








<b>TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT</b>											
Change Notice Number TPA-CN- 705	TPA CHANGE NOTICE FORM	Date: 12/7/2015									
Document Number, Title, and Revision: DOE/RL-2014-13-ADD1, Rev 0, Remedial Design Report/Remedial Action Work Plan for 300-FF-2 Soils <span style="margin-left: 200px;">1229942</span>		Date Document Last Issued: May 2015									
Originator: RF Guercia		Phone: 509 376-5494									
<b>Description of Change:</b> Clarify the Remedial Design Report/Remedial Action Work Plan for 300-FF-2 Soils (RDR/RAWP) to state that Institutional Controls do not apply for use of the river and shoreline of the Columbia River.											
<p>RF Guercia, RL _____ and B Simes (EPA) _____ agree that the proposed change            DOE <span style="margin-left: 100px;">Lead Regulatory Agency</span></p> <p>Modifies an approved work-plan/document and will be processed in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan, Section 9.0, <i>Documentation and Records</i>, and not Chapter 12.0, <i>Changes to the Agreement</i>.</p> <p>The following change is authorized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace Page 1-1 with attached same (no changes)</li> <li>- Replace Page 1-2, Figure 1-1, with attached same (whole page replacement).</li> </ul>											
											
<p>Note: Include affected page number(s)</p> <p><b>Justification and Impacts of Change:</b>            Modify the Remedial Design Report/Remedial Action Work Plan for 300-FF-2 Soils (RDR/RAWP), DOE/RL-2014-13-ADD1, Revision 0, Figure 1.1, "300-FF-1 and 300-FF-2 Operable Units" to more clearly reflect the Record of Decision for 300-FF-2 and 300-FF-5 and Record of Decision Amendment for 300-FF-1 (300 Area Final ROD). As stated in the responsiveness summary to the 300 Area Final ROD (Comment 1, page 106), no ICs are required for the use of the river and shoreline. The scale of the sketch used for Figure 1-1 of the RDR/RAWP does not make this distinction clear.</p>											
<p><b>Approvals:</b></p> <table style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 45%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">             DOE Project Manager         </td> <td style="width: 15%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">           12/8/15  <small>Date</small> </td> <td style="width: 40%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved         </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">             EPA Project Manager         </td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">           12/11/15  <small>Date</small> </td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved         </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">           Ecology Project Manager         </td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">           N/A  <small>Date</small> </td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved         </td> </tr> </table>			 DOE Project Manager	12/8/15 <small>Date</small>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved	 EPA Project Manager	12/11/15 <small>Date</small>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved	Ecology Project Manager	N/A <small>Date</small>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved
 DOE Project Manager	12/8/15 <small>Date</small>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved									
 EPA Project Manager	12/11/15 <small>Date</small>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved									
Ecology Project Manager	N/A <small>Date</small>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved									

300-FF-2

## 1 Introduction

The *Hanford Site 300 Area Record of Decision for 300-FF-2 and 300-FF-5, and Record of Decision Amendment for 300-FF-1* (hereafter referred to as the 300 Area ROD) (EPA 2013) defines selected remedies for the 300 Area of the Hanford Site. In general, these selected remedies can be grouped into three categories:

- Remove, treat, and dispose (RTD) for waste sites in the 300-FF-2 Operable Unit (OU), with interim pipeline void filling and surface barriers for waste sites associated with long-term retained facilities
- Uranium sequestration for the vadose zone and periodically rewetted zone for soils and sediments greater than 4.6 m (15 ft) below ground surface (bgs) in the 300-FF-1 and 300-FF-2 OUs
- Monitored natural attenuation for groundwater in the 300-FF-5 OU.

The *Integrated Remedial Design/Remedial Action Work Plan for the 300 Area (300-FF-1, 300-FF-2, & 300-FF-5 Operable Units)* (hereafter referred to as the Integrated RDR/RAWP) (DOE/RL-2014-13) addresses overarching common elements and integration considerations for these three categories. This addendum supplements the Integrated RDR/RAWP in addressing implementation requirements specific to the first category: temporary stabilization and remediation by RTD of 300-FF-2 waste sites.

The 300-FF-2 OU (Figure 1-1) is composed of waste sites that fall into four general categories: waste sites in the 300 Area industrial complex; outlying waste sites north and west of the industrial complex; general content burial grounds within and around the industrial complex; and transuranic (TRU)-contaminated burial grounds. The selected remedy is protective of future industrial uses of the 300 Area industrial complex and the 618-11 Burial Ground, and residential use for the remaining areas.

Remedial actions have been ongoing at the 300-FF-2 OU since 2001 under the *Interim Action Record of Decision for the 300-FF-2 Operable Unit, Hanford Site, Benton County, Washington* (EPA 2001). Approximately thirty 300-FF-2 waste sites were also remediated earlier due to their proximity to 300-FF-1 waste sites remediated under the *Record of Decision for the 300-FF-1 and 300-FF-5 Operable Units, Hanford Site, Benton County, Washington* (EPA 1996). These previous and ongoing remediation activities have been performed in accordance with the applicable revision of DOE/RL-2001-47, *Remedial Design Report/Remedial Action Work Plan for the 300 Area* (hereafter referred to as the interim action RDR/RAWP). The interim actions have established much of the document and process framework needed to successfully implement the scope of the 300 Area ROD. Upon approval, this addendum and the Integrated RDR/RAWP replace the interim action RDR/RAWP, but remedial designs, plans, and other regulatory agreements approved under interim actions shall remain in effect except where this addendum explicitly describes otherwise. Existing lower tier documents that reference the interim action RDR/RAWP may continue to be used with the understanding that these references are superseded by this approved addendum and the associated Integrated RDR/RAWP (DOE/RL-2014-13).




Figure 1-1. 300-FF-1 and 300-FF-2 Operable Units

NOTE: Institutional controls do not apply for use of the river and shoreline of the Columbia River.