



0035626

Incoming:9400859

Department of Energy

Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

94-RPS-157

MAR 14 1994

Mr. Joe Witczak, Unit Supervisor
Hanford Section
State of Washington
Department of Ecology
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia, Washington 98504-7600

Dear Mr. Witczak:

RESPONSE TO THE STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE BACKUP PACKAGE BOILER (PROJECT L-017)

Enclosed please find the response to the State of Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) request for additional information on the Backup Package Boiler (Project L-017). The additional information was requested during a January 31, 1994, discussion between Ms. Serap Brush, Ecology, Air Quality Section, Mr. Alan Carpenter, ENSERCH Environmental, Mr. Bob King of your staff, and representatives of U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, and Westinghouse Hanford Company.

During that discussion, Ecology requested information on two issues: 1) the degree of flue gas recirculation (FGR) necessary to optimize the nitrogen reduction for Best Available Control Technology (BACT), and 2) the purchase specification of oil as a limitation on the sulfur emissions from the package boiler.

The BACT for the package boiler provided an engineering analysis proposing low-nitrogen oxides (NOx) combustion (including low-NOx burners) with FGR at three percent of the exhaust gas. This level of FGR was specified by the vendors in their preliminary performance specification. Sulfur emissions were proposed to be limited by purchasing No. 2 fuel oil with a sulfur content not to exceed 0.5 percent.

Ecology raised the following concern with regard to the NOx control. Higher levels of FGR (percentages as high as 20 percent) recirculation appear feasible based on an engineering journal article provided by Ecology during this discussion. Further, higher levels of FGR appear to enhance the suppression of NOx formation, thereby providing a lower emission rate. Based on this concern, Ecology asked that the issue of amount of FGR be re-examined to determine if a higher percentage would better meet the requirements for Best Available Control Technology. It was agreed to investigate the issue and provide the analysis (Enclosure 1).



Mr. Joe Witczak
94-RPS-157

-2-

MAR 14 1994

Concerning oil as a limitation on sulfur emissions, Ecology asked that additional information be provided to support the request for a BACT determination for the 0.5 percent sulfur when information provided to Ecology states the Hanford Site is obtaining fuel oil with a content of 0.2 percent at this time. It was agreed to provide additional information to support the request for BACT at the higher level (Enclosure 2).

In neither case did Ecology assert that there was reason to be concerned with a potential for adverse environmental impact from the control levels proposed for the package boiler. The modeled ambient concentrations were all far below any level of possible human health impact. Ecology understands the purpose of the boiler is to provide back-up services when the 200 East Area steam line, which provides steam to the 200 West Area, is down for maintenance or when the demand exceeds the supply available from the 200 East Plant.

Finally, enclosed is the response to issues raised regarding the State Environmental Policy Act Environmental Checklist for the proposed backup package boiler (Enclosure 3).

A Notice of Construction (NOC) was submitted to Ecology on November 23, 1993, for the package boiler. The request for additional information is to support approval of the NOC and issuance of a permit by Ecology. Commencement of construction for the backup package boiler is scheduled for April 1, 1994.

Should you have any questions, please contact me or Mr. S. D. Stites of my staff on (509) 376-8566.

Sincerely,



James D. Bauer, Program Manager
Office of Environmental Assurance,
Permits, and Policy

EAP:SDS

Enclosure:

1. Response to Request
Additional NOx Analysis
2. Response to Request
Additional Sulfur Analysis
3. SEPA Checklist

cc w/encl:

S. Brush, Ecology
B. King, Ecology
R. Hulseman, WHC
J. Luke, WHC

Response to Request from the
State of Washington Department of Ecology
for Additional NOx Analysis
on the Proposed Package Boiler
Best Available Control Technology Assessment

On June 9, 1989, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed a New Source Performance Standard for small industrial-commercial-institutional steam generating units [Federal Register (FR) 54, 24792], which included an emission limitation for nitrogen oxides, based on an order from the federal courts to promulgate such a rule. The EPA evaluated low excess air, flue gas recirculation (FGR), and selective catalytic reduction. EPA cited a southern California study stating that controls would cost approximately \$6,000 per ton of low-Nitrogen oxides (NOx) reduced. EPA stated, "these cost-effectiveness levels are generally considered unreasonable for national NOx standards." Consequently, NOx standards for small steam generating units [100 million British thermal unit (Btu)/hour and less] were found to be unreasonable for all types of controls. The proposed package backup boiler is a 50,000 pound per year (approximately 60 million Btu per hour) oil-fired boiler.

EPA found the cost-effectiveness for 50 million Btu per hour units utilizing FGR to be in excess of \$3,000 per ton of NOx. EPA also determined that the emission reduction projections, "tend to overstate the actual achievable reductions so that the true cost-effectiveness values for FGR and SC (staged combustion) on small steam generating units are expected to be higher." EPA concluded that NOx controls might be necessary in "some areas of the country that have acute air quality problems." Nonetheless, EPA proposed a standard for NOx which could be met by every device, in order to meet the court's order, as interpreted by the EPA at the time of the proposal.

On September 12, 1990, EPA published the final rule (FR 55, 37674) for these small steam generating units. EPA eliminated the NOx standard entirely from the final rule. EPA found, "the proposed standards for NOx had no environmental benefit; therefore, the decision to eliminate the NOx standards from the final regulation will result in no environmental impact." EPA determined that the court did not require a standard to be established.

The U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (RL) has no better information than that provided by the EPA in its analysis of the need for NOx controls, and accepts EPA's results that no environmental benefit would occur from installation of NOx controls on the package boiler. Modeling provided in the support document substantiates this claim. Nonetheless, the specification has been written to include low-NOx burners and some level of flue gas recirculation. In accordance with EPA's finding, RL believes it is not warranted to establish a degree of NOx reduction to these voluntary measures since the amount of actual reduction may not be achieved in practice. Further, since some loss of efficiency will result from the flue gas recirculation, the energy impacts of FGR are adverse, while the environmental benefits are insignificant. Therefore, Best Available Control Technology (BACT) would require that no controls be implemented. Again, RL has included the measures as a voluntary specification, but does not believe that the cost-effectiveness meets BACT requirements.

Response to Request from the
State of Washington Department of Ecology
for Additional Sulfur Analysis
on the Proposed Package Boiler
Best Available Control Technology Assessment

On June 9, 1989, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) also proposed a New Source Performance Standard for small industrial-commercial-institutional steam generating units [Federal Register (FR) 54, 24792], which included an emission limitation for sulfur dioxide. The standard required small steam generating units to comply with the emission limitation by firing oil with a sulfur content less than 0.5 weight percent. EPA analyzed three types of oils: medium, low, and very low sulfur oils. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (RL) classifications, medium sulfur oils emit up to 1.6 lb. per million British thermal unit (Btu), low sulfur oils up to 0.8 lb. per million Btu, and very low sulfur oil up to 0.5 lb. per million Btu. EPA found, "generally speaking, low and very low sulfur residual oils are not widely available throughout the United States. Distillate oil, however, is widely available." For this reason, distillate oil was proposed for New Source Performance Standards (NSPS). EPA also found that, "although the sulfur content of distillate oil can be as low as 0.2 weight percent, the maximum sulfur content is limited to 0.5 weight percent by fuel oil specifications adopted by ASTM."

On September 12, 1990, EPA published the final rule (FR 55, 37674) for sulfur dioxide emissions. EPA established the performance standard at 0.5 weight percent sulfur for small oil-fired steam generators. EPA found that the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) standard for distillate fuels was sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the emission standard. It is believed that the long-term fuel purchasing conducted at the site will generally be in accordance with ASTM specification, and that establishing a lower fuel sulfur may lead to procurement problems. Suppliers will obtain distillate fuels meeting ASTM standards and may be unable to reliably obtain fuel oil with lower values of sulfur content leading to compliance problems for RL and the suppliers. EPA determined the incremental cost of very low sulfur fuel oil to be \$1,400 per ton of sulfur removed and found that to be too high on a national average. Since the Hanford Site is presently fueled in large part with coal having a significantly higher emission rate than distillate oil, and since compliance beyond the ASTM standard may be problematic, it is concluded that Best Available Control Technology is in accordance with the NSPS for such small units.

Response to Request from the
State of Washington Department of Ecology
For Additional Information
on the State Environmental Policy Act
Environmental Checklist

Additional information is requested on Question 2a:

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.

Response:

Construction equipment would emit exhaust gases and stir up dust. Such emissions would be minor and would cease when construction is completed. The Best Available Control Technology with the Lowest Achievable Emission Rate would be selected for the package boiler. Air emissions from the completed plant during operations would comply with Clean Air Act requirements. An air permit would be obtained.

Additional information is requested on Question 7a:

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.

Response:

Chemicals used in boiler makeup water would be Dearborn 66, Dearborn Polyquest 683, Dearborn SF-14, or similar products. These are non-regulated chemicals as used in boiler operations for water treatment. Salt brine is used to regenerate zeolite softeners and is discharged at less than ten percent concentration, which is non-regulated and nontoxic.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
FOR
BACKUP PACKAGE OIL-FIRED BOILER

REVISION 0

OCTOBER 1993

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

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Project L-017, "Steam System Rehabilitation, Phase II, Backup Package Oil-fired Boiler."

2. Name of applicants:

U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, and the Westinghouse Hanford Company.

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:

J. E. Rasmussen, Program Manager
Office of Environmental Assurance
Permits and Policy
(509) 376-2247

R. E. Lerch, Deputy Director
Restoration and Remediation
(509) 376-5556

4. Date checklist was prepared:

January 19, 1994

5. Agency requesting checklist:

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

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

The plant would be operational around June 1, 1994.

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

This project is part of Project L-017, "Steam System Rehabilitation, Phase II, Backup Package Oil-fired Boiler," which would repair the aged and deteriorating steam generating plant at the Hanford Site. No further action is proposed at this time.

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

This *State Environmental Policy Act* checklist is being submitted with a State of Washington Department of Ecology Notice of Construction Application, declaring intent to construct, install, or establish a new air containment source or replacement or substantial alteration of emission control technology on an existing stationary source.

On March 29, 1993, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Richland Operations Office made a *National Environmental Policy Act* Categorical Exclusion determination for Project L-017, "Steam System Rehabilitation, Phase II, Backup Package Oil-fired Boiler," which included the construction of a package oil-fired boiler.

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.

No other applications are pending at this time.

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

No other government approvals or permits will be needed.

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 proposed project would construct a stand-alone package boiler for the failed package oil-fired backup boiler at 284E Building. For efficiency, because of the steam tie-line between 200 East and 200 West Areas, the replacement package boiler would be placed adjacent to the 284W Building. This backup boiler would provide up to 50,000 pounds per hour of steam at 225 pounds per square inch gauge pressure. The backup boiler is intended to be brought on line only in the event that demand exceeds production because of boiler maintenance or the steam tie line is out of service. The boiler would be designed for burning #2 Fuel oil.

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 package boiler would be placed at the corner of 20th Street and Beloit Avenue, adjacent to the 284W Building in the 200 West Area of the Hanford Site. Section, Township, and Range are as follows: S 1, T 12N, R 25E.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**1. Earth**

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

Flat.

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

The approximate slope of the land 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 site consists of compacted sand and gravel fill material, underlain by sandy gravel, with excellent drainage characteristics.

No farming is permitted on 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.

Excavation would be required for the foundation of the package boiler, the fuel tank foundation, and for utilities. Any filling of utilities trenches would come from excavated soil.

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

Due to the soil types and dry climate erosion is not expected.

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

Package boiler would occupy about 2400 square feet of space, and the fuel tank would create about 1000 square feet of impervious surface.

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

No erosion control measures are planned.

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.

Construction equipment would emit exhaust gasses, and stir up dust. Such emissions would be minor and would cease when construction is completed. The Best Available Control Technology with the Lowest Achievable Emission Rate would be selected for the package boiler. Air emissions from the completed plant during operations would comply with Clean Air Act requirements. An air permit would be obtained.

- 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 construction activities, water trucks would be used to periodically spray the affected area.

The Best Available Control Technology with the Lowest Achievable Emission Rate would be selected for the package boiler.

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 closest body of water is the Columbia River, about 7 miles away. No streams flow into the river from the project area.

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.

No filling or dredging of wetlands or ponds would be involved.

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.

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. Any precipitation that occurs at the site seeps into the soil on and near the site. Storm water falling into the lagoon would not normally runoff or overflow, consequently none would enter surface waters.

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

No waste materials which could enter ground or surface waters would be generated by this proposal.

- 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

Small amounts of forbes and grasses might be seasonally present. Sagebrush and weeds are also present.

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

An area of approximately one quarter acre would be graded for this project. Native vegetation is practically nonexistent in this area.

- 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 site.

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

No landscaping is planned.

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.

Starlings, pigeons, coyotes, and rabbits have been observed nearby. Large mammals usually do not frequent the 200 East Area. There are no bodies of water and thus no fish in the project area

- 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, occurring 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 is known to occur on or near the 200 West Area.

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

The nearby Columbia River is part of the broad Pacific Flyway.

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

None at this time.

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.

The boiler would be powered by #2 fuel. Electricity would be used for lighting and power.

- 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.

Chemicals used in boiler makeup water would be Dearborn 66, Dearborn Polyquest 683, and Dearborne SF-14. These are non-regulated chemicals as used in boiler operations for water treatment. Salt brine is used to regenerate zeolite softeners and is discharged at less than 10 % concentration which is non-regulated and nontoxic.

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:

None.

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.

The oil-fired boiler, which would be run only as an emergency backup, would produce some locally discernable equipment noise.

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

None.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

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

The Hanford Site houses reactors, chemical separation systems, waste management facilities, and related facilities that have been used for the production of special nuclear materials. Other scientific and engineering programs also are carried out.

- 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.

The new unit would be placed next to the 384 Boiler House. Other nearby buildings include the 283 Water Treatment Plant, about 400 feet away, and a laundry building, which is also approximately 400 feet away.

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

No structures would be demolished.

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

The Hanford Site is zoned by Benton County as an Unclassified Use (U) 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." Non-nuclear 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.

The oil-fired boiler site and adjacent grounds have not been classified as environmentally sensitive.

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

No workers would be assigned to this building. During the intermittent periods of operation two or three people could be stationed at the boiler.

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.

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?

The package boiler stack would be about 70 feet tall. The exterior building surface would be sheet metal.

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

None.

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

None.

11. Light and Glare

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

Some exterior lighting would be used at night.

- 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?

None.

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

No.

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

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.

No places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers are known to be on or next to the site. A Cultural Resources Review would be performed.

- 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 sewage lagoons.

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

Does not apply.

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.

Does not apply.

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

The Hanford Site is a closed federal reservation and is not served by public transit. Nearest public transit is 30 miles away.

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

Graveled parking area for a few workers.

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

No new roads or streets would be required.

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

The proposed oil-fired boiler does not require use of water, rail, or air transportation facilities. None are nearby.

- 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 available. Only water and electricity would be used at the site.

- 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 are proposed.

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.

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

Date

R. E. Lerch, Deputy Director
Restoration and Remediation
Westinghouse Hanford Company

Date

CORRESPONDENCE DISTRIBUTION COVERSHEET

Author	Addressee	Correspondence No.
J. D. Bauer, RL (E. T. Coenenberg, WHC)	J. Witczak, Ecology	Incoming:9400859 XRef:9451381D

Subject: RESPONSE TO THE STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE BACKUP PACKAGE BOILER (PROJECT L-017)

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

Approval	Date	Name	Location	w/att
		Correspondence Control	A3-01	
		B. A. Austin	B2-35	
		E. M. Bright	S2-63	
		G. D. Carpenter	H6-30	
		E. T. Coenenberg	H6-25	
		W. T. Dixon, Assignee	H6-21	
		A. Greenberg	S2-66	
		R. C. Hulseman	N1-29	
		D. R. Herman	S2-66	
		G. P. Kyriazis	N1-29	
		R. J. Landon	H6-21	
		J. J. Luke	H6-25	
		P. J. Mackey	B3-15	
		H. E. McGuire, Level 1	B3-63	
		K. P. Nelson-Jensen	B4-40	
		J. M. Nickeĭs	H6-22	
		J. L. Wise	N1-22	
		EPIC	H6-08	
		ETC/File/LB	H6-25	