U.S. Department of Energy
Hanford Site

0062970

OCT 28 2004

05-AMCP-0024

Mr. Michael A. Wilson, Program Manager
Nuclear Waste Program
State of Washington
Department of Ecology
3100 Port of Benton Boulevard
Richland, Washington 99352

RECEIVED
NOV 02 2004
EDMC

Dear Mr. Wilson:

CALENDAR YEAR (CY) 2003 LAND DISPOSAL RESTRICTIONS (LDR) REPORT COMMENT RESPONSES

This letter is in reference to Ecology's letter from Eric Van Mason to us regarding "Ecology's Review and Response to the USDOE's CY 2003 Hanford Site Mixed Waste LDR Report, Submitted in Accordance with M-26-01N," dated September 14, 2004. 62770

In accordance with the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement), Section 9.0, Documentation and Records, enclosed are the responses to Ecology's comments for the CY 2003 Hanford Site Mixed Waste LDR Report (DOE/RL-2004-07) (CY 2003 LDR Report). The proposed approach and responses to Ecology's comments were agreed to at the October 19, 2004, Tri-Party Agreement Project Managers' meeting with Eric Van Mason, of your staff.

If the enclosed responses are acceptable, the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (RL) requests that Ecology sign the signature page contained in the CY 2003 LDR Report submitted April 30, 2004.

If you have questions, please contact me, or your staff may contact Matt McCormick, Assistant Manager for the Central Plateau, on (509) 373-9971, or Woody Russell, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Environmental Division, on (509) 373-5227.

for Keith A. Klein, Manager
Richland Operations Office

for Roy J. Schepens, Manager
Office of River Protection

AMCP:GLS

Enclosure

cc: See page 2

cc w/encl:
N. Ceto, EPA
J. D. Doughty, CHG
R. H. Gurske, FHI
S. Harris, CTUIR
J. S. Hertzel, FHI
R. Jim, YN
A. G. Miskho, FHI
E. J. Murphy-Fitch, FHI
K. Niles, ODOE
W. Russell, ORP
P. Sobotta, NPT
E. R. Skinnarland, Ecology
H. T. Tilden, PNNL
E. Van Mason, Ecology
R. W. Wilson, Ecology
D. M. Yasek, BHI
Administrative Record M-026
Environmental Portal

U.S. Department of Energy responses to
State of Washington Department of Ecology's Comments
On Calendar Year 2003 LDR Report
Milestone M-26-01N

Comment #1: (page B-53, Section 2.11.1) An Ecology inspection was conducted on July 23, 2004, to investigate the accuracy of the data contained in the data sheets for the 241-CX Tank System treatability group. The results of this inspection lead Ecology to disagree with the answer given on page B-53, section 2.11.1, which states that no further characterization is needed prior to acceptance for storage. Ecology believes this answer to be incorrect due to our inspection results, which show a severe lack of adequate characterization information on the three tanks in the tank system and any waste they still contain.

Action #1: Within forty-five (45) days, change the answer to question 2.11.1 on the Location Specific Data Sheet for the 241-CX Tank System from "No" to "Unknown at this time". In addition, provide an explanation of the steps that will be completed within one calendar year from the update of this report so that question 2.11.1 may be answered by "Yes" or "No". These steps should include, but not necessarily be limited to, characterization/designation of any tank contents and a determination of the condition of the tanks.

DOE Response: This comment contains two elements: (1) the information in the CY 2003 LDR Report for the 241-CX Tank System treatability group, and (2) the structure and format of the characterization questions contained within section 2.11 of the location-specific data sheets. DOE proposes to address item 1 at the time Ecology comments on the Operable Unit documentation describing characterization for the 241-CX Tank System, and as necessary, during the upcoming LDR storage assessment/data gap plan for the 241-CX Tank System. The LDR storage assessment is scheduled to start the 1st quarter of CY2005 (reference Volume 1 Table 3-2 of the CY 2003 LDR Report).

For item 2, DOE proposes to address the location-specific data sheet characterization questions within section 2.11 and the corresponding instructions as part of the monthly LDR Project Manager Meetings.

DOE will include information in future LDR reports as the issues are resolved.

Comment #2: (General) Treatability Group Data Sheets and Location Specific Data Sheets provide waste generation forecasts for each CY from 2004 through 2008. However, there is no information provided showing how much waste was generated from waste streams during the reporting period (i.e., calendar year 2003).

Action #2: Upon submission of next year's report, under Milestone M-26-01O, provide data showing the amount of waste generated during the reporting period.

DOE Response: DOE proposes to discuss waste generation information needs as part of the monthly LDR Project Manager Meetings. DOE will include information in future LDR reports as the issues are resolved.

Comment #3: (page B-599, 2.1.2) Ecology Part A Application records indicate a PSTF, Revision 0, Part A, was submitted on February 20, 1990. Westinghouse Hanford Corporation signed as co-operator of the facility on January 18, 1990. The Location Specific Data Sheet, section 2.1.2, lists the facility as being in operation since 1991.

Action #3: Upon submission of next year's report, under Milestone M-26-01O, change section 2.1.2 to reflect that the PSTF has been in operation since 1990.

DOE Response: Accept 1990 will be reflected in the CY 2004 LDR Report for the Purgewater Storage and Treatment Facility.

Comment #4: (page 1-8) Ecology is not aware of a treatability variance for the LAW and HLW fractions of tank waste.

Action #4: Within forty-five (45) days, provide an explanation for this assumption.

DOE Response: At present, a treatability variance does not exist for the LAW and HLW fractions of the tank waste. The misunderstanding may arise from the assumption on page 1-8 of the CY2003 LDR Report which states "For tank waste, it is assumed that a Treatability variance **is** in place for both the LAW and HLW fractions and a delisting petition is in place for the vitrified HLW fraction."

DOE-ORP and Ecology have been and will continue to be in LDR/delisting/treatability variance discussions. Those discussions have resulted in the issuance of the Data Quality Objective Process in support of LDR/delisting/treatability variance at the Waste Treatment Plant, 24590-WTP-RPT-ENV-0 1-01 2, Revision 2 on March 26, 2003.

It is suggested the language on page 1-8 be changed as follows in the CY 2004 LDR Report; "For tank waste, it is assumed that a treatability variance will be in place for both the LAW and HLW fractions and a delisting petition **will be** in place for the vitrified HLW fraction."