

0078831



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

3100 Port of Benton Blvd • Richland, WA 99354 • (509) 372-7950

September 25, 2008

RECEIVED
SEP 29 2008
EDMC

Mr. Matthew S. McCormick
Richland Operations Office
United States Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, MSIN: A5-11
Richland, Washington 99352

Re: Comments on Draft *U Plant Ancillary Facilities Removal Action Work Plan, Phase II*
[DOE/RL-2004-83, Draft A, Revision 1]

Dear Mr. McCormick:

The Department of Ecology reviewed the draft Removal Action Work Plan (RAWP) prepared by Fluor Hanford, Inc. Our comments on the RAWP are enclosed.

If you have any questions, contact Jennifer Ollero at 509-372-7988 or me at 509-372-7885.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rick Bond".

Rick Bond
Transition Project Manager
Nuclear Waste Program

jo/pll

Enclosure

cc: Stuart Harris, CTUIR
Gabriel Bohnee, NPT
Russell Jim, YN
Ken Niles, ODOE
Administrative Record: U Plant
Environmental Portal

**Washington State Department of Ecology
REVIEW COMMENT RECORD (RCR)**

1. Date	2. Review No.
3. Project No.	4. Page 1 of 2

5. Document Number(s)/Title(s) U Plant Ancillary Facilities Removal Action Work Plan, Phase II [DOE/RL-2004-83, Draft A, Revision 1]	6. Program/Project/Building Number Facilities Transition/U Plant	7. Reviewer Rick Bond, Jennifer	8. Organization/Group Waste Management	9. Location/Phone
---	---	------------------------------------	---	-------------------

17. Comment Submittal Approval:	10. Agreement with indicated comment disposition(s)	11. CLOSED			
Date 9/22/08	Organization Manager (Optional) Ron Skinnarland	Date	Reviewer/Point of Contact Jennifer Ollero	Date	Reviewer/Point of Contact
		Author/Originator		Author/Originator	

Item	Location in Document	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted.)	Status
1.		<p>General: The schedule information provided in the RAWP is not detailed (as stated in the DOE transmittal letter). Additionally, the anticipated schedule for disposition of these facilities under the Action Memorandum may be impacted by the negotiations for the Central Plateau Facilities (Agreement in Principle). The document does not identify the possible modification of such changes from the negotiations.</p> <p>There appears to be a disconnect between what was required per the Resolution of Dispute Agreement at the IAMIT [June 26, 2008] and what is provided in the RAWP. The current schedule as provided in Section 5.0 of the RAWP does not provide enough detail or reference the agreement in the dispute. Please revise and add more detail to the schedule.</p>			
2.		<p>General: Throughout the document are references to supporting documents, which are not DOE/RL documents, but contractor generated documents and are not available in the Administrative Record (AR). Since the process for addressing/describing these items are in these documents, Ecology suggests that the documents be made available in the AR, or the section(s) relying on this information be updated, summarizing the information in the document.</p> <p>Examples: <i>Site Specific Health and Safety Plan U Plant Ancillary D&D Project (CP-22176), on page 10.</i></p>			
3.	Page 8, Section 1.4.2	2712-U Instrument Building: Add a sentence to the last paragraph of this section to describe that disposition of this facility will occur in Phase III.			

Washington State Department of Ecology
REVIEW COMMENT RECORD (RCR)

1. Date

2. Review No.

3. Project No.

4. Page 2 of 2

4. *Page 6, Section*
1.4.2

Editorial: Suggest formatting the subsections with numbers.