

MEETING MINUTES TRANSMITTAL/APPROVAL
Unit Managers' Meeting: Remedial Action and Waste Disposal Unit/Source Operable Unit
3350 George Washington Way, Richland, Washington
April 1998

0049475

060784

FROM/APPROVAL: *Glenn Goldberg* Date 6-3-98
Glenn Goldberg, 100 Area Unit Manager, RL (H0-12)

APPROVAL: *Keith K. Holliday* Date 6-3-98
Wayne Soper/Keith Holliday, 100 Aggregate Area Unit Manager, Ecology
(B5-18)

APPROVAL: *Dennis Faulk* Date 6-3-98
Dennis Faulk, 100 Aggregate Area Unit Manager, EPA (B5-01)

APPROVAL: N/A (did not attend) Date _____
~~David Olson, 100-N Area Unit Manager, RL (H0-12)~~
Donna Wanek

APPROVAL: *Bryan Foley* Date 6-30-98
Bryan Foley, 200 Area Unit Manager, RL (H0-12)

APPROVAL: N/A (did not attend) Date _____
Joan Bartz/Shri Mohan, 200 Aggregate Area Unit Managers, Ecology
(B5-18)

APPROVAL: *Ted A. Wooley* Date 6/18/98
Ted A. Wooley, 200-B Area Project Manager

APPROVAL: *Robert G. McLeod* Date May 21 1998
Robert G. McLeod, 300 Area Unit Manager, RL (H0-12)

APPROVAL: N/A (did not attend) Date _____
Jeanne Wallace, 300 Area Aggregated Area Unit Manager
WA Dept of Ecology (B5-18)

APPROVAL: *David R. Einan* Date 21 May 98
David R. Einan, 300 Area Aggregated Unit Manager, EPA (B5-01)

APPROVAL: *Ted A. Wooley* Date 6/18/98
Ted A. Wooley, 300 Area Process Trenches Subproject Manager



Meeting minutes are attached. Minutes are comprised of the following:

060784

Attachment #1a and 1b	Agendas
Attachment #2a, 2b, and 2c	Attendance Records
Attachment #3-	Meeting Minutes
Attachment #4	Status Package
Attachment #5-	Current Schedule for 100 Area Burial Ground FS
Attachment #6	In Situ REDOX Manipulation Study Results
Attachment #7	100 Area Groundwater Update Package
Attachment #8	Final Status Briefing -- 116-C1 Site Closeout
Attachment #9	Meeting Minutes -- 107-D5 Proximity/Discovery Site
Attachment #10	Comparison of RAWD Budget Information Package
Attachment #11	200 Area Implementation Plan Schedule
Attachment #12	Maximum Concentrations of Chemical and Radiological Analytes Detected at the 216-B-2-2 Characterization Borehole -- Preliminary Results
Attachment #13	WIDS General Summary Reports, Site Maps, Discovery Site Evaluation Checklists, and Waste Site Reclassification Forms

Prepared by:

Michelle Peterson Date 7/27/98
Michelle Peterson (H0-10)/Tamen Rodriguez (H0-17)

Concurrence by:

Vern Dronen Date 8/3/98
Vern Dronen, BHI Remedial Action and Waste Disposal Project Manager
(H0-17)

UNIT MANAGERS' MEETING AGENDA
3350 George Washington Way, Room 1B45
April 16, 1998

060784

1:00 p.m. -- 300 Area

300-FF-1

300 Area Process Trenches

- Review of Verification Package
- Review of Closure by Removal Package
- Review of Inspection Monitoring and Maintenance Plan
- Regarding Plan
- Revised Post Closure Plan (Permit Modification)
- Current Project Schedule

Landfill 1D

- Status of Treatability Variance

618-4 Burial Ground

- Barium-Contaminated Soils
- Lead-Contaminated Soils
- Asbestos-Contaminated Soils
- D-38 Barrels
- Milestone M-16-03C
- Current Project Schedule

Landfill 1A

- Cultural Resource Test Trench

North and South Process Ponds

- Remediation Plan for Berms

300-FF-2

- 300 Area Revitalization
- FFS Scope

2:30 p.m. -- 200 Area

- 200 Area Implementation Plan Status
- Gable/B-Pond Group DQO Status
- 216-B-2-2 Borehole Summary Report Status
- 200-ZP-1 Status Report
- 200-ZP-2 Start-Up

UNIT MANAGERS' MEETING AGENDA
3350 George Washington Way, Room 1B45
April 23, 1998

060784

1:00 - 1:30 p.m.

- 100 Area Remaining Sites
 - Comment resolution status
 - Plans/schedule for public comment
 - Impact to cost estimates of adding 100-KE and 100-KW fuel storage
 - Basins to the cost estimate
 - Appendix C update
- 100 D-Ponds Revised Closure Report Status
- EPA status of partial deletion of 100-IU-1 and 100-IU-3 Operable Units
- 100-D Area chromium sampling status
- 100 Area Burial Ground FS status
- Design - status of RDR/RAWP and SAP

1:30 - 2:00 p.m.

- Groundwater topics
 - Groundwater monitoring results for 100-B/C and 100-D Areas
 - Status of pump-and-treat systems
 - Replacement well for 118A
 - In situ REDOX manipulation study results
 - NRTC chromium toxicity study status
- Are there any effects/improvements on down gradient water chemistry at the 100-D Area REDOX experiment?
- Discussion about permanently combining the 100 Area and Groundwater Unit Manager meetings.

2:00 p.m.

- 100 Area Remedial Action
 - 100-B/C Group 1 Sites draft position paper on 116-C-1 Closure Plan
 - 100-DR Group 2 Sites
 - Ecology concurrence on March 3, 1998, meeting minutes, subject, discovery/proximity site to Sludge Trench 107-D5 (WIDS 100-D-4).
 - Status of Ecology review of 107-D5 Cleanup Verification Package

Remedial Action and Waste Disposal Unit Manager's Meeting
Official Attendance Record - 100 Areas
April 23, 1998

060784

Please print clearly and use black ink

PRINTED NAME	ORGANIZATION	O.U. ROLE	TELEPHONE
Q.E. CORNEAU	BHI	TASK LEAD	372-0565
Glenn Goldberg	DOE	Proj. Manager	376-9552
Keith Holliday	Ecology	Proj. Manager	736-3030
ALVIN LANGSTAFF	ERC	RA Engineer	373-5876
Wayne Soper	Ecology	P.M.	736-3049
Eric Donahoe	BHI	Task Lead	531-0654
Roger Ovink	CHI	BGFPS Task Lead	372-9631
Dennis Faulstich	EPA	RPM	6-891
Larry Gadbois	EPA	U.M.	376-9884
Mark Buckmaster	BHI	task lead	2-9272
Pamela Innis	EPA	P.M	376-4919
Eric Paeck	CHI	Environ. Lead	372-9026
Chuck Hedel	CHI	100 Areas	372-9637
Frank Corvz	BHI	100 Area Engineering	373-1661
Arlene Tortoso	DOE	GW Project Mgr	373-1631
John Frucht	PNNL	Proj. Manager	376-3937
MARV FURMAN	DOE	GW Proj Mgr	373-9630
James Zeisler	DOE	GW	372-0188
Michelle Peterson	BHI	RA/WID Technical Editor	372-9516

**MEETING MINUTES
REMEDIAL ACTION AND WASTE DISPOSAL
UNIT MANAGERS' MEETING -- 100 AREA
April 23, 1998**

060784

Attendees: See Attachment #2a.

Agenda: See Attachment #1b for copy of meeting agenda.

Topics of Discussion:

100 Area Remaining Sites

1. Comment Resolution Status -- This topic was discussed at a meeting held earlier in the day. RL's responses to EPA and Ecology on project documents were discussed at that comment resolution meeting and plans were made for finalizing the documents by June 1, 1998. The public review/comment period for the Proposed Plan is anticipated to begin between June 15 and July 1, 1998.
2. Impact to Cost Estimates of Adding 100-KE And 100-KW Fuel Storage Basins to the Cost Estimate -- This topic was discussed at a meeting held earlier in the day. Cost estimates for confirmation sampling are \$1.5 million and \$1.0 million for 100-KE and 100-KW, respectively. Total costs estimated for the Proposed Plan are under \$60 million.
4. Appendix C Update and Plans/Schedule for Public Comment Period -- A list is being produced for the UMM to review. The anticipated date for signoff is by June 1, 1998. Discussion ensued regarding obtaining signatures from each operable unit manager before final signoff.

100-D Ponds Revised Closure Report Status

1. The revised closure report for the 100-D Ponds is planned to be submitted to Ecology by the end of April 1998.

EPA Status of Partial Deletion of 100-IU-1 and 100-IU-3 Operable Units

1. The partial deletion of the operable units is on track and is currently scheduled for completion by June 30, 1998. EPA stated that Region 10 has determined that a closeout report is no longer required in support of partial deletion from the National Priorities List.

100-D Area Chromium Sampling Status

1. Because the LIBS equipment is not ready for use commercially, the funds that were to be used for implementing this technology on the Hanford Site are being dispersed to other projects. The LIBS technology may be reconsidered at a later date. Alternate plans for sampling will be considered for FY 1999.

100 Area Burial Ground FS Status

1. A handout was provided (Attachment #5) of the current schedule. Sections 1 through 5 are nearing draft completion stage and will be ready during the first part of May 1998. A meeting will be held with EPA and Ecology on or about May 1998 to discuss some of the issues dealing with the report.

Design -- Status of RDR/RAWP and SAP

1. The documents are essentially finished and are anticipated to be transmitted to RL in early May 1998.

Groundwater Topics

1. NRTC Chromium Toxicity Study Status -- A working group, in conjunction with the Trustee Council and the Tri-Parties, is planning the Columbia River studies. Two activities are being conducted: (1) an overall 100 Area assessment dealing with aquatic impacts, and (2) the affects of chromium on aquatic resources. The study plan will kick off this fall to assess the affects of chromium (obtaining basic toxicity information) on Chinook salmon, and the plan will consist of two-phases, beginning in the laboratory, and then moving to the Columbia River to view the river impact of the concentration's effects. During the fall of 1999, the affects of chromium to the Hanford Site and the Columbia River will be assessed.

The USGS laboratory will perform the lab work for the toxicity studies. Chromium and strontium have shown up to date. The assessment will not be a "formal" kind of damage assessment; instead, it is just part of the CERCLA cleanup process. Current conditions will be assessed, and the measurable exposure and the effects from that exposure will be reviewed. The assessment plan is currently being drafted, and a draft report on the study should be out by mid-May 1998.

2. In Situ REDOX Manipulation Study Results -- A handout was provided (Attachment #6) to summarize the results of the in situ REDOX manipulation study, which was a treatability study for chromate contamination at 100-D. Five injection wells were sampled in January, and sampling of four additional wells will be performed in May/June 1998.
3. Status of Pump-and-Treat Systems -- A handout was provided (Attachment #7) containing information on the status of the pump-and-treat systems. Detailed data are provided in a report that was recently issued, which is a Tri-Party Agreement Milestone. The report is for informational purposes and contains BHI's recommendations for future types of proceedings. A meeting will be scheduled in the future to discuss BHI's recommendations and any comments on the report.
4. Replacement Well for 118A -- A procurement package is in place for the contractor to begin work on a replacement well for 118A. Funding has been secured, so the well will be replaced this summer and will be drilled 30 ft from the existing well. A meeting was held with the Tribal Nations to discuss drilling of the replacement well, and the Tribal Nations agreed for the drilling to proceed.

5. Groundwater Monitoring Results for 100-B/C and 100-D Areas -- PNNL looked at the 100-B/C Area and outlined a couple of areas by the Columbia River with some increase in strontium and tritium (see Attachment #7 for more information). The reason for the increase in strontium and tritium in these areas is not yet known.

The 100-D Area, near the retention basin (see Attachment #7), was found to have no current increase in trends, so essentially no change has occurred in this area.

Discussion About Permanently Combining the 100 Area and Groundwater Unit Manager Meetings

1. It was discussed, and agreed upon, that meetings will be combined for the 100 Area and Groundwater UMM **every other month**. It was also discussed and agreed upon to do the same kind of every-other-month meeting combination with the 100 Area and the D&D group.

The group decided that the 100 Area UMM will now be held in its own time slot, no longer in conjunction/on the same day as the 200 and 300 Area UMM. The next 100 Area UMM is tentatively scheduled for May 21, 1998, with the D&D group participating in this meeting.

100 Area Remedial Action

1. 100-B/C Group Sites Draft Position Paper on 116-C-1 Site Closeout -- Final analyses and RESRAD modeling indicate that all remedial action goals (RAGs) for direct exposure, protection of groundwater, and protection of the Columbia River have been attained. A handout (Attachment #8) was provided summarizing the final compliance assessment, which will be described in detail in the site closeout and verification report. It was noted that lead soil concentrations that were below site background were not included in the final compliance assessment.

Applicability of the 116-C-1 analyses and test pit to other sites in the 100-B/C-1 Operable Unit was discussed. It was noted that the trending of contaminant profile distribution is generally applicable. However, overall conclusions on attainment of RAGS still need to be developed on a site-by-site basis, depending on RESRAD modeling. The 116-C-5 site had an initial higher contaminant inventory than 116-C-1; however, the direct discharge effluent volume to the vadose zone was lower in the 116-C-5 steel-lined tanks (compared to the unlined 116-C-1 site). These and other differences are the reasons why there is not a direct link on final conclusions between 116-C-1 and 116-C-5.

At this time, no BHI assessments have been made on the correlation of the 116-C-1 test pit findings to any of the 100 D Group 2 effluent inventory sites, or whether or not a vadose zone test pit to groundwater is needed for these sites. Remedial action excavation for the concrete-lined 116-D-7 site has indicated that the contaminant profile distribution tapers to zero below the engineered structure and within the remedial action excavation. A potential candidate for a vadose zone test pit at the 100-D Group 2 sites would be the unlined 116-D-1/-2 site, which is not scheduled for site closeout until FY 1999.

The current schedule is for BHI to submit the 116-C-1 closeout and verification package to RL in late May 1998, with RL's submittal to EPA to follow thereafter.

EPA was advised by RL that plans are being made to backfill 116-C-1 in June 1998. EPA stated that RL would be backfilling at risk, if performed before RL received a signed verification package from EPA.

The interface and feedback received to date from Argonne National Laboratory (authors/originators of the RESRAD computer code) have been positive, with no exceptions to BHI's input/output and Hanford Site-specific use of RESRAD.

Separate of the final compliance assessment, recent RESRAD and 116-C-1 site-specific sensitivity analyses were also discussed:

- Hanford Site background for lead as soil concentrations was used as input to the RESRAD model. These sensitivity runs indicated that Site background values resulted in exceeding groundwater MCLs for lead (under a 30-in. per year, 1,000-year irrigation scenario).
- Site-specific Kd values calculated from the 116-C-1 test pit were discussed for lead. The Kd value specified in the RDR/RAWP is 30 for lead. Kd values calculated from the 116-C-1 test pit were 182 using ERC data and 933 using Ecology sample data. The Ames and Serne values in the RDR/RAWP are from laboratory tests, representative of absorption processes, whereas field conditions are representative of desorption processes, which are typically higher Kd values as seen in the field-calculated values. Utilizing these Kd values, groundwater RAGs are attained utilizing soil concentration values that are below background values.

2. 100-DR Group 2 Sites --

- Ecology concurrence on March 3, 1998, meeting minutes regarding discovery, proximity site to 107-D5 sludge trench (WIDS 100-D-4) -- Ecology concurred with the subject meeting minutes (see Attachment #9).
- Status of Ecology review of 107-D5 Cleanup Verification Package -- Ecology will complete their review, to include Washington State Department of Health comments, and will transmit to RL by May 1, 1998.

EPA will not have an opportunity to provide comment on the subject verification package, which was received as a courtesy copy (Ecology lead site). EPA noted that the preference to not format the document as a BHI document and instead transmit under an NPL Agreement Form.

Ecology noted that the MTCA three-point statistical test summary was adequately presented in the draft Data Quality Assessment Technical Memorandum for 107-D5 and will likely request inclusion of such in the verification package.

BHI will wait for formal written comments from Ecology before proceeding with finalization of the 107-D5 verification package.

3. Tri-Party Agreement Milestones --

- The target date for completion of Tri-Party Agreement milestones is May 19, 1998. The milestones will include/consider pipelines and ERDF expansion, in addition to having proposed interim milestones.
- The ERDF milestones need to include actual excavations for ERDF. Remedial action milestones do not need to include reseeded, but the milestones must include backfilling.
- A handout (Attachment #10) was provided with the following information:
 - Comparison of RAWWD budgets/tons for 3-year period
 - To-go spread of tons/dollars
 - Draft remedial action schedule based on \$60 million level of funding.
- Where existing/past milestones have been extended, an explanation must be provided for the change package.

**REMEDIAL ACTION AND WASTE DISPOSAL
UNIT MANAGERS' MEETING -- 200 AREA
April 16, 1998**

Attendees: See Attachment #2b.

Agenda: See Attachment #1a for copy of meeting agenda.

Topics of Discussion:

1. 200 Area Implementation Plan Status -- The implementation plan is scheduled for internal team review of the first draft on May 8, 1998 (see Attachment #11). The Tri-Party Agreement milestone date for completion of the plan is August 31, 1998.
2. Gable/B-Pond Group DQO Status -- The DQO workbook is currently being finalized to support future workshops. RL will review the revised DQO workbook next week with the group. The workshops will be finished and the workbooks finalized to support the 200 Area Implementation Plan by the end of May 1998. If the schedule is delayed and the DQO is not completed in time to support the implementation plan, BHI stressed that the DQO cannot be dropped since it is needed to support the group-specific work plan.
3. 216-B-2-2 Borehole Summary Report Status -- The report has been drafted and is currently being reviewed by the authors. The report should be issued by the end of April 1998. BHI is waiting for revised information from the laboratory for inclusion into the report. A handout was provided (see Attachment #12) containing information on the results obtained during the borehole characterization studies.
4. 200-ZP-1 Status Report -- DOE was present to discuss the status of 200-ZP-1. Due to the 200-ZP-1 regulator not being present, however, no discussions were held.
5. 200-ZP-2 Startup -- DOE was present to discuss the status of 200-ZP-2. Due to the 200-ZP-1 regulator not being present; however, no discussions were held.

**REMEDIAL ACTION AND WASTE DISPOSAL
UNIT MANAGERS' MEETING -- 300 AREA
April 16, 1998**

Attendees: See Attachment #2c.

Agenda: See Attachment #1a for copy of meeting agenda.

Topics of Discussion:

300-FF-1

300 Area Process Trenches

1. Review of Verification Package -- The package was sent out to the regulators for informal review. Comments were received and were incorporated. RL will formally transmit this package to the regulators, along with the remainder of the 300 Area Process Trenches documents. The goal is to have all of the documents transmitted to Ecology by April 20 (the 60-day review period would begin after Ecology approved the closure plan), to receive comments by May 8, and to have comments incorporated and Ecology's approval by June 1, 1998.
2. Review of Closure by Removal Package -- Ecology questioned attainment of clean closure and would like to see the raw data. Ecology stated that there was too much CERCLA and not enough RCRA in the document (use of MTCA Method B for clean closure, which must be met with supporting data if clean closure is to be obtained). Ecology also mentioned the need to discuss institutional controls.
3. Review of Inspection Monitoring and Maintenance Plan -- Ecology has not seen the monitoring/maintenance plan yet, but the plan has been through BHI internal review. The plan is geared toward meeting clean closure. BHI stated that a courtesy review copy would be forwarded to Ecology.
4. Regrading Plan -- BHI is currently working on a draft of the regrading plan and has not yet submitted the plan to Ecology for review. Discussion ensued on how the contours of the regrading plan would appear.
5. Revised Post-Closure Plan (Permit Modification) -- A new post-closure plan will be submitted reflecting revised requirements associated with clean closure. Essentially, the post-closure activities will be focused on maintenance of groundwater monitoring. This is the key document that must be finalized by June 1, 1998, in order to meet the schedule for Modification D to the RCRA permit.
6. Current Project Schedule -- The six drums of sediment from the headworks were sent to ERDF for disposal. All waste has physically been removed. The project team will try to obtain resolution on all documents before May 15, 1998, and have them ready for signature when the Ecology Project Manager returns in late May 1998.

Landfill 1D

1. Status of Treatability Variance -- BHI is working to compile a package on the treatability variance for EPA to review, but the package has not been completed yet. Discussion ensued on the use of XRF vs. TCLP. BHI will make a proposal for improving field screening data to better predict laboratory results.

Burial Ground 618-4

1. Barium-Contaminated Soils -- BHI is setting the barium-contaminated soil aside for now. It is highly unlikely that it will be acceptable for disposal without some form of treatment. This issue will be dealt with at a later date.
2. Lead-Contaminated Soils -- Multiple stockpiles of lead-contaminated soil are being made prior to shipment. Some of the lead-contaminated soils have exceeded land disposal restrictions. It is likely that a "failed stockpile" will be made (similarly to what was done at Landfill 1D).
3. Asbestos-Contaminated Soils -- Procedures have been implemented for handling the asbestos-contaminated soils at the burial ground (e.g., PAMs, double-lined containers, data collection/monitoring, screening of employees, etc.).
4. D-38 Barrels -- EPA visited the 618-4 Burial Ground to view the D-38 barrels on April 16. BHI will prepare a package to inform EPA of how the milestone will be affected. Discussion ensued on costs and contingencies.
5. Milestone M-16-03C -- Milestone meetings are being held on April 20 and 22, 1998, in an effort to determine when milestones will be met. It is possible that the original date of August 31, 1998, can be maintained if the scope of the burial ground report can be limited to the work performed to-date.

North and South Process Ponds

1. Remediation Plan for Berms -- EPA, BHI, and RL will meet on April 22, 1998, to discuss a remediation plan for the North and South Process Ponds berms.

Landfill 1A

1. Cultural Resource Test Trench -- A test trench will be excavated between the waste cells at Landfill 1A to assess the existence of any cultural resources.

300-FF-2

1. 300 Area Groundwater Sampling – Evaluation of the results from the first round of groundwater sampling has been completed. The concentration of uranium was found to be 73 $\mu\text{g/L}$, which is lower than previously detected, and the concentration of tributyl phosphate was approximately the same as previously detected. The second round of groundwater sampling will occur in late June/early July 1998.
2. FFS Scope – The approach was outlined and presented to EPA and will be discussed in greater detail at a meeting scheduled to be held with EPA on April 20, 1998.

060784

STATUS PACKAGE
UNIT MANAGERS' MEETING - MAY 1998
SOURCE OPERABLE UNITS

100-B/C, 100-K, 100-D, 100-H, 100-F

200 AREAS

300 AREA

Prepared by DOE-RL

05/21/98

100 AREAS

100 Area Burial Ground Focused Feasibility

Work continued on the 100 Area Burial Ground Feasibility Study. This feasibility study addresses 45 burial grounds associated with former plutonium reactors in the 100 Areas. Complete drafts of Sections 1 through 5 and a rough draft of Section 6 will be available by late May 1998.

100 Area Remaining Sites

A technical review period for the Remaining Sites Proposed Plan and its companion report, the Administrative Record Document, by RL, EPA, and Ecology ended on April 1, 1998, with the receipt of informal written comments. A comment resolution meeting was held on April 23, 1998. Resulting document revisions are planned to be completed in May. Documents are planned to be finalized by RL following senior management review by the regulatory agencies, expected to be completed by the end of May. Planning efforts are underway to support a 45-day public comment period anticipated to begin between June 15 and July 1, 1998.

100-D Area Soil Sampling

Laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy (LIBS), an emerging technology for characterizing subsurface soils, had been planned for use in the 100-D Area during FY 1998 to detect chromium in the vadose zone. Deployment, originally scheduled for October 1997, had been delayed several times at the subcontractor's request. The delays were due to technical difficulties that the subcontractor experienced with instrumentation. The inability of the contractor to mobilize the 100-D Area by the end of April 1998 has resulted in abandoning plans to use the LIBS technology. Use of technologies such as LIBS or other vadose zone characterization methods will be reconsidered for the 100-D Area during detailed work planning for FY 1999. RL is now finalizing a report summarizing characterization work performed during September 1997 at, and in the vicinity of, the 190-D Building in an earlier phase before closing out the project in June 1998.

100-D Ponds Closure Plan Revision

RL submitted the revised closure plan and comment response table to Ecology on May 7, 1998. The submittal supports Ecology's request to have all final documents supporting the Modification D to the RCRA Sitewide Permit submitted no later than June 1, 1998.

Partial Deletion of the 100 Area NPL Site for the 100-IU-1 and 100-IU-3 Operable Units

Public comment on partial deletion began in mid-May 1998 and will end mid-June to support partial deletion not later than June 30, 1998.

Remedial Design Report/Remedial Action Work Plan

The SAP for debris sampling and quality assurance sampling features was presented at the March UMM. Regulatory comments have now been resolved. Accordingly, Revision 1 of the RDR and SAP, with complete comment resolution packages and transmittal letters, are being prepared, and both documents are being finalized for issuance.

The Remedial Design Report/Remedial Action Work Plan (Rev. 1) and the Sampling and Analysis Plan (Rev. 1) for the 100 Area were transmitted to RL on May 4, 1998.

100-B/C Remedial Action

Baseline excavation at the 116-C-5 retention basins is completed. Remedial action excavation work on previously identified lateral vadose plumes at the northern and western limits of the basins is nearly ready to commence. As agreed with EPA, the plume area to the south will be remediated and closed out, concurrent with remediation of the 60-in.- and 66-in.-diameter effluent pipelines in the vicinity, separate of the 116-C-5 closeout and verification package.


ERC technical staff are currently working on the final evaluation of 116-C-1 site closeout and verification package issues, to include evaluation of uncertainties in the RESRAD analyses and associated input parameters. Current ERC target dates for 116-C-1 are the submittal of the closeout verification package to RL by May 1998, and backfilling the site in June 1998. These efforts, as well as the 116-C-5 site closeout (also scheduled in FY 1998) are subjects for discussion at the April 1998 UMM.

100-DR Remedial Action

Remedial excavation of overburden and concrete basin construction debris at the 116-D-7 and 116-DR-9 basins is ongoing and will continue through approximately the end of FY 1998, and beyond 1998 for 116-DR-9. A meeting is scheduled with RL and Ecology for April 16, 1998, to discuss elevation datum for the 116-D-7 waste site, in particular regarding with lateral plumes to the north of the waste site.

The 107-D-5 closeout report has been completed and submitted to RL and Ecology for review/comment and concurrence, with a courtesy copy submitted to EPA. Review comments are needed at the earliest time so the comments can be considered/incorporated into the upcoming closeout packages planned for the remainder of the fiscal year:

- 107-D1, 107-D2, and 107-D3 Sludge Pits
- 1607-D2 Abandoned Tile Field.



100-N Area Remedial Action Decision Documents

The public comment period held for the 100-N Remedial Action Decision Documents ended April 29, 1998. Numerous public comments were received during the comment period and are currently being addressed in coordination between Ecology and DOE.

200 AREAS

200 Areas Implementation Plan

The draft Implementation Plan was distributed for team review on May 11, 1998. A two-week team review period is scheduled for May 11 through 22, 1998.

200-BP-1 Operable Unit

The barrier-testing program continues to provide data on water infiltration, vegetation growth, and biointrusion associated with the Hanford Site barrier.

200-CW-1 Operable Unit

The 216-B-2-2 Ditch Borehole Summary Report was drafted and is currently being reviewed by DOE. The report is expected to be finalized by the end of May 1998 as a BHI document. The IDW waste disposal profiles were generated, and the IDW waste is planned to be disposed of at the ERDF by mid-May 1998.

Data quality objectives (DQOs) are being developed jointly by the ERC, DOE, and Ecology to define additional characterization for the 200-CW-1 Operable Unit. The results of the DQO process will support the 200 Area Implementation Plan and the preparation of a work plan for 200-CW-1 next fiscal year. A series of meetings/workshops have been held as part of the DQO development process. A DQO workbook has been drafted, which was provided to Ecology on April 24, 1998, for review. Following receipt of Ecology's comments, a follow-up DQO workshop is planned to resolve comments and to finalize the DQO workbook.

300 AREA

300-FF-1 Operable Unit

Process Trenches

Drafts of several documents were provided to Ecology for review, including the following: (1) the *Vadose Zone Clean Closure Report for the 300 Area Process Trenches*; (2) the *Inspection, Monitoring, and Maintenance Plan for the 300 Area Process Trenches*; and (3) the *300 Area Process Trenches Post-Closure Plan*. During this period, Ecology's comments were addressed and the documents approved via electronic mail. Formal documentation via letter approval is forthcoming. The vadose zone report documents that residual soils meet MTCA B residential standards for RCRA contaminants. Accordingly, the post-closure plan is a modification to the RCRA post-closure permit to reflect the "as remediated" site conditions. The current plan is to include the necessary changes in the next formal modification of the RCRA Permit, which is scheduled for December 1998. In the meantime, the inspection, monitoring, and maintenance plan will be used for post-closure. The 60-day time period to certify clean closure of the Process Trenches was initiated on May 14, 1998, per Ecology's completion of closure approval of the vadose zone clean closure report.

Landfill 1D

The EPA requested additional treatability variance information. The information is being compiled.

Burial Ground 618-4

The large cache of drums unearthed in the burial ground were stabilized during the past month. These drums are suspected of containing uranium mill tailings with various levels of mineral oil cover. Stabilization involved placing all of the drums in overpacks and filling the voids with mineral oil. The mineral oil protects the uranium fines from potentially catching fire. Excavation work in the burial ground was stopped after the drum stabilization activities were completed to allow time to (1) develop a drum characterization plan, (2) collect samples, (3) analyze the samples, (4) evaluate the data, (5) revise or prepare a new drum excavation plan, and (6) develop the treatment/disposal process for the drum contents.

North Process Pond

Upon demobilization of the burial ground, the remedial action subcontractor mobilized equipment to the North Process Pond where excavation was initiated in the pond settling basins on May 5, 1998.

300-FF-2 Operable Unit

Evaluation of the groundwater data from well 699-S6-E4A indicates that total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) have not been detected since September 1996. Per discussions with the regulators at the UMM in November 1997, it was agreed that these constituents may be considered for deletion if there were no further detections. (This will eliminate three analyses.) Further discussions will be held at the May 1998 UMM.

At a meeting held on April 20, 1998, with the regulators, it was proposed that a three-month extension to Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-15-23-B (*Submit the 300-FF-2 Operable Unit Focused Feasibility Study And Proposed Plan for Regulator Review*) be granted to allow for 300-FF-2 waste site categorization similar to that performed for the 100 Area Remaining Sites. The regulators tentatively agreed to extending the milestone from July 31 to October 31, 1999, and requested that a change control form be prepared.

Activity ID	Activity description	Rem Dur	% comp	RESP	Budget Quantity	FY98												FY99	
						S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A		S
100-HR-COMMON BURIAL GROUND STRATEGY (PE7116)																			
100-HR-COMMON PROJECT SUPPORT(B17HX1Y00C)																			
R8 4.4	Direct Project Support-FY98	114*	50		1,456	01OCT97A													30SEP98
100-HR-COMMON FINAL SCOPING (B17HX1H00C)																			
R81.1	Identify/Resolve Key Issues	0*	100		348	01OCT97A													
R81.2	Develop Annotated FS Outline	0*	100		104	01OCT97A													
R81.3	Establish Tri-Party Concurrence on 1.2	0	100		72	12NOV97A													
100-HR-COMMON DRAFT FS (CMS) REPORT (B17HX1H10C)																			
R8001	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	30	0	PETERSEN	79										15MAY98*			26JUN98	
R8011	INTRODUCTION (1.0)	11	95	WILSON	79										15MAR98A			04MAY98	
R8021	BG DESCRIPTIONS (2.0)	11	95	CLARK	240	21NOV97A												04MAY98	
R8031	RAOs/PRG's (3.0)	11	80	SMITH	364										26JAN98A			04MAY98	
R8041	REMEDIAL TECH. SCREEN (4.0)	0*	100	OVINK	180	01DEC97A									21JAN98A				
R8042	TEAM/BG TEAM REVIEW	0	100	OVINK	48										22JAN98A			11FEB98A	
R8043	REVISE	11	95	OVINK	42										12FEB98A			04MAY98	
R8051	REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES (5.0)	0	100	OVINK	156										02JAN98A			21JAN98A	
R8052	TEAM/BG TEAM REVIEW	0*	100	OVINK	0										22JAN98A			11FEB98A	
R8053	REVISE	11	95	OVINK	72										12FEB98A			04MAY98	
R8061	DETAILED ALT. ANALYSIS (6.0)	6*	50	BADDEN	460										19JAN98A			27APR98	
R8062	TEAM/BG TEAM REVIEW	20	0	BADDEN	28													28APR98	
R8063	REVISE	20	0	BADDEN	126													27MAY98	
R8071	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS (7.0)	40	0	PETERSEN	235													01MAY98*	
R8081	REFERENCE	72*	25	WEISS	15													15APR98A	
R8091	APPENDIX A. ARARs	17*	90	BADDEN	92													15MAR98A	
R8101	APPENDIX B. BG DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS	6*	99	CLARK	78	29DEC97A												27APR98	
R8111	APPENDIX C. RISK METHODS	21*	0	SMITH	88													01MAY98*	
R8121	APPENDIX D. DETAILED COSTS	47*	20	PARNELL	126													01APR98A	
R8131	DOCUMENT ASSEMBLY	66*	10	WEISS	324													02FEB98A	
R8141	618-4 LESSONS LEARNED	72*	30	OVINK	186	01DEC97A												31JUL98	
R8151	WEEKLY STATUS MEETINGS	51*	20	OVINK	224	01DEC97A												30JUN98	
100-HR-COMMON COMMENTS/REVISIONS (B17HX1H20C)																			
R81.5	CHI Draft FS Review/Comment Incorporation	21	0		388													03AUG98*	
R81.6	BHI Draft FS Review/Comment Incorporation	21	0		288													01SEP98	

Project Start 01OCT97
Project Finish 16MAR00
Data Date 20APR98
Run Date 16APR98



Early Bar
Target Bar
Progress Bar

MSTR:HR02


Sheet 1 of 1

100 AR BURIAL GRND STRATEGY / PE7116
BASELINE VS CURRENT SCHEDULE
STATUS AS OF 17APR98

Well Layout / Emplacement Strategy



8-26-97
Cr6+ (mg/L)




-
-
-
-


Pre D4-7 Injection Cr(VI) (mg/L)

8-26-97

SW - NE TRANSECT (Cross Gradient)





SE - NW TRANSECT (Along Gradient)




100-D Area In Situ Redox Manipulation Post D4-7 Injection Cr6+ (mg/L)


1-6-98


SW - NE TRANSECT (Cross Gradient)




SE - NW TRANSECT (Along Gradient)








1-6-98
Sulfate (mg/L)





100-D Area ISRM Status

- ◆ **D4-7 Dithionite Injection/Withdrawal**
 - Completed October 1997

- ◆ **Dissolved Gas Tracer Test**
 - Purpose: Characterize trapped air bubbles below the water table to study potential mechanisms for attenuation of anoxic plume
 - April 1998

- ◆ **Remaining 4 Dithionite Injection / Withdrawal**
 - May - June 1998

UNIT MANAGER'S MEETING
GROUNDWATER
April 23, 1998

- Pump and Treat – Status
 - 100-HR-3
 - 100-KR-4 & K118 Replacement Well
- Groundwater Monitoring Trends
 - 100-BC RA Area
 - 100-D RA Area
- Insitu Redox
- NRTC Chromium Toxicity Study

WEEKLY STATUS REPORT FOR WEEK ENDING APRIL 20, 1998

WEEKLY OPERATION SUMMARY 04/20/98					
OPERABLE UNIT	WEEKLY OPERATIONAL PERIOD	WEEKLY MAXIMUM HOURS AVAILABLE	ACTUAL SYSTEM AVAILABILITY (%)**	AVERAGE GPM	TOTAL VOLUME TREATED (L)
100-HR-3	04/14/98 to 04/20/98	168	93.4	150	5,678,000
100-KR-4	04/14/98 to 04/20/98	168	100	125	5,489,000
100-NR-2	04/14/98 to 04/20/98	168	100	62	2,366,000
200-UP-1	04/14/98 to 04/20/98	168	100	49	1,869,000
200-ZP-1	04/14/98 to 04/20/98	168	100	201	7,669,000

* Actual vs. previously reported

** System availability not toward PBCI.

START-UP TO DATE OPERATIONS SUMMARY			
OPERABLE UNIT	OPERATIONAL PERIOD	VOLUME (L)	MASS REMOVED
100-HR-3	7/01/97 to date	■281,096,000	23.87 kg
100-KR-4	10/01/97 to date	130,902,000	16.49 kg
100-NR-2	9/01/95 to date	252,434,000	.247 Ci
200-UP-1	3/31/97 to date	93,748,000	N/A
200-ZP-1	8/5/96 to date	■■■452,301,000	■■■3,801 kg

■ Includes 58M Liters from prior treated D Area Transfer

■■■ Includes updated prior totals from Phase I and Phase II




Figure 3-8. 100-HR-3 Pump-and-Treat System Influent and Effluent.

* Based on effluent concentration equal to the Hach 2100 Chrome Analyzer detection limits (5 µg/l.)

Figure 3-24. Hydraulic Containment Developed by 100-HR-3 OU
100-H Area Extraction Wells.






Figure 4-6. 100-KR-4 Pump-and-Treat System Influent and Effluent.




4-24


* Based on effluent concentration equal to the Hach 2010 Chrome Analyzer detection limits (10 $\mu\text{g/L}$).

Figure 4-14. Hydraulic Containment Developed by
100-KR-4 Area Extraction Wells.






Wells With Strontium-90 Elevation



Wells With Tritium Elevation

Figure 3-38. 100-D Area Chromium Plume Distribution for the Last Quarter of 1997.
(See Table 3-8 for List of Wells Used and Sampling Results).



3-75

Final Status Briefing 116-C1 Site Closeout

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to provide a final status briefing on the 116-C1 site closeout efforts. Summaries of the compliance assessment process and 116-C1 results are presented in Section 2.0, and summaries of the conclusions and recommendations are presented in Section 3.0. Details of these findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented in the Site Clean Up Verification Package for 116-C1.

2. COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

2.1 Process Description

The compliance assessment process has been developed to implement the site close out requirements of the ROD and RDR/RAWP. The process is slightly different for each category of COC, and for each of the shallow and deep zones. Additional information and requirements are provided in the ROD, RDR/RAWP, and SAP

2.1 Assessment Results

Shallow Zone (<15 ft deep). The 116-C1 site shallow zone is protective (direct exposure and protection of groundwater and river) for all of the radionuclide and metal/chemical COCs. Shallow zone RAGs have been met.

Overburden. The 116-C1 site overburden stockpile is protective (direct exposure and protection of groundwater and river) for all of the radionuclide and metal/chemical COCs. Shallow zone RAGs have been met.

Deep Zone (>15 ft deep) Protection of Groundwater. All COCs in the deep zone residual soil have been shown to be protective of groundwater.

- All radionuclides in the deep zone residual soil have been demonstrated to be protective of groundwater for a minimum of 1000 years using a 3 layer model and RESRAD analysis.
- Hexavalent chromium concentrations in the deep zone do not exceed the 2.2 mg/kg RAG, and are therefore protective of groundwater.
- Total chromium in the deep zone residual soil has been demonstrated to be protective of groundwater via the <100xMCL RAG.

- Mercury (Hg) in the deep zone residual soil exceeds the 100xMCL RAG; therefore, RESRAD modeling was performed. RESRAD modeling using a 3 layer model shows that Hg meets the groundwater protection RAG for a minimum of 1000 years.
- Lead (Pb) in the deep zone residual soil exceeds the 100xMCL RAG; therefore, RESRAD modeling was performed based on the 116-C1 site specific model. RESRAD modeling indicates that Pb in the upper layer (Layer 1) meets the groundwater protection RAG for a minimum of 1000 years. Soil concentrations found in Layer 2 and 3 are below Hanford site background values. Pb soil concentrations that are below background are not included in the final compliance assessment.

Deep Zone (>15 ft deep) Protection of River. All COCs in the deep zone residual soil has been demonstrated to be protective of the river within a period of 1000 years.


- All radionuclide COCs have been demonstrated by RESRAD modeling to be protective of the groundwater and therefore, are protective of the river (Radionuclide RAGs are identical for groundwater and the river).
- All metal and chemical COCs have been demonstrated to be protective of the river (<100xMCL x Dilution Attenuation Factor [DAF] RAG). This evaluation includes accounting for travel times to the river.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 116-C-1 site has met the shallow zone and deep zone RAGS. Work has begun on the Verification Package.


The knowledge and information collected from the 116-C1 site should be applied to other B/C sites. This information includes the contaminant profile in the deep zone. A separate status briefing is being prepared to address this issue. Based on the 116-C-1 data evaluation to date, the overall conclusion should not yet be directly applied to other waste sites. It is recommended that the trending of individual COC vertical contaminant distribution be applied to similar waste sites.

Deep Zone Lead



Soil values from level 2 and 3 area below background values.

Deep Zone Mercury



Environmental
Restoration
Contractor

ERC Team

058459

Job No. 22192

Written Response Required? NO
Closes CCN: N/A
OU: 100-DR-1
TSD: N/A
ERA: N/A
Subject Code: 4170

Meeting Minutes

SUBJECT 107-D5 Proximity/Discovery Site

TO Distribution

FROM F. M. Corpuz

DATE March 15, 1998

ATTENDEES

K. E. Cook H9-02
F. M. Corpuz X9-06
G. I. Goldberg H0-12
K. K. Holliday B5-18

DISTRIBUTION

R. D. Belden, w/a X9-06
R. L. Donahoe, w/a X9-06
J. D. Fancher, w/a X3-40
J. M. Frank, w/a X3-40
G. G. Hamilton, w/a X9-06
A. L. Langstaff, w/a X3-40
W. A. Pelly, w/a X9-06
M. T. Stankovich, w/a X9-06
Document and Info Services H0-09

Attachment: Plan and Cross Section of the
100-D-4 WIDS Site, and Discovery Site to
the South

The subject meeting was held on March 3, 1998, 9:00-10:00 a.m., at 3350 George Washington Way. Attendees included representatives from the Environmental Restoration Contractor (ERC), the U. S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations (DOE-RL), and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). The purpose of the meeting was to present information on a proximity/discovery site south of the 107-D5 Sludge Trench, to discuss any impact on the 107-D5 site closeout, achieve resolution of Waste Identification Data System (WIDS) issues, and identify the appropriate remedial action of the proximity/discovery site.

The following topics were discussed:

1. A small construction repair related crib has been discovered adjacent and to the south of the 107-D5 Sludge Trench (WIDS No. 100-D-4). The crib is connected to the 116-DR-9 Retention Basin, via a 6-inch pipeline. From review

of the historical documentation, it appears that the small crib was used to assist in draining portions of the 116-DR-9 Retention Basin during repairs to that structure. The 6-inch pipeline is part of the current 100 D, Group 2 Subcontract, but not scheduled for this fiscal year (See **Attached** Plan and Cross Section).


2. The 107-D5 Remedial Action work is completed and the Verification Package is near completion, for transmittal to DOE-RL.
3. Based upon as-built drawings, the proximity/discovery site was constructed circa 1949, at an invert elevation of about 131.0 meters. The 107-D5 Sludge Trench was constructed circa 1953, at an invert elevation of about 132.1 meters.
4. An inquiry was made as to Ecology's perspective for closing out waste site 107-D5 relative to the presence of the proximity/discovery site.

The following key decisions were made:

1. Ecology concurred with, and took no exception to, proceeding on closure of the 107-D5 Sludge Trench, exclusive of the presence of the proximity/discovery site to the south. This is because the proximity/discovery site is of earlier construction than the 107-D5 Sludge Trench, constructed at a lower elevation, and of different use.
2. Ecology concurred with the approach on updating the WIDS database as a result of this discovery (actions identified below).

The following actions were assigned:


1. ERC will update the WIDS database to reflect:
 - a) The 107-D5 Sludge Trench is associated with WIDS waste site number 100-D-4, which is currently described as an effluent disposal site. The 100-D-4 description will be updated to reflect the above findings, and 100-D-4 will be identified as a sludge trench.
 - b) The discovery site will be given a new WIDS number.
2. DOE-RL will issue a letter to Ecology requesting inclusion of the discovery site in remedial action of the 116-DR-9 site (since the 107-D5 site remediation will have been completed.)
3. The schedule and logistics for backfilling of both the 107-D5 and discovery site is at discretion of DOE-RL and ERC.



NOTES:
1. VERTICAL DATUM: NGVD29
2. SIDE SLOPE IS SHOWN 1:1


LEGEND

- Dorian and Richards Sample Hole Location
- 10.68M [35 FT] Deep Standpipes



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
DOE FIELD OFFICE, RICHLAND
HANFORD ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM

100 D/DR AREA
100 AREA REMEDIAL DESIGN
116-DR-9 SAMPLE HOLE LOCATIONS




VERTICAL SCALE EXAGGERATION: 4X

SECTION A

NOTES:

1. VERTICAL DATUM: NGVD29
2. SIDE SLOPE IS SHOWN 1:1
3. REFERENCE HANFORD DWG H-1-8630-DR, RETENTION BASIN ALTERATIONS AND REPAIRS

CH_17ERC.DWG



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
DOE FIELD OFFICE, RICHLAND
HANFORD ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM

100 D/DR AREA
100 AREA REMEDIAL DESIGN
107-D5 SUBDRAINAGE SYSTEM - SECTION A

Comparision of RA/WD Budgets / Tons for 3 Year Period

FY96 MYWP	FY96	FY97	FY98	Total
Tons	56,770	334,092	327,282	718,144
Budget	\$ 46,470	\$ 51,357	\$ 37,277	\$ 135,104
Actual				
Tons	35,778	442,411	613,300	1,091,489
Budget	\$ 42,873	\$ 38,047	\$ 45,685	\$ 126,605

To-Go Spread of Tons / Dollars Based on Attached Schedule

	Thru FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	Total
100 BC	558,010	64,180	78,845	46,329				747,364
100 DR	428,482	72,494	57,163					558,139
100 HR	-	139,722	276,143	103,959				519,824
300-FF-1	122,792	234,000	4,884					361,676
100 N			14,977	89,151	116,928	17,576		238,632
100 FR			89,573	316,543	312,804	156,765	27,490	903,175
100 KR						331,965	331,964	663,929
Total	1,109,284	510,396	521,585	555,982	429,732	506,306	359,454	3,992,739
Funding Basis	\$ 126,605	\$ 60,600	\$ 490,205					

Activity Description	Dur	Early Start	Early Finish	Tons to ERDF	Fiscal Year					
					FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
100-BC Remediation										
100-BC Existing Contract	372	01OCT97	26MAR99	302,895	20% Plumes 116-B-11/B-1 would 41,000 tons/63 day					
100-BC Small Sites	126	30NOV98*	28MAY99	16,770						
TPA Milestone M-16-08B	0		31JAN99*	0	◆ M-16-08B Complete 15 Waste Sites & Pipelines					
100-BC Pipelines	428	01JUN99*	08FEB01	100,000						
100-BC Remaining Sites	70	09FEB01	18MAY01	29,589						
100-DR Remediation										
100-DR Existing Contract	647	01OCT97	28APR00	316,574						
100-DR Small Sites & South Pipelines	188	01JUL99*	31MAR00	12,720						
TPA Milestone M-16-07B	0		30SEP99*	0	◆ M-15-07B Complete 15 Sites and Pipelines					
100-DR Remaining Sites	95	01MAY00	14SEP00	48,706						
300-FF-1 Remediation										
300-FF-1 Remediation	647	01OCT97	28APR00	331,184						
TPA Milestone M-16-03C	0		31AUG98*	0						
TPA Milestone M-16-03D	0		31MAY99*	0	◆ M-16-03D Complete Remediation of 300-FF-1 Sites					
100-HR Remediation										
TPA Milestone M-16-26A	0	30SEP98*		0	◆ M-16-26A Initiate RA in the 100-HR-1 OU					
100-HR Procurement/Mob	124	01OCT98*	31MAR99	0						
100-HR Remediation	425	01APR99*	05DEC00	467,572	20% plumes would add 104,000 tons/140 days					
TPA Milestone M-16-26B	0		31OCT00*	0	◆ M-16-26B Complete Remediation 37 Sites BC/DR/HR					
100-HR Backfill	150	06DEC00	10JUL01	0						
100-HR Remaining Sites	100	06DEC00	27APR01	52,251						
100-NR Remediation										
100-NR Cribs Design	214	01OCT98*	09AUG99	0						
100-NR Remediation	723	05JUL00*	13MAY03	238,632						
100-FR Remediation										
100-FR Procurement/Mob	294	01APR99*	31MAY00	0						
100-FR Remediation	796	01JUN00*	25JUL03	852,267	20% plumes would add 181,000 tons/245 days					
100-FR Backfill	200	28JUL03	11MAY04	0						

Project Start 01OCT97
Project Finish 12JUL05
Data Date 01OCT97
Run Date 22APR98

Early Bar
Progress Bar
Critical Activity

R60M


Sheet 1 of 2

RA schedule based on 60 M funding
Tons per FY

Activity Description	Dur	Early Start	Early Finish	Tons to ERDF						
					FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
100-FR Remaining Sites	100	28JUL03	17DEC03	50,908						
100-KR Remediation										
524100-KR Near River Remediation	524	01OCT02*	26OCT04	687,545				20% plumes would add 145,000 tons/192 days		
100-KR Backfill	180	27OCT04	12JUL05	0						
100-KR Near Basin Sites	115	27OCT04	11APR05	33,150						
100-KR Remaining Sites	40	12APR05	06JUN05	4,893						
100 Area Assessment & Design										
100 Area Assessment	1,007	01OCT97	28SEP01	0						
TPA Milestone M-15-00A	0		31DEC99*	0			◆M-15-00A Complete 100 Area Pre-ROD Investigation			
200 Area Assessment										
200 Area Assessment	1,511	01OCT97	30SEP03	0						
300-FF-2 Assessment										
300-FF-2 Assessment	459	01OCT97	30JUL99	0						
TPA Milestone M-15-23B	0		31JUL99*	0			◆M-15-23B Submit 300-FF-2 FS/PP for Review			
TPA Milestone M-15-00B	0		31DEC99*	0			◆M-15-00B Complete 300 Area Pre-ROD Investigation			
ERDF Expansion										
ERDF Expansion	1,764	01OCT97	30SEP04	0						
ERDF Transportation & OPS										
ERDF Transportation & OPS	1,764	01OCT97	30SEP04	0						
Program Planning										
TPA Milestone M-16-00F	0		31DEC01*	0					◆M-16-00F Establish Date to Complete all 100 RA	
TPA Milestone M-16-03A	0		30JUN02*	0					◆M-16-03A Establish Date to Complete all 300 RA	
Row	Group Name									
1	BC RA				64180	78845	46329			
2	DR RA				72494	57163				
3	HR RA				139722	276143	103959			
4	300-FF-1				234000	4884				
5	100-N RA					14977	89151	116928	17576	
6	FR RA					89573	316543	312804	156765	27490
7	KR RA								331964	331964*
8	100 A/D									
9	200 Asse									
10	300-FF-2									
11	ERDF Exp									
12	ERDF OPS									
13	Total				510395	521585	555982	429732	506304	359454*
					FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04

200 Area Implementation Plan Schedule

Activity ID	Activity description	Rem Dur	% comp
DOCUMENT PREPARATION			
0301	FINAL EDITING	5	0
0302	DOCUMENT COMPILATION/DUPLICATION	5	0
0303	AUTHOR/QUALITY REVIEW	10	0
0304	INCORPORATE/PRODUCE/DUPL.	15	0
REVIEW PROCESS			
000101	TEAM REVIEW OF 200 AREA IP	10	0
000102	INCORPORATE TEAM COMMENTS, PREP INTERNAL DRAFT	10	0
000110	ERC REVIEW OF 200 AREA IP INTERNAL DRAFT	10	0
000120	INCORPORATE ERC COMMENTS, PREP DECISIONAL DRAFT	15	0
000130	TRANSMIT DEC. DRAFT 200 AREA IP FOR DOE REVIEW	5	0
000140	DOE REVIEW OF 200 AREA IP, DECISIONAL DRAFT	10	0
000150	INCORPORATE DOE COMMENTS, PREP DRAFT A	10	0
000160	TRANSMIT DRAFT A 200 AREA IP TO DOE	4	0
000170	DOE TRANSMITS DRAFT A 200 AREA IP TO REGULATORS	3	0
000175	****TPA MILESTONE M-13-18****	0	0
000220	REGULATOR REVIEW DRAFT A	15	0
000230	INCORPORATE REGULATOR COMMENTS & PREP. REV 0	15	0
000240	TRANSMIT REV 0 TO DOE	5	0
000250	DOE ISSUES REV 0 TO REGULATORS FOR PUBLIC REVIEW	5	0
000260	PUBLIC REVIEW	29	0
000270	INCORPORATE COMMENTS & ISSUE REV 1	15	0



**Maximum Concentrations of Chemical and Radiological Analytes Detected at the 216-B-2-2
Characterization Borehole: Preliminary Results**

Analytes	Maximum Concentration		MTCA B Soil ¹	Background Soil ²
	Result	Depth (ft bgs)		
Target Volatile Organics (ug/kg)				
Acetone	22 B (detected in lab blank)	251.5 - 254	8,000	
Butanol, 1-	Not Detected		160,000	
Butanone, 2- (MEK)	Not Detected		48,000	
Carbon Tetrachloride	Not Detected		7.7	
Chloroform	Not Detected		164	
Diethyl Ether	Not Detected			
Methylene Chloride	3 J (estimated)	50 - 52.5		
Toluene	2 J (estimated)	150 - 152.5	16,000	
Trichloroethane, 1,1,1-	Not Detected		72,000	
Trichloroethane, 1,1,2-	Not Detected		77	
Non-Target Volatile Organics (ug/kg)				
Xylenes (total)	8	150 - 152.5	16,000	
Target Semivolatile Organics (ug/kg)				
Formaldehyde	Not Detected		33	
Kerosene	Not Detected			
Tributyl Phosphate	Not Detected			
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)	9200 J (Aroclor - 1260) (estimated)	8 - 10.5	0.13	
Naphthalene	Not Detected		3,200	
Non-Target Semivolatile Organics (ug/kg)				
Butylbenzylphthalate	240 J (estimated)	251.5 - 254	16,000	
Di-n-octylphthalate	52 J (estimated)	13 - 15.5		1
Target Inorganics (Metals) (mg/kg)				
Arsenic	3.7	75 - 77.5 100 - 102.5	1.7	6.5
Barium	89.4	8 - 10.5	5,600	132
Beryllium	0.7	8 - 10.5	0.23	1.5
Bismuth	37.1	8 - 10.5		NA
Boron	6.3 B (> instrument detec. limit, < quantitation limit)	8 - 10.5	7,200	NA
Cadmium	Not Detected		80	0.24 ³
Chromium	15.7	174 - 179	III: 1,600,000 VI: 8,000	18.5
Copper	14.9	13 - 15.5	2,960	22
Iron	25,000 J (estimated)	8 - 10.5		32,600
Lead	7.5	8 - 10.5	10	10.2
Manganese	356 J (estimated)	8 - 10.5	11,200	512
Mercury	0.15	13 - 15.5	24	0.33
Nickel	15	174 - 179	1,600	19.1
Potassium	1,490	174 - 179		2150
Selenium	0.5 B (> instrument detec. limit, < quantitation limit)	75 - 77.5	400	5 ⁴
Silver	0.86 B (> instrument detec. limit, < quantitation limit)	8 - 10.5	400	0.73

**Maximum Concentrations of Chemical and Radiological Analytes Detected at the 216-B-2-2
Characterization Borehole: Preliminary Results**

Analytes	Maximum Concentration		MTCA B Soil ¹	Background Soil ²
	Result	Depth (ft bgs)		
Tin	Not Detected		9,600	NA
Vanadium	70.2	8 - 10.5	560	85.1
Zinc	58.1 E (estimated)	8 - 10.5	4,800	67.8
Non-Target Inorganics (Metals) (ug/kg)				
Aluminum	7,090 J (estimated)	10.5 - 13		11,800
Antimony	5 BJ (> instrument detec. limit, < quantitation limit, estimated)	4 - 6.5	0.6	15.7 ³
Calcium	16,100	40 - 42.5		17,200
Cobalt	11.4	8 - 10.5		15.7
Magnesium	5,600	100 - 102.5		7,060
Sodium	671 BE (> instrument detec. limit, < quantitation limit, estimated)	10.5 - 13		690
General Chemistry (ug/kg)				
Acetate	Not Detected			
Ammonia	0.533	4 - 6.5	2,720,000	9.2
Cyanide	Not Detected		1,600	NA
Nitrate (Nitrogen in Nitrate)	35.8 J (estimated)	4 - 6.5	128,000	52
Nitrite (Nitrogen in Nitrite)	0.38	4 - 6.5	8,000	21 ⁴
Nitrate/Nitrite (NO ₂ /NO ₃)	32.4 J (estimated)	4 - 6.5		NA
Sulfate	43.3	8 - 10.5	250,000,000 (secondary MCL)	237
Target Radionuclides (pCi/g)				
Americium-241	0.589	8 - 10.5		NA
Cesium-137	100	13 - 15.5		1.1
Cobalt-60	Not Detected			Not Detected
Curium-244	Not Detected			NA
Europium-152	Not Detected			NA
Europium-154	1.29	8 - 10.5		0.03
Europium-155	Not Detected			0.05
Gross alpha	12.1	8 - 10.5		NA
Gross beta	13,900	13 - 15.5		23
Iodine-129	Not Detected			NA
Neptunium-237	Not Detected			NA
Plutonium-238	0.0213	20 - 22.5		0.004
Plutonium-239/240	4.97	13 - 15.5		0.025
Plutonium-241	Not Detected			NA
Selenium-79	Not Detected			NA
Strontium-90	4,710	13 - 15.5		0.18
Technetium-99	Not Detected			NA
Thorium-228	1.47	100 - 102.5		NA
Thorium-230	2.67 J (estimated)	8 - 10.5		NA
Thorium-232	1.03 J (estimated)	100 - 102.5		1.3
Uranium, Total Chemical	2.38 ug/g	13 - 15.5	4,800 (soluable salts)	NA
Uranium-233/234	Not Detected			1.1

**Maximum Concentrations of Chemical and Radiological Analytes Detected at the 216-B-2-2
Characterization Borehole: Preliminary Results**

Analytes	Maximum Concentration		MTCA B Soil ¹	Background Soil ²
	Result	Depth (ft bgs)		
Uranium-235	Not Detected			0.11
Uranium-235/236	Not Detected			NA
Uranium-238	0.653	251.1 – 254		1.1
Non-Target Radionuclides (pCi/g)				
Potassium-40	18.4	75 – 77.5		16.6
Radium-224	0.91	4 – 6.5		NA
Radium-226	0.762	4 – 6.5		8.2
Radium-228	0.917	4 – 6.5		NA

¹ Surface water (Water Quality Standards) not taken into account.

² The 90th percentile for the lognormal distribution of the Hanford Sitewide background data set.

³ All background values are below detection limits. Value given is the laboratory detection limit.

NA - not analyzed.

FROM THE DESK OF:

L. A. Dietz *LA Dietz*
 ERC Data Management
 372-9378, H0-20

TO: G. O. Gesell, H0-17

DATE: May 12, 1998

SUBJECT: ATTACHMENTS FOR THE UNIT MANAGERS MEETING MINUTES

This is to request that the attached WIDS General Summary Reports, Site Maps, Discovery Site Evaluation Checklists and Waste Site Reclassification Forms be included with the Unit Manager's Meeting Minutes. The attached documents have been prepared in accordance with the Maintenance of the Waste Information Data System (WIDS), Tri-Party Agreement Handbook Management Guidelines, Document Number RL-TPA-90-001, Management Procedure Number TPA-MP-14.

The attachment includes the supporting documentation for the following sites:

Operable Unit	WIDS Site Code	Change in Status
100-BC-1	126-B-4	Reclassified to Rejected
100-IU-1	600-140	Rejected
100-IU-1	600-141	Rejected
100-IU-1	600-142	Reclassified to Rejected
100-IU-1	600-143	Rejected
100-IU-1	600-144	Rejected
100-IU-2	600-135	Reclassified to Rejected
100-IU-2	600-189	Reclassified to Rejected
100-IU-2	600-199	Reclassified to Rejected
100-IU-3	600-154	Rejected
100-IU-3	600-229	Rejected
30-FF-1	300 FBP	Reclassified to No Action

Waste Information Data System General Summary Report

5/12/1998

Site Code:	126-B-4	Site Classification:	Accepted	Page 1
Site Names:	126-B-4, B Area Brine and Salt Dilution Pits, 126-B-4 Brine Pit. 184-B Salt Dissolving Pit and Brine Pump House			
Site Type:	Sump	Start Date:	1944	
Status:	Inactive	End Date:	1969	
Operable Unit:	100-BC-1	Coordinates:		
Hanford Area:	100B	(E)	564913.875	
		(N)	144901.297	
			Washington State Plane	
Site Description:	<p>The salt dissolving pits and brine pump pit were part of a single below-grade concrete structure that provided brine for the 184-D Powerhouse. The structure has been demolished and buried in situ. No evidence of the site remains at the surface. Before the structure was demolished, it was described as being partially backfilled with rubble with approximately 1900 liters (500 gallons) of water in the brine pump pit.</p> <p>The two salt dissolving pits each had inner dimensions of 4.3 meters (14 feet) long by 2.4 meters (8 feet) wide by 2.8 meters (9.25 feet) tall. They had a design high water line 2.4 meters (7.75 feet) from the pit bottom. An overflow slot connecting the two dissolving pits was located 0.3 meters (1 foot) above the high water line. The bottom of each pit was filled with a 12.7 centimeter (5 inch layer) of 1.3 to 2.6 centimeter (1/2 to 1 inch) gravel topped by a 17.8 centimeter (7 inch) layer of 0.3 to 0.6 centimeter (1/8 to 1/4 inch) gravel. The dissolving pits each had a 2.4 meter (8 foot) by 0.9 meter (3 feet) opening at the top for receiving salt. Each pit had a capacity of 23,600 kilograms (52,000 pounds) of salt.</p> <p>The brine pump pit is located adjacent to the two salt dissolving pits. The pit was 3.3 meters (10.67 feet) long by 2.2 meters (7.33 feet) wide by 2.1 meters (7 feet) deep. It held two pumps and associated piping (all brass) for the brine system. The floor of the pump pit sloped toward a 46 by 46 by 46 centimeter (18 by 18 by 18 inch) sump in a corner.</p>			
Location Description:	The site is located north of 184-B and just south of the railroad tracks.			
Process Description:	The brine was used to regenerate the zeolite ion exchange demineralizers that were part of the powerhouse water treatment system.			
Associated Structures:	The site is associated with the 184-B Power House.			
Site Comment:	<p>The site was demolished in situ March 1988. Prior to demolition, the pits were surveyed for radiological and nonradiological hazardous materials. The water analysis from the salt dissolving pits indicated no radioactivity above background, no reportable concentrations of heavy metals, and a sodium chloride concentration less than 1%. Holes were punched into the bottom of the pits to facilitate drainage. The pits were then partially backfilled with rubble which was compacted in place to minimize subsidence. The area was then leveled to grade with at least 0.9 meters (3 feet) of clean fill.</p> <p>Since the pits were used in the zeolite water treatment process, which was in use when the 184-B Powerhouse was in operation, it is presumed that the operating dates were from 1944 to 1969.</p>			
References:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. M. S. Kitts, 10/3/91, WIDS Site Addition, 126-B-4. 2. P. W Griffin, 10/5/88, 184-B Powerhouse, 184-D Powerhouse, 1717-F Maintenance Shop Facility Decommissioning Report, SD-DD-TI-033. 3. M-1600-B, Sht 5. 4. R. W. Carpenter, 05/18/94, 100-B Area Technical Baseline Report, WHC-SD-EN-TI-220. 5. DuPont, 11/12/43, POWER HOUSE - BUILDING NUMBERS 184 B-D-F & 284-W-E - SALT DISSOLVING PIT & BRINE PUMP HOUSE PLANS & SECTIONS ARRANGEMENT, W-70821. 			

Regulatory Information:

Programmatic Responsibility

Site Code: 126-B-4

Site Classification: Accepted

Page 2

DOE Program:	EM-40	Confirmed By Program:	Yes
DOE Division:	RPD		
Site Evaluation			
Solid Waste Management Unit:	Yes		
TPA Waste Management Unit Type:			
Permitting			
Part A Permit Application:	No	216/218 Permit:	No
Part B Permit Application:	No	NPDES:	No
Closure Plan:	No	State Waste Discharge Permit:	No
TSD Number:		Septic Permit:	No
Air Operating Permit:	No	Inert Landfill:	No
Air Operating Permit Number(s):			
Tri-Party Agreement			
Lead Regulatory Agency:	EPA		
Unit Category:	CPP		
TPA Appendix:			
Remediation and Closure			
Decision Document:	Interim Record of Decision, 100 Area Remaining Sites (Pending)		
Decision Document Status:	Proposed		
Remediation Design Group:	Remaining Sites		
Closure Document:			
Closure Type:			
Post Closure Requirements:			
	Residual Waste:		

Waste Information:

Type: Demolition and Inert Waste
Category: Nonhazardous/nonradioactive
Physical State: Solid
Description: The structure was demolished and buried in situ.
References: 1. P. W Griffin, 10/5/88, 184-B Powerhouse, 184-D Powerhouse, 1717-F Maintenance Shop Facility Decommissioning Report, SD-DD-TI-033.

Field Investigations

Type: Analytical Sampling
Begin Date: 1/13/88 Field Crew: V. D. Apple
End Date: 1/13/88


Site Code: 126-B-4

Site Classification: Accepted

Page 3

Purpose:	Sampling Prior to Demolition
Comment:	Four brine pit samples were submitted for analysis. Samples 1, 2, and 4 were from the 184-D Brine Pit and sample 3 was from the 184-B Brine Pit. The final report for the sample analysis mistakenly listed sample 3 as being from the 184-D Salt Brine Pit. From the original sample request and the liquid scintillation analysis report, it is clear that the third sample was from the 184-B Brine Pit.
Sample Number:	Lab Sample #3
Location Description:	A single sample was taken from the 184-B Brine Pit.
Result Summary:	The sample had a pH of 9, with all EP tox metals below analytical detection limits. The sample had a gross activity of <1.0 picocuries/gram.
References:	1. Hamilton, Maureen K. to V. D. Apple, 2/10/88, HEHF Letter: Waste Characterization, CO 12367.

WIDS Site-Specific Map: 126-B-4



ERC:jc 10/15/96 widmap and rev. 2 Database: 08-SEP-1997

DISCOVERY SITE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(To be completed by a member of ERC Data Management and included with the data package for a newly discovered potential waste management unit.)

Discovery Site ID Number: 186

Site Alias(es): 126-B-4, B Area Brine and Salt Dilution Pits, 126-B-4 Brine Pit.

Waste Management Unit Not a Waste Management Unit More Information Needed

1. Does the unit receive uncontaminated rainwater runoff only? y n

IF YES, CHECK "NOT A WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT" ABOVE AND STOP. IF NO, GO TO 2.

A check in any "YES" box below indicates the site is a waste management unit as defined in Section 3.1 of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and should be entered into WIDS. (Items 2 through 7 below correspond with the six waste management unit types found in the TPA definition.)

YES

NO

2. Complete items 2.a through 2.f below to determine if the unit is a solid waste management unit (SWMU) as specified under Section 3004(u) of RCRA.

2.a. Is the material at the unit a waste? (i.e., a regulated waste or a discarded material, including garbage, refuse, sludge, construction/demolition debris, industrial/sanitary wastewater or other discarded solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gas) y n

IF NO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF YES, GO TO 2.b.

2.b. Is the waste from historical residential activities? (i.e., not from industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, or community activities) y n

2.c. Is the unit an industrial wastewater point discharge permitted under the Clean Water Act? (i.e., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) y n

2.d. Does the waste consist ONLY of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act? y n

A YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS INDICATES THE SITE IS NOT A SWMU. IF SO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF ALL ARE NO, GO TO 2.e.

2.e. Was the waste placed in a discernable unit? (i.e., a landfill, surface impoundment, land treatment unit, waste pile, tank, container storage area, incinerator, injection well, wastewater treatment unit, waste recycling unit, or other physical, chemical, or biological treatment unit) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES AND GO TO 3. IF NO, GO TO 2.f.

<p>2.f. Is the unit the result of routine and systematic discharges? (i.e., areas receiving small but steady discharges over time from systematic human activity, such as from loading/unloading operations, solvent washing, industrial process sewer systems, etc.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">y <input type="radio"/> n <input type="radio"/></p> <p>IF YES, CHECK YES. IF NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 3.</p>	
<p>3. Is the unit a waste disposal unit? (Complete items 3.a and 3.b below)</p>	<p>YES NO</p> <p><input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>3.a. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the disposal of dangerous or mixed waste?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>	
<p>3.b. Have hazardous wastes or substances been disposed of in a burial ground, pit, pond, ditch, crib, trench, french drain, or land surface that is not subject to regulation as a RCRA disposal unit and may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste disposal units, pre-RCRA units)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p> <p>IF EITHER IS YES, CHECK YES. IF BOTH ARE NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 4.</p>	
<p>4. Is the unit an unplanned release that has not been adequately cleaned up and represents a potential threat to human health or the environment? (i.e., releases above CERCLA reportable quantities defined in 40 CFR 302.4; other hazardous substance releases, including petroleum, that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact)</p>	<p>YES NO</p> <p><input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>5. Is the unit an inactive, contaminated structure?</p>	<p>YES NO</p> <p><input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>6. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the treatment or storage of dangerous or mixed waste?</p>	<p>YES NO</p> <p><input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>7. Is the unit another type of storage unit that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste storage unit)</p>	<p>YES NO</p> <p><input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>

Comments:

Jeffrey P. Deegan
 ERC Data Management Investigator

1/7/97
 Date

Keith Schuch
 Regulatory Compliance Concurrence

1/7/97
 Date

DISCOVERY SITE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(To be completed by a member of ERC Data Management and included with the data package for a newly discovered potential waste management unit.)

Discovery Site ID Number: 186

Site Alias(es): 126-B-4, B Area Brine and Salt Dilution Pits, 126-B-4 Brine Pit. 184-B Salt Dissolving Pit and Brine Pump House

Waste Management Unit	Not a Waste Management Unit	More Information Needed
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. Does the unit receive uncontaminated rainwater runoff only? y n

IF YES, CHECK "NOT A WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT" ABOVE AND STOP. IF NO, GO TO 2.

A check in any "YES" box below indicates the site is a waste management unit as defined in Section 3.1 of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and should be entered into WIDS. (Items 2 through 7 below correspond with the six waste management unit types found in the TPA definition.)

YES	NO
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Complete items 2.a through 2.f below to determine if the unit is a solid waste management unit (SWMU) as specified under Section 3004(u) of RCRA.

2.a. Is the material at the unit a waste? (i.e., a regulated waste or a discarded material, including garbage, refuse, sludge, construction/demolition debris, industrial/sanitary wastewater or other discarded solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gas) y n

IF NO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF YES, GO TO 2.b.

2.b. Is the waste from historical residential activities? (i.e., not from industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, or community activities) y n

2.c. Is the unit an industrial wastewater point discharge permitted under the Clean Water Act? (i.e., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) y n

2.d. Does the waste consist ONLY of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act? y n

A YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS INDICATES THE SITE IS NOT A SWMU. IF SO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF ALL ARE NO,

2.e. Was the waste placed in a discernable unit? (i.e., a landfill, surface impoundment, land treatment unit, waste pile, tank, container storage area, incinerator, injection well, wastewater treatment unit, waste recycling unit, or other physical, chemical, or biological treatment unit) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES AND GO TO 3. IF NO, GO TO 2.f.

2.f. Is the unit the result of routine and systematic discharges? (i.e., areas receiving small but steady discharges over time from systematic human activity, such as from loading/unloading operations, solvent washing, industrial process sewer systems, etc.) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES. IF NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 3.

<p>3. Is the unit a waste disposal unit? (Complete items 3.a and 3.b below)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>3.a. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the disposal of dangerous or mixed waste? y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>	
<p>3.b. Have hazardous wastes or substances been disposed of in a burial ground, pit, pond, ditch, crib, trench, french drain, or land surface that is not subject to regulation as a RCRA disposal unit and may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste disposal units, pre-RCRA units) y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/> IF EITHER IS YES, CHECK YES. IF BOTH ARE NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 4.</p>	
<p>4. Is the unit an unplanned release that has not been adequately cleaned up and represents a potential threat to human health or the environment? (i.e., releases above CERCLA reportable quantities defined in 40 CFR 302.4; other hazardous substance releases, including petroleum, that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>5. Is the unit an inactive, contaminated structure?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>6. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the treatment or storage of dangerous or mixed waste?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>7. Is the unit another type of storage unit that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste storage unit)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>

Comments:

 ERC Data Management Investigator Date

 Regulatory Compliance Concurrence Date

FOR SITES REQUIRING DOE-RL AND REGULATOR REVIEW PER SECTION 5.2 OF RL-TPA-90-0001

 DOE-RL Concurrence Date

 Lead Regulatory Agency Concurrence Date

Waste Site Reclassification Form

<p><u>Date Submitted:</u> August 15, 1997</p> <p><u>Originator:</u> Clarence E. Corriveau, Jr., MSIN H0-17</p> <p><u>Phone:</u> 509-372-9565</p>	<p><u>Operable Unit(s):</u> 100-BC-1</p> <p><u>Waste Site ID:</u> 126-B-4, B Area Brine and Salt Dilution Pits</p> <p><u>Type of Reclassification Action:</u></p> <p>Rejected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Closed Out <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No Action <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Control Number:</u> 97-008</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------

This form documents agreement among the parties listed below authorizing classification of the subject unit as rejected, closed out, or no action and authorizing backfill of the site, if appropriate. Final removal from the NPL of no action or closed-out sites will occur at a future date.

Description of current waste site condition:

(Summarize status of investigation/remediation of the waste sites.)

Two salt-dissolving pits were part of a single below-grade concrete structure that provided sodium chloride brine used to regenerate the zeolite ion exchange demineralizers that were part of the water treatment system for the 184-B Power House. The facility was demolished in place during March 1988. Both pits were sampled for radiation and EP toxic metals. Samples showed no reportable concentrations of heavy metals and no radiation above background. Materials in the pits before cleaning contained less than 1 percent sodium chloride. Northwest Environmental Services, Inc., removed all waste and salt cake from the pits and certified them as clean before in situ demolition and final grading. The site currently appears as a cobble-covered area located north of the former location of the 184-B Power House and south of the railroad tracks.

Basis for reclassification:

(For closeout, reference supporting documentation, as listed in Table 2-3.)

Site is a Waste Management Unit but not a waste disposal unit. No other regulatory authorities apply. Sodium chloride in the form and concentration which may exist on site is not a hazardous waste, is nondangerous and nonradioactive.

<p>NA Werdel DOE Project Manager</p>	<p><i>Nancy Werdel</i> Signature</p>	<p>9/9/97 Date</p>
<p><i>N/A</i> Ecology Project Manager</p>	<p><i>[Signature]</i> Signature</p>	<p><i>[Date]</i> Date</p>
<p><i>[Signature]</i> EPA Project Manager</p>	<p><i>[Signature]</i> Signature</p>	<p>9-9-97 Date</p>

Site Code: 600-140

Site Classification: Rejected

Page 2

Unit Category: CPP

TPA Appendix:

Remediation and Closure

Decision Document:

Decision Document Status:

Remediation Design Group:

Closure Document:

Closure Type:

Post Closure Requirements:

Residual Waste:

Waste Information:

Type: Misc. Trash and Debris

Category: Nonregulated Waste

Physical State: Solid

Waste Obscured: Soil Overburden

Description: The sacks were constructed of natural fibers.

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

Field Investigations

Type: GPS Surveys

Begin Date: 1/11/95

Field Crew: K.A. Prosser, R.P. Prosser, B.M. Mar

End Date: 2/2/95

Data Repository: HGIS

Purpose: Mapping

Job Number: 3

Type: Post-Processed Kinematic

References:

Type: Site Walkdown

Begin Date: 6/18/97

Field Crew: T. F. Johnson

End Date: 6/18/97

Purpose: Initial Review

Site Cover:

Site Accessible: Yes

Site Found: Yes

Soil Discoloration: No

Debris Visible: Yes

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

DISCOVERY SITE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(To be completed by a member of ERC Data Management and included with the data package for a newly discovered potential waste management unit.)

Discovery Site ID Number: 1912

Site Alias(es): 600-140, Gunny Sacks south of H-70 Antiaircraft Site

Waste Management Unit	Not a Waste Management Unit	More Information Needed
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. Does the unit receive uncontaminated rainwater runoff only? y n

IF YES, CHECK "NOT A WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT" ABOVE AND STOP. IF NO, GO TO 2.

<p>A check in any "YES" box below indicates the site is a waste management unit as defined in Section 3.1 of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and should be entered into WIDS. (Items 2 through 7 below correspond with the six waste management unit types found in the TPA definition.)</p>	<p>YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/></p>	<p>NO</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
--	--	--

2. Complete items 2.a through 2.f below to determine if the unit is a solid waste management unit (SWMU) as specified under Section 3004(u) of RCRA.

2.a. Is the material at the unit a waste? (i.e., a regulated waste or a discarded material, including garbage, refuse, sludge, construction/demolition debris, industrial/sanitary wastewater or other discarded solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gas) y n

IF NO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF YES, GO TO 2.b.

2.b. Is the waste from historical residential activities? (i.e., not from industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, or community activities) y n

2.c. Is the unit an industrial wastewater point discharge permitted under the Clean Water Act? (i.e., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) y n

2.d. Does the waste consist ONLY of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act? y n

A YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS INDICATES THE SITE IS NOT A SWMU. IF SO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF ALL ARE NO,

2.e. Was the waste placed in a discernable unit? (i.e., a landfill, surface impoundment, land treatment unit, waste pile, tank, container storage area, incinerator, injection well, wastewater treatment unit, waste recycling unit, or other physical, chemical, or biological treatment unit) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES AND GO TO 3. IF NO, GO TO 2.f.

2.f. Is the unit the result of routine and systematic discharges? (i.e., areas receiving small but steady discharges over time from systematic human activity, such as from loading/unloading operations, solvent washing, industrial process sewer systems, etc.) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES. IF NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 3.

<p>3. Is the unit a waste disposal unit? (Complete items 3.a and 3.b below)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>3.a. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the disposal of dangerous or mixed waste? y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>	
<p>3.b. Have hazardous wastes or substances been disposed of in a burial ground, pit, pond, ditch, crib, trench, french drain, or land surface that is not subject to regulation as a RCRA disposal unit and may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste disposal units, pre-RCRA units) y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/> IF EITHER IS YES, CHECK YES. IF BOTH ARE NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 4.</p>	
<p>4. Is the unit an unplanned release that has not been adequately cleaned up and represents a potential threat to human health or the environment? (i.e., releases above CERCLA reportable quantities defined in 40 CFR 302.4; other hazardous substance releases, including petroleum, that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>5. Is the unit an inactive, contaminated structure?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>6. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the treatment or storage of dangerous or mixed waste?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>7. Is the unit another type of storage unit that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste storage unit)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>

Comments:

Timothy D. Johnson
ERC Data Management Investigator

6/25/97
Date

Joseph P. Zoric
Regulatory Compliance Concurrence

6/25/97
Date

FOR SITES REQUIRING DOE-RL AND REGULATOR REVIEW PER SECTION 5.2 OF RL-TPA-90-0001

[Signature]
DOE-RL Concurrence

1/26/98
Date

[Signature]
Lead Regulatory Agency Concurrence

1-27-98
Date

Waste Information Data System General Summary Report

5/7/1998

Site Code: 600-141	Site Classification: Rejected	Page 1
Site Names: 600-141, Barrels South of H-70 Antiaircraft Site		
Site Type: Dumping Area		Start Date:
Status: Inactive		End Date:
Operable Unit: 100-IU-1		Coordinates:
Hanford Area: 600		(E) 557277
		(N) 141247.172
		Washington State Plane
Site Description:	The site is two empty containers. One container is an empty 113 liter (30 gallon) drum painted army green and yellow. The other appears to be an empty garbage can. Both containers are partially buried. No labels or markings were visible on the containers that would identify what they were used for.	
Location Description:	The site is located in the northwest portion of the Hanford Site, north of highway SR24, west of highway SR240 and approximately 1.9 kilometers (1.2 miles) west of gate 122 from highway SR240 and approximately 240 meters (800 feet) south of the former antiaircraft site H-70 (Site Code 600-41).	
Access Requirements:	Key for gate 121 or 122.	
References:	1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.	

Site Hazards:

Hazards:	Status:	Date:
Biological Hazards	Discovered	6/18/97
References:		

Regulatory Information:

Programmatic Responsibility			
DOE Program: EM-70		Confirmed By Program:	Yes
DOE Division: SID			
Site Evaluation			
Solid Waste Management Unit:	No		
TPA Waste Management Unit Type:			
Permitting			
Part A Permit Application:	No	216/218 Permit:	No
Part B Permit Application:	No	NPDES:	No
Closure Plan:	No	State Waste Discharge Permit:	No
TSD Number:		Septic Permit:	No
Air Operating Permit:	No	Inert Landfill:	No
Air Operating Permit Number(s):			
Tri-Party Agreement			
Lead Regulatory Agency:	EPA		
Unit Category:	CPP		

Site Code: 600-141

Site Classification: Rejected

Page 2

TPA Appendix:**Remediation and Closure****Decision Document:****Decision Document Status:****Remediation Design Group:****Closure Document:****Closure Type:****Post Closure Requirements:****Residual Waste:****Waste Information:****Type:** Barrels/Drums/Buckets/Cans**Category:** Nondangerous/nonradioactive**Physical State:** Solid**Description:** An empty steel drum and a garbage can were found at the site.**References:** 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.**Field Investigations****Type:** GPS Surveys**Begin Date:** 1/11/95**Field Crew:** K.A. Prosser, R.P. Prosser, B.M. Mar**End Date:** 2/2/95**Data Repository:** HGIS**Purpose:** Mapping**Job Number:** 3**Type:** Post-Processed Kinematic**References:****Type:** Site Walkdown**Begin Date:** 6/18/97**Field Crew:** T. F. Johnson**End Date:** 6/18/97**Purpose:** Initial Review**Site Cover:****Site Accessible:** Yes**Site Found:** Yes**Soil Discoloration:** No**Debris Visible:** No**References:** 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

DISCOVERY SITE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(To be completed by a member of ERC Data Management and included with the data package for a newly discovered potential waste management unit.)

Discovery Site ID Number: 1913

Site Alias(es): 600-141, Barrels South of H-70 Antiaircraft Site

Waste Management Unit	Not a Waste Management Unit	More Information Needed
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. Does the unit receive uncontaminated rainwater runoff only? y n

IF YES, CHECK "NOT A WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT" ABOVE AND STOP. IF NO, GO TO 2.

A check in any "YES" box below indicates the site is a waste management unit as defined in Section 3.1 of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and should be entered into WIDS. (Items 2 through 7 below correspond with the six waste management unit types found in the TPA definition.)

YES **NO**

2. Complete items 2.a through 2.f below to determine if the unit is a solid waste management unit (SWMU) as specified under Section 3004(u) of RCRA.

2.a. Is the material at the unit a waste? (i.e., a regulated waste or a discarded material, including garbage, refuse, sludge, construction/demolition debris, industrial/sanitary wastewater or other discarded solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gas) y n

IF NO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF YES, GO TO 2.b.

2.b. Is the waste from historical residential activities? (i.e., not from industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, or community activities) y n

2.c. Is the unit an industrial wastewater point discharge permitted under the Clean Water Act? (i.e., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) y n

2.d. Does the waste consist ONLY of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act? y n

A YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS INDICATES THE SITE IS NOT A SWMU. IF SO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF ALL ARE NO,

2.e. Was the waste placed in a discernable unit? (i.e., a landfill, surface impoundment, land treatment unit, waste pile, tank, container storage area, incinerator, injection well, wastewater treatment unit, waste recycling unit, or other physical, chemical, or biological treatment unit) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES AND GO TO 3. IF NO, GO TO 2.f.

2.f. Is the unit the result of routine and systematic discharges? (i.e., areas receiving small but steady discharges over time from systematic human activity, such as from loading/unloading operations, solvent washing, industrial process sewer systems, etc.) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES. IF NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 3.

<p>3. Is the unit a waste disposal unit? (Complete items 3.a and 3.b below)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>3.a. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the disposal of dangerous or mixed waste? y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>	
<p>3.b. Have hazardous wastes or substances been disposed of in a burial ground, pit, pond, ditch, crib, trench, french drain, or land surface that is not subject to regulation as a RCRA disposal unit and may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste disposal units, pre-RCRA units) y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/> IF EITHER IS YES, CHECK YES. IF BOTH ARE NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 4.</p>	
<p>4. Is the unit an unplanned release that has not been adequately cleaned up and represents a potential threat to human health or the environment? (i.e., releases above CERCLA reportable quantities defined in 40 CFR 302.4; other hazardous substance releases, including petroleum, that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>5. Is the unit an inactive, contaminated structure?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>6. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the treatment or storage of dangerous or mixed waste?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>7. Is the unit another type of storage unit that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste storage unit)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>

Comments:

Timothy D. Johnson
ERC Data Management Investigator

6/25/97
Date

J.P. Zovic
Regulatory Compliance Concurrence

6/25/97
Date

FOR SITES REQUIRING DOE-RL AND REGULATOR REVIEW PER SECTION 5.2 OF RL-TPA-90-0001

[Signature]
DOE-RL Concurrence
[Signature]
Lead Regulatory Agency Concurrence

1/26/98
Date
1-27-98
Date

Waste Information Data System General Summary Report

5/7/1998

Site Code: 600-142	Site Classification: Accepted	Page 1
Site Names: 600-142, Car Body at McGee Ranch Fish Farm		
Site Type: Dumping Area	Start Date:	
Status: Inactive	End Date:	
Operable Unit: 100-IU-1	Coordinates:	
Hanford Area: 600	(E) 558368.188	
	(N) 139652.203	
	Washington State Plane	
Site Description:	The site is an abandoned automobile. The car is resting upside down on its roof and has been partially crushed. The engine, transmission, differential, and radiator remain in the car. No battery was found, the radiator appeared empty and no visible leaks of automotive fluids were observed.	
Location Description:	The site is located in the northwest portion of the Hanford Site, north of highway SR24, west of highway SR240 and approximately 1.1 kilometers (0.7 miles) west driving from gate 121 on highway SR240. The car is located at the McGee Ranch Fish Farm site, approximately 140 meters (450 feet) north of the McGee Well.	
Access Comments:	A key for gates 121 and 122 is needed for access to this site.	
References:	1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.	

Site Hazards:

Hazards:	Status:	Date:
Biological Hazards	Discovered	6/18/97
Dust	Discovered	1/23/98
Fire Hazards	Discovered	1/23/98
Off-Road Vehicle Use	Discovered	1/23/98
Remote Work Area	Discovered	1/23/98
References:	1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.	

Regulatory Information:

Programmatic Responsibility			
DOE Program: EM-70		Confirmed By Program:	Yes
DOE Division: SID			
Site Evaluation			
Solid Waste Management Unit:			
TPA Waste Management Unit Type:	Inactive contaminated structure		
Permitting			
Part A Permit Application:	No	216/218 Permit:	No
Part B Permit Application:	No	NPDES:	No
Closure Plan:	No	State Waste Discharge Permit:	No
TSD Number:		Septic Permit:	No
Air Operating Permit:	No	Inert Landfill:	No
Air Operating Permit Number(s):			

Site Code: 600-142

Site Classification: Accepted

Page 2

Tri-Party Agreement

Lead Regulatory Agency: EPA

Unit Category: CPP

TPA Appendix:

Remediation and Closure

Decision Document:

Decision Document Status:

Remediation Design Group:

Closure Document:

Closure Type:

Post Closure Requirements:

Residual Waste:**Waste Information:**

Type: Equipment

Category: Nondangerous/nonradioactive

Physical State: Solid

Description: The auto body is constructed of sheet metal and a steel frame.

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

Type: Oil

Category: Hazardous/Dangerous

Physical State: Liquid

Waste Obscured: Under Another Facility/Structure

Description: The engine, transmission, and differential may contain oil or oil residue.

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

Field Investigations

Type: GPS Surveys

Begin Date: 1/11/95

Field Crew: K.A. Prosser, R.P. Prosser, B.M. Mar

End Date: 2/2/95

Data Repository: HGIS

Purpose: Mapping

Job Number: 3

Type: Post-Processed Kinematic

References:

Type: Site Walkdown

Begin Date: 6/18/97

Field Crew: T. F. Johnson

End Date: 6/18/97

Site Code: 600-142**Site Classification:** Accepted

Page 3

Purpose: Initial Review**Site Cover:****Site Accessible:** Yes**Site Found:** Yes**Soil Discoloration:** No**Debris Visible:** No**References:** 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

Waste Site Reclassification Form

Date Submitted: 1/26/98 Originator: C. E. Corriveau Phone: 2-9565	Operable Unit(s): 100-IU-1 Waste Site ID: 600-142 Type of Reclassification Action: Rejected <input checked="" type="radio"/> Closed-Out <input type="radio"/> No Action <input type="radio"/>	Control Number: 98-010
--	---	-------------------------------




This form documents agreement among the parties listed below authorizing classification of the subject unit as rejected, closed-out, or no action and authorizing backfill of the site, if appropriate. Final removal from the NPL of no action or closed-out sites will occur at a future date.

Description of current waste site condition:

The site is an abandoned car body. The car is resting upside down on its roof and has been partially crushed. The engine, transmission, differential, and radiator remain in the car. No battery was found, the radiator appeared empty and no visible leaks of automotive fluids were observed at the site.

Basis for reclassification:

The site does not contain any CERCLA hazardous substance(s).

Glenn Goldberg DOE Project Manager	 Signature	2/6/98 Date
W/A Ecology Project Manager	 Signature	Date
 EPA Project Manager	 Signature	2-9-98 Date

DISCOVERY SITE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(To be completed by a member of ERC Data Management and included with the data package for a newly discovered potential waste management unit.)

Discovery Site ID Number: 1914

Site Alias(es): 600-142, Car body at McGee Ranch Fish Farm

Waste Management Unit	Not a Waste Management Unit	More Information Needed
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. Does the unit receive uncontaminated rainwater runoff only? y n

IF YES, CHECK "NOT A WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT" ABOVE AND STOP. IF NO, GO TO 2.

A check in any "YES" box below indicates the site is a waste management unit as defined in Section 3.1 of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and should be entered into WIDS. (Items 2 through 7 below correspond with the six waste management unit types found in the TPA definition.)

YES	NO
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

2. Complete items 2.a through 2.f below to determine if the unit is a solid waste management unit (SWMU) as specified under Section 3004(u) of RCRA.

2.a. Is the material at the unit a waste? (i.e., a regulated waste or a discarded material, including garbage, refuse, sludge, construction/demolition debris, industrial/sanitary wastewater or other discarded solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gas) y n

IF NO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF YES, GO TO 2.b.

2.b. Is the waste from historical residential activities? (i.e., not from industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, or community activities) y n

2.c. Is the unit an industrial wastewater point discharge permitted under the Clean Water Act? (i.e., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) y n

2.d. Does the waste consist ONLY of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act? y n

A YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS INDICATES THE SITE IS NOT A SWMU. IF SO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF ALL ARE NO,

2.e. Was the waste placed in a discernable unit? (i.e., a landfill, surface impoundment, land treatment unit, waste pile, tank, container storage area, incinerator, injection well, wastewater treatment unit, waste recycling unit, or other physical, chemical, or biological treatment unit) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES AND GO TO 3. IF NO, GO TO 2.f.

2.f. Is the unit the result of routine and systematic discharges? (i.e., areas receiving small but steady discharges over time from systematic human activity, such as from loading/unloading operations, solvent washing, industrial process sewer systems, etc.) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES. IF NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 3.

<p>3. Is the unit a waste disposal unit? (Complete items 3.a and 3.b below)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>3.a. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the disposal of dangerous or mixed waste? y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>	
<p>3.b. Have hazardous wastes or substances been disposed of in a burial ground, pit, pond, ditch, crib, trench, french drain, or land surface that is not subject to regulation as a RCRA disposal unit and may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste disposal units, pre-RCRA units) y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/> IF EITHER IS YES, CHECK YES. IF BOTH ARE NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 4.</p>	
<p>4. Is the unit an unplanned release that has not been adequately cleaned up and represents a potential threat to human health or the environment? (i.e., releases above CERCLA reportable quantities defined in 40 CFR 302.4; other hazardous substance releases, including petroleum, that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>5. Is the unit an inactive, contaminated structure?</p>	<p>YES NO <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/></p>
<p>6. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the treatment or storage of dangerous or mixed waste?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>7. Is the unit another type of storage unit that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste storage unit)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>

Comments: The car may contain residual oil in the engine, transmission and differential.

Timothy D Johnson
ERC Data Management Investigator

6/25/97
Date

Joseph P. Zani
Regulatory Compliance Concurrence

6-25-97
Date

FOR SITES REQUIRING DOE-RL AND REGULATOR REVIEW PER SECTION 5.2 OF RL-TPA-90-0001

DOE-RL Concurrence

Date

Lead Regulatory Agency Concurrence

Date

Waste Information Data System General Summary Report

5/7/1998

Site Code: 600-143 **Site Classification:** Rejected Page 1

Site Names: 600-143, Car body at Ford Well

Site Type: Dumping Area

Start Date:

Status: Inactive

End Date:

Operable Unit: 100-IU-1

Coordinates:

Hanford Area: 600

(E) 555920.438

(N) 139638.281

Washington State Plane

Site Description: The site is a car body only. The engine, transmission, radiator, and battery have been removed. Several bullet holes were observed in the car body.

Location Description: The site is located in the northwest portion of the Hanford Site, north of highway SR24 and west of highway SR240. From gate 121 on SR 240 just north of the Yakma Barricade, drive west 0.8 kilometers (0.5 miles) to the T. Turn left and follow the main road south and then west for 3.2 kilometers (2.0 miles) to well site 699-49-111. Turn right, and drive north 1.1 kilometers (0.7 miles) to the site, just past the Ford Well site. The car body located approximately 180 feet (55 meters) north of the Ford artesian well.

Access Requirements: Key for gate 121 or 122.

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

Site Hazards:

Hazards:

Status:

Date:

Biological Hazards

Discovered

6/19/97

References:

Regulatory Information:

Programmatic Responsibility

DOE Program: EM-70

Confirmed By Program:

Yes

DOE Division: SID

Site Evaluation

Solid Waste Management Unit: No

TPA Waste Management Unit Type:

Permitting

Part A Permit Application: No

216/218 Permit:

No

Part B Permit Application: No

NPDES:

No

Closure Plan: No

State Waste Discharge Permit:

No

TSD Number:

Septic Permit:

No

Air Operating Permit: No

Inert Landfill:

No

Air Operating Permit Number(s):

Tri-Party Agreement

Lead Regulatory Agency: EPA

Site Code: 600-143

Site Classification: Rejected

Page 2

Unit Category: CPP

TPA Appendix:

Remediation and Closure

Decision Document:

Decision Document Status:

Remediation Design Group:

Closure Document:

Closure Type:

Post Closure Requirements:

Residual Waste:

Waste Information:

Type: Equipment

Category: Nondangerous/nonradioactive

Physical State: Solid

Description: The car body is constructed of sheet metal and a steel frame.

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

Field Investigations

Type: GPS Surveys

Begin Date: 1/11/95

Field Crew: K.A. Prosser, R.P. Prosser, B.M. Mar

End Date: 2/2/95

Data Repository: HGIS

Purpose: Mapping

Job Number: 3

Type: Post-Processed Kinematic

References:

Type: Site Walkdown

Begin Date: 6/19/97

Field Crew: T. F. Johnson

End Date: 6/19/97

Purpose: Initial Review

Site Cover:

Site Accessible: Yes

Site Found: Yes

Soil Discoloration: No

Debris Visible: No

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

DISCOVERY SITE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(To be completed by a member of ERC Data Management and included with the data package for a newly discovered potential waste management unit.)

Discovery Site ID Number: 1915

Site Alias(es): 600-143, Car body at Ford Well

Waste Management Unit	Not a Waste Management Unit	More Information Needed
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. Does the unit receive uncontaminated rainwater runoff only? y n

IF YES, CHECK "NOT A WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT" ABOVE AND STOP. IF NO, GO TO 2.

A check in any "YES" box below indicates the site is a waste management unit as defined in Section 3.1 of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and should be entered into WIDS. (Items 2 through 7 below correspond with the six waste management unit types found in the TPA definition.)

YES	NO
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

2. Complete items 2.a through 2.f below to determine if the unit is a solid waste management unit (SWMU) as specified under Section 3004(u) of RCRA.

2.a. Is the material at the unit a waste? (i.e., a regulated waste or a discarded material, including garbage, refuse, sludge, construction/demolition debris, industrial/sanitary wastewater or other discarded solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gas) y n

IF NO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF YES, GO TO 2.b.

2.b. Is the waste from historical residential activities? (i.e., not from industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, or community activities) y n

2.c. Is the unit an industrial wastewater point discharge permitted under the Clean Water Act? (i.e., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) y n

2.d. Does the waste consist ONLY of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act? y n

A YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS INDICATES THE SITE IS NOT A SWMU. IF SO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF ALL ARE NO,

2.e. Was the waste placed in a discernable unit? (i.e., a landfill, surface impoundment, land treatment unit, waste pile, tank, container storage area, incinerator, injection well, wastewater treatment unit, waste recycling unit, or other physical, chemical, or biological treatment unit) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES AND GO TO 3. IF NO, GO TO 2.f.

2.f. Is the unit the result of routine and systematic discharges? (i.e., areas receiving small but steady discharges over time from systematic human activity, such as from loading/unloading operations, solvent washing, industrial process sewer systems, etc.) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES. IF NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 3.

<p>3. Is the unit a waste disposal unit? (Complete items 3.a and 3.b below)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>3.a. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the disposal of dangerous or mixed waste? y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>	
<p>3.b. Have hazardous wastes or substances been disposed of in a burial ground, pit, pond, ditch, crib, trench, french drain, or land surface that is not subject to regulation as a RCRA disposal unit and may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste disposal units, pre-RCRA units) y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/> IF EITHER IS YES, CHECK YES. IF BOTH ARE NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 4.</p>	
<p>4. Is the unit an unplanned release that has not been adequately cleaned up and represents a potential threat to human health or the environment? (i.e., releases above CERCLA reportable quantities defined in 40 CFR 302.4; other hazardous substance releases, including petroleum, that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>5. Is the unit an inactive, contaminated structure?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>6. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the treatment or storage of dangerous or mixed waste?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>7. Is the unit another type of storage unit that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste storage unit)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>

Comments:

Timothy D. Johnson
 ERC Data Management Investigator

6/25/97
 Date

A. J. Zovic
 Regulatory Compliance Concurrence

6/25/97
 Date

FOR SITES REQUIRING DOE-RL AND REGULATOR REVIEW PER SECTION 5.2 OF RL-TPA-90-0001

[Signature]
 DOE-RL Concurrence

1/26/98
 Date

[Signature]
 Lead Regulatory Agency Concurrence

1-27-98
 Date

Waste Information Data System General Summary Report

5/7/1998

Site Code: 600-144	Site Classification: Rejected	Page 1
---------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------

Site Names: 600-144, Car Body near top of Umptanum Ridge**Site Type:** Dumping Area**Start Date:****Status:** Inactive**End Date:****Operable Unit:** 100-IU-1**Coordinates:****Hanford Area:** 600

(E) 556561.25

(N) 142043.391

Washington State Plane

Site Description: The site is a car body only. The engine, transmission, radiator and battery have been removed. Several bullet holes were observed in the car.

Location Description: The site is located in the northwest portion of the Hanford Site, north of highway SR24 and west of highway SR240 and approximately 2.9 kilometers (1.8 miles) west northwest of gate 122 from highway SR 240 and approximately 0.2 kilometers (1/8 mile) south of the crest of Umptanum Ridge, on the east flank, just west of the road that leads to the ridge crest

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

Regulatory Information:

Programmatic Responsibility

DOE Program: EM-70**Confirmed By Program:** Yes**DOE Division:** SID

Site Evaluation

Solid Waste Management Unit: No**TPA Waste Management Unit Type:**

Permitting

Part A Permit Application: No**216/218 Permit:** No**Part B Permit Application:** No**NPDES:** No**Closure Plan:** No**State Waste Discharge Permit:** No**TSD Number:****Septic Permit:** No**Air Operating Permit:** No**Inert Landfill:** No**Air Operating Permit Number(s):**

Tri-Party Agreement

Lead Regulatory Agency: EPA**Unit Category:** CPP**TPA Appendix:**

Remediation and Closure

Decision Document:**Decision Document Status:****Remediation Design Group:**

Site Code: 600-144

Site Classification: Rejected

Page 2

Closure Document:**Closure Type:****Post Closure Requirements:****Residual Waste:****Waste Information:****Type:** Equipment**Category:** Nondangerous/nonradioactive**Physical State:** Solid**Description:** The car body is constructed of sheet metal and a steel frame.**References:** 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.**Field Investigations****Type:** GPS Surveys**Begin Date:** 1/11/95**Field Crew:** K.A. Prosser, R.P. Prosser, B.M. Mar**End Date:** 2/2/95**Data Repository:** HGIS**Purpose:** Mapping**Job Number:** 3**Type:** Post-Processed Kinematic**References:****Type:** Site Walkdown**Begin Date:** 6/19/97**Field Crew:** T. F. Johnson**End Date:** 6/19/97**Purpose:** Initial Review**Site Cover:****Site Accessible:** Yes**Site Found:** Yes**Soil Discoloration:** No**Debris Visible:** No**References:** 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

DISCOVERY SITE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(To be completed by a member of ERC Data Management and included with the data package for a newly discovered potential waste management unit.)

Discovery Site ID Number: 1916

Site Alias(es): 600-144, Car Body near top of Umptanum Ridge, Car Body near Transite and Metal Debris Pile

Waste Management Unit	Not a Waste Management Unit	More Information Needed
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. Does the unit receive uncontaminated rainwater runoff only? y n

IF YES, CHECK "NOT A WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT" ABOVE AND STOP. IF NO, GO TO 2.

A check in any "YES" box below indicates the site is a waste management unit as defined in Section 3.1 of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and should be entered into WIDS. (Items 2 through 7 below correspond with the six waste management unit types found in the TPA definition.)

YES	NO
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

2. Complete items 2.a through 2.f below to determine if the unit is a solid waste management unit (SWMU) as specified under Section 3004(u) of RCRA.

2.a. Is the material at the unit a waste? (i.e., a regulated waste or a discarded material, including garbage, refuse, sludge, construction/demolition debris, industrial/sanitary wastewater or other discarded solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gas) y n

IF NO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF YES, GO TO 2.b.

2.b. Is the waste from historical residential activities? (i.e., not from industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, or community activities) y n

2.c. Is the unit an industrial wastewater point discharge permitted under the Clean Water Act? (i.e., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) y n

2.d. Does the waste consist ONLY of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act? y n

A YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS INDICATES THE SITE IS NOT A SWMU. IF SO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF ALL ARE NO,

2.e. Was the waste placed in a discernable unit? (i.e., a landfill, surface impoundment, land treatment unit, waste pile, tank, container storage area, incinerator, injection well, wastewater treatment unit, waste recycling unit, or other physical, chemical, or biological treatment unit) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES AND GO TO 3. IF NO, GO TO 2.f.

2.f. Is the unit the result of routine and systematic discharges? (i.e., areas receiving small but steady discharges over time from systematic human activity, such as from loading/unloading operations, solvent washing, industrial process sewer systems, etc.) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES. IF NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 3.

<p>3. Is the unit a waste disposal unit? (Complete items 3.a and 3.b below)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>3.a. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the disposal of dangerous or mixed waste? y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>	
<p>3.b. Have hazardous wastes or substances been disposed of in a burial ground, pit, pond, ditch, crib, trench, french drain, or land surface that is not subject to regulation as a RCRA disposal unit and may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste disposal units, pre-RCRA units) y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p> <p>IF EITHER IS YES, CHECK YES. IF BOTH ARE NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 4.</p>	
<p>4. Is the unit an unplanned release that has not been adequately cleaned up and represents a potential threat to human health or the environment? (i.e., releases above CERCLA reportable quantities defined in 40 CFR 302.4; other hazardous substance releases, including petroleum, that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>5. Is the unit an inactive, contaminated structure?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>6. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the treatment or storage of dangerous or mixed waste?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>7. Is the unit another type of storage unit that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste storage unit)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>

Comments:

<p><u>Timothy J. Johnson</u> ERC Data Management Investigator</p>	<p><u>6/25/97</u> Date</p>
<p><u>J. J. Zoric</u> Regulatory Compliance Concurrence</p>	<p><u>6-25-97</u> Date</p>

FOR SITES REQUIRING DOE-RL AND REGULATOR REVIEW PER SECTION 5.2 OF RL-TPA-90-0001

<p><u>[Signature]</u> DOE-RL Concurrence</p>	<p><u>1/26/98</u> Date</p>
<p><u>[Signature]</u> Lead Regulatory Agency Concurrence</p>	<p><u>1-27-98</u> Date</p>

Waste Information Data System General Summary Report

22-Jan-98

Site Code:	600-135	Site Classification:	Accepted	Page 1
Site Names:	600-135, White Bluffs Spare Parts Machine Shop Landfill and Pit, Spare Parts Machine Shop Landfill, Horseshoe Pit			10/07/96
Site Type:	Burial Ground	10/17/97	Start Date:	
Status:	Inactive	10/07/96	End Date:	
Operable Unit:	100-IU-2	10/07/96	Coordinates:	
Hanford Area:	600		(E) 578363.062	
			(N) 148685.469	
			Washington State Plane	
Site Description:	This unit includes two potential waste sites. One site is called the Spare Parts Machine Shop Landfill, also known as the horseshoe pit. It was once a borrow pit that was later used as a waste disposal site. The borrow pit was dug in a semicircle to the northeast of nearby warehouses (hence the name horseshoe pit). The site appears to have been backfilled over about one-half to two-thirds of its area. The second site is a pit oriented in the east-west direction located directly west of Spare Parts Machine Shop Landfill. This pit measures about 90 meters (300 feet) long by 40 meters (130 feet) wide. No documentation could be found to indicate the purpose of the pit.			09/29/97
Location Description:	The site is located approximately 700 meters (2300 feet) northeast of the intersection of Route 2 North and Federal Avenue and approximately 75 meters (250 feet) off Federal Avenue on the left side (proceeding towards the Columbia River) of Federal Avenue.			09/29/97
Associated Structures:	A DuPont drawing indicates that the southwest corner of the site was the location of the MS-9 Warehouses. The same drawing indicates a well in the vicinity of the warehouses.			09/29/97
Cleanup Activities:	In November 1997, ERC staff removed the scattered transite siding.			12/02/97
References:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 8/30/47, PLOT PLAN WHITE BLUFFS & VICINITY SHOWING TEMPORARY FACILITIES, C-3316. 2. R. W. Carpenter, 12/95, White Bluffs, 100-IU-2 Operable Unit Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00448, Rev 0. 3. Shearer, J. P. with Chuck Hedel, 11/26/97, Interview: Removal of Transite Siding Debris. 			

Dimensions:

Diameter:	270.00 Meters	885.83 Feet	
Site Shape:	Circle		
References:	1. R. W. Carpenter, 12/95, White Bluffs, 100-IU-2 Operable Unit Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00448, Rev 0.		

Regulatory Information:

Programmatic Responsibility			
DOE Program:	EM-40	Confirmed By Program:	Yes
DOE Division:	RPD		
Site Evaluation			
Solid Waste Management Unit:	Yes		10/07/96
TPA Waste Management Unit Type:			
Permitting			
Part A Permit Application:	No	10/07/96	216/218 Permit: No 10/07/96
Part B Permit Application:	No	10/07/96	NPDES:

Site Code: 600-135

Site Classification: Accepted

Page 2

Closure Plan:	No	10/07/96	State Waste Discharge Permit:
TSD Number:			Septic Permit:
Air Operating Permit:	No	10/07/96	Inert Landfill:
Air Operating Permit Number(s):			

Tri-Party Agreement

Lead Regulatory Agency: EPA
Unit Category: CPP
TPA Appendix:

Remediation and Closure

Decision Document Type:
Decision Document Status:
Remediation Design Group: Remaining Sites
Closure Type:
Post Closure Requirements:

Residual Waste:**Waste Information:**

Type:	Equipment	10/07/96	
Category:	Unknown	10/07/96	
Physical State:	Solid	10/07/96	
Description:	Equipment parts and pieces are scattered about the area.		12/02/97
References:	1. R. W. Carpenter, 12/95, White Bluffs, 100-IU-2 Operable Unit Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00448, Rev 0.		

Type:	Asbestos (non-friable)	10/07/96	
Category:	Unknown	10/07/96	
Physical State:	Solid	10/07/96	
Description:	The entire area was covered with scattered transite siding.		12/02/97
References:	1. R. W. Carpenter, 12/95, White Bluffs, 100-IU-2 Operable Unit Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00448, Rev 0.		

Field Investigations

Type:	GPS Surveys			01/15/98	
Begin Date:	8/7/95	01/15/98	Field Crew:	K.A. Prosser, R.P. Prosser, Roger Ca	01/15/98
End Date:	10/4/95	01/15/98	Data Repository:	HGIS	01/15/98
Purpose:	Mapping				01/15/98
Job Number:	23				01/15/98
Type:	Post-Processed Kinematic				01/15/98
References:					

Waste Site Reclassification Form

Date Submitted: 12/15/97 Originator: Clarence E. Corriveau, Jr., MSIN H0-17 Phone: 509-372-9565	Operable Unit(s): 100-IU-2 Waste Site ID: 600-135 Type of Reclassification Action: Rejected <input checked="" type="radio"/> Closed-Out <input type="radio"/> No Action <input type="radio"/>	Control Number: 97-042
---	---	-------------------------------

This form documents agreement among the parties listed below authorizing classification of the subject unit as rejected, closed-out, or no action and authorizing backfill of the site, if appropriate. Final removal from the NPL of no action or closed-out sites will occur at a future date.

Description of current waste site condition:

This unit has two components. The Spare Parts Machine Shop Landfill is a borrow pit that was used as a waste disposal site and has been partially backfilled. The second component is an open pit containing no waste materials. Equipment parts and pieces are scattered about the area. Scattered transite siding was removed in November 1997.

Basis for reclassification:

Transite debris has been removed. The only waste remaining at the site is miscellaneous nonhazardous debris.

Glenn F. Goldberg		1/26/98
DOE Project Manager	Signature	Date
Ecology Project Manager	Signature	Date
Laurence E. Godbois		1-22-98
EPA Project Manager	Signature	Date

Waste Information Data System General Summary Report

22-Jan-98

Site Code:	600-189	Site Classification:	Accepted	Page 1
Site Names:	600-189, White Bluffs Warehouse Facility French Drains, 100-H-23			05/08/97
Site Type:	French Drain	09/25/96	Start Date:	
Status:	Inactive	09/25/96	End Date:	
Operable Unit:	100-IU-2	09/25/96	Coordinates:	
Hanford Area:	600	09/25/96	(E) 577527.312	
			(N) 149069.797	
			Washington State Plane	
Site Description:	The site is two french drains associated with a large warehouse and temporary construction facility. The area near the french drains is littered with debris and patches of gravel. There is no oil-stained soil or other indication of hazardous waste disposal at or near the french drains.			12/08/97
Location Description:	The sites are located approximately 750 meters northwest of the intersection of Route 2 North and Federal Avenue in a large warehouse-temporary construction facility area. One of the french drains was located east of the Special Warehouse Number 1 - 105 Areas. Approximately, 75 meters northeast of the first french drain was a second french drain. This french drain is in an area of temporary construction facilities (wood pads were used for foundation pads).			12/08/97
Process Description:	No documentation has been found describing the purpose of the drains. French drains were used for disposal of liquid wastes and these may have been used for wastewater and/or stormwater.			12/03/97
Site Comment:	The warehouses are identified on DuPont drawing C-3316 as the MS Warehouse -100 Areas, Special Warehouse Number 1 - 105 Areas, and Special Warehouse Number 2 - 105 Areas.			12/03/97
	A PNNL employee reported a buried yellow barrel or cement culvert as a new site. A field investigation on 4/7/97 confirmed that the reported site was actually one of the 600-189 french drains.			
Cleanup Activities:	In November 1997, the scattered transite siding was removed by ERC staff.			11/28/97
Release Description:	The use of the drains was not reported. Drains were constructed for disposal of liquid wastes and may have been used for wastewater and/or stormwater.			
References:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8/30/47, PLOT PLAN WHITE BLUFFS & VICINITY SHOWING TEMPORARY FACILITIES, C-3316. R. W. Carpenter, 12/95, White Bluffs, 100-IU-2 Operable Unit Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00448, Rev 0. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336. Shearer, J. P. with Chuck Hedel, 11/26/97, Interview: Removal of Transite Siding Debris. Dietz, L. A. to J. P. Shearer, 12/4/97, Comments From 10/6/97 Field Walkdown. 			

Regulatory Information:

		Programmatic Responsibility			
DOE Program:	EM-40	Confirmed By Program:		Yes	
DOE Division:	RPD				
Site Evaluation					
Solid Waste Management Unit:	Yes				
TPA Waste Management Unit Type:	Waste disposal unit				
Permitting					
Part A Permit Application:	No	09/28/96	216/218 Permit:	No	09/26/96
Part B Permit Application:	No	09/28/96	NPDES:		
Closure Plan:	No	09/28/96	State Waste Discharge Permit:		
TSD Number:			Septic Permit:		

Site Code: 600-189

Site Classification: Accepted

Page 2

Air Operating Permit: No 09/26/96 Inert Landfill:

Air Operating Permit
Number(s):**Tri-Party Agreement**

Lead Regulatory Agency: EPA

Unit Category: CPP

TPA Appendix:

Remediation and Closure

Decision Document Type:

Decision Document Status:

Remediation Design Group: Remaining Sites

Closure Type:

Post Closure Requirements:

Residual Waste:**Waste Information:**

Type: Water 09/26/96

Category: Unknown 09/26/96

Physical State: Liquid 09/26/96

Description: The waste may have been wastewater/stormwater. 09/26/96

References:

Type: Asbestos (non-friable) 09/26/96

Category: Unknown 09/26/96

Physical State: Solid 09/26/96

Description: Transite siding was scattered throughout the area. 09/26/96

References:

Field Investigations

Type: GPS Surveys 01/19/98

Begin Date: 8/7/95 01/19/98 Field Crew: K.A. Prosser, R.P. Prosser, Roger Ca 01/19/98

End Date: 10/4/95 01/19/98 Data Repository: HGIS 01/19/98

Purpose: Mapping 01/19/98

Job Number: 23 01/19/98

Type: Post-Processed Kinematic 01/19/98

References:

Type: Site Walkdown 01/19/98

Begin Date: 4/7/97 01/19/98 Field Crew: T. F. Johnson 01/19/98

End Date: 4/7/97 01/19/98

Purpose: Initial Review 01/19/98

Site Code: 600-189

Site Classification: Accepted

Page 3

Site Cover:**Accessibility:** Yes 09/25/96**Site Found:** Yes 09/25/96**Discoloration:** No**Debris Visible:** No**References:** 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

Waste Site Reclassification Form

Date Submitted: 12/15/97 Originator: Clarence E. Corriveau, Jr., MSIN H0-17 Phone: 509-372-9565	Operable Unit(s): 100-TU-2 Waste Site ID: 600-189 Type of Reclassification Action: Rejected <input checked="" type="radio"/> Closed-Out <input type="radio"/> No Action <input type="radio"/>	Control Number: 97-043
---	---	-------------------------------


This form documents agreement among the parties listed below authorizing classification of the subject unit as rejected, closed-out, or no action and authorizing backfill of the site, if appropriate. Final removal from the NPL of no action or closed-out sites will occur at a future date.

Description of current waste site condition:

The site is two french drains associated with a large warehouse and temporary construction facility. The area near the french drains is littered with debris and patches of gravel. Scattered pieces of transite siding were removed in November 1997.

Basis for reclassification:

Transite debris has been removed. There is no evidence of hazardous, dangerous, or radioactive waste disposal at this site.

Glenn I. Goldberg	 Signature	1/26/98 Date
Ecology Project Manager	Signature	Date
Laurence E. Godbois	 Signature	1-27-98 Date
EPA Project Manager	Signature	Date

Waste Information Data System General Summary Report

22-Jan-98

Site Code: 600-199	Site Classification: Accepted	Page 1
Site Names:	600-199, White Bluffs Ash Covered Concrete Pad	10/04/96
Site Type:	Dumping Area	10/04/96
Status:	Inactive	10/04/96
Operable Unit:	100-IU-2	10/04/96
Hanford Area:	600	10/04/96
		10/04/96
Site Description:	The site is a concrete foundation pad that is completely covered with coal ash. The original purpose of the pad is unknown.	10/04/96
Location Description:	The site is located approximately 700 meters southwest of the intersection of Route 2 North and Federal Avenue.	10/04/96
Site Comment:	Analytical sampling has been performed at an analogous site. The samples from the 126-D-1 Ash Pit (Samples B07258, B07259, B07260, B07261, B07262) found no evidence to indicate hazardous, dangerous, or radioactive waste exists.	12/15/97
Cleanup Activities:	In November 1997, the scattered transite siding was removed by ERC staff.	11/26/97
References:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. R. W. Carpenter, 12/95, White Bluffs, 100-IU-2 Operable Unit Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00448, Rev 0. 2. Shearer, J. P. with Chuck Hedel, 11/26/97, Interview: Removal of Transite Siding Debris. 3. Stankovich, M. T., 9/14/92, 126-D-1 Ash Disposal Basin Sampling, Sample Task 92-304. 	

Dimensions:

Length:	25.00 Meters	82.02 Feet
Width:	15.00 Meters	49.21 Feet

References: 1. R. W. Carpenter, 12/95, White Bluffs, 100-IU-2 Operable Unit Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00448, Rev 0.

Regulatory Information:

		Programmatic Responsibility			
DOE Program:	EM-40	Confirmed By Program:		Yes	
DOE Division:	RPD				
		Site Evaluation			
Solid Waste Management Unit:	Yes				10/04/96
TPA Waste Management Unit Type:					10/04/96
		Permitting			
Part A Permit Application:	No	10/04/96	216/218 Permit:	No	10/04/96
Part B Permit Application:	No	10/04/96	NPDES:		
Closure Plan:	No	10/04/96	State Waste Discharge Permit:		
TSD Number:			Septic Permit:		
Air Operating Permit:	No	10/04/96	Inert Landfill:		
Air Operating Permit Number(s):					

Site Code: 600-199

Site Classification: Accepted

Page 2

Tri-Party Agreement

Lead Regulatory Agency: EPA

Unit Category: CPP

TPA Appendix:

Remediation and Closure

Decision Document Type:

Decision Document Status:

Remediation Design Group: Remaining Sites

Closure Type:

Post Closure Requirements:

Residual Waste:**Waste Information:**

Type: Ash 10/04/96

Category: Nondangerous/nonradioactive 10/08/96

Physical State: Solid 10/04/96

Description: The waste is coal ash which is a state regulated solid waste. The waste has been placed in a waste pile (discernible unit). 10/07/96

References: 1. R. W. Carpenter, 12/95, White Bluffs, 100-IU-2 Operable Unit Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00448, Rev 0.
2. 1995, Washington Administrative Code, Title 173 WAC: Ecology, Department of, WAC, Subpart 173-304-100.

Type: Asbestos (non-friable) 10/04/96

Category: Unknown 10/08/96

Physical State: Solid 10/04/96

Description: Transite siding was scattered throughout the area. 10/07/96

References: 1. R. W. Carpenter, 12/95, White Bluffs, 100-IU-2 Operable Unit Technical Baseline Report, BHI-00448, Rev 0.
2. 1995, Washington Administrative Code, Title 173 WAC: Ecology, Department of, WAC, Subpart 173-304-100.**Field Investigations**

Type: GPS Surveys 01/19/98

Begin Date: 8/7/95 01/19/98 Field Crew: K.A. Prosser, R.P. Prosser, Roger Ca 01/19/98

End Date: 10/4/95 01/19/98 Data Repository: HGIS 01/19/98

Purpose: Mapping 01/19/98

Job Number: 23 01/19/98

Type: Post-Processed Kinematic 01/19/98

References:

Waste Site Reclassification Form

Date Submitted: 12/15/97 Originator: Clarence E. Corriveau, Jr., MSIN H0-17 Phone: 509-372-9565	Operable Unit(s): 100-IU-2 Waste Site ID: 600-199 Type of Reclassification Action: Rejected <input checked="" type="radio"/> Closed-Out <input type="radio"/> No Action <input type="radio"/>	Control Number: 97-044
---	---	-------------------------------

This form documents agreement among the parties listed below authorizing classification of the subject unit as rejected, closed-out, or no action and authorizing backfill of the site, if appropriate. Final removal from the NPL of no action or closed-out sites will occur at a future date.

Description of current waste site condition:

(Summarize status of investigation/remediation of the waste sites.)

The site is a concrete foundation pad that is completely covered with coal ash. The original purpose for the pad is not known. Scattered pieces of transite siding were removed in November 1997.

Basis for reclassification:


(For close-out, reference supporting documentation, as listed in Table 2-3.)

Studies have concluded that ash from Hanford Site power plants is nonradioactive and nondangerous:

- Analyses of Hanford Site coal ash samples from 126-D-1 and other ash piles have shown no evidence of hazardous, dangerous, or radioactive waste (see Section 4 of "100-D Ponds Closure Plan," DOE/RL-92-71, Rev. 1, September 1997).

- EP Toxicity tests of Hanford Site coal ash samples found all results to be "well below" the minimum extract concentrations required for designation as EP toxic material per WAC 173-303 (see page 9 of Rasmussen, O.R., and R. A. Carlson, 1987, "Design Specifications for the Semiworks (201-C) Site Engineered Barrier," WHC-SD-DD-TI-004, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA).

Scattered transite debris was removed in November 1997 per EPA requirements for rejection of the site.

<i>G.I. Goldbois</i> _____ DOE Project Manager	 _____ Signature	2/18/98 _____ Date
Ecology Project Manager	Signature	Date
<i>Laurence E. Goldbois</i> _____ EPA Project Manager	<i>Laurence E Goldbois</i> _____ Signature	3-11-98 _____ Date

Waste Information Data System General Summary Report

27-Jan-98

Site Code: 600-154	Site Classification: Rejected	Page 1
Site Names:	600-154, Remains of Windmill, RCRA General Inspection HIRIV-FY96 Item #6	07/21/97
Site Type:	Dumping Area	07/08/96
Status:	Inactive	07/08/96
Operable Unit:	100-IU-3	05/07/97
Hanford Area:	600	07/08/96
		Start Date:
		End Date:
		Coordinates:
		(E) 0
		(N) 0
		Washington State Plane
Site Description:	The site is the remaining parts from an old windmill. The windmill was constructed of sheet metal and steel. An abandoned well was observed approximately 90 meters (295 feet) southwest of the windmill.	07/21/97
Location Description:	The site is located due north of 100-D Area and approximately 50 meters (165 feet) north of the left bank (facing downstream) of the Columbia River. On the USGS Map Coyote Rapids Quadrangle 7.5 minute series, the site is located about 200 meters (656 feet) east of the intersection labeled "Wahluke". If driving to the site, take the only paved road from highway SR24 to the river.	07/21/97
Site Comment:	The EPA, USDOE (DOE-RL), and Ecology visited the site on January 28, 1998 and agreed that this site is not a waste site.	01/27/98
	On September 9 and 10, 1996, an inspection of the banks of the Columbia River within the Hanford Facility boundary was performed in accordance with the Hanford Facility RCRA Permit, Condition II.0.1.c. This site was identified at the time of inspection.	
Access Comments:	The site is located in a culturally and biologically sensitive area.	01/23/98
Access Requirements:	HGET Training	01/23/98
References:	1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.	

Site Hazards:

Hazards:	Status:	Date:
Biological Hazards	Discovered	6/24/97
References:		

Regulatory Information:

Programmatic Responsibility			
DOE Program: EM-70		Confirmed By Program:	Yes
DOE Division: SID			
Site Evaluation			
Solid Waste Management Unit:	No		07/21/97
TPA Waste Management Unit Type:			
Permitting			
Part A Permit Application:	No	07/21/97	216/218 Permit: No
Part B Permit Application:	No	07/21/97	NPDES: No
Closure Plan:	No	07/21/97	State Waste Discharge Permit: No
TSD Number:			Septic Permit: No

Site Code: 600-154 Site Classification: Rejected Page 2

Air Operating Permit:	No	07/21/97	Inert Landfill:	No	01/23/98
Air Operating Permit Number(s):					
Tri-Party Agreement					
Lead Regulatory Agency:	Ecology				
Unit Category:	CPP				
TPA Appendix:					
Remediation and Closure					
Decision Document Type:					
Decision Document Status:					
Remediation Design Group:					
Closure Type:					
Post Closure Requirements:					
Residual Waste:					

Waste Information:

Type:	Equipment	08/25/97
Category:	Nonregulated Waste	08/25/97
Physical State:	Solid	08/25/97
Description:	The waste is parts from an old windmill which was constructed of sheet metal and steel.	08/25/97
References:	1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.	

Field Investigations

Type:	Site Walkdown				
Begin Date:	6/24/97	Field Crew:	T. F. Johnson	08/25/97	
End Date:	6/24/97				
Purpose:	Initial Review				
Site Cover:					
Accessibility:	Yes	08/26/97	Site Found:	Yes	08/25/97
Discoloration:	No		Debris Visible:	No	
References:	1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.				

DISCOVERY SITE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(To be completed by a member of ERC Data Management and included with the data package for a newly discovered potential waste management unit.)

Discovery Site ID Number: 3813

Site Alias(es): 600-154, Remains of Windmill

Waste Management Unit	Not a Waste Management Unit	More Information Needed
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. Does the unit receive uncontaminated rainwater runoff only? y n

IF YES, CHECK "NOT A WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT" ABOVE AND STOP. IF NO, GO TO 2.

A check in any "YES" box below indicates the site is a waste management unit as defined in Section 3.1 of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and should be entered into WIDS. (Items 2 through 7 below correspond with the six waste management unit types found in the TPA definition.)

YES NO

2. Complete items 2.a through 2.f below to determine if the unit is a solid waste management unit (SWMU) as specified under Section 3004(u) of RCRA.

2.a. Is the material at the unit a waste? (i.e., a regulated waste or a discarded material, including garbage, refuse, sludge, construction/demolition debris, industrial/sanitary wastewater or other discarded solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gas) y n

IF NO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF YES, GO TO 2.b.

2.b. Is the waste from historical residential activities? (i.e., not from industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, or community activities) y n

2.c. Is the unit an industrial wastewater point discharge permitted under the Clean Water Act? (i.e., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) y n

2.d. Does the waste consist ONLY of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act? y n

A YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS INDICATES THE SITE IS NOT A SWMU. IF SO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF ALL ARE NO,

2.e. Was the waste placed in a discernable unit? (i.e., a landfill, surface impoundment, land treatment unit, waste pile, tank, container storage area, incinerator, injection well, wastewater treatment unit, waste recycling unit, or other physical, chemical, or biological treatment unit) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES AND GO TO 3. IF NO, GO TO 2.f.

2.f. Is the unit the result of routine and systematic discharges? (i.e., areas receiving small but steady discharges over time from systematic human activity, such as from loading/unloading operations, solvent washing, industrial process sewer systems, etc.) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES. IF NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 3.

<p>3. Is the unit a waste disposal unit? (Complete items 3.a and 3.b below)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>3.a. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the disposal of dangerous or mixed waste? y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>	
<p>3.b. Have hazardous wastes or substances been disposed of in a burial ground, pit, pond, ditch, crib, trench, french drain, or land surface that is not subject to regulation as a RCRA disposal unit and may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste disposal units, pre-RCRA units) y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p> <p>IF EITHER IS YES, CHECK YES. IF BOTH ARE NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 4.</p>	
<p>4. Is the unit an unplanned release that has not been adequately cleaned up and represents a potential threat to human health or the environment? (i.e., releases above CERCLA reportable quantities defined in 40 CFR 302.4; other hazardous substance releases, including petroleum, that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>5. Is the unit an inactive, contaminated structure?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>6. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the treatment or storage of dangerous or mixed waste?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>7. Is the unit another type of storage unit that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste storage unit)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>

Comments:

<p><u>Timothy F. Johnson</u> ERC Data Management Investigator</p>	<p><u>6/26/97</u> Date</p>
<p><u>J. Zoric</u> Regulatory Compliance Concurrence</p>	<p><u>6/26/97</u> Date</p>

FOR SITES REQUIRING DOE-RL AND REGULATOR REVIEW PER SECTION 5.2 OF RL-TPA-90-0001

<p><u>[Signature]</u> DOE-RL Concurrence</p>	<p><u>1/26/98</u> Date</p>
<p><u>[Signature]</u> Lead Regulatory Agency Concurrence</p>	<p><u>1/27/98</u> Date</p>

Site Code: 600-229

Site Classification: Rejected

Page 2

Air Operating Permit: No Inert Landfill: No

Air Operating Permit
Number(s):

Tri-Party Agreement

Lead Regulatory Agency: Ecology

Unit Category: CPP

TPA Appendix:

Remediation and Closure

Decision Document:

Decision Document Status:

Remediation Design Group:

Closure Document:

Closure Type:

Post Closure Requirements:

Residual Waste:

Waste Information:

Type: Barrels/Drums/Buckets/Cans

Category: Nondangerous/nonradioactive

Physical State: Solid

Waste Obscured: Soil Overburden

Description: Seven empty rusty 19 liter (five gallon) steel containers were found at the site. The containers are partially buried.

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

Type: Misc. Trash and Debris

Category: Nondangerous/nonradioactive

Physical State: Solid

Waste Obscured: Soil Overburden

Description: The site contains a relatively small amount of metal such as wire rope, barbed wire, wire, and sheet metal.

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

Field Investigations

Type: Site Walkdown

Begin Date: 6/30/97

Field Crew: T. F. Johnson

End Date: 6/30/97

Purpose: Initial Review

Site Cover:

Site Accessible: Yes

Site Found: Yes

Site Code: 600-229

Site Classification: Rejected

Page 3

Soil Discoloration: - No

Debris Visible: Yes

References: 1. T. F. Johnson, 10/24/96, Discovery Site Investigation Logbook, EL-1336.

DISCOVERY SITE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(To be completed by a member of ERC Data Management and included with the data package for a newly discovered potential waste management unit.)

Discovery Site ID Number: 4188

Site Alias(es): 600-229, White Bluffs Ferry Landing (East Side) Dumping Area

Waste Management Unit	Not a Waste Management Unit	More Information Needed
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. Does the unit receive uncontaminated rainwater runoff only? y n

IF YES, CHECK "NOT A WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT" ABOVE AND STOP. IF NO, GO TO 2.

A check in any "YES" box below indicates the site is a waste management unit as defined in Section 3.1 of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and should be entered into WIDS. (Items 2 through 7 below correspond with the six waste management unit types found in the TPA definition.)

YES	NO
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

2. Complete items 2.a through 2.f below to determine if the unit is a solid waste management unit (SWMU) as specified under Section 3004(u) of RCRA.

2.a. Is the material at the unit a waste? (i.e., a regulated waste or a discarded material, including garbage, refuse, sludge, construction/demolition debris, industrial/sanitary wastewater or other discarded solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gas) y n

IF NO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF YES, GO TO 2.b.

2.b. Is the waste from historical residential activities? (i.e., not from industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, or community activities) y n

2.c. Is the unit an industrial wastewater point discharge permitted under the Clean Water Act? (i.e., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) y n

2.d. Does the waste consist ONLY of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act? y n

A YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS INDICATES THE SITE IS NOT A SWMU. IF SO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF ALL ARE NO,

2.e. Was the waste placed in a discernable unit? (i.e., a landfill, surface impoundment, land treatment unit, waste pile, tank, container storage area, incinerator, injection well, wastewater treatment unit, waste recycling unit, or other physical, chemical, or biological treatment unit) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES AND GO TO 3. IF NO, GO TO 2.f.

2.f. Is the unit the result of routine and systematic discharges? (i.e., areas receiving small but steady discharges over time from systematic human activity, such as from loading/unloading operations, solvent washing, industrial process sewer systems, etc.) y n

IF YES, CHECK YES. IF NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 3.

<p>3. Is the unit a waste disposal unit? (Complete items 3.a and 3.b below)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>3.a. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the disposal of dangerous or mixed waste? y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>	
<p>3.b. Have hazardous wastes or substances been disposed of in a burial ground, pit, pond, ditch, crib, trench, french drain, or land surface that is not subject to regulation as a RCRA disposal unit and may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste disposal units, pre-RCRA units) y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/></p> <p>IF EITHER IS YES, CHECK YES. IF BOTH ARE NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 4.</p>	
<p>4. Is the unit an unplanned release that has not been adequately cleaned up and represents a potential threat to human health or the environment? (i.e., releases above CERCLA reportable quantities defined in 40 CFR 302.4; other hazardous substance releases, including petroleum, that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>5. Is the unit an inactive, contaminated structure?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>6. Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the treatment or storage of dangerous or mixed waste?</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>
<p>7. Is the unit another type of storage unit that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste storage unit)</p>	<p>YES NO <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/></p>

Comments: The waste is suspected to have been discarded from Army operations due to the olive green color of the empty containers.

Timothy E. Johnson
 ERC Data Management Investigator

7/1/97
 Date

Joseph L. Zovic
 Regulatory Compliance Concurrence

7/1/97
 Date

FOR SITES REQUIRING DOE-RL AND REGULATOR REVIEW PER SECTION 5.2 OF RL-TPA-90-0001

[Signature]
 DOE-RL Concurrence

[Signature]
 Lead Regulatory Agency Concurrence

1/28/98
 Date

1/27/98
 Date

Waste Information Data System General Summary Report

19-Feb-98

Site Code: 300 FBP	Site Classification: Accepted		Page 1
Site Names:	300 FBP, 300 Area Filter Backwash Pond		
Site Type:	Surface Impoundment	Start Date:	1987
Status:	Active	End Date:	
Operable Unit:	300-FF-1	Coordinates:	
Hanford Area:	300	(E) 594418.312	(N) 115976.742
		Washington State Plane	
Site Description:	The unit consists of a single basin approximately 6.1 to 7.6 meters (20 to 25 feet) deep. From 1987 to 1992, the basin operated as an unlined percolation pond. In 1992, the basin was lined with a synthetic liner on a concrete foundation.		
Location Description:	The site is located east of the 300 Area Ash Pits and south of the 300 Area Retired Filter Backwash Pond.		
Process Description:	Before the pond was lined, filter backwash was discharged to it and allowed to percolate to groundwater. Under current operations, the backwash is held in the lined pond to clarify. The clarified water is sent to the 300 Area TEDF (Treated Effluent Disposal Facility). The accumulated sediment is not regulated and can be disposed of in a landfill.		
Associated Structures:	The site is associated with the 384 Powerhouse and the 300 Area Treated Effluent Disposal Facility (TEDF).		
Site Comment:	The unlined pond first started receiving filter backwash on April 14, 1987. In 1992, the backwash was diverted to the east Ash Pit in order to construct the pond liner. Regulatory issues delayed the activation of the lined pond until July 1995.		
	This site replaced an earlier filter backwash pond (300 RFBP, 300 Area Retired Filter Backwash Pond) that was located in the east lobe of the south process pond. During the time the old pond was closed and the new pond was under construction, the backwash water was trucked to a gravel pit (300 IFBD, 300 Area Interim Filter Backwash Disposal) located across the highway, west of the 300 Area for disposal.		
Environmental Monitoring Description:	Weekly inspections are performed. There is no routine sampling of the 315 Water Treatment Plant filter backwash operations. This waste stream does not contain regulated materials, and there is no significant potential for it to receive regulated materials.		
References:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. K. H. Cramer, Hanford Site Waste Management Units Report, May 1987. 2. 2/89, Preliminary Operable Units Designation Project, WHC-EP-0216. 3. Duane Jacques, Environmental Protection to Sherry Griffin, 10/26/90, Review comments on the Hanford Site Waste Management Units Report, DSI. 4. M. J. McCarthy, 9/90, Westinghouse Hanford Company Effluent Report for 300, 400, and 1100 Area Operations for Calendar Year 1989, WHC-EP-0267-1. 5. C.R. Webb, 6/6/96, Telephone Conversation with Sam Camp related to Project V-784 Upgrades to the 300 Area Sanitary Sewer.. 6. Shearer, J. P. with Sam Camp, 300 Area Utilites, 1/5/98, Telecon: Disposal of Clarified Water from the 300 Area Filter Backwash Pond. 		

Dimensions:

Length:	97.54 Meters	320.00 Feet	
Width:	64.92 Meters	213.00 Feet	

References: 1. 11/9/90, 300 Area Sedimentation Pond, H-3-52159.

Regulatory Information:

Programmatic Responsibility

Site Code: 300 FBP

Site Classification: Accepted

Page 2

DOE Program: EM-70 Confirmed By Program: Yes
 DOE Division: SID

Site Evaluation

Solid Waste Management Unit: Yes

TPA Waste Management Unit Type:

Permitting

Part A Permit Application: No 216/218 Permit: No
 Part B Permit Application: No NPDES:
 Closure Plan: No State Waste Discharge Permit:
 TSD Number: Septic Permit:
 Air Operating Permit: No Inert Landfill:
 Air Operating Permit
 Number(s):

Tri-Party Agreement

Lead Regulatory Agency: EPA
 Unit Category: CPP
 TPA Appendix: C

Remediation and Closure

Decision Document Type:
 Decision Document Status:
 Remediation Design Group:
 Closure Type:
 Post Closure Requirements:

Residual Waste:

Waste Information:

Type: Water Amount: 76,000,000.00
 Category: Nondangerous/nonradioactive Units: Liters Per Year
 Physical State: Liquid

Description: The unit receives 76 million liters/year (20 million gallons/year) of water and alum backwashed from filters. Analysis of the backwash has shown it to be nonhazardous.

References: 1. K. H. Cramer, Hanford Site Waste Management Units Report, May 1987.
 2. M. J. McCarthy, 9/90, Westinghouse Hanford Company Effluent Report for 300, 400, and 1100 Area Operations for Calendar Year 1989, WHC-EP-0267-1.

SubSites:

SubSite Name: 300 FBP:1, 300 FBP (Unlined)
 SubSite Code: 300 FBP:1
 Classification: Accepted

Site Code: 300 FBP

Site Classification: Accepted

Page 3

ReClassification:

Description: The subsite represents the unlined pond that operated from 1987 to 1992. This component of the 300 FBP is included as a "no action" site within the 300-FF-1/300-FF-5 Record of Decision.

References: 1. John D. Wagoner, Chuck Clarke, Michael A. Wilson, 7/9/97, Declaration of the Record of Decision for the USDOE Hanford 300 Area 300-FF-1 and 300-FF-5 Operable Units, 038509.

SubSite Name: 300 FBP:2, 300 FBP (Lined)

SubSite Code: 300 FBP:2

Classification: Accepted

ReClassification:

Description: This subsite represent the active, lined filter backwash pond. This site is not addressed within the 300-FF-1/300-FF-5 Record of Decision.

References:

060784

Waste Site Reclassification Form

Date Submitted: 1/5/98	Operable Unit(s): 300-FF-1	Control Number: 98-05
Originator: L. A. Dietz, MSIN H0-20	Waste Site ID: 300 FBP	
Phone: 509-372-9378	Type of Reclassification Action:	
	Rejected <input type="radio"/> Closed-Out <input type="radio"/> No Action <input checked="" type="radio"/>	







This form documents agreement among the parties listed below authorizing classification of the subject unit as rejected, closed-out, or no action and authorizing backfill of the site, if appropriate. Final removal from the NPL of no action or closed-out sites will occur at a future date.

Description of current waste site condition:

The reclassification is for the 300 FBP:1, 300 FBP (Unlined) subsite for 300 FBP (300 Area Filter Backwash Pond). This subsite represents the unlined filter backwash pond that operated from 1987 to 1992. When the unlined pond was in use, the filter backwash was discharged to it and allowed to percolate to groundwater. The filter backwash did not contain regulated materials. This subsite was replaced by a lined pond (300 FBP:2), which is not covered under this reclassification.

Basis for reclassification:

This component of 300 FBP is included as a "no action" site within the 300-FF-1/300-FF-5 Record of Decision. This reclassification is for the 300 FBP:1 subsite only.

		
DOE Project Manager	Signature	Date
		
Ecology Project Manager	Signature	Date
		
EPA Project Manager	Signature	Date

**Unit Managers' Meeting: Remedial Action Unit/Source Operable Units
100, 200, and 300 Areas**

Mike Thompson.....	DOE-RL, RP (H0-12)
Glenn Goldberg.....	DOE-RL, RP (H0-12)
Owen Robertson.....	DOE-RL, RP (H0-12)
Bryan Foley.....	DOE-RL, RP (H0-12)
Robert McLeod.....	DOE-RL, RP (H0-12)
David Olson.....	DOE-RL, RP (H0-12)
Ellen Mattlin.....	DOE-RL, EAP (A5-15)
Steve Balone.....	DOE-RL, RPS (H0-12)
Lisa Treichel.....	DOE-HQ (EM-442)
Dennis Faulk.....	100 Aggregate Area Manager, EPA (B5-01)
David Einan.....	EPA (B5-01)
Larry Gadbois.....	EPA (B5-01)
Phil Staats.....	100 Aggregate Area Manager, WDOE (B5-18)
Joan Bartz.....	WDOE (Kennewick) (B5-18)
David Holland.....	WDOE (Kennewick) (B5-18)
Keith Holliday.....	WDOE (Kennewick) (B5-18)
Shri Mohan.....	WDOE (Kennewick) (B5-18)
Wayne Soper.....	WDOE (Kennewick) (B5-18)
Ted Wooley.....	WDOE (Kennewick) (B5-18)
Lynn Albin.....	Washington Dept. of Health
V. R. Dronen.....	BHI (H0-17)
J. R. James.....	BHI (L6-06)
T. L. Rodriguez.....	BHI (H0-17)
M. R. Peterson.....	BHI (H0-10)
J. G. Woolard.....	BHI (H0-02)
R. L. Donahoe.....	BHI (X9-06)
F. M. Corpuz.....	BHI (X9-06)
G. B. Mitchem.....	BHI (H0-17)
G. E. Van Sickle.....	BHI (T2-05)
R. A. Carlson.....	BHI (L6-06)
W. E. Remsen.....	BHI (H0-17)
A. L. Langstaff.....	BHI (X3-40)
L. C. Hulstrom.....	CHI (H9-03)
A. P. Goforth.....	BHI DCC (H0-09)
T. M. Wintczak.....	BHI (H0-02)

Please inform Tamen Rodriguez (372-9562) - BHI
of deletions or additions to the distribution list.