including intruders. Site worker and visitor exposure pathways primarily would involve  
11 incidental soil/sediment ingestion, inhalation of contaminants, dermal contact with contaminated  
12 soils/sediments, and external gamma radiation. Potential ecological receptors include terrestrial  
13 plants and animals using the sites. More details on these specific receptors were presented in  
14 Section 3.3.2. Site biota exposures primarily would involve incidental soil/sediment ingestion,  
15 biota ingestion (e.g., coyotes eating prey that live on the site or deer consuming plants growing  
16 on the site), dermal contact with contaminated soils/sediments, and external gamma radiation.  
17 A summary of the contaminant types, exposure mechanisms, and principal receptors for the  
18 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs is provided in Table 3-7. The conceptual exposure pathway  
19 model is presented graphically in Appendix E.

Table 3-7. Summary of Contaminants, Sources, Receptors, and Exposure Mechanisms for the  
200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units.

Contaminant Category	Sources	Potential Exposure Mechanisms	Receptors
Radionuclides <sup>a</sup>	Soil	Ingestion, inhalation (fugitive dust), direct dermal contact, and external exposure	Workers, intruders, visitors, plants, and animals
Metals	Soil	Ingestion and inhalation (fugitive dust)	Workers, intruders, visitors, plants, and animals
Organic compounds (volatile and semivolatile compounds)	Soil, air	Ingestion, inhalation	Workers, intruders, visitors, plants, and animals
Asbestos	Soil, air	Inhalation	Workers

<sup>a</sup>Only applies to the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit landfills.

### 1 3.6.2.2 Potential Impacts

2 This section discusses potential impacts to human and ecological receptors based on existing  
3 information. Potential contaminant exposures and health impacts to humans largely are  
4 dependent on land use.

5 A remediation pathway at the historical landfills that involves excavation and repackaging of  
6 waste could result in significant worker impacts. The 200-SW-2 OU RI and FS will explore the  
7 decision between the potentially high-dose, short-term risk of removal and the potentially lower  
8 dose, longer term effects if the waste is remediated with other options. Data collected to evaluate  
9 impacts to work safety will be balanced against consideration for reducing impacts to future  
10 intruders.

11 A SLERA for the Central Plateau landfills was developed in 2002. Based on the results of this  
12 SLERA, the full EPA eight-step ecological risk-assessment process was initiated in 2003. The  
13 DOE expects to complete the ecological risk assessment in conjunction with the ongoing RI/FS  
14 processes for the 200 Areas. The ecological risk-assessment process may identify additional  
15 characterization needs. Those needs could include soil sampling and analysis, biological studies  
16 (including sampling and analysis), or other studies. Any data needs may apply to one or more  
17 OUs. Ecological receptors have been identified and potential impacts to those receptors have  
18 been evaluated at landfills in the 200 Areas (PNNL-13230, *Hanford Site Environmental Report*  
19 *for Calendar Year 1999* (including some historical and early 2000 information); PNL-2253,  
20 *Ecology of the 200 Area Plateau Waste Management Environs: A Status Report*; and  
21 WHC-SD-EN-TI-216, *Vegetation Communities Associated with the 100-Area and the 200-Area*  
22 *Facilities on the Hanford Site*). The vegetation cover on the Central Plateau predominantly is a  
23 rabbitbrush-cheatgrass and sagebrush-cheatgrass in association with the incidental presence of  
24 herbaceous and annual species. Many areas are disturbed and void of vegetation or sparsely  
25 populated with annuals and weedy species such as Russian thistle. The contamination pathways  
26 to ecological exposures for the landfills are minimized by the stabilization activities that have  
27 been conducted.

### 28 3.6.3 Conceptual Site Models

29 Preliminary CSMs first were initially developed for the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs in  
30 DOE/RL-96-81; these CSMs were generalized models at the OU scale. Using landfill-specific  
31 information based on the historical-records research and results from the Phase I-A  
32 investigations, updated CSMs have been developed. Bin-level and site-specific CSMs are  
33 presented in Appendix E. Additional work to create CSMs for the 200-SW-1 OU landfills will  
34 not be performed, because these landfills likely will be closed independent of the RI/FS process.

35 The conceptual-exposure pathway model is included in Appendix E to develop an understanding  
36 of potential risks and exposure pathways associated with the 200-SW-2 OU landfills. This  
37 information forms the basis for an evaluation of potential human-health and environmental risk.

### 1 3.6.3.1 Hanford Site Feature, Event, and Process Methodology

2 PNNL-SA-36387, *A Comprehensive and Systematic Approach to Developing and Documenting*  
3 *Conceptual Models of Contaminant Release and Migration at the Hanford Site*, and  
4 PNNL-SA-42671, *A Systematic Approach for Developing Conceptual Models of Contaminant*  
5 *Transport at the Hanford Site*, described a comprehensive and systematic approach for  
6 developing and documenting Hanford Site-specific CSMs based on the features, events, and  
7 processes methodology used in scenario development for nuclear-waste-disposal programs  
8 (OECD/NEA, *Features, Events, and Processes [FEPs] for Geologic Disposal of Radioactive*  
9 *Waste: An International Database [Radioactive Waste Management]*). Given the large number  
10 of factors potentially applicable to conceptual site models for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills,  
11 application of the features, events, and processes analysis methodology was applied to help focus  
12 the conceptual site models in support of the RI/FS process for the 200-SW-2 OU.

13 The features, events, and processes methodology facilitates identification and  
14 screening/prioritization of factors that can be assembled into a limited number of scenarios or  
15 conceptual models to describe the potential risk sources, migration, and impacts relevant to the  
16 decisions made. Together with an understanding of the level of uncertainty about the most  
17 dominant factors, the relative effect of those factors on the decision errors can be analyzed.  
18 This, in turn, can help to focus the RI data collection by targeting the most dominant factors with  
19 the greatest level of uncertainty, which could contribute the most to the decision errors.

20 If, through field sampling, it is determined that the level of uncertainty can be reduced  
21 (e.g., sampling results are within the envelope of expected conditions), then a subsequent  
22 reduction in the decision errors can be expected. If, however, the results are outside the expected  
23 envelope of expected conditions, then uncertainty goes up as do the decision errors.

24 The streamlined approach for application of the Hanford Site features, events, and processes  
25 methodology to the 200-SW-2 OU consisted of two main phases. The initial phase was aimed at  
26 screening the Hanford Site features, events, and processes list against the existing conceptual site  
27 models to evaluate completeness and to record current project assumptions and technical  
28 arguments. Most of the primary Hanford Site features, events, and processes that are considered  
29 most relevant and important (and their interrelationships) were graphically portrayed on a  
30 process-relationship diagram developed in PNNL-SA-34515, *Use of Process Relationship*  
31 *Diagrams in Development of Conceptual Models*. Identification and prioritization (dominance)  
32 of these primary Hanford Site features, events, and processes was generated through a series of  
33 meetings held with representatives of the DQO team and other technical experts.

34 The second phase included an evaluation of all primary Hanford Site features, events, and  
35 processes previously identified as potentially relevant to Hanford Site clean-up (WMP-22922,  
36 *Prototype Hanford Features, Events, and Processes [HFEP] Graphical User Interface*). This  
37 evaluation included a subjective analysis and prioritization (based on a consensus of professional  
38 judgments) of those components of the conceptual site models (Hanford Site features, events,  
39 and processes) considered potentially dominant vs subordinate with respect to their impacts on  
40 remediation decision errors.

1 Using the process-relationship diagram developed for the 200-SW-2 OU and other supporting  
2 documentation on conceptual site model components, a methodical screening was conducted of  
3 the primary and the lower Hanford Site features, events, and processes. During this screening,  
4 some additional primary Hanford Site features, events, and processes were identified and  
5 incorporated into the primary list. This resulted in a total of 240 primary Hanford Site features,  
6 events, and processes. Of these, 81 were identified as potentially dominant to RI and clean-up of  
7 the 200-SW-2 OU, 78 were identified as subordinate, and 81 were identified as not being  
8 applicable.

9 Further analysis of the lower tiered Hanford Site features, events, and processes associated with  
10 the primary Hanford Site features, events, and processes considered potentially applicable to the  
11 200-SW-2 OU yielded a total of 90 individual (primary and/or lower tiered) Hanford Site  
12 features, events, and processes considered potentially dominant. Likewise, analysis of the lower  
13 tiered Hanford Site features, events, and processes yielded 87 potentially subordinate Hanford  
14 Site features, events, and processes.

15 Further detail regarding this Hanford Site features, events, and processes analysis can be found in  
16 SGW-34462, *Application of the Hanford Site Feature, Event, and Process Methodology to*  
17 *Support Development of Conceptual Site Models for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills.*

18

This page intentionally left blank.

## 4.0 WORK PLAN APPROACH AND RATIONALE

This chapter presents an overview of the approach that is planned to conduct additional investigations of the 200-SW-2 OU. The 200-SW-1 OU landfills are not included in this chapter, because no further characterization of these sites is planned at this time. Additional characterization likely will be required in support of the cover design during the post-ROD phase. These landfills are proposed to undergo closure as described in Chapter 5.0 of this RI/FS work plan.

### 4.1 SUMMARY OF DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVE PROCESS

The RI needs for the 200-SW-2 OU were developed in accordance with the DQO process (EPA/240/B-06/001, *Guidance on Systematic Planning Using the Data Quality Objectives Process*, EPA QA/G-4). The DQO process is a seven-step planning approach that is used to develop a data-collection strategy consistent with data uses and needs. The goals of the process are to identify the data required to refine the preliminary site conceptual model and support remedial decisions.

The Phase I-B DQO process to support the RI/FS work plan was implemented by a team of subject matter experts and key decision makers. Subject matter experts provided input on regulatory issues, the history and physical condition of the sites, and sampling and analysis methods. Key decision makers from the DOE, Ecology, and EPA participated in the process to develop the characterization approach outlined in the Phase I-B DQO summary report (SGW-33253). The DQO process and involvement of the team of experts and decision makers provide a high degree of confidence that the right type, quantity, and quality of data are collected to fulfill the informational needs of the RI decisional process. The DQO summary report presents the results of the DQO process for characterization of the landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU.

Objectives identified for the 200-SW-2 OU DQO process incorporated into the RI/FS work plan approach include the following.

- Determine the environmental measurements necessary to support the RI/FS process and remedial decision-making.
- Identify the data needed for development of the RI/FS work plan and SAP.
- Develop preliminary conceptual site models that reflect the physical characteristics of the landfills and the anticipated distribution of contaminants known to date. Data collection will support refinement of the models.
- Identify evaluation and preliminary remediation strategies that are inclusive of both RCRA and CERCLA requirements for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills.

1 The DQO process determined that the complexity of the landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU argue in  
2 favor of developing a binning approach to support characterization and remedial-action decisions  
3 for the sites. Bins were developed based on conceptual site models for sites, using existing site  
4 knowledge. A description of the six site bins is provided in Chapter 3.0 of this work plan.

5 In addition to site binning, the Phase I-B DQO process determined that characterization of the  
6 200-SW-2 OU landfills should be performed in a phased manner, beginning with additional  
7 nonintrusive characterization techniques, then progressively moving to more intrusive  
8 characterization techniques in future phases. The DQO process determined that the most  
9 appropriate method to evaluate the landfills in all six bins is through an approach that first uses  
10 historical records (e.g., logbooks, burial records) to focus the locations for nonintrusive field  
11 characterization work. In turn, the results of the intrusive and nonintrusive characterization work  
12 will be used to further refine the preliminary conceptual site models and focus future phase  
13 (Phases II and III) characterization. This approach will help to ensure that remediation activities  
14 are performed at sites where there is a potential risk to human health or the environment because  
15 of the presence of contamination above remediation standards. This approach initially will  
16 require survey or field screening (or both) of the landfills within a bin to determine the presence  
17 of contamination. The surveys and screening methods will involve the use of field  
18 instrumentation to evaluate the levels of radioactive and chemical COPCs. The results from the  
19 surveys and screening will provide a basis for determining the need for, and the extent of, further  
20 intrusive investigation. This phased approach to characterization is discussed in further detail in  
21 Section 5.3, and depicted graphically in Figure 5-2 in Chapter 5.0 of this RI/FS work plan.

22 Data used to make decisions regarding the remediation of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills will be  
23 collected and managed in accordance with DQOs to ensure data quality. The DQO process  
24 ensures that the data collected are of a type, quantity, and quality commensurate with the  
25 importance and intended use of the data. DQOs and quality-assurance objectives ensure that  
26 decisions made using the data are technically and scientifically sound and legally defensible.

27 The SAP (Appendix A) describes site-investigation activities. The SAP includes a quality  
28 assurance project plan, which defines the processes used to produce quality data and ensure that  
29 operations are fully compliant with applicable requirements. Sampling and sample handling are  
30 performed in accordance with approved Fluor Hanford procedures.

31 The data-quality assessment process compares completed field-sampling activities to those  
32 proposed in corresponding sampling documents and provides an evaluation of the resulting data.  
33 The purpose of the data evaluation is to determine if quantitative data are of the correct type and  
34 are of adequate quality and quantity to meet the project DQOs to support the decision-making  
35 process. The data-quality assessment is conducted in accordance with approved Fluor Hanford  
36 procedures.

#### 37 **4.1.1 Data Uses**

38 Existing information, as provided through the ongoing records research process for the  
39 200-SW-2 OU landfills, was used to perform the initial grouping or binning of the sites. The  
40 waste inventory information compiled to date also was used to establish and refine specific

1 details for each waste site. This information includes any available disposal history for the site  
2 that will assist the field team to do the following:

- 3 • Establish the locations of burial trenches
- 4 • Identify the primary COPCs
- 5 • Focus on a subset of the COPCs
- 6 • Provide a basis for estimating the lateral and vertical extent of contamination
- 7 • Provide a basis for focusing future-phase intrusive sampling
- 8 • Determine the stratigraphy beneath the landfills.

9 The landfill boundaries (surface area and depth) must be determined to support the selection and  
10 evaluation of appropriate site remediation technologies. The geophysical methods (i.e., EMI,  
11 total magnetic field, and GPR) used during Phase I-A and planned in Phase I-B investigations are  
12 recognized industry standards and provide necessary levels of site interrogation to determine the  
13 surface area and depth of buried wastes. Additionally, the geophysical methods can differentiate  
14 between metallic and nonmetallic materials, giving some indication of the type of waste buried at  
15 a location. Data collected from geophysical investigations will be used to guide future intrusive  
16 characterization activities to understand the physical, chemical, and radiological nature of the  
17 waste and the extent of subsurface contamination. This understanding is necessary to identify  
18 suitable retrieval, in situ treatment, and capping technologies for evaluation during the FS.

19 The 200-SW-2 OU landfills may contain many different radioactive and hazardous chemical  
20 constituents; therefore, it is important to screen COPCs for risk assessments. Often this  
21 screening is done as part of a screening assessment, the purpose of which is to evaluate the  
22 available data, identify data gaps, and screen COPCs. Screening may be accomplished by using  
23 a set of toxicological benchmarks. These benchmarks are helpful in determining whether  
24 contaminants warrant further assessment or are at a level that requires no further attention. If a  
25 chemical concentration or the reported detection limit exceeds a lower benchmark, further  
26 analysis is needed to determine the hazards posed by that chemical. If, however, the chemical  
27 concentration falls below the lower benchmark value, the chemical may be eliminated from  
28 further study. Concentrations exceeding an upper screening benchmark indicate that the  
29 chemical in question is clearly of concern and may require remedial actions. Existing  
30 chemical-use records, process flowsheets, waste-disposal records, and other historical  
31 information were reviewed to support development of the list of COPCs discussed in  
32 Chapter 3.0.

33 Knowledge of the lateral and vertical extent of contamination is important to the identification,  
34 evaluation, and selection of remediation technologies. Based on historical records, the  
35 200-SW-2 OU landfills received dry waste for the most part. Although historical records  
36 indicate disposal of small volumes of liquids in some landfill trenches, the liquids typically were  
37 sorbed and containerized. Understanding the COPCs is important to the lateral and vertical  
38 extent of contamination because of retardation factors ( $R_d$ ) and distribution coefficients ( $K_d$ )  
39 affecting contaminant fate and transport through the vadose zone. Some contaminants  
40 (e.g., technetium) have  $K_d$ s and  $R_d$ s such that they migrate with infiltrating moisture. Other  
41 contaminants (e.g., plutonium) move very little in surrounding soils, unless they are in the  
42 presence of complexing agents, low pH, or other conditions favorable to plutonium migration.  
43 Still other contaminants (e.g., carbon tetrachloride) are dense nonaqueous-phase liquids that can  
44 move independent of soil moisture in either the liquid or gaseous phase. Phase I-B of the site

1 investigations involves a limited number of direct pushes near the center of each landfill, with  
2 additional direct pushes in portions of landfills known to have been flooded in the past. These  
3 reconnaissance-level investigations will provide initial data in targeted areas to begin evaluating  
4 the presence of contamination and its lateral and vertical extent in the vadose zone. In addition,  
5 Phase I-B activities provide direction for future intrusive investigations to better define the  
6 nature and extent of vadose-zone contamination.

7 The stratigraphy beneath the 200-SW-2 OU landfills will have an impact on contaminant fate  
8 and transport and on the effectiveness of site-remediation technologies. Fine-grained sediment  
9 layers tend to retard the downward migration of liquids and are conducive to lateral spreading.  
10 Conversely, coarse-grained sediment layers provide little impediment to the downward flow of  
11 liquids. Existing lithologic logs from groundwater wells surrounding the periphery of the  
12 200-SW-2 OU landfills will be reviewed, and geologic cross-sections will be prepared. The  
13 limited number of direct pushes conducted during Phase I-B of the site investigation will provide  
14 data to evaluate the lateral continuity of geologic layers beneath the 200-SW-2 OU landfills and  
15 help to focus future intrusive site investigations.

16 Existing information was reviewed for the landfills to determine the dimensions of the sites,  
17 operating history, and potential waste inventory and forms. This information was used in the  
18 Phase I-A characterization to focus the nonintrusive characterization. Results of the Phase I-A  
19 characterization are used to further focus the characterization in Phase I-B. This combined  
20 information was used to develop the sampling approach for the landfills and to develop  
21 site-specific characterization activities for individual landfills in Phase I-B.

22 Data generated during the characterization of landfills will consist of output from field-screening  
23 instruments and nonintrusive surveys. These data will be used to focus future-phase intrusive  
24 sampling within the landfills and the vadose zone to support evaluation of the nature and extent  
25 of contamination, potential risks, need for interim remedial measures, and evaluation of remedial  
26 alternatives.

27 Data generated during Phase I-B characterization of the landfills will consist of analytical results  
28 for contaminants obtained from inside the landfills (direct pushes between the trenches) and from  
29 logging/surveys in adjacent soils. These data will be used to refine current information  
30 associated with the nature and extent of radiological and nonradiological contamination, support  
31 an initial evaluation (baseline) of potential human-health risks, assist in the evaluation and  
32 selection of a remedial alternative(s), and help to focus future intrusive site-investigation  
33 activities during subsequent phases. By defining the type and distribution of contamination, the  
34 preliminary conceptual models for contaminant distribution can be verified and refined.  
35 Determination of the lateral and vertical extent of contamination in soil surrounding the landfills  
36 will be evaluated using the data gathered by geophysical logging, limited direct pushes, and soil-  
37 vapor surveys from this and future phases of site investigation.

38 Determination of the lateral and vertical extent of contamination will require more extensive  
39 intrusive direct-push sampling and analysis using some combination of sodium-iodide  
40 spectral-gamma, passive-neutron, prompt fission neutron, thermal decay time, pulsed-neutron  
41 multimode gamma-ray spectroscopy, and moisture logging during future phases, and other tools  
42 deployable by direct-push techniques. The geophysical logging, limited direct pushes, and vapor

1 surveys conducted during Phase I-B will aid in identifying target locations for intrusive sampling  
2 and analysis during future phases of site investigation. If deep contamination is indicated  
3 (potentially extending to groundwater) after initial data gathering, subsequent evaluations  
4 (Phases II and III) will include plans for vadose-zone soil sampling and analysis to be completed  
5 to groundwater. Given the depth to groundwater (~76 m or 250 ft) and limitations of direct-push  
6 sampling technology (~30 m or 100 ft), "completion to groundwater" could be an expensive  
7 proposition and likely will require conventional drilling methods and handling of  
8 investigation-derived waste (IDW). With direct-push methods, knowledge of local geology will  
9 be used to determine the depth of sampling/characterization. Mobile contaminants (radiological  
10 and chemical) will tend to concentrate in fine-grained sediment layers beneath the burial trenches  
11 (~10 to 30 m or 50 to 100 ft). Initial direct-push wells will be logged for moisture to identify  
12 flow-restricting layers for more detailed sampling and analysis, using the dual-string sampling  
13 capability of the direct-push technology.

#### 14 **4.1.2 Data Needs**

15 A considerable amount of information has been presented in Chapters 2.0 and 3.0 of this RI/FS  
16 work plan regarding background information and existing characterization data. However, the  
17 existing data are not sufficient to determine the nature and extent of contamination for the  
18 200-SW-2 OU landfills. Pertinent existing information was used to develop the preliminary  
19 conceptual site models for the landfills. Additional information collected in Phase I-B and future  
20 phases will be used to further refine the CSMs and support development of a baseline risk  
21 assessment. For the majority of the landfills, information is available regarding location,  
22 construction design, and types of waste handled. But the data needed to verify and/or refine the  
23 conceptual contaminant-distribution model and conceptual exposure-pathway model are limited.

24 As stated in Section 4.1.1, data are needed to establish landfill boundaries, identify preliminary  
25 COPCs, focus on a subset of COPCs, provide a basis for estimating the lateral and vertical extent  
26 of contamination, provide a basis for determining future-phase intrusive sampling, and provide  
27 an understanding of the stratigraphy beneath the landfills. These data and evaluations are needed  
28 to support remedial decision making for the landfills and to help focus future intensive  
29 site-investigation activities during subsequent phases.

30 Further, data collection is needed for the landfills to support an evaluation of remedial  
31 alternatives based on the nine CERCLA criteria during the FS process. Because of the size of  
32 the landfills and complexity of the decisions concerning potential remedial alternatives, the  
33 data-collection strategy for the landfills is to use results of nonintrusive, surface-based sampling  
34 methods and field screening analyses, couples with direct pushes and well logging, to guide  
35 selection of locations for intrusive soil sampling and laboratory analyses or direct pushes  
36 (Phases II and III) to provide progressively more data.

37 Finally, additional data needs will be satisfied through focused treatability investigations.  
38 Pre-ROD treatability investigations will provide additional information for detailed analysis of  
39 site-remediation alternatives during the FS process in support of the proposed plan and  
40 subsequent ROD. Post-ROD treatability investigations will provide additional information to

1 support the remedial design and implementation of the remedial action. Separate DQOs, work  
2 plans, health/safety plans, and SAPs will be prepared for treatability investigations.

### 3 **4.1.3 Data Quality**

4 Data quality was addressed during the DQO process. Analytical performance criteria were  
5 established by evaluating potential ARARs and PRGs, which are regulatory thresholds and/or  
6 standards or derived risk-based thresholds. These potential ARARs and PRGs represent  
7 chemical-, location-, and action-specific requirements that are protective of human health and the  
8 environment. The potential ARARs and PRGs for the landfills that were considered in  
9 determining the detection-limit requirements are presented in the DQO summary report  
10 (SGW-33253). Regulatory thresholds and/or standards or preliminary cleanup levels provide the  
11 basis for establishing cleanup levels and dictate analytical performance levels (i.e., laboratory  
12 detection-limit requirements). Potentially applicable preliminary cleanup levels were identified  
13 and listed in the DQO summary report.

14 Detection-limit requirements and standards for precision and accuracy are used to define data  
15 quality. To provide the necessary data quality, detection limits should be lower than preliminary  
16 cleanup levels. Additional data quality is gained by establishing specific policies and procedures  
17 for the generation of analytical data and field quality-assurance/quality-control requirements.  
18 These requirements are discussed in detail in the SAP (Appendix A). Analytical performance  
19 requirements are specified in the DQO summary report (SGW-33253).

20 To provide the necessary data quality to support project requirements, detection limits should be  
21 lower than potential PRGs when possible. Analytical detection-limit tables provided in the SAP  
22 define the minimum detection limit, human-health action levels, quantitation limit, precision, and  
23 accuracy requirements for each analytical method. Clean-up levels protective of ecological  
24 receptors also are defined in the tables to verify that analytical detection limits can meet  
25 additional potential data-collection requirements. Additional data quality is gained by  
26 establishing the specific policies and procedures to be followed and specifying field  
27 quality-assurance/quality-control requirements. These procedures and requirements are  
28 discussed in detail in the SAP.

### 29 **4.1.4 Data Quantity**

30 Data quantity refers to the number of samples collected. Screening data were collected as part of  
31 the Phase I-A characterization activities and will be collected during Phase I-B characterization  
32 activities to provide an overview of site conditions and direction for future-phase  
33 site-investigation activities. An adequate number of survey points will be established based on  
34 an evaluation of site-specific conditions to ensure that the site is characterized sufficiently to  
35 support a basis for decisions. Because radioactive contamination survey and other  
36 field-screening results at the 200-SW-2 OU landfills will provide a significant amount of onsite  
37 data, the number of samples needed for laboratory analysis can be reduced. For Phase I-B  
38 activities, the number of samples needed to refine the preliminary conceptual site models and  
39 make decisions regarding future-phase site-investigation activities is based on a biased sampling  
40 approach.

1 Biased sampling is the intentional location of a sampling point based on existing information  
2 such as process knowledge, existing field-characterization data, and the expected behavior of the  
3 COPCs. This sampling approach is defined in Section 6.2.2 of the Implementation Plan  
4 (DOE/RL-98-28). Using this approach, sampling locations can be selected that increase the  
5 chance of encountering worst case areas of contamination.

6 Sample locations for landfills are based on the preliminary conceptual models of contaminant  
7 distribution presented in the DQO summary report (SGW-33253) and are presented in the SAP  
8 (Appendix A).

9 Because the 200-SW-2 OU landfills will be characterized using a phased approach, numbers of  
10 survey and sampling points will be determined based on information gathered during the  
11 previous phase. Each set of survey locations and associated data will be used to refine the  
12 conceptual site models and support remedial decision making in the feasibility study. The  
13 number and location of survey points currently defined for collection of data during Phase I-B  
14 characterization are presented in the SAP (Appendix A).

## 15 **4.2 CHARACTERIZATION APPROACH**

16 This section provides an overview of the phased characterization approach planned to meet the  
17 data needs for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills, as determined during the DQO process. The overall  
18 strategy for site characterization is to use an approach that progresses from less intrusive to more  
19 intrusive techniques to develop an adequate definition of site conditions to support a decision.  
20 The first step for all sites was to reassess the detailed, site-specific historical information and  
21 data gathered during Phase I-A characterization activities. The documentation in some cases will  
22 provide sufficient information to support the design of a site-survey plan. Field instruments and  
23 nondestructive-analysis equipment can provide an overview of site condition, such as the types  
24 and levels of contamination present and location and configuration of wastes. Results from these  
25 studies will be used to provide a basis for the next steps in the characterization  
26 (e.g., determination of locations requiring special attention, whether additional field screening or  
27 surveys are required, and/or whether samples should be collected). Additional characterization  
28 needs will be defined on a site-specific basis.

29 Phase I-B characterization activities within selected landfills will include passive soil-vapor  
30 surveys, radiological surveys, geophysical investigations, and visual inspection (caissons and  
31 unused portions of landfills). For the vadose-zone soils, borehole geophysical logging using  
32 spectral and gross-gamma, passive-neutron, and active-neutron (moisture) detectors, and other  
33 tools deployable by direct-push techniques will be performed. Small-diameter well casings will  
34 be driven to a depth of 30 m (100 ft) using direct-push technology (e.g., GeoProbe<sup>25</sup>, hydraulic  
35 hammer, or equivalent equipment). Well casings will be logged to determine regions of high  
36 moisture that also are likely areas for accumulation of mobile COPCs. High-moisture horizons  
37 will be logged with gross and spectral-gamma detectors and passive-neutron detectors to  
38 determine the presence of radioactive COPCs. Dual string casing will be driven into  
39 high-moisture zones to collect samples for analysis. Other tools deployable by direct-push

---

<sup>25</sup>GeoProbe is a registered trademark of Kejr, Inc., Salina, Kansas.

1 techniques and capable of in situ volatile organic compound sampling/analysis also are being  
2 considered.

3 The sampling strategy is designed to provide focused evaluations on potentially contaminated  
4 locations and media inside the landfills and in adjacent subsurface soils where migration may  
5 have occurred. Sampling and survey locations will be focused on various areas, based on the  
6 historical records research, as well as on the results of the Phase I-A nonintrusive  
7 characterization work.

8 Before intrusive activities are implemented, surface geophysical and radiation surveys will be  
9 conducted at all sampling locations. The surface geophysical surveys will be conducted using  
10 total magnetic field, GPR, and/or EMI and will aid in verifying buried utilities and subsurface  
11 anomalies. Furthermore, necessary excavation permits will be obtained in support of intrusive  
12 activities that will be conducted in previously disturbed areas within the landfills. Surface  
13 radiation surveys will identify areas of surface contamination that might impact the intrusive  
14 activities and health and safety requirements.

15 Further characterization of 200-SW-2 OU landfills is expected to be conducted in three phases.  
16 Phase I-B activities will be a combination of intrusive and nonintrusive activities. This phase  
17 consists of biased sampling that targets specific locations within and around the landfills. If  
18 known or suspected areas of waste accumulation cannot be identified, then locations will be  
19 selected randomly. Evaluation of the Phase I-B sampling data will be used to determine the  
20 current contaminant conditions inside the landfills and in adjacent soils at the direct-push  
21 locations. The specific landfills and sampling locations selected for investigation as part of  
22 Phase I-B are identified in the SAP.

23 The Phase II and III investigations will be initiated in out-years if Phase I-B results show COPC  
24 concentration values exceeding preliminary cleanup levels, or if data are inconclusive and cannot  
25 provide enough detail to support refinement of the conceptual site models and baseline risk  
26 assessment. Phases II and III likely will involve more intrusive investigations and require a  
27 larger data set for decision making. The Phase II and III evaluations are expected to entail more  
28 extensive sampling and laboratory analyses. Phase II and III data will support development of  
29 decision documents and completion of the RI/FS process. Selection of locations for Phase II and  
30 III sampling will be made after review of Phase I-B results. Phase II and III activities will be  
31 conducted under a separate DQO and a revision to this RI/FS work plan and SAP.

32 Phase I-B characterization activities are summarized in the following bullets, and described in  
33 more detail in the SAP (Appendix A).

- 34 • **Nonintrusive geophysical investigations** will be performed on the 218-E-2, 218-E-4,  
35 218-E-8, and 218-W-4A Landfills. All other landfills were surveyed with geophysical  
36 techniques as part of Phase I-A characterization activities.
- 37 • **Passive organic-vapor surveys** will be performed in the 218-W-3, 218-W-3AE,  
38 218-W-4B, and 218-W-5 Landfills. These landfills showed high concentrations of  
39 organic vapors when surveyed during Phase I-A characterization activities in 2006.  
40 Additional organic-vapor surveys are needed to focus the locations for potential active

1 organic-vapor sampling using direct-push techniques beneath the trenches during future  
2 phases.

- 3 • **Passive organic-vapor surveys** will be performed in the 218-E-1, 218-E-2A, 218-E-5,  
4 218-E 5A, 218-E-8, 218-E-12A, 218-W-1, 218-W-1A, 218-W-2, 218-W-2A, 218-W-3,  
5 and 218-W-11 Landfills. Organic-vapor surveys will be focused on those areas that  
6 showed a strong metallic signature during geophysical investigations performed as part of  
7 Phase I-A characterization activities. Passive organic-vapor surveys will be used to  
8 determine if containers of organic liquids may have been disposed in these landfills.  
9 Organic liquids were used in large quantities at the Plutonium Finishing Plant and fuel  
10 reprocessing facilities during their operating history. Future phases may deploy  
11 direct-push techniques to perform organic-vapor sampling beneath the trenches to  
12 differentiate the regional carbon tetrachloride plume from possible contributions from  
13 directly within the trenches.
- 14 • **Direct-push techniques** will be used in the centers of each of the 24 landfills. Pushes  
15 will be placed in areas between trenches, so that the buried waste is not penetrated. In  
16 addition to the center pushes, additional pushes will be performed in those landfills that  
17 have experienced historical events, such as rapid snow melt or infiltration of water, that  
18 could have provided a mechanism to cause contaminant migration. The direct pushes  
19 will employ gamma logging and moisture logging. Direct pushes also will be used to  
20 assess the stratigraphy under the landfills and to direct future-phase soil samples.
- 21 • **Intrusive inspection of the interiors of caissons** that are believed to be unused/empty  
22 will be conducted at the 218-W-4A and 218-W-4B Landfills. Evaluations will include  
23 both visual inspections and radiological-survey activities. Inspections will be used to  
24 determine if waste is present in the caissons. Caisson interior evaluations will include  
25 remote-camera surveys and radiological monitoring.
- 26 • **Borehole spectral logging** will be performed in a number of accessible boreholes and  
27 groundwater wells near the landfills, based on review of the most recent logging data and  
28 its applicability to Phase I-B site-investigation activities. Site well-status records indicate  
29 that wells may be accessible and are appropriately configured for geophysical logging.  
30 These wells are listed in the SAP (Appendix A). These wells represent data-collection  
31 points in the vicinity of the landfills. Logging of these wells will provide additional  
32 current site-specific information on contaminant distribution, both laterally and vertically,  
33 for comparison to previous surveys. Sodium-iodide spectral logging also will be  
34 conducted in the direct-push boreholes placed in the centers of each landfill, as discussed  
35 above.
- 36 • **Visual inspection** of unused portions and annexes of landfills will be performed during  
37 site walkdowns, coupled with review of aerial photographs, to locate disturbed soil within  
38 these areas. Areas that appear to be disturbed may be surveyed using geophysical  
39 techniques and/or radiological surveys to determine whether waste may be buried in these  
40 areas. After field surveys are completed, and if determined to be free of buried waste,  
41 these areas of unused landfills may be administratively reclassified in the WIDS

1 database, and permit changes will be initiated. The steps required to reclassify these  
2 areas are described in Chapter 5.0 of this RI/FS work plan.

### 3 **4.3 INVESTIGATION TECHNIQUES**

4 The following sections detail the proposed sampling and survey techniques to be used during  
5 Phase I-B characterization activities.

#### 6 **4.3.1 Surface Geophysical Surveys**

7 Several nonintrusive geophysical techniques are available and will be used as needed to gather  
8 information on buried waste. The geophysical surveys will be conducted in accordance with  
9 equipment manufacturers' recommendations and procedures using properly trained and qualified  
10 subcontractor personnel. Additional discussion on surface geophysical techniques is provided in  
11 EPA/625/R-92/007, *Use of Airborne, Surface, and Borehole Geophysical Techniques at*  
12 *Contaminated Sites: A Reference Guide*. Specific characterization locations and activities that  
13 will be used in Phase I-B are identified in the SAP (Appendix A).

##### 14 **4.3.1.1 Magnetometry**

15 Magnetometers permit rapid, noncontact surveys to locate buried metallic objects or features.  
16 This technique is applicable for use with buried metal waste forms or packages. Portable  
17 (one-person) field units can be used virtually anywhere that a person can walk, although they can  
18 be sensitive to local interferences such as fences and overhead wires. Field-portable  
19 magnetometers may be single or dual sensor. Dual-sensor magnetometers are called  
20 gradiometers, and they measure gradient of the magnetic field; single-sensor magnetometers  
21 measure total field. Magnetic surveys typically are run with two separate magnetometers. One  
22 magnetometer is used as the base station to record the earth's primary field. The other  
23 magnetometer is used as the rover to measure the spatial variation of the earth's field. The rover  
24 magnetometer is moved along a predetermined linear grid laid out at the site.

##### 25 **4.3.1.2 Ground-Penetrating Radar and Electromagnetic Induction**

26 Surface geophysical surveys using GPR and EMI techniques will be used to verify the locations  
27 of metallic or dense objects disposed of in the landfills. GPR uses a transducer to transmit  
28 frequency modulated electromagnetic energy into the ground. Interfaces in the ground, defined  
29 by contrasts in dielectric constants, magnetic susceptibility, and, to some extent, electrical  
30 conductivity, reflect the transmitted energy. The GPR system measures the travel time between  
31 transmitted pulses and the arrival of reflected energy. The reflected energy provides the means  
32 for mapping subsurface features of interest. The display and interpretation of GPR data are  
33 similar to those used for seismic-reflection data. When numerous adjacent profiles are collected,  
34 often in two orthogonal directions, a plan-view map showing the location and depth of  
35 underground features can be generated.

36 The EMI technique is a nonintrusive method of detecting, locating, and/or mapping shallow  
37 subsurface features. It complements GPR because of its response to metallic subsurface

1 anomalies and because it provides reconnaissance-level information over large areas to help  
2 focus GPR activities. The EMI techniques are used to determine the electrical conductivity of  
3 the subsurface and generally are used for shallow investigations. The method is based on  
4 a transmitting coil radiating an electromagnetic field that induces eddy currents in the earth.  
5 A resulting secondary electromagnetic field is measured at a receiving coil as a voltage that is  
6 linearly related to the subsurface conductivity.

#### 7 **4.3.2 Detection of Organic Vapors**

8 Passive soil-vapor samplers will be installed and collected to screen selected areas in the  
9 200-SW-2 OU landfills for the presence of volatile organic compounds. Results will be used to  
10 profile contamination in the landfills and determine the location of waste packages that may  
11 contain liquid organics that have breached their containment. Specific characterization locations  
12 and activities that will be used in Phase I-B are identified in the SAP (Appendix A).

13 Passive soil-vapor samplers, such as EMFLUX<sup>26</sup> or GORE-SORBER<sup>27</sup>, will be used to collect  
14 soil-vapor samples. These samplers consist of a small glass vial with an absorbent medium used  
15 to collect soil vapors. These samplers typically are placed in a shallow hole in the soil and left  
16 for a prescribed length of time, after which they are collected and sent to the manufacturer for  
17 analysis.

18 Whatever the relative concentration of source and associated soil gas, best results are realized  
19 when the ratio of soil-vapor measurements to actual subsurface concentrations remains as close  
20 to constant as possible. It is the reliability and consistency of this ratio, not the particular units of  
21 mass (e.g., nanograms), that determine usefulness. Therefore, follow-on intrusive sampling is  
22 required at points that show relatively high soil-vapor measurements, to obtain corresponding  
23 concentrations of buried contaminants. These values form the basis for approximating the  
24 required ratio. Once the ratio is established, it can be used in conjunction with the soil-vapor  
25 measurements (regardless of the units adopted) to estimate subsurface contaminant  
26 concentrations across the area surveyed. Specific conditions at individual sample points,  
27 including barometric pressure, soil porosity and permeability, and depth to contamination, can  
28 have significant impact on soil-vapor measurements at those locations.

29 The data can provide information that can be used to focus intrusive sampling and provide a list  
30 of expected volatile organic compounds.

#### 31 **4.3.3 Evaluation of Vadose-Zone Soils**

32 Intrusive investigations for the presence of contaminants in focused areas of the soils  
33 surrounding the landfills will be conducted using both indirect and direct evaluation techniques.

---

<sup>26</sup> EMFLUX is a registered trademark of Beacon Environmental Services, Inc., Bel Air, Maryland.

<sup>27</sup> GORE-SORBER is a trademark of W. L. Gore and Associates, San Francisco, California.

1 Subsurface investigations will include geophysical logging. Specific characterization locations  
2 and activities that will be used in Phase I-B are identified in the SAP (Appendix A).

### 3 **4.3.3.1 Direct-Push Investigative Techniques**

4 Subsurface investigations using direct-push installations will be employed as part of the  
5 assessment for soil surrounding selected landfills. This technology can be used to install casing  
6 and collect samples with minimal to no excess waste soil generated. Installations will be used to  
7 obtain information relating to a number of in situ soil characteristics including gamma  
8 radiological levels, alpha-emitting radionuclides through neutron measurement, organic-vapor  
9 concentrations, and soil moisture. This technology will work well in the unconsolidated  
10 sediments and fill material adjacent to buried waste. However, direct-push techniques vary  
11 considerably and range from static load rigs with hydraulic-push capabilities (e.g., cone  
12 penetrometers) to dynamic load rigs with hydraulic hammers (e.g., GeoProbe, EuroDrill<sup>28</sup>).  
13 Hanford Site experience favors the hydraulic hammer rigs over cone penetrometers because of  
14 their ability to "hammer through" consolidated material. The hydraulic hammer rigs also have  
15 the capability to rotate the drill string to facilitate rod insertion and extraction. Cone  
16 penetrometers, in contrast, tend to bend rods when encountering consolidated materials  
17 (i.e., compacted soil layers, rocks, caliche).

### 18 **4.3.3.2 Geophysical Logging**

19 Radioactivity levels will be measured in soils using geophysical-logging instrumentation. With  
20 the exception of *Bin 3 -- Dry Waste Alpha Landfills*, radioactive contamination generally is  
21 expected to be represented primarily by gamma emitters (e.g., Cs-137). Driven small-diameter  
22 casing will be installed and used for down-hole logging with gamma-logging tools. The depth of  
23 a driven casing will be limited by the subsurface conditions (i.e., cobbles or gravel), amount of  
24 driving force applied, and friction along the length of the casing. Gross-gamma and  
25 passive-neutron logging probes will be used to determine areas of potentially high Am-241  
26 (surrogate for plutonium) and Pu-239/240 concentrations. The small-diameter gross-gamma and  
27 passive-neutron-probe system uses bismuth-germanium-detector instrumentation for gross  
28 counting of the gamma-emitting radionuclides in the soil as a function of depth. The  
29 passive-neutron logging instrument with a He-3 detector can be configured to detect the neutron  
30 flux present in the below-ground soil environment. Active neutron logging will be used to  
31 determine soil-moisture content. Soil moisture will be reported as a percent volume fraction.  
32 Organic vapors present in the soil also can be detected using vapor instrumentation.

33 Spectral-gamma logging also will be performed in accessible boreholes and groundwater wells  
34 near the landfills. Site-well status records indicate that wells may be accessible and are  
35 appropriately configured for geophysical logging. A list of wells available for logging is  
36 presented in the SAP (Appendix A). Sodium-iodide spectral-gamma logging also may be  
37 performed in the direct-push boreholes.

38 Borehole-logging equipment currently in use for vadose-zone characterization at the Hanford  
39 Site includes spectral-gamma logging, neutron-moisture logging, and passive-neutron logging.

---

<sup>28</sup> Eurodrill is owned by Colcrete Eurodrill, Derbyshire, United Kingdom.

1 The spectral-gamma logging systems typically use either a cryogenically cooled, high-purity  
2 germanium (HPGe) crystal, or sodium-iodide or bismuth-germanate crystals to detect, identify,  
3 and quantify gamma-emitting radionuclides in the subsurface. While the HPGe detector is  
4 capable of higher “energy-peak” resolution, a minimum borehole inner diameter of 26 cm (4 in.)  
5 is required to deploy the HPGe detector because of the on-board cryogenic cooling system.  
6 Direct-push techniques typically do not accommodate 26 cm (4-in.-) diameter casings without  
7 much greater cost and much larger equipment, when compared to 13 cm (2-in.) and smaller  
8 casing typical of most direct-push techniques. An 18 cm (7-in.) casing was driven to the caliche  
9 layer (42.6 to 45.7 m or 140 to 150 ft bgs) in the 200 West Area in support of tank farms  
10 characterization in the SX, T, TX, and TY Tank Farms. The sodium-iodide and  
11 bismuth-germanate detectors are conducive to slim-hole applications. Of the two, the  
12 bismuth-germanate detector has a higher density and therefore higher efficiency. The  
13 bismuth-germanate also is more susceptible to being “swamped out” in high-radiation fields.

14 The neutron-moisture logging system uses a 50-mCi americium/beryllium source and H-3  
15 detector. Neutrons emitted from the source are scattered back to the detector after impinging on  
16 the surrounding materials. The dominant scattering mechanism in soil involves interaction with  
17 hydrogen atoms. The count rate at the detector is a function of the amount of hydrogen in the  
18 formation and can be correlated to soil-moisture content. Neutron-moisture logs are useful for  
19 stratigraphic correlations because of the tendency for fine-grained sediments to hold moisture  
20 and mobile contaminants.

21 Passive-neutron logging measures ambient neutron flux in the borehole and is a qualitative  
22 indicator of the presence of alpha-emitting radionuclides. Alpha particles emitted from the decay  
23 of transuranic elements (e.g., Pu-239, Am-241) interact with light elements in the soil (primarily  
24 oxygen), generating secondary neutrons by (alpha, n) reactions.

#### 25 **4.3.4 Inspection and Survey of Unused Caisson** 26 **Interiors**

27 Intrusive inspection of the interiors of caissons that are believed to be unused/empty will be  
28 conducted at two of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills. Evaluations will include both visual inspections  
29 and radiological-survey activities. Inspections will be used to determine if waste is present in the  
30 caissons. Visual inspections will be conducted directly or remotely, depending on access  
31 availability and a hazard assessment. Caisson interior evaluations may include remote-camera  
32 surveys, and radiological monitoring. Those evaluations or surveys that are applicable for  
33 Phase I-B are identified below. Specific characterization locations and activities that will be  
34 used in Phase I-B are identified in the SAP (Appendix A).

##### 35 **4.3.4.1 Visual Inspections and Camera Surveys**

36 Examination of the interior of suspect unused/empty caissons will be performed using a remote  
37 camera for selected caissons, where access is available and exposure hazards are manageable.  
38 This investigative technique will provide real-time information on the current conditions within  
39 these caissons. Conditions such as the extent of corrosion, debris, and waste present (if any) will  
40 be noted. Remote-camera surveys also will be used to document caissons that are fully intact,  
41 dry, and show no signs of past failure.

#### 1 4.3.4.2 Hand-Held and Deployed Instrument Radiological Surveys

2 Intrusive radiological surveys of unused/empty caisson interiors will be used to provide  
3 information concerning the presence or absence of radiological contamination. A number of  
4 deployment systems are available; some include a configuration with camera-survey equipment.  
5 Alpha, beta, and gamma radiation detectors can be used with some systems. Equipment and  
6 survey specifications are presented in the SAP.

#### 7 4.4 ITEMS OF INTEREST

8 During one of the Phase I-A DQO workshops, Ecology noted a desire to verify, through  
9 historical records research and nonintrusive investigations, the ability to identify and locate items  
10 on the items of interest list that was provided to RL during the 200-SW-2 OU collaborative  
11 discussions. An agreement was reached that, in part, requested RL to summarize the items of  
12 interest based on waste form and to focus on logic to support decisions on the items of interest.  
13 This list was included in the Phase I-A DQO summary report and was evaluated through a  
14 data-gap analysis to determine those items that could be located using nonintrusive survey  
15 techniques.

16 The items of interest list was carried forward into the Phase I-B DQO process and again  
17 evaluated to determine those items that could be located using the nonintrusive and intrusive  
18 characterization techniques proposed for use during the Phase I-B investigation. The results of  
19 this evaluation and the resulting data-gap analysis are provided in Table 4-1. This table lists the  
20 items of interest, those nonintrusive and intrusive surveying/sampling techniques that have the  
21 potential to locate these items, the potential limitations of these surveying/sampling techniques,  
22 and the expected threat of release presented by each waste form.

23 Phase I-B investigations continue nonintrusive reconnaissance-level radiological, geophysical,  
24 and soil-gas surveys in landfill areas not previously addressed in the Phase I-A DQO summary  
25 report, as discussed in Section 4.2. The items of interest covered by nonintrusive survey portions  
26 of this work plan and associated SAP include suspect caisson locations, D-2 column from  
27 PUREX K-cell, shallow-buried waste, cell cover blocks, potential organic waste, and large tanks.

28 As discussed in Section 4.2, limited intrusive investigations will be conducted during Phase I-B  
29 using direct pushes near the centers of all landfills, to better understand the lateral continuity of  
30 geologic layers, based on lithologic logs from surrounding groundwater-monitoring wells.  
31 Fine-grained sediment layers are of particular interest, because they tend to impede the  
32 downward movement of moisture and mobile contaminants through the vadose zone. Additional  
33 direct-push investigations will be performed in portions of landfills potentially impacted by  
34 atypical excess moisture. These direct pushes address the items of interest related to landfills  
35 that previously flooded and contained pond disposal areas.

36 Items of interest addressed by the Phase I-B work plan and SAP are highlighted in Table 4-1.  
37 Remaining items of interest may require intrusive investigations within landfill trenches and will  
38 be addressed in later site investigation phases.

39

Table 4-1. Data-Gap Analysis for Ecology's Items of Interest. (6 Pages)

Items of Interest	Characterization Techniques that Have a Potential for Locating Items of Interest	Potential Limitations of Characterization Techniques	Potential Threat to Human Health, Worker Safety, and/or Environment
High-dose-rate lab-packed liquid waste	Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; direct-push technologies (DPT) utilizing gamma logging	High-dose-rate lab-packed liquid waste may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques; however, the amount of shielding provided by the container and soil overburden may make locating this waste type difficult. DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of this waste, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.  Care must be exercised to avoid penetrating high dose rate lab packed liquid waste with DPT techniques.	<b>Low</b> – Potential threat to human health, worker safety, or the environment only if waste is unearthed.
Remote-handled low-level waste	Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging	Remote-handled low-level waste may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques; however, the amount of shielding provided by the container and soil overburden may make locating remote-handled low-level waste difficult. DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of this waste, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> – Potential threat to human health, worker safety, or the environment only if waste is unearthed.
Caissons used to receive remote-handled high-dose-rate and transuranic (TRU) <sup>a</sup> waste	Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging  Ground-penetrating radar (GPR); electromagnetic induction (EMI); total magnetic field (TMF)  DPT utilizing gamma and neutron logging	Caissons may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques; however, the amount of shielding provided by the container and soil overburden may make locating caisson waste difficult.  Locations of caissons in the landfills may be determined using GPR, EMI, or TMF survey techniques. Interferences caused by fines, or nearby buildings and utilities, may limit the effectiveness of these techniques.  DPT gamma and neutron logging may indicate the presence of high-dose rate waste and TRU waste within caissons, assuming the locations can be identified with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> – Potential threat to human health, worker safety, or the environment only if waste is unearthed. Records indicate that the waste does not contain liquids in quantities that could affect groundwater.  Post-1970 TRU waste within caissons will be retrieved via the Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-091 program.
Suspect caisson locations <sup>b</sup>	GPR, EMI, TMF  Visual and radiological surveys (Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors) to determine if waste is present.	Locations of caissons in the landfills may be determined using records research or GPR, EMI, and/or TMF survey techniques. Interferences caused by fines, or nearby buildings and utilities may limit these techniques' effectiveness.	<b>Low</b> – Records indicate that these caissons did not receive waste. Characterization will focus on locating and verifying that the caissons are empty.

Items of Interest	Characterization Techniques that Have a Potential for Locating Items of Interest	Potential Limitations of Characterization Techniques	Potential Threat to Human Health, Worker Safety, and/or Environment
Burial boxes containing remote-handled and contact-handled low-level waste	Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging	Burial boxes containing remote-handled low-level waste may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques; however, the amount of shielding provided by the container and soil overburden may make locating burial boxes containing remote-handled low-level waste difficult. Contact-handled low-level waste, which is expected to have a lower dose rate than remote-handled low-level waste, may be difficult to locate through the soil with either nonintrusive or intrusive techniques.  DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of remote handled waste, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> – Potential threat to human health, worker safety, or the environment only if remote handled waste is unearthed. Contact-handled low-level waste is expected to have a significantly lower dose rate and therefore would not pose a threat to human health, worker safety, or the environment.
Areas of highly contaminated tumbleweeds	Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging	Landfills containing buried tumbleweeds may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques; however, the amount of shielding provided by the soil overburden may make locating tumbleweeds difficult.  DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of highly contaminated tumbleweeds, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> –Tumbleweeds were likely not containerized and contamination is expected to be co-mingled with the surrounding soil. However, without a mechanism to drive the contamination, this waste form is not expected to be a threat to human health, worker, or groundwater.
Fuel element clips and spacers	Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging	Fuel element clips and spacers may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques, however, the amount of shielding provided by the container and soil overburden may make locating fuel element clips and spacers difficult.  DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of fuel element clips and spacers, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> – Fuel element clips and spacers are expected to consist of activated metal, rather than spent fuel. Therefore this waste form is not expected to be a threat to human health, worker, or groundwater.
Irradiated fuel elements	Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging	Irradiated fuel elements may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques, however, the amount of shielding provided by the container and soil overburden may make locating Irradiated fuel elements difficult.  DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of irradiated fuel elements, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> – Potential threat to human health, worker safety, or the environment only if spent fuel is unearthed.  Spent fuel may be designated as remote-handled TRU and retrieved as part of the M-091 Program.  Few references to irradiated fuel in burial records.
Ten large concrete burial boxes of soil from the S Tank Farm	GPR, EMI, TMF Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging	Location of concrete boxes in the landfills may be determined using GPR, EMI, or TMF survey techniques. Interferences caused by fines, or nearby buildings and utilities may limit the effectiveness of these techniques.  DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of this waste, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> – Records indicate that the waste soil is low dose rate. Worker safety and human health is not expected to be an issue.

Table 4-1. Data-Gap Analysis for Ecology's Items of Interest. (6 Pages)

Items of Interest	Characterization Techniques that Have a Potential for Locating Items of Interest	Potential Limitations of Characterization Techniques	Potential Threat to Human Health, Worker Safety, and/or Environment
Reactor fuel waste	Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging	Reactor fuel waste may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques, however, the amount of shielding provided by the container and soil overburden may make locating this waste difficult.  DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of this waste, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> – Reactor fuel waste is expected to consist of activated metal, rather than spent fuel. Therefore this waste form is not expected to be a threat to human health, worker, or groundwater.
Drums of test reactor and isotope production fuel waste	Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging	Fuel element clips and spacers may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques, however, the amount of shielding provided by the container and soil overburden may make locating fuel element clips and spacers difficult.  Location of metal drums in the landfills may be determined using GPR, EMI, or TMF survey techniques. Interferences caused by fines, or nearby buildings and utilities may limit the effectiveness of these techniques.  DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of fuel element clips and spacers, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> – Fuel element clips and spacers are expected to consist of activated metal, rather than spent fuel. Therefore this waste form is not expected to be a threat to human health, worker, or groundwater.
Areas of the landfills that were flooded with standing water <sup>b</sup>	Electrical-resistance technologies (ERT); Records review  DPT moisture logging	Location in landfills not likely to be confirmed using nonintrusive sampling/surveying techniques, however records research can provide information to locate these areas.  ERT or moisture logging may be used to indicate areas of past flooding events.	<b>Med</b> – Excessive water in landfills can provide a mechanism for contaminant transport to groundwater.
Pond disposal area, 216-T-4B Pond <sup>b</sup>	ERT; Records review  DPT moisture logging	Location in landfills not likely to be confirmed using nonintrusive sampling/surveying techniques, however records research can provide information to locate these areas.  ERT or moisture logging may be used to indicate areas of ponding.	<b>Med</b> – Excessive water in landfills can provide a mechanism for contaminant transport to groundwater.
Suspect TRU or contact-handles low-level waste-TRU in TSD units <sup>a</sup>	N/A – out of scope	N/A – out of scope.	<b>N/A</b> - TRU waste is not in the scope of this investigation. The M-091 Program is tasked with retrieval of this waste form.
Pre-1970s transuranically contaminated material	Records review; Xenon daughter product detection; Copper foil activation; Am-241 detection; passive neutron detection	Location in landfills not likely to be confirmed using nonintrusive sampling/surveying techniques.  Xenon daughter product detection, copper foil activation, passive neutron detection, and/or Am-241 detection methods have the potential to locate and quantify transuranic elements in soil, however the location must be determined with some accuracy for these methods to be effective.	<b>Med</b> – Lacks transport mechanism. Therefore this waste form is not expected to be a threat to human health, worker, or groundwater.

Table 4-1. Data-Gap Analysis for Ecology's Items of Interest. (6 Pages)

Items of Interest	Characterization Techniques that Have a Potential for Locating Items of Interest	Potential Limitations of Characterization Techniques	Potential Threat to Human Health, Worker Safety, and/or Environment
D-2 Column from PUREX K Cell <sup>b</sup>	GPR, EMI, TMF	<p>Location of the PUREX D-2 Column in the landfills may be determined using GPR, EMI, or TMF survey techniques. Interferences caused by fines, or nearby buildings and utilities may limit the effectiveness of these techniques.</p> <p>DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of the D-2 Column, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.</p>	<p><b>Low</b> - Potential for release only if the column contained a liquid heel containing significant concentrations of COPCs. Standard practices at Hanford Site facilities included flushing of equipment to mitigate contamination and for product recovery, therefore column contents would not likely be a threat to human health, worker safety, or groundwater.</p>
Shallow buried waste <sup>b</sup>	<p>GPR, EMI, TMF; Records review</p> <p>Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging</p>	<p>Locations of shallow-buried waste in the landfills may be determined using GPR, EMI, or TMF survey techniques. Interferences caused by fines, or nearby buildings and utilities may limit the effectiveness of these techniques.</p> <p>Shallow buried waste may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques, however, the amount of shielding provided by the container may make locating waste difficult.</p>	<p><b>Med</b> - Potential threat of release if waste is unearthed by human or biological intruders or erosion.</p>
Rotten wooden boxes	Records review noting areas of subsidence; no-walk and no-drive zones established in landfills; visual inspection for surface depressions	Location in landfills not likely to be confirmed using nonintrusive sampling/surveying techniques.	<p><b>Med</b> - Threat of release based on loss of integrity of burial container. However, without a mechanism to drive contaminants, the threat to groundwater is expected to be minimal. Personnel safety associated with subsidence.</p>
Drywells, vertical pipe units (VPU)	<p>Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma logging</p> <p>GPR, EMI, TMF</p> <p>DPT utilizing gamma logging</p>	<p>VPU's may be detected using nonintrusive radiological survey techniques; however, the amount of shielding provided by the container and soil overburden may make locating VPU waste difficult.</p> <p>Locations of VPU's in the landfills may be determined using GPR, EMI, or TMF survey techniques. Interferences caused by fines, or nearby buildings and utilities, may limit the effectiveness of these techniques.</p> <p>DPT gamma logging may indicate the presence of high-dose rate waste within VPU's, assuming the locations can be identified with some accuracy.</p>	<p><b>Low</b> - Potential threat to human health, worker safety, or the environment only if waste is unearthed. Records indicate that the waste does not contain liquids in quantities that could affect groundwater.</p>
High-activity Plutonium Finishing Plant waste	Plastic gamma scintillators; high-purity germanium detectors; DPT utilizing gamma and neutron logging	PFP waste materials do not contain gamma emitters of sufficient energy to be detected at the surface; DPT gamma and neutron logging may indicate the presence of this waste, assuming the location can be identified with some accuracy.	<p><b>Low</b> - Potential threat to human health, worker safety, or the environment only if waste is unearthed.</p>

Table 4-1. Data-Gap Analysis for Ecology's Items of Interest. (6 Pages)

Items of Interest	Characterization Techniques that Have a Potential for Locating Items of Interest	Potential Limitations of Characterization Techniques	Potential Threat to Human Health, Worker Safety, and/or Environment
Acid-soaked waste trenches	Records review DPT techniques with soil sampling and in situ pH analysis	Location in landfills is known based on historical records, however no other information is available regarding the waste form or concentrations of contaminants. Waste form and concentrations of contaminants are not likely to be confirmed using nonintrusive sampling/surveying techniques.	<b>Med</b> - historical records indicate that the acid-soaked waste was buried in shallow trenches; therefore, the potential for release is greater because of the possibility of biological intrusion or erosion of overburden; acidic environments are known to mobilize otherwise immobile COPCs (e.g., plutonium).
Cell cover blocks <sup>b</sup>	GPR, EMI, TMF	Locations of cell cover blocks in the landfills may be determined using records research or GPR, EMI, and/or TMF survey techniques. Interferences caused by fines, or nearby buildings and utilities may limit the effectiveness of these techniques.	<b>Low</b> - cell cover blocks, unless grossly contaminated, do not present a threat to human health, worker, or groundwater.
Potential organic waste <sup>b</sup>	Passive soil-gas or Active soil-gas sample techniques (DPT)	If the liquids are organic, detection is possible using intrusive or nonintrusive soil-gas sampling techniques. However, detection of organic vapors at the surface of the landfills is dependent on the liquids having breached their containment. Organic liquids contained within drums or boxes with no loss of integrity likely will not be detected using intrusive or nonintrusive sampling techniques.  Care must be exercised to avoid penetrating intact containers with DPT.	<b>Med</b> - potential for release if integrity of containers is compromised. Depending on the volumes of contaminated liquid organics present and the packaging, the threat of release may be higher. Liquid organic may present a groundwater threat if they are present in large volumes.
Potential liquid waste containing tritium	Tritium detectors	Tritium, or helium-3/helium-4 ratio, analysis can be performed on soil-gas samples; however, all identified fully developed methods are intrusive. Soil-gas samples collected for other analyses could be used, but no reports/literature was found to indicate that the results would correlate to tritium concentrations below grade. Intrusive soil-gas sampling methods have been used in this manner: PNNL developed and used such methods with Bechtel Hanford Inc., to delineate the tritium groundwater plume at the 618-11 Burial Ground (see RL, 2001, <i>Helium Isotope Analysis for Soil Gas to Delineate Tritium Plumes</i> , Technology Deployment Benefit Analysis Fact Sheet, and PNNL-13675	<b>Low</b> - Potential for release if integrity of containers is compromised. Based on the small volumes of liquids noted in the historical records, this waste likely is not a threat to groundwater.

Table 4-1. Data-Gap Analysis for Ecology's Items of Interest. (6 Pages)

Items of Interest	Characterization Techniques that Have a Potential for Locating Items of Interest	Potential Limitations of Characterization Techniques	Potential Threat to Human Health, Worker Safety, and/or Environment
Large tanks <sup>b</sup>	GPR, EMI, TMF	Locations of large tanks in the landfills may be determined using records research or GPR, EMI, and/or TMF survey techniques. Interferences caused by fines, or nearby buildings and utilities may limit the effectiveness of these techniques.	<b>Low</b> - Potential for release only if the tanks contained liquid heels containing significant concentrations of COPCs. Standard practices at Hanford Site facilities included flushing of equipment and tanks to mitigate contamination and for product recovery, therefore tank contents would not likely be a threat to human health, worker, or groundwater; large tanks provide a future potential for subsidence as the tanks deteriorate.
Pre-August 1987 laboratory waste	Records review; Passive soil-gas or Active soil-gas sample techniques; DPT (soil vapor samples)	Location in landfills is not likely to be confirmed using nonintrusive sampling/surveying techniques. DPT (soil vapor) may be used to detect the presence of laboratory waste, if the location of the waste can be determined with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> - Potential for release if integrity of container is compromised.
Mixed LLW disposal pre-1987	Records review; Passive soil-gas or Active soil-gas sample techniques; DPT (soil vapor samples)	Location in landfills is not likely to be confirmed using nonintrusive sampling/surveying techniques. DPT (soil vapor) may be used to detect the presence of mixed waste, if the location of the waste can be determined with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> - Potential for release if integrity of container is compromised.
Z Plant Burning Pit Waste	Records review; Passive soil-gas or Active soil-gas sample techniques; DPT (soil vapor samples)	Location in landfills is not likely to be confirmed using nonintrusive sampling/surveying techniques. DPT (soil vapor) may be used to detect the presence of waste residues, if the location of the waste can be determined with some accuracy.	<b>Low</b> - Waste burned in the pit was not containerized; therefore, only chemical residue is expected.

<sup>a</sup>TRU waste will be dispositioned through the TRU Retrieval Project and is not in the scope for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit.

<sup>b</sup>Highlighted items of interest will be addressed during Phase I-B investigations using nonintrusive soil-vapor or geophysical surveys and limited intrusive direct pushes. Remaining items of interest may require intrusive methods within landfill trenches and will be addressed in subsequent remedial investigation phases.

PNNL-13675, *Measurement of Helium-3/Helium-4 Ratios in Soil Gas at the 618-11 Burial Ground.*

RL, 2001, *Helium Isotope Analysis for Soil Gas to Delineate Tritium Plumes*, Technology Deployment Benefit Analysis Fact Sheet.

- |  |                                 |   |  |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--|
| COPC = contaminant of potential concern. | GPR = ground-penetrating radar. | PNNL = Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. | TRU = transuranic waste.                   |
| DPT = direct-push technology.            | LLW = low-level waste.          | PUREX = Plutonium-Uranium Extraction Plant.   | TSD = treatment, storage, and/or disposal. |
| EMI = electromagnetic induction.         | N/A = not applicable.           | TMF = total magnetic field.                   | VPU = vertical pipe unit.                  |
| ERT = electrical-resistance technology.  |                                 |   |  |

1 Table 4-2 provides a compilation of potentially appropriate analytical measurement methods that  
 2 may be used during the landfill investigation. Analytical methods highlighted in Table 4-2 are  
 3 planned for use during Phase I-B investigations. The remaining analytical methods or other  
 4 methods will be used in subsequent phases, as appropriate. Details regarding targeted items of  
 5 interest for the Phase I-B investigation are provided in the SAP (Appendix A). Additional  
 6 potential characterization technologies are detailed in PNNL-16105, *Technology Survey to*  
 7 *Support Revision to the RI/FS Work Plan for the 200-SW-2 OU at the U.S. Department of*  
 8 *Energy's Hanford Site.*

9 The data-gap analysis for the items of interest will be carried forward again into future-phase  
 10 DQO processes and evaluated against those characterization techniques proposed for the  
 11 appropriate phase investigation.

#### 12 4.5 OTHER SOURCES OF 13 CHARACTERIZATION DATA

14 Other projects being performed on the Hanford Site Central Plateau have the potential to provide  
 15 useful data that may be applied to the overall characterization of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills.  
 16 Some of these projects directly overlap the characterization work being performed to support  
 17 landfill characterization. These projects include the TRU waste-retrieval work being performed  
 18 in support of Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-091, characterization work associated with the  
 19 Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment, characterization and remediation activities  
 20 associated with the 618-10 and 618-11 Burial Grounds, and characterization work to support the  
 21 200-PW-1 OU. All data collected from these related projects will be integrated and presented in  
 22 the RI report for consideration during the FS. Additionally, information and lessons learned  
 23 from other DOE sites addressing the remediation of radioactive solid-waste landfills (e.g., Idaho  
 24 National Laboratory) will be closely monitored and applied, where appropriate.

25  
 Table 4-2. Potentially Appropriate Analytical Measurement Methods. (4 Pages)

Variable	Potentially Appropriate Measurement Method <sup>a</sup>	Possible Limitations or Reservations
Radiological screening <sup>m</sup>	Mobile surface-contamination monitor. Static HPGe detectors.	Because of shielding, buried sources may be difficult to detect <sup>b</sup> .
Tritiated Liquid	Tritium monitor	Tritium, or helium 3/helium 4 ratio, analysis can be performed on soil-gas samples; however, all identified fully developed methods are intrusive. Soil-gas samples collected for other analyses could be used, but no reports/literature was found that indicates that the results would correlate to tritium concentrations below grade. Intrusive soil-gas sampling methods have been used in this manner, and PNNL developed and used such methods with Bechtel Hanford Inc., to delineate the tritium groundwater plume at Burial Ground 618-11 (see RL, 2001, and PNNL-13675). Further research may uncover a method to correlate nonintrusive soil-gas measurements to tritium concentrations, however at this time it appears that this method should be considered as an intrusive method.

Table 4-2. Potentially Appropriate Analytical Measurement Methods. (4 Pages)

Variable	Potentially Appropriate Measurement Method <sup>a</sup>	Possible Limitations or Reservations
Metallic objects, Disturbed soil, trench/landfill boundaries <sup>m</sup>	Ground penetrating radar (GPR) <sup>c</sup>	GPR is a radar-reflection surface geophysical survey technique that detects contrasts in dielectric constants in the below grade environments from the surface. Requires subjective interpretation of the reflected signals. Lack of reflective below grade surfaces or the presence of interfering matrices can complicate or invalidate the findings. The presence of nearby buildings and utilities can interfere with reflected signals. Fines (e.g., clay, heavy fly ash) can act as a reflector to the radar signal.
Metallic objects, Disturbed soil, trench/landfill boundaries <sup>m</sup>	Electromagnetic induction (EMI) <sup>c</sup>	EMI is a surface geophysical survey technique that measures electrical conductivity in below grade soils, based on detected changes in electrical fields. The results of EMI generally are used to support the interpretation of GPR surveys and identify buried metal objects. Typical methods include EM-34, EM-61 <sup>k</sup> . Nearby buildings and utilities can cause interferences.
Metallic objects, Disturbed soil, trench/landfill boundaries <sup>m</sup>	Total magnetic field (TMF) <sup>c</sup>	TMF is a system used to perform examinations of potentially contaminated soil or buried objects. TMF uses electromagnetic analysis to differentiate and classify the unique electromagnetic signature of contaminants. The technique has a limited use history and is unproven for many contaminants.
VOCs <sup>m</sup>	Passive soil gas	Passive soil gas measurement is a method whereby a hydrophobic collector (e.g., EMFLUX <sup>®</sup> or GORE-SORBER <sup>™</sup> ) <sup>d, e</sup> is placed on the ground surface or buried in a shallow hole with direct exposure to the soils for a period of 72 hours or more. The collector then is retrieved and analyzed in the laboratory, using standard analytical methods, to determine the presence of chemical contamination. Can test for a wide variety of chemicals in a single test and can be integrated for a large area and time to determine chemical presence. Results can be influenced by barometric pressure changes and weather events.
VOCs	Colorimetric tube	Tube capability must be compared to the site-specific need to determine if field detection limits would be sufficient for the VOC of interest. Need to know specific VOCs of interest. Requires collection of a sample medium for use.
VOCs	Flame ionization detector (e.g., Foxboro OVA 128) <sup>f</sup>	Detection limit (1 to 5 mg/kg, methane-equivalent). Instrument capability must be compared to the site-specific need to determine if field detection limits would be sufficient for the VOC of interest. Need to know specific VOCs of interest. Limited to hydrogen-containing compounds. Requires collection of a sample medium for use.
VOCs	Photoacoustic infrared analyzer (e.g., B&K 1302) <sup>g</sup>	Instrument capability must be compared to the site-specific need to determine if field detection limits would be sufficient for the VOC of interest. Need to know specific VOCs of interest. Requires collection of a sample gas volume.
VOCs	Photoionization detector (e.g., thermo analytical organic-vapor monitor)	Detection limit (1 to 5 mg/kg, isobutylene-equivalent). Instrument capability must be compared to the site-specific need to determine if field detection limits would be sufficient for the VOC of interest. Need to know specific VOCs of interest. Limited to photoionizing compounds at 10.6 eV. Requires collection of a sample gas volume, but may be accomplished at the soil surface.
VOCs	Portable gas chromatograph with photoionization detector (e.g., Photovac 10S Plus) <sup>h</sup>	Detection limit (sub-mL/m <sup>3</sup> levels, depending on VOC of interest). Instrument capability must be compared to the site-specific need to determine if field detection limits would be sufficient for the VOC of interest. Need to know specific VOCs of interest. Limited to photoionizing compounds at 11.7 eV. Requires collection of a sample gas volume.
VOCs	Transportable mass spectrometer	Instrument use requires extensive training. Capital cost and setup is high; operational cost is moderate. Requires collection of a sample gas volume.

Table 4-2. Potentially Appropriate Analytical Measurement Methods. (4 Pages)

Variable	Potentially Appropriate Measurement Method <sup>a</sup>	Possible Limitations or Reservations
VOCs	MIRAN SapphiRe Ambient Air Analyzer <sup>J</sup>	Instrument uses infrared absorption spectra to determine compound concentration. Single compound selection can create false positives if another compound is present that has an absorption spectra of the target compound.
Gamma emissions	Cone penetrometer; sodium-iodide detector logging	A closed-end rod is pushed into the soil to the desired depth. A small-diameter sodium-iodide detector (or other suitable detector) is used to log the gross gamma response with depth. The cone penetrometer is not effective in cobbly or rocky soils, or compacted fine-grained sediments.
Gamma emissions <sup>m</sup>	Direct push; sodium-iodide detector logging	A small-diameter casing is pushed into the soil to the desired depth. A small-diameter sodium-iodide detector (or other suitable detector) is used to log the gamma response with depth. Direct-push methods (e.g., GeoProbe <sup>TM</sup> , hydraulic hammer) may be ineffective in cobbly or rocky soils given their hydraulic hammering and rotational capabilities.
Fission products	Borehole spectral gamma logging with HPGe detector	Gamma-ray logging provides the concentration profiles of gamma-emitting radionuclides such as Am-241, Pu-239, and many fission products in a borehole environment. It is considered by some to be more accurate than sampling and laboratory assay because the assay is performed in situ with less disturbance of the sample, there is higher vertical spatial resolution, and the sample size is much larger. This method may also be more economical than traditional sampling and analysis. This method does not assess radionuclides or daughter products that do not emit gamma rays. The gamma energies from these isotopes are at the low end of the spectrum, which results in high numerical minimum detectable activities and possible matrix effects from other isotopes. This technique requires the use of a single casing (installed by drilling or driving) in contact with the soil formation.
Plutonium	Borehole passive neutron logging	Passive neutron logging provides indication of the presence of alpha-emitting isotopes. Because of the very low incidence of spontaneous plutonium fission and alpha-N reactions, the passive neutron profile is orders of magnitude lower than the gamma emissions.
Transuranics	Borehole passive/active neutron-logging methods	This technique uses source materials or generators to release neutrons into the soil formation. Passive detectors measure the response to the neutron flux as a means of detecting specific transuranic constituents. Logistical problems can arise with the handling of intense sources or generators.
Areas of known flooding or past use as a pond <sup>m</sup>	Borehole neutron-neutron moisture logging	N-N moisture logs can be used to determine current moisture content profiles of the subsurface through new or existing boreholes. The moisture profiles are often directly correlated to contaminant concentrations, sediment grain size, composition, or subsurface structural features. For this project, the moisture profile may be useful for helping determine the location of contamination and/or the location of the ditch and establish geologic conditions to support contaminant fate and transport modeling. It may also be correlated to reflections identified in ground-probing radar surveys.

Table 4-2. Potentially Appropriate Analytical Measurement Methods. (4 Pages)

Variable	Potentially Appropriate Measurement Method <sup>a</sup>	Possible Limitations or Reservations
----------	---	--------------------------------------

<sup>a</sup> Other methods may be identified and implemented in conjunction with technology development.

<sup>b</sup> The tenth-value layer for Cs-137 in soil is about 25 cm (10 in.) So roughly for each 30 cm (1 ft) that a source is buried underground, the dose rate is reduced by an order of magnitude. Waste often was covered with a minimum of 1.2 m (4 ft) of soil. To be detected, the source strength at the surface has to be 10  $\mu$ R/h, then at 1.2 m (4-ft) depth it would have to have been 10 mrem/h.

<sup>c</sup> Details of geophysical surveys performed in 2005 are contained in D&D-28379.

<sup>d</sup> EMFLUX is a registered trademark of Beacon Environmental Services, Inc., Bel Air, Maryland.

<sup>e</sup> GORE-SORBER is a trademark of W. L. Gore and Associates, San Francisco, California.

<sup>f</sup> Foxboro and OVA 128 are trademarks of The Foxboro Company, Foxboro, Massachusetts.

<sup>g</sup> B&K is a trademark of Brüel and Kjær, S&V, Nærum, Denmark.

<sup>h</sup> Photovac 10S Plus is a trademark of Photovac, Inc., Waltham, Massachusetts.

<sup>j</sup> MIRAN and the SapphiRe Ambient Air Analyzer are registered trademarks of Thermo Electron Corporation, Franklin, Massachusetts.

<sup>k</sup> EM34 and EM61 are trademarks of Geonics Limited, Mississauga, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>m</sup> Highlighted analytical methods are planned for use during Phase I-B investigations. Subsequent phase investigations may use the remaining or other analytical methods, as appropriate. Final methods will be determined through the appropriate data-quality objectives process for each phase.

NOTE: There is no footnote for the letters (i) and (l).

D&D-28379, *Geophysical Investigations Summary Report; 200 Area Burial Grounds: 218-C-9, 218-E-2A, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, 218-E-8, 218-W-1A, 218-W-2A, and 218-W-11.*

PNNL-13675, *Measurement of Helium-3/Helium-4 Ratios in Soil Gas at the 618-11 Burial Ground.*

RL, 2001, *Helium Isotope Analysis for Soil Gas to Delineate Tritium Plumes*, Technology Deployment Benefit Analysis Fact Sheet.

<sup>TM</sup> GeoProbe is a registered trademark of GeoProbe Systems, Salinas, Kansas.

EMI = electromagnetic induction.

GPR = ground-penetrating radar.

HPGe = high-purity germanium.

PNNL = Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

TMF = total magnetic field.

VOC = volatile organic compound.

- 1
- 2 Although information contained in Sections 4.5.1, 4.5.2, 4.5.3, and Appendix D are not part of
- 3 planned scope under this RI/FS work plan and are being conducted by others, the data have
- 4 direct applicability and utility to the 200-SW-2 OU RI. Sampling and analysis of near-surface
- 5 soils following retrieval of waste by the M-091 Program provides valuable insights into the
- 6 possible migration of contaminants from leaking drums into the vadose zone beneath landfill
- 7 trenches (a condition possible in the 200-SW-2 OU landfills). Vadose-zone sampling and
- 8 analysis for carbon tetrachloride under the 200-PW-1 OU RI provides valuable insights into the
- 9 regional source of carbon tetrachloride (i.e., discharge of carbon tetrachloride to Plutonium
- 10 Finishing Plant cribs rather than materials disposed into 200-SW-2 OU landfill trenches).
- 11 Finally, organic-vapor samplers placed on unused portions of the 218-W-4C Landfill in support
- 12 of ecological risk-assessment sampling provides valuable data necessary to support
- 13 administrative reclassification of this area in the WIDS database based on its lack of use.
- 14 Data from other programs will be leveraged whenever appropriate in support of the
- 15 200-SW-2 OU landfills RI report and the FS. Coordination and integration of similar activities
- 16 and sharing of data, where possible, provide cost-effective and timely support to the overall
- 17 RI/FS process.

1 Information associated with the characterization and retrieval of waste from the 618-10 and  
2 618-11 Burial Grounds may provide useful data that may be applied to the characterization of the  
3 200-SW-2 OU landfills. Some of the key reference documents include the following:

- 4 • WMP-20394, *Design Basis/Design Criteria Report 618-10 And 618-11 Burial Ground*  
5 *Remedial Action Project*
- 6 • WMP-17684, *618-10 and 618-11 Burial Ground Remedial Design Technical Workshop*  
7 *Summary Report*
- 8 • PNNL-13656, *Enhanced Site Characterization of the 618-4 Burial Ground*
- 9 • EPA/ROD/R10-01/119, *Declaration of the Interim Record of Decision for the*  
10 *300-FF-2 Operable Unit*
- 11 • DOE/RL 88-31, *Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan for the 300-FF-1*  
12 *Operable Unit, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington.*

#### 13 **4.5.1 TRU Waste Retrieval**

14 Sampling is being conducted in conjunction with the TRU waste-retrieval activities. This  
15 sampling has been divided into three steps. The first step, which was completed before waste  
16 retrieval, involved organic-vapor sampling at the vent risers in the TRU waste trenches within  
17 the 218-W-3A, 218-W-4B, and 218-W-4C Landfills. In addition, passive organic-vapor soil  
18 samplers were placed at the 218-E-12B Landfill, because the TRU waste trenches in this landfill  
19 lack vent risers. Additional detail regarding TRU waste-retrieval activities can be found in  
20 Section 3.3.

21 Step 2 of the sampling is being conducted after the TRU or suspect-TRU waste has been  
22 removed from the trenches. This activity involves a radiological survey of the trench bottom, a  
23 survey of the perimeter of the asphalt pad (if present), and 1.8 to 3.7 m (6 to 12-ft) direct pushes  
24 every 6 m (20 ft) around the trench perimeter to collect vapor samples.

25 Step 3 will involve, as applicable, removal of soil samples for laboratory analysis. The locations  
26 of soil samples will be determined by the results of the Step 2 surveys.

27 Results of sampling performed to date are included in Appendix D of this RI/FS work plan.

28 The 200-SW-2 OU Project will continue to maintain close coordination with the TRU Waste  
29 Retrieval Project to identify “opportunistic sampling” events to support 200-SW-2 OU Project  
30 data needs in support of the RI/FS process.

#### 31 **4.5.2 200-PW-1 Operable Unit**

32 The RI for the 200-PW-1 OU included soil-vapor sampling and analysis used to explore the  
33 dispersed carbon tetrachloride plume in the vadose zone in the 200 West Area. Sampling being  
34 conducted in support of characterization at the 200-PW-1 OU includes passive and active

1 organic-vapor sampling. Active vapor sampling has been performed at the vent risers in the  
2 218-W-3A and 218-W-4C Landfills. Passive soil-vapor sampling has been performed in the  
3 218-W-3A landfill. Active soil-vapor sampling was performed using direct-push technology  
4 around the perimeter of the 218-W-4C Landfill. Data collected from the 200-PW-1 OU will be  
5 evaluated for applicability in the FS.

6 Results of sampling performed to date are included in Appendix D of this RI/FS work plan.

#### 7 **4.5.3 Ecological Risk Assessment Sampling**

8 Passive organic-vapor samplers were placed on the Central Plateau, including at the unused  
9 annex of the 218-W-4C Landfill, as part of investigation activities to support development of the  
10 Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment.

11 Results of sampling performed to date indicate no detectable levels of organics in the unused  
12 annex of the 218-W-4C Landfill.

13

## 5.0 REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY PROCESS

This chapter describes the RI/FS (investigation/evaluation) process for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills and the closure approach for the 200-SW-1 OU (NRDWL and 600 CL) landfills. A summary of the coordinated regulatory process for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills is provided in Section 5.1. Section 5.2 outlines the 200-SW-1 OU closure approach for the NRDWL and the 600 CL.

The development of, and rationale for, the RI/FS process is consistent with the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28). The purpose of the Implementation Plan is to define the framework for implementing soil-characterization activities in the 200 Areas to ensure consistency in applying regulatory and documentation requirements and in defining characterization requirements and reaching remedial-action decisions. The CERCLA RI/FS process has been followed for this OU and also meets the requirements of RCRA corrective action. In addition, these CERCLA RI/FS activities will be coordinated with the RCRA TSD closure activities.


Section 5.3 outlines the tasks to be completed during the RI phase, including planning and conducting field sampling activities and preparing the RI report. These tasks are designed to effectively manage the work, satisfy the DQOs (identified in Chapter 4.0), document the results of the RI, and manage the waste generated during field activities. The general purpose of the RI is to characterize the nature, extent, concentration, and potential transport of contaminants and to provide data to determine the need for and type of remediation. The detailed information that will be collected to carry out these tasks is presented in the SAP (Appendix A).

Tasks to be completed following the RI phase include preparing an FS, proposed plan, and ROD for the CERCLA remedial actions. In parallel, a proposed modification to the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit (WA7890008967) will be conducted for the RCRA TSD-unit landfills. Following issuance of the ROD, the remedial design/remedial action is implemented. Post-record-of-decision treatability investigations may be conducted in support of the remedial design and subsequent remedial action, if necessary. Figure 5-1 illustrates the process.

Project management occurs throughout the RI/FS process. Project management is used to direct and document project activities (so that the objectives of the work plan are met) and to ensure that the project is kept within budget and on schedule. The initial project management activity will be to assign individuals to roles established in Section 7.2 of the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28). Project management activities also include the following:

- Day-to-day supervision of and communication with project staff and support personnel
- Meetings
- Control of cost, schedule, and work
- Records management
- Progress and final reports
- Quality assurance
- Health and safety
- Community relations.

Figure 5-1. Coordinated Regulatory Process for RCRA Past-Practice, and RCRA Treatment, Storage, and/or Disposal Unit Closure.



1 Appendix A of the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28) provides the overall quality assurance  
2 framework that was used to prepare an OU-specific quality-assurance project plan for the  
3 200-SW-2 RI (Appendix A, Section A2.0). Appendix C of the Implementation Plan reviews  
4 data management activities that are applicable to the 200-SW-2 OU RI/FS and describes the  
5 process for the collection/control of data, records, documents, correspondence, and other  
6 information associated with OU activities.

## 7 **5.1 COORDINATED REGULATORY PROCESS** 8 **FOR THE 200-SW-2 OPERABLE UNIT**

9 The CERCLA regulations of 40 CFR 300 require an RI/FS process for proposing cleanup action  
10 at sites listed on the National Priorities List (40 CFR 300, Appendix B). The Tri-Party  
11 Agreement constitutes the required interagency agreement between the DOE and the EPA for  
12 implementation of National Priorities List cleanup at the Hanford Site. The Tri-Party Agreement  
13 also includes the agreed-upon approach between DOE and Ecology to implement RCRA  
14 corrective-action requirements during National Priorities List cleanup. Under separate  
15 provisions, the Tri-Party Agreement implements the approach that DOE will follow for  
16 permitting and closure of Hanford Site TSD units.

17 Ecology has jurisdiction through RCW 70.105, "Hazardous Waste Management," over waste  
18 with chemical constituents (in particular, dangerous waste and dangerous-waste constituents) and  
19 the chemical component in mixed waste (i.e., mixtures of dangerous waste and radiological  
20 contaminants) that exceed regulated concentrations under RCRA or WAC 173-303. RCRA and  
21 RCW 70.105 do not provide jurisdiction over waste with radiological contaminants only.  
22 CERCLA authority, however, encompasses not only hazardous/dangerous chemical wastes and  
23 mixtures, but also radionuclides. By applying CERCLA authority concurrently with RCRA  
24 closure and corrective-action requirements, cleanup will be addressing all regulatory and  
25 environmental obligations at the 200-SW-2 OU as effectively and efficiently as possible.  
26 Additional options for disposal of closure, corrective-action, and remedial-action wastes at the  
27 Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility are possible by applying CERCLA authority jointly  
28 with that of RCRA. The Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility ROD Amendment allows  
29 for disposal of RCRA wastes in addition to CERCLA wastes. By allowing flexibility in  
30 final-disposal options, the DOE intends to minimize disposal costs as much as possible while  
31 remaining fully protective of human health and the environment.

32 The RI/FS process will be used to reach a decision that will meet requirements for both National  
33 Priorities List cleanup and RCRA corrective action. TSD closure/postclosure for TSD-unit  
34 landfills within the boundaries of the 200-SW-2 OU will be coordinated with the RI/FS process.  
35 In addition, information from DOE and Ecology, 2005 (Collaborative Agreement) must be  
36 considered in formulating the regulatory strategy for the 200-SW-2 OU. The coordinated  
37 regulatory process for characterization and remediation of the 200-SW-2 OU will use this RI/FS  
38 work plan in combination with the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28) to satisfy the  
39 requirements for both an RI/FS work plan and a RCRA field investigation/corrective measures  
40 study work plan. General facility background information, potential ARARs, preliminary RAOs,  
41 and preliminary remedial technologies developed in the Implementation Plan are incorporated by  
42 reference into this RI/FS work plan.

1 This RI/FS work plan and subsequent CERCLA documentation and processes that are developed  
2 will refine the basic information provided in the Implementation Plan to meet the site-specific  
3 needs for the 200-SW-2 OU. This RI/FS work plan also will provide RCRA TSD-unit landfill  
4 closure-plan information addressing facility description, location and process information  
5 (Sections 2.1 and 2.2), waste characteristics (Section 3.1), and groundwater monitoring  
6 (Section 3.4). Following the completion of all phases of characterization, a RI report  
7 summarizing the results of the RI will be prepared and issued including the characterization  
8 information required for RCRA TSD-unit landfill closure decisions. The RI and FS will build on  
9 the basic information provided in the Implementation Plan to identify and evaluate remedial  
10 technologies and ARARs.

11 The following subsections summarize regulatory drivers used to implement the 200-SW-2 OU  
12 coordinated regulatory process. Table 5-1 summarizes the key points made in Sections 5.1.1  
13 through 5.1.7.

#### 14 **5.1.1 Regulatory and Tri-Party Agreement Drivers for** 15 **Closure of TSD-Unit Landfills**

16 The 200-SW-2 OU contains RCRA-permitted TSD-unit landfills. Landfills that received  
17 hazardous and/or mixed waste after the relevant effective date of regulation are subject to  
18 regulation as TSD-unit landfills. General TSD closure standards of WAC 173-303-610, and  
19 specific landfill closure requirements of WAC 173-303-665(6), "Landfills," "Closure and  
20 Post-Closure Care," are applicable to these landfills. The TSD closure standards simultaneously  
21 apply to these landfills independent of, and pursuant to, the Tri-Party Agreement. This is  
22 because WAC 173-303 applies to Hanford Site TSD-unit activities as a matter of Washington  
23 State law, while at the same time as a matter of agreement between RL and Ecology.

24 The Tri-Party Agreement requires land-disposal unit closure to follow applicable closure  
25 standards. The TSD-unit landfills are land-disposal units and, as such, are subject to the  
26 provisions of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 6.3.2 (Ecology et al., 1989b). The  
27 Tri-Party Agreement does not require TSD units to be subject to the past-practice process. The  
28 Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 3.2, addresses permitting and closure of TSD units at  
29 the Hanford Site. TSD units identified for closure concurrent with past-practice activities  
30 nevertheless still are subject to closure in accordance with WAC 173-303 and are not subject to  
31 the past-practice process in lieu of or in addition to those requirements. Coordination of  
32 TSD-unit closure with OU work essentially means to organize the work performed to meet  
33 RCRA closure standards with the work performed to reach past-practice unit decisions to  
34 minimize duplication of effort and prevent overlap. The closure standards for landfills do not  
35 require or address removal of wastes or soils. Under WAC 173-303, landfills are TSD units  
36 designed for the permanent disposal of dangerous wastes.

37

Table 5-1. Summary of Key Regulatory and Tri-Party Agreement Requirements.

Regulatory and Tri-Party Agreement Drivers for Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Closure	Requirements for Characterization Data for Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Landfills	Regulatory and Tri-Party Agreement Drivers for Past-Practice Landfills	Requirements for Characterization Data for Past-Practice Landfills	Regulatory Requirements for Cleanup of Pre-1970 Buried Waste	Regulatory Requirements for Disposal of Mixed Waste Post-August 19, 1987	Summary of Commitments Made in the Collaborative Agreement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TSD-unit burial grounds are RCRA landfills.</li> <li>• The closure regulations apply irrespective of the Tri-Party Agreement.</li> <li>• The Tri-Party Agreement does not require TSD units to be subject to the past-practice process.</li> <li>• The Tri-Party Agreement requires land disposal unit closure to follow applicable closure standards.</li> <li>• The closure standards for landfills do not require or address removal of wastes or soils.</li> <li>• The closure standards are specific regarding when waste is expected to be removed.</li> <li>• Alternate requirements can be applied to TSD-unit closure if a release has occurred.</li> <li>• There are no known releases from TSD-unit landfills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need for field characterization is driven by the need for removal or decontamination.</li> <li>• The closure standard for landfills does not include removal or decontamination.</li> <li>• The integration of TSD units with cleanup must follow the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 5.5.</li> <li>• The Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 5.5 requires TSD-unit closures to follow WAC 173-303.</li> <li>• Any sampling at TSD-units should be for the purpose of closure under WAC 173-303.</li> <li>• Sampling and analysis for TSD-unit landfill closure should be for purposes of the cover.</li> <li>• The Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 5.3 requires TSD units to be closed pursuant to WAC 173-303-610.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TSD closure standards are not directly applicable to past-practice units.</li> <li>• Past-practice units at Hanford are subject to the CERCLA remedial action process.</li> <li>• Past-practice units are potentially subject to RCRA corrective action.</li> <li>• The Tri-Party Agreement seeks to accomplish the objectives of both programs for all operable unit work.</li> <li>• Some TSD-units are listed in the Tri-Party Agreement for closure concurrent with past-practice work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Characterization needs at past-practice units are driven by the remedial investigation/feasibility study process.</li> <li>• TSD-unit closure standards do not automatically apply to past-practice landfills.</li> <li>• Characterization efforts should be commensurate with acceptable levels of uncertainty.</li> <li>• In addition to meeting applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements, a remedy must be determined to be protective.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-1970 buried waste is not subject to environmental rules for active management.</li> <li>• The U.S. Department of Energy plans to address pre-1970 buried wastes in accordance with the CERCLA process.</li> <li>• Decisions regarding pre-1970 transuranic buried waste will depend on results of the evaluation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed waste disposed after August 19, 1987, is subject to regulation as a TSD unit.</li> <li>• Inadvertent Mixed Waste disposal after August 19, 1987, when discovered is discussed with Ecology and actions taken as appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work plan agreement constitutes a comprehensive working agreement.</li> <li>• The work plan agreement addresses sampling at TSD units during investigation.</li> <li>• The scope of certain agreement aspects is questionable.</li> <li>• The commitment to identify sources of authority can be useful.</li> <li>• Some aspects of the work plan agreement seem to clearly extend beyond regulations.</li> </ul>

CERCLA = *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980.*  
 RCRA = *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976.*  
 Tri-Party Agreement = *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Ecology et al. 1989a).*

Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan = *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order Action Plan (Ecology et al. 1989b).*  
 WAC 173-303 = "Dangerous Waste Regulations."  
 WAC 173-303-610 = "Closure and Post-Closure."

1 After the RI is complete, remedial alternatives/closure strategies will be developed and evaluated  
2 against WAC 173-303-610(2), "Closure Performance Standard," performance standards and  
3 evaluation criteria. The integration process for the evaluation of remedial alternatives includes  
4 the preparation of an FS/closure plan that will satisfy the requirements for a corrective-measures  
5 study report. Both documents are required to include identification and development of  
6 corrective measures/remedial alternatives and an evaluation of those alternatives. The  
7 corrective-measures study generally also includes a recommended alternative, which typically is  
8 the purpose of the proposed plan under CERCLA. The FS will include a section that provides  
9 corrective action recommendations for past-practice units and a closure plan that will address the  
10 RCRA TSD units in this OU. The FS also will include further evaluation and refinement of  
11 potential ARARs that were identified in the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28).

### 12 **5.1.2 Characterization Data Requirements for** 13 **TSD-Unit Landfill Closure**

14 The Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 3.2 states, "some TSD groups/units, primarily  
15 land disposal units, are included within operable units..., and will be addressed concurrently  
16 with past-practice activities as defined in Section 5.5." The Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan,  
17 Section 5.5, defines the interface between TSD units and past-practice units. Section 5.5  
18 includes discussion about SAPs that outline the manner in which RCRA closure/postclosure plan  
19 requirements will be met in the work plan and subsequent documents. Per Section 5.5, proposed  
20 closure/postclosure activities are intended to (1) meet RCRA closure standards and requirements,  
21 (2) be consistent with closure requirements specified in the *Hanford Facility RCRA Permit*, and  
22 (3) be coordinated with the recommended remedial action(s) for the associated operable unit.  
23 Sampling at TSD-unit landfills should be for the purpose of closure under WAC 173-303.

24 Coordinating closure or permitting with the past-practice investigation and remediation is  
25 deemed necessary to preclude overlap and duplication of work. Section 5.5 indicates that  
26 the disposition of TSD units must be in accordance with Chapter 6.0. Chapter 6.0 drives  
27 TSD closure to follow the requirements of WAC 173-303, which does not require removal of  
28 wastes for landfill closures. WAC 173-303-610(4)(a), "Closure; Time Allowed for Closure,"  
29 indicates that at closure the owner or operator "must treat, remove from the unit or facility, or  
30 dispose of on site, all dangerous wastes in accordance with the approved closure plan."  
31 WAC 173-303-610(5), "Disposal or Decontamination of Equipment, Structures, and Soils,"  
32 states that "all contaminated equipment, structures and soils must be properly disposed of or  
33 decontaminated unless otherwise specified in WAC 173-303-640(8), WAC 173-303-650(6),  
34 WAC 173-303-655(8), WAC 173-303-660(9), WAC 173-303-665(6), or under the authority of  
35 WAC 173-303-680(2) and (4)." Thus, the closure standard for landfills does not include waste  
36 removal or site decontamination.

37 The Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 6.5, states that "in some instances, RCRA TSD  
38 units are included in OUs and are scheduled for investigation and closure." Sampling and  
39 analysis for TSD-unit landfill closure should be for purposes of the cover. Dangerous waste  
40 placed into a RCRA landfill is intended, by regulation, to remain disposed after closure.  
41 Notwithstanding, sampling and analysis needs at landfills should be established using the DQO  
42 process. Because TSD-unit landfills do not require removal of dangerous waste at closure, the

1 need for and level of sampling during their closure should be based on the DQO process.  
2 Some characterization may be necessary to support design and implementation of a landfill  
3 cover, if appropriate for compliance with the closure standards. The closure performance  
4 standard for landfills is design and construction of a final cover meeting the requirements of  
5 WAC 173-303-665(6)(a)(i) through (v). There are no requirements in WAC 173-303-665(6) for  
6 removal or decontamination of wastes or soils and hence no clear regulatory driver for field  
7 characterization during closure of landfills.

### 8 **5.1.3 Regulatory and Tri-Party Agreement Drivers for** 9 **Remediation of RCRA Past-Practice Landfills**

10 Landfills that are not TSD units are classified in the Tri-Party Agreement as past-practice units.  
11 Past-practice units (including landfills) identified in the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan,  
12 Appendix C are listed on the National Priorities List. Consequently, they are subject to  
13 CERCLA remedial action as implemented through the Tri-Party Agreement. Landfills cannot be  
14 simultaneously classified as TSD units and past-practice units. However, TSD units and  
15 past-practice units can be simultaneously addressed to meet the requirements of the respective  
16 individual authorities. The Tri-Party Agreement intent is to meet the objectives of both the  
17 RCRA and CERCLA past-practice processes for all OU work.

18 The Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan contains provisions for investigation and management of  
19 TSD units in conjunction with past-practice units. The intent is to provide the information  
20 necessary for performing TSD closure in coordination with the RI/FS documents. This does not  
21 mean that departure from the TSD closure standards is necessary. Coordination requires that  
22 past-practice units be evaluated using the RI/FS process, and TSD closure is attained in  
23 accordance with TSD closure standards, but efforts are made to perform and document the  
24 respective activities concurrently, as appropriate.

25 TSD closure standards are not applicable to landfills that did not receive hazardous and/or mixed  
26 waste after the relevant effective dates of regulation. However, past-practice units potentially are  
27 subject to RCRA corrective action. Past-practice units are potentially subject to the provisions of  
28 RCRA corrective action, because TSD operations occur at the Hanford Site. The regulations for  
29 implementing Washington's corrective-action program are found in WAC 173-303-64610,  
30 "Closure and Post-Closure," "Purpose and Applicability." These regulations would be used in  
31 their entirety for remediation performed using the RCRA past-practice process and require, at a  
32 minimum, application of certain portions of WAC 173-340, "Model Toxics Control Act –  
33 Cleanup," in the performance of corrective action. Only the substantive requirements deemed to  
34 be ARAR to the selected remedy would be used for remediation performed using the CERCLA  
35 past-practice process.

36 The requirements of RCRA corrective action are not precluded by a site's listing on the National  
37 Priorities List, nor are Federal facilities excluded from the requirements of RCRA corrective  
38 action. All TSD facilities are required to initiate RCRA corrective action at their facilities, as  
39 appropriate. RCRA corrective action is intended to address releases to the environment that  
40 contain dangerous constituents, even if the material released was not dangerous or mixed waste.

1 By statute, RCRA corrective-action provisions (as appropriate) must be addressed in all  
2 RCRA permits.

### 3 **5.1.4 Characterization Data Requirements for RCRA** 4 **Past-Practice Remediation**

5 The RI/FS process drives characterization needs at past-practice units. Field characterization  
6 generally is required at various stages in the RI/FS process. During the scoping phase, existing  
7 data are assembled and evaluated and are used to formulate initial CSMs. This information is  
8 used to support the logic for the associated work plan and is included in the work plan. During  
9 the RI, field sampling usually is necessary to support understanding of the nature and extent of  
10 contamination and refinement of CSMs. This information, in turn, is used to support further  
11 development of the remedial action. In addition, activities necessary to characterize and assess  
12 risks of exposure are intended for further development during the FS.

13 The general purpose of site characterization under CERCLA is to increase understanding of the  
14 level, type, and distribution of contamination at a site. Methods proposed for characterization  
15 must be appropriate for the level of uncertainty that will be acceptable for the identified end use  
16 of the site. Site-characterization work plans should begin with identification of COPCs and  
17 unique site conditions. As information is gathered to support risk-informed decision-making,  
18 balance between uncertainty and any benefit derived from further data collection/characterization  
19 should be sought. Often, uncertainty can be addressed by making conservative assumptions in  
20 selecting models and their parameters.

21 Past-practice units are subject to the RI/FS process that requires the gathering of adequate  
22 information to support evaluation of feasible alternatives for remedial action. This process is by  
23 design intended to explore various alternatives in the context of a predetermined criteria set.  
24 ARARs must be identified for each alternative that is considered as a potential remedy.  
25 Non-TSD-unit landfills received many of the same wastes as TSD-unit landfills, but TSD-unit  
26 closure standards do not automatically apply to past-practice landfills. A feasible alternative for  
27 remediation of non-TSD-unit landfills is closure as a TSD landfill. This option, if selected,  
28 would be implemented by identifying the TSD-unit landfill closure standards as relevant and  
29 appropriate, based on the nature and circumstances of the disposal activities. After completion  
30 of the RI/FS process and development of a proposed plan, the ARARs for the preferred remedy  
31 would be identified.

32 In addition to meeting ARARs, a remedy must be determined to be protective. It is important to  
33 note that although the identification of ARARs for a response action provides for the backbone  
34 of the cleanup, consideration also must be given to the level of protectiveness provided by the  
35 ARARs, so that additional provisions can be made, if necessary. For landfills that were operated  
36 in a manner similar to TSD-unit landfills, it may be protective from a RCRA perspective to  
37 initiate landfill closure in accordance with TSD-unit landfill standards. Depending on the  
38 circumstances, the presence of radionuclides not subject to the RCRA closure standards could be  
39 cause for further evaluation under CERCLA to ensure that the selected remedy is protective.

### 1 **5.1.5 Regulatory Requirements for Pre-1970 Buried** 2 **Waste**

3 DOE waste that was disposed of in the past is not automatically subject to today's waste-disposal  
4 standards. From a RCRA perspective, waste disposed of before the relevant effective date would  
5 not be subject to RCRA generator or TSD standards unless and until the waste is exhumed and  
6 actively managed.<sup>29</sup> However, solid waste (as defined by RCRA) is subject to the RCRA  
7 corrective-action requirements at facilities (such as the Hanford Site) that engage in TSD  
8 activities, irrespective of the date of disposal. This means that pre-1970 buried waste potentially  
9 is subject to the Washington RCRA corrective-action program, as well as CERCLA remedial  
10 action.

11 Although environmental laws and regulations pertaining to active management do not directly  
12 apply to pre-1970 buried wastes, current DOE plans may include characterization of many older  
13 past-practice disposal sites under CERCLA or RCRA corrective action. Such evaluation would  
14 be performed in the same manner, using the same criteria as for other hazardous substances.

15 DOE assumes that post-1970 retrievably-stored TRU waste will be shipped to the Waste  
16 Isolation Pilot Plant. Decisions regarding pre-1970 buried radioactive waste that may contain  
17 transuranic elements will be made through the Tri-Party Agreement using the CERCLA or  
18 RCRA past-practice process in collaboration with the EPA and/or Ecology.<sup>30</sup>

### 9 **5.1.6 Regulatory Requirements for Mixed Waste** 20 **Disposed of After August 19, 1987**

21 Mixed waste disposed of after the effective date of regulation<sup>31</sup> is subject to the RCRA TSD  
22 standards. Mixed wastes disposed to the RCRA landfills after the effective date of regulation  
23 historically have been coded on RCRA Part A Permit application maps with the color green.  
24 These disposal locations have been referred to as "green islands." Technically, "green islands"  
25 are subject to regulation as RCRA landfills.

26 Mixed wastes that were disposed of after the effective date, in accordance with all applicable  
27 standards, should be regulated in the same manner as other TSD-unit landfills (i.e., there is no  
28 requirement to remove wastes at closure). However, post-effective date wastes that were  
29 disposed of in a manner that is inconsistent with regulatory requirements that were applicable at  
30 the time of disposal potentially are subject to enforcement action, possibly including

---

<sup>29</sup> The EPA has defined active management as "physically disturbing the accumulated wastes within a management unit or disposing additional hazardous wastes into existing waste management units containing previously disposed wastes." [54 FR 36597, "Radioactive Waste, Byproducts Material Final Rule"] See also the EPA, 1964, memo, dated April 6, 1994, for clarification regarding the concept of active management at closing disposal facilities.

<sup>30</sup> Source, special nuclear, byproduct material, as defined by the *Atomic Energy Act of 1954*, is not subject to WAC 173-303, including RCRA corrective action.

<sup>31</sup> The State of Washington has informed the U.S. Department of Energy via letter (Ecology 1996) that the effective date for mixed waste regulation in the State of Washington is August 19, 1987.

1 investigation and cleanup to standards that exceed TSD-unit landfill closure standards. In other  
2 words, mixed wastes disposed of after the effective date of regulation are required to be disposed  
3 of in compliance with standards that are applicable at the time of disposal (e.g., land-disposal  
4 restrictions and minimum technical requirements).

#### 5 **5.1.7 Summary Assessment of Commitments in the** 6 **Collaborative Agreement**

7 The Collaborative Agreement (Ecology and DOE, 2005) was entered into between RL and  
8 Ecology in an effort to resolve, "...substantial differences between RL and Ecology in their  
9 respective understandings of the required scope of the work plan" for the 200-SW-1 and  
10 200-SW-2 OUs. The resultant document and its appendices constitute a comprehensive working  
11 agreement between RL and Ecology. The Collaborative Agreement includes language for  
12 conducting RI in a phased manner. This language addresses sampling at TSD and non-TSD  
13 units that includes site-survey and -screening activities discussed in the Tri-Party Agreement  
14 Action Plan, Section 7.3.2. Section 7.3.2 specifically states that, "...the sampling instruction will  
15 acknowledge WAC 173-303 as related to the TSD Units." This provision would not add any  
16 new requirements for sampling. As discussed in Section 5.1.3 above, sampling for TSD-unit  
17 landfill closure should be in accordance with WAC 173-303-665(6), and to support design and  
18 implementation of a landfill cover, if appropriate for compliance with the closure standards.

#### 19 **5.2 CLOSURE OF THE NONRADIOACTIVE** 20 **DANGEROUS WASTE LANDFILL AND THE** 21 **600 AREA CENTRAL LANDFILL**

22 The 200-SW-1 OU originally was a process-based OU composed of various nonradioactive  
23 landfills, dumps, and pits. In June 2002, RL and Ecology signed Tri-Party Agreement change  
24 requests concerning modification to 200 Areas OU cleanup milestones. The change requests  
25 established a CERCLA RI/FS process for the 200-SW-1 OU that included coordination of the  
26 closure of the NRDWL, a RCRA TSD unit, with the RI/FS process. The waste sites in the  
27 200-SW-1 OU, along with the 200-SW-2 OU, which contained radioactive waste sites, were  
28 submitted for RI under DOE/RL-2004-60, Draft A, in 2004.

29 In 2006, a supplemental characterization DQO process was conducted to provide for additional  
30 RI needs for waste sites on the Central Plateau. As a result of this DQO process, the Tri-Parties  
31 agreed to establish new OUs grouped by similarity of remedial decision. Two of these new OUs  
32 (the 200-MG-1 and 200-MG-2 OUs) were developed to include waste sites that already have  
33 sufficient data that have been evaluated and that the determination has been made that a remedial  
34 decision for the site is straightforward and the remedy is readily implementable, such as  
35 remove/treat/dispose, monitored natural attenuation, or no action for shallow waste sites. Most  
36 of the waste sites in 200-SW-1 OU have been reassigned to the 200-MG-1 and 200-MG-2 OUs.  
37 The two waste sites in the 200-SW-1 OU that were not reassigned are the NRDWL and the  
38 600 CL.

1 The following conclusions were made for the closure of NRDWL (the RCRA TSD unit) and  
 2 600 CL (the nonhazardous solid-waste landfill) to support the basis for closing these landfills  
 3 outside the RI/FS process.

- 4 • NRDWL and 600 CL are nonradioactive landfills that were operating at the time that the  
 5 National Priorities List was developed for the 200 Areas. Therefore, these landfills were  
 6 not originally included as waste sites that needed a CERCLA response action. However,  
 7 because operations have ceased for the 600 CL, the landfill was included in Appendix C  
 8 of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan. NRDWL was added to Appendix C to allow for  
 9 the closure to be coordinated with the CERCLA RI/FS process.
- 10 • NRDWL and the 600 CL will have to be closed under WAC 173-303-610 and  
 11 WAC 173-304-407, respectively
- 12 • Any characterization at RCRA TSD-unit landfills undergoing closure should be limited  
 13 in purpose to information necessary to achieve closure standards (e.g., installation of  
 14 a cap)
- 15 • A Tri-Party Agreement Change Request will be needed to document the removal of these  
 16 two landfills from Appendix C of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan
- 17 • All hazardous substances that may be COPCs are addressed under the landfill-closure  
 18 requirements. Additional benefits afforded under a CERCLA remedial-action process for  
 19 certain COPCs, such as remediation of radionuclides, are not necessary to close these  
 20 landfills
- 21 • Previous closure documents have been prepared for these landfills. These documents  
 22 need to be updated and resubmitted.

### 23 **5.2.1 Regulatory Basis for Closure Decisions**

24 NRDWL and the 600 CL were operating under existing environmental regulations that apply to  
 25 landfills, WAC 173-303-610, "Closure and Post-Closure," and WAC 173-304-407, respectively.  
 26 These environmental regulations contain requirements for closure and postclosure care that are  
 27 protective of human health and the environment, and their use is agreed upon by the Tri-Parties.  
 28 Before updated and revised closure plans for both NRDWL and the 600 CL are submitted, the  
 29 200-SW-2 OU project will evaluate and take advantage of efficiencies that could be realized  
 30 from a single closure plan that integrates both sites. Efficiencies could be seen in three phases:  
 31 (1) one closure plan for both sites, (2) design of an integrated barrier, and (3) construction of the  
 32 integrated barrier. Full collaboration and approval from Ecology on a single closure plan will  
 33 take place before submittal.

34 CERCLA response actions address those inactive waste sites that have had a release or a  
 35 potential for release that threatens human health and/or the environment at the Hanford Site.  
 36 Waste sites were evaluated, and hazard ranking scores were developed and aggregated into areas,  
 37 and were listed on the National Priorities List in 1987. NRDWL was an active TSD unit in 1987  
 38 and, as such, was not included when the 200 Areas National Priorities List was developed.

1 Therefore, there are no CERCLA statutory requirements that have to be met when closing this  
 2 landfill as a RCRA TSD unit. A Tri-Party Agreement change request will be needed to remove  
 3 the landfill from Appendix C of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, because there no longer  
 4 will be a need to coordinate the closure activities with CERCLA remedial activities.

5 The 600 Area CL also was operating when the original National Priorities List was developed  
 6 and was not included in the list of waste sites. However, because operation ceased in 1996, the  
 7 600 Area CL was added to Appendix C of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan. Appendix C  
 8 contains the list of waste sites that require RI or action under Section 120 of CERCLA (i.e., the  
 9 CERCLA RI/FS process) (Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 3.5). Therefore, to close  
 10 the landfill separate from the CERCLA RI/FS process, a Tri-Party Agreement change request  
 11 needs to be prepared to remove this waste site from the appendix. The Tri-Party Agreement  
 12 change request should provide the justification that, as a nonhazardous solid-waste landfill,  
 13 closing the 600 Area CL under the existing regulations (WAC 173-304) will satisfactorily  
 14 protect human health and the environment.

15 Both NRDWL and the 600 CL received only nonradioactive waste during their operating life.  
 16 No radioactive contamination has been found during past operations and groundwater  
 17 monitoring. All hazardous substances that may become COPCs are addressed under the existing  
 18 landfill closure requirements, either WAC 173-303-610 for NRDWL closure as a RCRA TSD or  
 19 WAC 173-304-407 for 600 CL closure as a solid-waste landfill. Additional benefits afforded  
 20 under a CERCLA remedial-action process for certain hazardous substances, such as  
 21 radionuclides, are not necessary to close these landfills.

22 Because there are no longer any waste sites in the 200-SW-1 OU, the OU designation no longer  
 23 is needed and can be deleted from Appendix C of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan through a  
 24 change request. Under CERCLA, OUs are developed to organize waste sites that have common  
 25 characteristics, to assist in the RI/FS process. Because there no longer will be any waste sites in  
 26 the 200-SW-1 OU, there is no need for the OU to exist.

27 The environmental documentation required for closing NRDWL under WAC 173-303-610 and  
 28 the 600 CL under WAC 173-304-407 is presented in Table 5-2.

Table 5-2. Documentation Required to Close the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and the 600 Area Central Landfill.

Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill	600 Area Central Landfill
Tri-Party Agreement Change Request	Tri-Party Agreement Change Request
Closure/Postclosure Plan <sup>a</sup>	Closure/Postclosure Plan <sup>a</sup>
Hanford Facility RCRA Permit Modification Part V – Closure Part VI – Postclosure	Not applicable
Final Status Groundwater Monitoring Plan <sup>b</sup>	Groundwater Monitoring Plan <sup>b</sup>
NEPA Documentation	NEPA Documentation
SEPA Checklist	SEPA Checklist

<sup>a</sup>Efficiencies will be evaluated for a single, combined closure plan.

<sup>b</sup>The groundwater monitoring plans will be included in the closure plan.

NEPA = *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*.

SEPA = *State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C)*.

### 1 5.3 PHASED CHARACTERIZATION 2 APPROACH

3 Because of the complexity of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills, a phased characterization approach  
4 will be employed to aid in remedial-action decision making. This approach was approved by RL  
5 and Ecology and documented in CCN 0073214.

6 A preliminary investigation began in 2004 to perform a comprehensive review of existing  
7 documentation associated with the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU waste sites. A large quantity of  
8 records were compiled and reviewed, and a database was created to capture information that  
9 could be used to focus future field-characterization activities. In 2005, a collaborative  
10 negotiations process was held with the Tri-Parties. This process rescoped the focus of the DQO  
11 to follow. The focus was changed to 22 waste sites in the 200-SW-2 OU. These waste sites  
12 included the original Bin 3A and Bin 3B sites and consisted of 21 landfills and one unplanned  
13 release. This DQO process (Phase I-A) focused on nonintrusive investigations of these waste  
14 sites, including geophysical, radiological, and organic-vapor surveys.

15 After Phase I-A field characterization activities were performed in mid-2006, a Phase I-B DQO  
16 process was performed to support development of this RI/FS work plan. The Phase I-B DQO  
17 process focused on 24 landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU. Additionally, two landfills in the  
18 200-SW-1 OU were included in the DQO, as well as in this RI/FS work plan; however, it is  
19 proposed that these landfills be closed outside of the CERCLA process and are included in this  
20 documentation for informational purposes only. A proposed regulatory path forward for closure  
21 of these landfills is presented in Chapter 5.0 of this RI/FS work plan. The Phase I-B DQO and  
22 SAP (Appendix A) focuses on additional nonintrusive characterization, as well as intrusive  
23 characterization techniques. The proposed phased characterization process for the  
24 200-SW-2 OU landfills is presented in Figure 5-2.

25 Additional DQO processes will be held following completion of the Phase I-B field  
26 characterization activities, as required. These potential future phase DQO processes will further  
27 aid in characterizing the landfills and will focus on progressively more intrusive characterization  
28 techniques, as required. Information gathered from all phases, including treatability  
29 investigations, will be used to support risk assessments, further refinement of the preliminary  
30 conceptual site models, and ultimately choosing a remedial-action alternative.

### 31 5.4 COMMUNITY RELATIONS

32 One of the useful and important aspects of the RI/FS process is to establish effective community  
33 relations. Community relations activities serve to keep communities informed of the activities at  
34 the site and help the DOE and regulatory agencies anticipate and respond to community  
35 concerns. A community relations plan has been developed for the Hanford Site to provide a  
36 framework for overall community relations and public involvement in activities under the  
37 purview of the Tri-Party Agreement. Community relations activities are conducted in  
38 accordance with *Hanford Site Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Community Relations*  
39 *Plan, Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order* (DOE et al., 2002).

1 The community relations plan provides guidelines for future community relations activities at the  
2 Hanford Site. The plan provides a site mailing list, a conveniently located place for access to  
3 public information about the site, an opportunity for a public meeting when the FS and proposed  
4 plan are issued, and a summary of public comments on the FS and proposed plan and Ecology's  
5 response to those comments.

6 The community relations plan intends to fulfill applicable state and Federal laws regarding  
7 development of community involvement and public participation plans. The plan also serves as  
8 one of the overall public participation plans guiding public involvement at the Hanford Site. The  
9 Tri-Parties recognize that people nationwide are concerned and affected by the Hanford Site.

## 10 **5.5 REMEDIAL-INVESTIGATION ACTIVITIES**

11 This section summarizes the planned tasks that have been and/or will be performed during the RI  
12 phase for the 200-SW-2 OU, including the following:

- 13 • Records review
- 14 • Planning
- 15 • Field investigation
- 16 • Site surveys
- 17 • Data integration and modeling
- 18 • Laboratory analysis and data validation
- 19 • Preparing an RI report.


20 These tasks and subtasks reflect the work breakdown structure that will be used to manage the  
21 work and to develop the project schedule discussed in Chapter 6.0. In addition, concurrent with  
22 the RI activities describe above, the project will identify or develop the appropriate models to  
23 support an evaluation of the personnel exposure levels (ALARA) associated with the various  
24 remedial alternatives and the cost for implementing those alternatives.

### 25 **5.5.1 Historical Information Review**

26 A historical information review was performed to determine the level of existing detail regarding  
27 the 200-SW-2 OU landfills. This information review was performed based on recommendations  
28 made by Ecology before and during the collaborative-negotiations process. Ecology  
29 recommended that a historical information review of burial records and other information  
30 pertaining to the 200-SW-2 OU landfills could be used to focus nonintrusive and intrusive  
31 surveys and sampling to aid in characterization of the landfills.

32

Figure 5-2. Phased Characterization Strategy for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills.



1 Existing information varies significantly in terms of completeness for the 200-SW-2 OU  
2 landfills. The initial step for all landfills was to assess the available documentation of site  
3 history to establish a basis for investigative needs. This information was reviewed and  
4 incorporated into the Phase I-A DQO process. The sampling and analysis instruction  
5 (D&D-28283) that was developed as a result of the Phase I-A DQO focused field surveys on  
6 those areas that were identified as requiring additional investigation (e.g., areas that may contain  
7 organic liquids, discrepancies in the historical information). The Phase I-B DQO process builds  
8 on information that was gathered as part of the Phase I-A DQO process and on an ongoing  
9 historical information review.

#### 10 **5.5.1.1 Information Sources**

11 Historical information research initially focused on the following information sources:

- 12 • Declassified Document Retrieval System
- 13 • DOE Public Reading Room at the Consolidated Information Center, Washington State  
14 University-Tri-Cities
- 15 • Documents listed in the references for DOE/RL-2004-60, Draft A
- 16 • Hanford Site Records Management Information System for documents that were  
17 electronically scanned
- 18 • Hanford Site Records Holding Area for documents that were archived and stored
- 19 • The WIDS database and library
- 20 • Past MSCM survey data
- 21 • The SWITS database.

22 The research encompassed many thousands of documents available through these systems. The  
23 Declassified Document Retrieval System contains over 125,000 documents, and the Records  
24 Management Information System contains over 1,000,000 documents. Approximately 50 boxes  
25 of older documents from the Records Holding Area archives were ordered and examined. The  
26 24 landfills are represented by about 100 maps and engineering drawings. A number of  
27 documents stood out as being the most valuable. The WIDS database and site maps and  
28 drawings defined general site characteristics, site locations, trench boundaries, and (in many  
29 cases) individual items of buried waste. Finally, a series of documents from the 1950s found in  
30 the Declassified Document Retrieval System described many of the landfills "as they were" at  
31 the time that those documents were published.

32 The SWITS database offered the most comprehensive and useful information of all the sources,  
33 with respect to individual burials. Several landfill logbooks from the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s  
34 were located in the Records Holding Area and in the WIDS library. These logbooks offered long  
35 lists of individual burials for past-practice (non-TSD) landfills. Property disposal records from

1 the 1940s and 1950s were located in the Declassified Document Retrieval System, the Records  
2 Holding Area, and the WIDS library and also included lists of individual burials.

3 Information from currently known sources for individual burials has been, and will continue to  
4 be, captured in a project records database throughout the RI process; if more logbooks or other  
5 records are discovered in the future, they too may be added to the database. Other future  
6 historical research may include the following:

- 7 • Reconciliation of historical records with information collected via other characterization  
8 methods
- 9 • Obtaining information regarding standards (such as limits on types of waste buried, types  
10 of burial boxes typically used) in effect at each landfill over its operating history
- 11 • Obtaining the basis for the plutonium and uranium inventories in older landfills.

12 Table 5-3 lists existing documents and data collected from previous investigations that are key  
13 resources for the 200-SW-2 OU RI/FS process and provides a summary of the pertinent  
14 information contained in each reference.

15 Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<b>AGGREGATE AREA MANAGEMENT STUDIES</b>	
<i>B Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00179, Rev 00</i>	Description of wastes sites and processes within the B Plant Aggregate Area. Includes composition of B Plant facilities wastes and descriptions of Landfills 218-E-2A, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-9. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038144">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038144</a>
<i>PUREX Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00178, Rev 00</i>	Description of waste sites and processes within PUREX Aggregate Area. Includes composition of PUREX facilities wastes and descriptions of Landfills 218-E-1, 218-E-8, 218-E-12A, 218-E-12B. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038126">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038126</a>
<i>S Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00176, Rev 00</i>	Description of waste sites and processes within S Plant Aggregate Area. Includes composition of S Plant (REDOX) facilities wastes. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038143">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038143</a>
<i>T Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00177, Rev 00</i>	Description of waste sites and processes within T Plant Aggregate Area. Includes composition of T Plant facilities wastes. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038140">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038140</a>

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<i>U Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report</i> , BHI-00174, Rev 00	Description of waste sites and processes within U Plant Aggregate Area. Includes composition of U Plant facilities wastes. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038132">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038132</a>
<i>Z Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report</i> , BHI-00175, Rev 00	Description of waste sites and processes within Z Plant Aggregate Area. Includes composition of Z Plant (Plutonium Finishing Plant) facilities wastes and descriptions of Landfills 218-W-1, 218-W-1A, 218-W-2, 218-W-2A, 218-W-3, 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4A, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, 218-W-5, 218-W-11. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038137">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198038137</a>
<b>CONTENTS, INVENTORIES, AND DESCRIPTIONS OF LANDFILLS</b>	
<i>200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial Investigation/ Feasibility Study Work Plan</i> , DOE/RL-2004-60, Draft A	Lists all sites in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units at the time of publication. Gives brief descriptions of all waste sites. Lengthy descriptions (history, hydrogeology, physical attributes) of the 22 sites in the former Bin 3. Gives description of the logic used for binning the sites, and lists sites according to bin. Describes characterization logic for site investigation. Also gives synopsis of history of the landfills. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D7030512">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D7030512</a>
<i>Burial Ground Characterization Engineering Report</i> , RHO-D0101ER0101, 1980	Stabilization plans and activities; trench surveys giving centerlines and end coordinates; general information such as location, radiation levels; for most past-practice sites.
<i>Burial Ground Log Books from Records Holding Area Box 85617 (1958-1964)</i> (GE 1964)	Record books, informal memos from this box for Landfills 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, 218-E-10, 218-E-12A, 218-W-2A, 218-W-3, 218-W-4A, 218-W-4B. They show trench contents, location of items, when trenches were dug, etc.
<i>Burial of Equipment and Material and Instruments 01/09/1947 Through 12/29/1947</i> , DDTS-GENERATED-5635 (GE 1947)	Informal memos listing property disposed of by burial; giving facility source. Can deduce that the material from 200 Area listed was buried in Landfill 218-W-1, 218-W-1A, or 218-E-1 by the dates. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9023872">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9023872</a>
<i>Burial of Equipment and Material and Instruments 01/14/1948 Through 12/21/1948</i> , DDTS-GENERATED-5636 (GE 1948)	Informal memos listing property disposed of by burial, giving facility source. Can deduce that the material from 200 Area listed was buried in Landfill 218-W-1, 218-W-1A, or 218-E-1 by the dates. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9023874">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9023874</a>

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<i>Burial of Equipment and Material and Instruments 03/01/1946 Through 12/27/1946, DDTS-GENERATED-5634 (GE 1946)</i>	Informal memos listing property buried; giving facility source. Can deduce that the material from 200 Area listed was buried in Landfill 218-W-1, 218-W-1A, or 218-E-1 by the dates. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9023859">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9023859</a>
<i>Burial of Hanford Radioactive Wastes, HW-77274, 1963</i>	Then-current (as of 1963) policies and procedures governing the landfills. Includes size/location of then-existing sites. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8504146">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8504146</a>
<i>Burial of Material 01/03/1949 Through 05/09/1949, DDTS-GENERATED-5640 (GE 1949a)</i>	Informal memos listing property disposed of by burial, giving facility source. Can deduce that the material from 200 Area listed was buried in Landfills 218-W-1, 218-W-1A, or 218-E-1 by the dates. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9023886">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9023886</a>
<i>Chemical Processing Division Monthly Reports (too numerous to list individually). An example is Chemical Processing Division Monthly Report for February 1957, HW-48835, 1957</i>	The monthly reports cover a wide variety of events (plutonium output, radiation occurrences, etc.). Of relevance to this DQO is the information regarding burials that often are found within the reports. The example report from February 1957 lists a PUREX clean up effort of materials taken for burial that reduced dose rates within a portion of the deck from 20 R/hr to 1 R/hr. The landfill receiving the material may be inferred from the type of waste and date buried. Example report available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199145682">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199145682</a>
<i>Criteria For Design Of Equipment Burial Containers, HW-83959, 1964</i>	Standards in effect in 1964 for equipment burials – weight limits, shielding, containment, backfill, etc. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8377050">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8377050</a>
<i>Description of Waste Buried in Site 218-W-4B, RHO-65462-80-035, 1980</i>	Describes areas of trenches with low-level waste suitable for demonstrations of remediation; describes specific items disposed of by trench; describes high-activity, large/heavy, and liquid items. This reference is in the <i>Waste Information Data System</i> library.
<i>Disposition of Contaminated Government Property 05/10/1949 Through 10/31/1949, DDTS-GENERATED-5637 (GE 1949b)</i>	Informal memos listing property disposed of by burial, giving facility source. Can deduce that the material from 200 Area listed was buried in Landfills 218-W-1, 218-W-1A, or 218-E-1 by the dates. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9023882">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9023882</a>
<i>Disposition Of Contaminated Processing Equipment At Hanford Atomic Products Operation 1958-1959, (01/01/1958 through 12/31/1959), HW-63703, 1960</i>	Lists equipment buried in 1958-1959, drawing number, size and dose rate. Does not give burial location. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8388213">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8388213</a>

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<i>Disposition of Plutonium to Burial</i> , HW-59645, 1959.	Discusses organically-contaminated plutonium waste generated at the Z-Plant complex. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8342063">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8342063</a>
<i>Final Report 218-E-1 Dry Waste Burial Ground Characterization Survey</i> , RHO-72710-82-167, 1982	Includes a summary of the historical data available up to the time of the survey, results from the ground penetrating radar and drilling work characterization performed in 1982, conclusions as to where the trenches in Landfill 218-E-1 are located and whether they were filled, and recommendations for confirmatory studies. This reference is in the <i>Waste Information Data System</i> library.
<i>Handbook 200 Areas Waste Sites</i> , RHO-CD-673, 1979	Descriptions of radioactive waste sites within the 200 Areas, excluding tank farms. This document also contains summary level descriptions and/or maps of most 200-SW-2 Operable Unit landfills (some did not yet exist at time of publication). In 3 volumes, available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196039027">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196039027</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196039028">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196039028</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196039029">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196039029</a>
<i>Hanford Site Mixed Waste Disposal</i> , Published Presentation, <i>Waste Management Conference 2001</i> , February 25 – March 1, 2001, Tucson, Arizona, by K. M. McDonald, D. E. McKinney, and T. A. Shrader	Describes the mixed-waste trenches in Landfill 218-W-5 and the general waste acceptance criteria for these trenches. Available at: <a href="http://www.wmsym.org/Abstracts/2001/59/59-8.pdf">http://www.wmsym.org/Abstracts/2001/59/59-8.pdf</a>
<i>Hazard Ranking System Evaluation of CERCLA Inactive Waste Sites at Hanford</i> , PNL-6456, 1988	Comprehensive listing of all Hanford CERCLA sites with risk ranking and capsule summaries. Does not include permitted low-level landfills. In 3 volumes, available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196006954">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196006954</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196006996">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196006996</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196007000">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196007000</a>
<i>Inconsistencies in 218-W-4B Site Data</i> , RHO-65463-80-126, 1980	Describes and offers reconciliation of inconsistencies among information sources (such as locations and types of caissons and locations of unsegregated waste types). This reference is in the <i>Waste Information Data System</i> library.
Individual Burial Records (too numerous to list individually).	Paper burial records, initiated at time of burial. Copies kept on paper in archive and on microfiche, and recently converted to digital format. Contains burial location, date, generating facility, material contents, container description and volume, contaminants, radiation level, etc.
<i>Radioactive Contamination in Unplanned Releases to Ground Within the Chemical Separations Area Control Zone through 1970</i> , ARH-2015 Part 4, 1971.	Documents the status of rails removed from 218-W-2A-T16.

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<p>Drawings of Trenches and Landfills</p> <p>218-C-9 H-2-32523 (of the Pond 216-C-9; no drawing of landfill has yet been located)</p> <p>218-E-1 H-2-124</p> <p>218-E-2A H-2-55534 (WHC-EP-0912 notes that the trench should be drawn farther north)</p> <p>218-E-5 H-2-55534</p> <p>218-E-5A H-2-55534</p> <p>218-E-8 H-2-33276 Rev. 17, Sheet 1 of 24</p> <p>218-E-9 H-2-55534</p> <p>218-E-12A H-2-32560</p> <p>218-E-12B H-2-96660</p> <p>218-W-1 H-2-75149</p> <p>218-W-1A H-2-2516</p> <p>218-W-2 H-2-2503</p> <p>218-W-2A H-2-32095, Sheets 1 &amp; 2</p> <p>218-W-3 H-2-32095, Sheet 1</p> <p>218-W-3A H-2-34880, Sheets 1 &amp; 2</p> <p>218-W-3AE H-2-75351, Sheet 1</p> <p>218-W-4A H-2-32487, layout and contents</p> <p>218-W-4B H-2-33055, layout H-2-74640, caisson installation</p> <p>218-W-4C H-2-37437 and other drawings, mainly of the waste configuration in TRU trenches</p> <p>218-W-5 H-2-94677</p> <p>218-W-11 H-2-94250</p> <p>UPR-200-E-95 (no engineering maps available; the site is included but not marked in H-2-55534)</p>	<p>Location, design, configuration, dimensions, and some contents of trenches and landfills. Complete reference citations for these drawings are included in Chapter 7.0.</p>
<p><i>Input and Decayed Values of Radioactive Solid Wastes Buried in the 200 Areas Through 1971</i>, ARH-2762, 1974</p>	<p>Short report giving volume, radionuclide inventories, areas of landfills, caissons, and other 200-SW-2 Operable Unit sites such as lab vaults. Radionuclide inventories were estimated by a computer model, as described in the report.</p> <p>Available at:  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8604385">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8604385</a></p>
<p><i>Radioactive Contamination in Liquid Wastes Discharged to Ground Within the Chemical Separations Area Control Zone Through 1969</i>, ARH-1608, 1970</p>	<p>Summary of radioactive liquid wastes discharged to ground. Gives initial radioactivity levels in landfills built at sites of former ponds.</p> <p>Available at:  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8603996">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8603996</a></p>

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<i>Radioactive Contamination In Unplanned Releases To Ground Within The Chemical Separations Area Control Zone Through 1972 (Exclusive of Liquid Waste Storage Tank Farms)</i> , ARH-2757, 1973	Reports on unplanned releases. Includes the location, radiation levels, and burial depths of some individual trenches such as the T Plant canyon block burials in 218-W-2A, and the status of removal of rails in 218-W-2A-T16. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8604174">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8604174</a> .
<i>Low-Level Burial Grounds Database</i> , WHC-MR-0008, 1989.	Contains voluminous inventory information (waste volume, total plutonium, uranium, beta-gamma, sometimes other isotopes, burial coordinates, container type, trench number, date buried, source facility, etc.). The document covers the permitted low-level landfills only. The data fill 8 volumes and go through 1989. It is the same data as in the <i>Solid Waste Information and Tracking System</i> database. The 8 volumes are available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066777">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066777</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066775">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066775</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066774">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066774</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066817">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066817</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066821">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066821</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066924">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066924</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066928">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066928</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066948">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066948</a>
<i>Scrap &amp; SS Material Waste For Burial At Richland</i> , HAN-95462, 1966	Lists property buried; gives facility source. Can deduce the most likely recipient site by the dates. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196095555">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196095555</a>
<i>Solid Waste Information and Tracking System</i> , Hanford Site database	Gives inventory information (waste volume, total plutonium, uranium, beta-gamma, etc.) For newer (post-1967) landfills, gives more extensive information, usually including burial coordinates, container type, trench number, date buried, source facility, nonradioactive contaminants, etc.
<i>Solid Waste Management History of the Hanford Site</i> , WHC-EP-0845, 1995	Summarizes the management of solid waste at Hanford from 1944-1995. Topics covered are extensive and include container types, waste categories, disposal practices, waste handling practices, documentation of buried waste, laws and orders pertinent to waste disposal, etc.

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<p>Source Data Records (too numerous to list individually). Example: <i>Burial Gardens Records FY1971 Month End &amp; Source Data 10/1970 Through 12/1970</i>, ARH-1913-2, 1970</p>	<p>The source data records contain many referrals to buried waste, often with brief waste descriptions and burial coordinates. The example document, p. 39, lists "Canyon Hood, Room Waste, Heater Element" and other items, and gives the waste site name (218-W-4B) and Hanford coordinates at which the items were buried.</p> <p>Example document available at:  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8668489">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8668489</a></p>
<p><i>Summary of Radioactive Solid Waste Burials in the 200 Areas During 1976</i>, ARH-CD-744-4Q, 1977</p>	<p>Inventory information – waste volume, total plutonium, uranium, and other isotopes. Some information on size of site, offsite sources, burial locations. Covers vaults and caissons as well as landfills.</p> <p>Available at:  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8604568">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8604568</a></p>
<p>Various historical photos - too numerous to be listed separately.  Examples of publicly available photos are:  <i>Burial of Equipment</i>, 9973-NEG-[A-I] (GE 1954)</p>	<p>Historical photographs of aerials of waste sites or surface shots of equipment burial showing burial box, trench construction, crane operations, cables used, etc.</p> <p>Examples available at:  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004409">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004409</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004410">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004410</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004411">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004411</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004412">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004412</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004413">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004413</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004414">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004414</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004415">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004415</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004416">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004416</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004417">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=N1D0004417</a></p>
<p><i>The History of the 200 Area Burial Ground Facilities</i>, WHC-EP-0912, 1996</p>	<p>Describes the landfill history from the inception of the landfills to 1996. Includes short descriptions of each landfill; historical landfill practices (such as digging of trenches, use of caissons), historical events in landfills (such as flooding, caisson plugging); the effects of DOE orders and state/Federal laws on burial practices; lists of offsite generators, classified waste, etc. Contains many photographs. In two volumes.</p> <p>Vol. 1 available at:  <a href="http://www.osti.gov/energycitations/servlets/purl/827767-N0u75G/native/">http://www.osti.gov/energycitations/servlets/purl/827767-N0u75G/native/</a></p>

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<i>Unconfined Underground Radioactive Waste and Contamination in the 200 Areas</i> , HW-28471, 1953	Gives short descriptions of the landfills that existed in 1953, including location of landfills, trench descriptions, maximum radioactivity levels of buried material, etc. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198128641">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D198128641</a>
<i>Unconfined Underground Radioactive Waste and Contamination in the 200 Areas</i> , HW-41535, 1956	Gives short descriptions of the landfills that existed in 1956, including location of landfills, trench descriptions, maximum radioactivity levels of buried material, etc. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199155779">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199155779</a>
<i>Unconfined Underground Radioactive Waste and Contamination in the 200 Areas - 1959</i> , HW-60807, 1959	Gives short descriptions of the landfills that existed in 1959, including location of landfills, trench descriptions, maximum radioactivity levels of buried material, etc. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8517123">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8517123</a>
<i>Waste Information Data System</i> , Hanford Site database reports	For all 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit sites. Summarizes site names, locations, types, status, site and process descriptions, associated structures, cleanup activities, environmental monitoring description, access requirements, references, regulatory information, and waste information (e.g., type, category, physical state, description, stabilizing activities).
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING FOR REMEDIATION AND CLOSURE</b>	
<i>200 Areas Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Implementation Plan-Environmental Restoration Program</i> , DOE/RL-98-28, 1999	Background waste site information and generic strategy for 200 Areas waste site investigations. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199153696">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199153696</a>
<i>Closure Plan for Active Low-Level Burial Grounds</i> , DOE/RL-2000-70, 2000	Approach to closure; hydrogeology under individual landfills; radionuclide and waste volume inventories. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8532666">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D8532666</a>
<i>Composite Analysis for Low-Level Waste Disposal in the 200 Area Plateau of the Hanford Site</i> , PNNL-11800, 1998	Provides an estimate of the cumulative radiological impacts from active and planned low-level radioactive waste disposal actions and other potentially interacting radioactive waste disposal sources that will remain following Hanford Site closure. Based on DOE O 435.1. Available at: <a href="http://gwmodeling.pnl.gov/ca98/start.htm">http://gwmodeling.pnl.gov/ca98/start.htm</a>
<i>Maintenance Plan for the Composite Analysis of the Hanford Site, Southeast Washington</i> , DOE/RL-2000-29, Rev. 1, 2000	Document describes the plan for maintaining the composite analysis that estimates the cumulative radiological impacts from active and planned low-level radioactive waste disposal actions and other potentially interacting radioactive waste disposal sources that will remain following Hanford Site closure. Based on DOE Order 435.1. Available at: <a href="http://gwmodeling.pnl.gov/reports/CAMplan.PDF">http://gwmodeling.pnl.gov/reports/CAMplan.PDF</a>

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<i>Performance Assessment for the Disposal of Low-Level Waste in the 200 West Area Burial Grounds</i> , WHC-EP-0645, 1995	Performance assessment analysis for the disposal of low-level waste in the 200 West Area based on DOE Order 5820.2A standards (Note: DOE Order 5820.2A has been superseded by DOE O 435.1 since publication). Waste exposure limits are calculated from the <i>Clean Air Act of 1990</i> and EPA drinking water standards. Includes hydrogeology, waste characteristics and generators, disposal practices, disposal facilities, conceptual models, intruder scenario, groundwater pathways, dose analysis, and sensitivity analysis.
<i>Performance Assessment for the Disposal of Low-Level Waste in the 200 East Area Burial Grounds</i> , WHC-SD-WM-TI-730, 1996	Performance assessment analysis for the disposal of low-level waste in the 200 East Area based on DOE Order 5820.2A standards (Note: DOE Order 5820.2A has been superseded by DOE O 435.1 since publication). Waste exposure limits are calculated from the <i>Clean Air Act of 1990</i> and EPA drinking water standards. Includes hydrogeology, waste characteristics and generators, disposal practices, disposal facilities, conceptual models, intruder scenario, groundwater pathways, dose analysis, and sensitivity analysis.
<i>Waste Site Grouping for 200 Areas Soil Investigations</i> , DOE/RL-96-81, 1997	Conceptual site models; description of waste group; known and suspected contamination; representative waste sites. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ARPIR/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D197197143">http://www2.hanford.gov/ARPIR/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D197197143</a>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL - RCRA AND NEPA DOCUMENTATION</b>	
<i>Final Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement</i> , DOE/EIS-0222-F, 1999	Land-use plan for the Hanford Site. It is available in 6 sections: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158842">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158842</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158843">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158843</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158844">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158844</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158845">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158845</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158846">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158846</a> <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158847">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D199158847</a>
<i>Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Part A Permit Application</i> , DOE/RL-88-21, older versions.	Older versions of the permit; e.g., Release 6, show maps of the low-level landfills with proposed and filled trenches. Release 6 available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196057317">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196057317</a>
<i>Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Part A Permit Application</i> , DOE/RL-88-21, September 2002 (most recent version that includes LLBGs).	Hazardous waste codes and maps of the permitted low-level landfills showing the areas where regulated mixed waste is stored. The maps do not show the trenches. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9155786">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D9155786</a> .

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<p><i>Revised Draft Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement</i>, DOE/EIS-0286D2, 2003  <i>Final Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement</i>, Richland, Washington, DOE/EIS-0286F, 2004                      Hanford Site Solid Waste records of decision</p>	<p>Provides a comprehensive analysis of the impacts of the proposed action and alternatives for managing radioactive and hazardous waste on the Hanford Site. Applies to permitted low-level landfills, not to past-practice sites. An overview is available at:  <a href="http://www.hanford.gov/doe/eis/sweis/overview.htm">http://www.hanford.gov/doe/eis/sweis/overview.htm</a></p>
<b>HYDROGEOLOGY AND GROUNDWATER MONITORING</b>	
<p><i>200 East Groundwater Aggregate Area Management Study Report</i>, DOE/RL-92-19, 1993</p>	<p>Description of waste management units impacting groundwater; surface hydrology and geology, preliminary site conceptual model, health and environmental concerns, potential ARARs, and recommendations for remediation in the 200 East Area.                      In 2 volumes, available at:  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196136029">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196136029</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196136305">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196136305</a></p>
<p><i>200 West Groundwater Aggregate Area Management Study Report</i>, DOE/RL-92-16, Rev. 0, 1993</p>	<p>Description of waste management units impacting groundwater; surface hydrology and geology, preliminary site conceptual model, health and environmental concerns, potential ARARs, and recommendations for remediation in the 200 West Area.                      Available at:  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196125315">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D196125315</a></p>
<p><i>Geologic Setting of the Low-Level Burial Grounds</i>, WHC-SD-EN-TI-290, 1994</p>	<p>General geologic setting and hydrogeology of 200 East and West Areas; hydrogeology of Landfills 218-E-10, 218-E-12B, 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, 218-W-5. Incorporates data from boreholes across the 200 Areas.</p>
<p><i>Hanford Site Groundwater Monitoring For Fiscal Year 2005</i>, PNNL-15670, 2005</p>	<p>Results of groundwater and vadose zone monitoring and remediation for fiscal year 2004 on the Hanford Site.                      Available at:  <a href="http://groundwater.pnl.gov/reports/gwrep05/start.htm">http://groundwater.pnl.gov/reports/gwrep05/start.htm</a></p>
<p><i>Hydrogeology of the 200 Areas Low Level Burial Grounds, an Interim Report</i>, PNL-6820, 1989</p>	<p>Hydrogeology of the 200 Areas; results and analysis of information from 35 groundwater monitoring wells around Landfills 218-E-10, 218-E-12B, 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4C, and 218-W-5. Information was collected between May 20, 1987, and August 1, 1988.                      In 3 volumes, available at:  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066506">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066506</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066592">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066592</a>  <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066599">http://www2.hanford.gov/arpir/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D195066599</a></p>

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<i>Revised Hydrogeology for the Suprabasalt Aquifer System, 200-East Area and Vicinity, Hanford Site, Washington, PNNL-12261, 2001</i>	Hydrogeology and conceptual groundwater flow model for the 200 East Area and vicinity. Available at: <a href="http://www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-12261.PDF">http://www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-12261.PDF</a>
<i>Revised Hydrogeology for the Suprabasalt Aquifer System, 200-West Area and Vicinity, Hanford Site, Washington, PNNL-13858, 2002</i>	Hydrogeology and conceptual groundwater flow model for the 200 West Area and vicinity. Available at: <a href="http://www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-13858/13858.pdf">http://www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-13858/13858.pdf</a>
<b>CHARACTERIZATION INVESTIGATIONS</b>	
<i>200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step I Sampling and Analysis of the Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose Zone Plume, CP-13514, 2003</i>	Investigation of carbon tetrachloride plume under 200-PW-1 Operable Unit waste sites. Describes GeoProbe <sup>a</sup> and cone penetrometer operations and results at Landfill 218-W-4C, Trenches 1, 4, and 7, and other locations during 2002.
<i>Report on Sampling and Analysis of Air at Trenches 218-W-4C and 218-W-5 #31 of the Low-Level Burial Grounds, HNF-SD-WM-RPT-309, 1997</i>	Results of sampling and analysis of air samples to determine type and concentration of volatile organics. Samples were taken from Landfill 218-W-4C, Trenches 1, 4, 7, and 20; and Landfill 218-W-5, Trench 31. The Landfill 218-W-4C samples showed significant concentrations of 1,1,1-trichloroethane, TCE, PCE, carbon tetrachloride, and chloroform.
<i>Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for Nonintrusive Characterization of Bin 3A and Bin 3B Waste Sites in the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit, D&amp;D-27257, 2006</i>	Developed to support characterization of the former Bin 3A/3B waste sites in the 200-SW-2, and shows logic developed to support non-intrusive characterization (records search, passive vapor, geophysical investigations, etc.)
<i>Sampling and Analysis Instruction for Nonintrusive Characterization of Bin 3A and Bin 3B Waste Sites in the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit, D&amp;D-28283, 2006</i>	Developed to support characterization of the former Bin 3A/3B waste sites in the 200-SW-2, and directs specifics of non-intrusive characterization (records search, passive vapor, geophysical investigations, etc.)
<i>Geophysical Investigations Summary Report: 200 Area Burial Grounds: 218-C-9, 218-E-2A, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, 218-E-8, 218-W-1A, 218-W-2A, and 218-W-1, D&amp;D-28379, 2006</i>	This document summarizes the results of geophysical investigations conducted at eight past-practice sites. The geophysical techniques used in the investigations were ground-penetrating radar (GPR), electromagnetic induction (EMI), and total magnetic field methods. Maps of inferred buried objects superimposed on H-2 drawings are provided.
<i>Geophysical Investigations Summary Report: 200 Area Burial Grounds: 218-E-1, 218-E-2A, 218-E-8, 218-E-12A, 218-W-1, 218-W-2, 218-W-3, and 218-W-11, D&amp;D-28379, 2006</i>	Information is provided on the ground-penetrating radar, electromagnetic induction, and magnetic data collected, along with details of the investigation, for each past-practice site discussed in this document. Maps of inferred buried objects superimposed on H-2 drawings are provided.
<i>Solid Waste Stream Hazardous and Dangerous Components Study, WHC-SD-WM-RPT-056, 1992</i>	Documents the results from characterizing some of the hazardous/dangerous chemicals and materials believed stored or disposed of in the 200 Areas Landfills. Materials were selected based on their probable frequency of occurrence in solid waste containers and the associated potential safety risk to onsite and offsite individuals. Covers wastes since 1970.
<i>Technology Survey to Support Revision to the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit at the U.S. Department of Energy's Hanford Site, Draft Report, 2006.</i>	A survey of technologies was conducted to provide a thorough survey of remediation and characterization options to enable this DQO process to consider the full range of potential alternatives. Technologies considered include in-situ, ex-situ, analytical, intrusive, non-intrusive, etc.

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<i>Alternatives to Control Subsidence at Low-Level Radioactive Waste Burial Sites</i> , RHO-LD-172, 1981	Explores alternatives to address subsidence; includes sites that are now 200-SW-2 waste sites. Available at: <a href="http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D6831709">http://www2.hanford.gov/ddrs/common/findpage.cfm?AKey=D6831709</a>
<b>SAFETY BASIS DOCUMENTATION</b>	
<i>Active and Retired Solid Waste Burial Grounds Safety Analysis Report</i> , SD-WM-SAR-038, 1984	Gives waste disposal specifications (as of 1984) including backfill, hazardous materials separations, dose limits, package and records inspections, etc. Also gives a list of documents governing landfill operations. Shows detailed trench and caisson design.
<i>Solid Waste Burial Grounds Interim Safety Basis</i> , HNF-SD-WM-ISB-002, Rev. 3B, 2001	Intended to cover TRU retrieval efforts, but covers all low-level landfills (218-E-10, 218-E-12B, 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, and 218-W-5), regardless of whether they contain post-1970 TRU <sup>b</sup> .
<i>Waste Management Project (WMP) Master Documented Safety Analysis (MDSA) for the Solid Waste Operations Complex (SWOC)</i> , HNF-14741, Rev. 2A, 2005	Current authorization basis covering work in the Low-Level Landfills.
<b>TRANSURANIC WASTE RETRIEVAL</b>	
<i>Contact Handled Transuranic Waste Characterization Based on Existing Records</i> , WHC-EP-0225, Rev. 1, 1991	Contains the results of characterizing the retrievably stored, contact-handled transuranic waste based on existing records. Data were derived from <i>Richland Solid Waste Information Management System</i> database and supporting documents and interviews with knowledgeable individuals.
<i>Phase 2 Solid Waste Retrieval Trench Characterization</i> , WHC-SD-W221-DP-001, Rev. 0, 1994	Includes Landfills/trenches 218-E-12B-T17, 218-E-12B-T27, 218-W-3A-TS6, 218-W-3A-TS9, 218-W-3A-T01, 218-W-3A-T04, 218-W-3A-T05, 218-W-3A-T06, 218-W-3A-T08, 218-W-3A-T10, 218-W-3A-T15, 218-W-3A-T17, 218-W-3A-T23, 218-W-3A-T30, 218-W-3A-T32, 218-W-3A-T34, 218-W-4B-T07, 218-W-4B-TV7, 218-W-4B-T11, 218-W-4C-T01, 218-W-4C-T04, 218-W-4C-T07, 218-W-4C-T19, 218-W-4C-T20, 218-W-4C-T29. Available at: <a href="http://www.osti.gov/bridge/servlets/purl/10192685-RRV5FS/webviewable/10192685.pdf">http://www.osti.gov/bridge/servlets/purl/10192685-RRV5FS/webviewable/10192685.pdf</a>
<i>Radioisotopic Characterization of Retrievably Stored Transuranic Waste Containers at the Hanford Site</i> , WHC-SD-WM-TI-517, Rev. 1, 1993	Provides a common source of material with which to characterize the nature of the TRU solid waste to be retrieved and disposed of from trenches, based on existing documentation (in 1993). Provides a basis for analyzing accidents and reducing conservatism, as well as providing a more accurate assessment of operational risk. Emphasis is on 55-gal drums, because they are the predominant container, but also addresses other container types. Only addresses wastes stored since May 1, 1970, in the 200 West Area and Landfill 218-E-12B through June 1993. Does not include caissons.

Table 5-3. Existing Documents and Data Sources for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit. (13 Pages)

Reference	Summary
<i>Sampling Plan for Retrieval of Stored Contact-Handled Transuranic Waste at the Hanford Site</i> , WHC-EP-0226, 1989	Assesses the integrity of retrievable waste containers; provides baseline information to support the Waste Receiving and Packaging facility design, including nondestructive analysis; and provides information to support equipment design for full-scale retrieval.
<i>The Hanford Environment as Related to Radioactive Waste Burial Grounds and Transuranic Waste Storage Facilities</i> , ARH-ST-155, 1977	Discusses the effect of Hanford Site climate and geology on the integrity of waste packaging.
"Description of TRU Waste Buried in Site 218-W-4B," letter, RHO-65462-80-036, 1980	Describes areas of trenches with post-1970 TRU; gives descriptions of trench construction and containers used; describes specific items disposed of, by trench. This reference is in the <i>Waste Information Data System</i> library.

<sup>a</sup> GeoProbe is a registered trademark of GeoProbe Systems, Salina, Kansas.

<sup>b</sup> Radioactive waste as defined in DOE G 435.1-1, *Implementation Guide for Use with DOE M 435.1-1*.

ARAR = applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement.  
 CERCLA = *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980*.  
 DDTS = Declassified Document Tracking System.  
 DOE = U.S. Department of Energy.  
 EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

NEPA = *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*.  
 PUREX = Plutonium-Uranium Extraction (Plant).  
 RCRA = *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*.  
 REDOX = Reduction-Oxidation (Plant).  
 SS = source and special.  
 TRU = Radioactive waste as defined in DOE G 435.1-1, *Implementation Guide for Use with DOE M 435.1-1*.

## 1 5.5.2 Planning

2 The planning subtask includes activities and documentation that need to be completed before  
 3 field activities can begin. Planning activities will be more or less complex, depending on the  
 4 completeness of available records reviewed, the nature and extent of site contamination, and the  
 5 anticipated remedial path forward. Activities include the preparation of a job-hazard analysis  
 6 and a site-specific health and safety plan (HASP), radiation work permits, excavation permits  
 7 and supporting surveys (e.g., cultural, radiological, wildlife, and utilities), work instructions,  
 8 personnel training, and the procurement of materials and services (e.g., laboratory support,  
 9 drilling, and geophysical-logging services).

10 Appendix B of the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28) provides a general HASP that outlines  
 11 health and safety requirements for RI activities. Site-specific HASPs will be prepared. Initial  
 12 surface radiological surveys will be performed to document any radiological surface  
 13 contamination and the background levels<sup>32</sup> in and around the sampling locations. This  
 14 information will be used to document initial site conditions and prepare HASPs and radiation  
 15 work permits.

16 Some of the landfills have access restrictions because of the potential for subsidence (see  
 17 HNF-2030, *Subsidence Potential in the Burial Grounds*). These landfills should be identified

<sup>32</sup>Background levels in this instance are determined for purposes of the HASP and are not to be used to determine background levels for screening against limits as prescribed in various sections of WAC 173-340, "Model Toxics Control Act - Cleanup."

1 early in the planning process to determine possible restrictions on access for field  
2 characterization and to develop a strategy to work around the restrictions, if possible.

### 3 **5.5.3 Field Investigation**

4 The field-investigation task involves data-gathering activities performed in the field that are  
5 required to satisfy the project DQOs. The field-characterization approach is summarized in  
6 Section 4.2 and detailed in the SAP (Appendix A). The scope includes site surveys with field  
7 instruments and geophysical, organic vapor, and direct-push techniques to gather data to aid in  
8 characterization of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills. Other activities include work-zone setup,  
9 mobilization and demobilization of equipment, equipment decontamination, and field/laboratory  
10 analyses.

11 Major subtasks associated with the field investigation include the following:

- 12 • Collection of data from chemical and radioactive contamination surveys
- 13 • Preparation of a field report.

#### 14 **5.5.3.1 Collection of Data from Field Surveys**

15 Planned field analyses include geophysical, organic-vapor, and direct-push techniques. An  
16 initial step in the investigations will be to perform a field screening to determine the exposure  
17 potential at sites and to establish areas with concentrations of radionuclides significantly above  
18 background. Radiological data will be used to establish radiation-control measures and to ensure  
19 worker health and safety. Further detail regarding field surveys is presented in Section 4.2 and  
20 Appendix A of this RI/FS work plan.

#### 21 **5.5.3.2 Data Integration and Modeling**

22 The project will screen the list of COPCs developed for the OU against the anticipated  
23 inventories at the landfills, to determine which sites have the highest potential for releases to the  
24 environment or personnel exposure. Samples will be collected in Phases II and III from  
25 locations that show the highest concentrations of contamination, based on surface geophysics  
26 and intrusive and/or nonintrusive evaluations of radionuclide and chemical inventories. The  
27 resulting data will be input to model the exposure potential, with accepted models commonly  
28 used to assess exposure at the Hanford Site.

#### 29 **5.5.3.3 Preparation of Field Report**

30 At the completion of the field investigation, a field report will be prepared to summarize  
31 activities performed and information collected in the field. The report will include geophysical,  
32 organic-vapor, and direct-push data-collection locations; the number and types of samples  
33 collected and associated HEIS numbers; and any chemical field-screening results.

#### 34 **5.5.3.4 Management of Investigation-Derived Waste**

35 Waste-designation DQOs will be established before intrusive-characterization activities begin to  
36 ensure that the information collected during the field activities supports the designation of all

1 IDW for the project. During the IDW DQO process, any listed waste issues will be resolved.  
2 Any additional sampling requirements or analytes needed to support waste-designation activities  
3 will be identified, and the requirements will be implemented through the waste-designation DQO  
4 summary report that will be prepared at that time.

5 Waste generated during the RI phase will be managed in accordance with a waste-control plan to  
6 be prepared for the sampling activities. DOE/RL-98-28, Appendix E, provides general  
7 waste-management processes and requirements for this IDW and forms the basis for  
8 activity-specific waste-control plans. The site-specific waste-control plan addresses the  
9 handling, storage, and disposal of IDW generated during the RI phase. Further, the plan  
10 identifies governing procedures and discusses types of waste expected to be generated, the  
11 waste-designation process, and the final-disposal location. The IDW management task begins  
12 when IDW is first generated at the start of the field investigation and continues through waste  
13 designation and disposal.

#### 14 **5.5.3.5 Laboratory Analysis and Data Validation**

15 Soil samples collected will be analyzed for a suite of nonradioactive constituents identified as  
16 COPCs during the DQO and defined in the SAP. The SAP lists the analytes, methods, and  
17 associated target detection limits. This task includes the laboratory analysis of samples,  
18 compilation of laboratory results into data packages, and validation of a representative number of  
19 laboratory data packages.

### 20 **5.6 EVALUATION OF PHASE I-A AND** 21 **PHASE I-B DATA**

22 All Phase I-A and I-B characterization data will be compiled and reviewed at the completion of  
23 field operations and receipt of laboratory results. Field-screening results, geophysical-logging  
24 data, radiological surveys, organic-vapor surveys, and laboratory analyses will be included.  
25 Results will be tabulated, and maps and plots will be prepared to show the contaminant  
26 distribution. Based on the results of Phases I-A and I-B, an assessment will be completed  
27 concerning the need for additional data collection for each of the bins. If the need for additional  
28 data collection is determined to be required to support risk-assessment evaluations and remedial  
29 decision-making, planning for Phase II will be initiated.

30 Phase II will entail gathering additional data to support remedial decisions. Additional  
31 characterization data will be acquired to allow for a statistical analysis of the data set. The data  
32 set may be used to determine a 95 percent upper confidence limit of the mean concentration for  
33 the COPCs. The uncertainty in the calculated values, based on the proposed total number of  
34 analyses that will be used, will be presented in the Phase II SAP. Results of all phases of  
35 characterization will be presented in the RI report.

### 36 **5.7 REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT**

37 This section summarizes data-evaluation and interpretation subtasks leading to the production of  
38 a RI report. The primary activities include a data-quality assessment; evaluating the nature,

1 extent, and concentration of contaminants based on sampling results; assessing contaminant fate  
2 and transport; refining the site conceptual models; and evaluating risks through a risk  
3 assessment. These activities will be performed as part of the RI report preparation task.

#### 4 **5.7.1 Data Quality Assessment**

5 A data-quality assessment will be performed on the analytical data to determine if they are the  
6 right type, quality, and quantity for their intended use. The data-quality assessment completes  
7 the data life cycle of planning, implementation, and assessment that began with the DQO  
8 process. In this task, the data will be examined to determine if they meet the analytical-quality  
9 criteria outlined in the DQO and are adequate to evaluate the decision rules in the DQO.

#### 10 **5.7.2 Data Evaluation and Conceptual-Model** 11 **Refinement**

12 This task will include evaluating the information collected during the investigation. The  
13 chemical and radionuclide data obtained from samples will be compiled, tabulated, and  
14 statistically evaluated to gain as much information as possible to satisfy the data needs. For  
15 RCRA TSD units, the data collected during the RI will be evaluated against WAC 173-303-610  
16 performance standards.

17 If contaminants not identified as COPCs are detected during laboratory analysis, the data will be  
18 evaluated against regulatory standards (or risk-based levels if exposure data are available) and  
19 existing process knowledge in support of remedial-action decision making.

#### 20 **5.7.3 Baseline Human-Health Risk Assessment**

21 For the 200-SW-2 OU, a quantitative baseline human-health risk assessment will be prepared as  
22 part of the RI report. The baseline risk assessment will evaluate risk to human receptors from  
23 potential exposure to contaminants in accessible surface sediments and shallow subsurface soils.  
24 The risk assessment also will evaluate the potential for contaminants currently in the  
25 vadose-zone soil to impact groundwater in the future. Risks from current groundwater  
26 contamination will not be evaluated; that evaluation will be conducted as part of the RI/FS  
27 process for the groundwater OUs.

28 A baseline risk analysis for those COPCs detected in the landfills also will be completed. Initial  
29 screening will consider the constituents to be directly accessible to potential receptors. Modeling  
30 of future exposure risks, as the waste containers degrade and constituents actually become  
31 available to surrounding soil, also will be completed.

32 The risk assessment presented in the RI report will use data collected from the Phases I-A and  
33 I-B sampling and will allow for initial quantification of risk. Human-health risks are evaluated  
34 based on a reasonably anticipated future land use for the Central Plateau, which is based on  
35 criteria consistent with the Tri-Parties' response (Klein et al., 2002, "Consensus Advice #132:

1 Exposure Scenarios Task Force on the 200 Area,") to Hanford Advisory Board (HAB)  
2 Advice #132 (HAB 132, "Exposure Scenarios Task Force on the 200 Area").

3 The Tri-Parties undertook the task of developing a risk framework to support risk assessments in  
4 the Central Plateau. This included a series of workshops completed in 2002 with representatives  
5 from DOE, EPA, Ecology, the HAB, the Tribal Nations, the State of Oregon, and other  
6 interested stakeholders. The workshops focused on the different programs involved in activities  
7 in the Central Plateau and the need for a consistent application of risk-assessment assumptions  
8 and goals.

9 The following items summarize the risk-framework description from the Tri-Parties' response to  
10 the HAB.

- 11 • The Core Zone (200 Areas including B Pond [main pond] and S Ponds) will have an  
12 industrial scenario for the foreseeable future.
- 13 • The Core Zone will be remediated and closed, allowing for "other uses" consistent with  
14 an industrial scenario (environmental industries) that will maintain an active human  
15 presence in this area, which in turn will enhance the ability to maintain the institutional  
16 knowledge of waste left in place for future generations. Exposure scenarios used for this  
17 zone should include a reasonable maximum exposure to a worker/day user, to possible  
18 Native American users (possible because of long-lived radionuclides and uncertainty  
19 regarding future land use), and to intruders.
- 20 • The DOE will follow the required regulatory processes for groundwater remediation  
21 (including public participation) to establish the points of compliance and RAOs. It is  
22 anticipated that groundwater contamination under the Core Zone will preclude beneficial  
23 use for the foreseeable future, which is at least the period of waste management and  
24 active institutional controls (150 years). It is assumed that the tritium and I-129 plumes  
25 beyond the Core Zone boundary will exceed the drinking water standards for the next  
26 150 to 300 years (less for the tritium plume).
- 27 • No drilling for water use or otherwise will be allowed in the Core Zone. An intruder  
28 scenario will be calculated for assessing the risk to human health and the environment.
- 29 • Waste sites outside the Core Zone but within the Central Plateau (200 North Area, Gable  
30 Mountain Pond, BC Controlled Area) will be remediated and closed based on an  
31 evaluation of multiple land-use scenarios to optimize institutional-control cost and  
32 long-term stewardship.
- 33 • An Industrial land-use scenario will set cleanup levels on the Central Plateau. Other  
34 scenarios (e.g., residential, recreational) may be used for comparison purposes to support  
35 decision making, especially for the following:
  - 36 – The post-institutional controls period (>150 years)
  - 37 – Sites near the Core Zone perimeter, to analyze opportunities to "shrink the site"
  - 38 – Early (precedent-setting) closure/remediation decisions.
- 39 • This framework does not consider the tank-waste-retrieval decision.

1 More recent publications, including *Record of Decision, 221-U Facility (Canyon Disposition*  
 2 *Initiative), Hanford Site, Washington* (Ecology, 2005), state that land-use controls (i.e., active  
 3 institutional controls) will be maintained indefinitely, until such time that the concentration of  
 4 hazardous substances in the soil and groundwater are at such levels to allow for unrestricted use  
 5 and exposure. The 221-U Record of Decision also states that groundwater underlying the  
 6 200 Areas may be considered a potential future drinking-water source and is, in any case,  
 7 hydraulically connected to groundwater that currently is used for drinking water and irrigation  
 8 purposes.

9 Following are other assumptions used in the human-health risk evaluation:

- 10 • Land use will be industrial-exclusive for the next 50 years (through 2050)
- 11 • Land use will be industrial (non-DOE worker) for 100 years after 2050
- 12 • Land use will be industrial after 150 years.

13 The human-health risk assessment will be conducted in accordance with appropriate subsections  
 14 of WAC 173-340 and with the following DOE and EPA guidance documents:

- 15 • DOE/RL-91-45, Rev. 3, *Hanford Site Baseline Risk Assessment Methodology*
- 16 • EPA/540/1-89/002, *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund (RAGs), Volume I – Human*  
 17 *Health Evaluation Manual, Part A (Interim Final)*
- 18 • EPA, 1991, *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Vol. I, Human Health Evaluation*  
 19 *Manual, Supplemental Guidance: Standard Default Exposure Factors, (Interim Final),*  
 20 OSWER Directive 9285.6-03
- 21 • EPA/600/P-95/002Fa, *Exposure Factors Handbook Volume 1: General Factors*
- 22 • EPA/540/R-99/005, *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume I: Human Health*  
 23 *Evaluation Manual (Part E, Supplemental Guidance for Dermal Risk Assessment) Final*
- 24 • EPA/600/P-92/003C, *Proposed Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment*
- 25 • EPA, 1992, *Supplemental Guidance to RAGS: Calculating the Concentration Term,*  
 26 OSWER Publication 9285.7-081.

27 After completion of all phases of characterization, risks initially will be evaluated by comparison  
 28 to risk-based standards such as WAC 173-340-745, “Soil Cleanup Standards for Industrial  
 29 Properties” or WAC 173-340-740, “Unrestricted Land Use soil Cleanup Standards,” depending  
 30 on the location of the site with respect to the Central Plateau land-use boundary. Contaminants  
 31 present at concentrations exceeding these risk-based standards will be considered further in the  
 32 risk-assessment process. Risks from nonradiological noncarcinogens will be evaluated by  
 33 calculating hazard quotients for individual constituents and a hazard index for cumulative risk.  
 34 Risks from nonradiological carcinogens and radionuclides will be evaluated by calculating  
 35 incremental cancer risks for individual constituents and a cumulative cancer risk.

36 The RESidual RADioactivity (RESRAD) computer program (ANL, 2002, *RESRAD for*  
 37 *Windows*, Version 6.21, or later update) will be used to obtain risk and dose estimates from

1 direct-contact exposure to radiological constituents present in the shallow zone of the waste sites.  
 2 The RESRAD transport model also will be used as a screening tool to assess potential impacts to  
 3 the groundwater from residual radionuclides in the vadose zone. Additional analysis may be  
 4 performed using other appropriate fate and transport models (e.g., PNNL-12034, *STOMP*,  
 5 *Subsurface Transport Over Multiple Phases, Version 2.0, User's Guide*) to assess near-field  
 6 impact to the groundwater from chemicals and radionuclides in the vadose zone.

7 In addition, the waste inventories at the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs will be evaluated to  
 8 determine the risks to workers associated with remedial alternatives. These risks include, for  
 9 example, dose related to direct exposure to gamma-emitting radionuclides and inhalation risk  
 10 from alpha- and beta-emitting particles.

11 Risk assessment will be performed for an industrial-exposure scenario to establish the baseline  
 12 risk. As part of the FS, additional risk assessment may be performed to evaluate other scenarios,  
 13 such as a Native American scenario or an intruder scenario, to evaluate postremediation residual  
 14 risks.

#### 15 **5.7.4 Ecological Evaluation and Risk Assessment**

16 A conservative evaluation will be made of risk to ecological receptors from stressors, in this case  
 17 introduction of contaminants and habitat elimination. The SLERA identifies pathways for  
 18 ecological receptors to be exposed to the contamination and evaluates potential risk from those  
 19 exposures.

20 The conceptual site model presented in Chapter 3.0 of DOE/RL-2001-54 provides an  
 21 understanding of the ecological resources and the ways that receptors may be exposed. The  
 22 model shows where chemicals and radionuclides from the waste sites are likely to come into  
 23 contact with receptors in the environment. The exposure pathways that are expected to be  
 24 complete at most waste sites include the following:

- 25 • Direct contact with, or ingestion of, soil by invertebrates (e.g., beetles and ants) and  
 26 burrowing mammals
- 27 • Uptake of contaminants in soil by vegetation
- 28 • Bioaccumulation through ingestion of food items (e.g., food-chain effects) consumed by  
 29 wildlife that may forage at the waste sites.

30 The ecological risk assessment being performed for the Central Plateau will stand as the baseline  
 31 ecological risk assessment for the 200-SW-2 OU. Nevertheless, the 200-SW-2 OU RI will  
 32 include an evaluation of contaminants against wildlife ecological soil-screening values.  
 33 Contaminants unique to the 200-SW-2 OU waste sites with potential ecological exposure  
 34 pathways will be evaluated in a screening assessment in the 200-SW-2 OU FS.

35 Only terrestrial-wildlife risks will be evaluated for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills because of their  
 36 location within the Central Plateau Core Zone boundary. This is consistent with  
 37 WAC 173-340-7490(3)(b), "Terrestrial Ecological Evaluation Procedures," "Goal," which

1 specifies that for industrial or commercial properties, current or potential for exposure to soil  
 2 contamination need only be evaluated for terrestrial wildlife protection. Plants and biota need  
 3 not be considered unless the species is protected under the Federal *Endangered Species Act*  
 4 *of 1973*. No Federally listed threatened or endangered species are known to exist in the area  
 5 occupied by the 200-SW-2 OUs. Ecological surveys conducted before field activities begin will  
 6 confirm the presence or absence of protected species.

7 **5.8 FEASIBILITY STUDY/RCRA TREATMENT,**  
 8 **STORAGE, AND/OR DISPOSAL UNIT**  
 9 **CLOSURE PLAN**

10 After the RI and pre-ROD treatability investigations are completed, remedial alternatives/closure  
 11 strategies will be developed and evaluated against CERCLA performance standards and  
 12 evaluation criteria in the FS/closure plan. Closure and corrective actions for RCRA TSD units  
 13 will be evaluated against the appropriate dangerous-waste performance standards. The FS  
 14 process consists of several steps:

- 15 1. Defining RAOs and RCRA closure and RCRA corrective-action performance standards
- 16 2. Identifying general response actions to satisfy RAOs
- 17 3. Identifying potential technologies and process options associated with each general  
 18 response action
- 19 4. Screening process options to select a representative process for each type of technology,  
 20 based on its effectiveness, implementability, and cost
- 21 5. Assembling viable technologies or process options into a range of treatment and  
 22 containment alternatives plus the no-action alternative
- 23 6. Evaluating alternatives and presenting information needed to support remedy selection  
 24 and RCRA closure of the unit as a landfill pursuant to Hanford Facility RCRA Permit  
 25 Condition II.K (WA7890008967).

26 **5.8.1 Remedial-Action Alternatives**

27 Likely response scenarios form a basis for identifying potentially viable remedial alternatives  
 28 and associated technologies. Formal development and evaluation of likely response scenarios  
 29 and associated remedial alternatives for the 200-SW-2 OU will occur during preparation of the  
 30 FS. The following potential remediation alternatives were identified in the Implementation Plan:

- 31 • No action
- 32 • Institutional controls
- 33 • Engineered surface barriers with or without vertical subsurface barriers
- 34 • Excavation and disposal with or without ex situ treatment
- 35 • Excavation, ex situ treatment, and geologic disposal of soil with TRU
- 36 • In situ grouting or stabilization of soil

- 1 • In situ vitrification of soil
- 2 • In situ vapor extraction of volatile organic compounds
- 3 • Monitored natural attenuation.

4 The Collaborative Agreement (Ecology and DOE, 2005), and the follow-up path forward  
 5 (DOE and Ecology, 2007, *Path Forward, 200-SW-1/2 RI/FS Work Plan Development*) identified  
 6 the following likely response scenarios as being potentially applicable to the 200-SW-2 Operable  
 7 Unit:

- 8 • Excavation, treatment (as necessary), and disposal of waste from within individual  
 9 landfills
- 10 • Excavation, treatment (as necessary), and disposal of waste from selected sections of  
 11 individual landfills
- 12 • Capping of individual landfills
- 13 • In situ treatment (e.g., vitrification, grouting) of portions of individual landfills
- 14 • Some combination of the above
- 15 • No action with continued monitoring.

16 A summary of each of these potential alternatives as they would apply to the 200-SW-2 OU  
 17 landfills is provided below. Two principal categories of remedial alternative currently are  
 18 identified, those actions that require removal and those that entail in-place remedies. In-place  
 19 remedies would include in situ treatment (stabilization), placement of an engineered barrier  
 20 system over the site, or maintaining an existing soil cover if already present, with institutional  
 21 controls.

#### 22 **5.8.1.1 No Action**

23 It is required by 40 CFR 300, that a “no-action” alternative be evaluated as a baseline for  
 24 comparison with other remedial alternatives. The no-action alternative represents a situation  
 25 where no legal restrictions, access controls, or active remedial measures are applied to the site.  
 26 No-action implies allowing the wastes to remain in the current configuration, thus being affected  
 27 only by natural processes. No maintenance or other activities would be instituted or continued.  
 28 Selecting the no-action alternative would require that a waste site poses no unacceptable threat to  
 29 human health or the environment.

#### 30 **5.8.1.2 Maintain Existing Soil Cover/Monitored Natural Attenuation/Institutional** 31 **Controls**

32 Under this alternative, existing soil cover that has been placed on a waste site would be  
 33 maintained and/or augmented as needed to provide protection from intrusion by biological  
 34 receptors, along with institutional controls, such as legal barriers (e.g., deed restrictions,  
 35 excavation permits) and physical barriers (e.g., fencing) that would mitigate contaminant  
 36 exposure. Radioactive contaminants remaining beneath the clean-soil cover would be allowed to

1 decay in place (i.e., to attenuate naturally), thereby reducing risk until remediation goals are met.  
2 This alternative may be preferable in the following circumstances:

- 3 • When contaminant concentrations are very close to remedial goals
- 4 • For contaminants that naturally attenuate and are not mobile in the environment
- 5 • When the cost to remediate does not gain a comparable amount of risk reduction
- 6 • When the cost for active remediation (e.g., remove and dispose, capping) is prohibitive.

7 For sites having a clean soil cover of <4.6 m [15 ft], more stringent institutional controls  
8 (e.g., physical and legal barriers, biological monitoring, control of deeply rooted plants, control  
9 of deep-burrowing animals) would need to be implemented. Water- and land-use restrictions  
10 also would be used to prevent exposure.

11 Natural attenuation relies on natural processes to lower contaminant concentrations until cleanup  
12 levels are met. Monitored natural attenuation would include sampling and/or environmental  
13 monitoring, consistent with EPA guidance (EPA 540/R-99/006, *Radiation Risk Assessment at*  
14 *CERCLA Sites: Q&A*, OSWER Directive No. 9200.4-31P) to verify that contaminants are  
15 attenuating as expected and to ensure that contaminants remain isolated (e.g., will not lead to  
16 degradation of groundwater or be released to air or biota). Attenuation-monitoring activities  
17 could include monitoring of the vadose zone using geophysical logging methods or groundwater  
18 monitoring to verify that natural-attenuation processes are effective. Monitoring of groundwater  
19 may be required near sites with mobile contaminants left in place, to verify that groundwater is  
20 not being impacted. Although not required by current regulations, vadose-zone monitoring may  
21 be conducted to provide early indications of contaminant movement and enable implementation  
22 of appropriate corrective actions before the groundwater is impacted.

### 23 **5.8.1.3 Removal/Treatment/Disposal**

24 Remedial alternatives will be evaluated that may involve different combinations of removal,  
25 treatment, and disposal actions, depending on site conditions. Consideration of radionuclide  
26 composition and activity, remediation-worker exposure hazards, and available disposal pathways  
27 will have a significant influence on remedy selection. Removal activities would involve  
28 excavation of buried waste and soil. Treatment may include in situ or ex situ operations.

### 29 **5.8.1.4 Capping/Barriers**

30 Capping consists of constructing a surface barrier over contaminated waste sites to control the  
31 amount of water that infiltrates into contaminated media to reduce or eliminate leaching of  
32 contamination to groundwater. In addition to their hydrological performance, barriers also may  
33 function as physical barriers to prevent intrusion by human and ecological receptors, limit wind  
34 and water erosion, and shield radiation. Institutional controls are required to prevent intrusion to  
35 the capped area and to prevent activities that might alter the effectiveness of the cap.  
36 Institutional controls (including legal, administrative, or physical controls such as deed  
37 restrictions, excavation permits, and fencing) are required to minimize the potential for exposure  
38 to contamination. Performance monitoring is associated with this alternative to ensure that the  
39 cap is performing as expected and groundwater is protected.

40 The Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28) identified surface barriers that are engineered for arid  
41 climates (i.e., alternative barriers) as a viable remediation alternative for containment of waste,

1 as opposed to conventional surface barriers (e.g., standard RCRA, Subtitle C barrier design).  
 2 Conventional barriers are multilayered systems that rely on geomembranes, clay layers, or a  
 3 combination of both to form a hydraulic barrier to prevent the vertical movement of water. The  
 4 clay layers in conventional surface-barrier designs have been shown to desiccate and crack if  
 5 optimum moisture contents established during construction are not maintained. More recently,  
 6 alternative barriers have been gaining acceptance, particularly for use in semiarid and arid  
 7 climates such as the Hanford Site. Alternative barriers that predominantly rely on evaporation  
 8 and plant transpiration to recycle incipient moisture to the atmosphere and near-surface water  
 9 balance and recharge are referred to as evapotranspiration barriers. Some alternative  
 10 surface-barrier designs also incorporate low-permeability layers (e.g., fluidized asphalt) deeper  
 11 in the profile to control water infiltration and landfill gas emissions.

12 In situations where surface barriers are constructed over biodegradable and/or collapsible waste,  
 13 dynamic compaction and/or grout injection can be used to control subsidence potential and  
 14 minimize potential future impacts on surface-barrier integrity and performance.

#### 15 **5.8.2 Remedial Alternatives, Performance Standards,** 16 **and Selection Criteria**

17 During the detailed analysis, each alternative will be evaluated against the following CERCLA  
 18 criteria (40 CFR 300.430, "Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study and Selection of Remedy"):

- 19 • Overall protection of human health and the environment
- 20 • Compliance with ARARs
- 21 • Long-term effectiveness and permanence
- 22 • Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment
- 23 • Short-term effectiveness
- 24 • Implementability
- 25 • Cost
- 26 • State acceptance.

27 One additional modifying criterion, community acceptance, will be addressed following issuance  
 28 of the FS and proposed plan but before the ROD is issued.

29 The NEPA values also will be evaluated as part of DOE's responsibility under this authority.  
 30 These NEPA values include impacts to natural, cultural, and historical resources; socioeconomic  
 31 aspects; and irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources. NEPA values are  
 32 discussed in further detail in Section 5.7.2.1.

33 The RCRA closure performance standards (WAC 173-303-610[2]) will be used to evaluate the  
 34 ability of alternatives to comply with RCRA closure requirements. These standards require the  
 35 closure of TSD units in a manner that achieves the following:

- 36 • Minimizes the need for further maintenance
- 37 • Controls, minimizes, or eliminates, to the extent necessary to protect human health and  
 38 the environment, postclosure escape of dangerous waste, dangerous-waste constituents,

1 leachate, contaminated run-off, or dangerous-waste decomposition products to the  
2 ground, surface water, groundwater, or the atmosphere

- 3 • Returns the land to the appearance and use of surrounding land areas to the degree  
4 possible, given the nature of the previous dangerous-waste activity.

5 In addition, RCRA corrective-action performance standards (WAC 173-303-64620, "Closure  
6 and Post-Closure," "Corrective Action," "Requirements") will be used to evaluate how well the  
7 alternatives comply with RCRA corrective-action requirements. These standards state that  
8 corrective action must achieve the following:

- 9 • Protect human health and the environment for all releases of dangerous waste and  
10 dangerous constituents, including releases from all solid waste management units at the  
11 facility
- 12 • Occur regardless of the time at which waste was managed at the facility or placed in such  
13 units, and regardless of whether such facilities or units were intended for the management  
14 of solid or dangerous waste
- 15 • Be implemented by the owner/operator beyond the facility boundary where necessary to  
16 protect human health and the environment.

17 The FS/closure plan also will include supporting information needed to complete the detailed  
18 analysis and meet regulatory integration needs, including the following:

- 19 • Summarize the RI, including the nature and extent of contamination, the  
20 contaminant-distribution models, and an assessment of the risks to help establish the need  
21 for remediation and to estimate the volume of contaminated media
- 22 • Refine the conceptual exposure-pathway model to identify pathways that might need to  
23 be addressed by remedial action
- 24 • Provide a detailed evaluation of potential ARARs, beginning with potential ARARs  
25 identified in the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28, Chapter 4.0)
- 26 • Refine potential RAOs and PRGs identified in the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28,  
27 Chapter 5.0), based on the results of the RI, ARAR evaluation, and current land-use  
28 considerations
- 29 • Refine the list of remedial alternatives identified in the Implementation Plan  
30 (DOE/RL-98-28, Appendix D) and in this section, based on the RI
- 31 • Include, as appendices, closure plans to address RCRA TSD units in the OU. The closure  
32 plans will incorporate, by reference, specific sections of the work plan or RI report  
33 containing specific closure-plan information. The closure plans will include closure  
34 performance standards, a closure strategy, and general closure activities including a  
35 general postclosure plan.

1 Additional RCRA coordination guidance for preparing an FS/closure plan is provided in  
2 DOE/RL-98-28, Section 2.4.

### 3 **5.8.2.1 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 Values**

4 NEPA values will be evaluated as part of DOE's responsibility. NEPA and its implementing  
5 regulations: DOE Order 451.1B, *National Environmental Policy Act Compliance Program*;  
6 *DOE Policies on Application of NEPA to CERCLA and RCRA Actions*, Memorandum,  
7 July 11, 2002 (DOE, 2002); and DOE G 430.1-4, *Decommissioning Implementation Guide*,  
8 require that NEPA values be incorporated into decisions and documents as part of the CERCLA  
9 process. These values include, but are not limited to, cumulative, ecological, cultural, historical,  
10 and socioeconomic impacts and irreversible and irretrievable statements, in lieu of preparing  
11 separate NEPA documentation. The impacts of these aspects of the human environment usually  
12 are not otherwise addressed within the CERCLA process. This integration provides a more  
13 comprehensive analysis of potential impacts resulting from the proposed 200-SW-2 OU cleanup  
14 activities. To support the CERCLA decision-making process, NEPA value analysis will be  
15 addressed in the FS and in the resulting CERCLA decision documents.

### 16 **5.8.3 Treatability Investigations**

17 The purpose of the FS process is to identify and evaluate alternatives for waste-site remediation  
18 in support of the proposed plan and subsequent ROD. Treatability and other focused  
19 investigations are conducted to fill data gaps with information required to reduce uncertainties  
20 and support better decision making and more cost-effective site remediation. Historically,  
21 treatability investigations have been conducted post-ROD. However, pre-ROD treatability  
22 investigations can provide valuable information regarding the effectiveness, implementability,  
23 and cost of candidate remedial technologies in support of detailed evaluation during the FS  
24 process. Closure and corrective actions for RCRA TSD units will be evaluated against  
25 appropriate dangerous waste performance standards. Under RCRA corrective action, treatability  
26 investigations are conducted during the corrective-measures study but are not identified as a  
27 separate step in the RCRA process. The FS process has several steps in support of  
28 remedial-alternatives identification and evaluation:

- 29 • Define RAOs and RCRA closure/corrective-action performance standards
- 30 • Identify general response actions to satisfy RAOs
- 31 • Identify potential technologies and process options associated with each general-response  
32 action
- 33 • Assess screening-process options to select a representative process for each type of  
34 technology, based on its effectiveness, implementability, and cost
- 35 • Assemble viable technologies or process options into alternatives representing a range of  
36 removal/treatment/ disposal and containment methods plus the no-action alternative.

1 SGW-34463, *Treatability Investigations Supporting the 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and*  
2 *Dumps Group Operable Unit*, (Treatability Investigations Report) was prepared to evaluate  
3 potential treatability investigations that may be used to support characterization and remediation  
4 of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills. SGW-34463 provides a detailed discussion of the  
5 treatability-investigation process and descriptions of proposed treatability investigations to be  
6 considered during the RI process.

### 7 **5.8.3.1 Technology Prescreening in Support of the RI/FS Process**

8 A technology prescreening document (PNNL-16105) relevant to the 200-SW-2 OU was prepared  
9 to support revision of this RI/FS work plan and to address, in part, comments documented in the  
10 Collaborative Agreement. A full range of remediation and characterization technologies were  
11 evaluated to support revision of this RI/FS work plan, preparation of DQOs and SAPs, and  
12 performance of treatability investigations.

13 The technology prescreening also served to update and expand remediation technology  
14 evaluations previously conducted in the Implementation Plan. Primary areas of technology  
15 expansion included methods for containment, removal, ex situ treatment, and in situ treatment.  
16 Information was assembled to update the descriptions of potential remediation technologies and  
17 support the technology basis for likely remedial-response scenarios. Information for each  
18 technology is presented with respect to maturity, effectiveness, implementability, and cost.  
19 Based on the maturity of technologies, the need for treatability investigations is indicated.  
20 Updated remediation-technology information also reflects site-remediation activities at the  
21 618-10 and 618-11 solid-waste Burial Grounds.

22 The prescreening also addressed potentially applicable characterization technologies. The  
23 following eight categories of information relevant to the characterization of the 200-SW-2 OU  
24 were addressed:

- 25 • Distribution of debris and physical boundaries of burial trenches (intrusive and  
26 nonintrusive)
- 27 • Distribution of heavy metals/inorganic compounds (intrusive and nonintrusive)
- 28 • Distribution of organic compounds (intrusive and nonintrusive)
- 29 • Lateral distribution of radionuclides (intrusive and nonintrusive)
- 30 • Vertical distribution of radionuclides (intrusive only)
- 31 • Identification of transuranic radionuclides (intrusive and nonintrusive)
- 32 • Enabling technologies (analytical)
- 33 • Enabling technologies (subsurface access).

4 The characterization technology prescreening considered activities at the 618-10/618-11  
5 solid-waste Burial Grounds, other Hanford Site projects, and other DOE sites. Discussions are

1 provided with respect to the advantages, disadvantages, limitations, uncertainties, maturity, and  
 2 relative cost of potentially viable characterization technologies. Remediation and  
 3 characterization technology experts from Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Idaho National  
 4 Engineering Laboratory, and Oak Ridge National Laboratory provided technical review and  
 5 input to the technology screening activities.

6 Table 5-4 provides a composite listing of likely response scenarios for the 200-SW-2 OU, based  
 7 on the Implementation Plan, Collaborative Agreement, and the technology prescreening report  
 8 (PNNL-16105). Also included are potential site-remediation technologies and an indication of  
 9 whether treatability investigations are recommended to support evaluation of remedial  
 10 alternatives during preparation of the FS.  
 11

Table 5-4. Likely Response Scenarios. (2 Pages)

Likely Response Scenario	Supporting Technologies	Treatability Investigation Needed?
<i>Applicable Within a Landfill</i>		
Surface and Subsurface Barriers	Arid climate engineered barrier	No
	Asphalt, concrete, cement-type cap	Yes (E)
	RCRA cap	No
	Slurry walls	No
	Grout curtains	No
	Dynamic compaction	No
Removal/Treatment/Disposal for all or portions of an individual landfill	Conventional	No
	Remote processes	No
	Stabilization and retrieval	Yes (E,I,C)
	Soil vacuum	No
	Vitrification	No
	In-container vitrification	No
	Soil Washing	No
	Mechanical separation	No
	Solidification/stabilization	No
	Automated segregation based on rad	No
In situ solidification and stabilization for all or portions of an individual landfill	Vitrification	No
	Grout injection	Yes (E)
	Soil mixing	Yes (E)
<i>Applicable in the Vadose Zone Beneath a Landfill</i>		
In situ solidification and stabilization	Grout injection	Yes (E)
	Supersaturated grouts	Yes (E)
	Soil desiccation	Yes (E)
	Reactive gases	Yes (E)
	Nanoparticles	Yes (E,I,C)
Contaminant extraction	Soil flushing	Yes (E)

Table 5-4. Likely Response Scenarios. (2 Pages)

Likely Response Scenario	Supporting Technologies	Treatability Investigation Needed?
	Electrokinetics	Yes (E)
Natural attenuation	Monitored natural attenuation	No

Additional information may be needed to support the feasibility study in the area of effectiveness (E), implementability (I), or cost (C). Some technologies not listed as requiring treatability investigations may still need site-specific design information as part of the remedial design report/remedial action work plan activities following determination of the record of decision.

RCRA = *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976.*

1 Consistent with the phased RI/FS approach discussed herein, treatability investigations are  
 2 proposed for phased implementation, given the current lack of information regarding the nature  
 3 and extent of contamination surrounding the burial trenches. The DOE complex and others have  
 4 conducted a significant body of work to develop and demonstrate technologies potentially  
 5 applicable to the characterization and remediation of radioactive and nonradioactive solid-waste  
 6 landfills. This work ranges from in-place isolation and stabilization using surface and subsurface  
 7 barrier technologies, to waste retrieval, treatment, and disposal. The majority of the DOE  
 8 complex work has been conducted at the Hanford Site and Idaho National Engineering  
 9 Laboratory.

10 Initial efforts will focus on the compilation of information to help focus pre-ROD treatability  
 11 investigations to address specific areas of interest. These areas of interest are listed in  
 12 Section 5.7.4.2 and primarily are paper studies.

13 As solid-waste landfill nonintrusive and intrusive investigations proceed, and more becomes  
 14 known about the nature and extent of contamination, focused treatability investigations can be  
 15 conducted to determine the effectiveness, implementability, and cost of site-remediation  
 16 technologies, based on likely response scenarios to address the nature and extent of  
 17 contamination. This approach minimizes the likelihood of unnecessarily investing in treatability  
 18 investigations for technologies that may not be required, once the nature and extent of  
 19 contamination is known.

20 Following completion of the RI/FS process, the results of the detailed alternatives analysis and  
 21 risk assessment become the basis and rationale for selecting the preferred alternative. Once a  
 22 preferred alternative is selected, a proposed plan is prepared in support of the ROD. Once the  
 23 ROD is issued, additional treatability investigations may be required to support the remedial  
 24 design and subsequent remedial actions. Furthermore, if new technologies emerge during the  
 25 execution of the RI/FS process, they will be considered as appropriate. If additional treatability  
 26 investigations are deemed necessary to support evaluation of emerging technologies, then test  
 27 plans and other supporting documentation will be prepared at that time.

28 The technology prescreening conducted to date evaluated potential technologies from the  
 29 standpoint of their applicability (1) within a landfill, and (2) within the vadose zone beneath a  
 30 landfill. SGW-34463 describes recommended treatability and other investigations (paper studies  
 31 not requiring field work) that may be performed in support of the 200-SW-2 OU. Technologies  
 32 not requiring treatability investigations were identified as such because it was determined that

1 their level of maturity was such that sufficient information exists with respect to effectiveness,  
2 implementability, and cost to support detailed analysis during the FS process.

### 3 **5.8.4 Feasibility Study Cost Estimating**

4 The National Contingency Plan and CERCLA require a detailed analysis of all the alternatives  
5 presented in an FS. The cost estimate is one part of the detailed analysis. The cost estimate will  
6 reflect a level of detail based on the data collected during the RI. Typically, the cost estimate is a  
7 "study level" cost estimate. The intent of the estimate is to prepare the estimate at relatively low  
8 cost within an accuracy of minus 30 to plus 50 percent (-30 to +50). In addition, the cost  
9 estimate will identify capital, operations, and maintenance costs for each alternative. The  
10 accuracy is specified in EPA/540/R-00/002, *A Guide to Developing and Documenting Cost*  
11 *Estimates during the Feasibility Study*, OSWER 9355.0-75. The cost estimates provide a  
12 discriminator for deciding between similar protective and implementable alternatives for a  
13 specific waste site. Therefore, the costs are relational, not absolute, costs for the evaluation of  
14 the alternatives. Cost estimates by landfill will be developed using cost models developed by the  
15 Fluor Hanford Project Controls organization.

16 The cost models do not evaluate the economies associated with implementing multiple landfills  
17 or groups with a common alternative or aggregated remediation. They will be considered in the  
18 future as part of long-range planning and through the post-ROD activities, such as remedial  
19 design. Potential areas of cost sharing to reduce overall remediation costs include the following:

- 20 • Remediating all waste sites with a common preferred alternative at the same time
- 21 • Sharing mobilization/demobilization costs
- 22 • Sharing surveillance and maintenance costs
- 23 • Sharing barrier-performance monitoring costs.

24 Present net-worth costs will be estimated using the real discount rate published in Appendix C of  
25 OMB Circular No. A-94, *Guidelines and Discount Rates for Benefit-Cost Analysis of Federal*  
26 *Programs*. The types of costs include the following: (1) capital costs, including both direct and  
27 indirect costs (2) annual operations and maintenance costs; and (3) net present value of capital  
28 and operation and maintenance costs (40 CFR 300.430(e)(9)(iii)(G), "Feasibility Study,"  
29 "Detailed Analysis of Alternatives," "Nine Criteria for Evaluation," "Cost").

30 Nondiscounted costs will be calculated because of recommendations presented in  
31 EPA/540/R-00/002. Nondiscounted constant dollar costs demonstrate the impact of a discount  
32 rate on the total present-value cost. The nondiscounted costs will be presented for comparison  
33 purposes only.

#### 34 **5.8.4.1 Cost for Treatability Investigations**

35 Many cost elements are applicable to all tiers of treatability investigations (remedy screening,  
36 remedy selection, remedial design/remedial action); however, some will increase from one tier to  
37 another. Some cost elements only will be applicable to a particular tier. For example,  
38 vendor-equipment rental is a key cost element in the performance of remedial design/remedial  
39 action testing. Most vendors have established daily, weekly, and monthly rates for the use of  
40 their treatment systems. Site preparation and logistics costs include costs for planning and

1 management, site design and development, equipment and facilities, health and safety  
 2 equipment, soil excavation, feed homogenization, and feed handling. Costs associated with the  
 3 majority of these activities normally are incurred only with remedial design/remedial action  
 4 testing of mobile field-scale units; however, some cost elements also are incurred in bench- and  
 5 pilot-scale remedy-selection testing. Analytical costs apply to all tiers and have significant  
 6 impact on the total project costs. Several factors affect the cost of the analytical program,  
 7 including the performing laboratory, the analyte list, number of samples, turnaround time, quality  
 8 assurance/quality control, radiological dose factors, and reporting. Transportation and disposal  
 9 of residuals are important elements that must be budgeted in all treatability investigations.  
 10 Depending on the technologies involved, a number of residuals will be generated.

11 Treatability investigations are laboratory or field tests conducted to provide data needed to  
 12 evaluate and implement remedial treatment technologies. The EPA has developed a three-tiered  
 13 approach to aid the planning and performance of cost-effective, on-time, and scientifically sound  
 14 treatability investigations. Table 5-5 presents a general comparison between the three tiers of  
 15 treatability investigations; namely remedy screening, remedy selection, and remedial  
 16 design/remedial action.

Table 5-5. Comparative Summary of the Three Tiers.

Tier	Study Scale	Type of Data Generated	Number of Replicates	Process Type	Waste Stream Volume	Time Required (Test Duration Only)	Cost (\$K)
Remedy Screening	Bench	Qualitative	Single or Duplicate	Batch	Small	Days	10 to 50
Remedy Selection	Bench or Pilot	Quantitative	Duplicate or Triplicate	Batch or Continuous	Medium	Days to Weeks	50 to 100
	Pilot or Full (onsite or offsite)	Quantitative	Duplicate or Triplicate	Batch or Continuous	Large	Weeks to Months	50 to 250
Remedial Design/Remedial Action	Full (onsite)	Quantitative	Duplicate or Triplicate	Batch or Continuous	Large	Weeks to Months	250 to 1,000

17 Summary level information is provided below for each of the three tiers. Detailed discussions of  
 18 the treatability investigation process may be found in SGW-34463.

#### 19 5.8.4.1.1 Remedy Screening

20 Remedy screening provides gross performance data needed to determine the potential feasibility  
 21 of technologies for treating contaminants and matrices of concern. Remedy-screening  
 22 treatability investigations may not be necessary when available technical literature contains  
 23 adequate data to assess the feasibility of a technology. The results of a remedy screening are  
 24 used to determine whether more-detailed treatability investigations should be performed at the  
 25 remedy-selection tier.

#### 1 **5.8.4.1.2 Remedy Selection**

2 Remedy-selection treatability investigations verify whether a process option can meet the OU's  
3 cleanup criteria and at what cost. This tier generates the critical performance and cost data  
4 necessary for remedy evaluation in the detailed analysis of alternatives during the FS.

#### 5 **5.8.4.1.3 Remedial Design/Remedial Action**

6 Remedial design/remedial action treatability investigations generate detailed design, cost, and  
7 performance data to optimize and implement the selected remedy. Remedial design/remedial  
8 action treatability investigations are conducted post-ROD. These treatability investigations are  
9 performed to (1) select among multiple vendors and processes within a prescribed remedy  
10 (prequalification), (2) implement the most appropriate remedy prescribed in a contingency ROD  
11 involving multiple remedies, and (3) support detailed-design specifications and the design of  
12 treatment trains.

#### 13 **5.8.4.2 Other Focused Investigations**

14 In addition to technology-based treatability investigations, other focused investigations are  
15 required to provide information needed in support of the overall RI/FS process. This information  
16 tends to be site-specific in nature, but has general applicability to all landfills where similar  
17 conditions exist. For the most part, these focused investigations involve research and  
18 compilation of information from available databases, other similar projects, and available  
19 literature. The results of these focused investigations will provide information to support  
20 refinement of conceptual site models, likely response scenarios, and remedial alternatives  
21 evaluated during the RI/FS process. Furthermore, some focused investigations will provide  
22 information important to site-characterization activities conducted during the RI/FS process.

23 The following bullets list the focused investigations envisioned in support of the RI/FS process.  
24 As site characterization information is obtained through the RI/FS process, the need for focused  
25 investigations may be expanded in response to newly identified information needs, and there  
26 may be a need for additional technology-based treatability investigations.

- 27 • Locations of large burial boxes
- 28 • Cost of waste retrieval vs barrier construction
- 29 • Caisson characterization and remedial techniques
- 30 • Retrieval of spent fuel
- 31 • Direct-push technology through or near waste trenches
- 32 • Acid-soaked material trenches
- 33 • Vadose-zone characterization and monitoring
- 34 • Compaction methods
- 35 • In situ detection of transuranics
- 36 • Soil vacuum removal methods.

#### 37 **5.8.5 Information and Data Management**

38 SGW-35016, *Information and Data Management Plan for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit*  
39 (Information Management Plan), has been prepared to compile and manage information specific

1 to the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs. Implementation of this plan will establish a project record  
2 in support of the RI/FS and/or RCRA closure process for remediating the landfills in these two  
3 OUs. Data management also is discussed in Appendix C of DOE/RL-98-28 (Implementation  
4 Plan).

5 The Information Management Plan describes how the RL prime contractor will manage data and  
6 other documentation for remedial projects under the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs. The scope  
7 of these projects includes collection and interpretation of historical records, as well as collection  
8 of data through sampling, surveying, and other techniques. The objective of the management of  
9 this information is to provide a technical and defensible basis for the remedial actions chosen for  
10 each landfill in these OUs, support implementation of those remedial actions, facilitate  
11 availability of project history, and facilitate the flow of information into information systems per  
12 Fluor Hanford requirements and procedures, which ultimately are driven by DOE orders, other  
13 Federal and state requirements, and the Tri-Party Agreement.

14 Although work elements associated with the TSD-unit landfills and past-practice landfills are  
15 collecting data and information necessary to support individual objectives, some of the elements  
16 identified under the Information Management Plan are not readily available in current document  
17 and data-management systems. The primary goal of the Information Management Plan is to  
18 systematically consolidate 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU project information needed for  
19 historical documentation, waste profiling, closure verification, nuclear-safety verification,  
20 endpoint verification, completion of removal actions, and support for future remedial decisions.  
21 In addition, the Information Management Plan will ensure that the data and information are  
22 readily available to all qualified Hanford Site personnel and regulators when needed, via widely  
23 available data- and document-management vehicles.

24 Requirements for information management are driven by higher level documents (e.g., DOE  
25 directives, *Code of Federal Regulations*) as well as RL prime contractor requirements and  
26 procedures. These procedures are discussed briefly in the Information Management Plan;  
27 however, the focus of the plan is the implementation.

28 Information management, as a process for the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs, still is under  
29 development and will be an ongoing process until final remediation of the landfills has occurred.  
30 Therefore, the following information-management activities may be subject to adjustment during  
31 the initial stages of data collection at the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs.

32 The overall purpose of the Information Management Plan is to collect and manage information  
33 specifically for the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs for the following purposes:

- 34 • Provide a readily available and continuous project history
- 35 • Establish a historical record of waste-management practices and waste disposed to  
36 individual waste sites within the OUs
- 37 • Establish a record of waste-designation activities to support the appropriate disposal of  
38 waste from remediation activities associated with the OUs

- 1 • Manage documentation required to support historic-preservation requirements for  
2 specific facilities at the OUs
- 3 • Ensure completion/control of closure-verification packages
- 4 • Provide links to nuclear-safety documentation and communicate effectively during work  
5 planning, hazards analysis, and other safety functions
- 6 • Document end-point verification information
- 7 • Document the remedial- or removal-action completion
- 8 • Record end-state conditions at the conclusion of completed activities as the project  
9 progresses, to support future activities and remedial decisions.

10 The plan does not apply to information collected from within the OUs that will require special  
11 handling for security purposes. All information archived per the Information Management Plan  
12 will be contained within the Hanford Site Integrated Data Management System.

13 **5.9 PROPOSED PLAN AND PROPOSED RCRA-**  
14 **PERMIT MODIFICATION**

15 The decision-making process for the 200-SW-2 OU will be based on the use of a proposed plan,  
16 ROD, with modification to the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit (WA7890008967), as appropriate.  
17 The decision-making process for the 200-SW-1 OU will be based on the use of a closure plan  
18 that will result in a modification to the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit for the NRDWL and the  
19 appropriate closure documentation for the 600 CL, in conjunction with WAC 173-304-407  
20 requirements.

21 The proposed plan will include information on the draft permit modifications. The draft permit  
22 modifications will include unit-specific conditions for the RCRA TSD units for incorporation  
23 into the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit

24 During the RI/FS process, a number of options for development of decision documents to  
25 support remediation as quickly as possible will be evaluated. Remedial decisions may proceed  
26 on an OU-by-OU basis, but it also is likely that alternative site groupings will be considered for  
27 waste sites in the Central Plateau. Several alternatives currently are under consideration, some of  
28 which may be used for the landfills addressed in this RI/FS work plan.

29 Three alternatives to the OU-by-OU remediation approach have been identified to provide  
30 flexibility in the decision-making process, facilitate early action, and remediate and close  
31 specific areas or zones. Examples of these alternatives are presented below.

### 1 **5.9.1 High-Risk Waste Sites Identified for Early** 2 **Action**

3 This alternative accelerates the start of remedial actions and closure of waste sites that present an  
4 ongoing or expected future threat to groundwater. Some high-risk sites already have been  
5 identified for early actions within the BC Controlled Area and near U Plant, PUREX, and the  
6 Plutonium Finishing Plant. These sites will be included in a proposed plan and ROD that  
7 promote early action. None of the landfills from the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs have been  
8 identified as high-risk sites, and it is not anticipated that any findings from this RI/FS process  
9 will change their status in this regard. However, if high-risk items (i.e., containerized liquid  
10 organics) are located during RI activities, removal/treatment/disposal of these waste forms may  
11 be performed as an early action.

### 12 **5.9.2 Regional Site Closure**

13 Waste-site remedial decision making may be adjusted under a regional closure strategy that  
14 aligns wastes sites into groups defined by geographical zones. Under this strategy, waste sites in  
15 a geographical area may be remediated as a group, even though they may be in different OUs.  
16 A strategy to implement this regional closure strategy is documented in CP-22319-DEL, *Plan for*  
17 *Central Plateau Closure*.

### 18 **5.9.3 Waste-Site Grouping by Characteristics or** 19 **Hazards**

20 A third example of remedial decision-making strategies is based on a specific characteristic or  
21 hazard that mandates additional requirements, such as supplemental ARARs, or more robust  
22 remedial alternatives. Grouping waste sites with other similarly contaminated soil sites in other  
23 OUs could streamline the decision-making process and tailor the requirements and alternatives to  
24 these specific hazards.

25 Following the completion of the FS/closure plan, a proposed plan will be prepared that identifies  
26 the preferred remedial alternative for the OUs (which will include RCRA closure and  
27 corrective-action requirements). In addition to identifying the preferred alternative, the proposed  
28 plan also will serve the following purposes:

- 29 • Provide a summary of the completed RI/FS
- 30 • Provide criteria by which analogous waste sites within the OUs not previously  
31 characterized will be evaluated after the ROD is issued, to confirm that the  
32 contaminant-distribution model for the site is consistent with the preferred alternative.  
33 Contingencies also will be developed to move a waste site to a more appropriate waste  
34 group
- 35 • Identify performance standards and ARARs applicable to the OUs.

1 The proposed plan also will include a draft permit modification for incorporation of  
 2 closure/postclosure plans into the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit (WA7890008967). After the  
 3 public review process is complete, Ecology (as the lead regulatory agency), in concert with the  
 4 DOE and EPA, will make a final decision on the remedial action to be taken, which is  
 5 documented in a ROD. The ROD will be covered by the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit in  
 6 accordance with Condition II.Y.2.a to satisfy RCRA corrective action requirements. If  
 7 alternative decision-making strategies are employed, lead regulatory agency realignments may  
 8 be considered in consultations between the DOE, EPA, and Ecology.

#### 9 **5.9.4 RCRA TSD-Unit Closure Performance** 10 **Standards and Closure Strategy**

11 Because the RCRA TSDs cannot be clean closed in accordance with WAC 173-303-610(2)(b),  
 12 the TSDs will be closed as a landfill in accordance with WAC 173-303-665(6). This closure  
 13 strategy is consistent with the requirements specified in WAC 173-303-665(6); the land-disposal  
 14 unit closure requirements of the Tri-Party Agreement, Section 6.3.2; and the landfill closure  
 15 requirements of Condition II.K.4 of the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit. The RCRA permit  
 16 modification will specify the closure requirements for the TSD as well as a compliance schedule  
 17 specifying the submittal of a postclosure plan and groundwater-monitoring plan at a later date.

18 Postclosure requirements will ensure that the engineered barrier is maintained (that is, repaired),  
 19 that it is monitored to ensure that it is performing as expected, and that water run-on/runoff is  
 20 managed. Postclosure activities will be coordinated with the operations and maintenance  
 21 organization for the 200-SW-2 OU.

22 A draft closure-permit modification will be prepared in accordance with Sections 5.5 and 6.3 of  
 23 the Tri-Party Agreement. After the public review and comment period, a revised draft closure  
 24 permit will be incorporated into the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit.

25 Table 5-6 illustrates the RCRA TSD closure requirements and indicates from which documents  
 26 the supporting materials will be collected. This table will be used as a crosswalk to orchestrate  
 27 required components for a RCRA "landfill" closure plan, in coordination with a CERCLA  
 28 remedial decision.  
 29

Table 5-6. Crosswalk Between RCRA Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Closure Plan Requirements and Supporting Documentation. (2 Pages)

<b>RCRA TSD Closure Plan Section</b>	<b>Information Contained</b>	<b>Location in Supporting Documents</b>
1.0 Introduction	Permitting history	DOE/RL-88-20, Chapter 2.0
	Closure strategy	DOE/RL-2004-60, Section 5.1
	Part A Permit Application	DOE/RL-88-21, Section 4.2.3.1
2.0 Facility Description and Location	Location maps and discussion	DOE/RL-88-21, Section 4.2.3.1
		DOE/RL-2004-60, Section 2.2.6
	Operational history	DOE/RL-88-20 DOE/RL-2004-60, Section 2.2.6

Table 5-6. Crosswalk Between RCRA Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Closure Plan Requirements and Supporting Documentation. (2 Pages)

RCRA TSD Closure Plan Section	Information Contained	Location in Supporting Documents
3.0 Process Information	Process history for waste streams discharged to the TSD	DOE/RL-88-20, Chapter 4.0 DOE/RL-2004-60, Section 2.2.1
4.0 Waste Characteristics	Waste types and characteristics discharged to the TSD	DOE/RL-88-20 FS (TBD),
5.0 Groundwater Monitoring	Groundwater impacts and monitoring activities	Groundwater monitoring requirements will be contained in the groundwater monitoring plan, DOE/RL-88-20, Chapter 5.0; and FS (TBD)
6.0 Closure Performance Standards	Closure strategy and performance standards	DOE/RL-2004-60, Section 5.4.4 FS (TBD)
7.0 Closure Activities	Sampling and analysis; closure alternatives and closure requirements; includes schedule and certification of closure	DOE/RL-2004-60, Chapter 5.0 DOE/RL-2004-60, Appendix A (SAP) Closure alternatives and requirements evaluated through FS (TBD) (Chapters 5.0 through 7.0) Closure schedule will be included in the remedial design report/remedial action work plan and closure certification through the actual remediation and closeout verification process,
8.0 Postclosure Plan	Groundwater monitoring, cover design, surveillance and maintenance, inspection plan, if needed when clean closure is not achieved	Will be incorporated through the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Operations and Maintenance Plan, as necessary. Groundwater monitoring requirements will be contained in the groundwater monitoring plan, DOE/RL-88-20, Chapter 5.0.

DOE/RL-88-20, *Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, Low-Level Burial Grounds.*

DOE/RL-88-21, *Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Part A Permit Application.*

DOE/RL-2004-60, *200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan, Draft B.*

FS (TBD) = feasibility study for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit.

RCRA = *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976.*

SAP = sampling and analysis plan.

TSD = treatment, storage, and/or disposal (unit).

#### 1 5.9.4.1 Closure of Unused Portions of RCRA Landfills

2 Portions of three of the RCRA TSD-unit landfills (i.e., the 218-W-4C, 218-E-10, and  
3 218-E-12B Landfills) were intended to be used for future disposal of waste; however,  
4 preliminary evaluation indicates that no waste disposals are known to have taken place in these  
5 areas. Because these portions are part of a RCRA TSD unit, procedural closure pursuant to the  
6 Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 6.3.3, "Procedural Closure," will be evaluated in lieu  
7 of developing a closure plan under WAC 173-303-610(3), "Closure Plan; Amendment of Plan."  
8 The procedural closure pathway, as described in the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, is  
9 intended for sites (such as these) that originally were classified as being TSD units but never

1 actually were used to treat, store, or dispose of hazardous waste including mixed waste. Work  
2 plan activities will gather records and perform field activities to support the conclusion required  
3 for certification pursuant to the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 6.3.3. These activities  
4 are described further in Appendix A.

## 5 **5.10 POST-RECORD OF DECISION ACTIVITIES**

6 After the ROD and modification to the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit have been issued, the  
7 implementation of the selected remedial actions will be documented in a remedial  
8 design/remedial action work plan. The remedial design/remedial action work plan will be  
9 prepared to detail the scope of the remedial action (which will identify RCRA closure and  
10 corrective-action requirements that address TSD remedial work that is overlapped by the  
11 CERCLA decision). Additional post-ROD treatability investigations may be performed in  
12 support of the remedial design and remedial action. As part of this activity, DQOs will be  
13 established and SAPs will be prepared to direct confirmatory and verification sampling and  
14 analysis efforts. Before remediation begins, confirmation sampling will be performed to ensure  
15 that sufficient characterization data are available to confirm that the selected remedy is  
16 appropriate for all waste sites within the OUs, to collect data necessary for the remedial design,  
17 and to support final cumulative risk assessments for the 200 Areas National Priorities List site.  
18 Verification sampling will be performed after the remedial action is complete to determine if  
19 ROD requirements have been met and if the remedy was protective of human health and the  
20 environment. Additional guidance for confirmatory and verification sampling is provided in  
21 Section 6.2 of the Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28).

22 The remedial design/remedial action work plan will include an integrated schedule of  
23 remediation activities for the OUs, including a coordinated schedule for RCRA TSD-unit  
24 closure, and will satisfy the technical requirements of a past-practice corrective-measures-  
25 implementation work plan and corrective-measures design report. The available options for  
26 remedy implementation throughout the 200 Areas will be explored during the course of the  
27 RI/FS process and may be reflected in the remedial design/remedial action work plan. Following  
28 the completion of the remediation, closeout activities will be performed as specified in the ROD,  
29 remedial design/remedial action work plan, and the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit. The RCRA  
30 closure activities and schedules will be defined in the closure plan and will be coordinated with  
31 those activities and schedules in the remedial design/remedial action work plan. Enforceable  
32 sections of the closure plan will be stated in the modification to the Hanford Facility RCRA  
33 Permit (WA7890008967). Certification of closure in accordance with WAC 173-303-610(6),  
34 "Certification of Closure," will be performed after completion of cleanup actions. The site will  
35 be restored as appropriate for future land use. If clean closure is not attained at a TSD-unit,  
36 postclosure care requirements will be met. These requirements will include final-status  
37 groundwater monitoring, maintenance and monitoring of institutional controls and/or surface  
38 barriers, and certification of postclosure at the completion of the postclosure period.

39

1

## 6.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE

2 Figure 6-1 illustrates the overall schedule for the implementation of the RI/FS work plan, SAP,  
3 and FS for the 200-SW-2 OU, and the closure schedule for the NRDWL and 600 CL in the  
4 200-SW-1 OU. Figure 6-2 illustrates the required steps for closure of the NRDWL and 600 CL  
5 in more detail. The information presented in Figure 6-1 is based on the critical assumption that  
6 DQO processes, SAPs, and RI/FS work plan revisions can be developed and approved within the  
7 specified timeframes. The review and comment periods for primary documents assume standard  
8 durations as specified in Section 9.0 of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan. Extended review  
9 and comment periods may warrant schedule change(s). The project schedule will be refined  
10 during each revision to the phased RI/FS work plan.

11 The comprehensive strategy for the 200 Areas radioactive landfills includes elements that will  
12 contribute to the RI and the remediation of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills, but that are not currently  
13 within the scope of the CERCLA RI/FS activities or coordinated RCRA closure activities,  
14 included in this RI/FS work plan. The following additional activities are related to  
15 characterization or remediation of solid-waste landfills.

- 16 • As noted in Section 1.3, the 218-E-12B, 218-W-3A, 218-W-4B, and 218-W-4C Landfills  
17 contain retrievably stored suspect TRU waste. The suspect TRU waste includes both  
18 contact-handled suspect TRU waste and remote-handled suspect TRU waste. The vast  
19 majority (94 percent of TRU containers) of contact-handled suspect TRU waste is stored  
20 in metal drums, with the remainder stored in a variety of container types. The  
21 remote-handled suspect TRU waste (about 4 percent of all TRU waste containers at the  
22 Hanford Site) is stored in a variety of containers such as casks, metal drums, boxes, and  
23 metal cans inside caissons. Activities associated with this scope of work that will  
24 contribute to the RI of these landfills include the following:
  - 25 – Contact-handled suspect TRU waste is being retrieved from four landfills in the  
26 LLBG TSD unit in accordance with Tri-Party Agreement Interim Milestone  
27 M-091-40, Requirement 1.
  - 28 – As retrieval of contact-handled suspect TRU waste proceeds, trench substrates will be  
29 sampled and analyzed in accordance with Tri-Party Agreement Interim Milestone  
30 M-091-40, Requirement 2. The purpose of the sampling is to evaluate whether  
31 contaminants have been released to the environment and, if so, the nature and extent  
32 of the contamination. A separate DQO summary report and SAP have been  
33 developed and are described in Section 3.3 for substrate sampling at each of the four  
34 landfills. Interface will be established between the 200-SW-2 OU Project and the  
35 M-091 Program to explore opportunistic sampling events during preparation of the  
36 DQO and SAP to provide information supportive of the 200-SW-2 OU RI/FS  
37 process.
  - 38 – Remote-handled suspect TRU waste will be retrieved from four landfills in  
39 accordance with Tri-Party Agreement Interim Milestone M-091-41, Requirement 1.



Figure 6-2. Schedule for Closure Activities at the 200-SW-1 Operable Unit.

ID	Task Name*	Start	Finish	Q4 07			Q1 08			Q2 08			Q3 08			Q4 08			Q1 09			Q2 09			Q3 09			Q4 09			Q1 10			Q2 10			Q3 10		
				Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
1	Prepare TPA Change Request	10/1/2007	11/30/2007	█																																			
2	Prepare closure/post closure plans (including groundwater monitoring plans)**	11/1/2007	4/30/2008	█	█	█	█	█	█																														
3	NOD Cycle	5/1/2008	3/30/2010																																				
4	Prepare permit modification (NRDWL)	4/1/2010	6/30/2010																																				
5	Support public involvement for permit mod (NRDWL)	7/1/2010	8/30/2010																																				
6	Prepare revised Part A (NRDWL)	12/3/2007	1/30/2008	█	█																																		
7	Prepare Environmental Assessment***	12/3/2007	5/30/2008	█	█	█	█	█																															
8	Prepare SEPA Checklists	12/3/2007	12/28/2007	█																																			

\*Unless otherwise specified, the task is for documents/actions needed for both the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and the 600 Area Central Landfill.

\*\*The cost and schedule include document preparation, submittal to the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, comment incorporation, and submittal to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). Schedule for resolutions of notices of deficiency and approval of the closure plan from Ecology will follow Figure 9-2 of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan (Ecology et al., 1989b). While the 600 Area Central Landfill closure plan normally would not follow Figure 9-2 but rather Figure 9-1 of the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan as a primary document, following the same notice of deficiency schedule for both documents would allow for better integration and coordination of closure activities between the two landfills.

\*\*\*Environmental assessment is needed if the action is over \$5 million and longer than 5 years. If the action is below these conditions, then a categorical exclusion may be appropriate.

This page intentionally left blank.

1

**7.0 REFERENCES**

- 2 04-AMCP-0321, 2004, "Transmittal of the Burial Ground Sampling and Analysis Results for  
3 January – March 2004," (letter to Michael A. Wilson, Program Manager, Nuclear  
4 Waste Program, Department of Ecology, Kennewick, Washington, from  
5 Matthew S. McCormick, Assistant Manager for the Central Plateau), U.S. Department  
6 of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington, June 4.
- 7 04-RCA-0037, 2003, "Notification of Completion of Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and  
8 Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement) Settlement and Tentative Agreement Interim  
9 Milestone M-91-40, Requirement for DOE to "Initiate Retrieval at Its Burial Ground  
10 218-W-4C No Later Than November 15, 2003"," (letter to Michael A. Wilson, Program  
11 Manager, Nuclear Waste Program, Department of Ecology, Kennewick, Washington,  
12 from J. Hebdon), U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland,  
13 Washington, December 22.
- 14 07-AMCP-0166, 2007, "Burial Ground Sampling and Analysis Results for October –  
15 December 2006," (letter to Jane A. Hedges, Program Manager, Nuclear Waste Program,  
16 Department of Ecology, Kennewick, Washington, from Matthew S. McCormick,  
17 Assistant Manager for the Central Plateau), U.S. Department of Energy, Richland  
18 Operations Office, Richland, Washington, April 24.
- 19 10 CFR 61, "Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste," Title 10, *Code*  
20 *of Federal Regulations*, Part 61.
- 21 10 CFR 835.2, "Occupational Radiation Protection," "Definitions," Title 10, *Code of Federal*  
22 *Regulations*, Part 835.2.
- 23 10 CFR 962, "Byproduct Material," Title 10, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 962.
- 24 40 CFR 191, "Environmental Radiation Protection Standards for Management and Disposal of  
25 Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes," Title 40, *Code of*  
26 *Federal Regulations*, Part 191.
- 27 40 CFR 261, "Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste," Title 40, *Code of Federal*  
28 *Regulations*, Part 261.
- 29 40 CFR 265, Subpart F, "Interim Status Standards for Owners and Operators of Hazardous  
30 Waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities," Subpart F, "Ground-Water  
31 Monitoring," Title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 265, Subpart F.
- 32 40 CFR 265.92, "Interim Status Standards for Owners and Operators of Hazardous Waste  
33 Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities," "Sampling and Analysis," Title 40, *Code of*  
34 *Federal Regulations*, Part 265.92.

- 1 40 CFR 300, "National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan,"  
2 Appendix B, "National Priorities List," Title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 300,  
3 Appendix B.
- 4 40 CFR 300.430, "Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study and Selection of Remedy," Title 40,  
5 *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 300.430.
- 6 40 CFR 300.430(e)(9)(iii)(G), "Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study and Selection of  
7 Remedy," "Feasibility Study," "Detailed Analysis of Alternatives," "Nine Criteria for  
8 Evaluation," "Cost," Title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 300.430(e)(9)(iii)(G).
- 9 52 FR 15937, "Radioactive Waste, Byproducts Material Final Rule," *Federal Register*, Vol. 52,  
10 p. 15937, May 1, 1987.
- 11 52 FR 35556, "Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program;  
12 Washington," *Federal Register*, Vol. 52, p. 35556, September 22, 1987.
- 13 54 FR 36597, "40 CFR Part 261, Mining Waste Exclusion; Final Rule," *Federal Register*,  
14 Vol. 54, p. 36597, Sept 1, 1989.
- 15 64 FR 61615, "Record of Decision: Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan Environmental  
16 Impact Statement (HCP EIS)," *Federal Register*, Vol. 64, No. 218, pp. 61615-61625,  
17 November 12, 1999.
- 18 AEC Immediate Action Directive 0511-21, 1970, *Policy Statement Regarding Solid Waste*  
19 *Burial*, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., March 20, 1970.
- 20 AEC, 1973, Atomic Energy Commission Manual Chapter 0511, *Radioactive Waste*  
21 *Management*, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.
- 22 ANL, 2002, *RESRAD for Windows*, Version 6.21, Environmental Assessment Division, Argonne  
23 National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois.
- 24 ARH-780, 1968, *Chronological Record of Significant Events in Chemical Separations*  
25 *Operations*, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 26 ARH-1608, 1970, *Radioactive Contamination in Liquid Wastes Discharged to Ground Within*  
27 *the Chemical Separations Area Control Zone Through 1969*, Atlantic Richfield Hanford  
28 Company, Richland, Washington.
- 29 ARH-1842, 1970, *Specifications and Standards for the Burial of ARHCO Solid Wastes*, Atlantic  
30 Richfield Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 31 ARH-2015, 1971, *Radioactive Contamination in Unplanned Releases to Ground Within the*  
32 *Chemical Separations Area Control Zone through 1970; Part 4*, Atlantic Richfield  
33 Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

- 1 ARH-2757, 1973, *Radioactive Contamination In Unplanned Releases To Ground Within the*  
2 *Chemical Separations Area Control Zone Through 1972 (Exclusive of Liquid Waste*  
3 *Storage Tank Farms)*, Part 4, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company, Richland,  
4 Washington.
- 5 ARH-2762, 1974, *Input and Decayed Values of Radioactive Solid Wastes Buried in the*  
6 *200 Areas through 1971*, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 7 ARH-3032, 1974, *Specifications and Standards for the Packaging, Storage, and Disposal of*  
8 *Richland Operations Solid Waste*, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company, Richland,  
9 Washington.
- 10 ARH-CD-353, 1976, *Design Criteria for Transuranic Dry Waste Steel and Reinforced Concrete*  
11 *Burial Containers*, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 12 ARH-CD-744-4Q, 1977, *Summary of Radioactive Solid Waste Burials in the 200 Areas During*  
13 *1976*, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 14 ARH-ST-155, 1977, *The Hanford Environment as Related to Radioactive Waste Burial Grounds*  
15 *and Transuranic Waste Storage Facilities*, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company,  
16 Richland, Washington.
- 17 *Atomic Energy Act of 1954*, 42 USC 2011, et seq.
- 18 BHI-00127, 1995, *100-H Area Technical Baseline Report*, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland,  
19 Washington.
- 20 BHI-00174, 1995, *U Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report*,  
21 Rev. 00, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 22 BHI-00175, 1995, *Z Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report*,  
23 Rev. 00, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 24 BHI-00176, 1995, *S Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report*,  
25 Rev. 00, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 26 BHI-00177, 1995, *T Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report*,  
27 Rev. 00, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 28 BHI-00178, 1995, *PUREX Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report*,  
29 Rev. 00, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 30 BHI-00179, 1995, *B Plant Aggregate Area Management Study Technical Baseline Report*,  
31 Rev. 00, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 32 BHI-01115, 1997, *Evaluation of the Soil-Gas Survey at the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste*  
33 *Landfill*, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.

- 1 Bjornstad, B. N., G. V. Last, and D. G. Horton, 2003, "Hydrogeology of the Hanford Site  
2 Vadose Zone," in *Abstracts with Programs: November 2-5, 2003*, Annual Meeting of the  
3 Geological Society of America, Seattle, Washington.
- 4 CCN 0073214, 2007, *Path Forward – 200-SW-1/2 RI/FS Work Plan Development, May 15,*  
5 *2007*, (agreement signed by Matthew S. McCormick, U.S. Department of Energy,  
6 Richland Operations Office, and John B. Price, Washington State Department of  
7 Ecology, Kennewick, Washington), at Richland, Washington.
- 8 *Clean Air Act of 1990*, 42 USC 7401, et seq., Pub. L. 101-549.
- 9 *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980*,  
10 42 USC 9601, et seq.
- 11 CP-13514, 2003, *200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step I Sampling and Analysis of the*  
12 *Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose Zone Plume*, Rev. 0, Fluor Hanford, Inc.,  
13 Richland, Washington.
- 14 CP-16886, 2003, *Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for the 218-W-4C Burial Ground*  
15 *Contaminant Release Investigation*, Rev. 0, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 16 CP-22319-DEL, 2004, *Plan for Central Plateau Closure*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland,  
17 Washington.
- 18 D&D-27257, 2006, *Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for Nonintrusive Characterization*  
19 *of Bin 3A and Bin 3B Waste Sites in the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit*, Rev. 0 Reissue, Fluor  
20 Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 21 D&D-28283, 2006, *Sampling and Analysis Instruction for Nonintrusive Characterization of Bin*  
22 *3A and Bin 3B Waste Sites in the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit*, Rev. 0 Reissue, Fluor  
23 Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 24 D&D-28379, 2006, *Geophysical Investigations Summary Report; 200 Area Burial Grounds:*  
25 *218-C-9, 218-E-2A, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, 218-E-8, 218-W-1A, 218-W-2A, and 218-W-11,*  
26 *Rev. 1*, prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc., for Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 27 D&D-30708, 2006, *Geophysical Investigations Summary Report; 200 Areas Burial Grounds:*  
28 *218-E-1, 218-E-2A, 218-E-8, 218-E-12A, 218-W-1, 218-W-2, 218-W-3, and 218-W-11,*  
29 Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 30 D&D-32015, 2007, *Sampling and Analysis Instruction for Artificial Animal Burrows, in Support*  
31 *of the Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment*, Rev. 0, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland,  
32 Washington.
- 33 DOE G 430.1-4, *Decommissioning Implementation Guide*, U.S. Department of Energy,  
34 Washington, D.C.

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

- 1 DOE G 435.1-1, 1999, *Implementation Guide for Use with DOE M 435.1-1*, U.S. Department of  
2 Energy, Washington, D.C.
- 3 DOE M 435.1-1, *Radioactive Waste Management Manual*, as amended, U.S. Department of  
4 Energy, Washington, D.C.
- 5 DOE O 435.1, *Radioactive Waste Management*, as amended, U.S. Department of Energy,  
6 Washington, D.C.
- 7 DOE O 451.1B, *National Environmental Policy Act Compliance Program*, as amended,  
8 U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.
- 9 DOE Order 5820.2A, *Radioactive Waste Management*, as amended, U.S. Department of Energy,  
10 Washington, D.C. (now superseded by DOE O 435.1).
- 11 DOE, 2002, *DOE Policies on the Application of NEPA to CERCLA and RCRA Cleanup Actions*,  
12 DOE Memorandum, Office of NEPA Policy and Compliance, Washington, D.C., July 11.
- 13 DOE/EIS-0222-F, 1999, *Final Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan Environmental Impact*  
14 *Statement*, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.
- 15 DOE/EIS-0286D2, 2003, *Revised Draft Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste*  
16 *Program Environmental Impact Statement*, U.S. Department of Energy,  
17 Washington, D.C.
- 18 DOE/EIS-0286F, 2004, *Final Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program*  
19 *Environmental Impact Statement, Richland, Washington*, U.S. Department of Energy,  
20 Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 21 DOE REG-0271, 2002, *Low-Level Burial Grounds Fact Sheet*, U.S. Department of Energy,  
22 Richland Operations Office, Richland Washington. available at:  
23 [http://www.hanford.gov/wastemgt/doe/files/LLBG\\_Fact\\_Sheet\\_Final\\_2\\_10.pdf](http://www.hanford.gov/wastemgt/doe/files/LLBG_Fact_Sheet_Final_2_10.pdf)
- 24 DOE/RL-88-20, 1997, *Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, Low-Level Burial*  
25 *Grounds*, Rev. 1, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland,  
26 Washington.
- 27 DOE/RL-88-21, 1990, *Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Part A Permit Application*, Rev. 6,  
28 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 29 DOE/RL-88-21, 2002, *Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Part A Permit Application*, Rev. 31,  
30 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 31 DOE/RL 88-31, 1992, *Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan for the 300-FF-1*  
32 *Operable Unit, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington*, U.S. Department of Energy,  
33 Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

- 1 DOE/RL-90-17, 1990, *Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill Closure/Postclosure Plan*,  
2 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 3 DOE/RL-91-28, 2004, *Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application*, Rev. 7,  
4 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 5 DOE/RL-91-32, 1991, *Expedited Response Action Proposal (EE/CA & EA) for 200 West Area*  
6 *Carbon Tetrachloride Plume*, Draft B, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations  
7 Office, Richland, Washington.
- 8 DOE/RL-91-45, 1995, *Hanford Site Baseline Risk Assessment Methodology*, Rev. 3,  
9 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 10 DOE/RL-91-50, 2000, *Environmental Monitoring Plan United States Department of Energy*  
11 *Richland Operations Office*, Rev. 3, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations  
12 Office, Richland, Washington.
- 13 DOE/RL-92-05, 1993, *B Plant Source Aggregate Area Management Study Report*, Rev. 0,  
14 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 15 DOE/RL-92-16, 1993, *200 West Groundwater Aggregate Area Management Study Report*,  
16 Rev. 0, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 17 DOE/RL-92-19, 1993, *200 East Groundwater Aggregate Area Management Study Report*,  
18 Rev. 0, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 19 DOE/RL-96-81, 1997, *Waste Site Grouping for 200 Areas Soil Investigations*, Rev. 0,  
20 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 21 DOE/RL-98-28, 1999, *200 Areas Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Implementation*  
22 *Plan – Environmental Restoration Program*, Rev. 0, U.S. Department of Energy,  
23 Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 24 DOE/RL-2000-29, 2000, *Maintenance Plan for the Composite Analysis of the Hanford Site*,  
25 *Southeast Washington*, Rev. 1, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office,  
26 Richland, Washington.
- 27 DOE/RL-2000-70, 2000, *Closure Plan for Active Low-Level Burial Grounds*, U.S. Department  
28 of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 29 DOE/RL-2000-72, 2000, *Performance Assessment Monitoring Plan for the Hanford Site*  
30 *Low-Level Burial Grounds*, Rev. 1, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations  
31 Office, Richland, Washington.
- 32 DOE/RL-2001-01, 2004, *Plutonium/Organic-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group*  
33 *Operable Unit RI/FS Work Plan, Includes: 200-PW-1, 200-PW-3, and 200-PW-6*  
34 *Operable Units*, Rev. 0, Reissue, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations  
35 Office, Richland, Washington.

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

- 1 DOE/RL-2001-54, 2005, *Central Plateau Ecological Evaluation*, Rev. 0, U.S. Department of  
2 Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 3 DOE/RL-2001-66, 2002, *Chemical Laboratory Waste Group Operable Units RI/FS Work Plan*,  
4 *Includes: 200-LW-1 and 200-LW-2 Operable Units*, Rev. 1, U.S. Department of Energy,  
5 Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 6 DOE/RL-2002-39, 2002, *Standardized Stratigraphic Nomenclature for Post-Ringold Formation*  
7 *Sediments Within the Central Pasco Basin*, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland,  
8 Washington.
- 9 DOE/RL-2003-48, 2003, *218-W-4C Burial Ground Sampling and Analysis Plan*, Rev. 0,  
10 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland, Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 11 DOE/RL-2004-60, 2004, *200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit*  
12 *and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial*  
13 *Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan*, Draft A, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland  
14 Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 15 DOE/RL-2004-70, 2006, *218-W-4B Burial Ground Sampling and Analysis Plan*, Rev. 0,  
16 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 17 DOE/RL-2004-71, 2006, *218-W-3A Burial Ground Sampling and Analysis Plan*, Rev. 0,  
18 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 19 DOE/RL-2006-51, 2007, *Remedial Investigation Report for the Plutonium/Organic-Rich Process*  
20 *Condensate/Process Waste Group Operable Unit: Includes the 200-PW-1, 200-PW-3,*  
21 *and 200-PW-6 Operable Units*, Draft B, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland  
22 Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 23 DOE and Ecology, 2007, *Path Forward, 200-SW-1/2 RI/FS Work Plan Development*,  
24 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office and U.S. Environmental  
25 Protection Agency, Richland, Washington, May 15.
- 26 DOE, EPA, and Ecology, 2002, *Hanford Site Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement*  
27 *Community Relations Plan, Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*,  
28 U.S. Department of Energy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington State  
29 Department of Ecology, Richland, Washington, January.
- 30 Ecology, 1996, (concerning the effective date for mixed-waste regulation), (letter to  
31 Patrick W. Willison, Office of Chief Counsel, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland  
32 Operations Office, from Tanya Barnett, Assistant Attorney General), Attorney General of  
33 Washington, Ecology Division, Lacy, Washington, September 26.

- 1 Ecology, 2005, *Record of Decision, 221-U Facility (Canyon Disposition Initiative), Hanford*  
2 *Site, Washington*, [Final Remedial Action Between the United States Department of  
3 Energy and the United States Environmental Protection Agency, with Concurrence by the  
4 Washington State Department of Ecology], Nuclear Waste Program, Washington State  
5 Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington. Available on the Internet at  
6 [http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/CLEANUP.NSF/9f3c21896330b4898825687b007a0f33/919](http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/CLEANUP.NSF/9f3c21896330b4898825687b007a0f33/9193b1bfe7feb192882565920054de57/$FILE/cdiROD.pdf)  
7 [3b1bfe7feb192882565920054de57/\\$FILE/cdiROD.pdf](http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/CLEANUP.NSF/9f3c21896330b4898825687b007a0f33/9193b1bfe7feb192882565920054de57/$FILE/cdiROD.pdf).
- 8 Ecology and DOE, 2005, *200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Collaborative Workshops, Agreement,*  
9 *Completion Matrix, and Supporting Documentation, Final Product*, (Correspondence  
10 Control No. 0064527), Washington State Department of Ecology and U.S. Department of  
11 Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington, April 18.
- 12 Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1989a, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order,*  
13 2 vols., as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental  
14 Protection Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington.
- 15 Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1989b, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*  
16 *Action Plan*, Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection  
17 Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington.
- 18 *Endangered Species Act of 1973*, 16 USC 1531, et seq.
- 19 EPA, 1991, *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Vol. I, Human Health Evaluation Manual,*  
20 *Supplemental Guidance: Standard Default Exposure Factors, (Interim Final)*, OSWER  
21 Directive 9285.6-03, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Toxics Integration  
22 Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 23 EPA, 1992, *Supplemental Guidance to RAGS: Calculating the Concentration Term*, OSWER  
24 Publication 9285.7-081, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response,  
25 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 26 EPA/240/B-06/001, 2006, *Guidance on Systematic Planning Using the Data Quality Objectives*  
27 *Process*, EPA QA/G-4, Office of Environmental Information, U.S. Environmental  
28 Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 29 EPA/540/1-89/002, 1989, *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund (RAGS), Volume I -- Human*  
30 *Health Evaluation Manual, (Part A) Interim Final*, OSWER 9285.7-01A,  
31 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 32 EPA/540/G-89/004, 1988, *Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility*  
33 *Studies under CERCLA, Interim Final*, OSWER 9355.3-01, Office of Solid Waste and  
34 Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 35 EPA/540/R-97/006, 1997, *Ecological Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Process for*  
36 *Designing and Conducting Ecological Risk Assessments (Interim Final)*, Office of Solid  
37 Waste and Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,  
38 Washington, D.C.

- 1 EPA/540/R-92/071a, 1992, *Guidance for Conducting Treatability Studies under CERCLA -*  
2 *Final*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 3 EPA/540/R-99/005, 2004, *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume I: Human Health*  
4 *Evaluation Manual (Part E, Supplemental Guidance for Dermal Risk Assessment) Final*,  
5 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 6 EPA/540/R-99/006, 1999, *Radiation Risk Assessment At CERCLA Sites: Q & A*,  
7 Directive 9200.4-31P, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Office of Radiation  
8 and Indoor Air, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. Available on  
9 the Internet at  
10 <http://www.epa.gov/oerrpage/superfund/resources/radiation/pdf/riskq&a1.pdf> .
- 11 EPA/540/R-00/002, 2000, *A Guide to Developing and Documenting Cost Estimates During the*  
12 *Feasibility Study*, OSWER 9355.0-75, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,  
13 Washington, D.C.
- 14 EPA/600/P-92/003C, 1996, *Proposed Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment*,  
15 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 16 EPA/600/P-95/002Fa, 1997, *Exposure Factors Handbook Volume 1: General Factors*,  
17 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Center for Environmental Assessment,  
18 Washington, D.C.
- 19 EPA/625/R-92/007, 1993, *Use of Airborne, Surface, and Borehole Geophysical Techniques at*  
20 *Contaminated Sites: A Reference Guide*, Office of Research and Development,  
21 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 22 EPA/ROD/R10-01/119, 2001, *Declaration of the Interim Record of Decision for the*  
23 *300-FF-2 Operable Unit*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington State  
24 Department of Ecology, and U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington.
- 25 FP0015, 2002, *Data Package Summary, Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas*  
26 *and Methane Monitoring Sampling, September 17, 2002*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland,  
27 Washington.
- 28 FS0419, 2001, *Data Package Summary, Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas*  
29 *and Methane Monitoring Round 1 Sampling, June 25, 2001*, Fluor Hanford, Inc.,  
30 Richland, Washington.
- 31 FS0438, 2001, *Data Package Summary, Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas*  
32 *and Methane Monitoring Round 1 Sampling, October 18, 2001*, Fluor Hanford, Inc.,  
33 Richland, Washington.
- 34 FS0473, 2001, *Data Package Summary, Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas*  
35 *and Methane Monitoring Round 1 Sampling, March 4, 2001*, Fluor Hanford, Inc.,  
36 Richland, Washington.

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

- 1 FS0508, 2002, *Data Package Summary, Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas*  
2 *and Methane Monitoring Round 1 Sampling, July 8, 2002*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland,  
3 Washington.
- 4 FS0529, 2002, *Data Package Summary, Analytical Laboratory Solid Waste Landfill Soil Gas*  
5 *and Methane Monitoring Round 1 Sampling, July 10, 2002*, Fluor Hanford, Inc.,  
6 Richland, Washington.
- 7 Gano, K. A., 1980, "Mortality of the Harvester Ant (*Pogonomyrmex owyheeii*) After Exposure to  
8 <sup>137</sup>Cs Gamma Radiation," *Environmental Entomology*, 10:39-44.
- 9 GE, 1946, *Burial of Equipment and Material and Instruments 03/01/1946 Through 12/27/1946*,  
10 DDTS-GENERATED-5634, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 11 GE, 1947, *Burial of Equipment and Material and Instruments 01/09/1947 Through 12/29/1947*,  
12 DDTS-GENERATED-5635, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 13 GE, 1948, *Burial of Equipment and Material and Instruments 01/14/1948 Through 12/21/1948*,  
14 DDTS-GENERATED-5636, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 15 GE, 1949, *Burial of Material 01/03/1949 Through 05/09/1949*, DDTS-GENERATED-5640,  
16 General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 17 GE, 1949, *Disposition of Contaminated Government Property 05/10/1949 Through 10/31/1949*,  
18 DDTS-GENERATED-5637, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 19 GE, 1954, *Burial of Equipment*, 9973-NEG-[A-I], General Electric Company, Richland,  
20 Washington.
- 21 GE, 1964, *Burial Ground Log Books from Records Holding Area Box 85617 (1958-1964)*,  
22 General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 23 Grubb, F. W. and L. F. Lust, 1975, *Hanford Engineering Development Laboratory Unusual*  
24 *Occurrence Report 38-75*, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company, Richland, Washington,  
25 October 30.
- 26 HAB, 2002, *Report of the Exposure Scenarios Task Force*, Hanford Advisory Board, Richland,  
27 Washington.
- 28 HAB 132, 2002, "Exposure Scenarios Task Force on the 200 Area," (letter to K. Klein,  
29 H. Boston, J. Iani, and T. Fitzsimmons from T. Martin), Hanford Advisory Board  
30 Consensus Advice #132, Richland, Washington, June 7.
- 31 HAN-95462, 1966, "Scrap & SS Material Waste For Burial At Richland," (U.S. Government  
32 Memorandum to G. F. Penn, Fuels & Metallurgy Branch, Production Division RL, from  
33 H. V. Werner, SS Materials Representative, SAN), U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,  
34 Richland, Washington, August 31.

- 1 *Hanford Environmental Information System, Hanford Site database.*
- 2 Hanford Site Drawings:
- 3 • H-2-00124, *218-E-1 Dry Waste Burial Ground*
  - 4 • H-2-02503, *218-W-2 Dry Waste Burial Ground*
  - 5 • H-2-2516, *Industrial Burial Ground 218-W-1A*
  - 6 • H-2-4010, *Strontium Semiworks & Vicinity Outside Lines Key Map*
  - 7 • H-2-4606, *216-C-9 Pond Modifications*
  - 8 • H-2-31268, *Solid Waste Burial Grounds Plot Plan*
  - 9 • H-2-32095, *218-W-2A Industrial Burial Ground & 218-W-3 Dry Waste Burial Ground*
  - 10 • H-2-32487, *218-W-4A Dry Waste Burial Site*
  - 11 • H-2-32523, *"C" Plant Liquid Waste Disposal Sites, 216 "C" Series*
  - 12 • H-2-32560, *As-Built Dry Waste Burial Site #218-E-12A*
  - 13 • H-2-33055, *Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-4B*
  - 14 • H-2-33276, *Sheets 1 and 2, Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-E-12B*
  - 15 • H-2-33692, *Dry Waste Disposal Caisson in 218-W4 Site*
  - 16 • H-2-34880, *Sheets 1 and 2, Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-3A*
  - 17 • H-2-37437, *Sheets 1 through 4, Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-4C*
  - 18 • H-2-55534, *218-E2, E2A, E4, E5, E5A, & E9 Industrial Burial Ground Plan & Details*
  - 19 • H-2-74640, *Installation – Filtered & Shielded Caisson Covers – Dry Waste Burial*
  - 20 *Ground 218-W-4B*
  - 21 • H-2-75149, *Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-1*
  - 22 • H-2-75351, *Sheets 1, 2, and 3, Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-3AE*
  - 23 • H-2-92004, *Sheets 1 and 2, Industrial Burial Ground 218-E-10 Site Plan and Details*
  - 24 • H-2-94250, *Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-11*
  - 25 • H-2-94677, *Sheets 1 and 2, Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-5*
  - 26 • H-2-96660, *East Area Dry Waste Burial Ground*
  - 27 • H-2-99933, *Dry Waste Burial Ground 218-W-6*
  - 28 • H-2-821555, *Sheets 1 and 2, Subsidence Drawing Burial Ground 218-W-3A*
  - 29 • H-2-821555, *Sheets 4 and 5, Subsidence Drawing Burial Ground 218-W-3AE*
  - 30 HNF-2030, 1998, *Subsidence Potential in the Burial Grounds, Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc.,*
  - 31 *Richland, Washington.*

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

- 1 HNF-EP-0063, 2006, *Hanford Site Solid Waste Acceptance Criteria*, Rev. 13 (Reissue), Fluor  
2 Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 3 HNF-SD-WM-ISB-002, 2002, *Solid Waste Burial Grounds Interim Safety Basis*, Rev. 3C, Fluor  
4 Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 5 HNF-SD-WM-RPT-309, 1997, *Report on Sampling and Analysis of Air at Trenches 218-W-4C  
6 and 218-W-5 #31 of the Low-Level Burial Grounds*, Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc.,  
7 Richland, Washington.
- 8 HW-28471, 1953, *Unconfined Underground Radioactive Waste and Contamination in the  
9 200 Areas*, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 10 HW-30372, 1953, *Manufacturing Dept Radiation Incident Investigation Class I No 94*, General  
11 Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 12 HW-41535, 1956, *Unconfined Underground Radioactive Waste and Contamination in the  
13 200 Areas*, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 14 HW-54636, 1958, *Summary of Environmental Contamination Incidents at Hanford 1952-1957*,  
15 Hanford Atomic Products Operation, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 16 HW-59645, 1959, *Disposition of Plutonium to Burial*, General Electric Company, Richland,  
17 Washington.
- 18 HW-60807, 1959, *Unconfined Underground Radioactive Waste and Contamination in the  
19 200 Areas - 1959*, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- 20 HW-63703, 1960, *Disposition of Contaminated Processing Equipment at Hanford Atomic  
21 Products Operation 1958 - 1959*, (01/01/1958 through 12/31/1959), General Electric  
22 Company, Richland, Washington.
- 23 HW-77274, 1963, *Burial of Hanford Radioactive Wastes*, General Electric Company, Richland,  
24 Washington.
- 25 HW-83959, 1964, *Criteria for Design of Equipment Burial Containers*, UNC Nuclear Industries,  
26 Richland, Washington.
- 27 IAEA 332, 1992, *Effects of Ionizing Radiation on Plants and Animals at Levels Implied by  
28 Current Radiation Protection Standards*, Technical Report Series No. 332, International  
29 Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria.
- 30 Klein, K. A., D. R. Einan, and M. A. Wilson, 2002, "Consensus Advice #132: Exposure  
31 Scenarios Task Force on the 200 Area," (letter to Mr. Todd Martin, Hanford Advisory  
32 Board, from Keith A. Klein, U.S. Department of Energy; David R. Einan,  
33 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; and Michael A. Wilson, State of Washington,  
34 Department of Ecology, 02-HAB-0006), Richland, Washington, July 11.

- 1 McDonald, K. M., D. E. McKinney, and T. A. Shrader, 2001, "Hanford Site Mixed Waste  
2 Disposal," *Waste Management Conference 2001*, February 25 – March 1,  
3 Tucson, Arizona.
- 4 *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*, 42 USC 4321, et seq.
- 5 NAVD88, 1988, *North American Vertical Datum of 1988*, National Geodetic Survey, Federal  
6 Geodetic Control Committee, Silver Spring, Maryland.
- 7 OECD/NEA, 2000, *Features, Events, and Processes (FEPs) for Geologic Disposal of*  
8 *Radioactive Waste: An International Database (Radioactive Waste Management)*,  
9 Nuclear Energy Agency, Organisation For Economic Co-operation and Development  
10 (OECD) Publications, Paris, France.
- 11 OMB Circular No. A-94, 2002, *Guidelines and Discount Rates for Benefit-Cost Analysis of*  
12 *Federal Programs*, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C., as revised.
- 13 PNL-2253, 1977, *Ecology of the 200 Area Plateau Waste Management Environs: A Status*  
14 *Report*, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 15 PNL-6456, 1988, *Hazard Ranking System Evaluation of CERCLA Inactive Waste Sites at*  
16 *Hanford*, 3 vols., Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 17 PNL-6820, 1989, *Hydrogeology of the 200 Areas Low Level Burial Grounds, An Interim Report*,  
18 Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 19 PNNL-00157, 2006, *Soil Measurements at 218-E-2 and E-5 Burial Grounds*, letter report to  
20 Greg Berlin, Fluor Hanford, from Andrey Mozhayev, Pacific Northwest Laboratory,  
21 Richland, Washington, September 27.
- 22 PNNL-11800, 1998, *Composite Analysis for Low-Level Waste Disposal in the 200 Area Plateau*  
23 *of the Hanford Site*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 24 PNNL-12034, 2000, *STOMP, Subsurface Transport Over Multiple Phases, Version 2.0, User's*  
25 *Guide*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 26 PNNL-12227, 1999, *Groundwater Monitoring Plan for the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste*  
27 *Landfill*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 28 PNNL-12261, 2001, *Revised Hydrogeology for the Suprabasalt Aquifer System, 200-East Area*  
29 *and Vicinity, Hanford Site, Washington*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory,  
30 Richland, Washington.
- 31 PNNL-13014, 2000, *Groundwater Monitoring Plan for the Solid Waste Landfill*, Pacific  
32 Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 33 PNNL-13230, 2000, *Hanford Site Environmental Report for Calendar Year 1999*, Pacific  
34 Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.

- 1 PNNL-13656, 2001, *Enhanced Site Characterization of the 618-4 Burial Ground*, Pacific  
2 Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 3 PNNL-13675, 2001, *Measurement of Helium-3/Helium-4 Ratios in Soil Gas at the 618-11 Burial*  
4 *Ground*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 5 PNNL-13858, 2002, *Revised Hydrogeology for the Suprabasalt Aquifer System, 200-West Area*  
6 *and Vicinity, Hanford Site, Washington*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory,  
7 Richland, Washington.
- 8 PNNL-13910, 2002, *Hanford Site Environmental Report for Calendar Year 2001*, Pacific  
9 Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 10 PNNL-14058, 2002, *Prototype Database and User's Guide of Saturated Zone Hydraulic*  
11 *Properties for the Hanford Site*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland,  
12 Washington.
- 13 PNNL-14753, 2006, *Groundwater Data Package for Hanford Assessments*, Rev. 1, Pacific  
14 Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 15 PNNL-14859-ICN-2, 2007, *Interim Status Groundwater Monitoring Plan for Low-Level Waste*  
16 *Management Areas 1 to 4, RCRA Facilities, Hanford, Washington*. Pacific Northwest  
17 National Laboratory, Richland, Washington, January 19.
- 18 PNNL-15892, Appendix 1, 2006, *Hanford Site Environmental Surveillance Data Report for*  
19 *Calendar Year 2005*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 20 PNNL-15892, Appendix 2, 2006, *Hanford Site Near-Facility Environmental Monitoring Data*  
21 *Report for Calendar Year 2005*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland,  
22 Washington.
- 23 PNNL-16105, 2007, *Technology Survey to Support Revision to the Remedial*  
24 *Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit at the*  
25 *U.S. Department of Energy's Hanford Site*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory,  
26 Richland, Washington.
- 27 PNNL-16346, 2007, *Hanford Site Groundwater Monitoring for Fiscal Year 2006*, Pacific  
28 Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 29 PNNL-SA-34515, 2001, *Use of Process Relationship Diagrams in Development of Conceptual*  
30 *Models*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- 31 PNNL-SA-36387, 2004, *A Comprehensive and Systematic Approach to Developing and*  
32 *Documenting Conceptual Models of Contaminant Release and Migration at the Hanford*  
33 *Site*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington. Published in  
34 *Journal of Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment*,  
35 Volume 18(2):109-116.

- 1 PNNL-SA-42671, 2004, *A Systematic Approach for Developing Conceptual Models of*  
2 *Contaminant Transport at the Hanford Site*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory,  
3 Richland, Washington. Published in *Eos Trans. AGU*, 85(47), Fall Meeting, Supplement,  
4 Abstract H13A-0386.
- 5 RCW 43.21C, "State Government – Executive," "State Environmental Policy," Title 43,  
6 Chapter 21C, *Revised Code of Washington*, as amended, Washington State, Olympia,  
7 Washington.
- 8 RCW 70.105, "Public Health and Safety," "Hazardous Waste Management," Title 70,  
9 Chapter 105, *Revised Code of Washington*, as amended, Washington State Department of  
10 Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 11 RCW 70.105.109, "Public Health and Safety," Chapter 105, "Hazardous Waste Management,"  
12 Section 109, "Regulation of Wastes with Radioactive and Hazardous Components,"  
13 *Revised Code of Washington*, as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology,  
14 Olympia, Washington.
- 15 *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*, 42 USC 6901, et seq.
- 16 RHO-65462-80-035, 1980, "Description of Waste Buried in Site 218-W-4B," from V. L. Hale,  
17 (internal letter report RHO-65462-80-035 to Distribution List), Rockwell Hanford  
18 Operations, Richland, Washington, September 10.
- 19 RHO-65462-80-036, 1980, "Description of TRU Waste Buried in Site 218-W-4B," from  
20 V. L. Hale, (letter RHO-65462-80-036 to Those Listed), Technology Development,  
21 Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington, September 10.
- 22 RHO-65463-80-126, 1980, "Inconsistencies in 218-W-4B Site Data," from W. G. Jasen (internal  
23 letter report RHO-65463-80-126 to G. D. Forehand), Rockwell Hanford Operations,  
24 Richland, Washington, December 9.
- 25 RHO-72710-82-167, 1982, "Final Report: 218-E-1 Dry Waste Burial Ground Characterization  
26 Survey," (letter to W. F. Heine, Environmental Control, from R. B. Kasper,  
27 Hydrogeology Unit), Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington, November  
28 10.
- 29 RHO-CD-78, 1977, *Assessment of Hanford Burial Grounds and Interim TRU Storage*, Rockwell  
30 Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington.
- 31 RHO-CD-194, 1977, *A Study of the 234-5 Building Inventory Difference for the Years 1956*  
32 *through 1966*, Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington.
- 33 RHO-CD-673, 1979, *Handbook 200 Areas Waste Sites*, 3 vols., Rockwell Hanford Operations,  
34 Richland, Washington.
- 35 RHO-D0101ER0101, 1980, *Burial Ground Characterization Engineering Report*, Rockwell  
36 Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington.

- 1 RHO-MA-222, 1980, *Hanford Radioactive Solid Waste Packaging, Storage, and Disposal*  
2 *Requirements*, Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington.
- 3 *Richland Solid Waste Information Management System* database.
- 4 RL, 2001, *Helium Isotope Analysis for Soil Gas to Delineate Tritium Plumes*, Technology  
5 Deployment Benefit Analysis Fact Sheet, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland  
6 Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 7 RL-TPA-90-0001, 1998, *Tri-Party Agreement Handbook Management Procedures*, Guideline  
8 Number TPA-MP-14, "Maintenance of the Waste Information Data System (WIDS),"  
9 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington,  
10 as revised.
- 11 SD-WM-SAR-038, 1984, *Active and Retired Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds Safety*  
12 *Analysis Report*, Rev. 0, Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington.
- 13 SGW-32683, in process, *Results from Passive Organic Vapor Sampling, Performed in Selected*  
14 *200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills (218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, and*  
15 *218-W-5) in June-July 2006*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 16 SGW-33253, in process, *Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for Landfills in the 200-SW-1*  
17 *and 200-SW-2 Operable Units*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 18 SGW-33492, 2007, *Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Data for the Period October through*  
19 *December 2006*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 20 SGW-33829, in process, *200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step II Sampling and Analysis of*  
21 *the Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose-Zone Plume*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland,  
22 Washington.
- 23 SGW-34462, in process, *Application of the Hanford Site Feature, Event, and Process*  
24 *Methodology to Support Development of Conceptual Site Models for the 200-SW-2*  
25 *Operable Unit Landfills*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 26 SGW-34463, in process, *Treatability Investigations Supporting the 200-SW-2 Radioactive*  
27 *Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 28 SGW-35016, in process, *Information and Data Management Plan for the 200-SW-2 Operable*  
29 *Unit*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 30 *Solid Waste Information and Tracking System*, Hanford Site database.
- 31 *Solid Waste Information Management System*, Hanford Site database.

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

- 1 WA7890008967, 2004, *Hanford Facility Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Permit,*  
2 *Dangerous Waste Portion, Revision 8, for the Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of*  
3 *Dangerous Waste,* Washington State Department of Ecology, Richland, Washington,  
4 as amended.
- 5 WAC 173-303, "Dangerous Waste Regulations," *Washington Administrative Code,* as amended,  
6 Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 7 WAC 173-303-070 through 173-303-100, "Designation of Dangerous Waste," *Washington*  
8 *Administrative Code,* as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia,  
9 Washington.
- 10 WAC 173-303-400, "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Interim Status Facility Standards,"  
11 *Washington Administrative Code,* as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology,  
12 Olympia, Washington.
- 13 WAC 173-303-400(3), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Interim Status Facility Standards,"  
14 "Standards," *Washington Administrative Code,* as amended, Washington State  
15 Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 16 WAC 173-303-610, "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Closure and Post-Closure," *Washington*  
17 *Administrative Code,* as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia,  
18 Washington.
- 19 WAC 173-303-610(2), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Closure and Post-Closure," "Closure  
20 Performance Standard," *Washington Administrative Code,* as amended, Washington State  
21 Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 22 WAC 173-303-610(3), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Closure and Post-Closure," "Closure  
23 Plan; Amendment of Plan," *Washington Administrative Code,* as amended, Washington  
24 State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 25 WAC 173-303-610(4), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Closure and Post-Closure," "Closure;  
26 Time Allowed for Closure," *Washington Administrative Code,* as amended, Washington  
27 State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 28 WAC 173-303-610(5), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Closure and Post-Closure," "Disposal  
29 or Decontamination of Equipment, Structures, and Soils," *Washington Administrative*  
30 *Code,* as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 31 WAC 173-303-610(6), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Closure and Post-Closure,"  
32 "Certification of Closure," *Washington Administrative Code,* as amended, Washington  
33 State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 34 WAC 173-303-640(8), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Tank Systems," "Closure and  
35 Post-Closure Care," *Washington Administrative Code,* as amended, Washington State  
36 Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.

- 1 WAC 173-303-650(6), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Surface Impoundments," "Closure and  
2 Post-Closure Care," *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State  
3 Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 4 WAC 173-303-655(8), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Land Treatment," "Closure and  
5 Post-Closure Care," *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State  
6 Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 7 WAC 173-303-660(9), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Waste Piles," "Closure and  
8 Post-Closure Care," *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State  
9 Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 10 WAC 173-303-665(6), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Landfills," "Closure and Post-Closure  
11 Care," *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State Department of  
12 Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 13 WAC 173-303-680(2), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Miscellaneous Units," "Environmental  
14 Performance Standards," *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington  
15 State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 16 WAC 173-303-680(4), "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Miscellaneous Units," "Post-Closure  
17 Care," *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State Department of  
18 Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 19 WAC 173-303-64610, "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Closure and Post-Closure," "Purpose  
20 and Applicability," *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State  
21 Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 22 WAC 173-303-64620, "Dangerous Waste Regulations," "Closure and Post-Closure,"  
23 "Corrective Action," "Requirements," *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended,  
24 Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 25 WAC 173-304, "Minimum Functional Standards for Solid Waste Handling," *Washington*  
26 *Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia,  
27 Washington.
- 28 WAC 173-304-407, "Minimum Functional Standards for Solid Waste Handling," "General  
29 Closure and Post-Closure Requirements," *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended,  
30 Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 31 WAC 173-340, "Model Toxics Control Act – Cleanup," *Washington Administrative Code*,  
32 as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington.
- 33 WAC 173-340-740, "Unrestricted Land Use Soil Cleanup Standards," *Washington*  
34 *Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia,  
35 Washington.

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

- 1 WAC 173-340-745, "Soil Cleanup Standards for Industrial Properties," *Washington*  
2 *Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia,  
3 Washington.
- 4 WAC 173-340-7490(3), "Terrestrial Ecological Evaluation Procedures," "Goal," *Washington*  
5 *Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia,  
6 Washington.
- 7 *Waste Information Data System*, Hanford Site database.
- 8 WHC-EP-0125-1, 1989, *Summary of Radioactive Solid Waste Received in the 200 Areas During*  
9 *Calendar Year 1988*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 10 WHC-EP-0225, 1991, *Contact-Handled Transuranic Waste Characterization Based on Existing*  
11 *Records*, Rev. 1, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 12 WHC-EP-0226, 1989, *Sampling Plan for Retrievably Stored Contact-Handled Transuranic*  
13 *Waste at the Hanford Site*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 14 WHC-EP-0645, 1995, *Performance Assessment for the Disposal of Low-Level Waste in the*  
15 *200 West Area Burial Grounds*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland,  
16 Washington.
- 17 WHC-EP-0845, 1995, *Solid Waste Management History of the Hanford Site*, Rev. 0,  
18 Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 19 WHC-EP-0912, 1996, *The History of the 200 Area Burial Ground Facilities*, 2 vols.,  
20 Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 21 WHC-MR-0008, 1989, *Low-Level Burial Grounds Database*, Westinghouse Hanford Company,  
22 Richland, Washington.
- 23 WHC-MR-0204, 1990, *200-East and 200-West Areas Low-Level Burial Grounds Borehole*  
24 *Summary Report*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 25 WHC-MR-0205, 1990, *Borehole Completion Data Package for Low-Level Burial Grounds -*  
26 *1990*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 27 WHC-MR-0418, 1994, *Historical Records of Radioactive Contamination in Biota at the*  
28 *200 Areas of the Hanford Site*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 29 WHC-SA-2772-FP, 1996, *History of Solid Waste Packaging at the Hanford Site*, Westinghouse  
30 Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 31 WHC-SD-EN-AP-015, 1989, *Revised Ground-Water Monitoring Plan for the 200 Areas*  
32 *Low-Level Burial Grounds*, prepared by Pacific Northwest Laboratory for Westinghouse  
33 Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

- 1 WHC-SD-EN-DP-064, 1993, *Data Package for Geophysical Investigation of Nonradioactive*  
2 *Solid Waste Landfill (NRDWL)*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland,  
3 Washington.
- 4 WHC-SD-EN-TI-181, 1993, *100-D Area Technical Baseline Report*, Westinghouse Hanford,  
5 Company, Richland, Washington.
- 6 WHC-SD-EN-TI-216, 1994, *Vegetation Communities Associated with the 100-Area and*  
7 *200-Area Facilities on the Hanford Site*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland,  
8 Washington.
- 9 WHC-SD-EN-TI-220, 1994, *100-B Area Technical Baseline Report*, Westinghouse Hanford  
10 Company, Richland, Washington
- 11 WHC-SD-EN-TI-239, 1994, *100-K Area Technical Baseline Report*, Westinghouse Hanford  
12 Company, Richland, Washington.
- 13 WHC-SD-EN-TI-248, 1994, *Conceptual Model of the Carbon Tetrachloride Contamination in*  
14 *the 200 West Area at the Hanford Site*, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company,  
15 Richland, Washington.
- 16 WHC-SD-EN-TI-251, 1994, *100-N Area Technical Baseline Report*, Westinghouse Hanford  
17 Company, Richland, Washington.
- 18 WHC-SD-EN-TI-290, 1994, *Geologic Setting of the Low-Level Burial Grounds*, Rev. 0,  
19 Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 20 WHC-SD-W221-DP-001, 1994, *Phase 2 Solid Waste Retrieval Trench Characterization*, Rev. 0,  
21 Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 22 WHC-SD-WM-RPT-056, 1992, *Solid Waste Stream Hazardous and Dangerous Components*  
23 *Study*, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- 24 WHC-SD-WM-TI-517, 1993, *Radioisotopic Characterization of Retrievably Stored Transuranic*  
25 *Waste Containers at the Hanford Site*, Rev. 1, Westinghouse Hanford Company,  
26 Richland, Washington.
- 27 WHC-SD-WM-TI-730, 1996, *Performance Assessment for the Disposal of Low-Level Waste in*  
28 *the 200 East Area Burial Grounds*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland,  
29 Washington.
- 30 WMP-17684, 2003, *618-10 and 618-11 Burial Ground Remedial Design Technical Workshop*  
31 *Summary Report*, Rev. 0, Fluor Hanford, Richland, Washington.
- 32 WMP-20394, 2004, *Design Basis/Design Criteria Report 618-10 And 618-11 Burial Ground*  
33 *Remedial Action Project*, Rev. 0, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.

- 1 WMP-20570, 2005, *Central Plateau Terrestrial Ecological Risk Assessment Data Quality*  
2 *Objectives Summary Report – Phase I*, Rev. 0, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland,  
3 Washington.
- 4 WMP-22922, 2004, *Prototype Hanford Features, Events, and Processes (HFEP) Graphical*  
5 *User Interface*, Rev. 0, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington. Prepared as  
6 PNNL-14874.
- 7 WMP-25493, 2005, *Central Plateau Terrestrial Ecological Risk Assessment Data Quality*  
8 *Objectives Summary Report – Phase II*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 9 WMP-26178, 2005, *Performance Evaluation Report for Soil Vapor Extraction Operations at the*  
10 *200-PW-1 Carbon Tetrachloride Site, Fiscal Year 2004*, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford,  
11 Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 12 WMP-29253, 2007, *Central Plateau Terrestrial Ecological Risk Assessment Data Quality*  
13 *Objectives Summary Report – Phase III*, Rev. 0, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland,  
14 Washington.

This page intentionally left blank.

1

**APPENDIX A**

2

3

4

**SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN FOR THE  
200-SW-2 OPERABLE UNIT LANDFILLS**

1

This page intentionally left blank.

2

1

## CONTENTS

2	A1.0	INTRODUCTION .....	A1-1
3	A1.1	BACKGROUND .....	A1-2
4	A1.2	WASTE SITE BINNING .....	A1-7
5	A2.0	QUALITY ASSURANCE PROJECT PLAN.....	A2-1
6	A2.1	PROJECT MANAGEMENT.....	A2-1
7		A2.1.1 Project/Task Organization .....	A2-1
8		A2.1.2 Problem Definition/Background.....	A2-4
9		A2.1.3 Project/Task Description.....	A2-5
10		A2.1.4 Quality Objectives and Criteria for Measurement Data .....	A2-6
11		A2.1.5 Special Training/Certification Requirements .....	A2-10
12		A2.1.6 Documentation and Records .....	A2-12
13	A2.2	MEASUREMENT/DATA ACQUISITION .....	A2-13
14		A2.2.1 Sampling Process Design.....	A2-13
15		A2.2.2 Sampling Methods .....	A2-14
16		A2.2.3 Sample Handling and Custody Requirements .....	A2-14
17		A2.2.4 Analytical Methods Requirements.....	A2-16
18		A2.2.5 Quality Control Requirements .....	A2-16
19		A2.2.6 Instrument/Equipment Testing, Inspection, and Maintenance	
20		Requirements .....	A2-18
21		A2.2.7 Instrument Calibration and Frequency.....	A2-18
22		A2.2.8 Inspection/Acceptance Requirements for Supplies and	
23		Consumables .....	A2-19
24		A2.2.9 Data Acquisition Requirements for Nondirect Measurements .....	A2-19
25		A2.2.10 Data Management.....	A2-20
26	A2.3	ASSESSMENT/OVERSIGHT .....	A2-21
27		A2.3.1 Assessments and Response Actions.....	A2-21
28		A2.3.2 Reports to Management .....	A2-21
29	A2.4	DATA VALIDATION AND USABILITY .....	A2-22
30		A2.4.1 Data Review, Validation, and Verification.....	A2-22
31		A2.4.2 Validation and Verification Methods.....	A2-23
32		A2.4.3 Reconciliation with User Requirements .....	A2-23
33	A3.0	FIELD-SAMPLING PLAN.....	A3-1
34	A3.1	DATA-COLLECTION TECHNIQUES.....	A3-1
35		A3.1.1 Nonintrusive Data-Collection Techniques.....	A3-1
36		A3.1.2 Intrusive Data-Collection Techniques .....	A3-16
37		A3.1.3 Investigation of Potentially Unused Caissons.....	A3-23

1 A4.0 HEALTH AND SAFETY PLAN ..... A4-1

2 A5.0 INVESTIGATION-DERIVED WASTE ..... A5-1

3 A6.0 REFERENCES ..... A6-1

4

5 **FIGURES**

6 Figure A1-1. Location of the Hanford Site..... A1-3

7 Figure A1-2. Location of 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills in the 200 East Area..... A1-4

8 Figure A1-3. Location of 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills in the 200 West Area. .... A1-5

9 Figure A2-1. Project Organization..... A2-2

10

11 **TABLES**

12 Table A1-1. 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills ..... A1-6

13 Table A2-1. List of Contaminants of Potential Concern. .... A2-6

14 Table A2-2. Analytical Performance Requirements..... A2-7

15 Table A2-3. Vapor Sample Preservation, Container, and Holding Time Guidelines for

16 Field Screening..... A2-15

17 Table A3-1. Stage 1 Passive Soil Vapor Survey Locations..... A3-3

18 Table A3-2. Stage 2 Passive Soil Vapor Survey Locations..... A3-9

19 Table A3-3. Geophysical Survey Locations. .... A3-12

20 Table A3-4. Existing Wells Available for Logging..... A3-18

21 Table A3-5. Direct-Push Locations ..... A3-22

22

## TERMS

1		
2	ALARA	as low as reasonably achievable
3	CERCLA	<i>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and</i>
4		<i>Liability Act of 1980</i>
5	COPC	contaminant of potential concern
6	DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
7	DPT	direct-push techniques
8	DQA	data quality assessment
9	DQO	data quality objective
10	Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
11	EMI	electromagnetic induction
12	EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
13	FFTF	Fast Flux Test Facility
14	FSP	field-sampling plan
15	GPR	ground-penetrating radar
16	HEIS	<i>Hanford Environmental Information System</i> database
17	HGET	Hanford General Employee Training
18	HISS	Hanford Inactive Site Survey
19	N/A	not applicable
20	ng	nanogram
21	OU	operable unit
22	QA	quality assurance
23	QAPjP	quality assurance project plan
24	QC	quality control
25	RCRA	<i>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976</i>
26	RI	remedial investigation
27	RI/FS	remedial investigation/feasibility study
28	RL	DOE, Richland Operations Office
29	SAP	sampling and analysis plan
30	TMF	total magnetic field
31	Tri-Parties	DOE, EPA, and Ecology
32	Tri-Party Agreement	<i>Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order</i>
33		(Ecology et al., 1989a)
34	TSD	treatment, storage, and/or disposal (unit)
35	VOC	volatile organic compound
36	WAC	<i>Washington Administrative Code</i>
37	WSP	Washington State Plane
38		

1

**METRIC CONVERSION CHART**

<b>Into Metric Units</b>			<b>Out of Metric Units</b>		
<i>If you know</i>	<i>Multiply by</i>	<i>To get</i>	<i>If you know</i>	<i>Multiply by</i>	<i>To get</i>
<b>Length</b>			<b>Length</b>		
inches	25.40	millimeters	millimeters	0.0394	inches
inches	2.54	centimeters	centimeters	0.394	inches
feet	0.305	meters	meters	3.281	feet
yards	0.914	meters	meters	1.094	yards
miles (statute)	1.609	kilometers	kilometers	0.621	miles (statute)
<b>Area</b>			<b>Area</b>		
sq. inches	6.452	sq. centimeters	sq. centimeters	0.155	sq. inches
sq. feet	0.0929	sq. meters	sq. meters	10.764	sq. feet
sq. yards	0.836	sq. meters	sq. meters	1.196	sq. yards
sq. miles	2.591	sq. kilometers	sq. kilometers	0.386	sq. miles
acres	0.405	hectares	hectares	2.471	acres
<b>Mass (weight)</b>			<b>Mass (weight)</b>		
ounces (avoir)	28.349	grams	grams	0.0353	ounces (avoir)
pounds	0.453	kilograms	kilograms	2.205	pounds (avoir)
tons (short)	0.907	ton (metric)	ton (metric)	1.102	tons (short)
<b>Volume</b>			<b>Volume</b>		
teaspoons	5	milliliters	milliliters	0.034	ounces (U.S., liquid)
tablespoons	15	milliliters	liters	2.113	pints
ounces (U.S., liquid)	29.573	milliliters	liters	1.057	quarts (U.S., liquid)
cups	0.24	liters	liters	0.264	gallons (U.S., liquid)
pints	0.473	liters	cubic meters	35.315	cubic feet
quarts (U.S., liquid)	0.946	liters	cubic meters	1.308	cubic yards
gallons (U.S., liquid)	3.785	liters			
cubic feet	0.0283	cubic meters			
cubic yards	0.764	cubic meters			
<b>Temperature</b>			<b>Temperature</b>		
Fahrenheit	$(^{\circ}\text{F}-32)*5/9$	Centigrade	Centigrade	$(^{\circ}\text{C}*9/5)+32$	Fahrenheit
<b>Radioactivity</b>			<b>Radioactivity</b>		
picocurie	37	millibecquerel	millibecquerel	0.027	picocurie

2

1 **APPENDIX A**

2 **SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN FOR THE**  
3 **200-SW-2 OPERABLE UNIT LANDFILLS**

4 **A1.0 INTRODUCTION**

5 The activities described in this sampling and analysis plan (SAP) are intended to support the  
6 *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA)*  
7 remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) process for the 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills  
8 and Dumps Operable Unit (200-SW-2 OU). Sampling activities for the landfills in the  
9 200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Operable Unit (200-SW-1 OU) are not  
10 addressed in this SAP, because these landfills are proposed to undergo closure independent of the  
11 RI/FS process. Discussion of the 200-SW-1 OU in this SAP is for informational purposes only.

12 The purpose of this Phase I-B SAP is to continue nonintrusive reconnaissance-level radiological,  
13 geophysical, and soil-gas surveys in landfill areas not previously addressed in the Phase I-A data  
14 quality objective (DQO) summary report as discussed in Section 4.2 of the RI/FS work plan.  
15 Limited intrusive investigations also will be conducted using direct-pushes near the centers of all  
16 landfills to better understand the lateral continuity of geologic layers based on lithologic logs  
17 from surrounding groundwater-monitoring wells. Fine-grained sediment layers are of particular  
18 interest because they tend to impede the downward movement of moisture and mobile  
19 contaminants through the vadose zone. Additional direct-pushes will occur in portions of  
20 landfills potentially impacted by atypical moisture from rapid melting of snow and seepage from  
21 a nearby wastewater ditch.

22 Data from this SAP will guide preparation of DQOs, work plans, and SAPs for future intrusive-  
23 phase investigations to determine the nature and extent of landfill contamination. Data from  
24 future site investigation phases will be used to refine conceptual contaminant distribution  
25 models, support baseline risk assessments, and evaluate remediation technology performance in  
26 support of the feasibility study, proposed plan, and eventual record of decision for 200-SW-2 OU  
27 landfills.

28 Characterization activities described in this plan are based on the implementation of the DQO  
29 process as documented in SGW-33253, *Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for the*  
30 *200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills*.

31 This chapter provides general background information about the OU, contaminants of potential  
32 concern (COPC), and potential preliminary remediation goals (PRG), and a summary of DQOs  
33 identified for the landfills. Subsequent chapters of this SAP present the quality assurance project  
34 plan (QAPjP), the field-sampling plan (FSP), and the health and safety and waste management  
35 requirements.

## 1 A1.1 BACKGROUND

2 The *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order* (Tri-Party Agreement)  
3 (Ecology et al., 1989a) identifies 800+ soil waste sites (and associated structures) resulting from  
4 the discharge of liquids and solids to the ground from 200 Areas processing facilities. These  
5 800+ sites have been arranged into separate waste groups (operable units) that contain CERCLA  
6 past-practice sites, *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* (RCRA) past-practice sites  
7 addressed through RCRA corrective action authorities, and RCRA treatment, storage, and/or  
8 disposal (TSD) units.

9 In accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement, the RI/FS work plan has been prepared to present  
10 information on how the RI/FS process will be conducted and eventually will lead to proposed  
11 remedies for the waste sites in the 200-SW-2 OU. Also in accordance with the Tri-Party  
12 Agreement, the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) has been designated as the  
13 lead regulatory agency for the 200-SW-2 OU. The RI/FS work plan follows the CERCLA  
14 format, with modifications to concurrently satisfy RCRA corrective action and TSD unit closure  
15 requirements as described in DOE/RL-98-28, *200 Areas Remedial Investigation/Feasibility*  
16 *Study Implementation Plan – Environmental Restoration Program*.


17 The 200-SW-2 OU consists of 24 landfills located in the Hanford Site's 200 East and 200 West  
18 Areas. The 200 Areas are located near the center of the Hanford Site in south-central  
19 Washington State and are within one of three areas on the Hanford Site that are on the  
20 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Priorities List under CERCLA  
21 (40 CFR 300, "National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan,"  
22 Appendix B, "National Priorities List"). Figure A1-1 shows the location of the Hanford Site and  
23 the 200 East and West Areas within. Figure A1-2 shows the 200-SW-2 OU landfill locations  
24 that are part of the 200 East Area. Figure A1-3 shows the 200-SW-2 OU landfill locations that  
25 are part of the 200 West Area. Table A1-1 provides a summary listing of the 24 landfills  
26 included in the 200-SW-2 OU. Additional detail on each of these landfills is provided in  
27 Chapter 2.0 of the RI/FS work plan.

28 The majority of waste disposed to the 200-SW-2 OU landfills originated from the processing  
29 facilities located in the 200 East and 200 West Areas of the Hanford Site. The 200-SW-2 OU  
30 landfills also contain some wastes that originated from the Hanford Site's 100 and 300 Areas, as  
31 well as from offsite sources.

32

1

Figure A1-1. Location of the Hanford Site.




E9803090.4

2

1  
2


Figure A1-2. Location of 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills in the 200 East Area.



3

1  
2

Figure A1-3. Location of 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills in the 200 West Area.



3

1

Table A1-1. 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills.

Site Code	Site Name	Bin Identification
218-E-10	Equip Burial #10	<i>Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills</i>
218-E-12B	Dry Waste #12B	<i>Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills</i>
218-W-3A	Dry Waste #3A	<i>Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills</i>
218-W-3AE	Dry Waste #3AE	<i>Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills</i>
218-W-4B	Dry Waste #4B	<i>Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills</i>
218-W-4C	Dry Waste #4C	<i>Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills</i>
218-W-5	Low Level Radioactive Mixed Waste Landfill	<i>Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills</i>
218-E-2A	Regulated Equip Storage	<i>Bin 2 – Industrial Landfill</i>
218-E-2	Equip Burial #2	<i>Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills</i>
218-E-5	Equip Burial #5	<i>Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills</i>
218-E-5A	Equip Burial #5A	<i>Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills</i>
218-E-9	200E Regulated Equipment Storage Site No. 009, Burial Vault (HISS)	<i>Bin 2 – Industrial landfills</i>
218-W-11	Regulated Storage Site	<i>Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills</i>
218-W-1A	Equip Burial #1	<i>Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills</i>
218-W-2A	Equip Burial #2	<i>Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills</i>
218-W-1	Solid Waste Burial #1	<i>Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills</i>
218-W-2	Dry Waste #2	<i>Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills</i>
218-W-3	Dry Waste #3	<i>Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills</i>
218-W-4A	Dry Waste #4A	<i>Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills</i>
218-E-1	Dry Waste #1	<i>Bin 4 – Dry Waste Landfills</i>
218-E-12A	Dry Waste #12A	<i>Bin 4 – Dry Waste Landfills</i>
218-C-9	Dry Waste & 216-C-9 Pond	<i>Bin 5 – Construction Landfills</i>
218-E-4	Equip Burial #4	<i>Bin 5 – Construction Landfills</i>
218-E-8	200E Construction Burial	<i>Bin 5 – Construction Landfills</i>

HISS = Hanford Inactive Site Survey.

TSD = treatment, storage, and/or disposal (unit).

## 1 A1.2 WASTE SITE BINNING

2 The 24 landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU have been sorted into six main categories/bins based on  
 3 similar characteristics. This sorting is anticipated to aid in choosing appropriate remedial paths,  
 4 based primarily on the results of the feasibility study and evaluation of candidate remedial  
 5 alternatives. The bins have been established based on a number of factors including waste  
 6 volume, waste type, waste form, disposal practices, periods of landfill operations, homogeneity  
 7 of waste, and potential risk, among others. The new bins are as follows:

- 8 • *Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills*
- 9 • *Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills*
- 10 • *Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills*
- 11 • *Bin 4 – Dry Waste Landfills*
- 12 • *Bin 5 – Construction Landfills*
- 13 • *Bin 6 – Caissons.*

14 The following paragraphs provide a brief description of each bin.

- 15 • **Bin 1 – TSD Unit landfills** – This bin includes landfills that are permitted as RCRA TSD  
 16 units and are included in the Low-Level Burial Ground Part A Permit (DOE/RL-88-20,  
 17 *Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, Low-Level Burial Grounds*).  
 18 This bin coincides with the original Bin 3A grouping from the Phase I-A DQO. The  
 19 majority of available historical documentation is associated with these sites  
 20 (approximately 110,000 of 147,000 total documents); the sites, therefore, are considered  
 21 the best-documented sites in the scope of the RI/FS work plan. Sites in this bin include  
 22 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, 218-W-5, 218-E-10, and 218-E-12B.

23 This bin also includes sites for which available historical documentation indicates that no  
 24 burials have been made and there is a low potential for contamination, but some  
 25 questions remain. Sites in this bin include annexes of 218-W-4C and 218-E-10 and  
 26 unused portions of 218-E-12B.

- 27 • **Bin 2 – Industrial landfills** – This bin includes past-practice landfills that received  
 28 radioactive waste that was usually packaged in large wooden or concrete boxes,  
 29 containing large quantities of fission products. For the most part, these sites were  
 30 restricted to burial of large pieces of failed or obsolete equipment from the chemical  
 31 processing facilities, although some items came from the 100 Areas. Many of these sites  
 32 contain burials made over 50 years ago. Historical burial documentation is good for the  
 33 218-W-2A and 218-E-5A Landfills; however, historical burial documentation for the  
 34 remaining sites is at a minimum. Sites in this bin include 218-W-2A, 218-E-5A,  
 35 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-5, 218-E-9, 218-W-1A, and 218-W-11 Landfills.

- 36 • **Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha landfills** – This bin includes past-practice landfills that  
 37 received radioactive waste packaged primarily in fiberboard or small wooden boxes,  
 38 wrapped in heavy brown paper or burlap, or placed in the trench without packaging. A  
 39 small proportion of the waste is packaged in metal drums. All types of miscellaneous  
 40 wastes, including contaminated soils and potentially contaminated rags, paper, wood, and  
 41 small pieces of equipment such as tools, have been placed in these sites. Some larger

1 equipment (e.g., motor vehicles, large canyon processing equipment) is known to have  
2 been disposed to these sites. Available historical documentation indicates that these sites  
3 contain at least 90 percent of the 200 Areas landfill pre-1970 alpha inventory. Available  
4 historical documentation for the older burial grounds (218-W-1 and 218-W-2 Landfills)  
5 in this bin generally is poor, because these landfills received waste in the 1940s and  
6 1950s. Available historical documents for the newer burial grounds (218-W-3 and  
7 218-W-4A) in this bin are more numerous, because these burial grounds received waste  
8 in the mid-1950s to 1960s.

- 9 • **Bin 4 – Dry Waste landfills** – This bin includes past-practice landfills that received  
10 radioactive waste packaged primarily in fiberboard or small wooden boxes, wrapped in  
11 heavy brown paper or burlap, or placed in the trench without packaging. A small  
12 proportion of the waste is packaged in metal drums. All types of miscellaneous wastes,  
13 including contaminated soils and potentially contaminated rags, paper, and wood, have  
14 been placed in these sites. These sites also contain a few pieces of large equipment such  
15 as tank farm pumps. Available historical documentation for these sites is generally poor.  
16 Sites included in this bin include 218-E-1 and 218-E-12A Landfills.
- 17 • **Bin 5 – Construction landfills** – This bin includes past-practice landfills that mainly  
18 were limited to burial of wastes resulting from construction work on existing facilities or  
19 demolition of surplus facilities. Wastes in these sites are believed to contain very little  
20 alpha contamination; beta-gamma contamination is likely also at a minimum.  
21 Documentation for 218-C-9 Landfill is believed to be nearly complete; however,  
22 available historical documents for 218-E-8 and 218-E-4 Landfills are few.
- 23 • **Bin 6 – Caissons** – This bin includes caissons and vertical pipe units used for disposal of  
24 hot-cell waste or high plutonium concentration waste in the 218-W-4A and  
25 218-W-4B Landfills. The vertical pipe units in the 218-W-4A Landfill were made of  
26 welded 208.2 L (55-gal) drums or corrugated pipe and concrete; the caissons in  
27 218-W-4B Landfill were made of metal and/or concrete. Documentation for the caissons  
28 in 218-W-4A Landfill generally is poor, while the documentation for the caissons in  
29 218-W-4B Landfill generally is more numerous (150 to 250 documents per caisson).  
30 Caissons located in this bin include 218-W-4B-C1, 218-W-4B-C2, 218-W-4B-C3,  
31 218-W-4B-C4, 218-W-4B-C5, 218-W-4B-C6, 218-W-4B-CU1, 218-W-4A-C1,  
32 218-W-4A-C2, 218-W-4A-C3, and 218-W-4A-C5 Caissons. This bin also includes  
33 caissons in 218-W-4A and 218-W-4B Landfills that are believed to be empty/unused,  
34 according to available historical documentation. These include 218-W-4A-C4,  
35 218-W-4A-C6, 218-W-4A-C7, and 218-W-4A-C8 Caissons.

36

1                                   **A2.0     QUALITY ASSURANCE PROJECT PLAN**

2    The QAPjP establishes the quality requirements for environmental data collection, including  
3    sampling, field measurements, and laboratory analysis. This QAPjP complies with the  
4    requirements of the following:

- 5       •   DOE O 414.1C, *Quality Assurance*
- 6       •   10 CFR 830 Subpart A, "Quality Assurance Requirements"
- 7       •   EPA/240/B-01/003, *EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans*,  
8         EPA QA/R-5.

9    The following sections describe the quality requirements and controls applicable to the remedial  
10   investigation (RI).

11   **A2.1   PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

12   This section addresses the basic areas of project management, and describes how project  
13   management will ensure that the project has a defined goal, that the participants understand the  
14   goal and approach to be used, and that the planned outputs have been appropriately documented.  
15   Project management roles and responsibilities discussed in this section apply to the major  
16   activities covered under the work plan and SAP including radiological, geophysical, and soil  
17   vapor surveys; and direct-push well installations and logging.

18   **A2.1.1   Project/Task Organization**


19   The Project Hanford Management Contractor is responsible for planning, coordinating,  
20   sampling, preparing, packaging, and shipping soil samples to the laboratory. The project  
21   organization is described in the subsections that follow and is shown graphically in Figure A2-1.

22   **A2.1.1.1   Central Plateau Remediation Manager**

23   The Central Plateau Remediation Manager has overall authority over the work scope in the  
24   RI/FS work plan and SAP; the Manager provides project-level oversight and coordinates with  
25   U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Richland Operations Office (RL) and the regulators in  
26   support of Central Plateau remediation activities, including sampling activities. The Central  
27   Plateau Remediation Manager interfaces with the Soil and Groundwater Remediation Vice  
28   President and the Project Hanford Management Contractor Senior Vice President and President.  
29   The Central Plateau Remediation Manager provides support to the Waste Site Remediation  
30   Manager to ensure that the work is performed safely and cost effectively.

1

Figure A2-1. Project Organization.



2

### 3 **A2.1.1.2 Waste Site Remediation Manager**

4 The Waste Site Remediation Manager provides oversight for all activities and coordinates with  
 5 the Central Plateau Remediation Manager, RL, and the regulators in support of sampling  
 6 activities. In addition, the manager provides support to the Waste Site Remediation Task Lead to  
 7 ensure that the work is performed safely and cost-effectively.

### 8 **A2.1.1.3 Waste Site Remediation Task Lead**

9 The Waste Site Remediation Task Lead is responsible for direct management of sampling  
 10 documents and requirements, field activities, and subcontracted tasks. The task lead works  
 11 closely with quality assurance (QA), health and safety, and the Field Team Lead to integrate  
 12 these and the other lead disciplines in planning and implementing the work scope. The task lead  
 13 also coordinates with, and reports to, RL and the Project Hanford Management Contractor on all  
 14 sampling activities. The task lead supports RL in coordinating sampling activities with the  
 15 regulators. The Waste Site Remediation Task Lead maintains the approved QAPjP.

1 **A2.1.1.4 Waste Site Remediation Field Project Manager**

2 The Waste Site Remediation Field Project Manager is responsible for coordinating field support  
3 resources and activities for the Waste Site Remediation Task Lead. The Field Project Manager  
4 ensures that field documentation is approved and properly implemented and that management is  
5 briefed on daily activities. The Field Project Manager coordinates obtaining equipment,  
6 personnel, and site support and has real-time direction of field activities and field decisions that  
7 affect sampling. The Field Project Manager has real-time responsibility for ensuring the QAPjP  
8 and SAP are followed in the field.

9 **A2.1.1.5 Quality Assurance Engineer**

10 The Quality Assurance Engineer is matrixed to the Central Plateau Remediation Manager and  
11 the Waste Site Remediation Task Lead and is responsible for QA issues on the project.  
12 Responsibilities include oversight of project QA requirements implementation, review of project  
13 documents including SAPs (and the QAPjP), and participation in QA assessments on sample  
14 collection and analysis activities, as appropriate.

15 **A2.1.1.6 Waste Management Lead**

16 The Waste Management Lead communicates policies and procedures and ensures project  
17 compliance for storage, transportation, disposal, and waste tracking in a safe and cost-effective  
18 manner. Other responsibilities include identifying waste management sampling/characterization  
19 requirements to ensure regulatory compliance interpretation of the characterization data to  
20 generate waste designations, profiles, and other documents that confirm compliance with waste  
21 acceptance criteria.

22 **A2.1.1.7 Environmental Compliance Officer**

23 The Environmental Compliance Officer provides technical oversight, direction, and acceptance  
24 of project and subcontracted environmental work and develops appropriate mitigation measures  
25 with a goal of minimizing adverse environmental impacts. The Environmental Compliance  
26 Officer also reviews plans, procedures, and technical documents to ensure that all environmental  
27 requirements have been addressed; identifies environmental issues that affect operations and  
28 develops cost-effective solutions; and responds to environmental/regulatory issues or concerns  
29 raised by the DOE and/or regulatory staff.

30 **A2.1.1.8 Field Team Lead**

31 The Field Team Lead has the overall responsibility for the planning, coordination, and execution  
32 of the field characterization activities. Specific responsibilities include converting the sampling  
33 design requirements into field task instructions that provide specific direction for field activities.  
34 Responsibilities also include directing training, mock-ups, and practice sessions with field  
35 personnel to ensure that the sampling design is understood and can be performed as specified.  
36 The Field Team Lead communicates with the Waste Site Remediation Task Lead to identify field  
37 constraints that could affect the sampling design. In addition, the Field Team Lead directs the  
38 procurement and installation of sampling materials and equipment needed to support  
39 the fieldwork.

1 The Field Team Lead oversees field-sampling activities that include sample collection,  
2 packaging, provision of certified clean sampling bottles/containers, and documentation of  
3 sampling activities in controlled logbooks, chain-of-custody documentation, and packaging and  
4 transportation of samples to the laboratory or shipping center. The samplers collect all samples,  
5 including replicates/duplicates, and prepare all sample blanks according to the SAP and  
6 corresponding standard procedures and work packages.

7 The Field Team Lead, samplers, and others responsible for implementation of this SAP and  
8 QAPjP will be provided with current copies of this document and any revisions thereto by the  
9 Waste Site Remediation Task Lead.

#### 10 **A2.1.1.9 Radiological Engineering Lead**

11 The Radiological Engineering Lead is responsible for the radiological engineering and health  
12 physics support to the project. Specific responsibilities include conducting  
13 as-low-as-reasonably-achievable (ALARA) reviews, exposure and release modeling, and  
14 radiological controls optimization for all work planning. In addition, radiological hazards are  
15 identified and appropriate controls are implemented to maintain worker exposures to the hazards  
16 ALARA. The Radiological Engineering Lead interfaces with the project Health and Safety  
17 representative and plans and directs radiological control technician support for all activities.

#### 18 **A2.1.1.10 Sample and Data Management**

19 The Sample and Data Management organization selects the laboratories that perform the  
20 analyses. This organization also ensures that the laboratories conform to Hanford Site internal  
21 laboratory QA requirements, or their equivalent, as approved by RL, EPA, and Ecology. Sample  
22 and Data Management receives the analytical data from the laboratories, makes the data entry  
23 into the *Hanford Environmental Information System* database (HEIS), and arranges for data  
24 validation. Validation will be performed on completed data packages by Project Hanford  
25 Management Contractor personnel or by an independent contractor qualified to perform  
26 validation by meeting the requirements of applicable Site procedures.

#### 27 **A2.1.1.11 Health and Safety Representative**

28 Responsibilities include coordination of industrial health and safety support to the project as  
29 carried out through health and safety plans, activity job hazard analyses, and other pertinent  
30 safety documents required by Federal regulation or by internal Project Hanford Management  
31 Contractor work requirements. In addition, assistance is provided to project personnel in  
32 complying with applicable health and safety standards and requirements. Personal protective  
33 clothing requirements are coordinated with Radiological Engineering.

#### 34 **A2.1.2 Problem Definition/Background**

35 The problem being addressed by this SAP is the need for investigation data for the  
36 200-SW-2 OU landfills. These data will augment existing RI data compiled during Phase I-A  
37 characterization activities, leading to future phases of characterization, and ultimately completion  
38 of the RI/FS process for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills addressed in the RI/FS work plan.

1 Additional details on the problem definition and background are provided in Chapter 1.0 of the  
2 RI/FS work plan.

### 3 **A2.1.3 Project/Task Description**

4 Because of the complexity of the 200-SW-2 OU landfills, a phased characterization approach  
5 will be employed to aid in remedial action decision making. A preliminary investigation began  
6 in 2004 to perform a comprehensive review of existing documentation associated with the  
7 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OU waste sites. A large quantity of records was compiled and  
8 reviewed, and a database was created to capture information that could be used to focus future  
9 field characterization activities. In 2005, a collaborative negotiations process was held with the  
10 Tri-Parties (DOE, EPA, and Ecology). This process re-scoped the focus of the DQO to follow.  
11 The focus was changed to 22 waste sites in the 200-SW-2 OU. These waste sites were the  
12 original Bin 3A and Bin 3B sites and consisted of 21 landfills and one unplanned release. This  
13 DQO process (Phase I-A) focused on nonintrusive investigations of these waste sites, including  
14 geophysical, radiological, and organic vapor surveys.

15 After Phase I-A field characterization activities were performed in mid-2006, a Phase I-B DQO  
16 process was performed to support development of this RI/FS work plan. The Phase I-B DQO  
17 process focused on 24 landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU. An additional two landfills in the  
18 200-SW-1 OU were included in the DQO, as well as this RI/FS work plan; however, it is  
19 proposed that these landfills be closed outside of the CERCLA process. They are included in  
20 this documentation for informational purposes only. A proposed regulatory path forward for  
21 closure of these landfills is presented in Chapter 5.0 of the RI/FS work plan. The Phase I-B  
22 DQO and this SAP focuses on additional nonintrusive characterization, as well as intrusive  
23 characterization techniques. Additional DQO processes will be held following completion of the  
24 Phase I-B field characterization activities, as required. These potential future phase DQO  
25 processes will further aid in characterizing the landfills and will focus on progressively more  
26 intrusive characterization techniques, as required. Information gathered from all phases will be  
27 used to support risk assessments, further refinement of the preliminary conceptual contaminant  
28 distribution models, and ultimately choosing a remedial action alternative.

29 The overall 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 OUs project description is to complete the RI/FS process  
30 and RCRA closure process for the 24 landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU, as well as closure of the  
31 landfills in the 200-SW-1 OU using the RCRA closure process for the Nonradioactive  
32 Dangerous Waste Landfill and the closure requirements in WAC 173-304, "Minimum Functional  
33 Standards for Solid Waste Handling") for closure of solid waste landfills for the 600 Area  
34 Central Landfill. As identified in this RI/FS work plan, Chapter 4.0, a combination of intrusive  
35 data-collection techniques, such as direct-pushes, will be used to collect geophysical logging  
36 data. Nonintrusive activities, such as surface geophysical surveys, existing well logging, passive  
37 soil vapor surveys, and remote visual and radiological surveys of potentially empty caissons, will  
38 be used to augment and focus intrusive data collection activities in future phases of  
39 characterization.

1 This SAP lays out the plan to complete data-collection activities for Phase I-B characterization.  
 2 The data will be incorporated into an RI report to support Tri-Party Agreement major  
 3 Milestone M-015-00C for completion of the RI/FS processes for the Central Plateau OUs by  
 4 December 31, 2011. Chapter 6.0 of the RI/FS work plan provides a schedule of the interim  
 5 milestones for the OUs leading to the major milestone.

#### 6 **A2.1.4 Quality Objectives and Criteria for** 7 **Measurement Data**

8 The QA objective of this plan is to develop implementation guidance to data-collection activities  
 9 that will provide data of known and appropriate quality. Data quality is assessed by data quality  
 10 indicators, by evaluation against identified DQOs, and by evaluation against the work activities  
 11 identified in the existing work plans, and this RI/FS work plan and SAP. The applicable quality  
 12 control (QC) guidelines and quantitative target limits for assessing data quality are dictated by  
 13 the intended use of the data and the nature of the analytical method. Table A2-1 identifies the  
 14 COPCs. Normally, the COPCs and their respective preliminary action levels would be identified  
 15 in support of establishing analytical requirements, including analytical method target limits,  
 16 however, because of the nature of the sampling techniques being performed in Phase I-B,  
 17 preliminary action levels are not included in this SAP. Analytical performance requirements for  
 18 the passive soil vapor surveys are included in Table A2-2, because these samplers are the only  
 19 media to be sent to an analytical laboratory under this SAP. All other characterization  
 20 techniques presented in this SAP are essentially field screening/logging techniques. The  
 21 quantitative and qualitative data quality indicators also are described below.

Table A2-1. List of Contaminants of Potential Concern.

<b>Chemical Constituents – Volatile Organics</b>	
1,1-dichloroethane (DCA)	Carbon Tetrachloride
1,1-dichloroethene	Chlorobenzene
1,1,1-trichloroethane (TCA)	Chloroform
1,1,2-trichloroethane	Cis-1,2-dichloroethylene
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	Dichloromethane (methylene chloride)
1,2-dichlorobenzene	Ethylbenzene
1,2-dichloroethane (DCA)	Naphthalene
1,3-dichlorobenzene	n-butyl Benzene
2,4-dinitrotoluene	Tetrachloroethylene (PCE)
2-butanone (methyl ethyl ketone/MEK)	Toluene
2-hexanone (methyl isobutyl ketone (MIBK)	Trans-1,2-dichloroethylene
2-methylphenol (o-cresol)	Trichloroethylene (TCE)
4-methylphenol (p-cresol)	Xylene
Benzene	Butanol

Table A2-2. Analytical Performance Requirements.

Analytical Parameter	Collection Device & Method	Target Detection Limit	Accuracy (%)	Precision (%)
<b>Laboratory Analysis</b>				
Organic vapors (VOCs per manufacturers' specifications)	Passive soil-gas (EMFLUX or GORE-SORBER), <sup>a</sup> EPA Method 8260B <sup>b</sup>	10 ng/sample	+/-25	70 – 130

<sup>a</sup>EMFLUX is a registered trademark of Beacon Environmental Services, Inc., Bel Air, Maryland. GORE-SORBER is a trademark of W. L. Gore and Associates, San Francisco, California.

<sup>b</sup>EPA Method 8260B (utilizes gas chromatography/ mass spectrometry) is found in SW-846, *Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste: Physical/Chemical Methods, Third Edition; Final Update III-A*.

EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

ng = nanogram.

VOC = volatile organic compound.

#### 1 **A2.1.4.1 Development of Contaminants of Potential Concern and Preliminary Action** 2 **Levels for Establishment of Analytical Requirements**

3 This section identifies the 200-SW-2 OU COPCs and identifies the process for development of  
4 their corresponding preliminary action levels in support of establishing appropriate analytical  
5 requirements. The analytical performance requirements for the passive soil vapor surveys,  
6 including target detection limits, are contained in Table A2-2.

##### 7 **A2.1.4.1.1 Development of Contaminants of Potential Concern**

8 The 200 Areas have been the center of activity for processing plutonium at the Hanford Site  
9 since the mid-1940s. There are five general plant process groupings: (1) fuel processing,  
10 (2) plutonium isolation, (3) uranium recovery, (4) cesium/strontium recovery, and (5) waste  
11 storage/treatment. All of these plant processes generated solid waste that was disposed of in the  
12 200-SW-2 OU waste sites. In addition, the 200-SW-2 OU waste sites contain solid waste  
13 generated in the 100 and 300 Areas of the Hanford Site and at other, non-Hanford facilities.

14 The set of organic COPCs that are likely to be present in the 200-SW-2 OU waste sites are based  
15 on the 200 Areas plant operations, as identified in various DQO documents for the 200 Areas  
16 OUs, including the 200-CW-1, 200-CS-1, 200-CW-5, 200-LW-1, 200-LW-2, 200-MW-1,  
17 200-PW-1, 200-PW-2, 200-PW-4, 200-TW-1, and 200-TW-2 OUs. In general, the majority of  
18 the waste disposed to the 200-SW-2 OU waste sites consists of solid wastes in the form of  
19 construction and building debris; maintenance wastes; process equipment, materials, and wastes;  
20 and limited amounts of liquid wastes, generally stabilized.

21 The original COPC list was screened, via the Phase I-B DQO process, to eliminate contaminants  
22 that are not readily detectable via nonintrusive survey techniques. Nevertheless, these COPCs  
23 for the 200-SW-2 OU will be preserved and carried forward into the Phase II DQO process for  
24 further evaluation for applicability in future phase sampling. The COPC list for the nonintrusive  
25 passive organic vapor sampling described in this SAP is presented in Table A2-1.

#### 1 **A2.1.4.1.2 Development of Preliminary Action Levels**

2 Preliminary action levels represent regulatory- or risk-based soil concentrations of  
3 nonradionuclide or radioactive constituents that are considered protective of human health,  
4 ecological receptors, and groundwater and could be used by the RI/FS process to meet remedial  
5 action objectives. Identification of preliminary action levels is not included in this SAP, because  
6 this SAP focuses on reconnaissance-level characterization techniques. These action levels will  
7 be developed during revision of this SAP, following the Phase I-B DQO process.

#### 8 **A2.1.4.2 Quantitative Analytical Parameters**

9 The quantitative analytical parameters of precision and accuracy as described in the following  
10 sections will apply to analytical data analysis.

##### 11 **A2.1.4.2.1 Accuracy**

12 Accuracy is an assessment of the closeness of the measured value to the true value. Accuracy of  
13 chemical test results is assessed through several standard methods. These methods include  
14 calibrating measurement systems using standards of known concentration (calibration);  
15 analyzing solutions known to contain no analytes of interest to verify that the sample processing  
16 and preparation process do not affect the measurement (blank analyses); routinely analyzing  
17 samples containing known concentrations of analyte(s) of interest (laboratory control sample  
18 analysis); and, spiking samples with known standards and establishing the average recovery  
19 (matrix spike analysis). Validity of calibrations is evaluated by comparing results from the  
20 measurement of a standard to known values and/or by generating in-house statistical limits based  
21 on three standard deviations (+/- 3 SD). Table A2-2 list the accuracy requirements for fixed  
22 laboratory analyses for the passive soil vapor surveys.

23 An additional element of the accuracy objective is measurement method sensitivity, frequently  
24 described by the minimum detectable concentration, also referred to as the detection limit. The  
25 detection limit reflects the smallest concentration of an analyte that can be reliably measured in a  
26 sample and must be established to provide data at concentrations low enough for comparison  
27 against remedial action levels and remediation goals established during the RI/FS planning  
28 process. Detection limits are functions of the analytical method used to provide the data and the  
29 quantity of the sample available for analyses. Detection limits identified for the analytes for the  
30 passive soil vapor surveys are listed in Table A2-2 (see Target Detection Limit column in the  
31 table). The preliminary action levels are estimates of potential cleanup levels and are used in this  
32 SAP to ensure that detection limits are established to provide laboratory data at low enough  
33 concentrations to assess potential action limits during the feasibility study, where potential  
34 applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements are identified. Required detection limits  
35 generally are lower than the preliminary action levels so that any nondetect laboratory results can  
36 be used to demonstrate that the field concentrations do not, in fact, exceed target action levels.  
37 The detection limits presented in the tables are typical for clean media and trace-level analysis  
38 and should be achievable by a laboratory in the absence of interferences. A laboratory analyzing  
39 samples displaying more than trace level contamination may not be able to achieve these  
40 detection limits.

1 The general objective for detection limits is to establish a minimum detectable concentration that  
2 is below the action level to prevent generation of inconclusive data. However, because the  
3 passive soil vapor surveys are being used as a general indicator of the presence of organic vapors  
4 in the soil, preliminary action levels will not be established in this SAP.

5 The accuracy of radiation detection instrumentation planned for use during execution of this SAP  
6 (i.e., spectral gamma) is +/- 20% with a target detection limit of 1 pCi/g (based on Cs-137  
7 concentration in surface soil).

8 Geophysical methods planned for use in executing this SAP (i.e., ground-penetrating radar  
9 [GPR], electromagnetic induction [EMI], total magnetic field [TMF]) record accurate and  
10 precise quantitative measurements when used in accordance with manufacturer's  
11 recommendations and procedures. However, subjective interpretations of data by properly  
12 qualified and trained professionals (i.e., geologists/geophysicists) are required. Accuracies  
13 within +/- 0.1% of full-scale measurements and +/- 1 m of actual location are typical.

#### 14 **A2.1.4.2.2 Precision**

15 Precision is a measure of the data spread when more than one measurement has been taken on  
16 the same sample. Precision is assessed through analysis of multiple aliquots of the same sample  
17 in the laboratory (laboratory replicate analysis), through analysis of split samples prepared in the  
18 field and submitted to the laboratory as separate samples (field duplicate analysis), and through  
19 assessment of multiple analyses of laboratory control samples. Precision typically is expressed  
20 as the relative percent difference for duplicate measurements. Analytical precision requirements  
21 for passive soil vapor surveys are listed in Table A2-2. These are typical precision levels that a  
22 laboratory should be able to achieve on project samples. Inability to achieve the precision  
23 requirements is an indicator that there is a problem with the sampling process, analytical system,  
24 or sample matrix and requires further investigation.

25 The precision of radiation detection instrumentation planned for use during execution of this  
26 SAP is 10 percent. The precision of geophysical methods planned for use in executing this SAP,  
27 like accuracy, is good when instrument operation is in accordance with manufacturer's  
28 recommendations and procedures.

#### 29 **A2.1.4.2.3 Completeness**

30 Completeness is a measure of the amount of valid data needed to be obtained from a  
31 measurement system. This parameter compares the number of valid measurements completed to  
32 the minimum number of samples to be collected and analyzed to establish description/  
33 measurement of the system at a minimum confidence with those established by the project's  
34 quality criteria (DQOs or performance/acceptance criteria).

35 For this RI activity, the overall objective for completeness will not be established, because the  
36 techniques used for characterization in this phase are reconnaissance-level surveys that will be  
37 used to focus future phase intrusive characterization activities.

### 1 **A2.1.4.3 Qualitative Analytical Parameters**

2 Qualitative analytical parameters identified in this section include representativeness and  
3 comparability. These parameters are described below.

#### 4 **A2.1.4.3.1 Representativeness**

5 Representativeness refers to the degree to which a data set actually describes a sample of a  
6 population (e.g., the information presented by the data set can be extrapolated to describe the  
7 overall site or system). The measurements of a data set must be evaluated to determine whether  
8 the data are collected in such a manner that they represent the environment or condition being  
9 measured or studied (i.e., the actual concentration and distribution of the radiological  
10 constituents in the matrix sampled). Representativeness should be assessed on a gross (i.e., site  
11 or system) level and on an individual measurement level to ensure that the data user understands  
12 how the data set can be used to describe the target system. Sampling plan design, sampling  
13 techniques, and sample handling protocols (e.g., storage, preservation, transportation) have been  
14 developed and are discussed in subsequent sections of this document. Representativeness of the  
15 data set will be evaluated during the data quality assessment (DQA). The DQA process is  
16 described in Section A2.4.3.

#### 17 **A2.1.4.3.2 Comparability**

18 Comparability is an expressed measure of confidence that one data set can be compared to  
19 previous and subsequent measurements and so can be combined for purposes of decision  
20 making. This parameter compares sample collection and handling methods, sample preparation  
21 and analytical procedures, holding times, stability issues, and QA protocols. Data comparability  
22 will be maintained using standard procedures, consistent methods, and consistent units.  
23 Table A2-2 lists applicable fixed-laboratory methods for analytes and target detection limits.

### 24 **A2.1.5 Special Training/Certification Requirements**

25 A graded approach is used to ensure that workers receive a level of training that is commensurate  
26 with their responsibilities and that complies with applicable DOE orders and government  
27 regulations. The Field Team Lead, in coordination with line management, ensures that all field  
28 personnel meet all special training requirements.

29 Typical training requirements or qualifications have been instituted by the primary contractor  
30 management team to meet training requirements imposed by the Project Hanford Management  
31 Contract (DE-AC06-96RL13200, *Contract Between the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland*  
32 *Operations Office, and Fluor Hanford, Inc.*), regulations, DOE orders, DOE contractor  
33 requirements documents, American National Standards Institute/American Society of  
34 Mechanical Engineers, *Washington Administrative Code*, etc. For example, the environmental,  
35 safety, and health training program provides workers with the knowledge and skills necessary to  
36 safely execute assigned duties.

1 Field personnel typically will have completed the following training before starting work:

- 2 • Occupational Safety and Health Administration 40-hour hazardous waste worker training  
3 and supervised 24-hour hazardous waste-site experience
- 4 • 8-hour hazardous waste worker refresher training (as required)
- 5 • Hanford General Employee Training (HGET)
- 6 • Radiological worker training.

7 Project specific training includes the following.

- 8 • Training requirements or qualifications needed by sampling personnel will be in  
9 accordance with QA requirements.
- 10 • Training requirements or qualifications required by sampling personnel will be in  
11 the statements of work for subcontracted services.
  - 12 – Project personnel deploying passive soil-gas sampling devices will receive training in  
13 accordance with manufacturer's recommendations and procedures for proper use of  
14 the equipment. At a minimum, procedures for equipment use will be "required  
15 reading" with documentation of completion in project files.
  - 16 – Geophysical methods (GPR, EMI, TMF, borehole logging) will be subcontracted  
17 work. Subcontractors will be required to operate equipment in accordance with  
18 manufacturer's recommendations and procedures, using or under the supervision of  
19 properly trained and qualified geologists or geophysicists. Documentation of  
20 training, qualifications, or other certifications will be maintained in the project files.
  - 21 – Direct-push activities will be subcontracted work. Subcontractors will be required to  
22 operate equipment in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations and  
23 procedures using properly trained and qualified personnel. Documentation of  
24 training, qualifications, or other certifications will be maintained in the project file.
- 25 • Qualification requirements for radiological control technicians are established by the  
26 Radiation Protection Program; radiological control technicians assigned to these activities  
27 will be qualified through the prescribed training program and will undergo ongoing  
28 training and qualification activities.

29 Project-specific safety training, geared specifically to the project and the day's activity, will be  
30 provided. Pre-job briefings will be performed to evaluate an activity and its hazards by  
31 considering many factors including the following:

- 32 • Objective of the activities
- 33 • Individual tasks to be performed
- 34 • Hazards associated with the planned tasks
- 35 • Controls applied to mitigate the hazards

- 1 • The environment in which the job will be performed
- 2 • The facility where the job will be performed
- 3 • The equipment and material required
- 4 • Review of Materials Safety Data Sheets, as applicable
- 5 • The safety procedures applicable to the job
- 6 • The training requirements for individuals assigned to perform the work
- 7 • The level of management control
- 8 • The proximity of emergency contacts.

9 Training records are recorded for each individual in an electronic training record database. The  
10 Fluor Hanford training organization maintains the training records system. Line management  
11 will confirm that an individual employee's training is appropriate and up-to-date before  
12 performing any fieldwork.

### 13 **A2.1.6 Documentation and Records**

14 The Waste Site Remediation Task Lead is responsible for ensuring that the current version of the  
15 SAP is being used and for providing any updates to field personnel. Version control is  
16 maintained by the administrative document control process. Minor changes to the FSP, such as  
17 sample location changes, may be made in the field by the Waste Site Remediation Field Project  
18 Manager and Task Lead. Significant changes to the FSP that affect the DQOs will be reviewed  
19 and approved by RL and Ecology before implementation; this approval may be through actual  
20 revision of this RI/FS work plan and/or SAP documents or may be documented through Unit  
21 Manager Meeting minutes under the Tri-Party Agreement. Performance of additional field  
22 activities (collection of more samples or additional locations) based on the results of the field  
23 activities will not require approval. The Waste Site Remediation Task Lead and Field Project  
24 Manager are responsible for ensuring that the field instructions are maintained up to date and  
25 aligned with any revisions to the SAP. As appropriate, the document revision process will  
26 follow the requirements set forth in Section 9.3 of the *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and*  
27 *Consent Order Action Plan* (Ecology et al., 1989b).

28 The project file will include the following, as appropriate:

- 29 • Field logbooks or operational records
- 30 • Global Positioning System data
- 31 • Chain-of-custody forms
- 32 • Sample receipt records
- 33 • Inspection or assessment reports and corrective action reports
- 34 • Interim progress reports
- 35 • Final reports.

36 The Waste Site Remediation Task Lead is responsible for ensuring that the data file is properly  
37 maintained. The project files will contain the records or references to their storage locations.

1 The laboratory is responsible for maintaining and having available upon request:

- 2 • Analytical logbooks
- 3 • Raw data and QC sample records
- 4 • Standard reference material and/or proficiency test sample data
- 5 • Instrument calibration information.

6 Records may be stored in either electronic or hard copy format. Documentation and records,  
7 regardless of medium or format, are controlled in accordance with internal work requirements  
8 and processes that ensure accuracy and retrievability of stored records. Records required by the  
9 Tri-Party Agreement will be managed in accordance with the requirements of the Agreement.

## 10 **A2.2 MEASUREMENT/DATA ACQUISITION**

11 This section presents the requirements for sampling methods, sample handling and custody,  
12 analytical methods, and field and laboratory QC. Instrument calibration, maintenance supply  
13 inspection, and data management requirements also are addressed.

### 14 **A2.2.1 Sampling Process Design**

15 The sampling process design describes the data-collection design for the project, including types  
16 and numbers of samples required, sampling locations and frequency, sample matrices, and the  
17 rationale for the design. The sample design focuses on the following:

- 18 • Further investigation of areas showing elevated levels of organic vapors detected during  
19 Phase I-A characterization activities
- 20 • Investigation using passive organic vapor surveys of areas showing a strong metallic  
21 signature detected during Phase I-A geophysical surveys
- 22 • Investigation of remaining landfills using surface geophysical techniques (13 of the  
23 24 landfills were surveyed during Phase I-A activities)
- 24 • Radiological and remote visual inspection of caissons that are believed to be  
25 empty/unused to verify the absence of waste
- 26 • Visual inspections and potential geophysical surveys of unused areas of TSD unit  
27 landfills to support administrative closure of these areas
- 28 • Direct-pushes into landfills (between trenches) to determine stratigraphy, moisture  
29 content, and radiological conditions
- 30 • Logging (i.e., moisture, radiological, geophysical) of existing monitoring wells near the  
31 200-SW-2 OU landfills.

32 This SAP is aimed at collecting data to focus future intrusive characterization, provide a better  
33 understanding of the geology beneath the landfills, refine the preliminary conceptual

1 contaminant distribution models, and ultimately support the RI/FS process. Therefore, the  
2 sampling design for activities conducted under this SAP is mainly a focused (or judgmental)  
3 strategy aimed at targeted locations. The focused sampling is a result of having existing  
4 historical knowledge of contaminants from site-specific information. These data include  
5 construction information, burial records, contaminant inventories, information from similar sites,  
6 geophysical logging within or near sites, passive soil vapor surveys, and/or surface geophysical  
7 surveys (additional details on sampling are provided in Section A3.1).

8 Additional sampling is anticipated following the record of decision to collect confirmatory,  
9 design, and verification samples at sites as needed. Post-record of decision sampling needs will  
10 be identified through a series of DQO processes as described in Chapter 5.0 of the RI/FS work  
11 plan.

## 12 **A2.2.2 Sampling Methods**

13 This SAP provides information on a variety of nonintrusive sampling methods that may be used  
14 during Phase I-B characterization. Data-collection methods include passive soil vapor surveys,  
15 direct-push geophysical logging, surface geophysical surveys, radiological screening, and other  
16 methods as warranted by the data needs. Nonintrusive data-collection techniques will be used to  
17 augment the existing data and to focus future phase intrusive characterization activities. The  
18 resulting data will aid in evaluating the nature and extent of contamination during the RI/FS  
19 process. Details of sample and data-collection methods included in this SAP are provided in  
20 Section A3.1.

### 21 **A2.2.2.1 Decontamination of Sampling Equipment**

22 To prevent contamination of the samples, care should be taken to use clean equipment for each  
23 sampling activity. In general, disposable sampling equipment will be used where appropriate.

24 Special care should be taken to avoid the following common ways in which cross-contamination  
25 or background contamination may compromise the samples:

- 26 • Improperly storing or transporting sampling equipment and sample containers
- 27 • Contaminating the equipment or sample bottles by setting the equipment/sample bottle on  
28 or near potential contamination sources (e.g., uncovered ground)
- 29 • Handling bottles or equipment with dirty hands or gloves
- 30 • Improperly decontaminating equipment before sampling or between sampling events.

### 31 **A2.2.3 Sample Handling and Custody Requirements**

32 All field-sample handling, shipping, and custody requirements will be consistent with established  
33 procedures. The radiological control technician will measure the contamination levels and dose  
34 rates associated with the sample containers. This information, along with other data, will be used

1 to select proper packaging, marking, labeling, and shipping paperwork and to verify that the  
 2 sample can be received by the analytical laboratory in accordance with the laboratory's  
 3 acceptance criteria. Preliminary container types and volumes are identified in Table A2-3.  
 4 The final types and volumes will be indicated on the Sampling Authorization Form prepared by  
 5 Sample and Data Management; however, field changes can be made if necessary.  
 6 Field-determined radiological properties of the sample also may affect the container size. Each  
 7 sample container will be labeled with the following information, using a waterproof marker on  
 8 firmly affixed, water-resistant labels:

- 9 • Sampling Authorization Form
- 10 • HEIS number
- 11 • Sample collection date/time
- 12 • Name of person collecting the sample
- 13 • Analysis required
- 14 • Preservation method (if applicable).

Table A2-3. Vapor Sample Preservation, Container, and Holding Time Guidelines  
for Field Screening.

Analytes	Analytical Priority	Matrix	EMFLUX or GORE-SORBER Sampler*		Preservation	Packing Requirements	Holding Time
			Number	Volume			
<b>Volatile Organic Compounds</b>							
Volatile organic compounds	1	Vapor	293 (see Tables A3-1 and A3-2 for coordinates)	As prescribed by the manufacturer	Ambient temperature, at or near atmospheric pressure	N/A	14-28 days

\*EMFLUX is a registered trademark of Beacon Environmental Services, Inc., Bel Air, Maryland. GORE-SORBER is a trademark of W. L. Gore and Associates, San Francisco, California.

N/A = not applicable.

15 Sample transportation will be in compliance with the applicable regulations for packaging,  
 16 marking, labeling, and shipping hazardous materials, hazardous substances, and hazardous waste  
 17 that are mandated by the U.S. Department of Transportation (49 CFR 171-177, "Transportation,"  
 18 Chapter 1, "Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation,"  
 19 Part 171, "General Information, Regulations, and Definitions," through Part 177, "Carriage By  
 20 Public Highway") in association with the International Air Transportation Authority, DOE  
 21 requirements, and applicable program-specific implementing procedures.

22 Sample custody during laboratory analysis is addressed in the applicable laboratory standard  
 23 operating procedures. Laboratory custody procedures will ensure that sample integrity and  
 24 identification are maintained throughout the analytical process. Storage of samples at the  
 25 laboratory will be consistent with laboratory instructions prepared by Sample and Data  
 26 Management.

27 The Fluor Hanford *Sample Data Tracking* database will be used to track the samples from the  
 28 point of collection to through the laboratory analysis process. The HEIS database is the  
 29 repository for the laboratory analytical results. The HEIS sample numbers will be issued to the

1 sampling organization for the project. Each radiological, nonradiological, and physical  
2 properties sample will be identified and labeled with a unique HEIS sample number. The sample  
3 location, depth, and corresponding HEIS numbers will be documented in the sampler's field  
4 logbook. All field-sample handling, shipping, and custody requirements will be consistent with  
5 established procedures.

#### 6 **A2.2.3.1 Sample Preservation, Containers, and Holding Times**

7 Sample preservation, container, and holding-time requirements will be indicated on Chain of  
8 Custody/Sample Analysis Request forms in accordance with internal work processes and  
9 requirements and the specific analytical method prepared for specific sample events. The sample  
10 preservation, container, and holding time requirements for the analyses to be performed are  
11 summarized in Table A2-3.

#### 12 **A2.2.4 Analytical Methods Requirements**

13 Analytical parameters and methods are listed in Table A2-2. These analytical methods are  
14 implemented in accordance with the laboratory's QA plan and the requirements of this QAPjP.  
15 The Project Hanford Management Contractor conducts oversight of offsite analytical laboratories  
16 to qualify them for performing Hanford Site analytical work. This section only applies to the  
17 analysis of passive organic vapor samplers, because these are the only sample media to be  
18 analyzed at a laboratory under Phase I-B.

19 Deviations from the analytical methods noted in Table A2-2 must be approved by the Waste Site  
20 Remediation Task Lead. If the laboratory uses a nonstandard or unapproved method, the  
21 laboratory must provide method validation data to confirm that the method is adequate for the  
22 intended use of the data. This includes information such as determination of detection limits,  
23 quantitation limits, typical recoveries, and analytical precision and bias.

24 Laboratories providing analytical services in support of this SAP will have in place a corrective  
25 action program that addresses analytical system failures and documents the effectiveness of any  
26 corrective actions. Errors reported by the laboratories are reported to the Sample and Data  
27 Management Project Coordinator, who is responsible to document analytical errors and to  
28 establish the resolution in coordination with the Waste Site Remediation Task Lead.

29 Communications with the laboratory will be managed by the Sample and Data Management  
30 organization. Sample and Data Management will be responsible for communicating status,  
31 issues, corrective actions, and other pertinent laboratory information to the Waste Site  
32 Remediation Task Lead and the Waste Site Remediation Manager.

#### 33 **A2.2.5 Quality Control Requirements**

34 The QC procedures must be followed in the field and laboratory to ensure that reliable data are  
35 obtained. Field QC samples will be collected to evaluate the potential for cross-contamination  
36 and to provide information pertinent to field variability. Field QC for sampling will require the  
37 collection of field replicates (duplicates), trip or field blanks, and equipment blanks. Laboratory

1 QC samples estimate the precision and bias of the analytical data. QC sampling is described  
2 here in general terms; actual QC samples and the required frequency for collection are described  
3 in the following sections.

4 The collection of QC samples for onsite measurements is only applicable to passive organic  
5 vapor sampling. Field-screening instrumentation (i.e., radiological instrumentation, logging  
6 equipment) will be calibrated and controlled as discussed in Sections A2.2.6 and A2.2.7, as  
7 applicable.

8 The laboratory method blanks, laboratory control sample/blank spike, and matrix spike are  
9 defined in Chapter 1 of SW-846, *Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste: Physical/Chemical*  
10 *Methods, Third Edition; Final Update III-B*, and will be run at the frequency specified in  
11 that reference.

12 To ensure sample and data usability, the sampling associated with this SAP will be performed in  
13 accordance with established sampling practices, procedures, and requirements pertaining to  
14 sample collection, collection equipment, and sample handling. The Field Team Lead and the  
15 Waste Site Remediation Task Lead are responsible for ensuring that all field procedures are  
16 followed completely and that field-sampling personnel are adequately trained to perform  
17 sampling activities under this SAP. The Waste Site Remediation Lead, or the Field Team Lead  
18 at the discretion of the Waste Site Remediation Task Lead, must document all deviations from  
19 procedures or other problems pertaining to sample collection, chain of custody, COPCs, sample  
20 transport, or noncompliant monitoring. As appropriate, such deviations or problems will be  
21 documented in the field logbook or on nonconformance report forms in accordance with internal  
22 corrective-action procedures. The Waste Site Remediation Lead, or the Field Team Lead at the  
23 discretion of the Waste Site Remediation Task Lead, will be responsible for communicating field  
24 corrective-action requirements and for ensuring that immediate corrective actions are applied to  
25 field activities.

#### 26 **A2.2.5.1 Field Duplicates**

27 Field duplicates are independent samples collected as close as possible to the same point in space  
28 and time, taken from the same source, stored in separate containers, and analyzed independently.

29 Field duplicates normally are collected from a minimum frequency of 5 percent of the total  
30 collected samples, or a minimum of one field duplicate for each landfill. The duplicate samples  
31 will be sent to the primary laboratory in the same manner that the routine site samples are sent.  
32 The field duplicates will be analyzed for all of the analytes listed in Table A2-1.

#### 33 **A2.2.5.2 Field Splits**

34 Field splits of passive soil vapor samples are not considered necessary to be collected under  
35 this SAP.

#### 36 **A2.2.5.3 Equipment Rinsate Blanks**

37 The use of equipment rinsate blanks is not applicable under this SAP.

1 **A2.2.5.4 Field Blanks**

2 Field blanks for passive soil vapor samples are not applicable to be collected under this SAP.

3 **A2.2.5.5 Field Duplicates**

4 For soil-vapor samples collected in EMFLUX<sup>1</sup> or GORE-SORBER<sup>2</sup> samplers, duplicates are  
5 defined as independent samples collected as close as possible to the same point in space and  
6 time, taken from the same source, stored in separate containers, and analyzed independently  
7 (i.e., not homogenized). A minimum of one duplicate sample will be collected during soil-vapor  
8 sampling of each landfill.

9 **A2.2.6 Instrument/Equipment Testing, Inspection,  
10 and Maintenance Requirements**

11 Measurement and testing equipment used in the field or in the laboratory that directly affects the  
12 quality of analytical data will be subject to preventive maintenance measures to ensure  
13 minimization of measurement system downtime. Laboratories and onsite measurement  
14 organizations must maintain and calibrate their equipment. Maintenance requirements (such as  
15 parts lists and documentation of routine maintenance) will be included in the individual  
16 laboratory and the onsite organization QA plan or operating procedures (as appropriate).  
17 Calibration of laboratory instruments will be performed in a manner consistent with SW-846 or  
18 with auditable DOE Hanford Site and contractual requirements. Consumables, supplies, and  
19 reagents will be reviewed in accordance with SW-846 requirements and will be appropriate for  
20 their use.

21 **A2.2.7 Instrument Calibration and Frequency**

22 All onsite environmental instruments are calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's  
23 operating instructions, internal work requirements and processes, and/or work packages that  
24 provide direction for equipment calibration or verification of accuracy by analytical methods.  
25 The results from all instrument calibration activities are recorded in logbooks and/or  
26 work packages.

27 Field instrumentation, calibration, and QA checks will be performed in accordance with the  
28 following.

- 29 • Calibration of radiological field instruments on the Hanford Site is performed under  
30 contract by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, as specified in their program  
31 documentation.

---

<sup>1</sup> EMFLUX is a registered trademark of BEACON Environmental Services, Inc., Bel Air, Maryland.

<sup>2</sup> GORE-SORBER is a registered trademark of W. L. Gore and Associates, San Francisco, California.

- 1 • Daily calibration checks will be performed and documented for each instrument used to  
2 characterize areas that are under investigation. These checks will be made on standard  
3 materials that are sufficiently like the matrix under consideration that direct comparison  
4 of data can be made. Analysis times will be sufficient to establish detection efficiency  
5 and resolution.

6 Analytical laboratory instruments and measuring equipment are calibrated in accordance with the  
7 laboratories' QA plan.

8 Calibration is conducted with equipment or standards with known valid relationships to  
9 nationally recognized performance standards. Field equipment used in this data-collection  
10 activity that requires calibration will be listed in the fieldwork package. Such equipment is  
11 uniquely identified and calibrated in accordance with the equipment-specific calibration  
12 procedure, including the program for maintaining calibration records traceable to the uniquely  
13 identified piece of equipment. The results from all instrument calibration activities are recorded  
14 in logbooks and/or work packages.

#### 15 **A2.2.8 Inspection/Acceptance Requirements for** 16 **Supplies and Consumables**

17 Supplies and consumables procured by Fluor Hanford that are used in support of sampling and  
18 analysis activities are procured in accordance with internal work requirements and processes that  
19 describe the Project Hanford Management Contractor acquisition system. The procurement  
20 process ensures that purchased items and services comply with applicable procurement  
21 specifications, thereby ensuring that structures, systems, and components, or other items and  
22 services procured/acquired for Fluor Hanford, meet the specific technical and quality  
23 requirements. Supplies and consumables are appropriately issued to the field and then checked  
24 and accepted before use.

25 Supplies and consumables procured by the analytical laboratories are procured, checked, and  
26 used in accordance with their QA plans.

#### 27 **A2.2.9 Data Acquisition Requirements for Nondirect** 28 **Measurements**

29 Nondirect measurements include data obtained from sources such as computer databases,  
30 programs, literature files, and historical databases. Nondirect measurements (e.g., historical  
31 records and reports) were used extensively in identification of data needs and DQOs for this RI.  
32 Nondirect measurements are not planned to be acquired as a portion of the data-collection  
33 activity under this SAP. However, any incidental nondirect measurement used as data acquired  
34 during this SAP activity (e.g., weather data from other sources) and used in decision making will  
35 be documented.

## 1 **A2.2.10 Data Management**

2 Analytical data resulting from the implementation of this QAPjP will be managed and stored in  
3 accordance with the applicable programmatic requirements governing data management  
4 procedures, as well as with SGW-35016, *Information and Data Management Plan for the 200-*  
5 *SW-2 Operable Unit*. Electronic data access, when appropriate, will be via a database (e.g.,  
6 HEIS or a project-specific database). Where electronic data are not available, hard copies will be  
7 provided in accordance with Section 9.6 of the Tri-Party Agreement (Ecology et al., 1989a).

8 Planning for sample collection and analysis will be in accordance with the programmatic  
9 requirements governing fixed-laboratory sample collection activities, as discussed in the sample  
10 team's procedures. In the event that specific procedures do not exist for a particular work  
11 evolution, or it is determined that additional guidance to complete certain tasks is needed, a work  
12 package will be developed to adequately control the activities, as appropriate. Examples of the  
13 sample team's requirements include activities associated with the following:

- 14 • Chain of custody/sample analysis requests
- 15 • Project and sample identification for sampling services
- 16 • Control of certificates of analysis
- 17 • Logbooks and checklists
- 18 • Sample packaging and shipping.

19 Approved work control packages and procedures will be used to document field activities,  
20 including radiological measurements, when this SAP is implemented. All field activities will be  
21 recorded in field logbooks or appropriate forms invoked by procedure. Examples of the types of  
22 documentation for field radiological data include the following:

- 23 • Instructions regarding the minimum requirements for documenting radiological controls  
24 information in accordance with 10 CFR 835, "Occupational Radiation Protection"
- 25 • Instructions for managing the identification, creation, review, approval, storage, transfer,  
26 and retrieval of primary contractor radiological records
- 27 • The minimum standards and practices necessary for preparing, performing, and retaining  
28 radiological-related records
- 29 • The indoctrination of personnel on the development and implementation of sample plans
- 30 • The requirements associated with preparing and transporting regulated material
- 31 • Daily reports of radiological surveys and measurements collected during conduct of field  
32 investigation activities. Data will be cross-referenced between laboratory analytical data  
33 and radiation measurements to facilitate interpreting the investigation results.

34 Errors are reported to the Fluor Hanford Office of Sample and Data Management on a routine  
35 basis. Laboratory errors are reported to the Sample Management Project Coordinator, who  
36 initiates a Sample Disposition Record in accordance with Project Hanford Management  
37 Contractor procedures. This process is used to document analytical errors and to establish their

1 resolution with the Waste Site Remediation Task Lead. The Sample Management Project  
2 Coordinator provides the Sample Disposition Record to the Task Lead for review and signature.  
3 The Sample Disposition Records become a permanent part of the analytical data package for  
4 future reference and for records management.

### 5 **A2.3 ASSESSMENT/OVERSIGHT**

6 This section identifies the activities for assessing project and associated QA and QC activities for  
7 compliance with QAPjP requirements.

#### 8 **A2.3.1 Assessments and Response Actions**

9 The Project Hanford Management Contractor management, regulatory compliance, quality,  
10 and/or health and safety organizations may conduct random surveillances and assessments to  
11 verify compliance with the requirements outlined in this SAP, project work packages, the project  
12 quality management plan, procedures, and regulatory requirements. Project-specific  
13 management assessments will be conducted on an annual basis for activities conducted under  
14 this RI/FS work plan and SAP. Field supervision will also perform assessments via documented  
15 pre-job readiness meetings, and routine oversight of field activities. Other assessments may be  
16 conducted on a random or as-needed basis. Data obtained under this SAP will undergo DQA in  
17 accordance with Section A2.4.3. No validation will be performed for radiological survey data or  
18 geophysical survey data. Although no validation will be performed for radiological and  
19 geophysical survey data, the surveys will be conducted by trained personnel, in accordance with  
20 approved procedures, using properly calibrated equipment.

21 If circumstances should arise in the field that would dictate the need for additional assessment  
22 activities, these activities would be performed and recorded in accordance with approved  
23 procedures. Deficiencies identified by these assessments will be reported in accordance with  
24 existing programmatic requirements. The project's line management chain coordinates the  
25 corrective actions/deficiencies in accordance with the Project Hanford Management Contractor  
26 Quality Assurance Program, the Corrective Management Action Program, and associated  
27 approved procedures that implement these programs.

28 Oversight activities in the analytical laboratories, including corrective action management, are  
29 conducted in accordance with the laboratories' QA plans. To ensure that laboratory QA  
30 requirements are met, Project Hanford Management Contractor personnel conduct periodic  
31 oversight activities for offsite analytical laboratories in accordance with Hanford Site QA  
32 program requirements to qualify them for performing Hanford Site analytical work.

#### 33 **A2.3.2 Reports to Management**

34 Reports to management on data quality issues will be made if and when these issues are  
35 identified by self-assessments or other types of assessments. Errors reported by the laboratories  
36 are communicated to the Field Team Lead, who initiates a sample disposition record in

1 accordance with primary contractor procedures. This process is used to document analytical  
2 errors and to establish resolution with the Waste Site Remediation Task Lead.

3 DQA reports will be prepared to evaluate whether the type, quality, and quantity of the data that  
4 were collected meet the quality objectives described in the DQO.

## 5 **A2.4 DATA VALIDATION AND USABILITY**

6 Data validation and usability activities occur after the data-collection phase of the project is  
7 completed. Implementation of these elements determines whether the data conform to the  
8 specified criteria, thus satisfying the project objectives.

### 9 **A2.4.1 Data Review, Validation, and Verification**

10 Data will be reviewed, and data verification and validation will be performed on analytical data  
11 sets. Only the passive organic vapor samplers will result in analytical data. All other  
12 characterization activities involve qualitative reconnaissance-level surveys that will not require  
13 data verification and verification. These activities confirm that sampling and chain-of-custody  
14 documentation is complete and sample numbers can be tied to the specific sampling location  
15 described in Section A2.2, that samples were analyzed within required holding times identified  
16 in Table A2-3, and that sample analyses met the data quality requirements specified in  
17 this QAPjP.

18 Data verification will be performed on analytical data sets to ensure and document that the  
19 reported results reflect what was actually done. The criteria for verification include, but are not  
20 limited to, review for completeness (i.e., all samples were analyzed as requested), use of the  
21 correct analytical method/procedure, transcription errors, correct application of dilution factors,  
22 appropriate reporting of dry weight versus wet weight, and correct application of conversion  
23 factors. Laboratory personnel may perform data verification.

24 Data validation will be performed on analytical data sets to ensure that the data quality goals  
25 established during the planning phase have been achieved. As recommended in EPA guidance  
26 (Bleyler 1988a, *Laboratory Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Inorganics*  
27 *Analyses*; Bleyler 1988b, *Laboratory Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating*  
28 *Organics Analyses*), the criteria for data validation are based on a graded approach. Fluor  
29 Hanford has defined five levels of validation, A – E. Level A is the lowest level and is the same  
30 as verification. Level E is a 100 percent review of all data (e.g., calibration data; calculations of  
31 representative samples from the dataset). Validation will be performed to Level C.

32 Level C validation includes a review of the QC data and specifically requires verification of  
33 deliverables and requested versus reported analyses and qualification of the results based on  
34 analytical holding times; method blank results; matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate; surrogate  
35 recoveries; duplicates; and analytical method blanks. Level C validation will be performed for  
36 up to 5 percent of the data by matrix and analyte group. Analyte group refers to categories, such  
37 as radionuclides, volatile chemicals, semivolatiles, polychlorinated biphenyls, metals, and  
38 anions. The goal is to cover the various analyte groups and matrices during the validation.

1 No validation of physical data and/or field-screening results will be performed. However, field  
2 QA/QC (Section A2.2) will be reviewed to ensure that the data are useable.

### 3 **A2.4.2 Validation and Verification Methods**

4 Validation activities will be based on EPA functional guidelines (Bleyler 1988a; Bleyler 1988b).  
5 Data validation may be performed by the analytical laboratory, Sample and Data Management,  
6 and/or by a party independent of both the data collector and the data user. Only the passive  
7 organic vapor samplers will result in analytical data. However, since the passive organic vapor  
8 sampling results are used primarily for screening purposes, validation and verification is not  
9 warranted. Validation and verification may be applicable for future/follow-on sampling. All  
10 other characterization activities involve qualitative reconnaissance-level surveys that will not  
11 require data verification and verification.

12 When outliers or questionable results are identified, additional data validation will be performed.  
13 The additional validation will be performed for up to 5 percent of the statistical outliers and/or  
14 questionable data. The additional validation will begin with Level C and may increase to  
15 Levels D and E as needed to ensure that the data are useable. Note that Level C validation is a  
16 review of the QC data, while Levels D and E include review of calibration data and calculations  
17 of representative samples from the dataset. Data validation will be documented in data  
18 validation reports, which will be provided to the Sample and Data Management organization and  
19 in the DQA report (see Section A2.4.3). The Sample and Data Management organization is  
20 responsible for distributing the data validation report to the Waste Site Remediation Task Lead  
21 and to others as necessary. The determination of data usability will be documented in the DQA.

### 22 **A2.4.3 Reconciliation with User Requirements**

23 Following data verification and validation, the data need to be evaluated to determine if they  
24 answer the original questions asked (e.g., DQOs). The DQA process compares completed  
25 field-sampling activities to those proposed in corresponding sampling documents and provides  
26 an evaluation of the resulting data. Only the passive organic vapor samplers will result in  
27 analytical data. All other characterization activities involve qualitative reconnaissance-level  
28 surveys that will not require data verification and verification. The purpose of the data  
29 evaluation is to determine if quantitative data are of the correct type and are of adequate quality  
30 and quantity to meet the project DQOs. The Waste Site Remediation Task Lead is responsible  
31 for ensuring that a DQA is performed. The results of the DQA will be reported to the Waste Site  
32 Remediation Task Lead and will be used in interpreting the data and determining if the  
33 objectives of this activity have been met.

1 The EPA DQA process, EPA/240/B-06/002, *Data Quality Assessment: A Reviewers Guide*,  
2 EPA QA/G-9R, and EPA/240/B-06/003, *Data Quality Assessment: Statistical Tools for*  
3 *Practitioners*, EPA QA/G-9S, identifies five steps for evaluating data generated from this  
4 project, as summarized below.

5 **Step 1. Review DQOs and Sampling Design.** This step requires a comprehensive review of  
6 the sampling and analytical requirements outlined in the project-specific DQO workbook and  
7 SAP.

8 **Step 2. Conduct a Preliminary Data Review.** In this step, a comparison is made between the  
9 actual QA/QC achieved (e.g., detection limits, precision, accuracy) and the requirements  
10 determined during the DQO. Any significant deviations will be documented. Basic statistics  
11 will be calculated from the analytical data at this point, as appropriate to the data set, including  
12 an evaluation of the distribution of the data and in accordance with the DQOs.

13 **Step 3. Select the Statistical Test.** Using the data evaluated in Step 2, an appropriate statistical  
14 hypothesis test is selected and justified.

15 **Step 4. Verify the Assumptions.** In this step, the validity of the data analyses is assessed by  
16 determining if the data support the underlying assumptions necessary for the analyses or if the  
17 data set must be modified (e.g., transposed, augmented with additional data) before further  
18 analysis. If one or more assumptions are questioned, Step 3 is repeated.

19 **Step 5. Draw Conclusions from the Data.** The statistical test is applied in this step, and the  
20 results either reject the null hypothesis or fail to reject the null hypothesis. If the latter is true,  
21 the data should be analyzed further. If the null hypothesis is rejected, the overall performance of  
22 the sampling design should be evaluated by forming a statistical power calculation to assess the  
23 adequacy of the sampling design.

24

## A3.0 FIELD-SAMPLING PLAN

The FSP describes the field activities for collection of field observations, measurements, and samples for laboratory analysis. This FSP provides more detailed information on sampling methods, field-screening technologies, and waste management activities. All of the data-collection techniques may not be required at each landfill. Tables in this chapter provide the site-specific sample locations. Some locations in the 200-SW-2 OU landfills may not be accessible for sampling due to access restrictions (e.g., no-walk/no-drive zones), or conflicts with other related field operations.

The objective and purpose of the data collection and this FSP are identified in this RI/FS work plan. Applicable sampling and data-collection techniques are identified in the following sections of this FSP.

### A3.1 DATA-COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

As discussed in Section A2.2, a variety of sample methods and measurements may be applicable to data-collection activities identified for Phase I-B characterization. The data needs identified through the DQO require sampling and surveys, including the following:

- Passive soil vapor
- Surface geophysics
- Logging of existing wells
- Direct pushes
- Radiological surveys
- Visual inspections.

This SAP includes a range of data-collection techniques that will be used to obtain further characterization information. Data-collection techniques used will be both intrusive (i.e., penetrate the vadose zone deeper than 0.30 m [1 ft]) and nonintrusive. The following subsections present intrusive and nonintrusive techniques that will be used under this SAP.

#### A3.1.1 Nonintrusive Data-Collection Techniques

Nonintrusive techniques consist of a broad range of geophysical, radiological, and field-screening applications that can provide data on radionuclides, physical parameters, chemicals, vapors, and other characteristics that add to the understanding of the nature and extent of contamination.

##### A3.1.1.1 Passive Soil-Vapor Surveys

Passive soil-vapor surveys will be used to screen the landfills for the presence of volatile organic compounds. Results will be used to provide a qualitative indication of contamination in the landfills and determine the general location of waste packages that may contain liquid organics that have breached their containment.

1 The utility of passive soil vapor surveys is directly proportional to their accuracy in reflecting  
2 and representing changes in the subsurface concentrations of source compounds. Passive  
3 soil-vapor surveys are collected from the vapor phase emanating from the source. The vapor  
4 phase is merely a fractional trace of the source; therefore, the units used in reporting detection  
5 values from passive soil vapor surveys are smaller than those employed for source compound  
6 concentrations.

7 Possible impacts from the regional carbon tetrachloride plume in the 200 West Area may affect  
8 survey results. However, later phases of intrusive characterization beneath the trench bottoms  
9 are expected to provide data needed to help differentiate between the regional plume and  
10 possible contributions from buried waste in the landfills.

11 Whatever the relative concentration of source and associated soil gas, best results are realized  
12 when the ratio of soil vapor measurements to actual subsurface concentrations remains as close  
13 to constant as possible. It is the reliability and consistency of this ratio, not the particular units of  
14 mass (e.g., nanograms), that determine usefulness. Therefore, follow-on intrusive sampling is  
15 required at points that show relatively high soil-vapor measurements, to obtain corresponding  
16 concentrations of buried contaminants. These values form the basis for approximating the  
17 required ratio. Once the ratio is established, it can be used in conjunction with the soil-vapor  
18 measurements (regardless of the units adopted) to estimate subsurface contaminant  
19 concentrations across the area surveyed. Specific conditions at individual sample points,  
20 including soil porosity and permeability and depth to contamination, can have significant impact  
21 on soil-vapor measurements at those locations.

22 The data can provide information that can be used to focus intrusive sampling and provide a list  
23 of expected compounds.

#### 24 **A3.1.1.1.1 Passive Soil Vapor Samplers**

25 A passive soil-vapor sampler (EMFLUX or GORE-SORBER) consists of a glass vial containing  
26 hydrophobic adsorbent cartridges with a length of wire or string attached to the vial for retrieval.  
27 The sampler is placed in a shallow, vertical hole in the soil. The sampler is covered with soil,  
28 and the location of the sampler is recorded.

29 At the end of the exposure period, the samplers are withdrawn and sent to the appropriate  
30 laboratory for analysis.

#### 31 **A3.1.1.1.2 Sampling Design for Passive Soil Vapor**

32 A two stage sampling design has been developed for this project for the detection of organic  
33 vapors:

- 34 • The Stage 1 passive organic vapor surveys will be performed in the 218-W-3,  
35 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, and 218-W-5 Landfills. Specific locations in these landfills  
36 showed high concentrations (greater than 25 ng/sample) of organic vapors when surveyed  
37 during Phase I-A characterization activities. Additional organic vapor surveys are needed  
38 to focus locations for potential active organic vapor sampling. Passive organic vapor  
39 samplers will be placed in a circular pattern around the point that showed an elevated

1 concentration as a result of the Phase I-A surveys. Nine vapor samplers per Phase I-A  
 2 sample location will be spaced approximately 9.1 m (30 ft) apart in a circular pattern to  
 3 ensure some overlap of vapor detection. The landfills in which Stage 1 surveys will be  
 4 performed, as well as trench numbers, and specific coordinates for sampler placement are  
 5 listed in Table A3-1.

- 6 • The Stage 2 passive organic vapor surveys will be focused on those areas that showed a  
 7 strong metallic signature during geophysical investigations performed as part of Phase I-  
 8 A characterization activities. Passive organic vapor surveys will be used to determine if  
 9 containers of carbon tetrachloride or other organic liquids may have been disposed of in  
 10 these landfills. Carbon tetrachloride and other organic liquids were used in large  
 11 quantities at the Plutonium Finishing Plant and other facilities during their operating  
 12 history. The vapor samplers will be spaced approximately 9.1 m (30 ft) apart in a circular  
 13 array to ensure some overlap of vapor detection. The number of samples per location  
 14 will vary depending on the size and shape of the geophysical signature. The landfills in  
 15 which Stage 2 surveys will be performed, as well as trench numbers, and specific  
 16 coordinates for sampler placement are listed in Table A3-2.

Table A3-1. Stage 1 Passive Soil Vapor Survey Locations. (7 Pages)

Trench Number	Sample Location	WSP West/WSP North (Hanford West/Hanford East)
<i>218-W-3A Landfill</i>		
T04	T04-A-1	576300/147227 (77901/44500)
	T04-A-1a	576291/147227 (77901/44530)
	T04-A-1b	576282/147227 (77901/44560)
	T04-A-1c	576310/147227 (77901/44470)
	T04-A-1d	576319/147227 (77901/44440)
	T04-A-1e	576300/147236 (77931/44500)
	T04-A-1f	576300/147245 (77961/44500)
	T04-A-1g	576300/147217 (77871/44500)
	T04-A-1h	576300/147208 (77841/44500)
T05	T05-A-1	576288/147260 (78010/44540)
	T05-A-1a	576279/147260 (78010/44570)
	T05-A-1b	576270/147260 (78010/44600)
	T05-A-1c	576297/147260 (78010/44510)
	T05-A-1d	576306/147260 (78010/44480)
	T05-A-1e	576288/147269 (78040/44540)
	T05-A-1f	576288/147278 (78070/44540)
	T05-A-1g	576288/147251 (77980/44540)
	T05-A-1h	576288/147241 (77950/44540)

Table A3-1. Stage 1 Passive Soil Vapor Survey Locations. (7 Pages)

Trench Number	Sample Location	WSP West/WSP North (Hanford West/Hanford East)
T12	T12-A-1	576203/147254 (77992/44820)
	T12-A-1a	576194/147254 (77992/44850)
	T12-A-1b	576185/147254 (77992/44880)
	T12-A-1c	576212/147254 (77992/44790)
	T12-A-1d	576221/147254 (77992/44760)
	T12-A-1e	576203/147263 (78022/44820)
	T12-A-1f	576203/147272 (78052/44820)
	T12-A-1g	576203/147245 (77962/44820)
	T12-A-1h	576203/147236 (77932/44820)
T19	T19-A-1	576100/147086 (77443/45160)
	T19-A-1a	576090/147086 (77443/45190)
	T19-A-1b	576081/147086 (77443/45220)
	T19-A-1c	576109/147086 (77443/45130)
	T19-A-1d	576118/147087 (77443/45100)
	T19-A-1e	576100/147096 (77473/45160)
	T19-A-1f	576100/147105 (77503/45160)
	T19-A-1g	576100/147077 (77413/45160)
	T19-A-1h	576100/147068 (77383/45160)
T22	T22-A-1	576063/147235 (77931/45280)
	T22-A-1a	576054/147235 (77931/45310)
	T22-A-1b	576044/147235 (77931/45340)
	T22-A-1c	576072/147235 (77931/45250)
	T22-A-1d	576081/147235 (77931/45220)
	T22-A-1e	576063/147244 (77961/45280)
	T22-A-1f	576063/147253 (77991/45280)
	T22-A-1g	576063/147226 (77901/45280)
	T22-A-1h	576063/147217 (77871/45280)
T24	T24-A-1	576039/147087 (77445/45360)
	T24-A-1a	576030/147087 (77445/45390)
	T24-A-1b	576020/147087 (77445/45420)
	T24-A-1c	576048/147087 (77445/45330)
	T24-A-1d	576057/147087 (77445/45300)
	T24-A-1e	576039/147096 (77475/45360)
	T24-A-1f	576039/147105 (77505/45360)
	T24-A-1g	576039/147078 (77415/45360)
	T24-A-1h	576039/147069 (77385/45360)

Table A3-1. Stage 1 Passive Soil Vapor Survey Locations. (7 Pages)

Trench Number	Sample Location	WSP West/WSP North (Hanford West/Hanford East)
T29	T29-A-1	575978/147126 (77573/45560)
	T29-A-1a	575968/147126 (77573/45590)
	T29-A-1b	575959/147126 (77573/45620)
	T29-A-1c	575987/147126 (77573/45530)
	T29-A-1d	575996/147126 (77573/45500)
	T29-A-1e	575978/147135 (77603/45560)
	T29-A-1f	575978/147144 (77633/45560)
	T29-A-1g	575978/147117 (77543/45560)
	T29-A-1h	575978/147108 (77513/45560)
T31	T31-A-1	575953/147118 (77548/45640)
	T31-A-1a	575944/147118 (77548/45670)
	T31-A-1b	575935/147118 (77548/45700)
	T31-A-1c	575962/147118 (77548/45610)
	T31-A-1d	575972/147118 (77548/45580)
	T31-A-1e	575953/147127 (77578/45640)
	T31-A-1f	575953/147136 (77608/45640)
	T31-A-1g	575953/147109 (77518/45640)
	T31-A-1h	575953/147100 (77488/45640)
T33	T33-A-1	575929/147259 (78012/45720)
	T33-A-1a	575919/147259 (78012/45750)
	T33-A-1b	575910/147259 (78012/45780)
	T33-A-1c	575938/147259 (78012/45690)
	T33-A-1d	575947/147259 (78012/45660)
	T33-A-1e	575929/147269 (78042/45720)
	T33-A-1f	575929/147278 (78072/45720)
	T33-A-1g	575929/147250 (77982/45720)
	T33-A-1h	575929/147241 (77952/45720)
T34	T34-A-1	575916/147265 (78029/45760)
	T34-A-1a	575907/147265 (78029/45790)
	T34-A-1b	575898/147265 (78029/45820)
	T34-A-1c	575925/147265 (78029/45730)
	T34-A-1d	575935/147265 (78029/45700)
	T34-A-1e	575916/147274 (78059/45760)
	T34-A-1f	575916/147283 (78089/45760)
	T34-A-1g	575916/147255 (77999/45760)
	T34-A-1h	575916/147246 (77969/45760)

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table A3-2. Stage 2 Passive Soil Vapor Survey Locations. (3 Pages)

Sample Location	WSP West/WSP North (Hanford West/Hanford East)
<b>218-E-12A</b>	
1	574952/136676 (49010/43287)
2	574952/136699 (49010/43361)
3	574863/136710 (49304/43399)
4	574840/136744 (49378/43510)
5	574814/136751 (49464/43535)
6	574989/136949 (48888/44181)
7	574836/136979 (49388/44281)
8	574836/136994 (49388/44330)
9	574026/136994 (52046/44338)
10	575026/137017 (48764/44406)
<b>218-W-1 and 218-W-2</b>	
1	566152/136048 (77892/41302)
2	566339/136053 (77277/41317)
3	566182/136263 (77792/42007)
4	566302/136300 (77398/42129)
5	566342/136345 (77267/42274)
6	566172/135988 (77827/41105)
7	566260/135978 (77538/41071)
8	566275/136178 (77488/41727)
<b>218-W-1A</b>	
1	567013/137088 (75057/44708)
2	564028/137088 (84852/44732)
3	567013/137100 (75057/44747)
4	567004/137124 (75087/44826)
5	567007/137136 (75077/44865)
6	567097/137157 (74781/44933)
7	567019/137166 (75037/44964)
8	567079/137190 (74840/45042)
9	567115/137181 (74722/45012)
10	567121/137214 (74702/45120)
11	566989/137190 (75135/45043)
12	567001/137208 (75096/45102)
13	567181/137211 (74505/45110)
<b>218-W-2A</b>	
1	566261/136758 (77529/43632)
2	566328/136661 (77309/43311)
3	566428/136658 (76981/43302)
4	566411/136731 (77038/43540)
5	566461/136813 (76873/43811)
6	566393/136868 (77094/43992)
7	566348/136888 (77241/44058)
8	566301/136903 (77397/44107)

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table A3-2. Stage 2 Passive Soil Vapor Survey Locations. (3 Pages)

Sample Location	WSP West/WSP North (Hanford West/Hanford East)
9	566533/136848 (76635/43925)
10	566303/136963 (77388/44304)
11	566545/136906 (76595/44113)
12	566508/136921 (76716/44163)
13	566456/136938 (76888/44221)
14	566418/136953 (77011/44270)
15	566376/136966 (77150/44312)
16	566328/136986 (77306/44378)
17	566578/136923 (76486/44171)
18	566583/136943 (76470/44236)
19	566653/136943 (76240/44236)
<b>218-W-3</b>	
1	566112/136690 (78019/43408)
2	566103/136713 (78046/43484)
3	566118/136702 (77999/43447)
4	566179/136717 (77797/43496)
5	566154/136791 (77878/43740)
6	566134/136807 (77944/43792)
7	566196/136802 (77743/43777)
8	566214/136797 (77681/43759)
9	566214/136800 (77681/43769)
10	566308/136813 (77375/43813)
11	566235/136800 (77612/43769)
12	566235/136750 (77613/43606)
<b>218-W-11</b>	
1	566170/136328 (77829/42222)
2	566184/136330 (77785/42227)
3	566203/136328 (77721/42222)
4	566248/136333 (77573/42236)

WSP = Washington State Plane.

### 1 A3.1.1.1.3 Positional Surveying

2 All sampling locations established during this sampling activity will be surveyed after the  
3 sampling and decommissioning activities are completed. Surveys will be performed according  
4 to approved procedures. Data will be recorded in the *North American Vertical Datum of 1988*  
5 (NAVD88) and the Washington State Plane (South Zone) *North American Datum of 1983*  
6 (NAD83), with the 1991 adjustment for horizontal coordinates. All survey data will be recorded  
7 in meters and feet.

### 8 A3.1.1.2 Surface Geophysical Surveys

9 The geophysical techniques used in previous investigations at the 200-SW-2 OU landfills in  
10 2005 and 2006 were the GPR, EMI, and TMF methods. These methods were selected because  
11 they are cost-effective and nonintrusive and have been successful in similar waste  
12 characterization projects conducted at the Hanford Site. These same methods may be used for  
13 the scope addressed in this SAP; however, other methods also may be considered for application.  
14 Brief descriptions of the GPR, electromagnetic induction, and TMF methods are provided in the  
15 following subsections.

16 Landfills selected for surface geophysical investigations are listed in Table A3-3. This table also  
17 lists number of trenches (if known), as well as total surface area of the landfill to be surveyed.  
18 The total surface area may be reduced if no-walk or no-drive zones are present in these landfills  
19 that would limit access by workers and survey equipment.

Table A3-3. Geophysical Survey Locations.

Landfill	Length in m (ft) <sup>a</sup>	Width in m (ft)	Number of Trenches	Estimated Area in ha (acres)
218-E-2	165 (541)	134 (441)	b	0.20 (0.51)
218-E-4	238 (780)	61 (200)	b	1.38 (3.4)
218-E-9	130 (427)	30 (100)	b	0.39 (0.96)
218-W-4A	320 (1,050)	267 (875)	30	7 (18)
<b>Total</b>				9 (23)

<sup>a</sup>All dimensions are approximate.

<sup>b</sup>No information is available to determine the number of trenches for these sites.

### 20 A3.1.1.2.1 Frequency-Domain Electromagnetic Induction

21 The Geonics EM31 Terrain Conductivity Meter<sup>3</sup> is a frequency-domain EMI instrument that is  
22 designed to measure the apparent electrical conductivity of soil and to detect ferrous and  
23 nonferrous metal objects to a depth of approximately 3 to 4 m (10 to 12 ft) (in ideal situations).  
24 The EM31 consists of a transmitter coil and receiver coil at either end of a 4 m (12 ft) long

<sup>3</sup> Geonics EM31 is a trademark of Geonics Limited, Mississauga, Ontario, Canada.

1 boom. The transmitter generates pulses of electromagnetic energy (the primary field) at regular  
2 intervals, which are transmitted into the ground where they induce eddy currents in electrically  
3 conductive material (soil and/or metal objects). The induced eddy currents generate their own  
4 electromagnetic field (the secondary field), which transmits back toward the instrument. The  
5 receiver coil on the EM31 measures and records the strength of the secondary field both in phase  
6 and out of phase with the primary field transmitter. The in-phase component of the measurement  
7 is most strongly influenced by the presence of metallic objects in the subsurface, while the  
8 out-of-phase component is directly related to the electrical conductivity of the surrounding soil.

9 The normal mode of operation is to mark out regularly spaced data-collection lines and then  
10 walk down the lines with the instrument held at hip height, collecting data at regularly spaced  
11 intervals. Both the in-phase and the out-of-phase (terrain conductivity) measurements are  
12 collected and plotted for analysis. The instrument is most useful for locating large  
13 concentrations of buried metallic objects and for detecting subtle shifts in background soil  
14 properties. While the EM31 is capable of detecting drum-size metallic objects to a depth of 3 to  
15 4 m (10 to 12 ft) in ideal situations, the lateral resolution of the position of detected objects is on  
16 the order of +/-1 m.

17 Conditions that limit the detection capability of the EM31 include high-background soil  
18 conductivities and proximity to cultural interference such as buildings and fences. High soil  
19 conductivities have the effect of limiting the depth of investigation of the instrument, because  
20 they significantly attenuate the propagation of the primary and secondary fields. This same  
21 phenomenon limits GPR depth of investigation in areas of high soil conductivity. Large,  
22 metallic surface features effectively can skew the results of the data. Sites with a significant  
23 number of buried utilities also may generate data that are difficult to interpret.

#### 24 **A3.1.1.2.2 Total Magnetic Field/Vertical Gradient**

25 A magnetometer measures the intensity of the earth's magnetic field. The presence of ferrous  
26 material, man-made or natural, creates local variations in the strength of the earth's overall  
27 magnetic field. These variations are proportional to several factors, including the mass of the  
28 ferrous material and the distance between the ferrous material and the detector. The distance is  
29 significant, because it changes the response by a factor of one over the distance cubed. The  
30 primary measurement that will be taken is the TMF intensity. The TMF, as the name implies, is  
31 a summation of all of the magnetic variables around the sensor. When the ferromagnetic sources  
32 are close to the detector, large variations in the TMF can occur. Therefore, it often is difficult to  
33 differentiate individual anomalies based on the TMF alone.

34 To improve the resolution of a magnetic survey, the magnetic gradient also can be measured.  
35 This is accomplished by making two simultaneous TMF measurements at each data point, using  
36 two sensors separated by a fixed vertical distance. The difference between the two  
37 measurements is the vertical magnetic gradient (referred to in this document as the magnetic  
38 gradient). The response to ferrous material falls off at a rate of one over the distance to the  
39 fourth power. Because of this, the magnetic gradient measurement should help differentiate  
40 individual anomalies and waste boundaries better than the TMF alone. Both the TMF and  
41 gradient values typically are displayed on contour maps for analysis.

### 1 **A3.1.1.2.3 Ground-Penetrating Radar**

2 The GPR system uses a transducer to transmit electromagnetic energy into the ground.  
3 Interfaces in the ground, defined by contrasts in dielectric constants, magnetic susceptibility, and,  
4 to some extent, electrical conductivity, reflect the transmitted energy. The GPR system then  
5 measures the travel time between transmitted pulses and the arrival of reflected energy. Buried  
6 objects (such as pipes, barrels, foundations, wires) can cause all or a portion of the transmitted  
7 energy to be reflected back toward a receiving antenna. Geologic features such as cross-bedding,  
8 lateral and vertical changes in soil properties, and rock interfaces also can cause reflections of a  
9 portion of the electromagnetic energy.

10 The velocity of the electromagnetic energy primarily is controlled by the dielectric constant and  
11 magnetic susceptibility of the medium. For calculating depth, values of electromagnetic  
12 velocities are determined by measurement, experience in an area, ties to known buried reflectors,  
13 and knowledge of the subsurface medium.

14 The effective depth of investigation is a function of the transmitted power, receiver sensitivity,  
15 frequency of the antenna, and attenuation of the transmitted energy from the geologic medium.  
16 The maximum depth of investigation may vary significantly as a result of changing soil  
17 conditions. High attenuation and, therefore, smaller penetration depths of the electromagnetic  
18 energy typically occur where the soil conductivity is elevated and/or in areas with numerous  
19 reflective interfaces. Depth of investigation also is affected by highly conductive material, such  
20 as metal drums or pipes, that essentially reflects all of the energy. The method cannot "see"  
21 directly below areas of highly reflective material, because all of the energy is reflected.

22 The reflected energy provides the means for mapping the subsurface features of interest, whether  
23 synthetic or geologic.

### 24 **A3.1.1.2.4 Survey Grid Parameters**

25 Civil survey coordinates shown on the site drawings will be used to develop base grids at each  
26 site. Base grids will be created on centers of a chosen distance throughout the individual sites.  
27 The coordinates of the nodes will be supplied to Fluor Hanford civil survey personnel, who will  
28 use Global Position System instrumentation to stake the grids in the field. Personnel then will  
29 mark data collection lines at set intervals between the nodes.

30 The geophysical data plots will be presented in local grid coordinates. The local grids generally  
31 are established by assigning, to the southwestern-most grid node, the arbitrary location of  
32 North 100, East 100 (N100/E100). Positions then can be measured from this position. In some  
33 instances, the grids may be expanded after establishment and therefore may have coordinates less  
34 than N100/E100. The interpretation drawings for each site will show Washington State Plane  
35 coordinates (in meters) for selected grid nodes, allowing a tie between them and the local  
36 grid coordinates.

### 1 **A3.1.1.2.5 Sampling Design for Surface Geophysical Surveys**

2 Surface geophysical investigations will be performed as reconnaissance-type surveys that are  
3 aimed at defining the following characteristics:

- 4 • Locations of landfill trench edges, ends, and centerlines
- 5 • Locations of buried waste or other significant features/anomalies
- 6 • Presence and extent of voids within a given trench
- 7 • Definition of most likely waste container type (e.g., wood, metal boxes, metal drums,  
8 cardboard, waste item)
- 9 • Differentiation between different types of waste containers in a given trench
- 10 • Depth of soil cover above waste items
- 11 • Depth to trench bottom (where possible).

12 The depth of investigation for the geophysical instruments used in this work is limited to  
13 approximately 3 to 4 m (10 to 12 ft). Geophysical survey locations are indicated in Table A3-3.  
14 Unless otherwise noted, the entire landfill will be surveyed using geophysical techniques.

### 15 **A3.1.1.3 Visual Inspections and Historical Information Reviews for Unused Portions of** 16 **Landfills**

17 Portions of three of the RCRA TSD-unit landfills within the 200-SW-2 OU never have received  
18 buried waste. Annexes of the 218-W-4C and 218-E-10 Landfills, as well as unused portions of  
19 the 218-E-12B Landfill, were intended to be used for future disposal of waste; however, no  
20 waste disposals are known to have taken place in these areas. In addition, the 218-W-6 Landfill  
21 is not known to have received waste. Although this landfill is not in the scope of this  
22 RI/FS work plan, coordination with the 200-MG-1 OU may be performed to investigate this  
23 landfill during the same timeframe that the other areas are investigated. The 200-SW-2 and  
24 200-MG-1 OUs will evaluate and take advantage of efficiencies that could be realized from  
25 coordination of these activities.

26 Visual inspection of unused portions and annexes of landfills will be performed during site  
27 walkdowns, coupled with review of aerial photographs, to locate disturbed soil within these  
28 areas. Areas that appear to be disturbed may be surveyed using geophysical techniques and/or  
29 radiological surveys to ensure that no waste is buried in these areas. Other historical information  
30 also may be reviewed to determine if waste has been buried at these sites.

31 After field surveys are completed, these areas of unused landfills will be administratively  
32 reclassified in the *Waste Information Data System* database. Those steps required to reclassify  
33 these areas are described in Chapter 5.0 of the RI/FS work plan.

### 1 **A3.1.2 Intrusive Data-Collection Techniques**

2 Intrusive characterization techniques to be used during Phase I-B consist of geophysical logging  
3 of existing monitoring wells, direct-pushes within the boundaries of the landfills, and remote  
4 camera and radiological surveys of potentially unused caissons. These techniques can provide  
5 data on radionuclides, physical parameters, chemicals, and other characteristics that add to the  
6 understanding of the nature and extent of contamination. The following subsections describe the  
7 techniques to be used in Phase I-B.

#### 8 **A3.1.2.1 Downhole Geophysical Logging**

9 Logging data from existing monitoring wells will be reviewed for applicability to 200-SW-2 OU  
10 landfills. Information regarding soil moisture content with depth, site stratigraphy, and the  
11 presence of radionuclides or other contaminants is of particular interest in support of efforts to  
12 determine the nature and extent of contamination. Phase I-B will provide preliminary  
13 information and support site investigation scoping for subsequent intrusive phases focused on  
14 determining the nature and extent of contamination. At least one upgradient and one  
15 downgradient monitoring well will be logged with a high-resolution spectral gamma-ray logging  
16 system to provide continuous vertical logs of gamma-emitting radionuclides, and with a neutron  
17 moisture-logging system to identify moisture changes (additional wells may be logged  
18 depending on the results from the upgradient and downgradient wells). The spectral gamma  
19 logging of existing wells in the vicinity of a landfill can be a cost-effective method of providing  
20 data on the vertical and lateral distribution of gamma-emitting radionuclides. The spectral  
21 gamma logging system uses instrumentation to identify and quantify gamma-emitting  
22 radionuclides in wells as a function of depth.

23 The spectral gamma logging system uses laboratory-grade high-purity germanium detectors or  
24 sodium iodide detectors to collect gamma energy spectra at discrete depth increments.  
25 Radionuclide identification and assay are based on characteristic gamma emissions associated  
26 with decay. At each depth increment, the gamma energy spectrum is analyzed to detect peaks,  
27 and to determine net count rate, counting error, and minimum detectable activity for each peak.  
28 The energy resolution capability of the detector varies between approximately 2 and 4 keV,  
29 depending on energy level and background activity. Net counts from individual gamma energy  
30 peaks are processed with the detector calibration function, dead time correction, casing  
31 correction, and water correction to determine the bulk concentration, analytical error, and  
32 minimum detectable level. All quantities are reported in picocuries per gram. For selected  
33 radionuclides, specific regions of interest can be "forced" to determine the minimum detectable  
34 activity even when no peak is detected. Thus, the minimum detectable activity and analytical  
35 error are calculated on a point-by-point basis and shown on the log plot. The minimum  
36 detectable activity depends on the intensity (yield) of the characteristic gamma ray, detector  
37 efficiency, casing thickness, and background activity level.

38 A logging system is defined as a unique combination of downhole sonde (detector) and logging  
39 system (cable, winch, power supply, control system, and data acquisition system). The spectral  
40 gamma logging system and the neutron moisture logging system are calibrated on an annual  
41 basis, or after any significant repairs or modifications to either the sonde or the logging system.  
42 Calibration measurements are made at the Hanford Calibration Facility, located near the central

1 weather station, just east of the Hanford Site 200 West Area. Each calibration is documented  
2 with a calibration certificate.

3 The neutron-moisture logging system, which measures moisture, employs a weak americium  
4 beryllium neutron source and neutron detector to provide a direct reading of hydrogen atom  
5 distribution in the soil surrounding the borehole. This detector will be used to measure  
6 continuous vertical moisture in the vadose zone. The spectral gamma logs will be used to aid in  
7 determining the vertical distribution of radionuclides in the vadose zone beneath the landfills and  
8 to aid in geological interpretation of subsurface stratigraphy.

9 The spectral gamma logging equipment calibration is conducted annually, and the data acquired  
10 during the calibrations are used to derive factors that convert measured peak-area count rate to  
11 radionuclide concentrations in picocuries per gram. Corrections are applied to the data to  
12 compensate for the gamma ray attenuation by the casing.

#### 13 **A3.1.2.1.1 Sampling Design for Geophysical Logging of Existing Wells**

14 Table A3-4 lists wells within 50 m (164 ft) of the 24 landfills in the scope of this SAP that are  
15 currently available for logging. Following review of existing logging data and determination of  
16 applicability and utility in determining site stratigraphy, soil moisture content, and presence of  
17 contamination, the logging techniques listed in the section above will be used to log at least one  
18 upgradient and one downgradient well if no information exists.

19 Geophysical logging data will be collected in HEIS; a summary report also will be prepared by  
20 the logging contractor to document the logging activity and results. The logging summary  
21 reports will be documented in the field summary report so they can be referenced in the RI report  
22 and other documents as necessary.

#### 23 **A3.1.2.2 Direct-Push Techniques and Logging**

24 Direct-push techniques (DPT) use a pushing method, such as a diesel hammer, hydraulic  
25 hammer, cone penetrometer, or GeoProbe,<sup>4</sup> to penetrate the vadose zone to obtain downhole  
26 geophysical data (e.g., small-diameter spectral gamma, moisture). These methods generally are  
27 limited in the depth of penetration and in sample volume as compared to borehole drilling; they  
28 generally are less expensive than drilling, however. In general, these methods do not generate  
29 drill cuttings, thereby minimizing personnel exposure to contamination and minimizing the  
30 volume of investigation-derived waste.

31 Direct-push holes will be installed to obtain spectral gamma, neutron moisture, and/or passive  
32 neutron logs as discussed in the following section. Direct-push holes are decommissioned in the  
33 same manner as standard boreholes, in accordance with appropriate state regulations. Maximum  
34 depth for these techniques is near 33 m (100 ft), based on experience at the Hanford Site.

---

<sup>4</sup> GeoProbe is a registered trademark of Kejr, Inc., Salina, Kansas.

Table A3-4. Existing Wells Available for Logging. (4 Pages)

Well Name	Well Purpose	Date Last Sampled	Drill Date	Drill Depth (ft)	Hanford Easting Coordinate	Hanford Northing Coordinate	Landfill within 50 m
B2485	Unclassified	Unknown	30-Apr-96	99	574431.043	136501.929	216-C-9
B2484	Unclassified	Unknown	30-Apr-96	99	574393.288	136495.588	218-C-9
B2486	Unclassified	Unknown	30-Apr-96	102	574393.488	136504.880	218-C-9
B2487	Unclassified	Unknown	30-Apr-96	104	574430.167	136492.918	218-C-9
299-E28-26	Groundwater	22-Dec-06	6-Nov-87	329	572941.553	137024.016	218-E-10
299-E28-27	Groundwater	22-Dec-06	29-Sep-87	302	573226.784	137070.063	218-E-10
299-E28-28	Groundwater	18-Jan-07	17-Apr-90	296	572804.351	137108.259	218-E-10
299-E32-10	Groundwater	19-Dec-06	15-Apr-92	246	572951.130	137741.690	218-E-10
299-E32-2	Groundwater	19-Dec-06	30-Sep-87	289	572648.020	137467.509	218-E-10
299-E32-3	Groundwater	10-Jan-07	30-Sep-87	304	572600.614	137383.996	218-E-10
299-E32-4	Groundwater	3-Jan-07	30-Sep-87	311	572603.743	137187.218	218-E-10
299-E32-5	Groundwater	19-Dec-06	9-Nov-89	294	572599.697	137285.125	218-E-10
299-E32-6	Groundwater	19-Dec-06	1-Aug-91	279	572600.400	137515.100	218-E-10
299-E32-7	Groundwater	3-Jan-07	26-Jul-91	274	572600.380	137647.050	218-E-10
299-E32-8	Groundwater	10-Jan-07	10-Jun-91	257	572663.390	137741.470	218-E-10
299-E32-9	Groundwater	4-Jan-07	12-Jul-91	255	572795.110	137741.690	218-E-10
299-E33-10	Groundwater	12-May-03	30-Apr-55	290	573255.504	137258.189	218-E-10
299-E33-28	Groundwater	10-Jan-07	15-Oct-87	278	573226.365	137375.019	218-E-10
299-E33-29	Groundwater	10-Jan-07	30-Sep-87	291	573227.858	137231.193	218-E-10
299-E33-30	Groundwater	21-Dec-06	30-Sep-87	280	572923.796	137467.779	218-E-10
299-E33-34	Groundwater	21-Dec-06	23-Apr-90	240	573104.458	137740.427	218-E-10
299-E33-35	Groundwater	21-Dec-06	17-Apr-90	250	573220.798	137605.098	218-E-10
299-E27-109	Vadose	Unknown	30-Apr-75	100	575124.874	136612.062	218-E-12A
299-E27-124	Vadose	Unknown	31-Mar-77	60	575108.300	136635.100	218-E-12A
299-E27-15	Groundwater	22-Dec-06	3-Oct-89	263	575095.256	136630.359	218-E-12A
299-E27-10	Groundwater	18-Jan-07	19-Aug-87	240	575100.298	137052.481	218-E-12B

A3-18

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table A3-4. Existing Wells Available for Logging. (4 Pages)

Well Name	Well Purpose	Date Last Sampled	Drill Date	Drill Depth (ft)	Hanford Easting Coordinate	Hanford Northing Coordinate	Landfill within 50 m
299-E27-11	Groundwater	30-Oct-06	18-Oct-89	265	574652.930	137062.736	218-E-12B
299-E27-17	Groundwater	1-Nov-06	11-Nov-91	246	574547.310	137122.010	218-E-12B
299-E27-8	Groundwater	1-Nov-06	30-Sep-87	257	574759.080	137044.178	218-E-12B
299-E27-9	Groundwater	1-Nov-06	31-Aug-87	245	574917.649	137040.904	218-E-12B
299-E34-10	Groundwater	7-Nov-06	29-Oct-91	249	574284.400	137224.570	218-E-12B
299-E34-12	Groundwater	1-Nov-06	15-Apr-92	248	574411.004	137168.544	218-E-12B
299-E34-2	Groundwater	7-Nov-06	30-Sep-87	242	574634.810	137220.694	218-E-12B
299-E34-5	Groundwater	11-Apr-05	15-Aug-87	192	574643.809	137743.332	218-E-12B
299-E34-7	Groundwater	11-Aug-05	17-Oct-89	206	575274.184	137357.745	218-E-12B
299-E34-8	Groundwater	1-Nov-06	20-Apr-90	260	574206.438	137249.622	218-E-12B
299-E34-9	Groundwater	7-Nov-06	5-Nov-91	235	574186.020	137429.820	218-E-12B
299-E35-51	Vadose	Unknown	N/A	#N/A	575088.700	137069.300	218-E-12B
299-W11-18	Groundwater	17-Aug-06	1-Mar-67	300	567181.916	137161.484	218-W-1A
299-W11-31	Groundwater	17-Feb-99	25-Feb-92	267	567221.580	137235.280	218-W-1A, 218-W-6
299-W6-4	Groundwater	24-Feb-00	26-Nov-91	258	567132.250	137290.490	218-W-1A, 218-W-6
299-W15-49	Groundwater	28-Nov-06	1-Nov-04	435	566307.200	135972.910	218-W-2, 218-W-4B
299-W10-179	Vadose	Unknown	31-Aug-78	23	566242.787	136999.124	218-W-2A, 218-W-3A
299-W10-19	Groundwater	6-Sep-05	24-Jul-92	238	566346.190	137037.140	218-W-2A, 218-W-3A
299-W10-21	Groundwater	19-Sep-05	27-Aug-93	232	566583.991	137154.721	218-W-2A, 218-W-3AE
299-W10-20	Groundwater	16-Mar-06	18-Nov-93	251	566249.695	136866.607	218-W-3, 218-W-3A, 218-W-2A
299-W7-11	Groundwater	22-Jan-02	24-May-91	235	566186.200	137636.000	218-W-3A
299-W7-2	Groundwater	19-Nov-97	30-Sep-87	236	566302.803	137638.502	218-W-3A
299-W7-3	Groundwater	26-Oct-06	23-Nov-87	477	566292.031	137638.641	218-W-3A
299-W10-31	Groundwater	3-Oct-06	20-Apr-06	279	566266.440	136968.340	218-W-3A, 218-W-2A
299-W10-29	Groundwater	3-Oct-06	1-Mar-06	287	566082.980	136828.740	218-W-3A, 218-W-3, 218-W-5

A3-19

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table A3-4. Existing Wells Available for Logging. (4 Pages)

Well Name	Well Purpose	Date Last Sampled	Drill Date	Drill Depth (ft)	Hanford Easting Coordinate	Hanford Northing Coordinate	Landfill within 50 m
299-W7-4	Groundwater	26-Oct-06	19-Nov-87	235	566408.771	137308.243	218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE
299-W7-12	Groundwater	23-Sep-05	28-May-91	245	566040.800	137636.300	218-W-3A, 218-W-5
299-W7-5	Groundwater	17-Mar-05	19-Nov-87	229	566476.026	137635.688	218-W-3AE
299-W7-6	Groundwater	29-Jan-03	2-Nov-87	243	566658.078	137636.314	218-W-3AE
299-W7-7	Groundwater	9-Sep-03	27-Nov-89	231	566566.749	137636.075	218-W-3AE
299-W15-2	Groundwater	23-Aug-06	12-Aug-54	261	566093.762	136336.237	218-W-4A
299-W15-224	Groundwater	22-Jan-07	8-Feb-06	274	566307.890	135926.080	218-W-4B
299-W15-207	Vadose	Unknown	31-Aug-78	27	566200.578	135874.550	218-W-4B
299-W15-83	Groundwater	22-Jan-07	9-Aug-05	278	566304.520	135826.240	218-W-4B
299-W15-15	Groundwater	22-Jan-07	2-Sep-87	255	566088.805	135751.493	218-W-4B, 218-W-4C
299-W15-30	Groundwater	31-Jan-07	5-May-95	268	566304.617	135748.936	218-W-4B, 218-W-4C
244-W15-1	Soil Tube	30-Mar-04	4-Nov-02	35	566252.657	135662.527	218-W-4C
244-W15-2	Soil Tube	30-Mar-04	4-Nov-02	10	566252.200	135662.527	218-W-4C
244-W15-3	Soil Tube	3-Jun-04	4-Nov-02	32	566305.250	135674.346	218-W-4C
299-W15-14	Groundwater	27-Sep-05	15-Dec-76	581	566093.439	135648.274	218-W-4C
299-W15-152	Groundwater	29-Jan-07	15-Sep-05	358	566309.400	135550.000	218-W-4C
299-W15-16	Groundwater	29-Sep-05	10-Sep-87	244	566307.006	135733.625	218-W-4C
299-W15-17	Groundwater	31-Jan-07	28-Oct-87	450	566306.891	135718.958	218-W-4C
299-W15-94	Groundwater	29-Jan-07	19-Sep-05	278	566307.580	135640.340	218-W-4C
299-W18-157	Soil Tube	30-Aug-06	31-Aug-76	110	566357.809	135368.180	218-W-4C
299-W18-21	Groundwater	22-Jan-07	29-Jul-87	227	566097.700	134978.692	218-W-4C
299-W18-22	Groundwater	26-Jan-07	25-Sep-87	455	566088.632	134990.157	218-W-4C
299-W18-23	Groundwater	22-Aug-06	1-Jul-87	255	566084.533	135342.438	218-W-4C
299-W18-24	Groundwater	18-Feb-03	10-Aug-87	240	566370.843	135346.316	218-W-4C
299-W18-247	Soil Tube	30-Jan-07	6-May-92	227	566503.137	135231.658	218-W-4C
299-W18-27	Groundwater	15-Jan-03	7-May-91	239	566090.189	135226.541	218-W-4C

Table A3-4. Existing Wells Available for Logging. (4 Pages)

Well Name	Well Purpose	Date Last Sampled	Drill Date	Drill Depth (ft)	Hanford Easting Coordinate	Hanford Northing Coordinate	Landfill within 50 m
299-W18-28	Groundwater	14-Jul-98	9-May-91	230	566092.569	135106.788	218-W-4C
299-W18-3	Groundwater	17-Dec-90	15-Jan-59	450	566212.102	135529.497	218-W-4C
299-W18-32	Groundwater	20-Jan-99	29-Jul-92	225	566515.584	134975.641	218-W-4C
CPT-10	Soil Tube	19-Dec-06	N/A	107	566354.000	135334.000	218-W-4C
CPT-34	Soil Tube	26-Sep-06	14-May-96	86	566375.560	135288.030	218-W-4C
299-W10-13	Groundwater	12-Mar-02	25-Sep-87	250	566027.407	136606.806	218-W-5
299-W10-14	Groundwater	3-Oct-06	18-Nov-87	462	566017.194	136608.895	218-W-5
299-W7-1	Groundwater	9-Sep-03	30-Jul-87	245	565932.047	137647.125	218-W-5
299-W7-9	Groundwater	29-Jan-03	11-Apr-90	252	565844.438	137646.402	218-W-5
299-W8-1	Groundwater	17-Nov-06	23-Jul-87	271	565749.422	137646.639	218-W-5
299-W9-1	Groundwater	4-Apr-00	22-Oct-87	295	565657.655	137023.769	218-W-5
299-W10-30	Groundwater	3-Oct-06	14-Mar-06	283	566082.780	136739.330	218-W-5, 218-W-3
299-W6-1	Groundwater	6-Jun-97	7-Aug-57	476	567214.128	137510.135	218-W-6
299-W6-10	Groundwater	1-Sep-05	13-Feb-92	278	567413.340	137453.050	218-W-6
299-W6-11	Groundwater	10-Apr-06	21-May-92	280	567162.516	137634.825	218-W-6
299-W6-12	Groundwater	10-Apr-06	14-Apr-92	259	566915.534	137635.159	218-W-6
299-W6-6	Groundwater	10-Apr-06	24-Oct-91	472	567318.740	137638.720	218-W-6
299-W6-7	Groundwater	4-Feb-03	17-Jul-91	276	567311.300	137638.800	218-W-6
299-W6-3	Groundwater	17-Jul-02	15-Oct-91	441	567118.180	137299.130	218-W-6, 218-W-1A
299-W6-9	Groundwater	18-Aug-00	22-Feb-92	253	567031.610	137363.120	218-W-6, 218-W-1A
299-W7-10	Groundwater	18-Apr-00	17-Apr-90	244	566858.212	137457.533	218-W-6, 218-W-3AE
299-W7-8	Groundwater	13-Mar-02	13-Dec-89	241	566761.393	137636.665	218-W-6, 218-W-3AE

N/A = not applicable.

1 **A3.1.2.2.1 Sampling Design for Direct-Push Techniques**

2 The DPT will be used in the centers of each of the 24 landfills. The pushes will be located at the  
 3 coordinates listed in Table A3-5. Pushes will be placed in areas between trenches, so that the  
 4 buried waste is not penetrated. Logging, as described in Section A3.1.1.3, will be performed  
 5 within these pushes.

Table A3-5. Direct-Push Locations. (2 Pages)

Landfill	Hanford Northing Coordinate	Hanford Easting Coordinate
<i>Landfill Centroids</i>		
218-C-9	136474.3	574615.3
218-E-1	135574.9	574754.7
218-E-10	137267.6	572944.8
218-E-12A	136814.3	574935.1
218-E-12B	137197.1	574926.5
218-E-2	137077.9	573510.5
218-E-2A	136991.1	573545.8
218-E-4	136890.7	573497.0
218-E-5	137079.6	573417.1
218-E-5A	137087.6	573355.9
218-E-8	137224.7	575115.4
218-E-9	137078.2	573584.2
218-W-1	136221.5	566205.1
218-W-11	136318.6	566204.9
218-W-1A	137184.3	567059.8
218-W-2	136062.0	566205.5
218-W-2A	136907.2	566437.5
218-W-3	136746.3	566161.0
218-W-3A	137272.9	566228.4
218-W-3AE	137391.3	566616.5
218-W-4A	136490.9	566227.8
218-W-4B	135880.5	566190.6
218-W-4C	135352.5	566200.4
218-W-5	137164.6	565869.7
<i>Additional Pushes Based on Area of Liquid Infiltration</i>		
218-W-3A	137513.7	566236.3
218-W-3A	137393.3	566236.6
218-W-3A	137200.4	566237.2
218-W-3A	137127.9	566237.3
218-W-3A	136953.0	566179.2

Table A3-5. Direct-Push Locations. (2 Pages)

Landfill	Hanford Northing Coordinate	Hanford Easting Coordinate
218-W-4B	135926.3	566190.5
218-W-4B	135834.6	566190.7
218-W-4C	135656.2	566191.3
218-W-4C	135526.0	566142.3
218-W-4C	135230.8	566212.9
218-W-4C	135109.1	566213.2
218-E-12B	137065.3	574774.7
218-E-12B	137195.8	575011.8
218-E-12B	137198.3	574841.2

1 In addition to the center pushes, additional pushes will be performed in those landfills that have  
 2 experienced historical events, such as rapid snowmelt or infiltration of water, that could have  
 3 provided a mechanism to cause contaminant migration. The coordinates for this pushes are  
 4 listed in Table A3-5. Logging, as described in Section A3.1.1.3, will be performed within these  
 5 pushes.

6 Direct-pushes will be driven to a maximum depth of 33 m (100 ft), or to refusal. The vertical  
 7 direct pushes described above will be used to assess the stratigraphy under the landfills and  
 8 radiological conditions, and to direct future phase soil samples.

9 Logging data will be collected in HEIS; a summary report also will be prepared by the logging  
 10 contractor to document the logging activity and results. The logging summary reports will be  
 11 documented in the field summary report so they can be referenced in the RI report and other  
 12 documents as necessary.

### 13 **A3.1.3 Investigation of Potentially Unused Caissons**

14 The following sections describe the intrusive characterization techniques that will be used to  
 15 investigate caissons that are potentially unused. This investigation will determine if the suspect  
 16 caissons contain waste, or are in fact empty, as indicated by historical information.

#### 17 **A3.1.3.1 Radiological Surveys**

18 Radiological screening of caisson interiors will be conducted by the radiological control  
 19 technician or other qualified personnel for evidence of radioactive contamination.

20 A pre-investigation background radiological survey will be performed around the caissons to  
 21 document the background radiological conditions in the area. Surveys of the caisson interiors  
 22 will be conducted using standard Hanford Site radiological survey equipment including

1 Geiger-Mueller<sup>5</sup> counters and/or sodium iodide detectors for beta-gamma emitting radionuclides  
2 and portable alpha monitors for alpha-emitting radionuclides. Results of the radiological surveys  
3 will be documented on a Radiological Survey Report for each caisson investigated.

4 Caissons to be investigated include those caissons in the 218-W-4A and 218-W-4B Landfills that  
5 are believed to be empty/unused according to available historical documentation. These include  
6 the 218-W-4A-C4, 218-W-4A-C6, 218-W-4A-C7, and 218-W-4A-C8 Caissons.

7 **A3.1.3.2 Remote Camera Inspections**

8 Remote camera inspections using a fiber optic camera or an equivalent, in conjunction with  
9 adequate lighting equipment, will be performed in conjunction with the radiological surveys  
10 described above to investigate those caissons that are believed to be unused based on historical  
11 documentation. These techniques will verify that the caissons are free of waste, which will allow  
12 administrative closure activities to be performed. Closure activities will include a  
13 reclassification in the *Waste Information Data System* database to a “no-action” status.

14

---

<sup>5</sup> Geiger-Mueller (radiation counter) is not a trademark.

1

**A4.0 HEALTH AND SAFETY PLAN**

2 All field operations will be performed in accordance with Prime Contractor health and safety  
3 requirements outlined in a site-specific health and safety plan. In addition, a work control  
4 package will be prepared that will further control site operations. This work package will  
5 include an activity hazard analysis, and will reference applicable radiological control  
6 requirements.

7 The sampling processes and associated activities will take into consideration exposure reduction  
8 and contamination control techniques that will minimize radiation exposure to the sampling  
9 team, as required by minimum requirements established by 10 CFR 835, and provide the basis  
10 for consistent and uniform implementation of radiological control requirements.

This page intentionally left blank.



1

This page intentionally left blank.

2

**A6.0 REFERENCES**

- 1
- 2 10 CFR 830, Subpart A, "Quality Assurance Requirements," Title 10, *Code of Federal*  
3 *Regulations*, Part 830, Subpart A, as amended.
- 4 10 CFR 835, "Occupational Radiation Protection," Title 10, *Code of Federal Regulations*,  
5 Part 835.
- 6 40 CFR 300, "National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan,"  
7 Appendix B, "National Priorities List," Title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 300,  
8 Appendix B.
- 9 49 CFR, "Transportation," Title 49, *Code of Federal Regulations*.
- 10 Bleyler, R., 1988a, *Laboratory Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Inorganics*  
11 *Analyses*, Hazardous Site Evaluation Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,  
12 Washington, D.C.
- 13 Bleyler, R., 1988b, *Laboratory Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Organics*  
14 *Analyses*, Hazardous Site Evaluation Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,  
15 Washington, D.C.
- 16 DE-AC06-96RL13200, 1996, *Contract Between the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland*  
17 *Operations Office, and Fluor Hanford, Inc.*, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland  
18 Operations Office, Richland, Washington, as amended.
- 19 DOE O 414.1C, *Quality Assurance*, as amended, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.
- 20 Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1989a, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*,  
21 2 vols., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection  
22 Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington, as amended.
- 23 Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1989b, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*  
24 *Action Plan*, Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection  
25 Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington.
- 26 EPA/240/B-01/003, 2001, *EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans*, EPA QA/R-5,  
27 Quality Assurance Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 28 EPA/240/B-06/003, 2006, *Data Quality Assessment: Statistical Tools for Practitioners*,  
29 EPA QA/G-9S, Office of Environmental Information, U.S. Environmental Protection  
30 Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 31 EPA/240/B-06/002, 2006, *Data Quality Assessment: A Reviewers Guide*, EPA QA/G-9R, Office  
32 of Environmental Information, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

- 1 *Hanford Environmental Information System*, Hanford Site database.
- 2 NAD83, 1991, *North American Datum of 1983*, National Geodetic Survey, Federal Geodetic  
3 Control Committee, Silver Spring, Maryland, as revised.
- 4 NAVD88, 1988, *North American Vertical Datum of 1988*, National Geodetic Survey, Federal  
5 Geodetic Control Committee, Silver Spring, Maryland.
- 6 *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*, 42 USC 6901, et seq.
- 7 *Sample Data Tracking database*, Hanford Site database.
- 8 SGW-33253, in process, *Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for Landfills in the 200-SW-  
9 1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 10 SGW-35016, in process, *Information and Data Management Plan for the 200-SW-2 Operable  
11 Unit*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- 12 SW-846, 2005, *Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste: Physical/Chemical Methods, Third  
13 Edition; Final Update III-B*, as amended, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency  
14 Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. Available on the  
15 Internet at [www.epa.gov/SW-846/main.htm](http://www.epa.gov/SW-846/main.htm) .
- 16 WAC 173-304, "Minimum Functional Standards for Solid Waste Handling," *Washington  
17 Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia,  
18 Washington.
- 19 *Washington Administrative Code*, as amended, Washington State Department of Ecology,  
20 Olympia, Washington.
- 21 *Waste Information Data System Report*, Hanford Site database.
- 22

1

**APPENDIX B**

2

3

4

5

**SUMMARY DESCRIPTIONS AND FIGURES OF WASTE SITES IN THE  
200-SW-1 AND 200-SW-2 NONRADIOACTIVE AND RADIOACTIVE  
LANDFILLS AND DUMPS OPERABLE UNITS**

This page intentionally left blank.

**FIGURES**

1		
2		
3	Figure B-1. 218-C-9 Landfill.....	B-2
4	Figure B-2. 218-E-1 Landfill.....	B-3
5	Figure B-3. 218-E-2, -2A, -4, -5, -5A, and -9 Landfills.....	B-4
6	Figure B-4. 218-E-10 Landfill.....	B-5
7	Figure B-5. 218-E-12A Landfill.....	B-6
8	Figure B-6. 218-E-12B and 218-E-8 Landfills.....	B-7
9	Figure B-7. 218-W-1 Landfill.....	B-8
10	Figure B-8. 218-W-1A Landfill.....	B-9
11	Figure B-9. 218-W-2 Landfill.....	B-10
12	Figure B-10. 218-W-2A Landfill.....	B-11
13	Figure B-11. 218-W-3 Landfill.....	B-12
14	Figure B-12. 218-W-3A Landfill.....	B-13
15	Figure B-13. 218-W-3AE Landfill.....	B-14
16	Figure B-14. 218-W-4A Landfill.....	B-15
17	Figure B-15. 218-W-4B Landfill.....	B-16
18	Figure B-16. 218-W-4C Landfill.....	B-17
19	Figure B-17. 218-W-5 Landfill.....	B-18
20	Figure B-18. 218-W-11 Landfill.....	B-19
21	Figure B-19. Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and 600 Central Landfill	
22	(Solid Waste Landfill).....	B-20

**TABLES**

23		
24		
25		
26	Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit	
27	Landfills.....	B-21
28	Table B-2. Summary of Information for Waste Sites Co-Located with 200-SW-2	
29	Operable Unit Landfills.....	B-36

1

This page intentionally left blank.

2

## APPENDIX B

SUMMARY DESCRIPTIONS AND FIGURES OF WASTE SITES IN THE  
200-SW-1 AND 200-SW-2 NONRADIOACTIVE AND RADIOACTIVE  
LANDFILLS AND DUMPS OPERABLE UNITS

The tables in this appendix contain descriptions of the 24 landfills within the 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Operable Unit (OU) that were considered during the data quality objectives (DQO) process for this remedial investigation/feasibility study work plan (Table B-1), as well as the 600 Area landfills (Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill [NRDWL] and 600 Central Landfill [600 CL] [Solid Waste Landfill]).

Table B-2 shows descriptions for fifteen 200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps OU and 200-SW-2 OU waste sites. These waste sites are included because they are co-located within, or are close to, the twenty-four 200-SW-2 OU landfills that were considered in the Phase I-B DQO process. Contamination potentially remaining from these sites may be located within in-scope landfills. It should be noted that 13 of the 15 waste sites are "consolidated" within 200-SW-2 OU landfills and will be remediated with the landfill, one waste site is classified as "rejected," and one as "no action." Those classified as "rejected" or "no action" do not require any further remediation.


The information given in the tables is as follows:

- **Site Code:** Identifying code assigned to the waste site by the *Waste Information Data System* database
- **OU:** Operable unit in which the site resides
- **Site Name:** Name(s), and aliases if any, by which the site is known
- **Location:** General description of where the site is located relative to better-known Hanford Site landmarks
- **Dates of Operation:** Dates the site actively received waste
- **Source Facility:** Facility generating the waste
- **Contaminant Inventory/Volume Released:** Amount and type of waste inventory
- **Depth:** Maximum depth and/or height of waste site
- **Waste Site Dimensions:** Area of waste site in terms of length and width
- **General Description:** Description of the waste site, what it contains, whether waste is on the surface or buried, whether any special structures exist, and whether any special history or stabilization notes or other pertinent information exists.

Figures B-1 through B-18 depict the 24 landfills in the scope of the 200-SW-2 OU. Figure B-19 depicts the NRDWL and 600 CL Landfills in the 200-SW-1 OU.

1  
2  
3

Figure B-1. 218-C-9 Landfill.



SW2\_FG070604.21\_070710

**LEGEND**

-  Unused Solid Waste Area (includes 216-C-9 liquid waste disposal area)
-  Radioactive Solid Waste
-  Wells Available for Sampling/Logging
-  Decommissioned Wells


Not to scale

Years of Operation: 1985-1989

4

Figure B-2. 218-E-1 Landfill.  
(No wells within 50 m.)

1  
2  
3



SW2\_FG070604.17\_070710

**LEGEND**

- ①A Trench Number
- Unused Waste Area
- Radioactive Waste


Not to scale

Years of Operation  
1945 - 1953

4


1  
2  
3  
4

Figure B-3. 218-E-2, -2A, -4, -5, -5A, and -9 Landfills.  
(No wells within 50 m.)



5  
6

Figure B-4. 218-E-10 Landfill.



**LEGEND**

①A Trench Number	Radioactive Waste
95 Year Last Filled	Post-August 19, 1987 Mixed Waste
IS Trench in Service	Retrievably Stored Waste
Unused Trench Area	Wells Available for Sampling/Logging
Unused Waste Area	Decommissioned Wells


Not to scale

Years of Operation: 1955 - 2000

SW2\_FG070604.2\_070710


Figure B-5. 218-E-12A Landfill.

1  
2



3

Figure B-6. 218-E-12B and 218-E-8 Landfills.



**LEGEND**

<b>1A</b> Trench Number	<b>Radioactive Waste</b>
<b>95</b> Year Last Filled	<b>Post-August 19, 1987 Mixed Waste</b>
<b>IS</b> Trench in Service	<b>Retrievably Stored Waste</b>
<b>Unused Trench Area</b>	<b>Wells Available for Sampling/Logging</b>
<b>Unused Waste Area</b>	<b>Decommissioned Wells</b>

Not to scale

Years of Operation (218-E-8): 1958-59  
 Years of Operation (218-E-12B): 1967 - Present


SW2\_FG070604.1\_070710

1  
2

3  
4  
5

1  
2  
3

Figure B-7. 218-W-1 Landfill.  
(No wells within 50 m.)



SW2\_FG070604.9\_070710

**LEGEND**


- ①A Trench Number
- Unused Waste Area
- Radioactive Waste

Not to scale

Years of Operation  
1944 - 1952

4

Figure B-8. 218-W-1A Landfill.




1  
2

3

Figure B-9. 218-W-2 Landfill.

1  
2



**LEGEND**

- ①A Trench Number
- Unused Waste Area
- Radioactive Waste
- Wells Available for Sampling/Logging
- ⊕ Decommissioned Wells

Not to scale

Years of Operation: 1953 - 1956

3

Figure B-10. 218-W-2A Landfill.






Figure B-11. 218-W-3 Landfill.

1  
2



3

Figure B-12. 218-W-3A Landfill.



**LEGEND**

<b>①A</b> Trench Number	<span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: yellow; border: 1px solid black;"></span> Radioactive Waste
<b>95</b> Year Last Filled	<span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: green; border: 1px solid black;"></span> Post-August 19, 1987 Mixed Waste
<b>IS</b> Trench in Service	<span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: red; border: 1px solid black;"></span> Retrievably Stored Waste
<span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: gray; border: 1px solid black;"></span> Unused Trench Area	<span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%;"></span> Wells Available for Sampling/Logging
<span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: lightblue; border: 1px solid black;"></span> Unused Waste Area	<span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">⊕</span> Decommissioned Wells

Not to scale

Years of Operation: 1970 - 1998


SW2\_F070604.6\_070710

1  
2

3

Figure B-13. 218-W-3AE Landfill.

1  
2



**LEGEND**

①A Trench Number	Radioactive Waste
95 Year Last Filled	Post-August 19, 1987 Mixed Waste
IS Trench in Service	Retrievably Stored Waste
Unused Trench Area	Wells Available for Sampling/Logging
Unused Waste Area	Decommissioned Wells


Not to scale

Years of Operation: 1981 - 2004

SW2\_FG070604.7\_070710

3

Figure B-14. 218-W-4A Landfill.




1

2

1

Figure B-15. 218-W-4B Landfill.



**LEGEND**

①A Trench Number	Radioactive Waste
95 Year Last Filled	Post-August 19, 1987 Mixed Waste
IS Trench in Service	Retrievably Stored Waste
Unused Trench Area	Wells Available for Sampling/Logging
Unused Waste Area	Decommissioned Wells
	Caissons

Not to scale


Years of Operation: 1967 - 1990

SW2\_FG070604.3\_070710

2

Figure B-16. 218-W-4C Landfill.

1  
2



**LEGEND**

(1A) Trench Number	Radioactive Waste
95 Year Last Filled	Post-August 19, 1987 Mixed Waste
IS Trench in Service	Retrievably Stored Waste
Unused Trench Area	Wells Available for Sampling/Logging
Unused Waste Area	Decommissioned Wells

Not to scale


Years of Operation: 1978 - 2005

SW2\_FG070604.4\_070710

3  
4

1

Figure B-17. 218-W-5 Landfill.



LEGEND	
①A Trench Number	Radioactive Waste
95 Year Last Filled	Post-August 19, 1987 Mixed Waste
IS Trench in Service	Retrievably Stored Waste
Unused Trench Area	Wells Available for Sampling/Logging
Unused Waste Area	Decommissioned Wells

Not to scale


Years of Operation: 1985 - Present

SW2\_FG070604.5\_070710

2

Figure B-18. 218-W-11 Landfill.


1  
2



3  
4

Figure B-19. Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill and 600 Central Landfill (Solid Waste Landfill).

1  
2  
3



4

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
600 CL	200-SW-1 Past-Practice	600 CL, 600 Area Central Landfill, Central Landfill, Central Waste Landfill, CWL, Solid Waste Landfill, SWL, 671	Southeast of 200 East Area on Army Loop Road (south of Route 4 South)	1973 to 1996	N/A	596,000 m <sup>3</sup> (780,000 yd <sup>3</sup> ) miscellaneous solid debris.  600 CL also received up to 5,000,000 L (1,320,000 gal) of sewage and 380,000 L (100,000 gal) of garage wash water.  The site does not contain radioactive wastes.	294 by 907 m (965 by 2,976 ft)	The site consists of 39 unlined solid waste trenches and 5 unlined liquid disposal trenches. All the trenches have been backfilled and are enclosed by an 8-ft fence with lockable gates. The landfill was developed in phases. In 1973, the first trench (JA Jones Trench) accepted sanitary waste, construction and demolition debris, asbestos, and liquid waste. In 1975, the northern 10 acres (NRDWL, or Trenches 1N, 2N, 18N, 19N, and 20-34) were isolated for disposal of asbestos and nonradioactive chemical waste. Phase II expanded the landfill south, and Trenches 36 through 54 received liquid sewage and 1100 Area catch tank liquids. From 1982 to 1987, sewage was placed in three additional trenches to the west. After 1987, liquid waste no longer was accepted, and since March 1996 all sanitary wastes have been sent to the City of Richland Landfill. Inspections are performed quarterly using a monitoring system consisting of a large basin and lysimeter. Leachate was noticed in July 1996 and initially collected at a rate of 10 gal/wk. The leachate is sampled and disposed of at the 300 Area Treated Effluent Disposal Facility. Routine gas and groundwater monitoring also are conducted. Before 1982, detailed logbooks were not maintained and chemicals disposed were not recorded. It is estimated that 40% (vol) of the waste is paper, 10% is asbestos, and 1% to 5% are sewage and 1100 Area catch basin wastes. The remainder of the waste is miscellaneous office and construction debris, bulky containers, medical wastes, appliances, furniture, and chemicals.

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
600 NRDWL	200-SW-1 TSD	600 NRDWL, 600 Area Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill, NRDW Landfill, Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill (Central Landfill), NRDWL	Southwest of the intersection with Route 4 South and southeast of the 200 East Area on Army Loop Road	1975 to 1985	Various Hanford Site operations/processes	Laboratory chemicals, solvents, waste paints, oils, and empty containers; miscellaneous solid debris. The site does not contain radioactive wastes.	Typical trench length and width is 122 by 5 m (400 by 16 ft)	The site is a RCRA TSD unit. The landfill consists of 19 unlined trenches that are all backfilled. Wastes containing components that are currently regulated by Washington State as dangerous waste were disposed to this site before August 19, 1987. These wastes were generated from various process operations, research laboratories, maintenance activities, and transportation functions throughout the Hanford Site. Trenches 18N, 24, and 32 never were used. In March 2001, the average conductance value for groundwater exceeded the critical mean value in wells 699-25-34A&B (CCN 089215). No free liquids have been disposed in the landfill. All liquids disposed were containerized. Quarterly radiation surveys and groundwater monitoring are conducted. In 1993 and 1997, soil gas surveys were performed and various VOCs were detected in each event (WHC-SD-EN-TI-199).
218-C-9	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-C-9, Dry Waste No. 0C9, 218-C-9 Landfill	North of 7th St and north of Hot Semiworks Plant	Liquid discharges 1953 to 1983.  Solid waste burial 1985 to 1989	Hot Semiworks (201-C) demolition	1 billion L (264 million gal) mildly radioactive steam condensate liquid discharge 7,580 m <sup>3</sup> (9,920 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of miscellaneous solid debris and soil.  The site contains LLW only. The site contains no Pu, and less than a milligram of U.	76 by 66 m (251 by 217 ft)	The burial pit is located at the site of the dried 216-C-9 Pond. SWITS and paper burial records indicate other burials outside the pit area. The dried pond was covered with a layer of washed gravel, and material from the deactivation and demolition material of the Hot Semiworks Plant was disposed. In August 1986, a fire was discovered in the burial pit. It was determined that metal frames cut with a torch had been placed in the pit before fully cooling and ignited flammable material. The entire site has been backfilled and surface stabilized. A routine radiological survey is performed annually. Debris at the site consists of radiologically contaminated concrete rubble, large equipment, roofing material, metal scrap, and other Hot Semiworks Plant demolition wastes. Contaminated soil from UN-216-E-37 and UN-216-E-39 also was placed in the pit.

B-22

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-E-1	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-E-1, 200 East Dry Waste No. 001	West of PUREX (202-A Building) and south of 4th St	1945 to 1953	200 East Area – believed to be mainly B Plant wastes	3,030 m <sup>3</sup> (2,317 yd <sup>3</sup> ) dry waste. The site contains unsegregated waste only. 0.9 kg Pu, 400 kg U.	148 by 88 m (486 by 290 ft)	The landfill consists of 15 north-to-south trenches 61 m (200 ft) long, ranging from 5 to 6 m (16 to 20 ft) wide. In 1974, areas with surface depressions were filled to grade with cinders from the 284-E Powerhouse and topped with gravel. In October 1978, an area of previously buried waste was uncovered at the south end of a trench. The contamination was reburied and covered with clean soil. The entire landfill was surface stabilized with 46 cm (18 in.) of clean soil and vegetated with wheat grass.
218-E-2	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-E-2, 200 East Industrial Waste No. 002, Equipment Landfill #2	North of B Plant and south of BX Tank Farm; co-located with Landfills 218-E-5, 218-E-5A and 218-E-9	1945 to 1953	200 East Area	9,033 m <sup>3</sup> (11,815 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of industrial wastes. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 0.8 kg Pu, 300 kg U.	Total site is 165 by 134 m (541 by 441 ft)	The landfill consists of 9 industrial trenches. The unit was surface stabilized in 1979 with 0.3 m (1 ft) of clean backfill material and vegetated with wheat grass. Trench lengths vary from 27 to 142 m (90 to 465 ft). The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-9.
218-E-2A	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-E-2A, Regulated Equipment Storage Site No. 02A, Burial Trench	North of B Plant and south of 218-E-2. A railroad spur separates 218-E-2 from 218-E-2A	1945 to 1950	Unknown	The site contains unsegregated waste only. Nothing is known about waste volume or inventories.	98 by 14 m (320 by 46 ft)	The site contains a single east-west trench and was used as an above-ground storage site for contaminated equipment. There are no records or inventories for this site. A 1978 inspection noted a number of sinkholes. During 1979, several loads of soil were placed over the sinkholes, and the stored above-ground equipment was buried in the 218-E-10 Landfill. The site was surface stabilized with 0.3 m (1 ft) of soil, revegetated, and posted/marked as an underground radioactive material area in 1980 to 1981. The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-9.

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-E-4	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-E-4, 200 East Minor Construction No. 4, Equipment Landfill #4	Irregularly shaped polygon located between two railroad tracks and north of 221-B Building	1955 to 1956	200 East Area – (B Plant [221-B] construction and modifications)	1,586 m <sup>3</sup> (2,074 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of mainly construction debris. The site contains .01 kg Pu, 1 kg U. All waste is unsegregated.	238m by 61 m (780 by 200 ft)	The site received repair and construction waste from the 221-B modifications. The exact number of trenches remains unknown. It is believed that two trenches run parallel to the railroad tracks. In June 1960, UPR-200-E-23 occurred and contaminated the area to a maximum reading of 1 rad/h. The site was surface stabilized in 1980 and is posted as Underground Radioactive Material. A radioactive survey is performed annually. The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-9.
218-E-5	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-E-5, 200 East Industrial Waste No. 05, Equipment Landfill #5	North of B Plant and southwest of BX Tank Farm, adjacent to 218-E-2 Landfill	1954 to 1956	200 East Area – PUREX (202-A)	3,172 m <sup>3</sup> (4,149 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of miscellaneous debris. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 0.62 kg Pu, 120 kg U.	102 by 63 m (335 by 207 ft)	The site contains two areas of trenches. One area is 104 m (341 ft) long by 40 m (131 ft) wide and contains multiple narrow trenches that received industrial dry waste and small boxes. The second area is a single trench oriented north/south that is 102 m (335 ft) long by 20 m (64 ft) wide. This trench contains railroad boxcars contaminated by uranyl nitrate hexahydrate at the north end. The burial areas were stabilized and covered with 0.3 m (1 ft) of clean soil in 1980. The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-9.
218-E-5A	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-E-5A, 200 East Industrial Waste No. 005A, Equipment Landfill #5A	North of B Plant and southwest of BX Tank Farm, adjacent to the 218-E-5 Landfill	1956 to 1959	200 East Area – PUREX (202-A)	6,173 m <sup>3</sup> (8,740 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of PUREX failed equipment. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 1.38 kg Pu, 120 kg U	37 by 30 m (120 by 100 ft)	Literature indicates that the site is one large burial trench that contains wooden boxes of spent PUREX equipment. The trench was backfilled in 1961. The site was stabilized in 1980, covered with 1 ft of clean backfill, and revegetated. The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, and 218-E-9.

B-24

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-E-8	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-E-8, 200 East Construction Landfills	North of the 218-E-12A, on the hillside adjacent to the 218-E-12B Landfill	1958 to 1959	200 East Area – PUREX (202-A and 293-A)	2,265 m <sup>3</sup> (2,963 yd <sup>3</sup> ) miscellaneous solid construction debris. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 0.02 kg Pu, 2 kg U	122 by 35 m (400 by 115 ft)	The site consists of an unknown number of trenches. In 1979, contaminated tumbleweed fragments were found that had blown in and accumulated inside the site and along the west boundary. The trenches were backfilled, and the site was surface stabilized in 1980. An annual radiological survey is performed. Debris included construction and repair wastes from the 293-A Building and the PUREX crane addition.
218-E-9	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-E-9, 200 East Regulated Equipment Storage Site No. 009, Burial Vault (HISS)	North of B Plant and east of the 218-E-2 Landfill	1953 to 1958	Unknown – believed to be uranium-recovery process operations at tank farms	Equipment. Nothing is known about the waste volume or contaminant inventory. The site contains unsegregated waste only.	130 by 30 m (427 by 100 ft)	The site was used as an above-ground storage site for fission product equipment that became contaminated in the Uranium Recovery Process operations at tank farms. It is not certain that it ever was used as a landfill. The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, and 218-E-5A and stabilized in 1980. The site was re-stabilized in 1991 when contaminated vegetation was found.
218-E-10	200-SW-2 TSD	218-E-10, 200 East Industrial Waste No. 10, Equipment Landfill #10	Northwest of B Plant and directly west of the 218-E-5A Landfill	1955 to 2000	100 Area, B Plant (221-B/224-B), Offsite, PUREX (202-A)	26,900 m <sup>3</sup> (35,200 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of equipment/industrial wastes. The site contains LLW, MLLW, and unsegregated waste. The site contains 4.94 kg Pu, 801 kg U. Contaminants include asbestos, lead, and di-n-octyl phthalate.	Total site is 716 by 617 m (2,350 by 2,025 ft)	The site is located within the LLBG TSD unit. It consists of 13 trenches running north-south and one trench running east-west. Trenches range from 264 to 433 m (865 to 1,420 ft) long by 4.6 to 5 m (15 to 16 ft) wide at the bottom. Wastes disposed to the site include cover blocks, tube bundles, jumper vessels, pumps, columns, and filters. In June 1960, a partially covered burial box of PUREX tube bundles caused an airborne contamination spread (UPR-200-E-23). In 1980, Trenches 1 through 5 were backfilled and stabilized. The section was vegetated with grasses. Surface stabilization also was completed for the eastern 10 ha (25 acres) in 1980.

B-25

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-E-12A	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-E-12A, 200 East Dry Waste No. 12A	Northwest of the C Tank Farm and south of 218-E-12B Landfill	1953 to 1967	200 East Area	15,300 m <sup>3</sup> (20,000 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of dry waste. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 8.9 kg Pu, 995 kg U.	Total site is 362 by 12 m (1,188 by 40 ft)	The site contains 28 burial trenches that received cardboard boxes and plastic bags of radioactive waste. Trenches 4 through 11, 15, 16, and 26 through 28 contain acid-soaked material. The specific contents of Trench 28 are not listed. A waste inventory logbook documents burials of tank farm dip tubes, an impact wrench, contaminated cable, jumpers, animal carcasses from 108-F, and an off-site shipment of depleted uranium. The trenches were backfilled, and stabilization occurred in 1979 and 1980. Biobarriers installed at the site included polyethylene liners and ureabor (herbicide) to kill vegetation. The site was stabilized again in 1994 with 46 to 61 cm (19.8 to 24 in.) of clean fill.
218-E-12B	200-SW-2 TSD	218-E-12B, 200 East Dry Waste No. 12B	North of the C Tank Farm and south of 12th St	1967 to present	200 East Area, B Plant, Offsite, PUREX, Tank Farms	65,600 m <sup>3</sup> (85,800 yd <sup>3</sup> ) industrial wastes. The site contains unsegregated, low-level, and transuranic wastes. In-scope wastes contains 1.39 kg Pu, 7.64 kg U. These inventories do not include Trench 94, containing U.S. Navy reactor compartments, nor post-1970 TRU, which are out of scope of this project.	Total site is 1,259 by 698 m (4,130 by 2,290 ft)  All trenches are 4.9 m (16 ft) deep.	The site is located within the LLBG TSD unit. The landfill has the design capacity for 138 trenches running north to south. A total of 38 trenches are filled, 2 were partially filled, and one was excavated and never used. The remaining trenches never were excavated. The southern portion of the site (Trenches 1 through 17) were interim stabilized in 1981 with clean fill. In January 2000, two contaminated tumbleweeds were removed from the site.

B-26

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-W-1	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-W-1, 200-W Area Dry Waste No. 001, Solid Waste Landfill #1	Northwest of the 234-5Z Building; east of Dayton Ave, between the 218-W-2 and 218-W-11 Landfills	1944 to 1953	200 West Area	7,164 m <sup>3</sup> (9,370 yd <sup>3</sup> ) dry waste. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 94 kg Pu, 700 kg U.	Total site is 159 by 140 m (521 by 485 ft)  Trenches are 2.4 to 2.7 m (8 to 9 ft) deep	The site contains 15 trenches that run east to west. Twelve trenches are "V" shaped 2.4 m (8 ft) deep and 5 m (16 ft) wide at ground level. The other three trenches are flat-bottomed at 2.7 m (9 ft) deep and 7.3 m (24 ft) wide at the surface. "V" trenches typically were used to dispose of small contaminated articles such as paper, filters, and small pieces of equipment. The flat-bottom trenches contain large pieces of contaminated equipment and wooden, metal, and concrete burial boxes. The trenches have been backfilled, and the site was stabilized in 1983. A surface radiological survey is performed annually.
218-W-1A	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-W-1A, 200-W Area Industrial Waste Landfill #1, Equipment Landfill #1	Northwest of 221-T, between two railroad spurs	1944 to 1961	200 West Area	13,700 m <sup>3</sup> (17,900 yd <sup>3</sup> ) equipment and industrial wastes. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 2.0 kg Pu, 900 kg U.	Total site is 184 by 139 m (605 by 457 ft)	The site is the first landfill in the 200 West Area to receive large, contaminated equipment. The site contains approximately ten burial areas. The areas include typical trenches and "burial holes." The exact locations of the holes are not known. Most of the equipment was disposed of in wooden boxes that eventually rotted and settled, creating sinkholes. The sinkholes were filled in 1975 with 1.8 m (6-ft) thick concrete cell blocks and clean fill. Radiological surveys are performed annually.
218-W-2	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-W-2, 200-W Area Dry Waste No. 002, Dry Waste Landfill No. 2	Northwest of the 234-5Z Building between 218-W-4B and 218-W-1	1953 to 1956	200 West Area	8,240 m <sup>3</sup> (10,778 yd <sup>3</sup> ) dry waste. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 126 kg Pu, 1400 kg U.	Total site is 180 by 159 m (589 by 521 ft)	The site is a landfill that contains 20 trenches running east to west. Before backfilling, waste was observed to be within 46 cm (18 in.) of the ground surfaces. Sinkholes were filled in 1974. The site was surface stabilized in 1983 with a minimum of 0.6 m (2 ft) of clean fill and vegetated. A surface radiological survey is performed annually.

B-27

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-W-2A	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-W-2A, Industrial Waste No. 02A, Equipment Landfill #2	West of the 221-T Building, north of 23rd St, and directly east of the 218-W-3 Landfill	1954 to 1985	200 Area facilities including T Pond soil, REDOX, B Plant, and 234-5Z	25,100 m <sup>3</sup> (32,800 yd <sup>3</sup> ) equipment and industrial wastes. This site contains unsegregated and low-level wastes. The site contains 6.38 kg Pu, 2,690 kg U	Total site is 536 by 340 m (1,758 by 1,116 ft)	The site is an industrial burial area with 19 trenches; 17 run east to west and 2 run north to south. Solid wastes disposed to the site include tanks, concrete blocks, facility wastes, process equipment, contaminated soil scraped from the 216-T-4-1 Pond (Trench 27), REDOX centrifuges, jumpers, pumps, filters, and miscellaneous cell equipment and wastes. Trench 21 contains a plutonium glovebox. In January 1959, a contamination spread occurred when a burial box containing REDOX jumpers collapsed during backfill operations (UPR-200-W-53). The site was backfilled and surface stabilized in 1980. However, the site remained active until 1985 because of two unused trenches and the cell block burial sites. An undocumented burial box was discovered in June 1983 while extending an active trench. The site was re-stabilized with clean fill and gravel in 2001.
218-W-3	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-W-3, Dry Waste No. 003	West of the 221-T Building and directly west of the 218-W-2A Landfill	1957 to 1961	PPF	12,400 m <sup>3</sup> (16,220 yd <sup>3</sup> ) mostly dry wastes buried with some equipment. This site contains unsegregated wastes only. The site contains 68 kg Pu, 70,000 kg U	Total site is 218 by 155 m (716 by 510 ft)	Although drawings (H-2-32095, Sheet 1, Rev. 11) indicate that the site consists of 20 east-west trenches that range from 122 to 145 m (400 to 475 ft) long with unknown widths, geophysical data collected in 2006 (D&D-30708) and unpublished 1960s logbook evidence show both east-west and north-south trenches that are different in location and differently numbered. The site received miscellaneous unsegregated wastes including drums of depleted uranium, a 1951 pickup truck, and other miscellaneous items, mainly in cardboard boxes. The site is backfilled and was surface stabilized in 1983. A surface radiological survey is performed annually.

B-28

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-W-3A	200-SW-2 TSD	218-W-3A, Dry Waste No. 003A	West of the 221-T Building and north of 218-W-3 Landfill	1970 to 1998	100 Area, 200 West Area, 300 Area, PFP, Tank Farms	<p>97,500 m<sup>3</sup> (127,500 yd<sup>3</sup>) dry waste and some equipment. The site contains TRU, TRUM, LLW, MLLW, and unsegregated wastes.</p> <p>The site contains 0.55 kg Pu, 634 kg U.</p> <p>Chemicals in wastes disposed to the in-scope trenches or portions of trenches (LLW, MLLW, and unsegregated wastes) include 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene; acetic acid; butyl ester; acetonitrile; aliquat 336; anase; asbestos; barium; batteries; beryllium; cadmium; carbon tetrachloride; carcinogens; caustic; charcoal; chromium; coal tar; copper; cortisporin; cyclohexane; cyclohexanone; dibutyl phosphate; dibutyl-n,n-dichylcarbomyl phosphate; dioxane (1,4-diethylene dioxide); ethanol; ethanolamine; ethylene glycol; glycerin; isopropyl alcohol; kerosene; lead; lithium fluoride; mercury; methanol; naphthalene; naphthylamine tritium; n-hexane; n-hexanol; nitric acid; normal paraffins; oil; organic; phosphoric acid; polyurethane; pseudocumene; silver; silver nitrate; slaked lime; sodium; sodium hydroxide; solvents; tetrahydrofuran; toluene; tributyl phosphate; trichloroethylene; trichlorofluoromethane; trioctylphosphine oxide; uranium fluoride; xylene (mixed isomers); zinc; zirconium.</p>	Outside dimensions of the site are 747 by 283 m (2,450 by 930 ft)	The site is located within the LLBG TSD unit. The site was designed to contain 61 trenches running in an east to west direction. Four trenches have not been dug, and the 57 that have been constructed range from 127 to 284 m (417 to 930 ft) in length. In January 1997, beta/gamma contamination caused by pieces of wind-blown tumbleweeds were found at Trench 26. Routine airborne and groundwater monitoring is performed. Perimeter radiological surveys are conducted annually.

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-W-3AE	200-SW-2 TSD	218-W-3AE, Industrial Waste No. 3AE, Dry Waste No. 3AE	East and adjacent to the 218-W-3A Landfill in the 200 West Area	1981 to 2004	100 Area, 1100 Area (1171 Transportation & Maintenance Building), 300 Area, Offsite	<p>34,300 m<sup>3</sup> (44,900 yd<sup>3</sup>) of miscellaneous wastes.</p> <p>The site contains TRU, LLW, and MLLW. The TRU at this site will be removed and processed; it is not part of the TPA M-91 scope.</p> <p>The site contains 0.12 kg Pu, 439 kg U.</p> <p>Chemicals in wastes disposed to this site include aluminum nitrate; 2,4-dinitrotoluene; ammonium chloride; asbestos; beryllium; bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate; chromium; copper; dibutyl phosphate; ferric nitrate; ferrous ammonium sulfate; hydrobromic acid; lead; mercury; nickel hydroxide; nitrate; oil; polychlorinated biphenyls; potassium nitrate; silver; sodium hydroxide; sodium nitrate; sodium nitrite; sulfuric acid; tetrachloroethylene; trichloroethene; trichlorofluoromethane; zirconium.</p>	<p>Outside dimensions of site are 555 by 445 m (1,820 by 1,460 ft)</p> <p>Trenches are 4.6 to 6.1 m (15 to 20 ft) deep.</p>	<p>The site is located within the LLBG TSD unit. It originally was designed to contain 24 trenches. However, it was re-designed to contain only 12 trenches at deeper depths. Only eight of the trenches were excavated; three of these are only partially filled. The location of this site also included a portion of the 216-T-4B Pond. The site received miscellaneous wastes including rags, paper, rubber gloves, disposable supplies, broken tools, laboratory wastes and industrial waste such as failed equipment, tanks, pumps, ovens, agitators, heaters, hoods, jumpers, decommissioned change trailers, etc. Trenches 5 and 8 contain post-1987 mixed waste.</p>

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-W-4A	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-W-4A, Dry Waste No. 04A	Southeast of the intersection of 23rd St and Dayton Ave	1961 to 1968	200 West Area, PFP, REDOX	16,700 m <sup>3</sup> (21,800 yd <sup>3</sup> ) dry wastes and some equipment. This site contains unsegregated wastes only. The site contains 35.4 kg Pu, 394,000 kg U	Outside dimensions of 320 by 267 m (1,050 by 875 ft)	The site contains 21 trenches oriented east to west and six to eight vertical pipe units or drywells. In addition there is a special burial trench at the east end of Trench 11 containing a REDOX column. All trenches are 9 m (30 ft) wide, with 12.2 m (40 ft) between trench centerlines. They range in length from 153 to 305 m (500 to 1,000 ft). The vertical pipe units were installed near the east end of Trench 16. Each consists of two 55-gal drums welded together with the ends removed except the bottom of the lower drums; they were placed 4.6 m (15 ft) bgs. After each drop containing waste, dirt was shoveled into the well to shield the gamma radiation. Two vertical pipe units as deep as 15 m (48 ft) may be located near the east end of Trench 18. No information has been found on their contents. Drawing H-2-32487 shows details of many individual burials. Unplanned releases to this site (Table B-2) include a fire in the landfill (UPR-200-W-16), spotty contamination release (UPR-200-W-26), a burial box collapse (UPR-200-W-53), and a release of previously buried waste (UPR-200-W-72). The site was stabilized in 1983.

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-W-4B	200-SW-2 TSD	218-W-4B, Dry Waste No. 04B	Northwest of the 234-5Z Building, directly west of 231-Z Building	1968 to 1990	222-S, 300 Area, PFP, and T Plant	<p>10,466 m<sup>3</sup> (13,690 yd<sup>3</sup>) of waste as of September 30, 2005.</p> <p>The site contains TRU, LLW, and unsegregated wastes.</p> <p>The site contains 8.98 kg Pu and 21.6 kg U.</p> <p>Chemicals in wastes disposed to the in-scope trenches or portions of trenches (LLW and unsegregated wastes) include beryllium, lead, oil, and zirconium.</p>	189 by 183 m (620 by 600 ft)	<p>The site is located within the LLBG TSD unit and contains miscellaneous debris including rags, paper, cardboard, plastic, and equipment. The site contains 13 trenches and one row of 12 caissons (5 alpha, 6 MFP, and 1 deeper, silo-type that became plugged after receipt of two waste packages). Trenches 7 and 11 and the alpha caissons contain TRU waste planned to be retrieved under M-91. Four of the 5 alpha caissons were used from 1970 to 1979; the fifth is believed to be empty. The alpha and MFP caissons are up to 2.7 m (8.8-ft-) diameter, 3 m (10 ft) high concrete and/or corrugated steel containers with an access chute diameter of approximately 90 cm (36 in.). The silo-type caisson is a 3 m (10-ft-) diameter, 9 m (30-ft-) tall container placed on a concrete foundation with a concrete shielding top slab; it has a 107 cm (42-in.-) diameter access chute. All caissons are equipped with air-filtering systems. Trenches 1 through 6 were surface stabilized and backfilled with clean soil in 1983. Trench 7 is covered with a 1.2 m (4 ft) soil mound. The remaining trenches were backfilled after use and stabilized with clean gravel in 1995.</p>

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-W-4C	200-SW-2 TSD	218-W-4C, Dry Waste No. 004C	Main section located west and southwest of the 234-5Z Building, east of Dayton Ave. Annex is located directly south of the 234-5 Building, north of 16th St	1978 to 2005	100 Area, 300 Area, Offsite, PFP, REDOX	15,200 m <sup>3</sup> (19,900 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of waste as of September 30, 2005. The site contains TRU, TRUM, LLW, and MLLW. The site contains 0.026 kg Pu, 215 kg U. Chemical in wastes disposed to the in-scope trenches or portions of trenches (LLW/MLLW) include: 1,2-diaminopropane; 1-butene; 2,2,4-trimethylpentane; 3,4(benz-3,6)pyrene; acetic anhydride; acetophenone; acid; chromium; coal tar; copper; cumene hydroperoxide; di-t-butyl-p-cresol; indole picrate; isopropyl iodide; lead; mercury; n,n-disalicylidene; naphthalene; 2-methyl-naphthalene; oil; paint thinner; phenol; silver; slaked lime; sodium; t-butyl hydroperoxide; uranium fluoride; vinyl chloride (chloroethylene); zirconium.	Main portion is 774 by 232 m (2,540 by 760 ft)  Unused Annex is 219 by 203 m (719 by 665 ft)	The site is within the LLBG TSD unit. The site is divided into two parts; the section containing burial trenches to the west, and an annex (which never has been used) to the east. The landfill is designed to contain up to 65 trenches. Only 14 trenches have been excavated; 6 of these are only partially filled. The landfill annex area never has been used. The trenches run east to west and range in length from 50 to 232 m (162 to 760 ft). The Z Plant burning pit, which operated during the late 1940s and early 1950s, was reportedly excavated in the 1970s during the construction of Trench 7. Some of the TRU-containing trenches are asphalt lined. Trenches 1, 4, 7, 20, 24, and 29 contain retrievably stored, suspect TRU waste. One drum of suspect TRU was buried in what is otherwise a LLW trench in 1981; records were later examined, and the drum and trench were redefined as containing only LLW. Trenches NC, 14, and 58 contain post-1987 mixed waste.

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
218-W-5	200-SW-2 TSD	218-W-5. Dry Waste Landfill, Low-Level Radioactive Mixed Waste Landfills	West of Dayton Ave and north of 23rd St	1985 to present	100 Area, 300 Area, Offsite, PFP, Tank Farms	71,000 m <sup>3</sup> (92,900 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of total wastes as of September 30, 2005. This site contains LLW and MLLW. The site contains 0.17 kg Pu, 6,915 kg U. Chemicals in wastes disposed to the in-scope trenches (i.e., all trenches except 31 and 34) include lead, oil, and slaked lime.	Outside dimensions of 1,013 m by 366 m (3,320 by 1,200 ft)	The site is an active TSD unit. The landfill is designed to contain 18 low-level and four mixed waste trenches. Currently there are 11 inactive low-level trenches; two of these (Trenches 22 and 24) contain post-August 19, 1987, mixed waste. In addition, the only two currently active RCRA-compliant lined mixed waste trenches within the LLBG TSD are located at this landfill (Trenches 31 and 34). The RCRA-compliant trenches are out of scope of this project.
218-W-11	200-SW-2 Past-Practice	218-W-11, Regulated Storage Site	Northwest of the 234-5Z Building and north of 218-W-1	1960 - 1960	Tank Farms - Uranium Recovery Process and Sr/Cs Recovery Operations	1,160 m <sup>3</sup> (1,520 yd <sup>3</sup> ) miscellaneous solid debris. The site contains unsegregated wastes only. No plutonium or uranium inventories are reported for this site.	Total area is 159 by 55 m (520 by 180 ft)  Trenches are 4.6 m (15 ft) deep.	The unit consists of two burial trenches 77 m (258 ft) and 46 m (150 ft) long, respectively. Sources conflict as to whether the southernmost of the two trenches ever was excavated and filled. Geophysics data collected in 2006 (D&D-30708) suggest that the trench does not exist. Before stabilization in 1983, a portion of the landfill was used for above-ground storage of contaminated equipment. The waste is low-level contaminated equipment. A surface radiological survey is performed annually.

CCN 089215, "Notification of Exceedance of Critical Mean Value for Specific Conductance at the Non-Radioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill."  
 D&D-30708, *Geophysical Investigations Summary Report; 200 Areas Burial Grounds: 218-E-1, 218-E-2A, 218-E-8, 218-E-12A, 218-W-1, 218-W-2, 218-W-3, and 218-W-11.*  
 Ecology et al., 1989, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order.*  
 H-2-32487, *218-W-4A Dry Waste Burial Site.*  
 H-2-32095, *218-W-2A Industrial Burial Ground & 218-W-3 Dry Waste Burial Ground.*  
*Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, 42 USC 6901, et seq.*  
*Waste Information Data System Report, Hanford Site database.*  
 WHC-SD-EN-TI-199, *NRDWL Soil Gas Survey Final Data Report.*

B-34

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table B-1. Summary of Information for 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (15 Pages)

Site Code	OU and Category	Site Name	Location	Dates of Waste Receipt	Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume	Contaminant Inventory Volume (In-Scope Low-Level and Unsegregated Wastes only)	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
-----------	-----------------	-----------	----------	------------------------	--	--	-----------------------	---------------------

bgs = below ground surface.  
 LLBG = low-level landfill.  
 LLW = low-level waste.  
 MFP = mixed fission product.  
 MLLW = mixed low-level waste.  
 N/A = not available or not known.  
 OU = operable unit.  
 PFP = Plutonium Finishing Plant.  
 PUREX = Plutonium-Uranium Extraction (Plant).  
 RCRA = *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*.  
 REDOX = Reduction oxidation (S Plant).

RR = railroad.  
 SWITS = *Solid Waste Information and Tracking System*.  
 TPA = Tri-Party Agreement (*Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order* (Ecology et al., 1989)).  
 TRU = Radioactive waste as defined in DOE G 435.1 1, *Implementation Guide for Use with DOE M 435.1-1*.  
 TRUM = transuranic waste mixed with dangerous waste components.  
 TSD = treatment, storage, and/or disposal (unit).  
 UPR = unplanned release.  
 WIDS = *Waste Information Data System* database.

Table B-2. Summary of Information for Waste Sites Co-Located with 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (6 Pages)

Site Code	OU	Site Name	Location	Dates of Operation	Source Facility	Contaminant Inventory/ Volume Released	Depth	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
UPR-200-E-23	SW-2	UPR-200-E-23, Burial Box Collapse at 218-E-10, UPR-200-W-158	Release occurred at 218-E-10 Landfill; the contamination spread east and southeast up to 3 miles (4.8 km) beyond the 200 East Area perimeter fence.	June 10, 1960	PUREX F-11 and H-4 tube bundles	Particles and contaminated soil	N/A	N/A	The unplanned release (UPR-200-E-23) occurred at the 218-E-10 Landfill when large boxes of contaminated PUREX equipment collapsed and spread contamination. The maximum dose rate at the box was 5 rad per hour (100 ft) from the box. The box was covered partially with soil. ("Consolidated").
UPR-200-E-24	SW-2	UPR-200-E-24, Contamination Plume from the 218-E-10 Landfill, UN-200-E-24	Contamination spread from 218-E-10 Landfill to 3 miles (4.83 km) beyond the 200 East Area perimeter fence.	June 10, 1960	PUREX F-11 and H-4 Tube bundles	Particles and contaminated soil	N/A	N/A	An unplanned release (UPR-200-E-23) occurred at the 218-E-10 Landfill when large boxes of PUREX equipment collapsed and spread contamination. This related unplanned release (UPR-200-E-24) is also reported to account for the airborne contamination plume from the broken box. ("Consolidated").
UPR-200-E-30	SW-2	UPR-200-E-30, UN-200-E-30	Within the 218-E-10 Landfill.	April 20, 1961	N/A	Process jumpers and contaminated soil	N/A	Area of 37,161 m <sup>2</sup> (400,000 ft <sup>2</sup> )	A wooden burial box containing 82 highly contaminated process jumpers collapsed as it was covered with soil. This has been assigned to the 218-E-10 Landfill. Maximum contamination of 500 m <sup>2</sup> /h was spread over a 400,000 ft <sup>2</sup> area. The landfill has been surface stabilized. ("Consolidated").

B-36

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table B-2. Summary of Information for Waste Sites Co-Located with 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (6 Pages)

Site Code	OU	Site Name	Location	Dates of Operation	Source Facility	Contaminant Inventory/ Volume Released	Depth	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
UPR-200-E-53	SW-2	UPR-200-E-53, UN-200-E-53, Contamination at 218-E-1	The release occurred at 218-E-1 Landfill.	October 17, 1978	N/A	Contaminated soil	N/A	46 by 15 m (150 by 50 ft)	In October 1978, a contamination spread occurred during backfilling operations when shallow buried contaminated waste in an adjacent trench was uncovered by a bulldozer. Numerous spots of radioactive contamination were detected within the south end of the 218-E-1 Trench. The contaminated soil was reburied, and clean fill was spread over the area. The surface of the landfill was stabilized in 1981. The release is not marked or posted, but the 218-E-1 Landfill is marked and posted. ("Consolidated").
UPR-200-E-61	SW-2	UPR-200-E-61, Radioactive Contamination from Railroad Burial Cars, UN-216-E-61, UN-200-E-61	The release occurred in the railroad right-of-way at the landfill unloading ramp in the 218-E-10 Landfill area.	1981	B Plant	N/A	N/A	N/A	This contamination already has been cleaned up. The site is located at the railroad right-of-way within the area mapped as the Industrial Landfills (218-E-10). It is contamination found after a concrete burial box was off-loaded from railroad cars to landfills. The box left B Plant with unacceptable levels of contamination that were not found until after the box had been off-loaded. Both the railroad car and the offloading ramp showed smearable contamination. They were decontaminated within a few days after discovery. ("Rejected").

Table B-2. Summary of Information for Waste Sites Co-Located with 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (6 Pages)

Site Code	OU	Site Name	Location	Dates of Operation	Source Facility	Contaminant Inventory/ Volume Released	Depth	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
UPR-200-W-11	SW-2	UPR-200-W-11, Landfill Fire, UN-200-W-11, UPR-200-W-16	Within the 218-W-1 Landfill.	July 9, 1952	N/A	Airborne radioactive contamination including alpha particles.	N/A	N/A	This site was a result of a spontaneous fire in the 218-W-1 Landfill. It is a duplicate of UPR-200-W-16. ("Consolidated").
UPR-200-W-134	SW-2	UPR-200-W-134, Improper Drum Burial	218-W-3A Landfill, Trench 30, WSP coordinates 137358N, 566159 to 566166 E.	Oct. 28, 1975	325 Building, 300 Area.	None.	N/A	N/A	UPR-200-W-134 involved the improper burial of a TRU-labeled drum (container ID 325-75-0473S) in 1975 at the 218-W-3A Landfill. Although the drum did not fail nor release contamination, it was not buried as retrievably stored waste per requirements. The trench section where it was buried was re-designated as transuranic (ARH-CD-594). ("Consolidated").
UPR-200-W-16	SW-2	UPR-200-W-11, Landfill Fire, UN-200-W-11, Fire at 218-W-1 Landfill	Within 218-W-1 Landfill.	July 9, 1952	N/A	Airborne radioactive contamination including alpha particles.	N/A	N/A	The release was a result of a spontaneous fire in the 218-W-1 Landfill. The trench where the fire occurred runs east and west and was roughly in the center of the landfill. A fire in the dry waste spread plutonium contamination in the vicinity of 231-Z Building. The contaminated soil was bulldozed into the trench. The ground on the north side was stabilized with oil, and roads near Z Plant were washed down with water. ("Consolidated").

B-38

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table B-2. Summary of Information for Waste Sites Co-Located with 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (6 Pages)

Site Code	OU	Site Name	Location	Dates of Operation	Source Facility	Contaminant Inventory/ Volume Released	Depth	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
UPR-200-W-26	SW-2	UPR-200-W-26, Contamination Spread During Burial Operation	Assumed to be 218-W-1A Landfill and along the railroad tracks.	November 27, 1953	221-T	Soil contamination from 221-T spent equipment	N/A	N/A	A box of used connectors was removed from the 221-T Building and buried in the 218-W-1A (alias Railroad) Landfill. During unloading, the lid was dislodged and contamination was spread to the flatcar and surrounding ground. ("Consolidated").
UPR-200-W-37	SW-1	UPR-200-W-37, Contaminated Boxes Found in a Burn Pit	East of Dayton Avenue Ave, southwest of Z Plant within the 218-W-4C Landfill.	June 10, 1955	N/A	High-level dry waste	N/A	N/A	Three boxes mistakenly containing dry, high-activity waste were sent to the Z Plant burn pit, which was located within what is now 218-W-4C. The boxes were noticed before being burned, but during removal, it was noted that one box had opened in the pit causing radiological contamination. The boxes were removed and sent to the proper burial trench. ("Consolidated").
UPR-200-W-45	SW-2	UPR-200-W-45, Burial Box Collapse	Believed to have occurred in 218-W-2A	November 6, 1957	REDOX	Ruthenium-contaminated soil and airborne particles	N/A	10 km <sup>2</sup> (4 miles <sup>2</sup> )	A burial box containing ruthenium-contaminated process equipment from REDOX collapsed and released contamination throughout the 200 West Area in November 1957. Skin and/or personal clothing contamination occurred to 12 employees and 15 vehicles. Personnel and property were decontaminated, and measures to prevent the spread of contamination were implemented. ("No Action").

Table B-2. Summary of Information for Waste Sites Co-Located with 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (6 Pages)

Site Code	OU	Site Name	Location	Dates of Operation	Source Facility	Contaminant Inventory/ Volume Released	Depth	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
UPR-200-W-53	SW-2	UPR-200-W-53, Burial Box Collapse	East from the 218-W-2A Landfill to within 275 m (902 ft) of the east perimeter fence of the 200 West Area	January 8, 1959	REDOX	Spent equipment caused contaminated soil and airborne particles	N/A	101 ha hectares (250 acres)	A burial box containing process equipment from REDOX collapsed and released fission product contamination into the 200 West Area in January 1959. Skin and/or personal clothing contamination occurred to 12 employees and 15 vehicles. Personnel and property were decontaminated, and measures to prevent the spread of contamination were implemented. ("Consolidated").
UPR-200-W-72	SW-2	UPR-200-W-72, Contamination at 218-W-4A	Within the 218-W-4A Landfill.	1975	N/A	Laboratory waste and contaminated soil	N/A	15 by 15 m (50 by 50 ft)	Contaminated laboratory waste was found with gross alpha and mixed fission product contamination in October 1975. The waste had been buried years before at the previously required 1.2 m (4 ft) depth. Soil erosion caused the waste to become exposed. The waste was removed, and the area was covered with 15 cm (6 in.) of sand, a layer of urea bore, a layer of 10-mil plastic, 31 to 36 cm (12 to 14 in.) of soil, and 8 to 10 cm (3 to 4 in.) of rock. ("Consolidated").
UPR-200-W-84	SW-2	UPR-200-W-84, Ground Contamination During Burial Operation at 218-W-3A	Within the 218-W-3A landfill, most likely Trench TS9	July 23, 1980	N/A	Liquid waste	N/A	N/A	In July 1980, a liquid spill occurred in the 218-W-3A Landfill when chemical waste (beta/gamma) was being pumped from a truck to the landfill. The pump and contaminated soil were placed in a burial trench. The truck was cleaned and thoroughly decontaminated at a separate site. ("Consolidated").

B-40

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table B-2. Summary of Information for Waste Sites Co-Located with 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. (6 Pages)

Site Code	OU	Site Name	Location	Dates of Operation	Source Facility	Contaminant Inventory/ Volume Released	Depth	Waste Site Dimensions	General Description
Z Plant BP	SW-1	Z PLANT BP, Z Plant Burning Pit	It is located east of Dayton Ave, within the boundaries of the current 218-W-4C Landfill.	1948 to 1960	N/A	The burn pit received 2,000 m <sup>3</sup> of wastes for burning, including less than 1,000 m <sup>3</sup> of laboratory chemicals.	3.0 m	12.2 by 15.2 m	Consolidated with 218-W-4C. This unit is a rectangular burning pit located within (under) Landfill 218-W-4C. The site was exhumed during the excavation of Trench 7 in the 218-W-4C Landfill. ("Consolidated").

ARH-CD-594, *Specifications for the Transuranic Drum buried on October 28, 1975.*  
*Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, 42 USC 6901, et seq.*

BP = burning pit.  
 N/A = not applicable.  
 OU = operable unit.  
 PUREX = Plutonium-Uranium Extraction (Plant).  
 RCRA = *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976.*  
 REDOX = Reduction Oxidation (S Plant).  
 SW-1 = 200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Operable Unit.

SW-2 = 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Operable Unit.  
 TRU = Radioactive waste as defined in DOE G 435.1-1, *Implementation Guide for Use with DOE M 435.1-1.*  
 TSD = treatment, storage, and/or disposal (unit).  
 UPR = unplanned release.  
 WIDS = *Waste Information Data System* database.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**REFERENCES**

ARH-CD-594, 1975, *Specifications for the Transuranic Drum buried on October 28, 1975*, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

CCN 089215, 2001, "Notification of Exceedance of Critical Mean Value for Specific Conductance at the Non-Radioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill," (letter to M. J. Furman, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, from S. P. Luttrell), Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington, May 11.

D&D-30708, 2006, *Geophysical Investigations Summary Report; 200 Areas Burial Grounds: 218-E-1, 218-E-2A, 218-E-8, 218-E-12A, 218-W-1, 218-W-2, 218-W-3, and 218-W-11*, Fluor Hanford, Richland, Washington.

Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1989, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*, 2 vols., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington, as amended.

H-2-32095, *218-W-2A Industrial Burial Ground & 218-W-3 Dry Waste Burial Ground*, Hanford Site Drawing.

H-2-32487, *218-W-4A Dry Waste Burial Site*, Hanford Site Drawing.

*Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*, 42 USC 6901, et seq.

*Waste Information Data System Report*, Hanford Site database.

WHC-SD-EN-TI-199, 1993, *NRDWL Soil Gas Survey Final Data Report*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

1

**APPENDIX C**

2

3

**COLLABORATIVE-NEGOTIATIONS COMPLETION MATRIX STATUS**

This page intentionally left blank.

**CONTENTS**

1

2 C1.0 INTRODUCTION ..... C-1

3 C2.0 REFERENCES ..... C-14

4

**TABLE**

5

6 Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages) ..... C-2

7

1

This page intentionally left blank.

2

**TERMS**

1		
2	CERCLA	<i>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and</i>
3		<i>Liability Act of 1980</i>
4	DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
5	DQO	data quality objective
6	Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
7	FS	feasibility study
8	OU	operable unit
9	RCRA	<i>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976</i>
10	RI/FS	remedial investigation/feasibility study
11	RL	U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
12	ROD	record of decision
13	Tri-Parties	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington State
14		Department of Ecology, U.S. Department of Energy
15	Tri-Party Agreement	<i>Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order</i>
16		(Ecology et al., 1989)
17	TRU	Radioactive waste as defined in DOE G 435.1-1, <i>Implementation</i>
18		<i>Guide for Use with DOE M 435.1-1</i>
19	TSD	treatment, storage, and/or disposal (unit)
20		

This page intentionally left blank.



Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
1.2 Scope and Objectives, or in 2.0 Background and Setting	<p>Add a table of "Key Assumptions" that drive your scope/cost/schedule.</p> <p>See Idaho OU7-13-14 for example of key assumptions.</p> <p>Note that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's guidance on RI/FSs (EPA/540/G-89/004) suggests a work plan section titled "Costs and Key Assumptions." It may be appropriate to add such a section to this work plan, to the extent that certain cost information would be helpful. For example, if treatability investigations are anticipated, and the cost would be in the range of \$20 million per year (the Idaho National Laboratory figure), that would be information that would be critical for scheduling the RI/FS.</p>	<p>DOE will develop a table of key assumptions that drive scope, schedule, and cost. During the DQO process, these key assumptions will be developed jointly by Ecology and DOE.</p> <p>Costs: DOE will provide summary level cost estimates to support funding requests to complete the RI/FS, and for managing the project.</p>	<p>Key assumptions developed during the collaborative DQO processes have been added to Section 1.4 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.</p> <p>A description of the detailed cost analysis that will be evaluated in the FS is presented in Section 5.7.4 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.</p>
2.2 Waste Site Descriptions and History	<p>Update this section using the results of geophysical surveys, soil gas surveys, and surface radiation surveys. The scope of the nonintrusive sampling will include the entire surface area of the Bin 3B sites (15) and the used portions of the radioactive Bin 3A sites (7).</p>	<p>DOE agrees to update Section 2.2 or 3.0 of the work plan using mutually agreed upon, nonintrusive sampling information.</p>	<p>Section 3.4.2 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan includes the results of the nonintrusive field work performed as part of the Phase-IA DQO process. This also includes a discussion of the additional geophysics performed before completion of the Phase-IB DQO and sampling and analysis instruction.</p> <p>Phase-IA survey results are presented in Appendix D of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.</p>

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
2.2 Waste Site Descriptions and History	Update this section using the results of the records review. The scope of the records review should focus on waste streams, waste form, dates of operation, waste descriptions, and anomalous conditions.	DOE agrees to update Section 2.2 or Section 3.0 of the work plan using the historical records approach consistent with the Draft A work plan.	<p>Section 2.2 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan has been revised to include information gathered during the historical records review performed as part of the Phase I-A DQO process.</p> <p>Additionally, Section 5.4.1.1 details the historical information review process. The initial conceptual site models presented in Appendix E also resulted from the extensive records review.</p>
3.0 Initial Evaluation of Waste Sites	Expand description of why contamination is not expected to be a threat to groundwater. NOTE: Simple graphics and associated statements in existing work plan are an adequate and acceptable format and content for the conceptual site model.	DOE will add to the existing conceptual site model in Draft B of the work plan discussions concerning mobility of contaminants and those areas where there has been flooding or other sources of water.	<p>Section 3.9 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan discusses the initial conceptual site model development process, including the results of the Hanford Features, Events, and Processes analysis performed by Fluor Hanford and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory personnel.</p> <p>Initial conceptual site model graphics for the six bins, as well as the 24 landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU, are presented in Appendix E of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.</p>

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
3.1 Known and Suspected Contamination, and 3.2 Conceptual Contaminant Distribution Models	Summarize the "items of interest" (i.e., distributed in Session 3) and identify which ones are more likely to pose a threat of release.	DOE agrees to summarize items of interest based on waste form; waste stream with focus on logic to support decisions. The DQO Data Gap Analysis Table will provide the format for the summary.	The Ecology "Items of Interest" were evaluated in the Phase I-A and I-B DQOs. Both DQOs included a detailed data gap analysis to identify those items that are most likely to pose a threat of release. The results of the data gap analysis from the DQOs have been carried forward into the Draft B RI/FS work plan, Section 4.4.
3.5.2 Potential Human and Ecological Receptors	Discuss potential exposure pathways especially for industrial items. Cross-reference to: Section 5.0 RI/FS Study Process: discuss assumptions about release mechanisms for contamination in industrial items. For example, less sampling could be required because of the waste form and/or release mechanism (e.g., contaminated rail cars). Use this section discussion to drive 4.1.2 Data Needs.	DOE agrees to add discussion on exposure pathways and the release mechanisms for different waste forms.	Section 3.8.1 discusses potential human health and ecological receptors.  Additionally, the conceptual exposure pathway model is presented graphically in Appendix E of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.

C-4

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
4.0 Work Plan Approach and Rationale	Develop logic for vadose-zone sampling to confirm conceptual site model for potential threat to groundwater. Propose some deeper (beyond the bottom elevation of trenches) data collection to characterize the depth of contamination, tying the sampling locations to those locations where infiltration is more of a concern (e.g., where there is a record of flooding).	DOE agrees to provide a more developed data collection logic to characterize depth of contamination below trenches in the waste sites. Specific sampling location/ methodologies will be developed through the DQO process.	Section 4.2 discusses the proposed use of direct pushes into the vadose zone as part of Phase I-B characterization activities. Additional details regarding the Phase I-B sampling design are presented in Appendix A (sampling and analysis plan) of the Draft B RI/FS work plan. Following the completion of Phase I-B, another DQO process will be held to specify additional intrusive sampling for Phase II.
4.0 Work Plan Approach and Rationale	Update the rationale to tie sampling locations to results of geophysical surveys, soil gas surveys, and surface radiation surveys (when available).	DOE agrees to update the rationale for sample design to include knowledge gained through geophysical surveys, soil gas surveys, and surface radiation surveys as defined in Section 2.2.	Section 4.2 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan presents the rationale for using historical information reviews and the results of the Phase I-A field surveys to focus the Phase I-A field surveys. This section also states that future phase characterization activities will be focused by past-phase sampling activities.

C-5

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
4.1.1A. Data Uses	<p>Identify data uses for treatability investigations. Cross-reference to: Section 5.0 RI/FS Study Process: where there should be a separate section on treatability investigations. Cross-reference to: Section 5.5 Post-Record of Decision (ROD) Activities: where there should be a discussion of post-ROD treatability investigations for design. Ecology commented that pilot tests may be needed because of the limited usefulness of Idaho National Laboratory and M-091 cost data.</p>	<p>DOE will update the work plan to include the process that will be used to evaluate the need for treatability studies (see discussion under Section 5.0.A). DOE will evaluate the value of pilot test data versus the relatively (compared to bench scale tests) large cost of these types of tests. This will be done through a qualitative evaluation – based on what we know, data available that are applicable, no data available but can make assumptions. Currently envision that these data will be captured in the treatability table and treatability subsection.</p>	<p>Treatability investigations proposed for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills are discussed in Section 5.7.3 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan. Other focused investigations are discussed in Section 5.7.4.2.</p>

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
4.1.1B Data Uses	Explain how the data will allow an evaluation of each likely response scenario, including problems with potential for worker exposure.	DOE will explain how proposed data collection will allow balancing between short-term effectiveness, long-term effectiveness, cost, and implementability.	<p>This comment will be addressed in the next revision of the RI/FS work plan, to be published after the completion of the Phase II DQO process.</p> <p>Data to be collected during Phase I-B characterization activities mainly include investigative nonintrusive surveys. These data will help focus future-phase characterization efforts that will be more specifically tied to evaluation of each likely-response scenario. Phase I-B generally supports all scenarios.</p> <p>The nine CERCLA criteria are discussed in Section 5.8.2 of the RI/FS work plan and will be carried forward into future revisions of the document.</p>

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
4.1.1C Data Uses	Ecology believes that some of the data from M-091 retrievals might satisfy the data needs that will be identified in the DQO for this work plan. If so, describe what data will come out of M-091 retrievals, and how the data will be used in this RI/FS.	DOE anticipates including unit cost data and worker exposure data from appropriate M-091 activities. Implementability data may be available as well. DOE will report how M-091 retrievals validated or changed conceptual site models derived from process knowledge (i.e., generate confidence in process knowledge for those waste streams for those years).	<p>Data collected as part of the M-091 Program activities, as well as data from the 200-PW-1 OU remedial investigation are discussed in Section 3.3.2.1. In addition, analytical data are presented in Appendix D of this RI/FS work plan.</p> <p>These data will be included in the RI report and carried forward into the FS for evaluation.</p>
4.1.2A Data Uses	Ecology believes that some of the data from potential 618-10/11 technology deployment might satisfy the data needs that will be identified in the DQO for this work plan. If so, describe what data will come out of 618-10/11 technology deployment and how the data will be used in this RI/FS.	DOE will identify data needs and determine if other projects such as 618-10 and 618-11 can provide that information.	Relevant information from the 618-10/11 project is discussed in Section 5.7.3 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan. The RI/FS work plan also discusses the importance of coordination with TRU waste retrieval (M-091 Program) and post-retrieval characterization activities.

C-8

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
4.1.2B Data Needs	<p>Identify what cost data are needed, especially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where would data come from for removal, treatment, and disposal estimates (noting that this is not a routine estimate)?</li> <li>• The Implementation Plan (DOE/RL-98-28) identified need for site-specific information for in situ vitrification. Where will cost data come from for in situ vitrification?</li> <li>• Where will cost data come from for removal, treatment, and disposal or in situ treatment of various items of interest?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See 4.1.1A</li> <li>• See 4.1.1A</li> <li>• DOE will use the DQO to evaluate the need for cost data for items of interest. If needed, DOE will evaluate if these data already exist in the Treatability Table described above. If not available, then DOE will evaluate how to get the data.</li> </ul>	<p>Information on cost estimating is presented in Section 5.7.4 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.</p>
4.1.2C Data Needs	<p>Discuss whether data are needed to refine estimates of transuranics. Is the likely percentage of removal, treatment, and disposal waste that would designate as TRU a key parameter in cost estimates? If so, what additional data are needed to develop more accurate estimates?</p>	<p>DOE will evaluate in situ technologies for assaying transuranics.</p>	<p>Treatability investigations regarding evaluation of in situ technologies for assaying transuranics are discussed in Section 5.7.3 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.</p>

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
4.1.4 Data Quantity	Burial grounds are difficult to characterize. Ecology expects that the heterogeneity of the waste may result in small data sets. Describe what statistical evaluation of data will be used in the risk assessment for small data sets. Ecology will participate and concur in the DQO.	DOE will specify data evaluation for small data sets. DOE and Ecology will have risk assessors participate/discuss the issue of small data sets as part of the DQO process.	<p>This comment will be addressed in the next revision of the RI/FS work plan, to be published after the completion of the Phase II DQO process.</p> <p>Data to be collected during Phase I-B characterization activities include mainly investigative nonintrusive surveys to help focus future-phase characterization efforts.</p> <p>A baseline risk assessment is proposed for development in fiscal year 2008, as noted in Figure 5-2.</p>
4.2 Characterization Approach or 4.1	Discuss available characterization approaches, and justify why some approaches were discarded and why the selected approach was chosen.	DOE agrees to provide characterization approaches rationale in a format similar to Chapter 7.0 (add a column that describes why technique was not selected) of the DQO.	This comment is addressed in Section 5.7.31, and within the referenced document (PNNL-16105).
5.0A RI/FS Study Process	Include a separate section on treatability study investigations.	DOE will add this as a separate section and treatability needs will be discussed as well.	Treatability investigations proposed for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills are discussed in Section 5.7.3 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
5.0B RI/FS Study Process	Add a subsection for "Cost Estimating." Describe the potential cost estimating alternatives; e.g., computer package, parametric approach, specialty cost for estimating nonstandard, unusual costs that typically are not estimated. Identify the key cost parameters; e.g., waste volume, waste treatment costs, disposal costs. Identify the data needed or already available to supply these parameters.	DOE will list the possible estimating approaches (re: DOE guidance) to identify the different data needs that might be used to feed each. The data needs will be addressed in Chapter 4.0 of the work plan.	Information on cost estimating is presented in Section 5.7.4 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.
5.0C RI/FS Study Process	Ecology will supply an expanded description of RCRA-CERCLA integration, specifically identifying how to avoid "pre-decisional" actions.	DOE will review and comment on the draft and both parties will resolve comments. Anticipate within the next 2 to 4 weeks.	Section 5.1 provides an expanded description of RCRA-CERCLA coordination.
5.3 FS/RCRA TSD Unit Closure Plan	Describe approach to close unused portions of TSDs. <i>(Ecology will provide the manner in which RCRA TSD closure/post closure plan requirements will be met in the Work Plan and subsequent documents [Section 5.5 of the TPA])</i>	DOE will prepare reclassification forms before the work plan revision for the unused portions. For sites that are not reclassified as rejected, DOE will place those sites in Bin 1.	Closure of the unused portions of the TSDs are addressed in Section 5.8.4.1 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.
5.4 Proposed Plan and Proposed RCRA Permit Modification	Add a closure plan crosswalk (e.g., as done in the 200-UW-1 FS [DOE/RL-2003-23]). The crosswalk can be used to do a completeness review for those components of the Closure Plan that will come from the RI/FS work plan or other existing documents. Ecology also can use it to evaluate the adequacy of the planned investigations to satisfy TSD unit sampling requirements.	DOE will provide the crosswalk in the revised work plan (Table 11, page 33 of the 200-UW-1 Proposed Plan [DOE/RL-2003-24] [Ecology's generic crosswalk format]).	A closure plan crosswalk is presented in Table 5-6 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.
5.4.2 Regional Site Closure	Revise the text to address DOE's interest in "Integration/alignment of 'decisions' and activities in the Core Zone. Cross-reference this to Sections 4.1 and 4.2 and summarize how this affected the DQOs or characterization approach.	DOE will incorporate additional detail when the work plan is updated and submitted.	The regional closure strategy was prepared by Fluor Hanford and is documented in CP-22319-DEL, <i>Plan for Central Plateau Closure</i> . This plan is cited in Section 5.8.2 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
5.5 Post-ROD Activities	Discuss long lead time activities including potential treatability investigations for design.	DOE will describe the concept of phasing a response for different areas and how the lead time on treatability investigations for design could make some burial grounds come later in the overall response. DOE will explain how the need for post-ROD treatability investigations will not prevent them from meeting the requirement for substantive and continuous remediation 15 months post-ROD.	Treatability investigations proposed for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills are discussed in Section 5.7.3 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.
6.0A Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add optional “treatability investigations” with a typical duration, showing the critical path relationship.</li> <li>• It’s okay to distinguish between treatability investigations required for the FS, and those required for remedial design.</li> <li>• Show activities to two work breakdown structure levels below treatability investigation, to allow evaluation of the “typical” duration. Two levels below might include:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Draft test plan</li> <li>– Regulatory review/approval cycle for test plan</li> <li>– Procurement</li> <li>– Testing</li> <li>– Draft test report</li> <li>– Regulatory review/approval cycle for report</li> <li>– The predecessor-successor relationship to the FS.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If DOE can establish in the DQO that a treatability investigation is not needed, then this level of detail is not required.</li> <li>• If needed, DOE will provide the treatability test plan schedule consistent with the level of detail currently in the work plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Treatability investigations proposed for the 200-SW-2 OU landfills are discussed in Section 5.7.3 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.</p> <p>As the need for treatability investigations is determined, a more detailed schedule will be included in Chapter 6.0. This likely will be included after the Phase II DQO process and revision to the RI/FS work plan has occurred. Under the phased approach, future/ additional sampling and analysis plan and revisions to this work plan are planned (as noted in the schedule).</p>

Table C-1. Collaborative-Negotiations Completion Matrix. (11 Pages)

Section	Description (Ecology)	Details (RL)	Resolution
6.0B Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss critical assumptions for schedule, unless discussed in earlier (added) section on key assumptions.</li> <li>Discuss long lead time activities including nuclear safety authorization.</li> </ul>	DOE will discuss critical assumptions, and long lead activities unless discussed in earlier section on "Key Assumptions" (Section 1.1.2).	Chapter 6.0 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan includes a high-level schedule of activities based on the Fluor Hanford baseline working schedule. Project assumptions also are noted in Section 1.4 of the Draft B RI/FS work plan.

*Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, 42 USC 9601, et seq.*

DOE/RL-98-28, *200 Areas Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Implementation Plan – Environmental Restoration Program.*

DOE/RL-2003-23, *Focused Feasibility Study for the 200-UW-1 Operable Unit.*

DOE/RL-2003-24, *Proposed Plan for the 200-UW-1 Operable Unit.*

Ecology et al., 1989, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order.*

EPA/540/G-89/004, *Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies under CERCLA, (Interim Final), OSWER 9355.3-01.*

*Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, 42 USC 6901, et seq.*

CERCLA = *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980.*

DOE = U.S. Department of Energy.

DQO = data quality objective.

Ecology = Washington State Department of Ecology.

FS = feasibility study.

OU = operable unit.

RCRA = *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976.*

RI/FS = remedial investigation/feasibility study.

RL = U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office.

ROD = record of decision.

TPA = Tri-Party Agreement (*Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order* (Ecology et al., 1989).

TRU = Radioactive waste as defined in DOE G 435.1-1, *Implementation Guide for Use with DOE M 435.1-1.*

TSD = treatment, storage, and/or disposal (unit).

## C2.0 REFERENCES

- 1  
2 *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980,*  
3 42 USC 9601, et seq.
- 4 CP-22319-DEL, 2004, *Plan for Central Plateau Closure*, Rev. 0, Fluor Hanford, Richland,  
5 Washington.
- 6 DOE/RL-98-28, 1999, *200 Areas Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Implementation*  
7 *Plan – Environmental Restoration Program*, Rev. 0, U.S. Department of Energy,  
8 Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 9 DOE/RL-2003-23, 2005, *Focused Feasibility Study for the 200-UW-1 Operable Unit*, Rev. 0,  
10 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 11 DOE/RL-2003-24 Reissued, 2005, *Proposed Plan for the 200-UW-1 Operable Unit*, Rev. 0,  
12 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 13 DOE/RL-2004-60, 2004, *200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit*  
14 *and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial*  
15 *Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan*, Draft A, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland  
16 Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- 17 Ecology and DOE, 2005, *200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Collaborative Workshops, Agreement,*  
18 *Completion Matrix, and Supporting Documentation, Final Product*, (Correspondence  
19 Control No. 0064527), Washington State Department of Ecology and U.S. Department of  
20 Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington, April 18.
- 21 Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1989, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*,  
22 2 vols., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection  
23 Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington, as amended.
- 24 EPA/540/G-89/004, 1988, *Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility*  
25 *Studies under CERCLA, (Interim Final)*, OSWER 9355.3-01, Office of Solid Waste and  
26 Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 27 PNNL-16105, 2007, *Technology Survey to Support Revision to the Remedial*  
28 *Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit at the*  
29 *U.S. Department of Energy's Hanford Site*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory,  
30 Richland, Washington.
- 31 *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*, 42 USC 6901, et seq.
- 32

1

**APPENDIX D**

2

3

4

**DATA COLLECTED TO SUPPORT CHARACTERIZATION  
OF LANDFILLS IN THE 200-SW-2 OPERABLE UNIT**

This page intentionally left blank.

**TABLES**

1

2 Table D-1. Laboratory Results of 218-W-3A Landfill Vent Riser Samples. .... D-2

3 Table D-2. Laboratory Results of the 218-W-4B Landfill Vent Riser Samples..... D-2

4 Table D-3. Field Screening Results of the 218-W-4C Landfill Vent Riser Samples. .... D-3

5 Table D-4. Soil Gas Probe Results Near Trench 4 in the 218-W-4C Landfill. .... D-4

6 Table D-5. Field Screening Results for Samples Collected From the Vadose Zone in the

7 218-W-4C Landfill. .... D-5

8 Table D-6. Laboratory Analysis of 218-W-4C Landfill Vent Riser Samples. .... D-7

9 Table D-7. Summary of Passive Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3A Landfill..... D-9

10 Table D-8. Summary of Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3AE Landfill. .... D-17

11 Table D-9. Summary of Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-4B Landfill..... D-20

12 Table D-10. Summary of Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-4C Landfill..... D-21

13 Table D-11. Summary of Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-5 Landfill..... D-22

14 Table D-12. Radiological Survey Results for 218-E-2 and 218-E-5 Landfills..... D-22

15 Table D-13. Plutonium and Uranium Estimates in 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills. .... D-23

16 Table D-14. 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfill Inventories..... D-25

17 Table D-15. Select Radionuclide Inventory for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills

18 (Curies). .... D-30

19

1

This page intentionally left blank.

2

## APPENDIX D

DATA COLLECTED TO SUPPORT CHARACTERIZATION  
OF LANDFILLS IN THE 200-SW-2 OPERABLE UNIT

This appendix includes a collection of results of the records research, field sampling, and survey data collected to date to support characterization of landfills in the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit (OU). These data supported the Phase I-B data quality objectives (DQO) process (SGW-33253, *Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills*) for this remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) work plan. This appendix also contains relevant data collected from other associated projects, such as the M-091 TRU Retrieval Project and the 200-PW-1 OU remedial investigation project. References for each data source are provided within each table. Because these projects collected data that may be of use to the 200-SW-2 OU investigation, the data collected have been captured in this appendix and ultimately will be summarized in the remedial investigation report for evaluation during the remedial investigation/feasibility study process. A discussion of, and reference to, these data is provided in Chapter 3.0 of this RI/FS work plan.

## REFERENCES

- 04-AMCP-0321, 2004, "Transmittal of the Burial Ground Sampling and Analysis Results for January – March 2004," (letter to Michael A. Wilson, Program Manager, Nuclear Waste Program, Department of Ecology, Kennewick, Washington, from Matthew S. McCormick, Assistant Manager for the Central Plateau), U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington, June 4.
- CP-13514, 2003, *200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step I Sampling and Analysis of the Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose Zone Plume*, Rev. 0, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- PNNL-00157, 2006, *Soil Measurements at 218-E-2 and E-5 Burial Grounds*, letter report to Greg Berlin, Fluor Hanford, from Andrey Mozhayev, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington, September 27.
- SGW-32683, in process, *Results from Passive Organic Vapor Sampling, Performed in Selected 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills (218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, and 218-W-5) in June-July 2006*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- SGW-33253, in process, *Data Quality Objectives Summary Report for Landfills in the 200-SW-1 and 200-SW-2 Operable Units*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- SGW-33829, in process, *200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step II Sampling and Analysis of the Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose-Zone Plume*, Fluor Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.

1

Table D-1. Laboratory Results of 218-W-3A Landfill Vent Riser Samples.<sup>a</sup>

Analyte	Chemical Abstracts Service Registry Number	Concentration Detected in Vent Riser Samples (ppmv)			
		Vent Riser T-05-02	Vent Riser T-08-03	Vent Riser T-08-05 <sup>b</sup>	Vent Riser T-08-05 <sup>b</sup> Duplicate
1,1-Dichloroethene	75-35-4	1.6	N/A	N/A	N/A
1,2-Dichloroethane	107-06-2	0.62	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chloroform	67-66-3	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tetrachloroethene (PCE)	127-18-4	3	4,200	18	17
Trichloroethene	79-01-6	1.3	8.8	N/A	N/A

<sup>a</sup>Samples collected in August and September 2005 to support the M-091 Program (SGW-33829, 200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step II Sampling and Analysis of the Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose-Zone Plume).

<sup>b</sup>Vapor samples from vent risers T-05-02 and T-08-03 contained the highest volatile organic compound concentrations, based on field screening, in Trenches T-05 and T-08, respectively. An additional SUMMA canister sample and the duplicate sample were collected from vent riser T-08-05.

SUMMA is a trademark of Moletrics, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

ppmv = parts per million by volume.

2

Table D-2. Laboratory Results of the 218-W-4B Landfill Vent Riser Samples.<sup>a</sup> (2 Pages)

Analyte	Chemical Abstracts Service Registry Number	Concentration Detected in Vent Riser Samples (ppmv)					
		Vent Riser T-07-4		Vent Riser T-07-6		Vent Riser T-07-6 <sup>b</sup> Duplicate	
<i>Analytical Results</i>							
Propane	74-98-6	4.6		1.2		5.6	
Methylene chloride	75-09-2	ND		ND		0.72	
1,1-Dichloroethene	75-35-4	5.6		ND		ND	
Carbon tetrachloride	56-23-5	66		42	D	140	D
Chloroform	67-66-3	11		4		9.3	
Tetrachloroethene (PCE)	127-18-4	36		0.99		2	
Trichloroethene (TCE)	79-01-6	8.4		0.44		0.94	
Methanol	67-56-1	53	J	1	J	8.6	DJ
Acetone	67-64-1	86	J	0.78	J	2.3	J
Toluene	108-88-3	ND		ND		0.63	
Ethanol	64-17-5	ND		ND		1.2	
<i>Tentatively Identified Compounds</i>							
Trichlorofluoromethane	75-69-4	ND		2.4		5.9	
1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	76-13-1	73		1.4		3.7	
1,1,1-trichloroethane	71-55-6	49		1.7		4.2	

Table D-2. Laboratory Results of the 218-W-4B Landfill Vent Riser Samples.<sup>a</sup> (2 Pages)

Analyte	Chemical Abstracts Service Registry Number	Concentration Detected in Vent Riser Samples (ppmv)				
		Vent Riser T-07-4		Vent Riser T-07-6		Vent Riser T-07-6 <sup>b</sup> Duplicate
Dichlorodifluoromethane	75-71-8			2.6		6.1
Methylcyclohexane	108-87-2	ND		ND		1.4
C3 benzene <sup>c</sup>	ND	82		ND		ND

<sup>a</sup>Samples collected September to November 2006 to support the M-091 Program (SGW-33829, 200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step II Sampling and Analysis of the Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose-Zone Plume).

<sup>b</sup>The vapor sample from vent riser T-07-4 contained the highest volatile organic compound concentrations, based on field screening, in Trench T-07. An additional SUMMA canister sample and the duplicate sample were collected from vent riser T-07-6. The additional and duplicate SUMMA canister samples were collected from a vent riser with slightly lower volatile organic compound concentrations to reduce the potential that the highest volatile organic compound concentrations would exceed calibration standards and make the duplicate analysis of little value.

<sup>c</sup>The tentatively identified compound identified as C3 benzene is a three-carbon benzene with high-quality spectral matches with 1,3,5-, 1,2,3-, and 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene. High match qualities also were obtained for the three structures of ethyl methyl benzenes. These compounds often are observed in hydrocarbon mixtures but rarely as an individual tentatively identified compound at a high concentration level.

SUMMA is a trademark of Moletrics, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

ND = not detected.

D = analyte was identified at a secondary dilution factor.

J = estimated value.

ppmv = parts per million by volume.

Table D-3. Field Screening Results of the 218-W-4C Landfill Vent Riser Samples.\* (2 Pages)

Trench Number and Sample Location	Carbon Tetrachloride (CAS 56-23-5) (ppmv)	Chloroform (CAS 67-66-3) (ppmv)	Water Vapor (CAS N/A) (ppmv)	HEIS Number
T1-01	2.24	6.80	6400	B14K18
T1-02	2.14	6.34	6370	B14K19
T1-03	1.55	3.31	6410	B14K20
T1-04	1.48	2.87	6560	B14K21
T4-01	7.64	23.2	7530	B14K22
T4-02	8.87	24.0	8060	B14K23
T4-03	852	28.8	7930	B14K24
T4-04	1760	59.3	8270	B14K25
T4-04 Duplicate	1750	59.1	7640	B14K29
T4-04A	812	15.2	11900	B14K46
T4-05	365	7.42	8840	B14K26
T4-05A	8.27	7.53	10500	B14K45
T4-06	8.66	7.83	10600	B14K27

Table D-3. Field Screening Results of the 218-W-4C Landfill  
Vent Riser Samples.\* (2 Pages)

Trench Number and Sample Location	Carbon Tetrachloride (CAS 56-23-5) (ppmv)	Chloroform (CAS 67-66-3) (ppmv)	Water Vapor (CAS N/A) (ppmv)	HEIS Number
T4-07	5.21	34.7	11900	B14K28
T4-08	1.12	12.6	9240	B14K30
T4-09	2.81	5.95	9120	B14K31
T4-10	7.87	3.97	10100	B14K32
T4-11	8.04	3.72	10600	B14K33
T4-12	6.61	2.68	10800	B14K34
T4-13	7.74	3.07	11400	B14K35
T4-14	8.80	3.48	12000	B14K36
T4-14 Duplicate	8.80	3.61	11600	B14K39
T4-15	8.66	3.52	13100	B14K37
T4-16	8.43	3.49	13600	B14K38
T7-01	6.27	1.39	7880	B14K40
T7-02	5.98	1.29	7990	B14K41
T7-03	6.68	1.40	8360	B14K42
T7-04	7.58	42.0	8620	B14K43
T7-05	1.0 U	1.81	9150	B14K44

\*Samples collected in 2002 to support the M-091 Program (CP-13514, 200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step I Sampling and Analysis of the Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose Zone Plume).

CAS = Chemical Abstracts Service registry number.

HEIS = Hanford Environmental Information System database.

N/A = not applicable.

ppmv = parts per million by volume.

U = analyzed for but not detected. Value reported is the reporting limit.

1

Table D-4. Soil Gas Probe Results Near Trench 4 in the 218-W-4C Landfill.\*

Location	Depth (ft bgs)	Carbon Tetrachloride (ppmv)	Chloroform (ppmv)
C4056	34.3 – 34.8	< 1.0 – 19.5	< 1.0 – 5.25
C4057	8.9 – 9.4	6.58 – 48.0	< 1.0 – 10.3
C4058	30.5 – 31.0	< 1.0 – 5.52	< 1.0 – 29.3

\*Samples collected between 2002 and 2004 to support the 200-PW-1 OU remedial investigation (SGW-33829, 200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step II Sampling and Analysis of the Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose-Zone Plume).

bgs = below ground surface.

ppmv = parts per million by volume.

2

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-5. Field Screening Results for Samples Collected From the Vadose Zone in the 218-W-4C Landfill.\* (2 Pages)

Borehole Number	Carbon Tetrachloride (CAS 56-23-5) (ppmv)	Chloroform (CAS 67-66-3) (ppmv)	Water Vapor (CAS N/A) (ppmv)	HEIS Number
C4011	10.5	2.80	17,500	B154R1
C4011	6.91	2.07	14,500	B154R0
C4012	62.1	12.2	18,100	B154T3
C4012	7.25	2.32	19,500	B154R3
C4012	15.6	4.10	15,700	B154R2
C4017	1.0 U	1.41	19,700	B154T6
C4017	1.0 U	1.72	18,200	B154T5
C4014	1.0 U	1.07	17,500	B154R7
C4014	1.36	1.85	15,800	B154R6
C4019	1.0 U	1.55	17,900	B154V0
C4019	1.0 U	2.57	15,500	B154T9
C4022	1.0 U	1.56	19,000	B154V6
C4022	2.4	2.78	16,700	B154V5
C4018	1.0 U	1.16	18,700	B154T8
C4018	1.0 U	1.50	17,200	B154T7
C4021	1.0 U	1.62	20,300	B154V4
C4021	1.0 U	1.83	17,700	B154V3
C4015	1.0 U	2.09	13,900	B154R9
C4015	1.0 U	2.31	14,100	B154R8
C4020	1.0 U	1.47	19,800	B154V2
C4020	1.0 U	1.52	16,600	B154V1
C4013	1.0 U	1.0 U	19,200	B154R5
C4013	1.0 U	1.08	16,300	B154R4
C4016	12.7	5.77	14,000	B154T2
C4016	14.8	4.48	16,200	B154T1
C4016	14.3	4.51	16,200	B154T4 Duplicate
C4016	4.80	3.37	15,600	B154T0
C3869	9.61	3.12	13,400	B15J55
C3869	16.0	5.08	14,300	B15J56
C3869	12.9	4.40	14,700	B15J57
C3869	14.0	5.63	16,400	B15J58
C3869	11.3	4.75	15,800	B15J59
C3866	1.0 U	1.0 U	10,400	B15J37
C3866	1.0 U	1.0 U	10,400	B15J38
C3866	1.0 U	1.0 U	10,100	B15J39

Table D-5. Field Screening Results for Samples Collected From the Vadose Zone in the 218-W-4C Landfill.\* (2 Pages)

Borehole Number	Carbon Tetrachloride (CAS 56-23-5) (ppmv)	Chloroform (CAS 67-66-3) (ppmv)	Water Vapor (CAS N/A) (ppmv)	HEIS Number
C3866	1.0 U	1.0 U	9,810	B15J40
C3866	1.0 U	1.0 U	9,890	B15J41
C3866	1.0 U	1.0 U	9,870	B15J42
C3867	45.8	9.53	16,100	B15J43
C3867	47.6	9.59	15,700	B15J49 Duplicate
C3867	7.34	1.71	10,600	B15J44
C3867	14.9	3.64	13,100	B15J45
C3867	23.9	5.48	14,200	B15J46
C3867	35.8	8.30	18,900	B15J47
C3867	24.9	6.77	22,200	B15J48
C3868	5.23	3.13	19,800	B15J50
C3868	3.95	3.98	22,100	B15J51
C3868	4.88	3.88	23,300	B15J52
C3868	7.26	4.24	21,000	B15J53
C3868	8.73	4.27	24,200	B15J54
C3865	1.0 U	1.0 U	18,800	B15J30
C3865	1.0 U	1.13	20,900	B15J31
C3865	1.0 U	1.28	19,500	B15J32
C3865	3.49	1.90	21,600	B15J33
C3865	6.20	2.13	22,400	B15J34
C3865	6.19	2.10	22,400	B15J36 Duplicate
C3865	1.95	1.73	27,900	B15J35
C3870	3.58	2.11	12,000	B15J60
C3870	5.13	2.99	11,800	B15J61
C3870	5.15	3.11	11,900	B15J62
C3870	6.37	3.67	12,300	B15J63
C3870	6.15	3.93	14,500	B15J64
C3870	6.12	3.71	14,400	B15J65 Duplicate

\*Samples collected in 2002 to support the 200-PW-1 OU remedial investigation (CP-13514, 200-PW-1 Operable Unit Report on Step I Sampling and Analysis of the Dispersed Carbon Tetrachloride Vadose Zone Plume).

CAS = Chemical Abstracts Service registry number.

HEIS = Hanford Environmental Information System database.

N/A = not applicable.

U = analyzed for but not detected. Value reported is the reporting limit.

Table D-6. Laboratory Analysis of 218-W-4C Landfill Vent Riser Samples.<sup>a</sup> (2 Pages)

Analyte	CAS Number	Concentration Detected in Vent Riser Samples (ppbv)						
		Vent Riser T1-04	Vent Riser T4-04	Vent Riser T4-04 duplicate	Vent Riser T7-06	Vent Riser T20-03	Vent Riser T29-01-S <sup>b</sup>	Vent Riser T29-04-N <sup>b</sup>
1-Chlorobutane <sup>c</sup>	109-69-3	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	280
1,1-Dichloroethane <sup>c</sup>	75-34-3	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	16	ND
1,1,1-Trichloroethane <sup>c</sup>	71-55-6	110	ND	ND	40	ND	68	ND
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	76-13-1	ND	ND	ND	44	ND	ND	ND
1,2-Dichloroethane	107-06-2	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	13	ND
1-Butanol	71-36-3	ND	320,000 D	ND	ND	ND	12	ND
2-Butanone	78-93-3	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	46	31
3-Methylhexane	589-34-4	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	78	ND
Acetaldehyde	75-07-0	ND	ND	ND	22	15 B	ND	70
Acetic acid, methylester <sup>c</sup>	79-20-9	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	29	ND
Acetone	67-64-1	ND	ND	ND	14	ND	220	140
Acetonitrile	75-05-8	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	17
Benzene	71-43-2	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	33	19
Carbon Tetrachloride	56-23-5	16	ND	ND	2,700 D	18	3,400 D	1,900 D
Choroethane	75-00-3	ND	ND	ND	21	ND	180	87
Chloroform	67-66-3	ND	ND	ND	95	ND	75	40
Chloromethane	74-87-3	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	730 D	220
Dichlorodifluoromethane	75-71-8	NA	NA	NA	NA	910 D	NA	NA
Ethanol	64-17-5	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	23
Methanol	67-56-1	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	430 D	230
Methylene Chloride	75-09-2	51	ND	ND	ND	ND	110	59
n-Heptane	142-82-5	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	19	11
n-Butane	106-97-8	20	ND	ND	ND	ND	66	25

D-7

DOE/RI-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-6. Laboratory Analysis of 218-W-4C Landfill Vent Riser Samples.<sup>a</sup> (2 Pages)

Analyte	CAS Number	Concentration Detected in Vent Riser Samples (ppbv)						
		Vent Riser T1-04	Vent Riser T4-04	Vent Riser T4-04 duplicate	Vent Riser T7-06	Vent Riser T20-03	Vent Riser T29-01-S <sup>b</sup>	Vent Riser T29-04-N <sup>b</sup>
Tetrachloroethene	127-18-4	25,000 D	14,000,000 D	6,200,000 D	36,000 D	ND	2,400 D	2,800 D
Toluene	108-88-3	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	16	ND
Trichloroethene	79-01-6	16	ND	ND	21	ND	ND	ND
Trichloromonofluoromethane	75-69-4	800 D	ND	ND	7,900 D	8,600 D	ND	ND
Vinyl Chloride	75-01-4	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	17	ND

<sup>a</sup>Samples collected in 2003 to support the M-091 Program (04-AMCP-0321, "Transmittal of the Burial Ground Sampling and Analysis Results for January - March 2004").

<sup>b</sup>A SUMMA canister sample was collected from vent riser T29-04-N in Trench T-29 on October 21, 2003. However, the maximum carbon tetrachloride concentration in Trench T-29 was detected at vent riser T29-01-S. A second SUMMA canister sample was collected in Trench T-29 from vent riser T29-01-S on October 22, 2003, to correct this unintentional mistake. Both of these SUMMA canister samples were submitted for laboratory analysis.

<sup>c</sup>Tentatively identified compound.

SUMMA is a trademark of Moletrics, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

- B = analyte found in associated blank.
- CAS = Chemical Abstracts Service registry number.
- D = analyte was identified at a secondary dilution factor.
- NA = not analyzed.
- ND = not detected.
- ppbv = parts per billion by volume.

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-7. Summary of Passive Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3A Landfill.\* (9 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
<i><b>Trench T04</b></i>		
T04-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	103
	Benzene	36
	Tetrachloroethene	1113
	Trichloroethene	60
T04-B-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	296
	Benzene	65
	Tetrachloroethene	431
T04-B-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	152
	1,1-Dichloroethene	91
	Tetrachloroethene	480
T04-C-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	375
	1,1-Dichloroethene	80
	Benzene	34
	Tetrachloroethene	170
T04-C-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	149
	Benzene	32
	Tetrachloroethene	147
<i><b>Trench T05</b></i>		
T05-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	218
	Benzene	33
	Tetrachloroethene	76
T05-B-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	544
	1,1-Dichloroethene	1057
	1,1-Dichloroethene	80
	1,2-Dichloroethane	80
	Benzene	37
	Chloroform	160
	Tetrachloroethene	570
T05-C-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	208
	Benzene	32
	Chloroform	69
	Tetrachloroethene	1123
	Trichloroethene	40
T05-C-1D	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	155
	Benzene	36
	Chloroform	43
	Tetrachloroethene	616

Table D-7. Summary of Passive Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3A Landfill.\* (9 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
T05-D-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	56
	Benzene	59
	Tetrachloroethene	1262
	Trichloroethene	27
T05-D-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	86
	Tetrachloroethene	118
T05-D-3	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	509
	Benzene	51
	Tetrachloroethene	1025
T05-D-4	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	293
	Benzene	29
	Chloroform	40
	Tetrachloroethene	806
T05-E-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	591
	1,1-Dichloroethane	101
	1,1-Dichloroethene	163
	Chloroform	388
	Tetrachloroethene	328
T05-F-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	11754
	1,1-Dichloroethane	1171
	1,1-Dichloroethene	2712
	1,2-Dichloroethane	1980
	Benzene	72
	Chloroform	9370
	Tetrachloroethene	1250
	Trichloroethene	89
<b><i>Trench T12</i></b>		
T12-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	191
	1,1-Dichloroethene	51
	Tetrachloroethene	38
T12-B-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	40
	Benzene	29
	Tetrachloroethene	606
	Toluene	29
T12-C-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	148
	Benzene	43
	Tetrachloroethene	2495
	Trichloroethene	40

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-7. Summary of Passive Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3A Landfill.\* (9 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
T12-C-2	Tetrachloroethene	639
	Trichloroethene	29
<b><u>Trench T19</u></b>		
T19-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	754
	1,1-Dichloroethane	39
	1,1-Dichloroethene	178
	Benzene	43
	Tetrachloroethene	1593
	Trichloroethene	50
<b><u>Trench T20</u></b>		
T20-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	534
	1,1-Dichloroethene	26
	Benzene	26
	Tetrachloroethene	215
T20-A-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	256
	Benzene	46
	Tetrachloroethene	199
<b><u>Trench T22</u></b>		
T22-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	408
	1,1-Dichloroethene	40
	Benzene	60
	Chloroform	42
	Tetrachloroethene	20457
	Trichloroethene	342
T22-A-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	167
	Benzene	43
	Tetrachloroethene	10456
	Trichloroethene	223
<b><u>Trench T24</u></b>		
T24-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	72
	Benzene	53
	Tetrachloroethene	1353
T24-A-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	72
	Benzene	37
	Tetrachloroethene	461
<b><u>Trench T29</u></b>		
T29-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	126
	Benzene	53
	Tetrachloroethene	68

Table D-7. Summary of Passive Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3A Landfill.\* (9 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
T29-A-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	105
	Benzene	52
	Tetrachloroethene	101
T29-B-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	251
	1,1-Dichloroethene	38
	Benzene	38
	Chloroform	37
	Tetrachloroethene	350
T29-B-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	294
	Benzene	44
	Carbon Tetrachloride	32
	Chloroform	33
	Tetrachloroethene	426
T29-B-2D	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	193
	1,1-Dichloroethene	50
	Benzene	27
	Tetrachloroethene	277
T29-C-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	382
	1,1-Dichloroethene	99
	Benzene	31
	Tetrachloroethene	222
T29-C-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	295
	1,1-Dichloroethene	63
	Tetrachloroethene	131
<b><i>Trench T31</i></b>		
T31-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	56
	Benzene	34
	Tetrachloroethene	60
T31-A-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	57
	Benzene	39
	Tetrachloroethene	144
T31-B-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	74
	1,1-Dichloroethene	26
	Tetrachloroethene	286
T31-B-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	590
	Benzene	58
	Carbon Tetrachloride	29
	Tetrachloroethene	819

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-7. Summary of Passive Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3A Landfill.\* (9 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
T31-C-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	247
	Benzene	47
	Tetrachloroethene	51
T31-C-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	622
	Benzene	70
	Tetrachloroethene	254
<b><u>Trench T32</u></b>		
T32-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	185
	Benzene	45
	Tetrachloroethene	63
<b><u>Trench T33</u></b>		
T33-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	511
	Benzene	33
	Tetrachloroethene	232
T33-B-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	270
	1,1-Dichloroethane	80
	1,1-Dichloroethene	65
	Benzene	33
	Chloroform	36
	Tetrachloroethene	125
<b><u>Trench T34</u></b>		
T34-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	205
	1,1-Dichloroethene	32
	Benzene	31
	Tetrachloroethene	523
<b><u>Trench T35</u></b>		
T35-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	251
	1,2-Dichloroethane	25
	Benzene	29
	Chloroform	225
	Tetrachloroethene	742
<b><u>Trench T41</u></b>		
T41-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	179
	Benzene	35
	Tetrachloroethene	83
<b><u>Trench T44</u></b>		
T44-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	34
	Benzene	25
T44-A-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	79
	Tetrachloroethene	32

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-7. Summary of Passive Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3A Landfill.\* (9 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
T44-B-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	72
	Benzene	46
T44-B-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	40
	Benzene	27
<b><u>Trench T46</u></b>		
T46-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	2828
	1,1-Dichloroethane	553
	1,1-Dichloroethene	490
	Benzene	28
	Tetrachloroethene	382
T46-A-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1204
	1,1-Dichloroethane	182
	1,1-Dichloroethene	186
	Benzene	37
T46-A-2D	Tetrachloroethene	61
	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1352
	1,1-Dichloroethane	188
	1,1-Dichloroethene	381
T46-B-1	Benzene	27
	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	230
	1,1-Dichloroethene	58
	Tetrachloroethene	230
T46-C-1	Benzene	39
	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	510
	1,1-Dichloroethane	111
	1,1-Dichloroethene	41
	Tetrachloroethene	27
T46-C-2	Benzene	26
	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	259
	1,1-Dichloroethane	90
	1,1-Dichloroethene	117
	Tetrachloroethene	32
<b><u>Trench T48</u></b>		
T48-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	31
	Benzene	29
T48-A-3	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	147
	Benzene	27
T48-B-1	Benzene	34

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-7. Summary of Passive Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3A Landfill.\* (9 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
<u><i>Trench TS0</i></u>		
T50-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	35
	Benzene	29
T50-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	79
	Benzene	25
<u><i>Trench TS1</i></u>		
TS1-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	11693
	1,1-Dichloroethane	4025
	1,1-Dichloroethene	938
	Benzene	53
	Chloroform	57
	Tetrachloroethene	107
	Toluene	25
TS1-A-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	2025
	1,1-Dichloroethane	684
	1,1-Dichloroethene	638
	Chloroform	186
	Tetrachloroethene	148
<u><i>Trench TS3</i></u>		
TS3-A-1	Benzene	45
TS3-A-2	Benzene	33
	Tetrachloroethene	83
TS3-A-3	Benzene	31
TS3-A-4	Tetrachloroethene	192
TS3-A-5	Benzene	78
	Tetrachloroethene	130
TS3-A-6	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	32
	Benzene	57
TS3-A-7	Tetrachloroethene	78
TS3-A-8	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	26
	Tetrachloroethene	38
TS3-A-9	Benzene	29
	Tetrachloroethene	47
TS3-A-10	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	85
	Tetrachloroethene	142
TS3-A-11	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	62
	Benzene	42
	Carbon Tetrachloride	26
	Chloroform	36
	Tetrachloroethene	32

Table D-7. Summary of Passive Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3A Landfill.\* (9 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
TS3-A-12	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	68
	Carbon Tetrachloride	149
	Chloroform	241
	Tetrachloroethene	96
TS3-A-13	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	27
	Benzene	28
TS3-A-14	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	46
	Benzene	30
	Tetrachloroethene	73
TS3-A-15	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	80
	Benzene	32
TS3-A-16	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	100
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	412
	Benzene	42
	Tetrachloroethene	40
TS3-A-17	Benzene	34
TS3-A-17D	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	37
TS3-A-18	Benzene	30
	Tetrachloroethene	25
TS3-A-19	Benzene	30
<b><i>Trench TS6</i></b>		
TS6-A-1	Benzene	28
	Tetrachloroethene	97
TS6-A-2	Tetrachloroethene	72
TS6-A-3	Benzene	55
	Tetrachloroethene	116
TS6-A-4	Benzene	61
	Chloroform	52
	Tetrachloroethene	36
TS6-B-1	Tetrachloroethene	94
TS6-B-2	Tetrachloroethene	58
TS6-B-3	Benzene	31
	Tetrachloroethene	91
TS6-B-4	Benzene	37
TS6-C-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	34
	Chloroform	76
	Tetrachloroethene	35

Table D-7. Summary of Passive Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3A Landfill.\* (9 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
TS6-C-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	45
	Benzene	38
	Chloroform	61
	Tetrachloroethene	26
<b><u>Trench TS8</u></b>		
TS8-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	133
	Benzene	25
	Tetrachloroethene	70070
	Trichloroethene	608
TS8-A-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	58
	Benzene	28
	Tetrachloroethene	706
<b><u>Trench TS9</u></b>		
TS9-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	164
	1,1-Dichloroethane	134
	Benzene	43
	Carbon Tetrachloride	1184
	Chloroform	1200
	Tetrachloroethene	295

\*Samples collected in June and July 2006 to support the 200-SW-2 OU remedial investigation (SGW-32683, Results from Passive Organic Vapor Sampling, Performed in Selected 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills (218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, and 218-W-5) in June-July 2006).

ng/sample = nanograms/sample.

1

Table D-8. Summary of Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3AE Landfill.\* (3 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
<b><u>Trench T05</u></b>		
T05-G-1	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	13788
	Benzene	43
T05-G-2	Benzene	36
T05-G-3	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	482
	Benzene	26
T05-G-5	Benzene	48
T05-G-5D	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	227
	Benzene	48
T05-G-6	Benzene	32
T05-G-7	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	446
	Benzene	44
T05-G-8	Benzene	29
T05-H-1	Benzene	25

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-8. Summary of Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3AE Landfill.\* (3 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
T05-H-2	Benzene	26
T05-H-3	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	33
T05-H-4	Benzene	42
T05-H-5	Benzene	50
T05-H-6	Tetrachloroethene	30
T05-H-7	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	31
	Benzene	34
	Tetrachloroethene	139
T05-H-8	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	40
	Benzene	26
	Tetrachloroethene	32
T05-H-8D	Tetrachloroethene	142
T05-H-9	Benzene	36
<b><u>Trench T08</u></b>		
T08-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1894
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	1082
	1,1-Dichloroethane	63
	1,1-Dichloroethene	123
	Benzene	40
	Tetrachloroethene	373
<b><u>Trench T10</u></b>		
T10-A-2	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	27
	Benzene	55
T10-A-3	Benzene	54
T10-A-4	Benzene	32
T10-A-5	Benzene	32
T10-A-6	Benzene	31
T10-A-8	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	50
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	797
	Benzene	33
T10-A-9	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	54
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	5870
	Benzene	38
T10-A-10	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	87
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	2212
	Benzene	40
	Tetrachloroethene	62

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-8. Summary of Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-3AE Landfill.\* (3 Pages)

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
T10-A-11	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	29
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	793
	Benzene	26
	Tetrachloroethene	30
T10-A-12	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	622
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	8059
	1,1-Dichloroethane	102
	1,2-Dichloropropane	92
	Benzene	88
	Chloroform	58
	Tetrachloroethene	51
T10-A-13	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	42
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	5534
T10-A-14	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	87
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	6949
	Benzene	35
T10-A-15	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	273
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	1813
	1,1-Dichloroethene	169
	Benzene	29
T10-A-16	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	85
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	794
	1,1-Dichloroethene	27
	Benzene	39
T10-A-17	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	118
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	1187
	Tetrachloroethene	64
	Trichloroethene	846
T10-A-18	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	70
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	423
	Benzene	95
	Trichloroethene	30
T10-B-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	21153
	1,1-Dichloroethane	3386
	1,1-Dichloroethene	965
	Benzene	37
	Tetrachloroethene	145911
	Trichloroethene	483

\*Samples collected in June and July 2006 to support the 200-SW-2 OU remedial investigation (SGW-32683, Results from Passive Organic Vapor Sampling, Performed in Selected 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills (218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, and 218-W-5) in June-July 2006).  
ng/sample = nanograms/sample.

1

Table D-9. Summary of Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-4B Landfill.\*

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
<u>Trench T08</u>		
T-08-1A	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1224
	1,1-Dichloroethane	166
	1,1-Dichloroethene	313
	1,2-Dichloropropane	1402
	Benzene	54
	Carbon Tetrachloride	87204
	Chloroform	7220
	Tetrachloroethene	230
	Trichloroethene	387
T08-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	778
	1,1-Dichloroethene	315
	1,2-Dichloropropane	1177
	Benzene	26
	Carbon Tetrachloride	70396
	Chloroform	6762
	Tetrachloroethene	110
	Trichloroethene	284
T08-A-2	Benzene	62
	Carbon Tetrachloride	30
T08-A-3	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	720
	1,1-Dichloroethane	73
	1,1-Dichloroethene	82
	1,2-Dichloropropane	486
	Benzene	43
	Carbon Tetrachloride	33091
	Chloroform	3070
	Tetrachloroethene	115
	Trichloroethene	369
T08-A-4	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	731
	1,1-Dichloroethane	97
	1,1-Dichloroethene	156
	1,2-Dichloropropane	2096
	Benzene	28
	Carbon Tetrachloride	79082
	Chloroform	5742
	Tetrachloroethene	232
	Trichloroethene	351

\*Samples collected in June and July 2006 to support the 200-SW-2 OU remedial investigation (SGW-32683, Results from Passive Organic Vapor Sampling, Performed in Selected 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills (218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, and 218-W-5) in June-July 2006).  
ng/sample = nanograms/sample.

2

## DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-10. Summary of Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-4C Landfill.\*

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
<b><u>Trench T19</u></b>		
T19-A	Benzene	54
	Chloroform	30
	Toluene	25
T19-B-1	Benzene	36
T19-B-2	Benzene	32
T19-B-3	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	40
<b><u>Trench T23</u></b>		
T23-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	2003
	1,1-Dichloroethane	53
	1,1-Dichloroethene	79
	Benzene	35
<b><u>Trench T58</u></b>		
T58-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	88
	Benzene	36
	Tetrachloroethene	79
T58-A-1D	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	37
	Benzene	37
	Tetrachloroethene	57
T58-B-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	605
	1,1-Dichloroethene	48
	Benzene	54
	Tetrachloroethene	30

\*Samples collected in June and July 2006 to support the 200-SW-2 OU remedial investigation (SGW-32683, Results from Passive Organic Vapor Sampling, Performed in Selected 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills (218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, and 218-W-5) in June-July 2006).

ng/sample = nanograms/sample.

1

Table D-11. Summary of Soil-Gas Survey Data for the 218-W-5 Landfill.\*

Sample Location	Organic Compounds	Analytical Results (ng/sample)
<b><i>Trench T22</i></b>		
T22-A-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	188
	Benzene	47
	Tetrachloroethene	78
T22-A-2	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1020
	1,1-Dichloroethane	84
	1,1-Dichloroethene	190
	Benzene	37
	Tetrachloroethene	250
T22-B-1	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	2310
	1,1,2-Trichlorotrifluoroethane	410
	1,1-Dichloroethane	159
	1,1-Dichloroethene	470
	Benzene	35
	Tetrachloroethene	2621
	Trichloroethene	49

\*Samples collected in June and July 2006 to support the 200-SW-2 OU remedial investigation (SGW-32683, Results from Passive Organic Vapor Sampling, Performed in Selected 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills (218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, and 218-W-5) in June-July 2006).

ng/sample = nanograms/sample.

2

Table D-12. Radiological Survey Results for 218-E-2 and 218-E-5 Landfills.\* (2 Pages)

Location	Cs-137 Concentration [pCi/g]ND	
	Measured value $\pm$ 1 sigma (Minimum Detectable Levels)	
	First Model (1' clean layer A + 6" Cs-137 in B)	Second Model (6" Cs-137 in layer A)
1	123 $\pm$ 9 {18}	0.68 $\pm$ 0.05 {0.10}
2	1698 $\pm$ 65 {24}	9.38 $\pm$ 0.37 {0.13}
3	1280 $\pm$ 50 {20}	7.07 $\pm$ 0.28 {0.11}
4	822 $\pm$ 33 {19}	4.54 $\pm$ 0.19 {0.10}
5	1200 $\pm$ 47 {20}	6.62 $\pm$ 0.27 {0.11}
6	1542 $\pm$ 59 {22}	8.52 $\pm$ 0.34 {0.12}
7	1059 $\pm$ 42 {20}	5.84 $\pm$ 0.24 {0.11}
8	1535 $\pm$ 61 {28}	8.48 $\pm$ 0.35 {0.16}
9	132 $\pm$ 9 {16}	0.73 $\pm$ 0.05 {0.09}

Table D-12. Radiological Survey Results for 218-E-2 and 218-E-5 Landfills.\* (2 Pages)

Location	Cs-137 Concentration [pCi/g]ND	
	Measured value $\pm$ 1 sigma (Minimum Detectable Levels)	
	First Model (1' clean layer A + 6" Cs-137 in B)	Second Model (6" Cs-137 in layer A)
A	1717 $\pm$ 71 {36}	9.48 $\pm$ 0.41 {0.20}
B	1686 $\pm$ 70 {42}	9.31 $\pm$ 0.40 {0.23}
C	1132 $\pm$ 50 {35}	6.25 $\pm$ 0.28 {0.19}

\*Data collected in September 2006 to support the 200-SW-2 OU remedial investigation (PNNL-00157, *Soil Measurements at 218-E-2 and E-5 Burial Grounds*).

ND Concentration values are based on the model applied for analysis and reported uncertainty does not include systematic component of the model accuracy.

1

Table D-13. Plutonium and Uranium Estimates in 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills.  
(2 Pages)

Landfill	Size (acres)	Estimated Total Plutonium Inventory (g)	Estimated Plutonium Inventory (g/ac)	Estimated Total Uranium Inventory (g)	Estimated Uranium Inventory (g/ac)
218-C-9	1.25	0	0	0	0
218-E-1	3.24	900	278	400,000	123,574
218-E-2	5.49	800	146	300,000	54,678
218-E-2A	1.07	--	--	--	--
218-E-4	3.58	10	3	1,000	279
218-E-5	2.44	623	255	120,001	49,116
218-E-5A	1.1	1,380	1,258	120,000	109,356
218-E-8	1.06	20	19	2,000	1,894
218-E-9	0.98	--	--	--	--
218-E-10	70.16	4,942	70	801,015	11,418
218-E-12A	28.24	8,931	316	994,740	35,228
218-E-12B	217.17	1,393	6	7,640	35
218-W-1	6.34	94,030	14,840	700,000	110,478
218-W-1A	14.97	2,000	134	900,000	60,129
218-W-2	7.05	126,010	17,879	1,400,000	198,645
218-W-2A	20.39	6,385	313	2,690,000	131,955
218-W-3	8.08	68,240	8,445	79,798,801	9,875,102
218-W-3A	56.93	552	10	634,186	11,139
218-W-3AE	61.29	122	2	439,222	7,166
218-W-4A	21.01	35,386	1,684	393,806,555	18,743,767
218-W-4B	9.34	8,977	961	21,568	2,308
218-W-4C	44.08	26	1	214,777	4,873

Table D-13. Plutonium and Uranium Estimates in 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills.  
(2 Pages)

Landfill	Size (acres)	Estimated Total Plutonium Inventory (g)	Estimated Plutonium Inventory (g/ac)	Estimated Total Uranium Inventory (g)	Estimated Uranium Inventory (g/ac)
218-W-5	90.91	166	2	6,914,968	76,065
218-W-11	2.3	--	--	--	--

g = grams.

g/ac = grams per acre.

-- = unknown quantity.

Table D-14. 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfill Inventories. (5 Pages)

Landfill	Items Known to be Disposed
218-C-9	Absorbent, Air Conditioners, Aluminum, Asbestos, Asbestos Covered Pipe, Asbestos Piping And Duct, Asphalt, Blacktop, Cardboard, Cardboard, Cement, Chain Link Fence, Cloth, Concrete, Concrete, Concrete Metal, Contaminated Soil, Cut Pipe, Diatomaceous Earth, Dirt, Drums Soil, Dump Trucks Soil, Electric Motors, Fiberglass, Floor Sweep, Floor Sweeps, Foam, Galvanized, Galvanized Metal Gutters, Glass, Greenhouse, Hay, HEPA Filter, Iron, Kitty Litter, Leather, Leather, Lumber, Metal, Metal Brackets, Metal Demolition Debris, Metal Doors, Metal Foam Wood Poles, Metal Pipe, Nylon, Packages of Transit Sheeting Asbestos, Paper, Paper & Plastic In A Steel Box, Pipe, Piping, Plastic, Plastic And Weeds In DOT 55-Gal Drums, Plastic Foam, Plastic Rubber, Plywood, Polyurethane, Pyrofoam, Rags, Rubber, Rubber, Sample Pump, Sand, Sheet Metal Ducts, Soil, Soil & Plastic In Metal Box, Soil In Drums, Soil Packaged In One-Lb Metal Cans, Stainless Steel, Stainless Steel And Aluminum, Stainless Steel Metal Doors, Stainless Steel Pulsar Columns, Stainless Tanks, Standard Boxes Paper, Steel, Steel Beams And Channel, Straw, Structural Steel Pipe Gallery, Styrofoam, Sweeping Compound, Transit Asbestos, Tumbleweeds, Tumbleweeds - Self-Contained, Tumbleweeds, Tumbleweeds Delivered In A Compactor Truck, Tumbleweeds In Plastic Wrap, Vermiculite, Weeds, Weeds In Plastic Wrap, Wood, Wood Demolition Debris, Wood Piles, Wood Poles, Wood Poles W/ Metal Brackets, Wood Power Poles, Wood Telephone Poles
218-E-1	154 B Connector, 18-3 tank lid, 7-4 Sampling assembly, 75 ton crane hook cable, Decontamination pot, Dissolver yoke, GE Tube for Section 14, Precipitator Yoke # 63065, Pressure gauge, Sec. 13 Connector 32, Sec. 18 Connector 2-37, Stainless steel pipe, Assault masks, Dissolver buckets, Pipe flanges, Spray nozzles, Chemox face piece, Dissolver bucket yokes, Cell drain blocks, Sample stand pipes, Bucket from Cask Assembly #190
218-E-2	No data
218-E-2A	No data
218-E-4	No data
218-E-5	H-2 Purex column, Purex FA1 filter, Purex I, Cell Concentrator (complete), Purex offgas heater, Purex Process Solution Pump, J2 Purex pulse column, Purex 2-1-A Ventilation Fans of Carbon Steel, Purex Silver Reactors, Purex Waste Concentrator Heat Exchanger Tube Bundles, misc equipment from tank farm recovery program
218-E-5A	Purex J2-Column package, Purex K2-Column package, Purex L-Cell package, Boxes contained Purex L cell package, K-2 tower and J-2 tower, boxes of misc. cell equipment
218-E-8	No data
218-E-9	No data
218-E-10	Wood Roofing, Wood And Roofing, Wood, WEST Drums, Waste From Trap Pit #5 Reading Over 1000 C/1/3, Waste From Trap Pit #2, Waste From Membrane Filter Press, Waste From 225-B In Drums Out Of Cell 4, Waste Drums From 225-B, Waste Drums, Waste Boxes, Valves, Two Tube Bundles #63 And 68, Two Purex Tube Bundles H4 & F-11, Two Purex Tube Bundles F6 & 11, Two Hood Panels From 7 Plant In Sid Concrete Burial Box, Tumbleweeds, Tube Bundles, Terra Cotta, T-18-2 Column, Steel Spacers, Steel Roll Door, Steel Overpacks, Steel Low-Boy Trailer With Wooden Box, Stainless Steel, Spacers, Soil, Sieve Plate And Misc. Small Items, Scrubbers, Scrap Metal From 221-T Canyon, Sand & Gravel From A-Farm Complex Fence Line, Sampler, Rudy Cart, Rubble, Rubber, Roofing, Resin TK From 18-2 Tank, Resin Tank And Filter, Railroad Rail With Two Wheel Stops, Radiation Waste Boxes, Purex I-A Column, Purex HC Column, Purex I-A-1 Filter, Purex Cover Blocks, Purex Centrifuge Blocks, Pumps F-22-5 Filters, Pumps, Pump-Agitator, PRTR Connectors, PPE, Plywood Boxes, Plastic Liner Inside Concrete Box, Plastic Liner and Absorbent Materials With Plywood Boxes, Plastic Liner, Plastic, Planks, PDR RHO-82-359 2-Concentrator, Parts For 2 Pumps, Paper, P-25-2 Pumps, Old Pt Cans, Non-Containerized Tumbleweeds Collected In Compactor Truck, Misc. Small Tools, Misc. Dry High Dose Rate B-G Contaminated Failed Equipment From the Purex Canyon, Misc Purex Canyon Waste Including Piping, Misc Jumpers and Rags From Canyon, Misc High Level Waste Consisting Of Failed Canyon Jumpers and Metal Items All Dry, Misc Failed Equipment, Misc Dry Waste, Misc Dry High Rate B-G Waste, Misc Contaminated Equipment, Misc Canyon Waste, Misc Canyon Trash, Metal, Mark F Type Wrapped In Plastic And Loose Packed Metal Basin Debris, LLW Soil From 3707D Facility In 300 Area, LLW, Lead Shielding, Laundry Bags, Laundry And Barrels From 225-B (Misc), Laundry, Lard Cans, L-9 Vessel And Piping, Key Block Off Of Cell 39, K-3 Filter B-Plant, K-3 Filter Box, Junk Metal, Jumpers, ITS Heaters, Irradiated Steel Spacers, Irradiated Spacers In Burial Box, Irradiated N Reactor Carbon Steel Dummies, Irradiated Fuel Spacers Removed From 105-N #2 Site, Irradiated Fuel Spacers, Irradiated Canisters, Hot Shop Wastes, Hood Panels From I-9, High Level Equipment, High Level B-G Contaminated Failed Equipment From Purex Canyon, HEPA Filters, General Purpose Burial Box, Gantry Crane Steel Beam, Gantry Crane Parts, Fuel Spacers and Canisters Inside Plastic Lined Concrete Box, Fuel Spacers, Fuel Canisters, Filters From 233-S Building, Filters, FB Boxes Waste Rags, Failed Pumps and Agitators, Failed Process Equipment, Failed Motor, Failed Jumpers, Failed Equipment Out Of Canyon, Failed Equipment, F-22-5 Filters, F1 Filter, Expansion Joints, Excess Jumpers, Excavation Material From 2706T W-259 Project, Equipment, Electric Cable Hoist With Trolley, E-E-1 Nozzle Plate, F-E-1 Frame, E-5-2 Concentrator, Drums Of Waste Laundry, Drums Of Waste From 225-B, Drums, Drum Of Filters, Disposal Of Contaminated Change Trailer, Dewatered Sludge, Cut Up Jumpers, Cover Blocks, Contaminated Laundry, Concrete Waste Burial Box, Concrete Styrofoam, Concrete Slab, Concrete Rubble, Concrete Roofing, Concrete Expansion Joints, Concrete Cell Blocks, Concrete Blocks, Concrete, Concentrator Tube Bundles # 53 & 56, Cloth, Centrifuge Blocks From 221-B, Cell Jumpers, Caster Heads, Caster Assembly, Cask With Nozzle Inside, Case Core 15R/C, Carbon Steel, Canyon Waste, Canyon Trash, Canyon Burial From Purex, Canisters Inside Wood Boxes, Canisters, Bulk Soil, Box Filled With Absorbent Loyer, Box Containing Straw, Blanks And A Pump, Bent Jumpers, B-2 Tank, Asphalt, Aluminum Shavings, Agitators, Absorbent Material, 55 Gal Drums, 2A Column, 244-AR-Filter Box, 244-AR Vanet Pump, 125 Hp Electric Motor
218-E-12A	Containers, Drums Depleted Uranium And Contaminated Scrap, 241-A Bumper Log, 90 Linear Feet of Hogwire From The B-Plant Intersection Diversion Box, 5/8" Purex Gantry Crane Cable, An Impact Wrench (Redox Type) With The Attached T-Bar Encased In Plastic, Animal Carcasses From 100F, Cardboard Cartons, Containers & Pcs Piping, Containers Air Conditioner Pads, Containers Misc. Waste, Containers Offsite Depleted Uranium, Diversion Box Vent Pipe, Jumper From Purex #6 Trap Pit, Metal, Misc. Boxes, Misc. Shelving, Bins, & Scrap Lumber, Pickup Load of Paper, Poles, Preheat Coil Reading, Routine Trench Accumulation From Purex, Several Truck Loads of Tumbleweeds From 275-EA At Purex's Request, Standard Boxes - Misc. Waste, Temp. Construction Shack, The 102A Pump From 241-A Tank Farm In Special Plastic Shrouded Rack, Boxed Waste From The Purex Plant Containing Both Pu And Mixed Fission Products, Truck Loads of Contaminated Lumber And Trash From 275 EA, Tubes From 241-CR Encased In Plastic And In Burial Boxes, Used Light Bulbs, Waste Cartons of Filter Media From 2E General Area, Wires, Wood, Wood Box Containing Purex Waste From Trap Pit #2
218-E-12B	10 Mil Liner, 303K Building Demolition Rubble - Bulk Waste, 5 Mil Liner, 50 Metal Pallet Bulk Shipment, Absorbed Sludge, Absorbent, Absorbent Pads, Acid, Asbestos, Ashes, Asphalt, Banding, Banding (Steel), Batteries, Blacktop, Bldg A Concrete & Wood, Bldg C & Bldg A Hot Cell, Blocking & Bracing, Blocks Plastic & Wood, Brick, Building A Concrete And Rubble, Building A Rubble Concrete, Building Debris (Asbestos Containing Material), Bulk Asbestos Insulation From 1304N, Bulk Shipment LI,SW Insulation From 1304N Emergency Dump Tank, Bulk Waste, Cardboard, Cement, Clay, Cloth, Coal Tar, Coal Tar Creosote, Concrete From A Unit, Concrete, Copper, Cork, Cotton, Cover Blocks, Creosote, D&D Debris From Unit A, D&D of Buildings Parking And Driveway, Dewatered Sludge, Diatomaceous Earth, Dirt, Dried Paint, Driveway, Expansion Joints & Roofing, Feces, Fiberglass, Film Formers (Paints), Filters, Fire Brick, Firebrick, Flange, Flatcar Assembly, Flatcar Wheel Assembly, Floor Sweeps, Floor Tile, Foam, Galvanized, Glass, Glass Small Tools And Parts Incident To The Operation And Maintenance of TTR Experimental Systems, Gravel, Grout, Grout, Hose, Inert Non-Hazardous Material, Insulation Non-Asbestos, Insulation From 1304N Emergency Dump Tank, Irradiated Non-Regulated Metal (Bulk Waste), Kotex, Lead, Leather, Line Pole 35' Wood, Low-Level Waste, Lucite, Lumber, Metal, Metal Pallets In Bulk Shipment To LJVWG'S, Neutron Activated Construction Debris With Radiological Contamination Below Regulatory Limits, Non-Containerized Tumbleweeds Collected In Compactor Truck, Nylon, Oil, Organic Debris, Oxides, Paints, Panel Covers, Paper, Parks Bldg Rubble, Pedestal Racks, Plaster, Plastic, Plastic Piping, Plexiglas, Plywood, Polyurethane, Porcelain, Powders, Pumps, Pyrofoam, Radioactive Tumbleweeds Collected In A Compactor Truck From Various Tank Farm Location, Resins, Richland Landfill Waste, Rocks, Roofing, Rope, Rubber, Sand, Seabble Debris, Sheet, Sheetrock, Sludges, Soil, Solid Non-Haz Components (Non-Specified), Stainless Steel, Steel, Styrofoam, Tape, Tar, Telephone Pole From Area Next To 2715-Z Pad, Transformer(Iron), Tumbleweeds, Valves, Vegetation, Vermiculite, Void Filler, Waste Dunnage Wood And Pallets, Waste From Membrane Filter Press, Waste Generated By D&D of Building Parking & Driveway, Water, Weeds, Wire, Plastic Packaging, Wood
218-W-1	Misc. Piping From Cell 6C, Sample Can Drying Head No. 1, 2" Powell Globe Valve, 3-5R To 4-8 Gang Valve, Adapter Plug #173, Adapter Plug Wrench Holder, Case Spray Assembly (3 Pcs) From F-2 Centrifuge, Case Spray Line (2 Pieces), Closure Plug #173, Conductivity Cell, Connector Head, Crescent Wrench, Cylindrical Lead Jacket, Dist. Dip Tube, Filter Box W-75399, Filter Cap Holder, Filter Holder For F-3 Vent Line, Gang Valve, 5-6 To 6-1, HF Dip Tube, Micro-Burette, Misco, Ring Balance Recording Meter, Sample Can #173, Sample Can And Adapter Plug #860, Sample Can Carrier Assembly #1000, Sampler, Sampler Assembly, Sampler Assembly From D-4 Tank, Sampler Dip Tube From D-4 Tank, Still Vacuum Receiver, Testing Plug (Old Style), Wexler Temperature Indicator, Adapter Plugs, Sampler Cups (Minus Air Jet), Miscellaneous Cell Connectors, Brackets & Bolts (Part of Sample Cup Holder), Bulk Samples, Chemox Mask, Connector Heads, Crescent Wrenches, Filter Box 231-Z, Filter Cap Supports, Sample Cup Holder Braces (Part of Sample Cup Holders), Sample Cup Holders, Sample Cup Hooks, U-Shaped Sample Cup Guides, Steam Hose, Connectors, Drainage Trays, Stainless Steel, Air Filters, Impact Wrench, Lubrication Connectors, Vacuum Cleaner, Shipping Plugs For Sample Cans, Beckman Tube

D-25

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-14. 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfill Inventories. (5 Pages)

Landfill	Items Known to be Disposed
218-W-1A	<p>Seal Pots, "A" Jumpers From #152 Diversion Box, (E-1) HF Dip Tubes, (E-1) Thermohms And Wells, (E-3) Thermohm And Well, "A" Jet Assemblies, "B" Jet Assemblies, 1/6 Hp Motor, 1" Alloyco 150 Stainless Valve/224-T, 10 GPM Jets/224-T, 291-T No. 2 Fan Assembly Including Steel Inlet And Outlet Duct Work, 3 Gpm Jet/224-T, 30 Ft Pipe, Stainless Steel, 500 Ft Water Hose, A-1 Thermohm, Agitator, AT Tank, B-1 Thermowell, Bed Cover Bows, Bottom Section of Scrubber, Bucket From Cask Assembly 190#, Cabinets, Capsule Section of ORNL Waste Storage Tank Sludge Sampler In 10" Pipe Container, Centrifuge Concrete Block Section 19-R, Centrifuge, Foundation, Clothes Drying Machine, Commander Air Sampler, Superstructure of Clamshell Type ORNL Waste Storage Tank Sludge Sampler Capsule Type Plus The Carrier Lift Yoke - In 10" Pipe Container, Centerpole And Condenser, Stainless Steel, Corrosion Sampler, C-R-2 Tank, D-12 Pot Redox, D-12 Waste Concentrator Pot, D-2 To D-3 Overflow Line, D-3 Thermowell, Damper Section of Outlet Duct Over The Electrically Driven Fan / 231-Z, Dip Tube, Distributor B-1, Double Thermohm And Well For B-1 Tank, Drip Catcher From Recycle Line, Drive Fork From E-4 Centrifuge, Electric Muffle Furnace, F-10 Tank No. 224-140, Fan And Ductwork / 291-T, G.F. Ion Chamber, GE Air Sampler, HF Dip Tubes, Idler Wheel, Inlet &amp; Outlet Ducts To Steam Engine Fan / 291-T, Invasion Pipe, Jet Assembly, Jumper Upper 2 To Lower 13 Having Blank Supporting Connector To Upper 7, Jumpers Redox, Lead Cask For Wafers, Metallurgical Cut-Oil Box, Model K Skilblower, Overflow Lines From Tanks, Overflow Pipes (25-12 Fabrication)/224-T, Overflow Pots Det. 63730/224-T, Plow From B-2 Centrifuge, Plow From F Centrifuge, Preheater Coils, Reduction Gear, Repair Scaffold, Rubber Floor Mat, Rubber Tires From Lorain Crane, Sample Cans (#134, 150, 180, 272, 374), Sampler Dip Tube, Sampler Dip Tube From E-4 Tank, Sampler Jet And Assembly/224-T, Seal Pots &amp; Overflow Lines, Stainless Steel, Sections Sludge Pipe, Selsyn Motor, Shipping Crates Known As "Bird Cages", Side Boards, Silver Reactor And A D-3 Condenser Redox, Skimmer From B-2 Centrifuge, Sludge Box, Sparger D-1, Stainless Steel Drum 15 Gallons, Steam Coils--Air Conditioning Units 221-B, Tank Distributor And Tail Pipe (2 Pieces), Tank Sampler Dip Tube, Tank Thermohm Dip Tube, Tank Wt. Ftr. Dip Tube, Tarpaulin Cover, Thermohm, Thermohm Dip Tube, From D-1 Tank, Thermom Well Timer - Model Sm 60, Top of Glass Lined Tank, Transfer Box And Cover of Capsule Type ORNL Waste Storage Tank Sludge Sampler In Wood Box, Two Silver Reactors Redox - Box Broke During Burial, Variac From Chemical Assay Board, Vari-Speed Stirrer Motor (Without Stand), Vent Pipe From E-4 Tank, Wt. Ftr. Sp Gr Dip Tube Assembly, Wt. Ftr. Sp Gr Dip Tube From D-1 Tank, H-4 Oxidizer Pot Redox, Misc. Canyon Waste Redox, One ORNL Supernatant Waste Sample (Pump Type), One Transfer Box For ORNL Waste Storage Tank Sludge Sample (Clamshell Type), One Carrier Assembly For ORNL Waste Storage Tank Sludge Sample (Capsule Type)</p>
218-W-2	<p>No data</p>
218-W-2A	<p>Pumps, Process Tube Sections, Lumber, Misc Hardware, Plywood, Burial Log Reports BNW Waste 10-10-73, Buried Contaminated Railroad Tracks, Cell Equipment, Contaminated Soil, D-12 Concentrator, D-14 Vessel PDR 89-63, H-4 Vessel, L-1 Vessel, Lines And Whaler Box, Misc. Redox Cell Equipment, Old Purex Pump Box, Redox B-12 Tower, Redox B-4 Filter, Redox H-4 Pot, Redox Tube Bundles, Silo Jumpers (Brandy), "D" Cell Sludge, B-Plant Centrifuge Yoke, 1951 International Harvester Dump, 1B-3 Cask Fuel Assembly, 2 B-Plant Filter Assembly, Pumps, 324 Bkg "Hot Cell" - Dry Solid Wastes, A 2 VBH Filter From Redox, A Redox Centrifuge, A Vapor Line From The B-4 Pot, Agitator Motor, Agitators, Agitators And The Tunnel Door, AR Filter, B-3 Dissolver Lower From Purex, Barrels of Waste, Metal Junk Boxes, Box Containing Jumpers, Burial Vault Marked "B-Plant 58526", Canyon Cleanup, Cell 2E Filter B-Plant, Cell Cover Blocks, Chain Nail, Concrete, Concrete "Hot-Waste" Disposal Box Containing Dry-Solid Waste From 324 Bkg Cells, Concrete Plugs From 241-TX Tank Farm, Concrete Posts And Tumbleweed, Container Misc. Scrap From 271-T, Container Silo Jumpers, Contaminated Dirt, Contaminated Dirt From Laundry Bern, Contaminated Load Dirt, Contaminated Railroad Iron, Contaminated Soil, CR Filter, Diatomaceous Earth, Dirt, Dirt Scraped From Top of The Bottom of Old 216-T-4-1 Pond, Dump Truck Loads of Contaminated Soil From 200-W Laundry Ditch, Dump Truck Loads of Contaminated Soil Removal From Laundry Bern-West Area, Galvanized, Gaskets, Glove Boxes, Gondolas Containing Misc. Materials From B-Plant, Gravel From Roof of Building 222S, H-2 Redox Centrifuges, H4 Redox Vessels, Iron, Irradiated Ring From Fuel Case, Jumpers, Laboratory And Building Equipment, Lard Cans, Lids From Diversion Box 241-TX Tank Farm, Metal, Misc. Lab Waste, Misc. Purex Connector Heads, Misc. Waste From Redox Canyon, Miscellaneous Items From Redox, Miscellaneous Items From U-Plant, Obsolete Parts, Pallets, Pipe, Pipe Plugs From 241-SX Tank Farm, Pipes, Pumps, Purex Dissolver Tower Jig, Purex Tube Bundles, Rad. Signs And Chains, Railroad Steel Rails And Short Ties From 241-TX, Railroad Ties, Railroad Agitators, Redox D-12 Vessel, Redox Heat Exchanger Tube Bundles, Redox L3 Concentrator Loop Without Tube Bundle, Redox Offgas Heaters Stainless Clad, Redox Process Solution Pump, Redox Pumps Black Iron, Redox Silver Reactors, Redox D-13 Agitator Motor, Scrap Materials, Scrap Steel, Sheet, Shim Rod Sections, Small Contaminated Parts, Small Pumps, Soil, Sprockets, Stainless Steel Rods Used For Hanging Fuel Elements In The PRTR And Test Assembly, Steel Posts, Tank Farm Exhaust Filter, Titanium Tube Bundle - Purex H-4 Tube Bundle #58, Tumbleweeds, Tunnel Door, Vent Blower Motor, Waste Mgt Sheeting 25-1 Tank, Waste-Scavenging Equipment, Wood</p>
218-W-3	<p>109SX Pump, Misc. Lumber, 10" Tube, 200' Hose, 3" Pipe, 30 Gal Drum Concrete, 30-Gal Drums, 55-Gal Barrel, 5-Gal Cans, Agitator Motor, Asst. Cylinders, Bales Misc Paper, Barrel Oil, Barrels, Broken Hand Tools, Buckets of Dirt, Cartons, Container Hood Panel, Container Poppy Instr., Containers, Containers Filters, Leached UO3 Powder Bags, Misc Plastic, Misc. Pipe, Misc. Pipe Double Wrapped In Plastic, Misc. Trash, Cones, Containers Paper, Containers Rock And Dirt, Containers Waste Oil, Metal Box From U Plant, Conveyor And Process Hood, Crates, Disposable Supplies, Drums, Drums Depleted "U", Ductwork From 241-WR, Dump Truck Load of Misc. Waste From UO3, Exhauster &amp; Tube Bundle, Failed Dissolver Pot, Motor, Fiber Barrel of Misc Scrap, Filter &amp; Vent Pipe, Filters &amp; Frames, Flat Car Decking, Gravel, Hood, Hood Panel, Iron Tanks, Junk, K-9 Pump, KOH Cans, Loads Junk, Loads of Duct &amp; Scrap Roofing, Loose Metal, Misc Junk, Misc. Lumber, Misc. Pipe, Obsolete Z Plant Conveyor Belt, Obsolete Z Plant Filter Boats, Obsolete Z Plant RC Line Hoods And Associated Process Equipment, Pails, Palletized 30 Gal Drums, Paper, Cardboard, Paper Sacks, Pipe, Plastic Covered Panel, Pumps In Boxes, Recycle Processing Vessels, Rubber Gloves, Scrap Lead, Scrap Roofing, Shelves, Shipment of California Package Waste, Small Z-Plant Centrifuge, Special Wood Box, Stainless Tanks, Standard Carton, Tumbleweeds, Vehicle/Carryall Id-491, Vent Pipes, Windows, Wood Box And Stainless Steel Cabinet, Wooden Box, Wooden Box Covered, Z Plant Condenser Tanks D24 And D25, Z-Plant Nash Hycor Vacuum Pumps of Cast Iron, Z-Plant RMA Line Fluorinator, Z-Plant Vacuum Receivers</p>
218-W-3A	<p>10 Mil Liner, Greenhouse (Carbon Steel And Plexiglas) And Conweb Pads Triple Wrapped In FMP From N-Basin, Carbon Steel Cask Rotator And Conweb Pads Triple Wrapped In FMP From N-Basin, Stainless Steel Table And Damaged Cotton PPE From N-Basin Wrapped In Flexible Material Packaging, Cyclotron Accelerator Steering "C" Magnet, Self-Contained Equipment, Stainless Steel Test Weight Triple Wrapped In Fmp From N-Basin, Carbon Steel Sample Cabinet And Conweb Pads Triple Wrapped In FMP From N-Basin, Carbon Steel Table And Conweb Pads Wrapped In Flexible Material Packaging, Stainless Steel Table And Conweb Pads Triple Wrapped In Fmp From N-Basin, Carbon Steel Rotator Pad And Conweb Pads Triple Wrapped In FMP From N-Basin, 90 Mil Plastic Drum Liner, Carbon Steel Cask Rotator Base Assembly And Conweb Pads Triple Wrapped In FMP From N-Basin, Absorbed Aqueous Solution, Absorbent, Acid, Aluminum Box, Aluminum Wash Tank And Components Internally Contaminated With Depleted Uranium, Animal Waste, Anti-Corrosive Radpad, Asbestos, Ashes, Boron Balls And Boron Ball Dust, Brass Metal, Bulk Shipment Waste of Sludge, Butyl Hypalon Basin Liner, Cardboard, Catalyst Pack, Cement, Ceramics, Charcoal, Clay, Cloth, Compactor Truck of Tumbleweeds, Compressor Supply Fan #5, Concrete, Contaminated Forklift, Contaminated Tensile Tester, Conweb Pads, Copper Magnet Coil Coated With Cured Epoxy, Copper Metal, Copper Wire, Cork, Courtoy Rotary Pellet Press, Diatomaceous Earth, Diatomite, Dirt, Duct Tape, Equipment, Excavated Pavement And Soil, Feces, Ferrous Metal, Fiberglass, Filters, Flat Cars, Floor Sweeps, Floor Tile, Foam, Glass, Glovebox, Graphite, Gravel, Grout, HEPA Filters, Hitman Liner, Hitman Metal Box, Hot Cell Waste, Insulation, Insulation Non-Asbestos, Ion Exchange Column, Ion Exchange Module, Ion Exchange Resins, Iron, Lab Waste, Lead Brick, Leather, Liquid, Magnets, Material From The D And D of The Imhoff Bldg, Mercury, Metal, Metal Dumpster, Metal I-Beam, Metal Piping, Metal Plate Padded With Cloth And Wrapped With Reinforced Plastic, Non-Hazardous Metals, Oils, Organics, Out of Date Equipment, P.V.C., Pallets, Paper, Pipe, Plaster, Plastic, Plastic Bags, Plastic Pyrofoam Rock, Plastic Wrap, Plastic Wrapped Arc Welder, Plastic Wrapped Concrete, Plastic Wrapped Electric Motor, Plastic Wrapped Railroad Flat Car, Plastic Wrapped Steam Coil Heater, Plexiglas, Porcelain, Pyrofoam Rock, Rad-Sorb Absorbent, Resins, Rock, Roofing Material, Rubber, Rubber Hose, Salt Bath, Sand, Scrap Yard Cleanup, Sheetrock, Silica Gel, Sludge Waste, Sludges, Soap, Soil Organics, Stainless Steel, Stainless Steel Fuel Baskets, Steel, Steel And Concrete Beam Stop, Steel Blocks, Steel Plate, Steel Shot, Steel Storage Tank, Tank, Tank Farms Generator, Tape, Tar, Teflon, Telephone Poles, TMB V Container, Tower T-K2, Tower T-K3, Transite, Tumbleweeds, Vegetation, Waste From Accelerator Maintenance, Waste From D&amp;D of Glove Box Facility, Waste From Haz, Waste Facility Cleanup, Waste From Plasma Exhaust Process, Waste From Plasma Exhaust Process, Waste From R&amp;D Activities, Waste From Scrap Yard Cleanup, Waste From Valve Changeout, Waste Tank From 200W Area Tank 50% Caustic, Water Treatment Process Waste, Wire, Wood, Wooden Structure Surrounding The Uni-I Caisson, Wrapped Railroad Flat Cart, Wyk Absorbent, Zircoloy</p>

D-26

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-14. 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfill Inventories. (5 Pages)

Landfill	Items Known to be Disposed
218-W-3AF	<p>1 Gal Paint Cans, 10 Mil Drum Liner, 12 Mil Plastic Liner, Steel Heat Exchanger With Asbestos Wrapped In Plastic, 200 ADP B-Plant LLW And HEPA Filters, 250MI Poly Bottles, 2714U Pad UO3 Drum Overpack, 291T Prefilter # 1, Electric Motor Wrapped In Plastic, Steel Motor With Asbestos Wrapped In Plastic, 300 ADP - 1.25% Enriched Fuel Billet, 300 ADP - Depleted Uranium Dioxide, Soil, Steel Pump Wrapped In Plastic, 324 Airlock Waste, 324 B Cell Grout Container, 324 B-Cell Clean Out - 1B Rack, 324 Facility A-Frame HEPA Filter With Steel Shielding, 324 Facility Non-Compactable Waste, 324 Facility Waste, 324 Legacy Waste - C-Cell Waste, 325 Waste Supercompacted At ATG, 327 Basement Waste (LLW), 327 Facility Compacted Waste, 327 Legacy Waste - IX Resin, 327 PNNL Legacy Waste, 3712 Building - Depleted Uranium Billets (Stuck Mandrels), Wood Box Filled With Wire Rope Chockers Wrapped In Plastic, Steel Plate Wrapped In Plastic, 55 Gallon Crushed Drums, 55 Gallon Metal Drum, Steel Plate Wrapped In Plastic, Lab Aqueous Solution - Solidified, Bag of Trash And Empty Poly Bottles From I&amp;H Lab Filled With Kitty Litter, Empty 15 Gallon Drum Filled With Kitty Litter, 90 Mil Plastic Drum Liner, Absorbent, Absorbent Rad Pad, Absorbed Liquid Waste, Absorbed LLW, Absorbed Non-Haz, Liquid And Small Amount of Non-Haz, Paint, Absorbed Oil, Absorbed Plain Water That Is Radioactively Contaminated, Absorbed Sludge, Absorbed Tritiated Water, Absorbed Tritiated Water In Inner Containers, Absorbent, Acid Brick, Acid Brick And Concrete Mortar, Acid Neutralized, Activated Accelerator Components, Activated Charcoal, Activated Metal, Activated Metal From The High Beam Reactor Canal, Activated Metal In Lead Shielded Cask, Activated Scrap &amp; Equipment, Aerosol Can Empty, Airlock Waste, Aluminum Canisters, Aluminum Canisters &amp; Cubicle Lids, Aluminum Frame, Aluminum Light Assembly, Aluminum Paper, Aluminum Pipes, Analytical Process Waste, Animal Waste, Asbestos, Asbestos Contaminated Equipment And Material Used For Decontamination, Asbestos Contaminated HEPA Filters, Asbestos Floor Tile, Asphalt, ATG Compacted LLR Waste, ATG Compacted LLR Waste From 222S Analytical Ops. Shipment 99-W-491, B-25 Metal Box, Bags, Bags Metal Pipes, Bags Paper, Basement Cleanout Waste, Batco - West Jefferson Compacted Low-Level Debris, Battelle Columbus LLW From Cell Cleanout, B-Cell Bridge Crane, B-Cell Cleanout - Grouted-Hittman Liner, Beam Line Dismantling, Bedding, Biological Material, Bldg 310 Retention Tanks, Blower, Brookhaven Graphite Research Fiberglass Mesh And Associated Framework, Buckets, Buggy Springs, Bulk LLW Waste From BDI Roll-Off Boxes, Bulk LLW Waste From Compactor Truck, Bulk LLW Waste From HO-68H-3500 Compactor Truck, Bulk LLW Waste From Mowatt Construction Dumpster, Bulk Shipment of Waste Byproduct of Iron Co-Precipitation, Bulk Shipment Waste of Sludge, Bulk Waste For Disposal, Bulk Waste Shipment, Burial Box, Butyl Hypalon Basin Liner, Camera, Canister Crusher From N-Basin Wrapped In Plastic, Cans, Canvas, Canvas Gloves, Canyon Deck Cleanout, Carbon And Stainless Steel, Carbon Steel, Cardboard, Cast Iron, Catalyst Pack, Category 1 Noncompactable LLW, Category 3 Noncompactable LLW, Cation Exchange Resin, Cell Equipment And Miscellaneous Solids, Cement, Cement Powder, Cemented Sludge, Ceramic, Cesium IX Columns From D-Cell, Chairs, Charcoal, Cheesecloth, Clamps Fittings, Clay, Cleanout of Contaminated Equipment From C-Farm, Cleanout of Legacy Waste From Pits And Trenches, Closure Head And Related Hardware, Closure Head Shipping Container, Cloth, Cloth, Co-60 Irradiator That Contains Lead Shielding, Coal Tar, Coke Breeze From Anodes, Compactable LLW, Compactable Trash, Compacted 55 Gallon Drums of General Lab Waste, Compacted Cloth, Compacted Empty Tru Drum Pucks, Compacted Gallery Waste, Compacted Laundry By Products From Interstate Nuclear Services, Compacted LLW, Compacted Non-Hazardous Waste, Compacted Paper, Compacted Plastic, Compacted Rubber, Compacted Trash, Concrete, Concrete Vault, Conded Pads, Contact Handled LLW From SFO, Contaminated Dumpster, Contaminated Earth, Contaminated Equipment, Contaminated Ion Exchange Columns And Associated Material, Contaminated Material From The Hot Cell, Contaminated Pre-Filter Form 100K Basins, Contaminated Supplies From 324 Facility, Contaminated Water, Conveyor Belts From K1H Hot Yard, Conwed Pads, Coolant Pump And Motor, Copper, Core Basket Thermal Shield And Related Hardware, Cotton, CP5 Reactor Metal, CP5 Reactor Paper, CP5 Reactor Plastic And Concrete With Steel, CPC Metal Box, Crushed Aluminum Fuel Storage Canisters And Cubicle Lids, Crushed Drums Used To Store And Ship Radioactive Liquid, Crushed Glass, Cured Chco Compound, Cut-Up Cement Mixer, D&amp;D Clean-Up Waste, D-Cell Skids, Debris, Decommissioned Change Trailer, Dewatered Filter Press Sludge, Dirt, Depleted Cf-252 Source, Disposal of Old Equipment, Drained Metal Pumps, Drained Vacuum Pumps, Dried Sludge Cake, Drill Press From N-Basin Wrapped In Plastic, Drop Light, Dry Solid Material Segregated In Oil Solidification Project, Dry Vermiculite, Duct Tape, Ductwork, Dunnage Plate, Electric Motor, Electric Wire And Plug, Electrical Wire, Electro-Static-Precipitator, Empty Collection Poly Bottle, Empty Thermocouple Receiver (Steel), Encapsulated Radium Beryllium Source, Enduropak, Equipment, Excavated Soil And Pavement, F-102 Filter Assembly, Fan Wheels From Duct Level, Fiber Glass, Fiberglass, Filter Frames, Filter Wheel From Duct Level, Filters, Fire Retardant Blankets (Fiberglass), Floor Sweeping Compound, Floor Tiles, Fuel Basket, Fuel Spacers, Gantry Crane, Garbage Cans, Garden Hose, Gasket, General Lab Waste, Glass, Glove Box Waste, Glove Port "O" Rings, Glovebox, Glovebox Filters, Gloves, Graphite Blocks, Gravel, Grease, Grit Blast Media, Groundwater Slurry, Grout, Grouted Hittman Liner From B-Cell Cleanout, Grouted Uranium, Grouted Waste, H-3 Contaminated Water, Hard Tool Slurries From Water Table, Heavy Equipment, Hemp Rope, HEPA Filters, HEPA Vacuum Pre-Filters, HEPA Vacuums, Hrch Process Tubes, Hittman Cask, Hood Parts Generated From Maintenance Operations, Hood Waste, Hoses, Hot Cell And Gallery Waste At 324 Facility, Hot Cell Compactable Waste, Hot Cell LLW, Hot Cell Metal Hardware, HWME Yard Waste, Hydraulic Fluid Filters, Hypalon Gloves, Industrial Waste Water Gravity Filter Media, Insulation, Insulation And Absorbed Non-Haz Liquids, Insulation And Rubber, Irradiated Hardware, Irradiated Metal LLW, Kitty Litter, Ladder, Lathe, Lathe From N-Basin Wrapped In Plastic, Laundry By Products From Interstate Nuclear Services, Lead (Used As Shielding), Leather, Legs From Columns, Light Metal, Lime And Animal Feces, Liner, Old Style Cartridge Filters Packaged Inside 2 Inch Metal Liner Om Poly Reinforced Bag With Radsorb, Enduropak (Tritium Absorbed On Charcoal Filter), Machinery Parts, Manipulator Body, Mask Filters, Material From D And D of A Reactor Facility, Material From D And D of The Imhoff Building, Materials Loaded From B-Cell, Metal, Metal Bolts, Metal Cabinet, Metal Carts, Metal Ducting, Metal Ducting Metal And Rubber Debris, Metal Framed HEPA Filter, Metal Framed HEPA Filters In 12 Mil Liner, Metal Glovebox, Metal I-Beam, Metal Rail Car Used To Transport Recovered Acid, Metal Scaffolding, Metal Steel Shot, Metal Tools, Metal Valves, Milling Press From N-Basin Wrapped In Plastic, Mirvada Ore (Dirt), Miscellaneous Solids With Tritium (Absorbed), Miscellaneous Solids With Tritium Gas, Molecular Sieve, Mono Tube Pistons, Mop Head, Motor, Mud, N Reactor &lt;1% Enriched Contaminated Finished Fuel, N Springs Bottle Rinse - Solidified, Neoprene Hose, Non-Containerized Tumbleweeds, Non-Reg Oily Rags, Non-Regulated Leaded And Unleaded Hypalon Gloves, Non-Regulated Mask Filters, N-Reacto Carbon Steel Fuel Spacers, Nylon Reinforced Plastic Liner, Nylon Rope, Oil, Oil Mist Bound In HEPA Filter Media, Oil Solidified With Petrosel II, Oils (Lab Pack Form), Organics Solidified, Paint Chips, Pam Probe, Pans, Paper, Pipettes, Plasma Exhaust Treatment Waste, Plastic, Plastic Fire Blanket, Plastic Glove Rings, Plastic Scraps, Plastic Sheets, Plastic Strike Plates, Plastic Wrap, Plastic Wrapped HEPA Filters And 12 Mil Liner, Plate, Plexiglas, Poly Bag, Portland Cement, Powder Sources, PPE, Precipitate From Neutralization of Acidified Dog Tissue Grouted With Portland Type III Cement, Pre-Filter #2 From 291T Filter Changeout, Pre-Filters &amp; Tent From 242A, Prefilters And Steppoff Pad Waste, Pressure Washers, Pumice, Pump, Pump Capsule &amp; Pump Sleeve, Pyrofoam, Quimto Lubric On Rags And Filters, Rabbit Feces, Rad Gloves, Rad Pad And Pyrofoam Void Space Filter, Rad Rope, Rad Sorb, Rad, Contaminated Material From The Hot Cell, Radiologically Contaminated Equipment Which Has No Further Use, Radium Sources, Radium-Beryllium Neutron Sources Shielded With DU &amp; Polyethylene, Rags, Rail Car Truck (Wheel Assembly), Railroad Ties, RARA Tumbleweed Cleanup, Reactor Closure Head, Reactor Parts From The CP-5 Reactor, Rebar, Rec Airlock Waste, Regulated Low Level HEPA Filters, Remote Filer Media And Metal Framing, Resins, RH Debris Waste From 327 Hot Cells, RH LLW Hot Cell Waste Shielded To CHL levels, Ridge Nuclear Cutting Fluid On Rags, RMW Grease #2, Rock, Rod Sections, Rollers, Rolls of Plastic, Roofing Material, Room 301 Waste Removal, Rope, Rope (Hemp), Rubber, Rubber Bucket, Rubber Hoses, Rubber Matting, Rubber Shoes, Rubber(Electrical Wire), Rubble, Sample Liners, Sampler And Universal Liners, Sand, Saw Blades, Scissors, Scrap, Scrap Metal, Self Contained Equipment, Self-Contained Prefilter From 291T Filter Banks, Sheeting, Sheetrock, Shovel, Shredder, Signs, Sissel Craft Paper, Size Reduced Dunnage, Small Metal Carts, Small Tools, Soil, Solidified Liquids, Source And Source Like Material, Sources In Pigs, Spacer, Spacer Funnel, Sr-90 Stainless Steel Source Tabs, Stainless And Aluminum Canisters, Stainless Pipe, Stainless Steel, Stainless Steel Fuel Basket, Steel, Steel Bearings, Steel Shot, Steel Tools, Step Off Pad Waste, Stir Mechanism, Strippable Coating And Metal Wire, Sump Cooler Squirrel Cage, Supertiger Waste, Suspect Radioactive Pipe With Smaller Pipes Inside, Table, Tank Contacted Waste, Tank Scale, Tank Solids, Tape, TIDF Bulk Shipment of Sludges, Telephone Poles Wrapped In Plastic, Thorium Metal Samples, Tk-131 Pump And Riser Pipes, TMB-V Container, Tool Box, Tools, Transit Ductwork, Treated Grouted Uranium, Tritium Target Canisters, Trolley From 30-Ton Crane System, Truck Assembly From Rail Cars, Tumbleweeds, Unirradiated Aluminum Clad Fuel, Vadose Zone Hard Tool Slurry, Vegetation, Vent Duct, Vermiculite, Waste From Cleanout And Refining of Process Sewer, Waste From D And D of A Reactor Facility, Waste From D And D of Glove Box Facility, Waste From Membrane Filter Press, Waste From O And M of TETR, Waste From Pad Cleanup, Waste From Water Treatment, Waste Generated From Analytical Operations, Waste From The Supertiger Waste Substream, Waste Water Filter Samples, Water, Water Table Sand And Groundwater, Water Tower Pieces 3902-B Demolition, Water Treatment Process Waste, Welding Rod Wood Towel, WJSE Hot Cell Cleanout, West Jefferson Compacted Low Level Waste, Wiring, Wood, Wrap Process Area Room Waste Drum, Paper, Wrap Room Waste Drum Pucks Containing Imbifer Beads</p>

D-27

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-14. 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfill Inventories. (5 Pages)

Landfill	Items Known to be Disposed
218-W-4A	<p>Containers, Ladders, Panel, Vacuum Pump, Wooden Boxes, #8 Filter Box, 002-Ur Agitator Assay From 106-Tx Tank Farm, Refrigerator, Loose Concrete, Blacktop, Roofing Grave, Hot Dirt, Gate, Coil (Helical), Boxes - Contaminated Filters, Wooden Box, 14-Ft Stipladder, 1A Column &amp; Capsule, 2 Sections of Down Corner Pipe, 2 Ton Dump Truck of Scrap Metal From Minor Construction, 22 Pallets Holding 88 Drums, 221-T Dissolver And Tower, 233S Ductwork, 233S Filters, 241-SX Pump, 241-SX Deep Well Pump, Filters, 30 Gal Drum Dirty Beryllium Parts &amp; Scrap, 3P-SXB-5411-218 Broken Column, Cart, 4 Wheel Cart, Box With 108-F Hood, Drums, A DXT Hood From Room 38, A Small Paint Locker From 231Z, A T-Canyon Waste Receiptack, A Weighing Hood From Room 179-B, Agitator, Agitator Box, Agitator Parts, Air Duct From 100E, Air Ducts, Airsamplers, An Iron Box From U Plant Containing A Purex Tube Bundle And Misc. Other Debris, Ballast Pump, Barrel, Barrels From Coors, Batteries From Garage, Beam Off Roof, Belt Sander Buchler, Boeing Missile Waste, Box, Boxes From 234-5 Bldg Task 1 RMA, Broken Hand Tools, Buried 3 Stage Pumps, Buried 3-R Dissolver &amp; Tower From 221-T Bldg, Cans, Cat, Centrifuge And Tank From U Canyon, Centrifuge Block, C-Line Hood 39, Coil, Coils From The #5 Boiler Room At Redox, Column, Column Jumpers, Concrete, Concrete Block Classified Debris Samples, Container of Pipe, Container Paper, Containers Natural Uranium, Containers of Pipe, Containers of Silo Waste, Containers of Std Cartons &amp; Buckets, Containers P.R. Can, Containers Special Burial P&amp;Co Unloaded Box, Containers Waste Oil, Contaminated Parts, Cover Block, Crate, Cribbing, Cylinders Containing Unclassified Material, D-1 Dissolver From Recuplex, Deep Well Pump TX-115, Desks, Diffuser Pump, Dirt, Disposable Supplies, Dog Cage, Door, Down Corner Pipe Cones From Heaters, Drum, Drums Beryllium, Dry Blender Mixer, Dry Waste, Duct Boxes, Ducts, Dumped 221-T Canyon Waste, Failed Agitator Assembly With Motor, Fiber Barrels, Filters, Fire Brick Out of Incinerator, Food Mixer Hobart, Four Hoods From 222-U, Fuel PRTR Element, Furnace, Glass, Glove Boxes, Gondola From T Plant, Gratings, Green Hut Junk, HEPA Filter, Hood #16, Hood 6-A, Hood From The 234-5 Analytical Lab, Hood Panels, Hoods From 234-5 For Finished Products, Iron Lung From 233, Iron Plate, K-9 Vessel, Knockout Pots, L-16 Agitator 233S Bldg., Lab Capsule, Lard Cans, Large Box, Large Hood Type Container, Laundry Boxes, Lead Shield, Light Bulbs, Load Asphalt From Roof, Loads Stones, Loose Automotive Parts, Machine Parts, Metal Container of Classified Scrap, Metal Turnings, Minor Const. Burials, Misc Junk From T Plant Around Stack, Misc. Canyon Scrap, Misc. Waste From Redox Canyon, Wood Cabinets, Missile Parts From Boeing, Oil Drum, Oil Drums From 231-Z, Ore, Duck Dunk Truck, Package Ductwork, Panc, Pc Plywood, Pieces Dockwork, Pieces of Lumber, Pieces of Pipe, Plastic Greenhouse &amp; Piping, Plow And Car Chassis, Pr Can, Propane Bottles, PRTR Shim Rods In Cap, Pump Motor, Pump Wrapped In Plastic, Pump X19 From 224-U, Pu-Oven, Purex 1-D Column Capsule, Purex Wall Racks, Radiator, Rags, Rc Can, Recuplex Waste, Recycle Hood And Piping Reading, Redox Column Carrier, Redox Column Carrier Chain, Redox Dissolver Filters A4 &amp; C4, Redox F-1 Pot, Redox Silo Equipment, Room Fan, Rubber Gloves, S Farm Steam Line Lagging Tx, Salt Pot, Sand, Scaffolding, Scrap From 291 Z, Scrubbers, Several Dry Filters From 234-5, Sieve Testing Shaker, Electric Motors From 224-U, Slab Cover, Smokestack, Spray Ring, Stainless Steel Polishing Hoods From 234-5, Standard Cartons, Steam Radiators, Stove Port 234-5, SX-118 Pump, T Plant Junk Box, Tank #8 221-U Bldg, Ties, Tile, Tile Field From 234-5, Tires, Tower, Trailer Planking, Tubing And Tin Boxes, Tumbler, Valves, Vent Tubes, Weeds, Windows, Wood Crate, Wood Crated Process Hood, Wooden Box, Wooden Boxes Containing Bamboo Scrap, Wooden Crates From 233S</p>
218-W-4B	<p>17' Boat &amp; 60 Hp Outboard Motor, 165 Lb. Furnace, 2" Hand Rail, 55-Gallon Drums Encased In Concrete, 9B Filter Head Assembly, Absolute Filters, Beryllium Contaminated Waste, Blocks, Box, Burial Box, C.W.S. Filters, Cables, Canyon Waste Boxes, Carbon Steel Tank, Cartons, Cell Waste, Centrifuge, Chem Pumps, Concrete, Conduit, Construction Scaffolding, Crushers, D-6 Agitator Motor Assembly, Dead Animals, Drive Heads, Drum Dot 6M, Drums of Sand, Dry Boxes, Dry Filters - 55 Gal Drums, Duct Units, Ductwork, Evaporator Pot, Exhaust Line, Failed Crane Wheels, Filter Box, Filters, Fittings, Flange, Furne Hood Filters, Furnaces, Gear Reducer, Glove Boxes, Grinder Machine &amp; Hood, Hardware Steel, HEPA Filter, Hood, Hoods, Hot Dirt In Rags, Hot Sand, Hydrostatic Pump, Ice Chest, Inlet/Outlet Exhaust Dampers, Kinney KC-3 Vacuum Pump, Lab Misc. Waste, Lab Paper Waste, Lab Stool, Ladders, Lumber, Manipulator Boots, Metal Boxes, Metal Canyon Waste Boxes, Metal Dry Filters, Milling Machine And Hood, Misc. Laundry, Misc. Scrap, Non-Combustible Waste, Oily Rags, Pallets of Lead Brick, Paper, Piping, Plastic, Plate, Plywood Boxes, Process Filter, Process Waste, Pumps, Radiation Boxes, Rats, Rubber Gloves, Safeway Scaffold, Saw Fines, Scaffold Board, Scrap From Vipac, Shelving, Steel Boxes, Steel Decking, Steel Table, Transit Pipe, Two Boxes From 292-T, Vacuum Gage, Vacuum Pumps, Valves, Vinyl Bags, Wood, Wood Box With Lab Equipment, Wood Decking From Railroad Platcar, Zak Machine, Absorbent, Animal Waste, Cardboard, Ceramics, Cloth, Concrete, Cotton, Diatomaceous Earth, Dirt, Filters, Galvanized, Glass, Graphite, Insulation Non-Asbestos, Iron, Kitty Litter, Kotex, Lumber, Metal, Nylon, Oils, Paper, Plastic, Polyurethane, Rags, Resins, Rubber, Sheet, Stainless Steel, Vermiculite, Wood</p>
218-W-4C	<p>10 MIL Plastic Drum Liner, 100N Compacted Waste, 100N Compactor Drums, 26" Vac. Job, 30 Ton Cask, 327 Facility Compacted Waste, 55 Gallon Waste Drums, 8 Mil Liner, 90 MIL Plastic Drum Liner, Absorbed Aqueous Solution, Absorbed Liquid Waste, Absorbed Urine, Absorbent, Acid, Activated Accelerator Components, Activated Stainless Steel From FTT Reactor, Aluminum Tubing, Animal Feeces, Animal Tissue, Animal Waste, Anti-Corrosive Radpad, Asbestos, Asbestos Contaminated Equipment And Material Used For Decontamination, Ashes, Asphalt, Batco Pool Filters And Resins, Biological Material, Blacktop, Blood, Bolts, Boron Carbide Balls, Brass Metal, Brick, Bulked Waste, Carbon Steel, Carbon Steel Shot, Cardboard, Cask Coolant Pump, Cathode Tubes, Cell Equipment, Cement, Cemented Sludge, Ceramics, Charcoal, Chemical Stripper, Clay, Cleanout of Legacy Waste From Pits And Trenches, Cloth, Cloth Rags, Commercial Lab Sample Return, Compacted Empty Bottles, Compacted Gallery Waste, Compacted Lab Waste, Compacted I.L.R, Compacted LLSW, Compacted Paper, Compacted Plastic, Compacted RCRA-Empty Bottles, Compactable Waste, Compactor Drum, Concrete, Conweb Pads, Coolant Pump, Copper Metal, Copper Wire, Cork, Cotton, Crushed Glass, Debris Waste, Decon Tank, Depressurized Fire Extinguishers (Full), Desiccant, Dewatered Sludge, Diatomaceous Earth, Dirt, Drierite, Dry Vermiculite, Duct Tape, EAL Lab Labpack, Epoxy, Equipment, Excavation For 2706T Construction Project, Excess Non Regulated Chemicals From Building Clean Out, Feeces, Ferrous Metal, Fiberglass, Fiberglass Floor Filters, Fiberglass Floor Tiles, Fiberglass Prefilters, Filter, Filters, Firebrick, Fissile Waste Drum, Flanges, Floor Sweeps, Flume Hood Pre Filters, Foam, Foil, Fuel, Galvanized, General Lab Waste, Glass, Glassware, Glovebox, Gloves, Graphite, Gravel, Grease, Grout, HEPA Filters, HJC, I-Beams, Insulation Non-Asbestos, Ion Exchange Column, Iron, Kitty Litter, Kotex, Lead, Leather, Light Bulbs, Lime, I.L.R From Duct Level, I.L.R Generated From Analytical Operations, I.L.R Soil From Room 1A Upgrade, I.L.W Cat 1 Used GAC And Powersorb, Lumber, Metal, Metal Bolts, Metal Cask, Mineral, Mineral Oil In Kl, Non-Hazardous Metals, Non-Hazardous Paint Waste, Non-Infectious Biological Material, Non-Reg Paint Related Waste, Non-Reg, Oily Rags, Nylon, Oilbase, Oils, Oily Rags, Organics (Nonhazardous), Oxides, Paint Chips, Paints, Paper, Paraffin Wax, Parks Township Soil, Pigments, Pins Or Rods, Plaster, Plastic, Plastic Liners From 200-BP-5 Pump And Treat, Plexiglas, Plywood, Polyacrylate, Polypropylene, Polyurethane, Powders, PPE, Pumice Rock, Pyrofoam, Pyrofoam Rock, Pyrofoam Void Space Filler, Rad Pad, Rags, Railroad Ties, Resins, RMW "Oil-Related Waste", Rocks, Roofing Material, Rope, Rubber, Rubber Gloves, Rust Sweepings, Salt Bath, Sand, Sheet, Sheetrock, Silica Gel, Slaked Lime, Sludges, Soap, Soils, Solidified Sludge From Heel of 200-BP-5 Pump And Treat Tanks, Solvents, Special Fab Type A Container, Sponge, Stainless Steel, Steel, Steel Piping, Steel Shot, Styrofoam, Super 80 Rubber, Taic, Tape, Tar, Teflon, Thinners, Treated Acidic Solids, TRU Room Waste, Tubing, Tuf-Glide, Tumbleweeds, Twigs, Universal Polypropylenes, Used Hurrisafe On Towels, Valves, Vegetation, Vermiculite, Void Filler, Waste From B Cell Cleanout, Waste From D And D of The Ga Hot Cell, Waste From Membrane Filter Press, Waste From O And M of T/FR Experimental Systems, Waste From R And D Activities, Waste From The Nat. Tritium Labeling Facility, Water, Water Treatment Process Waste, Wax, Weeds, Wire, Wood, Wyk (Silica Absorbent), Zircoloy</p>

D-28

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-14. 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfill Inventories. (5 Pages)

Landfill	Items Known to be Disposed
218-W-5	<p>Stainless Steel Canisters, Stainless Steel Canisters, "Exit" Signs With H-3, 1" Pipe, 10 Mil Liner, 152-1R Contamination, Light Pole, 1-Inch Bolts, 219-S Cell Cover Block, 221T Canyon Deck Cleanoff, 241BY Farm Cleanup, 241-TX Misc I.L.W. 242B Swamp Cooler Removed And Packaged Intact, 250 MI Poly Bottles, 2706T &amp; Headend Greenhouses, 2706T Cleanup And Step-Off Pad Waste, 2706T Decon And Housekeeping Activities, 3' Bottle Cart, 30' 1.5 ID Abs Pipe, 4" Pipe, 5 Gal. Paint Cans, 60 Horse Power Elect Motor, 85 Gal. Empty Puck Drum, 90 Mil Liner, A Cell Equipment, Abandoned Exhauster Frame, Abs (Pvc) Piping, Absorbent, Absorbed Liquid, Absorbed Oil, Absorbed Propylene Glycol, Absorbed Rad, Contaminated Water And Resin, Absorbed Rainwater, Absorbed Tritiated Water, Absorbed Water, Accelerator Waste, Acetylene Bottles, Acid Brick And Concrete Mortar, Acid Spill Pillows, Activated Accelerator Components, Activated Unused Spare Pump, Adsorbed Plasma Gas, Aerosol Cans, Agar, Air Filters, Air Sampling Equipment, Airline Hose, Airlock Waste, Alara Strip Paint, Aluminum Alloy Casting, Aluminum Channel, Aluminum Conduit, Aluminum Foil, Aluminum Ladder, Aluminum Tape, Angle Iron, Angled Steel, Animal Tissue, Animal Waste, Anion Resin, Annulus Pump Assembly, Asbestos, Ash, Asphalt, Automatic Transmission Fluid, B-12 Box, B-25 Box, B-25 Metal Box, B-26 Box, B87 Metal Box, Bag Floor Dry, Bag Floor Sweep, Bag Laundry, Bag Metal Clamps And Tube, Bag Rubber Boots, Bags Mineral Wool, Bags of Tape, Bags Rock, Barbed Wire, Barrel Rotator, Barrier Cream, Base cabinets, Basin Blow Sand Clean Up, Billet Boxes, Binders, Bio Rad Exchange Resin, Biological Waste, Bird Bones, Bird Carcasses, Bird Debris, Bird Droppings, Bird Nests, Black Beauty Abrasive, Black Mita Toner Cartridge, Bolts, Bone Char, Books, Boral Sheet, Boron Ball Dust, Boron Balls, Boron Carbide Balls, Boxes, Diamond Plate, Braided Steel Cable, Brass Chem-Pump, Brass Piping, Bricks, Broom End, Brooms, Brushes, Bucket, Cabinet, Cable, Phone, Canisters, Cans, Canvas, Canvas Gloves, Canvas Tarp, Canyon Cleanout Waste, Cardboard, Carbon Boiling Chips, Carbon Pieces, Carbon Rods, Carbon Steel Cable Trays, Carbon Steel Pipes, Carbon Steel Shot, Carbon Steel Shot From Scabbie Machine, Carbon Steel Shot In Plastic Pail, Carbon Steel Valves, Carbon Steel Ventilation Piping Filled With Pyrofoam, Cardboard, Carpet, Cart, Cast Iron, Cast Iron Pipe, Catalyst Pack, Cathode Tubes, Cattails, Ceiling Grid, Ceiling Tile, Cement, Cemented Sludge, Ceramic Blocks, Ceramic Drywall, Ceramic Insulation, Ceramic Pipes, Ceramic Plates, Cernex, Chain Hoist, Chairs, Charcoal, Chips, Chukar Droppings, Circuit Boxes, Clay, Clay Pipe, Clips, Cloth, Cloth Rags, Cl-SR Chemical Japack, Compacted 55 Gal. Drums, Compacted Air Cooled Chiller, Compacted Gallery Waste, Compacted Tumbleweeds, Compaction Disks, Compactor Motor, Compressed Air Bottle(De-Energized), Computer Mouse, Concrete, Concrete Blocks, Conduit Pipe, Construction Debris, Containment Tent, Contaminated Equipment, Contaminated Rad HEPA Filters, Contaminated Refrigerator, Contaminated Ductwork, Contaminated Soil, Contaminated Tools, Contaminated Wood, Conwed Pads, Cooling Tubing, Copper From An Annulus Fan Motor, Copper Piping, Copper Rods, Copper Wiring, Cork, Corkboard, Cosmolubric Hydraulic Oil, Cotton, Cotton Filter, Cotton Insulation, Cotton Liners, Crane Cable, Crushed Spray Canst(Aluminum), Crushed Stainless Steel Canisters From N-Basin, Crushed Vessel (Injection Tank), Crushed Vials, Crylic Latex, Cured Epoxy, Cured Non-Haz Polyurethane Caulking, Custom Container Containing Molecular Sieve, Cut End Fuel Rods, D&amp;D Cyclotron Waste, D&amp;D From Janus Reactor, D-5 Pit Waste, Debris, Decon of Core Sample Truck, Depleted Uranium Turnings &amp; Grout, Depressurized Gas Cylinders, Dewatered Sludge, Diatomaceous Earth, Diesel Motor, Diode Detector, Disassembled 105A Exhauster, Discarded Tools, Disk Drive, Dog Pen D&amp;D, Doors, Drain Pipe, Drain Traps, Drum Rings, Dry Combustibles, Dry Silicone, Dry Sweep, Dry Transformers, Dry Vegetation, Drywall, Duet Tape, Ducting, Dust Pans, Duststop Filters, Electric Cord, Electric Hacksaw, Electric Motors, Electric Submersible Pumps, Electrical Box, Electrical Guide Wire Spool, Electrical Switches, Electroplated Steel, Electropolisher Unit From 324 A-Cell, Empty Punctured Aerosol Cans, Empty Sand Bags From Sand Blast Operation, Empty Shipping Cask, Euroclean HEPA Vacs, Alpha Detectors, Extension Cord, Face Shields, Fan Housing, Feces, Felt, Fiberglass Carts, Fiberglass Insulation, Filler Rock, Filter Media, Fire Hose, Fission Chambers, Flanges, Flex Hose, Floor Tile With Asbestos, Flyash, Foam, Fuel Baskets Wrapped In Plastic, Fuel Rod Spacer, Funnel Covers, Furnace Brick, Furnace Filter, Furnace Slag, GAC Drums, Gas Analyzer, Gate Valve, Generators, Glass Bottles, Glass Insulation, Glass Test Tubes, Glass Wool, Gloves, Gorilla Pipe, Green Metal Fuel Monitor From 100N Basin, Green Tape, Griffon Fire Retardant Plastic, H-3 Contaminated Water And Resin, Hand Tools, Hazardous Ion Exchange Resins, Headache Ball, Heater, Hemp Rope, HEPA Box, HEPA Filter, Herculite, Hitman Liner, Hoist, Hood Gloves With Plastic Ring And Rubber O-Ring, Hoses, HVAC Filters, Hydraulic Cylinder, Hydraulic Lift Table, Hydraulic Oil, Ion Exchange Column, Ion Exchange Resin, Irreparable Garments, Jasco Pump, Kilty Litter, Ladder, Latex Gloves, Laundry, Laundry By-Product, Lava Rock, Leachate From Collection Tank At 218W5, Leather, Lids, Life Preserver, Lint, Magnet, Mask Canisters, Mask Cartridge, Mask Cartridge Filters, Mass Spectrometer, Metal Bars, Metal Boxes, Metal Clam Bucket From KIH Hot Yard, Metal Equipment Known As "Blue Goose" From 325, Metal Garbage Can, Metal Lathe, Metal Mounting Bracket, Metal Nut, Metal Pump From Empty Purgewater Truck, Metal Sprayer, Mops, Motors, Mouse Feces, Mylar Paper, Nails, Neutron Activated Construction Debris, Nickel Chromium Wire, Noncontainerized Tumbleweeds, Non-Friable Asbestos, Nonregulated Oil, Nuts, Nylon Ropes, Oscilloscope Camera, Paint Cans, Palmolive, Paper, Paper Cups, Paper Towels, Petric Dishes, Piece of Rail Car Platform Shipped As Self Contained Item, Pigeon Nests, Pigments, Plasma Exhaust Treatment Waste, Plastic Brushes, Plastic Hard Hat, Plastic Port Ring, Porcelain Sinks, Portable Heater, Portable Light, PPE, PR Rubber Gloves, Propane Tank, Pucks With 90-Mil Liners, Pumice Rock, Pump, Pump Motors, Pump Valve, Pures Inlet Filters, Pures Supply Filters Waste, Pures Tower # T-C3-1, Pures Tower T-G2, Pures Tower T-J4, Pures Tower T-L2, PVC Insulation, PVC Piping, Pyrofoam, Rabbit Droppings, Rad Crushed Glass, Rad Sings, Rad Sorb Pads, Radiation Barrier Rope, Radiation Monitors, Radiators, Radiologically Contaminated Equipment That Has No Further Use, Radios, Rags, Railroad Ties, Rain Gear, RCRA Empty Crushed Aerosol Cans &amp; Debris, Rear Truck Assemblies From I.J.W Rail Flat Car, Rebar, Resin De-Watering Operation Waste, Respirator Cartridges, Respirator Filters, Returned Laundry, Roll of Foam, Rope (Hemp), Rope (Nylon), RR Wheels, Rubber, Rubber "O" Ring, Safety Helmets, Safeway Ladder, Sagebrush, Saw Blade, Sawdust, Scaffolding, Scrap Light Fixtures From Duct Level, Screws, Sea-Land Container, Shear Blocks, Sheet Metal, Shield Plugs, Shoring Materials, Silica Gel From Glove Box Ambient Air Exhaust Scrubber, Silica Gel From Vacuum Pump, Slurries, Smoke Detectors, Snow Roof From U-Cell Cover Blocks, Soft Trash, Solidified Animal Feces And Urine, Sound Proof Doors, Steel Balls, Steel Bellows Transformer, Steel Cable, Steel Elevator Shaft, Submersible Pump, Sump Pumps, Superliger Waste, Surgeons Gloves, Swamp Cooler, Synthetic Polymeric Material, Tape, Tar Paper, Temp Gage, Teri Wipes, Texwipe Cloths, Thermocouples, Tools, Transformers, Transic Panel With Asbestos, Trash, Tumbleweeds, Tygon Hose, Unistrut, Vacuum Parts, Vacuum Vessel, Vacuums, Verification Tape, Vermiculite, Vinyl Flooring Contains Asbestos, Waste Byproduct of Iron Co-Precipitation, Waste From Animal Research, Water Fountain, Water Sampler, Water Tower 3902-A Demolition, Welding Hoses, Welding Machines, Welding Slag Is of Steel, Wood, Wood Blocks, Wood Carts, Zone 3 HEPA Filters, Zonolite Absorbent</p>
218-W-11	No data

D-29

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B

Table D-15. Select Radionuclide Inventory for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Landfills (Curies).

Landfill	C-14	Co-60	Cs-137	H-3	I-129	Sr-90	Tc-99
218-C-9	0	0	5.03931	0	0	0.89909	0
218-E-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-E-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-E-2A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-E-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-E-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-E-5A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-E-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-E-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-E-10	0	1900	949237.2	8E-08	0	782838.1	0.004498
218-E-12A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-E-12B	5.59E-12	48001.98	26775.87	0.000199	0	25630.13	0
218-W-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-W-1A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-W-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-W-2A	0	3.4	11	0	0	6.2	0
218-W-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-W-3A	0.139011	47903.9	283259.9	430481.3	0.014386	63955.04	0.285383
218-W-3AE	14.21024	102669.7	83083.31	66818.9	0.000427	61613.57	34.15656
218-W-4A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218-W-4B	0	18936.85	322.887	231128.1	0.501	157.612	0
218-W-4C	2.61351	672420.7	2987.699	18971.45	0.00143	4190.551	16.3985
218-W-5	5.445151	4270.958	2850.087	37945.17	3.005093	84746.33	7.235188
218-W-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

1

**APPENDIX E**

2

3

4

**INITIAL CONCEPTUAL SITE MODELS FOR THE  
200-SW-2 OPERABLE UNIT LANDFILLS**

This page intentionally left blank.

## FIGURES

2	Figure E-1. Contaminant Exposure Model for the 200-SW-2 OU Landfills .....	E-3
3		
4	<b><u>Bin Level CSMs</u></b>	
5	Figure E-2. Initial Conceptual Site Model for Bin 1 TSD Unit Landfills.....	E-4
6	Figure E-3. Initial Conceptual Site Model for Bin 2 Industrial Landfills.....	E-5
7	Figure E-4. Initial Conceptual Site Model for Bin 3 Dry Waste Alpha Landfills.....	E-6
8	Figure E-5. Initial Conceptual Site Model for Bin 4 Dry Waste Landfills.....	E-7
9	Figure E-6. Initial Conceptual Site Model for Bin 5 Construction Landfills.....	E-8
10	Figure E-7. Initial Conceptual Site Model for Bin 6 Caissons.....	E-9
11		
12	<b><u>Individual Site Level CSMs</u></b>	
13	Figure E-8. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-C-9 Landfill.....	E-10
14	Figure E-9. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-1 Landfill.....	E-11
15	Figure E-10. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-2 Landfill.....	E-12
16	Figure E-11. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-2A Landfill.....	E-13
17	Figure E-12. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-4 Landfill.....	E-14
18	Figure E-13. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-5 Landfill.....	E-15
19	Figure E-14. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-5A Landfill.....	E-16
20	Figure E-15. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-8 Landfill.....	E-17
21	Figure E-16. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-9 Landfill.....	E-18
22	Figure E-17. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-10 Landfill.....	E-19
23	Figure E-18. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-12A Landfill.....	E-20
24	Figure E-19. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-E-12B Landfill.....	E-21
25	Figure E-20. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-1 Landfill.....	E-22
26	Figure E-21. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-1A Landfill.....	E-23
27	Figure E-22. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-2 Landfill.....	E-24
28	Figure E-23. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-2A Landfill.....	E-25
29	Figure E-24. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-3 Landfill.....	E-26
30	Figure E-25. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-3A Landfill.....	E-27
31	Figure E-26. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-3AE Landfill.....	E-28
32	Figure E-27. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-4A Landfill.....	E-29
33	Figure E-28. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-4B Landfill.....	E-30
34	Figure E-29. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-4C Landfill.....	E-31
35	Figure E-30. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-5 Landfill.....	E-32
36	Figure E-31. Initial Conceptual Site Model for the 218-W-11 Landfill.....	E-33
37	Figure E-32. Initial Conceptual Site Model for 218-W-4A and 218-W-4B Caissons .....	E-34

38

39

## TABLE

40	Table E-1. Summary of 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Bins.....	E-2
----	--	-----

This page intentionally left blank.

## APPENDIX E

INITIAL CONCEPTUAL SITE MODELS FOR THE  
200-SW-2 OPERABLE UNIT LANDFILLS

This appendix presents the initial conceptual site models (CSM) for the 200-SW-2 Operable Unit (OU) landfills.

Information pertaining to contaminant sources, release mechanisms, transport media, exposure route, and receptors has been incorporated into the CSMs. The conceptual exposure pathway model (Figure E-1) is included to develop an understanding of potential risks and exposure pathways associated with the waste sites. This information forms the basis for an evaluation of potential human health and environmental risk.

Figures E-2 through E-7 present an overview of the CSM for each of the six bins in the 200-SW-2 OU. These CSMs provide a brief description of each bin, including those landfills that are part of the bin. Also included in these figures are photos showing typical sites within the bin, as well as maps showing the locations of the sites.

Figures E-8 through E-33 present the individual site CSMs for each of the 24 landfills in the 200-SW-2 OU. Also included is a CSM for the caissons and vertical pipe units (VPU) in the 218-W-4A and 218-W-4B Landfills. Information included in these CSMs includes historical information, preliminary contaminant distribution models, a summary of past characterization activities, and aerial photos and individual site figures.

Subsequent to publication of DOE/RL-2004-60, *200-SW-1 Nonradioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit and 200-SW-2 Radioactive Landfills and Dumps Group Operable Unit Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Work Plan*, Draft A, a number of smaller waste sites that once resided in the 200-SW-2 OU were moved to the 200-MG-1 OU in accordance with *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order* (Tri-Party Agreement) change requests. This migration of waste sites primarily affected Bin 1 and Bin 2, as described in the Draft A RI/FS work plan. Based on a reassessment of the 24 landfills that now remain in the 200-SW-2 OU, a new set of groupings or "bins" has been established for this version of the work plan. This new set of bins was established based on factors such as waste volume, waste type, waste form, disposal practices, periods of landfill operations, homogeneity of waste, and potential risk, among others. The new bins have been named as follows and are identified as such throughout this document:

- *Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills*
- *Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills*
- *Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills*
- *Bin 4 – Dry Waste Landfills*
- *Bin 5 – Construction Landfills*
- *Bin 6 – Caissons.*

Table E-1. Summary of 200-SW-2 Operable Unit Bins.


Bin	Number of Landfills or Caissons in Bin	Landfill Name	General Features
<b>Bin 1 – TSD Unit Landfills</b>	7	218-E-10 218-E-12B 218-W-3A 218-W-3AE 218-W-4B 218-W-4C 218-W-5	Included in DOE/RL-88-20, <i>Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, Low-Level Burial Grounds</i> Contain retrievably-stored TRU waste (M-091 Project) Potential for small volumes of sorbed, containerized liquids Potential for areas of subsidence High dose rates
<b>Bin 2 – Industrial Landfills</b>	8	218-E-2 218-E-2A 218-E-5 218-E-5A 218-E-9 218-W-1A 218-W-2A 218-W-11	Potential for subsidence High internal void volume Disposal of failed/obsolete equipment High dose rates Waste typically contained in large wooden or concrete boxes
<b>Bin 3 – Dry Waste Alpha Landfills</b>	4	218-W-1 218-W-2 218-W-3 218-W-4A	Contain ~ 90% of the pre-1970 alpha contaminated low-level waste Waste primarily packaged in fiberboard cartons/boxes/drums Low potential for subsidence
<b>Bin 4 – Dry Waste Landfills</b>	2	218-E-1 218-E-12A	Waste primarily packaged in fiberboard cartons/boxes/drums Medium dose rate (up to 2,000 mR/h) Low potential for subsidence Primarily beta-gamma contaminated waste Surface stabilized with fly ash
<b>Bin 5 – Construction Landfills</b>	3	218-C-9 218-E-4 218-E-8	Low activity waste (<100 mR/h) Primarily construction/demolition debris and concrete rubble Low potential for areas of subsidence
<b>Bin 6 – Caissons</b>	~19	218-W-4A 218-W-4B	Some high-dose-rate waste Some remote-handled waste Small containers, such as 3.8 to 18.9 L (1- to 5-gal) cans Some high beta-gamma radiation Potential for small volumes of sorbed organics (lab packs) Eight caissons/vertical pipe units in 218-W-4A Landfill (four potentially unused) Five alpha caissons (M-091 Program; out-of-scope for 200-SW-2 Operable Unit; one potentially unused) Six dry waste caissons in 218-W-4B Landfill

DOE/RL-88-20, 1997, *Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, Low-Level Burial Grounds*, Rev. 1, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.






TSD = treatment, storage, and/or disposal (unit).

TRU = Radioactive waste as defined in DOE G 435.1 1, *Implementation Guide for Use with DOE M 435.1-1*.

DOE/RL-2004-60 DRAFT B  
 Figure E-1. Conceptual Exposure  
 Pathway Model for the 200-SW-2  
 Operable Unit Landfills.







# Bin 1 TSD Unit Landfills



This bin includes the seven 200-SW-2 OU landfills that are permitted as RCRA TSD Unit Landfills and are included in the Low-Level Burial Grounds Dangerous Waste Permit Application, Part A (DOE/RL-88-20, Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, Low-Level Burial Grounds). The majority of available historical documentation for 200-SW-2 Landfills is associated with these sites (approximately 110,000 of 117,000 total documents). These landfills, therefore, are considered the best-documented sites in the scope of the RI/FS work plan. Sites in this bin include the 218-W-3A, 218-W-3AE, 218-W-4B, 218-W-4C, 218-W-5, 218-E-10, and 218-E-12B Landfills. Historical documentation suggests that no burials have been made to several large-area portions of the 218-W-4C, 218-E-10, and 218-E-12B Landfills. The seven landfills and associated in-scope trenches in this bin received waste at various times from 1955 to 2004. Approximately 70 percent of the 200-SW-2 OU's overall waste volume is included in this bin.





# Bin 2 Industrial Landfills



This bin includes eight past practice landfills that received radioactive waste that was generally packaged in large wooden or concrete boxes, containing large quantities of mixed fission products. For the most part, these landfills were dedicated for burial of large pieces of failed or obsolete equipment from the chemical processing facilities. Many of these sites contain burials made over 50 years ago. Historical burial documentation is good for the 218-W-2A and 218-E-5A Landfills; however, historical burial documentation for the remaining sites is at a minimum. Sites in this bin include the 218-W-2A, 218-E-5A, 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-5, 218-E-9, 218-W-1A, and 218-W-11 Landfills. The eight landfills included in this bin received waste at various times from 1944 to 1985. Approximately 13 percent of the 200-SW-2 OU's overall waste volume is included in this bin.



## Bin 3 Dry Waste Alpha Landfills

This bin includes four past practice landfills that received radioactive waste packaged primarily in fiberboard or small wooden boxes, wrapped in heavy brown paper or burlap, or placed in the trench without packaging. A small percentage of the waste is packaged in metal drums. All types of miscellaneous wastes, including contaminated soils and potentially contaminated rags, paper, wood, and small pieces of equipment such as tools, have been placed in these sites. Some larger equipment (e.g., several motor vehicles, large canyon-processing equipment) is known to have been disposed to these sites. Available historical documentation suggests that these four sites collectively contain at least 90 percent of the 200 Areas landfill pre-1970 alpha inventory. Available historical documentation for the older landfills (218-W-1 and 218-W-2 Landfills) in this bin generally is poor because these landfills received waste in the 1940s and 1950s. Available historical documents for the newer landfills (218-W-3 and 218-W-4A) in this bin are more numerous, as these two landfills received waste in the mid-1950s to 1960s. The four landfills included in this bin received waste at various times from 1944 to 1968. Approximately 10 percent of the 200-SW-2 OU's overall waste volume is included this bin.






# Bin 4

## Dry Waste Landfills



This bin includes two past practice landfills that received radioactive waste packaged primarily in fiberboard or small wooden boxes, wrapped in heavy brown paper or burlap, or placed in the trench without packaging. A small percentage of the waste is packaged in metal drums. All types of miscellaneous wastes, including contaminated soils and potentially contaminated rags, paper, and wood, have been placed in these sites. These sites also contain a few pieces of large equipment such as tank farm pumps. Available historical documentation for these sites is generally poor. Sites included in this bin include 218-E-1 and 218-E-12A Landfills. The two landfills in this bin received waste at various times between 1945 and 1967. Approximately 4 percent of the 200-SW-2 OU's overall waste volume is included in this bin.




# Bin 5 Construction Landfills




This bin includes three past practice landfills that mainly were limited to burial of wastes resulting from construction work on existing facilities or demolition of surplus facilities. Wastes in these sites are believed to contain very little alpha contamination; beta-gamma contamination is likely also at a minimum. Documentation for 218-C-9 Landfill is believed to be nearly complete; however, few historical documents exist for the 218-E-8 and 218-E-4 Landfills. The three landfills in Bin 5 received waste at various times between 1955 and 1989. Approximately 3 percent of the 200-SW-2 OU's overall waste volume is included this Bin.

# Bin 6 Caissons

This bin includes fifteen cylindrical containment structures commonly known as caissons and/or vertical pipe units that were used (or intended to be used) for disposal of hot-cell waste or high plutonium concentration waste. The vertical pipe units (sometimes termed caissons) located in the 218-W-4A Landfill were made of welded 208.2 L (55 gal.) drums or corrugated pipe and concrete; the caissons in 218-W-4B Landfill were made of metal and/or concrete. Documentation for the caissons in 218-W-4A Landfill generally is poor, while more documentation exists for the caissons in 218-W-4B Landfill (150 to 250 documents per caisson). Caissons located in this bin include 218-W-4B-C1, 218-W-4B-C2, 218-W-4B-C3, 218-W-4B-C4, 218-W-4B-C5, 218-W-4B-C6, 218-W-4B-CU1, 218-W-4A-C1, 218-W-4A-C2, 218-W-4A-C3, and 218-W-4A-C5 Caissons. This bin also includes some caissons in 218-W-4A and 218-W-4B Landfills that are believed to be empty/unused, according to available historical documentation; caissons that are suspected to be empty include the 218-W-4A-C4, 218-W-4A-C6, 218-W-4A-C7, 218-W-4A-C8, and 218-W-4B-Alpha5 Caissons. Waste was disposed in caissons from 1959 to 1990. Approximately 0.01 percent of the 200-SW-2 OU's overall waste volume is included in this bin.



Caisson Mockup Site




# 218-C-9

Bin 5 Construction Landfill


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-C-9, Dry Waste No. 0C9, 218-C-9 Burial Ground
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Construction
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	Liquid discharges 1953 to 1983. Solid waste burial 1985 to 1989
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	1.81 ha (4.46 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	North of 7th St and north of Hot Semiworks Plant
<b>General Description</b>	The burial pit is located at the site of the dried 216-C-9 Pond. The dried pond was covered with a layer of washed gravel, and material from the deactivation and demolition material of the Hot Semiworks Plant was disposed. In August 1986, a fire was discovered in the burial pit. It was determined that metal frames cut with a torch had been placed in the pit before fully cooling and ignited flammable material. The entire site has been backfilled and surface stabilized. A routine radiological survey is performed annually. Debris at the site consists of radiologically contaminated concrete rubble, large equipment, roofing material, metal scrap, and other Hot Semiworks Plant demolition wastes. Contaminated soil from UN-216-E-37 and UN-216-E-39 also was placed in the pit.
<b>Trenches</b>	1 large pit
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	1 billion L (264 million gal) mildly radioactive steam condensate liquid discharge 7,580 m <sup>3</sup> (9,920 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of miscellaneous solid debris and soil. The site contains LLW only. The site contains no Pu, and less than a milligram of U. 43 Ci of Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	Hot Semiworks (201-C) demolition
<b>References</b>	WIDS; Burial Records; H-2-44501 Sheet 93; H-2-44501 Sheet 94; H-2-32523; Interview with JD Anderson 25 July 2005; ARH-1608; Engineering Order No. 19813 dated 10/8/1985; RHO-CD-673


## 218-C-9 Site Map



## Geophysical Anomalies




## Aerial Photo



## Characterization Summary

### 218-C-9

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - o Geophysical data indicates that this landfill does not appear to contain large, continuous concentrations of buried objects or debris in well-defined trenches or pits.
  - o See Section 3 for results




- Low activity waste (<100 mR/hr)
- Primarily construction/demolition debris and concrete rubble
- Low potential for subsidence
- Used in past as the 216-C-9 pond


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-E-1, 200 East Dry Waste No. 001
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Dry Waste
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1945 to 1953
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	0.961 ha (2.37 acres) - rectangle
<b>Location</b>	West of PUREX (202-A Building) and south of 4th St
<b>General Description</b>	In 1974, areas with surface depressions were filled to grade with cinders from the 284-E Powerhouse and topped with gravel. In October 1978, an area of previously buried waste was uncovered at the south end of a trench. The contamination was reburied and covered with clean soil. The entire landfill was surface stabilized with 46 cm (18 in.) of clean soil and vegetated with wheat grass.
<b>Trenches</b>	15 north-to-south trenches 61 m (200 ft) long, ranging from 5 m to 6 m (16 ft to 20 ft) wide
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	3,030 m <sup>3</sup> (2,317 yd <sup>3</sup> ) dry waste. The site contains unsegregated waste only. 0.9 kg Pu, 400 kg U. 100 Ci of Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 East Area – believed to be mainly B-Plant wastes
<b>References</b>	WIDS; WHC-EP-0912; RHO-CD-673; H-2-124; HW-60807; SWITS; RHO-72710-82-167


218-E-1 Site Map



Geophysical Anomalies



Aerial Photo




Characterization Summary

### 218-E-1

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - o Geophysical data indicates that 218-E-1 contains 15 trenches with variable amounts of metallic material contained in each.
  - o The buried material does not appear to be continuous throughout the entire length of most trenches.
  - o See Section 3 for results

## 218-E-1

Bin 4 Dry Waste Landfill



- Waste primarily packaged in fiberboard cartons/boxes/drums
- Medium dose rate (up to 2,000 mR/hr)
- Low potential for subsidence
- Primarily beta-gamma contaminated waste.
- Surface stabilized with fly ash


# 218-E-2

Bin 2 Industrial Landfill


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-E-2, 200 East Industrial Waste No. 002, Equipment Burial Ground #2
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Industrial
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1945 to 1953
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	2.05 ha (5.06 acres) - rectangle
<b>Location</b>	North of B Plant and south of BX Tank Farm; co-located with Landfills 218-E-5, 218-E-5A and 218-E-9
<b>General Description</b>	The unit was surface stabilized in 1979 with 0.3 m (1 ft) of clean backfill material and vegetated with wheat grass. Trench lengths vary from 27 m to 142 m (90 ft to 465 ft). The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A and 218-E-9.
<b>Trenches</b>	9 industrial (wide) trenches.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	9,033 m <sup>3</sup> (11,815 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of industrial wastes. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 0.8 kg Pu, 300 kg U, 25,000 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 East Area
<b>References</b>	WIDS; SWITS


## 218-E-2 Site Map



## Relative Volume of Waste by Year




## Aerial Photo



## Characterization Summary

### 218-E-2

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface radiological surveys
  - o In September 2006 radiological soil measurements at the 218-E-2 and 218-E-5 Landfills were performed in support of the 200-SW-2 OU non-intrusive characterization effort.
  - o Eight survey locations (hot-spots) were selected for further radiological soil measurements in and around the two landfills, based on previously collected MSCM data.
  - o Cesium contamination appears to be close to the surface and probably not directly related to the landfill.
  - o See section 3 for results




- High internal void volume
- High potential for subsidence
- Disposal of failed/obsolete equipment
- High dose rates
- Waste typically contained in large wooden or concrete boxes


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-E-2A, Regulated Equipment Storage Site No. 02A, Burial Trench
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Industrial
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1945 to 1950
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	0.372 ha (0.918 acres) - rectangle
<b>Location</b>	North of B Plant and south of 218-E-2. A railroad spur separates 218-E-2 from 218-E-2A
<b>General Description</b>	The site was used as an above-ground storage site for contaminated equipment. There are no records or inventories for this site. A 1978 inspection noted a number of sinkholes. During 1979, several loads of soil were placed over the sinkholes, and the stored above-ground equipment was buried in the 218-E-10 Landfill. The site was surface stabilized with 0.3 m (1 ft) of soil, revegetated, and posted/marked as an underground radioactive material area in 1980 to 1981. The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A and 218-E-9.
<b>Trenches</b>	One east-west trench
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	The site contains unsegregated waste only. Nothing is known about waste volume or inventories.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	Unknown
<b>References</b>	WIDS; H-2-55534


218-E-2A Site Map



Geophysical Anomalies



Aerial Photo




Characterization Summary

### 218-E-2A

- Historical documentation review
  - See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - Investigation conducted was an expansion of the area covered in the first phase of geophysical investigations (D&D 28379). Results of the previous investigation appeared to show anomalies extending beyond the edge of the landfill boundary to the west. This investigation concluded no buried debris or objects are interpreted to be west of the landfill boundary.
  - See Section 3 for results

## 218-E-2A Bin 2 Industrial Landfill




- Low activity waste (<100 mR/hr)
- Primarily construction/demolition debris and concrete rubble
- Low potential for subsidence
- Believed to be many small burials


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-E-4, 200 East Minor Construction No. 4, Equipment Burial Ground #4
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Construction
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1955 to 1956
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	1.38 ha (3.41 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	Irregularly shaped polygon located between two railroad tracks and north of 221-B Building
<b>General Description</b>	The site received repair and construction waste from the 221-B modifications. In June 1960, UPR-200-E-23 occurred and contaminated the area to a maximum reading of 1 rad/h. The site was surface stabilized in 1980 and is posted as Underground Radioactive Material. A radioactive survey is performed annually. The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-5, 218-E-5A, and 218-E-9.
<b>Trenches</b>	The exact number of trenches remains unknown. It is believed that 2 trenches run parallel to the railroad tracks.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	1,586 m <sup>3</sup> (2,074 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of mainly construction debris. The site contains .01 kg Pu, 1 kg U. All waste is unsegregated. 10 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 East Area –(B-Plant [221-B] construction and modifications)
<b>References</b>	WIDS; SWITS


218-E-4 Site Map



Relative Volume of Waste by Year



Aerial Photo




Characterization Summary

- 218-E-4
- Historical documentation review
    - See Section 5 for a summary of the review process

## 218-E-4

Bin 5 Construction Landfill




- Low activity waste (<100 mR/hr)
- Primarily construction/demolition debris and concrete rubble
- Low potential for subsidence
- Believed to be many small burials


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-E-5, 200 East Industrial Waste No. 05, Equipment Burial Ground #5
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Industrial
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1954 to 1956
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	1.09 ha (2.69 acres) - rectangle
<b>Location</b>	North of B Plant and southwest of BX Tank Farm, adjacent to 218-E-2 Landfill
<b>General Description</b>	The westernmost trench contains railroad boxcars contaminated by uranyl nitrate hexahydrate at the north end. The burial areas were stabilized and covered with 0.3 m (1 ft) of clean soil in 1980. The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5A and 218-E-9.
<b>Trenches</b>	The site contains two areas of trenches. One area is 104 m (341 ft) long by 40 m (131 ft) wide and contains multiple narrow trenches that received industrial dry waste and small boxes. The second area is a single trench oriented north/south that is 102 m (335 ft) long by 20 m (64 ft) wide.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	3,172 m <sup>3</sup> (4,149 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of miscellaneous debris. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 0.62 kg Pu, 120 kg U, 3,500 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 East Area - PUREX (202-A)
<b>References</b>	WIDS; HW-60807; H-2-55534; RHO-CD-673; SWITS


218-E-5 Site Map



Geophysical Anomalies



Aerial Photo




## 218-E-5 Characterization Summary

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface radiological surveys
  - o In September 2006 radiological soil measurements at the 218-E-2 and 218-E-5 Landfills were performed in support of the 200-SW-2 OU non-intrusive characterization effort.
  - o Eight survey locations (hot-spots) were selected for further radiological soil measurements in and around the two landfills, based on previously collected MSCM data.
  - o Cesium contamination appears to be close to the surface and probably not directly related to the landfill.
  - o See section 3 for results
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - o The 218-E-5 and 218-E-5A Landfills are contiguous and were investigated as a single landfill. Two trenches are documented in 218-E-5. Trench 2 appears to be roughly 20 m to the west of its documented location. In the eastern half of the landfill, a second trench was detected that correlates well with the documented location of Trench 3 shown on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-55534.
  - o See Section 3 for results

# 218-E-5

## Bin 2 Industrial Landfill



- High internal void volume
- High potential for subsidence
- Disposal of failed/obsolete equipment
- High dose rates
- Waste typically contained in large wooden or concrete boxes


# 218-E-5A

Bin 2 Industrial Landfill


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-E-5A, 200 East Industrial Waste No. 005A, Equipment Burial Ground #5A
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Industrial
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1956 to 1961
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	1.42 ha (3.51 acres) - rectangle
<b>Location</b>	North of B Plant and southwest of BX Tank Farm, adjacent to the 218-E-5 Landfill
<b>General Description</b>	Literature indicates that the site contains wooden boxes of spent PUREX equipment. The trench was backfilled in 1961. The site was stabilized in 1980, covered with 1 ft of clean backfill, and revegetated. The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, and 218-E-9.
<b>Trenches</b>	Probably one large pit.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	6,173 m <sup>3</sup> (8,740 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of PUREX failed equipment. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 1.38 kg Pu, 120 kg U, 16,500 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 East Area - PUREX (202-A)
<b>References</b>	WIDS; HW-60807; H-2-55534; 218-E-5A Logbook; HW-63703; RHO-CD-673; PNL-6456; SWITS

## 218-E-5A Site Map



## Geophysical Anomalies




## Aerial Photo



## Characterization Summary

### 218-E-5A

- Historical documentation review
  - See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - The 218-E-5 and 218-E-5A Landfills are contiguous and were investigated as a single landfill. Data indicates that there is one trench in the 218 E 5A Landfill; an oblong-shape trench or pit containing a significant amount of metallic debris or objects.
  - See Section 3 for results




- High internal void volume
- High potential for subsidence
- Disposal of failed/obsolete equipment
- High dose rates
- Waste typically contained in large wooden or concrete boxes

# 218-E-8

## Bin 5 Construction Landfill

### Landfill Summary Information


<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-E-8, 200 East Construction Burial Grounds
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Construction
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1958 to 1959
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	0.444 ha (1.10 acres) - rectangle
<b>Location</b>	North of the 218-E-12A, on the hillside adjacent to the 218-E-12B Landfill
<b>General Description</b>	In 1979, contaminated tumbleweed fragments were found that had blown in and accumulated inside the site and along the west boundary. The trenches were backfilled, and the site was surface stabilized in 1980. An annual radiological survey is performed. Debris included construction and repair wastes from 293-A Building and the PUREX crane addition.
<b>Trenches</b>	The site consists of an unknown number of trenches.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	2,265 m <sup>3</sup> (2,963 yd <sup>3</sup> ) miscellaneous solid construction debris. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 0.02 kg Pu, 2 kg U, 10 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 East Area - PUREX (202-A and 293-A)
<b>References</b>	WIDS; HW-60807; BHI-00178; H-2-33276 Sheet 2; H-2-33276 Sheet 5; PNL-6456; SWITS



### Characterization Summary

218-E-8

- Historical documentation review
  - See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - Most of the landfill shows a scattering of anomalies of variable concentrations. A significant pit of buried debris, not fully characterized by this investigation, was located approximately 60 m east of the landfill.
  - See Section 3 for results



- Low activity waste (<100 mR/hr)
- Primarily construction/demolition debris and concrete rubble
- Low potential for subsidence

## Landfill Summary Information

**WIDS Code & Aliases** 218-E-9, 200 East Regulated Equipment Storage Site No. 009, Burial Vault (HISS)

**Landfill Type** Industrial

**OU & Category** 200-SW-2, past practice

**Dates of Waste Receipt** 1953 to 1958

**Area & Shape** 0.572 ha (1.41 acres) - rectangle  
**Location** North of B Plant and east of the 218-E-2 Landfill

**General Description** The site was used as an above-ground storage site for fission product equipment that became contaminated in the Uranium Recovery Process operations at tank farms. It is not certain that it ever was used as a landfill. The site is co-located with Landfills 218-E-2, 218-E-2A, 218-E-4, 218-E-5, and 218-E-5A and stabilized in 1980. The site was re-stabilized in 1991 when contaminated vegetation was found.


**Trenches** The site consists of an unknown number of trenches. Some overlap with trenches in 218-E-2.

**Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level & Unsegregated Wastes only)** Equipment. Nothing is known about the waste volume or contaminant inventory. The site contains unsegregated waste only.

**Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume** Unknown – believed to be uranium-recovery process operations at tank farms

**References** WIDS; RHO-CD-673; H-2-55534


218-E-9 Site Map



Aerial Photo



Aerial Photo




## Characterization Summary

218-E-9

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process

\* historical document(s) indicate that 218-E-9 is located as shown in the aerial photo but that there is uncertainty in its actual location (which is more likely to be the area east of trench 11)




- High internal void volume
- High potential for subsidence
- Disposal of failed/obsolete equipment
- High dose rates
- Waste typically contained in large wooden or concrete boxes
- Used for above ground storage of waste


## 218-E-10 Bin 1 TSD Unit Landfill

### Landfill Summary Information


<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-E-10, 200 East Industrial Waste No. 10, Equipment Burial Ground #10
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Industrial
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, TSD Unit
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1955 to 2000
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	22.9 ha (56.6 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	Northwest of B Plant and directly west of the 218-E-5A Landfill
<b>General Description</b>	Wastes disposed to the site include cover blocks, tube bundles, jumper vessels, pumps, columns, and filters. In June 1960, a partially covered burial box of PUREX tube bundles caused an airborne contamination spread (UPR-200-E-23). In 1980, Trenches 1 through 5 were backfilled and stabilized. The section was vegetated with grasses. Surface stabilization also was completed for the eastern 10 ha (25 acres) in 1980.
<b>Trenches</b>	Landfill consists of 13 trenches running north-south and one trench running east-west. Trenches range from 264 m to 433 m (865 ft to 1,420 ft) long by 4.6 m to 5 m (15 ft to 16 ft) wide at the bottom.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	26,900 m <sup>3</sup> (35,200 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of equipment/industrial wastes. The site contains LLW, MLLW, and unsegregated waste. The site contains 4.94 kg Pu, 801 kg U. 4,700,00 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial. Contaminants include asbestos, lead, and di-n-octyl phthalate.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	100 Area, B-Plant (221-B/224-B), Offsite, PUREX (202-A)
<b>References</b>	WIDS; HW-60807; H-2-58025; DOE/RL-2000-70; H-2-92004; DOE/RL-88-21 Release 22 Low Level Burial Grounds Rev. 11 12/23/98; SWITS



### Relative Volume of Waste by Generator




### Aerial Photo



### Characterization Summary

#### 218-E-10

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- RCRA groundwater monitoring
  - o LLWMA 1- monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant indicator parameters, groundwater quality parameters, drinking water parameters, and site specific parameters as required by WAC 173-303-400(3).
  - o See section 3 for results




- Under LLBG Dangerous Waste Permit Application - Part A
- Potential for small volume, sorbed, containerized liquids
- Potential for subsidence
- High dose rates
- Northern portion believed unused; will be verified by field walk downs and/or geophysics

## 218-E-12A Bin 4 Dry Waste Landfill


### Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-E-12A, 200 East Dry Waste No. 12A
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Dry Waste
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1953 to 1967
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	12.1 ha (30.0 acres) - nearly rectangular
<b>Location</b>	Northwest of the C Tank Farm and south of 218-E-12B Landfill
<b>General Description</b>	The site received cardboard boxes and plastic bags of radioactive waste. Trenches 4 through 11, 15, 16, and 26 through 28 contain acid-soaked material. The specific contents of Trench 28 are not listed. A waste inventory logbook documents burials of tank farm dip tubes, an impact wrench, contaminated cable, jumpers, animal carcasses from 108-F, and an off-site shipment of depleted uranium. The trenches were backfilled, and stabilization occurred in 1979 and 1980. Biobarriers installed at the site included polyethylene liners and ureabor (herbicide) to kill vegetation. The site was stabilized again in 1994 with 46 cm to 61 cm (19.8 in. to 24 in.) of clean fill.
<b>Trenches</b>	28 burial trenches
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	15,300 m <sup>3</sup> (20,000 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of dry waste. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 8.9 kg Pu, 995 kg U, 890 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 East Area
<b>References</b>	WIDS; HW-60807; H-2-32560; 218-E-12A Logbook; PNL-6456; SWITS


218-E-12A Site Map



Geophysical Anomalies




Aerial Photo



### 218-E-12A Characterization Summary

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - o In all of the dry waste trenches, concentrations of metallic waste were identified. Because of the depth of burial of the debris in trenches and the marginally favorable soil conditions, it is assumed that there is more debris in the trenches than was detected in the data.
  - o All of the acid trenches are documented as being in the eastern half of the landfill where the soil conditions are least favorable to GPR.
  - o See Section 3 for results




- Waste primarily packaged in fiberboard cartons/boxes/drums
- Medium dose rate (up to 2,000 mR/hr)
- Low potential for subsidence
- Primarily beta-gamma contaminated waste
- Contains several trenches that contain acid soaked material most likely from decontamination activities at the PUREX facility

## 218-E-12B Bin 1 TSD Unit Landfill


### Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-E-12B, 200 East Dry Waste No. 12B
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Dry Waste
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, TSD Unit
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1967 to present
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	73.6 ha (182 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	North of the C Tank Farm and south of 12th St
<b>General Description</b>	The southern portion of the site (Trenches 1 through 17) were interim stabilized in 1981 with clean fill. In January 2000, two contaminated tumbleweeds were removed from the site.
<b>Trenches</b>	The landfill has the design capacity for 138 trenches running north to south. 38 trenches are filled, 2 were partially filled, and one was excavated and never used. The remaining trenches were never excavated.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	65,600 m <sup>3</sup> (85,800 yd <sup>3</sup> ) industrial wastes. The site contains unsegregated, low-level, and transuranic wastes. In-scope wastes contains 1.39 kg Pu, 7.64 kg U. 183,000 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial. These inventories do not include Trench 94, containing U.S. Navy submarine reactor compartments, nor post-1970 TRU, which are out of scope of this project.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 East Area, B-Plant, Offsite, PUREX, Tank Farms
<b>References</b>	WIDS; WHC-EP-0912; H-2-33276 Sheet 1; DOE/RL-88-20, Rev. 1, Low Level Burial Grounds Rev. 10, 7/25/97

218-E-12B Site Map



Relative Volume of Waste by Generator




Aerial Photo



Characterization Summary

#### 218-E-12B

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- RCRA groundwater monitoring
  - o LLWMA 2- monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant indicator parameters, groundwater quality parameters, drinking water parameters, and site specific parameters as required by WAC 173-303-400(3).
  - o See section 3 for results




- Under LLBG Dangerous Waste Permit Application - Part A
- Contains retrievably stored TRU waste (M-91 Project)
- Potential for small volume, sorbed, containerized liquids
- Potential for subsidence
- High dose rates
- Small portion of landfill affected by past seepage from B-Ditch
- Decommissioned naval reactor compartments in trench 94 are out of scope
- Western portion believed unused; will be verified by field walk downs and/or geophysics


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-1, 200-W Area Dry Waste No. 001, Solid Waste Burial Ground #1
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Dry Waste
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1944 to 1952
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	3.32 ha (8.19 acres) - rectangle
<b>Location</b>	Northwest of the 234-SZ Building; east of Dayton Ave, between the 218-W-2 and 218-W-11 Landfills
<b>General Description</b>	"V" trenches typically were used to dispose of small contaminated articles such as paper, filters, and small pieces of equipment. The flat-bottom trenches contain large pieces of contaminated equipment and wooden, metal, and concrete burial boxes. The trenches have been backfilled, and the site was stabilized in 1983. A surface radiological survey is performed annually.
<b>Trenches</b>	The site contains 15 trenches that run east to west. Twelve trenches are "V" shaped 2.4 m (8 ft) deep and 5 m (16 ft) wide at ground level. The other three trenches are flat-bottomed at 2.7 m (9 ft) deep and 7.3 m (24 ft) wide at the surface.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	7,164 m <sup>3</sup> (9,370 yd <sup>3</sup> ) dry waste. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 94 kg Pu, 700 kg U, 200 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 West Area
<b>References</b>	WIDS; H-2-75149; SWITS; DDTS-GENERATED-5634; DDTS-GENERATED-5635; DDTS-GENERATED-5636; DDTS-GENERATED-5637; DDTS-GENERATED-5640; HAN-95462

218-W-1 Site Map



Geophysical Anomalies



Aerial Photo




Characterization Summary

218-W-1

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - o Geophysical data for 218 W 1 indicates pockets of debris in each of the identified trenches. Discrete concentrations of metallic waste were identified in most of the trenches.
  - o Three East-West-oriented trenches were identified that are not shown on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-75149. They are north of the northernmost trench shown on the drawing (Trench 9) and south of the 218-W-11 Landfill.
  - o See Section 3 for results

## 218-W-1

Bin 3 Dry Waste Alpha Landfill




- One of four landfills believed to contain ~ 90% of the pre-1970 alpha contaminated LLW
- Waste primarily packaged in fiberboard cartons/boxes/drums
- Low potential for subsidence


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-1A, 200-W Area Industrial Waste Burial Ground #1, Equipment Burial Ground #1
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Industrial
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1945 to 1961
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	4.86 ha (12.0 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	Northwest of 221-T, between two railroad spurs
<b>General Description</b>	The site is the first landfill in the 200 West Area to receive large, contaminated equipment. Most of the equipment was disposed in wooden boxes that eventually rotted and settled, creating sinkholes. The sinkholes were filled in 1975 with 1.8 m (6-ft) thick concrete cell blocks and clean fill. Radiological surveys are performed annually.
<b>Trenches</b>	The site contains approximately ten burial areas. The areas include typical trenches and "burial holes." The exact locations of the holes are not known.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	13,700 m <sup>3</sup> (17,900 yd <sup>3</sup> ) equipment and industrial wastes. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 2.0 kg Pu, 900 kg U, 48,000 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 West Area
<b>References</b>	WIDS; WHC-EP-0912; RHO-CD-673; SWITS


218-W-1A Site Map



Geophysical Anomalies




Aerial Photo



Characterization Summary

- 218-W-1A
- Historical documentation review
    - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
  - Surface geophysical surveys
    - o Landfill contains a large number of small, scattered shallow anomalies that confound the interpretation of distinct burial trenches in the GPR data. For this reason, concentrations of buried debris are inferred primarily from EMI and magnetic data.
    - o See Section 3 for results

## 218-W-1A Bin 2 Industrial Landfill




- High internal void volume
- High potential for subsidence
- Disposal of failed/obsolete equipment
- High dose rates
- Waste typically contained in large wooden or concrete boxes


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-2, 200-W Area Dry Waste No. 002, Dry Waste Burial Ground No. 2
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Dry Waste
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1953 to 1956
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	3.45 ha (8.51 acres) - rectangle
<b>Location</b>	Northwest of the 234-5Z Building between 218-W-4B and 218-W-1
<b>General Description</b>	Before backfilling, waste was observed to be within 46 cm (18 in.) of the ground surfaces. Sinkholes were filled in 1974. The site was surface stabilized in 1983 with a minimum of 0.6 m (2 ft) of clean fill and vegetated. A surface radiological survey is performed annually.
<b>Trenches</b>	The site is a landfill that contains 20 trenches running east to west.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	8,240 m <sup>3</sup> (10,778 yd <sup>3</sup> ) dry waste. The site contains unsegregated waste only. The site contains 126 kg Pu, 1400 kg U. 500 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 West Area
<b>References</b>	WIDS; H-2-2503; BHI-00175; SWITS

218-W-2 Site Map



Geophysical Anomalies



Aerial Photo




Characterization Summary

- 218-W-2
- Historical documentation review
    - See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
  - Surface geophysical surveys
    - All 20 of the trenches in 218-W-2 were clearly evident in the geophysical data. The geophysical data indicates that pockets/zones of debris are located and mapped in each of the identified trenches.
    - See Section 3 for results

## 218-W-2

Bin 3 Dry Waste Alpha Landfill




- One of four landfills believed to contain ~ 90% of the pre-1970 alpha contaminated LLW
- Waste primarily packaged in fiberboard cartons/boxes/drums
- Low potential for subsidence


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-2A, Industrial Waste No. 02A, Equipment Burial Ground #2
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Industrial
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1954 to 1985
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	16.5 ha (40.7 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	West of the 221-T Building, north of 23rd St, and directly east of the 218-W-3 Landfill
<b>General Description</b>	Solid wastes disposed to the site includes tanks, concrete blocks, facility wastes, process equipment, contaminated soil scraped from the 216-T-4-1 Pond (Trench 27), REDOX centrifuges, jumpers, pumps, filters, and miscellaneous cell equipment and wastes. Trench 21 contains a plutonium glovebox. In January 1959, a contamination spread occurred when a burial box containing REDOX jumpers collapsed during backfill operations (UPR-200-W-53). The site was backfilled and surface stabilized in 1980. However, the site remained active until 1985 because of two unused trenches and the cell block burial sites. An undocumented burial box was discovered in June 1983 while extending an active trench. The site was re-stabilized with clean fill and gravel in 2001.
<b>Trenches</b>	The site is an industrial burial area with 19 trenches; 17 run east to west and 2 run north to south.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	25,100 m <sup>3</sup> (32,800 yd <sup>3</sup> ) equipment and industrial wastes. This site contains unsegregated and low-level wastes. The site contains 6.38 kg Pu, 2,690 kg U. 247,000 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 Area facilities including T-Pond soil, REDOX, B Plant, and 234-5Z
<b>References</b>	WIDS; H-2-32095; SWITS; 218-W-2A Logbook; ARH-2757; ARH-2015 Part 4; D&D-28379, Rev. 1

## 218-W-2A Site Map



## Geophysical Anomalies



## Aerial Photo




## Characterization Summary

### 218-W-2A

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - o Data indicates that there are burial trenches at most of the locations shown for trenches on Hanford Site Drawing H-2-32095. Most of the debris or objects in the trenches have a ferrous metal content; some have a significant ferrous content.
  - o See Section 3 for results

## 218-W-2A Bin 2 Industrial Landfill




- High internal void volume
- High potential for subsidence
- Disposal of failed/obsolete equipment
- High dose rates
- Waste typically contained in large wooden or concrete boxes
- 216-T-4A used to occupy the northern portion of landfill contained 216-T-4A ditch; ditch use discontinued to expand landfill; 216-T-4A ditch will be investigated by 200-MG-2 OU


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-3, Dry Waste No. 003
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Dry Waste
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1957 to 1961
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	3.97 ha (9.81 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	West of the 221-T Building and directly west of the 218-W-2A Landfill
<b>General Description</b>	The site received miscellaneous unsegregated wastes including drums of depleted uranium, a 1951 pickup truck, and other miscellaneous items, mainly in cardboard boxes. The site is backfilled and was surface stabilized in 1983. A surface radiological survey is performed annually.
<b>Trenches</b>	Although drawings (H-2-32095, Sheet 1, Rev. 11) indicate that the site consists of 20 east-west trenches that range from 122 m to 145 m (400 ft to 475 ft) long with unknown widths, geophysical data collected in 2006 (D&D-30708) and unpublished 1960s logbook evidence show both east-west and north-south trenches that are different in location and differently numbered.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	12,400 m <sup>3</sup> (16,220 yd <sup>3</sup> ) mostly dry wastes buried with some equipment. This site contains unsegregated wastes only. The site contains 68 kg Pu, 70,000 kg U, 900 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	PFP
<b>References</b>	WIDS; H-2-32095; D&D-30708; SWITS; 218-W-3 Logbook

## 218-W-3 Site Map



## Geophysical Anomalies



## Aerial Photo




## Characterization Summary

### 218-W-3

- Historical documentation review
  - See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - Geophysical data for 218-W-3 indicates that there are approximately 14 East-West oriented trenches containing varying amounts of metallic debris. Other than the two southernmost trenches, the interpreted trench locations do not correlate with the locations shown in drawings.
  - See Section 3 for results

# 218-W-3

## Bin 3 Dry Waste Alpha Landfill



- One of four landfills believed to contain ~90% of the pre-1970 alpha contaminated LLW
- Waste primarily packaged in fiberboard cartons/boxes/drums
- Low potential for subsidence


# 218-W-3A

Bin 1 TSD Unit Landfill


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-3A
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, TSD Unit
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1970 to 1998
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	21.9 ha (54.2 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	West of the 221-T Building and north of 218-W-3 Landfill
<b>General Description</b>	The site was designed to contain 61 trenches running in an east to west direction. Four trenches have not been dug, and the 57 that have been constructed range from 127 m to 284 m (417 ft to 930 ft) in length. 97,500 m <sup>3</sup> (127,500 yd <sup>3</sup> ) dry waste and some equipment. The site contains TRU, TRUM, LLW, MLLW, and unsegregated wastes. The site contains 0.55 kg Pu, 634 kg U, 1,330,000 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial. Chemicals in wastes disposed to the in-scope trenches or portions of trenches (LLW, MLLW, and unsegregated wastes) include: 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene; acetic acid; butyl ester; acetonitrile; aliquat 336; anase; asbestos; barium; batteries; beryllium; cadmium; carbon tetrachloride; carcinogens; caustic; charcoal; chromium; coal tar; copper; cortisporin; cyclohexane; cyclohexanone; dibutyl phosphate; dibutyl-n,n-diethylcarbomyl phosphate; dioxane (1,4-diethylene dioxide); ethanol; ethanolamine; ethylene glycol; glycerin; isopropyl alcohol; kerosene; lead; lithium fluoride; mercury; methanol; naphthalene; naphthylamine tritium; n-hexane; n-hexanol; nitric acid; normal paraffins; oil; organic; phosphoric acid; polyurethane; pseudocumene; silver; silver nitrate; slaked lime; sodium; sodium hydroxide; solvents; tetrahydrofuran; toluene; tributyl phosphate; trichloroethylene; trichlorofluoromethane; trioctylphosphine oxide; uranium fluoride; xylene (mixed isomers); zinc; zirconium
<b>Trenches</b>	100 Area, 200 West Area, 300 Area, PFP, Tank Farms
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	WIDS; H-2-34880 Sheet 1; H-2-34880 Sheet 2; DOE/RL-88-21 Release 22 Low Level Burial Grounds Rev. 11 12/23/98; WHC-EP-0912; RHO-CD-673

## 218-W-3A Site Map



## Relative Volume of Waste by Generator




## Aerial Photo




## Characterization Summary

- Historical documentation review
  - See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Passive soil vapor surveys
  - Specific sampling locations were chosen based on detailed reviews of engineering drawings, historical documents, and waste burial record information located in the SWITS database.
  - Samples were analyzed for the presence of 28 organic compounds identified to be contaminants of potential concern.
  - Two sample locations had CCl<sub>4</sub> levels greater than 100 nanograms: trench 3-S had a reading of 149 nanograms; at another location, trench 9-S had a CCl<sub>4</sub> level of 1,185.
  - See Section 3 for results
  - Passive soil vapor sampling was also conducted by 200-PW-1 in 218-W-3A.
- Vent riser vapor samples
  - Performed on retrievably stored TRU waste trench segments; although this waste is not in the scope of this investigation, these results are included in this RI/FS work plan for completeness.
  - See Section 3 for results
  - Vent riser sampling in non-RSW trenches was also conducted by 200-PW-1 in 218-W-3A.
- RCRA groundwater monitoring
  - LLWMA 3- monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant indicator parameters, groundwater quality parameters, drinking water parameters, and site specific parameters as required by WAC 173-303-400(3).
  - See section 3 for results



- Under LLBG Dangerous Waste Permit Application - Part A
- Contains retrievably stored TRU waste (M-91 Project)
- Potential for small volume, sorbed, containerized liquids
- Potential for subsidence
- High dose rates
- Temporarily flooded in past due to rapid snow melt

## 218-W-3AE Bin 1 TSD Unit Landfill




- Under LLBG Dangerous Waste Permit Application - Part A
- Potential for small volume, sorbed, containerized liquids
- Potential for subsidence
- High dose rates
- Old 216-T-4B pond/ditch contained within landfill boundary; being investigated by 200-CW-1 OU
- No trenches under M-91 Project


### Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-3AE, Industrial Waste No. 3AE, Dry Waste No. 3AE
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Industrial
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, TSD Unit
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1981 to 2004
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	22.9 ha (56.6 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	East and adjacent to the 218-W-3A Landfill in the 200 West Area
<b>General Description</b>	The location of this site also included a portion of the 216-T-4B Pond. The site received miscellaneous wastes including rags, paper, rubber gloves, disposable supplies, broken tools, laboratory wastes and industrial waste such as failed equipment, tanks, pumps, ovens, agitators, heaters, hoods, jumpers, decommissioned change trailers, etc. Trenches 5 and 8 contain post-1987 mixed waste.
<b>Trenches</b>	It originally was designed to contain 24 trenches. However, it was re-designed to contain only 12 trenches at deeper depths. Only eight of the trenches were excavated; three of these are only partially filled.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	34,300 m <sup>3</sup> (44,900 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of miscellaneous wastes. The site contains TRU, LLW, and MLLW. The TRU at this site will be removed and processed; it is not part of the TPA M-91 scope. The site contains 0.12 kg Pu, 439 kg U, 223,000 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial. Chemicals in wastes disposed to this site include aluminum nitrate; 2,4-dinitrotoluene; ammonium chloride; asbestos; beryllium; bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate; chromium; copper; dibutyl phosphate; ferric nitrate; ferrous ammonium sulfate; hydrobromic acid; lead; mercury; nickel hydroxide; nitrate; oil; polychlorinated biphenyls; potassium nitrate; silver; sodium hydroxide; sodium nitrate; sodium nitrite; sulfuric acid; tetrachloroethylene; trichloroethene; trichlorofluoromethane; zirconium.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	100 Area, 1100 Area (1171 Transportation & Maintenance Building), 300 Area, Offsite
<b>References</b>	WIDS; H-2-75351; DOE/RL-88-21 Release 22 Low Level Burial Grounds Rev. 11 12/23/98; WHC-EP-0912

### 218-W-3AE Site Map



### Relative Volume of Waste by Generator



### Aerial Photo




### Characterization Summary

- 218-W-3AE
- Historical documentation review
    - See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
  - Passive soil vapor surveys
    - Specific sampling locations were chosen based on detailed reviews of engineering drawings, historical documents, and waste burial record information located in the SWITS database.
    - Samples were analyzed for the presence of 28 organic compounds identified to be contaminants of potential concern.
    - See Section 3 for results
  - RCRA groundwater monitoring
    - LLWMA 3- monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant indicator parameters, groundwater quality parameters, drinking water parameters, and site specific parameters as required by WAC 173-303-400(3).
    - See section 3 for results


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-4A, Dry Waste No. 04A
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Dry Waste
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1960 to 1968
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	7.29 ha (18.0 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	Southeast of the intersection of 23rd St and Dayton Ave
<b>General Description</b>	The vertical pipe units were installed near the east end of Trench 16. Each consists of two 55-gal drums welded together with the ends removed except the bottom of the lower drums; they were placed 4.6 m (15 ft) bgs. After each drop containing waste, dirt was shoveled into the well to shield the gamma radiation. Two vertical pipe units as deep as 15 m (48 ft) may be located near the east end of Trench 18. No information has been found on their contents. Drawing H-2-32487 shows details of many individual burials. Unplanned releases to this site (Table B-2) include a fire in the landfill (UPR-200-W-16), spotty contamination release (UPR-200-W-26), a burial box collapse (UPR-200-W-53), and a release of previously buried waste (UPR-200-W-72). The site was stabilized in 1983.
<b>Trenches</b>	The site contains 21 trenches oriented east to west and six to eight vertical pipe units or drywells. In addition there is a special burial trench at the east end of Trench 11 containing a REDOX column. All trenches are 9 m (30 ft) wide, with 12.2 m (40 ft) between trench centerlines. They range in length from 153 m to 305 m (500 ft to 1000 ft).
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	16,700 m <sup>3</sup> (21,800 yd <sup>3</sup> ) dry wastes and some equipment. This site contains unsegregated wastes only. The site contains 35.4 kg Pu, 394,000 kg U, 3,820 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	200 West Area, PFP, REDOX
<b>References</b>	WIDS; H-2-33564; DOE/RL-88-21; H-2-32487; 218-W-4A Logbook; SWITS

## 218-W-4A Site Map



## Relative Volume of Waste by Generator



## Aerial Photo




## Characterization Summary

### 218-W-4A

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - o Five trenches were identified in the southern part of 218-W-4A during the geophysical investigation of 218-W-11 in June 2006.
  - o See Section 3 for results

# 218-W-4A

## Bin 3 Dry Waste Alpha Landfill




- One of four landfills believed to contain ~ 90% of the pre-1970 alpha contaminated LLW
- Waste primarily packaged in fiberboard cartons/boxes/drums
- Low potential for subsidence
- Believed to contain 8 vertical pipe unit caissons; 4 are believed empty and require verification


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-4B, Dry Waste No. 04B
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Dry Waste
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, TSD Unit
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1967 to 1990
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	4.07 ha (10.1 acres) - rectangle
<b>Location</b>	Northwest of the 234-5Z Building, directly west of 231-Z Building
<b>General Description</b>	The site contains miscellaneous debris including rags, paper, cardboard, plastic, and equipment. Trenches 7 and 11 and the alpha caissons contain TRU waste planned to be retrieved under M-91. Four of the 5 alpha caissons were used from 1970 to 1979; the fifth is believed to be empty. The alpha and MFP caissons are up to 2.7 m (8.8-ft-) diameter, 3 m (10 ft) high concrete and/or corrugated steel containers with an access chute diameter of approximately 90 cm (36-in.-). The silo-type caisson is a 3 m (10-ft-) diameter, 9 m (30-ft-) tall container placed on a concrete foundation with a concrete shielding top slab; it has a 107 cm (42-in.-) diameter access chute. All caissons are equipped with air-filtering systems. Trenches 1 through 6 were surface stabilized and backfilled with clean soil in 1983. Trench 7 is covered with a 1.2 m (4 ft) soil mound. The remaining trenches were backfilled after use and stabilized with clean gravel in 1995.
<b>Trenches</b>	The site contains 13 trenches and one row of 12 caissons (5 alpha, 6 MFP, and 1 deeper, silo-type which became plugged after receipt of two waste packages).
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	10,466 m <sup>3</sup> (13,690 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of waste as of September 30, 2005. The site contains TRU, LLW, and unsegregated wastes. The site contains 8.98 kg Pu and 21.6 kg U. 406,000 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial. Chemicals in wastes disposed to the in-scope trenches or portions of trenches (LLW and unsegregated wastes) include: beryllium, lead, oil, and zirconium.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	222-S, 300 Area, PFP, and T-Plant
<b>References</b>	WIDS; WHC-EP-0912; DOE/RL-88-21 Release 22 Low Level Burial Grounds Rev. 11 12/23/98; RHO-CD-0673; RHO Internal Letter 65462-80-035

## 218-W-4B Site Map



## Relative Volume of Waste by Generator



## Aerial Photo




## Characterization Summary

### 218-W-4B

- Historical documentation review
  - See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Passive soil vapor surveys
  - Specific sampling locations were chosen based on detailed reviews of engineering drawings, historical documents, and waste burial record information located in the SWITS data base.
  - Samples were analyzed for the presence of 28 organic compounds identified to be contaminants of potential concern.
  - One sample location had CCl<sub>4</sub> levels greater than 100 nanograms: targeted location, trench 8 had CCl<sub>4</sub> levels in excess of 70,000 nanograms.
  - See Section 3 for results
- Vent riser vapor samples
  - Performed on retrievably stored TRU waste trench segments; although this waste is not in the scope of this investigation, these results are included in this RI/FS work plan for completeness.
  - See Section 3 for results
- RCRA groundwater monitoring
  - LLWMA 4- monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant indicator parameters, groundwater quality parameters, drinking water parameters, and site specific parameters as required by WAC 173-303-400(3).
  - See section 3 for results

## 218-W-4B Bin 1 TSD Unit Landfill




- Under LLBG Dangerous Waste Permit Application - Part A
- Contains retrievably stored TRU waste (M-91 Project)
- Potential for small volume, sorbed, containerized liquids
- Potential for subsidence
- High dose rates
- Temporarily flooded in past due to rapid snow melt
- Contains 11 Caissons; 7 are in scope and 4 under M-91 Project


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-4C, Dry Waste No. 004C
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Dry Waste
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, TSD Unit
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1978 to 2005
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	22.8 ha (56.2 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	Main section located west and southwest of the 234-5Z Building, east of Dayton Ave. Annex is located directly south of the 234-5 Building, north of 16th St
<b>General Description</b>	The site is divided into two parts; the section containing burial trenches to the west and an annex, (which never has been used) to the east. The Z Plant burning pit, which operated during the late 1940s and early 1950s, was reportedly excavated in the 1970s during the construction of Trench 7. Some of the TRU-containing trenches are asphalt lined. Trenches 1, 4, 7, 20, 24, and 29 contain retrievably stored, suspect TRU waste. One drum of suspect TRU was buried in what is otherwise a LLW trench in 1981; records were later examined, and the drum and trench were redefined as containing only LLW. Trenches NC, 14, and 58 contain post-1987 mixed waste.
<b>Trenches</b>	The landfill is designed to contain up to 65 trenches. Only 14 trenches have been excavated; 6 of these are only partially filled. The landfill annex area never has been used. The trenches run east to west and range in length from 50 m to 232 m (162 ft to 760 ft).
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	15,200 m <sup>3</sup> (19,900 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of waste as of September 30, 2005. The site contains TRU, TRUM, LLW, and MLLW. The site contains 0.026 kg Pu, 215 kg U, 1,100,000 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial. Chemical in wastes disposed to the in-scope trenches or portions of trenches (LLW/MLLW) include: 1,2-diaminopropane; 1-butene; 2,2,4-trimethylpentane; 3,4(benz-3,6)pyrene; acetic anhydride; acetophenone; acid; chromium; coal tar; copper; cumene hydroperoxide; di-t-butyl-p-cresol; indole picrate; isopropyl iodide; lead; mercury; n,n-disalicylidene; naphthalene; 2-methyl-naphthalene; oil; paint thinner; phenol; silver; slaked lime; sodium; t-butyl hydroperoxide; uranium fluoride; vinyl chloride (chloroethylene); zirconium
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	100 Area, 300 Area, Offsite, PFP, REDOX
<b>References</b>	WIDS; DOE/RL-88-21 Release 22 Low Level Burial Grounds Rev. 11 12/23/98

## 218-W-4C Site Map



## Relative Volume of Waste by Generator




## Aerial Photo



## Characterization Summary

- Historical documentation review
  - See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Passive soil vapor surveys
  - Specific sampling locations were chosen based on detailed reviews of engineering drawings, historical documents, and waste burial record information located in the SWITS database.
  - Samples were analyzed for the presence of 28 organic compounds identified to be contaminants of potential concern. See Section 3 for results
- Vent riser vapor samples
  - Performed on retrievably stored TRU waste trench segments; although this waste is not in the scope of this investigation, these results are included in this RI/FS work plan for completeness.
  - See Section 3 for results
  - Vent riser sampling was also conducted by 200-PW-1 in 218-W-4C.
- Soil vapor samples
  - See Section 3 for results
- RCRA groundwater monitoring
  - LLWMA 4- monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant indicator parameters, groundwater quality parameters, drinking water parameters, and site specific parameters as required by WAC 173-303-400(3).
  - See section 3 for results
- Under LLBG Dangerous Waste Permit Application - Part A
- Contains retrievably stored TRU waste (M-91 Project)
- Potential for small volume, sorbed, containerized liquids
- Potential for subsidence
- High dose rates
- Temporarily flooded in past due to rapid snow melt
- Eastern portion believed unused; will be verified by field walk downs and/or geophysics.
- Trench NC contains components from the Department of the Navy and is out of scope


## 218-W-4C Bin 1 TSD Unit Landfill




## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-5, Dry Waste Burial Ground, Low-Level Radioactive Mixed Waste Burial Grounds
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Dry Waste
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, TSD Unit
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1985 to present
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	38.6 ha (95.3 acres) - irregular shape
<b>Location</b>	West of Dayton Ave and north of 23rd St
<b>General Description</b>	Trenches 22 and 24 contain post-August 19, 1987 mixed waste.
<b>Trenches</b>	The Landfill is designed to contain 18 low-level and four mixed waste trenches. Currently there are 11 inactive low-level trenches. In addition, the only two currently active RCRA compliant lined mixed waste trenches within the LLBG TSD are located at this landfill (Trenches 31 and 34). The RCRA-compliant trenches are out of scope of this project.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	71,000 m <sup>3</sup> (92,900 yd <sup>3</sup> ) of total wastes as of September 30, 2005. This site contains LLW and MLLW. The site contains 0.17 kg Pu, 6,915 kg U, 31,400 Ci Beta-Gamma at burial. Chemicals in wastes disposed to the in-scope trenches (i.e., all trenches except 31 and 34) include lead, oil, and slaked lime.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	100 Area, 300 Area, Offsite, PFP, Tank Farms
<b>References</b>	WIDS; DOE/RL-88-21 Release 22 Low Level Burial Grounds Rev. 11 12/23/98


218-W-5 Site Map



Relative Volume of Waste by Generator



218-W-5  
 Bin 1 TSD Unit Landfill



Aerial Photo



Characterization Summary

### 218-W-5


- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Passive soil vapor surveys
  - o Specific sampling locations were chosen based on detailed reviews of engineering drawings, historical documents, and waste burial record information located in the SWITS database.
  - o Samples were analyzed for the presence of 28 organic compounds identified to be contaminants of potential concern.
  - o See Section 3 for results
- RCRA groundwater monitoring
  - o LLWMA 3- monitoring wells have been sampled since 1988 for contaminant indicator parameters, groundwater quality parameters, drinking water parameters, and site specific parameters as required by WAC 173-303-400(3).
  - o See section 3 for results

- Under LLBG Dangerous Waste Permit Application - Part A
- Potential for small volume, sorbed, containerized liquids
- Potential for subsidence
- High dose rates
- Contains two RCRA compliant trenches (31 & 34); out of scope
- No trenches under M-91 Project


## Landfill Summary Information

<b>WIDS Code &amp; Aliases</b>	218-W-11, Regulated Storage Site
<b>Landfill Type</b>	Industrial
<b>OU &amp; Category</b>	200-SW-2, past practice
<b>Dates of Waste Receipt</b>	1960
<b>Area &amp; Shape</b>	1.43 ha (3.53 acres) - rectangle
<b>Location</b>	Northwest of the 234-5Z Building and north of 218-W-1
<b>General Description</b>	Before stabilization in 1983, a portion of the landfill was used for above-ground storage of contaminated equipment. The waste is low-level contaminated equipment. A surface radiological survey is performed annually.
<b>Trenches</b>	Two burial trenches 77 m (258 ft) and 46 m (150 ft) long. Sources conflict as to whether the southernmost of the two trenches ever was excavated and filled. Geophysics data collected in 2006 (D&D-30708) suggest that the trench does not exist.
<b>Waste Volume, Pu/U Inventory, and Contaminant Inventory (In-Scope Low-Level &amp; Unsegregated Wastes only)</b>	1,160 m <sup>3</sup> (1,520 yd <sup>3</sup> ) miscellaneous solid debris. The site contains unsegregated wastes only. No plutonium, uranium, or beta-gamma inventories are reported for this site.
<b>Source Facilities Contributing More than 5% of Waste by Volume</b>	Tank Farms - Uranium Recovery Process and Sr/Cs Recovery Operations
<b>References</b>	WIDS; H-2-94250; BHI-00175; SWITS

## 218-W-11 Site Map



## Geophysical Anomalies



## Aerial Photo




## Characterization Summary

### 218-W-11

- Historical documentation review
  - o See Section 5 for a summary of the review process
- Surface geophysical surveys
  - o Geophysical data indicates that the investigation area contains two concentrations of buried debris or objects. One trench and one "pit" make up the 218-W-11 Landfill. The trench location correlates very well with the trench documented in Hanford Site Drawing H-2-31268.
  - o See Section 3 for results

## 218-W-11 Bin 2 Industrial Landfill



- Internal void volume
- Potential for subsidence
- Disposal of failed/obsolete equipment
- Used for above ground storage of waste

## Caisson Summary Information

### Vertical Pipe Units in 218-W-4A

The 218-W-4A landfill contains 21 miscellaneous dry waste trenches oriented east to west and six or eight vertical pipe unit style caissons. A grouping of six vertical pipe units were installed near the east end of Trench 16 and reportedly consist of five 55-gal drums welded together with the lids and bottoms removed and were installed 4.6 m (15 ft) below ground surface. Two deeper vertical pipe caissons may be located between the eastern end of Trenches 17, 18, and 19 and buried to depths of 16 m (48 ft).

### Caissons in 218-W-4B


The caissons contained within the 218-W-4B landfill were used for disposal of alpha and MFP containing waste.

Caissons 1 through 5 (also called alpha caissons) were planned for TRU waste and are considered out of scope for 200-SW-2. From 1970 to 1988, retrievably stored TRU waste was placed in four of the five caissons, caisson Alpha #5 has never been used. The five alpha caissons are approximately 2.7 to 3 m (8.75 to 10 ft) in diameter, 3 m (10 ft) high concrete and steel covered vaults with steel lifting lugs and a 0.9 m (3 ft) diameter access chute. The alpha caissons weigh approximately 11,800 kg (26,000 lb).


Six general (also called dry waste or MFP) caissons containing LLW were filled from 1968 to 1979. Dry waste or MFP-type caissons are 2.4 m (8 ft) in diameter and 3.1 m (10 ft) high. According to WIDS, two of these caissons were constructed the same way as the alpha caissons, except with corrugated metal instead of steel and concrete for the upright cylinder. The last shipment of caisson waste in 218-W-4B was deposited into MFP Caisson #6 in 1990.

There is one caisson noted in the literature as a United Nuclear Industries (UNI) below grade silo-type caisson used for high-activity N Reactor waste. The UNI silo-type caisson is 3 m (10 ft) in diameter and 9 m (30 ft) tall with corrugated pipe containers placed on a concrete foundation with a top concrete shielding slab. It has a 1.1 m (3.5 ft) diameter access chute.


Waste is placed beneath a concrete slab 4.6 m (15 ft) below grade. The chute of this caisson was plugged shortly after it began receiving waste and was taken out of service after plugging.



## 218-W-4A Site Map




## 218-W-4B Site Map




## Caissons

218-W-4A  
 218-W-4B



- Located in 218-W-4A and 218-W-4B landfills
- Vertical pipe units located in 218-W-4A
- Caissons located in 218-W-4B
- High dose rate
- Typically remote handled waste
- Small containers (1-5 gallons cans)
- High beta-gamma radiation
- Potential for small volumes of sorbed organics (lab packs)
- 4 of 19 caissons in M-91 Project scope (not 200-SW-2 scope)
- 4 Caissons are possibly unused



**DISTRIBUTION**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

**Onsite**

1	<u>U.S. Department of Energy,</u> <u>Richland Operations Office</u>	
	DOE Public Reading Room	H2-53
1	<u>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory</u>	
	Hanford Technical Library	P8-55
2	<u>Lockheed Martin Information Technology</u>	
	Administrative Record	H6-08
	Document Clearance	H6-08

1

This page intentionally left blank.

2

3