

0065321

Leslie C. (Les) Davenport
16414 N.E. 244th Street
Battle Ground, WA 98604-9710

Phone (360) 687-3415
Email davenport@owt.com

January 21, 2005

Craig Cameron
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Hanford Project Office
712 Swift Boulevard, Suite 5
Richland, WA 99352

RECEIVED
JUN 13 2005

EDMC

Dear Mr. Cameron:

Subject: Comments on Proposed Plan for Remediation of the 221-U Facility

I support the choice of the recommended Alternative Six (Close in Place – Partially Demolished Structure) in *Proposed Plan for Remediation of the 221-U Facility (Canyon Disposition Initiative)*, DOE/RL-2001-29, Rev. 0, November 2004.

I did not see anything indicating when this work would be initiated, although the document states that it would take 9 to 10 years to achieve RAOs. I would like to see work started as soon as funding becomes available to:

- decontaminate the outside railroad tunnel and wing walls
- stabilize and disposition identified transuranic material
- stabilize (or remove) contamination on interior surfaces, in the hot pipe trench, and inside the cells and three galleries
- size reduce and dismantle contaminated legacy equipment currently on the canyon deck and place it into the cells
- fill the cells with grout, including filling tanks and pipes with grout
- maintain the canyon structure sufficiently to keep radioactive and hazardous materials inside the canyon.

When the canyon is demolished, consider taking the walls down as close to ground level as is reasonable, with demolition debris kept either inside the canyon footprint or close outside the canyon walls. No imported Hanford waste should be placed outside the canyon footprint, although it would be acceptable to place such waste inside the cells before the cells are grouted. This should help to minimize the size, thickness and consequently the cost of the final engineered barrier.

Consider using the Pipe and Electrical Galleries for disposal of containers filled with acceptable waste forms, such as was proposed in Alternative 3, provided it is cost effective when compared with disposal at ERDF.

Sincerely,

Les Davenport

Les Davenport