

**START**

9613589.0057

**0042621**

8  
C

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST  
FOR  
CLOSURE OF THE 300 AREA PROCESS TRENCHES

REVISION 0

August 1994



WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORMS  
(WAC 197-11-960)

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

Closure of the 300 Area Process Trenches (300 APT).

**2. Name of applicants:**

U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), and the Westinghouse Hanford Company (Westinghouse Hanford).

**3. Address and phone number of applicants and contact persons:**

U.S. Department of Energy  
Richland Operations Office  
Post Office Box 550  
Richland, Washington 99352

Westinghouse Hanford Company  
P.O. Box 1970  
Richland, Washington 99352

**Contact Persons:**

S. H. Wisness, Acting Program  
Manager  
Office of Environmental Assurance  
Permits and Policy  
(509) 376-6798

W. T. Dixon, Manager  
Regulatory Support  
Waste, Analytical and  
Environmental Services  
(509) 376-0428

**4. Date checklist was prepared:**

1994

**5. Agency requesting checklist:**

Washington State  
Department of Ecology  
Post Office Box 47600  
Olympia, Washington 98504-7600

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

It is proposed that a plan for closure of the 300 APT be submitted to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by August 15, 1994.

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

The 300 APT are located within the *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980* (CERCLA) 300-FF-1 Operable Unit (OU). While the 300 APT is designated a treatment, storage, and/or disposal (TSD) unit by the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* (RCRA), the closure plan will integrate requirements of both statutes. Closure of the 300 APT will be performed in conjunction with remediation of the 300-FF-1 OU to ensure that the activities of the two units remain physically consistent and to allow the TSD unit closure to capitalize on

the economies of speed and scale presented by the larger-scale OU activities. This closure plan addresses only the 300 APT and not the adjacent CERCLA areas.

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

The 300 APT has been designated a TSD unit in the *Hanford Site Dangerous Waste Part A Permit Application* (DOE-RL 1988). The TSD unit will be closed in conjunction with the CERCLA remedial action process for the 300-FF-1 OU. Documents already initiated in support of this activity include a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) work plan (DOE-RL 1990), a Phase I RI (DOE-RL 1992d), the Phase I and II FS (DOE-RL 1992e), and the Phase II RI (DOE-RL 1993c). Forthcoming documents include the Phase III FS and Proposed Plan and a Record of Decision (ROD) for the 300-FF-1 OU.

Further, in 1991, the DOE-RL undertook major TSD unit interim-status action in the form of the 316-5 Process Trenches Expedited Response Action (ERA), which was designed to immobilize unit contaminants in order to prevent the possibility of these contaminants entering the groundwater. This ERA was conducted as part of the 300-FF-1 OU RI/FS process. The ERA is documented in the ERA Proposal for the 316-5 Process Trenches (DOE-RL 1991a) and the ERA Assessment for the 316-5 Process Trenches (DOE-RL 1992a).

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

*The Draft Hanford Facility Part A Permit* (Ecology 1994b) was prepared and issued for public comment by Ecology and the EPA Region 10 in February 1994. This permit is designed to identify the Hanford Site as one RCRA TSD facility.

A CERCLA FS is being prepared that will provide the basis for an ROD for the remediation of the entire 300-FF-1 OU. The anticipated date for the ROD is the second quarter of calendar year 1995.

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

The approval of this SEPA Checklist and approval of the closure plan for the 300-FF-1 OU by Ecology is required. Final closure of this TSD will entail withdrawal of the unit-specific Part A, Form 3.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page.

The closure plan will contain information describing the closure of the 300 APT to levels determined by requirements of both CERCLA and RCRA as implemented by Ecology's *Dangerous Waste Regulations* (WAC 173-303-610). It is believed that because the 300 Area of the Hanford Site will

continue to operate in a fashion that will preclude unrestricted use, the site will be cleaned up to industrial-based standards.

The site consists of two parallel, unlined trenches running north and south separated by an earthen berm. A wire mesh fence surrounds the unit and a metal birdscreen covers the length of the trenches to prevent intrusion by wildlife. A concrete outfall weir box at the south end of the trenches provides the effluent feed source. These trenches are roughly 350 meters (1,200 feet) long and approximately 3.5 meters (11 feet) deep. The original width of the trenches was 9 meters (30 feet), but they were widened after the ERA was conducted in 1991. This ERA also consolidated low-level mixed waste soils in the northern 91 meters (300 feet). The trenches are approximately 5 meters (18 feet) above the water table.

It is anticipated that remediation and/or removal of 300 APT TSD unit soils, structures, and/or equipment will be required for unit closure. Physical closure activities for TSD unit soil, structures, and equipment will be carried out by the 300-FF-1 OU in accordance with 300-FF-1 ROD specifications and 300 APT closure plan specifications, which will be in substantive agreement. The ROD will select a remedy from alternatives and information presented during the RI/FS. The potential alternatives considered to date are containment (Hanford Site Barrier), removal and disposal, or removal and treatment (soilwashing).

Soilwashing is currently considered the most promising alternative and vendor testing has been and is being conducted on soilwashing equipment in order to determine its effectiveness on Hanford Site soils. Soilwashing will greatly reduce the volume of waste by separating the contamination, located mostly on the finest particles of the soil (i.e., the 'fines'), from the remaining coarser fraction of the soil matrix. The fines will then be appropriately designated as waste. The coarser fraction, which will represent the majority of the soil volume, could be used for backfill during site restoration.

Other TSD unit media will be removed and decontaminated as feasible and necessary. These media will likely include any piping that is located within the TSD boundaries, and the concrete outfall structure and weir box. The remediation of soil contaminated from pipeline leaks within the TSD unit boundaries will be documented by this closure plan. Those areas outside the boundaries will be addressed as part of the OU closure.

In addition, if a removal and treatment alternative is selected, the closure plan will include sampling of the excavated and decontaminated soil to determine the soil's suitability as backfill for 300 APT excavation(s). The site will be contoured and revegetated or otherwise restored to the 300-FF-1 OU ROD specifications.

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

duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The 300 APT are situated north of the 300 Area, which is located at the southern portion of the Hanford Site. The Hanford Site is located in southcentral Washington State, near the confluence of the Columbia, Yakima, and Snake Rivers. The Columbia River, the nearest natural water body to the 300 APT, is located 305 meters (1,000 feet) to the east.

The 300-FF-1 OU, which is partially located within the 300 Area, is found in Section 2, Township 10 north, Range 28 east.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATION FOR  
AGENCY USE ONLY

## B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

### 1. Earth

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

Flat.

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

The trench walls have an approximate 40-percent slope. The slope of the land at the site is less than 2 percent.

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

The soil at the 300 APT consists of mostly of sand with interspersed large cobbles.

No farming occurs at the Hanford Site.

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

No.

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

The extent of fill material necessary will be dependent upon the selected remedy as presented in the ROD for the 300-FF-1 OU. If containment (Hanford Barrier) is selected, extensive backfilling is unlikely; however, grading in order to reestablish a normal terrain for the vicinity prior to installing the barrier could be necessary. If the removal

and disposal remedy is selected, the current trenches and the newly excavated areas would require more extensive backfilling using offsite material and/or grading in order to reestablish a normal terrain for the vicinity. If removal and treatment (soilwashing) is selected, less offsite fill would be necessary because of the use of the onsite remediated fraction as backfill.

To backfill the currently configured trenches to the level of grade surrounding them would require approximately 26,760 cubic meters (35,000 cubic yards) of material. This material would come from other, noncontaminated areas of the Hanford Site.

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

Because of the soil types and dry climate, erosion is not expected. In addition, the area would be resurfaced, either at the end of this closure activity or when the entire OU is remediated, to provide continuity with adjacent areas and to ensure proper drainage characteristics.

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

The final site configuration for the 300 APT is as yet undetermined. Final site configuration will be consistent with the method of remediation and future usage of the property as specified in the ROD for the 300-FF-1 OU. WAC 173-303-610 performance standards must be considered in restoration of the site to the appearance and use of the surrounding land areas where appropriate. If an immediate use of the property requiring the construction of impervious surfaces is not indicated, the area will likely be contoured to match existing topography and revegetated.

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

The revegetation effort and appropriate surface contouring will provide a measure of erosion control deemed adequate given the Hanford Site's dry climate and mild slope.

## 2. Air

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

If the remedy selection process for the OU settles upon the removal alternative, the activity would have the potential to generate dust. This dust would possibly contain some contaminants. The impacts of dust to the environment and/or to site workers would be mitigated by proper dust abatement measures. Such measures could entail activities such as site watering and/or stopping work during high winds. They could also entail site worker protection measures such as protective clothing and respirators that would be specified in the appropriate documents governing job safety (e.g., Hazardous Waste Operations Permit (HWOP)).

In addition, vehicles and machinery used in the closure activities would produce minor amounts of air emissions in the form of exhaust gases. These emissions can be considered negligible when compared to total Hanford Site releases. At the end of closure activities, the 300 APT unit will be deactivated and the site will be stabilized and no longer produce emissions.

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

No.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to the air, if any?

In order to control the amount of dust generated by excavation activities, water trucks could be used to periodically spray designated areas, work may be halted as necessitated by winds, and/or additional measures such as those described in [40].

### 3. Water

#### a. Surface

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

The Columbia River is approximately 305 meters (1,000 feet) east of the trenches. There are no other natural bodies of water near the site. There are some manmade water treatment basins also located in the 300-FF-1 OU. These basins are used for treatment of process effluent and sanitary waste discharge and would not be impacted by the proposed activity.

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

No.

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

None.

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

No

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

The project location is not within the 100-year floodplain.

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

No discharge of waste materials to surface waters would occur.

**b. Ground**

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

Water would not be withdrawn from or discharged to the ground.

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

No waste material would be discharged into septic tanks or the ground.

c. Water Run-off (including storm water)

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

The Hanford Site has a mild desert climate and receives only 6 to 7 inches of annual precipitation. This small amount of natural precipitation poses little threat of erosion to the unit and is readily absorbed into the soil on and near the site. If a removal remedy is selected, erosion of site soils occurring during remediation will be corrected as a portion of site restoration. In the event that the containment remedy (e.g., Hanford Barrier) is selected, the barrier would be designed to discourage erosion.

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

Treatment, storage, and/or disposal closure waste is not anticipated to enter ground or surface waters regardless of the remedy selected for site remediation. Contaminated soils will either be removed or immobilized if covered with a barrier. Any contaminated waste generated during a soil treatment phase of remediation would be managed as waste that would require containerized storage for shipment and disposal.

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

No impacts to water are expected by this proposal.

**4. Plants****a. Check or circle the types of vegetation found on the site.**

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

The 300 APT and the area immediately adjacent contain both dryland shrubs and grasses typically found at the Hanford Site as well as some cattails and reeds, characteristic of wet soils.

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

These wet soil plants, however, may be contaminated to some degree and will be removed and disposed of appropriately.

Some sagebrush and grasses, both annual and perennial, and the wet soil plants will be disturbed by work in the 300 APT. This vegetation removal might be mitigated by revegetation efforts when the site is closed.

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

No threatened or endangered plant species are known to occur on or near the project sites.

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

Restoration will be commensurate with the remedial alternative and future site usage specified by the ROD for the 300-FF-1 OU. Containment as a remedial alternative would provide for long-term ground cover. Vegetation would be considered in its design. Performance of a removal alternative would also require site restoration that could include backfilling, grading, and the use of appropriate, native vegetation.

**5. Animals**

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

Birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds.

Mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver.

Fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish.

Because of the proximity of the Columbia River, there are a wide variety of bird species found in the immediate vicinity of the proposed action. Because of the presence of metal grates, which extend the length of the trenches, these bird species cannot gain access to the contaminated effluent. The area is home to a variety of small mammals found throughout the Hanford Site and occasional deer. There are no fish in the trenches.

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

Of the two federal- and state-listed endangered species observed on the Hanford Site, the bald eagle is a regular winter visitor, appearing principally along the Columbia River, and the peregrine falcon is an uncommon visitor. The state-listed American white pelican is an uncommon seasonal resident along the Columbia River. No federal- or state-listed endangered species are known to occur on or near the 300 Area. The bald eagle and the American white pelican, while found along the Columbia River, do not usually frequent the 300-FF-1 OU.

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

The nearby rivers, both the Columbia and Yakima, are part of the broad Pacific Flyway; however, screens keep birds or waterfowl out of the trenches.

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

If the trenches are backfilled and/or revegetated as a portion of the selected remedy for the 300-FF-1 OU, such vegetation could become habitat for some species found at the Hanford Site. However, the current use of the property is industrial and is anticipated to remain so for the foreseeable future; consequently, wildlife inhabitation of the property will likely not be encouraged.

**6. Energy and Natural Resources**

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

Gasoline and electricity will be temporarily required during TSD unit remedial action. After closure, the TSD unit site will have no foreseeable energy needs.

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

No.

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

None.

**7. Environmental Health**

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

Workers could be exposed to dangerous and/or radioactive waste constituents during site remediation. The nature and extent of worker exposure will depend upon the remedy selected for TSD unit remediation by the ROD for the OU.

1. Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Hanford Site security, fire response, and ambulance services are on call at all times in the event of an onsite emergency.

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

Proper operating procedures (e.g., dust abatement) will minimize the risk of a harmful release of radioactive materials during site remediation activities and proper worker safety measures (e.g., protective clothing) will minimize worker exposures to as low as reasonably achievable levels. After trench remediation (by containment or removal) the trenches will pose no threat to human health or the environment.

**b. Noise**

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

None.

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

Excavation equipment and machinery would produce a temporary increase in noise levels in the immediate vicinity of the 300-FF-1 OU. These increases would occur primarily during the day and cease when the closure activities are completed.

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

The site of the 300 APT is currently an industrial area and a temporary increase in noise during site remediation will have no impact requiring noise abatement.

**8. Land and Shoreline Use**

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

The 300 Area is a highly developed portion of the Hanford Site that has been used primarily for laboratory support and research for the operations conducted by the DOE and its predecessor, the Atomic Energy Commission. In addition, research programs in support of other agencies have been conducted in this area. The 300-FF-1 OU has several individual waste units within its boundaries. These include several solid waste burial grounds, process water treatment ponds, ash pits, and sanitary water trenches.

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

No part of the Hanford Site has been used for agricultural purposes since 1943.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

While the 300 Area contains many structures, the 300-FF-1 OU, and specifically the 300 APT, is free of buildings, however a concrete weir box exists at the southern end of the trenches.

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

No structures except the weir box will be demolished.

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

The Hanford Site is zoned by Benton County as an Unclassified Use district.

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

The 1985 Benton County Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates the Hanford Site as the "Hanford Reservation." Under this designation, land on the Hanford Site may be used for "activities nuclear in nature." Nonnuclear activities are authorized "if and when DOE approval for such activities is obtained."

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

Does not apply.

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

No.

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

None.

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

None.

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

Does not apply.

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

Future land use for this area has not yet been determined. The CERCLA remedial action process for the 300-FF-1 OU will consider all reasonable future land use scenarios in its establishment of appropriate cleanup levels and its selection of a remedial method to achieve those levels.

**9. Housing**

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

None.

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

None.

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

Does not apply.

**10. Aesthetics**

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

No onsite building is currently proposed.

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

None.

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

The backfilled trenches would be revegetated, which will increase the aesthetic value of the area.

**11. Light and Glare**

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

None.

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

No.

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

None.

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

Does not apply.

**12. Recreation**

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

The 300 Area is within the Hanford Site boundary and public access is restricted.

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

No.

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

Does not apply.

**13. Historic and Cultural Preservation**

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

There are no places or objects that have special historic or cultural significance. Because the trenches occupy a disturbed location, no cultural resources are expected to be disturbed by excavations.

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

There are no known archaeological, historical, or native American religious sites on or next to the proposed location. Excavation will be halted in the event that the project uncovers any artifacts or archaeological finds.

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

A cultural resources review is triggered by an excavation permit, and would ensure the consideration of potentially significant cultural sites.

**14. Transportation**

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

Access to the trenches is served by Stevens Drive, the main north-south route leading to the 300 Area. Existing gravel roads connect Stevens Drive to the 300 APT.

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

Public transportation is provided several miles to the south in the City of Richland. There is no public transit system for the 300 Area, although a bus system serves the area for employees.

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

Does not apply.

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

Several temporary roads might be required to introduce earthmoving equipment to the trenches and to site the soil washing equipment.

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

The 300-FF-1 OU is located immediately to the east of the railroad corridor that serves the 300 Area. No additional work to this corridor or new railroad spurs will be required as part of this project.

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

Daily vehicular trips would be negligible.

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

None.

**15. Public Services**

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

No.

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

Does not apply.

**16. Utilities**

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


Electricity, potable water, telephone, sewage septic system, and refuse services are currently available in the 300 Area and will be available at the site on a temporary basis as necessary during unit remediation.

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

No additional utilities will be introduced, however, minor modifications to the electrical system may be required.

**SIGNATURES**

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



James E. Rasmussen, Acting Program Manager  
Office of Environmental Assurance,  
Permits, and Policy  
U.S. Department of Energy  
Richland Operations Office

8-9-94  
Date



W. T. Dixon, Manager  
Regulator Support Waste, Analytical  
and Environmental Services  
Westinghouse Hanford Company

8/9/94  
Date



9613389.0876

## Department of Energy

Richland Operations Office  
P.O. Box 550  
Richland, Washington 99352  
AUG 08 1994

94-PRD-006

Mr. Steve M. Alexander  
Perimeter Areas Section Manager  
Nuclear Waste Program  
State of Washington  
Department of Ecology  
P.O. Box 1386, N1-05  
Richland, Washington 99352-0539

Mr. Douglas R. Sherwood  
Hanford Project Manager  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
712 Swift Boulevard, Suite 5  
Richland, Washington 99352-0539

Dear Messrs. Alexander and Sherwood:

TRANSMITTAL OF THE 300 AREA PROCESS TRENCHES CLOSURE PLAN, REVISION 0  
(D-3-1)

The U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (RL), and the Westinghouse Hanford Company (WHC) are submitting DOE/RL-93-73, "300 Area Process Trenches Closure Plan," Revision 0, for approval by the State of Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology). Submittal of this closure plan to Ecology by August 15, 1994, satisfies Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order Milestone M-20-32.

This closure plan documents a proposed coordinated effort to close a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) treatment, storage, and disposal (TSD) unit located within a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) operable unit (OU). Accordingly, this closure plan relies heavily on data and documentation produced from previous CERCLA work in the 300-FF-1 OU. Data from previous characterization work as well as an interim removal action in the process trenches are used.

In accordance with submittal schedules presented in the "Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order Action Plan," (Appendix D), closure plan preparation has been coordinated with preparation of the CERCLA DOE/RL-94-49, "Phase III Feasibility Study (FS) Report for the 300-FF-1 Operable Unit." In accordance with the "Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order Action Plan," (Sections 3.3, 5.5 and Appendix C) it is expected that further integration efforts will occur in potential future remediation activities to "prevent overlap and duplication of work, thereby economically and efficiently addressing the contamination." Therefore, it is important that the FS report and the closure plan remain on the same schedule for review and public comment. This will require coordination of document review and finalization schedules by the RCRA and CERCLA regulators.

Under current draft schedules, a Proposed Plan documenting the preferred remedial alternative for the 300-FF-1 OU, including the process trenches TSD facility, will go to public review in early 1995. This would be followed by a Record of Decision in mid 1995. Coordinated, timely reviews by the regulators

AUG 08 1981


Messrs. Alexander and Sherwood  
94-PRD-006

-2-

and a coordinated effort to resolve comments will be required to meet this proposed time frame.

Should you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact Mr. R. G. McLeod, RL, on 372-0096 or F. A. Ruck III, WHC, on 376-9876.

Sincerely,



James E. Rasmussen, Acting Program Manager  
Office of Environmental Assurance,  
Permits and Policy  
DOE Richland Operations Office

PRD:RGM



W. T. Dixon, Manager  
Regulatory Support  
Westinghouse Hanford Company

Enclosure

- cc w/encl:
- D. Duncan, EPA (2)
- D. Einan, EPA
- M. Janaskie, EM-442 (2)
- M. Jaraysi, Ecology (4)
- R. Jim, YIN
- T. Michelena, Ecology (2)
- D. Powaukee, Nez Perce Tribe
- S. Price, WHC
- J. Wilkenson, CTUIR
- Admin Records (D-3-1), H6-08

- cc w/o encl:
- W. Burke, CTUIR
- R. Cook, YIN
- W. Dixon, WHC
- S. Liedle, BHI
- F. Ruck III, WHC
- H. Rueben, Nez Perce Tribe
- D. Sherwood, EPA
- R. Stanley, Ecology



8703018-54CN  
(PHOTO TAKEN 1987)

2A-1. 300 Area Process Trenches Pre-Expedited Response Action (Facing South).



93050254-48CN  
(PHOTO TAKEN 1993)

2A-2. 300 Area Process Trenches Post-Expedited Response Action  
(Facing South).