Air Quality and Protection
The Hanford Site continued to comply with the Hanford Site Air Operating Permit that contains requirements for emission sources on the Hanford Site. There was one Notice of Violation requiring action involving airborne radioactive materials pertaining to license requirements and filing annual certificates at Tank Farms. There was a Stop Work Order sent to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) from the Environmental Protection Agency and Washington State Department of Ecology concerning the Plutonium Finishing Plant Demolition Project (issued in January 2018); The Stop Work was lifted for all work to restart in June 2019.

Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment
Potential sources of radionuclide release from the Hanford Site include airborne emissions, groundwater seeping into the Columbia River, and fugitive emissions from soils and facilities. The annual dose to a maximally exposed member of the public continued to be well below the DOE public dose limit of 100 mrem/yr. The dose to biota of the Columbia River and other offsite locations was also well below the DOE standards. Section 4.0, Radiological Protection and Doses, explains the determination of public and biota dose in detail.

Pollution Prevention and Waste Minimization
The Hanford Site diverted 50% (1,075 metric tons) of nonhazardous solid waste for recycling and worked with a company that separates transformer oil and carcasses for recycling, rather than dispose of them as a hazardous waste. The Hanford Site received a three-star 2019 Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool Purchaser award for the procurement of sustainable electronics.

External Environmental Audits and Inspections
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington State Department of Health, and the City of Richland representatives conducted audits, inspections, and site visits of various Hanford Site environmental programs to ensure regulatory compliance with state and federal regulations, the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order, and associated permits and licenses.

2.0 Compliance Summary

JR Draper

For the protection of human health and the environment through safe operations, the Hanford Site has compliance programs designed to meet applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws, regulations, and requirements and comply with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) orders, notices, directives, policies, and guidance (Section 2.9). These measures include specific requirements, actions, plans, and schedules identified in the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement [TPA]) (Ecology et al. 1989) and other compliance or consent agreements. The U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) and Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) recognize the importance of maintaining a proactive program of self-assessment and regulatory reporting to ensure that environmental compliance is achieved and maintained at the Hanford Site. This
report fulfills reporting requirements for the annual compliance status under the environmental standards specified in DOE O 231.1B, Chg 1, *Environmental, Safety and Health Reporting*. The Order is intended to ensure that the DOE, including the National Nuclear Security Administration, receives timely, accurate information about events that have affected or could adversely affect the health, safety, and security of the public or workers, the environment, the operations of DOE facilities, or the credibility of DOE.

Section 2.0 summarizes the laws and regulations that govern Hanford Site activities with regard to federal environmental protection statutes and associated state and local environmental regulations. This section discusses both permits required under specific environmental protection regulations and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)-issued notices of violation or non-compliance. Notices of violation are the regulatory means of informing organizations that their work activities are not meeting requirements; notices of non-compliance are informal notifications of regulatory violations.

## 2.1 Hazardous Materials and Waste Management

This section provides compliance information regarding federal environmental statutes and regulations related to hazardous materials and waste management at the Hanford Site.

### 2.1.1 Federal Facility Compliance Act of 1992

*ME Mills*

Enacted by Congress on October 6, 1992, the *Federal Facility Compliance Act of 1992* amends Section 6001 of the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* (RCRA) to specify that the U.S. waives sovereign immunity from civil and administrative fines and penalties for RCRA violations. In addition, RCRA requires EPA to conduct annual inspections of all federal facilities. Authorized states are given authority to conduct inspections of federal facilities to enforce compliance with state hazardous waste programs. A portion of RCRA also requires DOE to provide mixed waste information to EPA and the states. DOE provides this information annually as part of the Hanford Site Mixed Waste Land Disposal Restrictions Reports pursuant to TPA Milestone M-026-01.

### 2.1.2 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976

*DI Weyns*

Congress enacted RCRA in 1976 to protect human health and the environment. In 1984, the *Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments* amended RCRA, imposing new requirements on hazardous waste management. RCRA’s central principle is to establish cradle-to-grave management to track hazardous waste from its generation to treatment, storage, and disposal (TSD). The state of Washington is authorized under RCRA and EPA’s implementing regulations to implement state law and regulations in lieu of the federal regulations. The Hanford Site hazardous waste activities are subject to applicable provisions of WAC 173-303, “Dangerous Waste Regulations.”
2.1.2.1 Hanford Facility RCRA Permit

EPA assigned the Hanford Site a single EPA identification number for permitting purposes (WA7890008967); as such, the Hanford Site is a single RCRA facility, though there are numerous TSD units spread over large geographic areas. The permit is issued to the following seven permittees:

- DOE-RL and DOE-ORP as the owners/operators
- Five of DOE’s contractors as co-operators
  - Bechtel National, Inc.
  - CH2M Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC)
  - Mission Support Alliance, LLC (MSA); the permit identifies MSA as a permittee but not a co-operator
  - Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
  - Washington River Protection Solutions, LLC (WRPS).

The Washington State dangerous waste regulations (WAC 173-303) require Ecology to issue a new permit after a term of up to 10 years. The initial Hanford Facility RCRA permit was issued on September 27, 1994, for a 10-year term. DOE submitted an application for a new permit on March 30, 2004. The permit expired on September 27, 2004; since that time, Ecology has endeavoring to prepare and issue a new permit. Because the DOE submitted a timely application for a new permit, and Ecology subsequently determined the application was complete, the DOE is allowed to operate under the expired permit per WAC 173-303-806(7). The DOE continues to operate under the expired permit Hanford Facility Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Permit, Dangerous Waste Portion for the Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of Dangerous Waste (Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit) (Ecology 1994).

In May 2012, Ecology issued a draft permit for public comment (Ecology 2012). Ecology received approximately 1,800 comments from the public and 3,000 comments from the DOE on the draft permit during the comment period held from May 1 to October 22, 2012. Issues raised during the comment period identified substantial new questions; as a result, Ecology plans to make revisions and reopen the public comment period for the draft renewal permit. The new permit is expected to be issued in the 2023 time frame. The process will include the following activities:

- Review and evaluate the comments received from the first comment period and develop responses to all comments
- Revise the permit based on significant information and issues raised in the first comment period and other changes that have occurred in the intervening years
- Issue a revised draft permit and responses to the original comments
• Reopen the comment period

• Prepare responses to the next round of public comments

• Issue the final permit.

Ecology is working with the DOE to perform the actions in first and second bullets above.

While operating under the expired permit, DOE is required to submit permit modifications reflecting changing operations in order to keep the permit consistent with current operations. During 2018, modifications were made to the expired permit. The changes affected requirements for the following TSD units pursuant to WAC 173-303-830, “Permit Changes”:

• Liquid Effluent Retention Facility and 200 Areas Effluent Treatment Facility (Operating Unit Group 3)
• 242-A Evaporator (Operating Unit Group 4)
• 325 Hazardous Waste Treatment Unit (Operating Unit Group 5)
• Hanford Tank Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) (Operating Unit 10)
• Integrated Disposal Facility (Operating Unit 11)
• 400 Area Waste Management Unit (Operating Unit 16)
• 1325-N Liquid Waste Disposal Facility (Closure Unit Group 1)
• 1301-Liquid Waste Disposal Facility (Closure Unit Group 2)
• 1324-N Surface Impoundment (Closure Unit Group 3)
• 1324-NA Percolation Pound (Closure Unit Group 3)
• 1706-KE Waste Treatment System (Closure Unit Group 14)
• Purge water Storage and Treatment Facility (Closure Unit Group 15)
• 300 Area Process Trenches (Post-Closure Unit Group 1).

2.1.2.2 Regulatory Agency Inspections

SA Szendre

During fiscal year (FY) 2018, 85 regulatory agency inspections and visits were conducted at DOE facilities on the Hanford Site. Some of the agency inspections were conducted jointly between multiple agencies.

Ecology inspections were conducted by the Nuclear Waste Program Office located in Richland, Washington. EPA Region 10 inspections focused on TSD facilities and conducting oversight of Ecology and Washington State Department of Health (WDOH) inspections under EPA-delegated authority. WDOH inspections were performed by the Office of Radiation Protection, Richland, Washington. WDOH focused on Major and Minor Emission Units, the progress of work involved with the PUREX Tunnel 1 and 2, and the Plutonium Finishing Plant Demolition Project. The City of Richland inspection focused on the 300 Area of the Hanford Site to evaluate compliance with Industrial Wastewater Discharge Permit (CR-IU010) requirements, including the monitoring of wastewater discharges to the publicly-owned treatment works. The DOE-RL, DOE-ORP, and Pacific Northwest Site Office facility inspections are performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Air Operating Permit, Radioactive Air Emissions License, Wastewater Discharge Permits, and RCRA Permit. Inspections are supported by the Hanford Site contractors responsible for the facilities being inspected.
Regulatory agency inspections can result in alleged violations of regulations and other concerns. If deemed appropriate, regulatory agencies may initiate a variety of enforcement and compliance actions, which are discussed further in Section 2.10.

DOE utilizes two internal tracking databases to track regulatory agency inspection activity and agency enforcement actions. The Regulatory Agency Inspection Database includes documentation for regulatory agency inspections of DOE facilities on the Hanford Site managed by the DOE-RL, DOE-ORP, and Pacific Northwest Site Office. Regulatory agency inspections can result in noncompliance or enforcement actions for alleged violations of applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. As such, the Regulatory Agency Inspection Database links to the Environmental Action Tracking System. The Environmental Action Tracking System documents alleged regulatory noncompliance and enforcement actions and their status for the Hanford Site (Section 2.9).

**RCRA Inspections.** The Ecology inspections focused on TSD unit compliance with the Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit (Ecology 2012) and WAC 173-303, “Washington State Dangerous Waste Regulations.” The TSD units and other facilities inspected during 2018 included the following:

- 200 Areas Effluent Treatment Facility
- Waste Encapsulation Storage Facility
- 222-S Laboratory
- 400 Area Waste Management Unit
- 242-A Evaporator
- 325 Building
- 324 Building
- B-Plant
- Liquid Effluent Retention Facility
- Hexone Storage and Treatment Facility
- Central Waste Complex
- Low-level Burial Grounds Trenches 31 and 34
- Plutonium Finishing Plant
- Plutonium Uranium Extraction Facility (PUREX)/PUREX Storage Tunnel
- Double-shell tank and single-shell-tank tank farms
- T-Plant
- Waste Receiving and Processing Facility
- 90-day accumulation areas
- Satellite accumulation areas
- Universal waste management operations.
- Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill
- Groundwater Monitoring Network Wells
- Waste Treatment Facility
- Low-level Burial Grounds.

Section II.O of the RCRA permit addresses general inspection requirements required in accordance with WAC 173-303-320. General Inspections are required to be done by the permittees in addition to the TSD unit inspections specified in Parts III, V, and VI of the RCRA permit. The RCRA permit requires General Inspection of the 100, 200-East, 200-West, 300, and 400 Areas, as well as the Columbia River shoreline. General Inspections are performed annually in these areas by Hanford Site contractors, with oversight.
from DOE, to identify and correct potential malfunctions, deterioration, operator errors, and discharges that may cause or lead to the release of dangerous waste constituents to the environment or that threaten human health. In accordance with RCRA permit requirements, Ecology is notified of the general inspections at least 7 days in advance to allow their participation. RCRA permit general inspection summary reports are maintained in the Hanford Facility Operating Record and Regulatory Agency Inspection Database.

Clean Air Act Inspections
SA Szendre and CJ Perkins
In 2018, the WDOH inspections focused on compliance of point and non-point emission units with the Radioactive Air Emissions License (FF-01). Ecology inspections included inspections of discharge points (e.g., emergency engines/generators and passive vents and stacks) and packaged boiler systems regulated under the Hanford Site Air Operating Permit.

2.1.2.3 RCRA Groundwater Monitoring
MJ Hartman

2.1.3 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
GT Berlin
In 1980, Congress passed the *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980* (CERCLA) to address response, compensation, and liability for past releases or potential releases of hazardous substances (including radionuclides), pollutants, and contaminants to the environment. Because the operation of nuclear production and disposal facilities at the Hanford Site has resulted in past releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants, the facility is subject to CERCLA provisions.

The *Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986* (SARA) amended CERCLA on October 17, 1986. SARA reflected EPA’s experience in administering the complex Superfund program during its first 6 years and made several important changes and additions to the program:

- Stressed the importance of permanent remedies and innovative treatment technologies in cleaning up hazardous waste sites
- Required Superfund actions to consider the standards and requirements found in other state and federal environmental laws and regulations
- Provided new enforcement authorities and settlement tools
- Increased state involvement in every phase of the Superfund program
- Increased the focus on human health problems posed by hazardous waste sites
- Encouraged greater citizen participation in making decisions on how sites should be cleaned up
• Increased the size of the trust fund to $8.5 billion.

SARA also required EPA to revise the Hazard Ranking System to ensure that it accurately assessed the relative degree of risk to human health and the environment posed by uncontrolled hazardous waste sites that may be placed on the National Priorities List.

2.1.3.1 CERCLA Five-Year Reviews

For waste sites where hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remain at the site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, CERCLA requires a review every 5 years to evaluate the implementation and performance of a remedy to determine if the remedy is or will be protective of human health and the environment. The 5-year review requirement applies to all remedial actions selected under CERCLA Section 121. The CERCLA Five-Year Review Report documents the review methods, technical assessments, and protectiveness statements. Recommendations to address identified issues are also provided. The results of the four 5-year reviews conducted since 2000 are documented in the USDOE Hanford Site First Five-Year Review Report (EPA 2001); DOE/RL-2006-20, Second CERCLA Five-Year Review Report for the Hanford Site; DOE/RL-2011-56, Hanford Site Third CERCLA Five-Year Review Report; and DOE/RL-2016-01, Hanford Site Fourth CERCLA Five-Year Review Report.

The Hanford Site Fourth CERCLA Five-Year Review Report (DOE/RL-2016-01), addressing 2011 through 2015, was completed by DOE-RL in 2017 and received EPA concurrence (EPA 2017). This report aligned with EPA’s latest guidance on 5-year review reports, as well as recent training provided to multi-federal agencies as they strove for more consistent reports and the use of substantive tables and figures to more concisely present information that supports the protectiveness statements.

This latest CERCLA 5-year review report (DOE/RL-2016-01) evaluates the protectiveness of 30 operable units with remedies that have been documented in interim or final Records of Decision (RODs). Approximately 16 of the Hanford Site’s operable units do not have remedies documented in interim or final RODs at this time; however, they will be addressed in future 5-year review reports as additional RODs are issued. A breakdown of the source and groundwater operable units that are were in scope and out of scope for Hanford’s fourth CERCLA 5-year review report is provided below.

• In scope (operable units with interim or final RODs):

• Out of scope (operable units without RODs):

Of the 23 source operable units assessed in Hanford’s fourth CERCLA 5-year review, five operable units (100-FR-1, 100-FR-2, 100-IU-2, 100-IU-6, and 1100-EM-1) were determined to be in the EPA protectiveness category of “Protective”; 18 operable units (100-BC-1, 100-BC-2, 100-DR-1, 100-DR-2, 100-HR-1, 100-HR-1, 100-FR-1, 100-KR-1, 100-KR-2*, 100-NR-1, 300-FF-1, 300-FF-2, 200-CU-1, 200-CU-3, 200-CW-5, 200-PW-1, 200-PW-3 and 200-PW-6) were determined to be in the category of “Will Be Protective”. Of the seven groundwater operable units assessed in Hanford’s fourth CERCLA 5-year review, one operable unit (200-ZP-1) was determined to be in the EPA protectiveness category of “Protective”; five operable units (100-FR-3, 100-HR-3*, 100-KR-4*, 300-FF-5, and 200-UP-1) were determined to be in the category of “Will Be Protective”; and one operable unit (100-NR-2*) was determined to be in the category of “Not Protective”. For the operable units in this paragraph that include an asterisk (*), recommendations for issues identified during the 5-year review are described within DOE/RL-2016-01.

Hanford’s next CERCLA 5-year review report is due by May 4, 2022.

### 2.1.3.2 Institutional Controls

**GT Berlin**

The MSA Long-Term Stewardship (LTS) program is responsible for managing institutional controls (IC) along the River Corridor with the exception of a portion of the 100-K Area. CHPRC is responsible for the ICs associated with groundwater. The DOE/RL 2001-41, *Sitewide Institutional Controls Plan for Hanford CERCLA Response Actions and RCRA Corrective Actions*, describes the Institutional Controls for the Hanford Site in accordance with CERCLA and/or RCRA decision documents. The CERCLA decision documents present the selected remedial actions chosen in accordance with CERCLA, as amended by the SARA and implemented under 40 CFR 300. CERCLA decision documents are developed as part of the cleanup mission at the Hanford Site. The selected remedies chosen may include ICs through implementation of the remedy and then afterwards. The CERCLA decision documents identify the specific requirements for these ICs.

The ICs are primarily administrative in nature and typically are used to augment the engineered components of a selected remedy to minimize the potential for human exposure to residual contaminants. Active ICs, such as controlling access to the Hanford Site or activities that may affect remedial action, are generally employed during remediation. After remediation is completed, passive ICs are employed such as permanent markers, retaining public records and archives, or sustaining regulations regarding land or resource use. ICs such as drilling and excavation restrictions for waste sites with contamination below 15 ft (4.6 m), monitoring and controlling access to the area, and warning signs also may be employed after remediation is completed.

As required by DOE/RL-2001-41, ICs are assessed annually as required by the CERCLA and/or RCRA decision document. Hanford Site contractors provide an annual update on the effectiveness of the ICs to EPA and Ecology at the area unit managers meetings each September. Minutes from the unit managers’ meeting are available on the TPA Administrative Record Public Information Repository website [http://pdw.hanford.gov/arpir/](http://pdw.hanford.gov/arpir/). The Hanford Site CERCLA 5-year review also includes a rollup of the issues/actions noted during the annual assessments.
The MSA LTS organization is responsible for managing ICs related to Hanford Site access control and the wastes sites in the River Corridor area. The results of LTS’s 2018 annual assessment can be summarized as follows:

- **Entry Restrictions**
  - Active badging program and barricades in place to control unauthorized entries.
  - Damaged fences were observed in eight locations and repairs have been completed.

- **Warning Notices**
  - Warning signs required by decision documents are in place.
  - “No Trespassing” signs along road perimeter that were found to be damaged or illegible due to general weathering are being repaired.

- **Land Use Management**
  - LTS reviewed 20 site evaluations to ensure land-use ICs are kept in place.
  - LTS approval is mandatory on excavation permits.
  - 181 excavation permits were evaluated for IC compliance.
  - No change in land-use designations occurred in FY 2018 (e.g., industrial use).
  - No disturbances or natural subsidence/erosion found on the waste sites with ICs.
  - Thirty-six waste sites in the 300 Area Industrial Complex with enhanced recharge controls:
    - Drainage during storm events was observed to address potential drainage issues
    - Snow-pile staging area plans were developed to prevent enhanced recharge
    - Collaboration continues facilities to minimize impact of discharges from fire testing and to improve/maintain drainage systems to support enhanced-recharge control ICs.

- **Groundwater-Use Management**
  - Wells drilled in the LTS-managed areas are approved through the site excavation permit process.

- **Miscellaneous Provisions**
  - Two reportable trespassing incidents on Hanford Site from October 1, 2017, through August 31, 2018.
Operable units in the Central Plateau of the Hanford Site also have a number of ICs in both interim and final ROD documents. In calendar year (CY) 2018, an assessment of ICs at 200-UP-1 Operable Unit, 221-U Facility, and 200-ZP-1 Operable Unit identified no deficiencies.

2.1.4 Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986
GM Fritz

Title III of SARA, also known as the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (EPCRA), requires owners and operators of facilities that handle certain hazardous chemicals onsite to provide information on the release, storage, and use of these chemicals to organizations responsible for emergency response planning. EPCRA has four major provisions: emergency planning, emergency release notification, hazardous chemical inventory reporting, and toxic chemical release inventory reporting. Table 2-1 summarizes sections of EPCRA and its requirements, including two annual reports: the Tier Two Emergency and Hazardous Chemical Inventory, which provides information about hazardous chemicals stored at each facility in amounts exceeding minimum threshold levels, and the Toxic Chemical Release Inventory, which describes total annual releases of certain toxic chemicals and associated waste management activities. Table 2-2 provides an overview of reporting under the EPRCA during 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>CFR Section</th>
<th>Reporting Criteria</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Agencies Receiving Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>40 CFR 355, “Emergency Planning and Notification”</td>
<td>Presence of an extremely hazardous substance in quantity equal to or greater than threshold planning quantity at any time.</td>
<td>Within 60 days of threshold planning quantity exceedance</td>
<td>Local Emergency Planning Committee; State Emergency Response Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change occurring at a facility that is relevant to emergency planning.</td>
<td>Within 30 days after change has occurred</td>
<td>Local Emergency Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>40 CFR 370, “Hazardous Chemical Reporting”</td>
<td>Release of an extremely hazardous substance or a CERCLA hazardous substance in quantity equal to or greater than reportable quantity.</td>
<td>Initial notification: immediate (within 15 min of knowledge of reportable release). Written follow-up within 14 days of release.</td>
<td>Local Emergency Planning Committee; State Emergency Response Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
<td>The presence at any one time at a facility an OSHA hazardous chemical in quantity greater than or equal to 10,000 lbs (4,500 kg) or an extremely hazardous substance in quantity equal to or greater than threshold planning quantity or 500 lbs (230 kg), whichever is less.</td>
<td>Revised list of chemicals due within 3 months of a chemical exceeding a threshold</td>
<td>Local Emergency Planning Committee; State Emergency Response Commission; Local Fire Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td>The presence at any one time at a facility an OSHA hazardous chemical in quantity equal to or greater than 10,000 lbs (4,500 kg), or an extremely hazardous</td>
<td>Annually by March 1</td>
<td>Local Emergency Planning Committee; State Emergency Response Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>CFR Section</th>
<th>Reporting Criteria</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Agencies Receiving Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>40 CFR 372, “Toxic Chemical Release Reporting”</td>
<td>Substance in quantity equal to or greater than threshold planning quantity or 500 lbs (230 kg), whichever is less.</td>
<td>Annually by July 1</td>
<td>EPA; State Emergency Response Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CERCLA = Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act  
CFR = Code of Federal Regulation  
CY = calendar year  
EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
OSHA = Occupational Safety and Health Administration

Table 2-2. Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Compliance Reporting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description of Reporting</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Emergency planning notifications</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Extremely hazardous substance release notification</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>No releases occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Material safety data sheet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Chemical inventory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Toxic release inventory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOE/RL-2019-10, 2018 Hanford Site Tier Two Emergency and Hazardous Chemical Inventory, was submitted to Ecology’s Community Right-To-Know Unit; local emergency planning committees for Benton, Franklin, and Grant Counties; and the City of Richland and Hanford Site Fire Department before the annual March 1 deadline. The Hanford Site had 50 hazardous chemicals that exceeded the reporting thresholds. One chemical category (lead acid batteries, which contain sulfuric acid - an extremely hazardous substance) exceeded the reporting threshold for offsite locations (700 Area, 1100 Area, and the Federal Building). Table 2-3 lists the average quantities of the 10 hazardous chemicals stored in greatest quantity on the Hanford Site in 2018.
Table 2-3. Average Quantity of the 10 Hazardous Chemicals Stored in Greatest Quantities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS#</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
<th>TPQ</th>
<th>Average Amount (lb/kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7647-14-5</td>
<td>Sodium Chloride</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,465,584/1,571,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-0</td>
<td>Diesel Fuel</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,761,530/1,252,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7440-23-5</td>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,351,029/1,066,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8012-95-1</td>
<td>Mineral Oil</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>798,715/362,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8052-42-4</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>786,120/356,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8006-61-9</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>744,976/337,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65997-15-1</td>
<td>Portland Cement</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>601,688/272,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-0</td>
<td>Lead Acid Batteries</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>559,160/253,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-98-6</td>
<td>Propane</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>406,786/184,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7782-63-0</td>
<td>Ferrous Sulfate Heptahydrate</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>400,002/181,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DOE/RL-2019-25, 2018 Hanford Site Toxic Chemical Release Inventory, report was submitted to EPA and Ecology before the annual July 1 deadline. During CY 2018, the Hanford Site exceeded activity thresholds for lead, naphthalene, propylene and toluene. Information concerning these chemicals is described in Table 2-4.

Table 2-4. Toxic Chemicals Exceeding Reporting Thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS No.</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
<th>Non-Exempt Use Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7439-92-1</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Ammunition fired during range practice by Hanford Safeguards and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-20-3</td>
<td>Naphthalene</td>
<td>Diesel used for stationary equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-07-1</td>
<td>Propylene</td>
<td>Propane gas used sitewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-88-3</td>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>Gasoline used for stationary equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.5 Environmental Release Reporting

ME Mills

Federal regulations establish reporting requirements for certain environmental releases that must be reported to the National Response Center. The National Response Center is the central point of contact for reporting hazardous substance and oil spills. Reportable releases include spills or discharges of hazardous substances to the environment other than releases permitted under state or federal law. CERCLA Section 103 requires reporting for releases of hazardous substances that equal or exceed specified reportable quantities, including releases that are continuous and stable in quantity and rate but exceed specified limits. Washington State regulations (WAC 173-303-145, “Spills and Discharges into the Environment”) also require that spills or non-permitted discharges of dangerous waste or hazardous substances to the environment be reported. The requirement applies to spills or discharges onto the ground, into groundwater or surface water (Columbia River), or in the air such that human health or the environment are threatened, regardless of the quantity of dangerous waste or hazardous substance.

During the reporting period, hazardous substance releases were conservatively assessed under WAC 173-303-145, and none of these events required notification to Ecology. These relatively minor spill events primarily involved petroleum products from leaking equipment and vehicles (e.g., hydraulic
fluid, diesel fuel, and motor oil). These spills have all been logged per CRD 436.1. All of these spilled products were cleaned up and all resulting materials (e.g., absorbents and impacted soils) were processed for disposal in accordance with applicable requirements.

2.1.6 Toxic Substances Control Act

DI Weyns

The Hanford Site has a well-structured program that complies with the regulations promulgated under the authority granted to EPA by the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). TSCA primarily involves regulation of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). TSCA also regulates other constituents (e.g., asbestos, lead-based paint, and radon). The applicability of TSCA to the management of these constituents at the Hanford Site is discussed in the following:

- **Lead-based Paint**
  - TSCA regulations for lead-based paint are applicable to residential and child-occupied facilities and do not apply to Hanford Site activities.

- **Radon**
  - The radon regulations under TSCA pertain to schools and public or assisted-housing and do not apply to Hanford Site activities.

- **Asbestos**
  - Asbestos at the Hanford Site is primarily regulated by the Clean Air Act and Occupational Safety and Health Administration.
  - The TSCA accreditation and training requirements found at 40 CFR 763, Appendix C, are applicable at the Hanford Site. These requirements specify the minimum training standards for personnel engaged in asbestos abatement activities.

- **PCBs** – federal regulations for use, storage, and disposal of PCBs are contained in 40 CFR 761, “Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) Manufacturing, Processing, Distribution in Commerce, and Use Prohibitions.” Background information regarding Hanford Site PCB management activities are as follows:
  - PCB wastes on the Hanford Site are stored and/or disposed of in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 761.
  - Some radioactive PCB waste remains in extended storage onsite pending the development of adequate treatment and disposal technologies and capacities.
  - In service electrical equipment that might contain PCBs is maintained in accordance with 40 CFR 761.
the regulatory issues associated with managing PCB waste at the WTP, tank farms, and affected waste management units adjacent to the tank farms.


− Work performed under risk-based disposal approvals (RBDA) continued in 2018 including, but not limited to, single-shell tank waste retrieval activities in accordance with EPA Phase I and II RBDA for the use of double-shell tank PCB remediation waste in accordance with 40 CFR 761.61(c), “PCB Remediation Waste.” Note: Phase I identifies general conditions that apply to the overall strategy and retrieval process, and Phase II identifies tank-specific conditions.

− Work was performed at the 242-A Evaporator under the RBDA for the 200 Areas Liquid Waste Processing Facilities.

− The EPA’s 2005 RBDA letter (EPA 2005) allowed for the solidification of the K-Basins North Load-Out Pit (NLOP) sludge, which was a multi-phasic (mixture of liquid and non-liquid phases) PCB remediation waste. The waste was solidified at the Hanford Site T-Plant facility to meet radiological treatment standards in preparation for disposal.

− Condition 5 of the NLOP RBDA requires DOE to submit to EPA plans and schedules for final decontamination and/or disposal of the NLOP treatment system. As of 2018, DOE is developing plans to place additional K-Basin sludge containers in T-Plant, which will require removal of the NLOP treatment equipment. When the K-Basins Sludge Project is finalized, EPA will be notified of plans to decontaminate or dispose of the NLOP treatment equipment.

2.1.7 Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

JM Rodriguez


2.2 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

JW Cammann

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires federal agencies to assess the environmental consequences of proposed actions prior to making decisions that may have environmental effects. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations that implement NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508) and DOE’s NEPA implementing procedures (10 CFR 1021) ensure compliance with the letter and spirit of NEPA.
NEPA and its implementing regulations and procedures require federal agencies to integrate NEPA reviews early in project planning to ensure decisions reflect environmental considerations, avoid delays later in the process, and anticipate and resolve conflicts; rather than be an after-the-fact process that justifies decisions already made. NEPA reviews are an “umbrella” for compliance with other federal, state, and local requirements. The evaluation of many resource areas fall within the jurisdiction of other environmental laws and regulations, which may require a specific standard to be met (substantive requirements) or may require a permit, license, or other approval by the agency responsible for administering the law.

Proposed actions are evaluated in accordance with the CEQ on Environmental Quality regulations and DOE NEPA implementing procedures to determine whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or Environmental Assessment (EA) is required; or the proposed action is categorically excluded (CX) from preparation of an EIS or EA.

This section provides the status of NEPA documentation (EISs, EAs, and CXs) completed or underway at the Hanford Site during CY 2018. Hanford Site NEPA documentation is available online at https://www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/Documents.

2.2.1 Hanford Site Environmental Impact Statements.
There were no Environmental Impact Statements completed or underway at the Hanford Site during CY 2018.

2.2.2 Hanford Site Environmental Assessments.
Hanford Site EAs that were completed or underway in CY 2018 are described in this section.

2.2.2.1 Environmental Assessment for Rebuild of the North Loop 230-kV Electrical Transmission Line (DOE/EA-2033). DOE prepared an EA for the rebuild of approximately 28 mi (45 km) of the North Loop transmission line in the northern part of the Hanford Site. The proposed project would reconfigure switching station and substation components, install equipment and conductors, build and recondition access roads, and remove structures and other ancillary activities. DOE made a determination to prepare an EA for the rebuild of the transmission line on February 1, 2016.

During CY 2018, work continued on the EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). The FONSI was signed on May 7, 2018.

2.2.2.2 Environmental Assessment for Benton-Othello 115-kV Transmission Line Rebuild Project (DOE/EA-2038). An EA is under preparation to assess environmental effects of Avista Utilities’ (Avista) proposal to rebuild 12.6 mi (20.27 km) of the Benton-Othello Switching Station electrical transmission line on the Hanford Site. The upgrade on the Hanford Site would begin approximately 0.5 mi (0.8 km) south of State Route 24

DOE made a determination to prepare an EA for the rebuild of the transmission line on April 6, 2016. A Public Scoping Notice to prepare an EA was issued on January 3, 2017. Avista, in coordination with DOE and other agencies with jurisdiction, has been conducting cultural, ecological, and wetland field studies and a floodplain evaluation. Work continued on the EA during CY 2018.
2.2.3  Hanford Site Categorical Exclusions.
Categorical exclusions encompass classes of actions that DOE has analyzed and determined do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the environment and for which neither an EA nor an EIS is required (10 CFR 1021).

The DOE/RL NEPA Compliance Officer (NCO) approved a total of 51 categorical exclusions during CY 2018. Of these, 43 were annual categorical exclusions to cover routine and recurring work activities planned to be performed during CY 2018 at the Hanford Site (Mission Support Alliance – 28, CH2M Plateau Remediation Company – 8, and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory – 7). A total of eight activity-specific CXs were approved by the NCO (Mission Support Alliance – six, and CH2M Plateau Remediation Company – two). The Office of River Protection had no CXs for CY 2018. Annual and activity-specific categorical exclusions approved by the DOE NCO may be viewed at http://www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/CategoricalExclusions.

2.3  Radiation Protection Statutes, Regulations, and Directives

By TA Ikenberry

The Hanford Site is subject to radiation protection statutes and regulations designed to protect the health and safety of the public, workforce, and the environment. Relevant laws and regulations are described in the following sections.

2.3.1  Atomic Energy Act of 1954
To ensure proper management of radioactive materials, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (AEA) and its amendments include provisions to delegate roles and responsibilities to control radioactive materials and nuclear energy primarily to DOE, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and EPA. Through the AEA, DOE regulates the control of radioactive materials under its authority, including the TSD of low-level radioactive waste from its operations. Sections of the AEA authorize DOE to establish radiation protection standards for itself and its contractors. Accordingly, DOE promulgated a series of regulations (e.g., 10 CFR 820, “Procedural Rules for DOE Nuclear Activities”; 10 CFR 830, “Nuclear Safety Management”; and 10 CFR 835, “Occupational Radiation Protection”). Additional DOE directives to protect public health and the environment from potential risks associated with radioactive materials include DOE O 458.1, Radiation Protection of the Public and Environment, and DOE O 435.1, Chg. 1, Radioactive Waste Management. Hanford Site operations are subject to these regulations and directives.


2.3.2  DOE O 458.1, Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment
The purpose of DOE O 458.1 is to establish standards and requirements for conduct of DOE and DOE contractor operations to provide radiological protection of the public and the environment. DOE O 458.1 was developed and issued consistent with DOE’s policy to implement legally applicable radiation protection requirements; consider and adopt, as appropriate, recommendations by authoritative organizations (e.g., the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements and the
International Commission on Radiological Protection); and adopt and implement standards generally consistent with those of the NRC for DOE facilities and activities not subject to NRC authority. Specifically, relative to guidance, standards, and regulatory requirements existing at the time of its issuance, DOE O 458.1 adopted applicable standards issued by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements and International Commission on Radiological Protection, incorporated regulatory requirements applicable to DOE operations, and consolidated and upgraded DOE guidance for property with residual radioactive material.

DOE O 458.1 applies to all DOE elements and contractors performing work for DOE, as provided by law and/or contract, and as implemented by the appropriate contracting officer. DOE O 458.1 was developed and issued under the authority of the AEA as amended, which authorizes DOE to provide for the radiological health and safety of the public for operations conducted under DOE direction.

Relative to the radiological health and safety of the public, the goals of DOE O 458.1 are to ensure that DOE operations achieve the following:

- Maintain radiation exposures to the public within established limits
- Manage real and personal property to control residual radioactivity
- Ensure potential exposures to the public are as far below established limits as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA)
- Ensure DOE facilities have the capabilities consistent with the types of operations conducted to monitor routine and non-routine releases and to assess doses to the public.

In addition to providing radiological protection to the public, the objective of DOE O 458.1 is to provide radiological protection of the environment to the extent practical.

Table 2-5 provides the standards (dose limits) for radiation protection of the public and the environment from routine DOE operations. While the public dose limit of 100 mrem/yr (1 millisievert [mSv]/yr) is the primary dose standard, other regulations impose additional constraints on the dose that may be received through specific exposure pathways. The air and water pathways are also regulated by the EPA and Washington State; they are discussed in more detail in Sections 2.4 and 2.5. DOE O 458.1 provides dose limits for protection of aquatic and terrestrial plants and animals in the vicinity of radiological activities on the Hanford Site. In addition, dose constraints are provided for the dose that could be received by a member of the public from certain other activities, including radioactive waste management, storage, and disposal, as well as unrestricted release to the public or clearance of real and personal property.

These radiation standards are dose limits but not DOE’s expectation for dose to the public and the environment. DOE O 458.1 requires the application of the ALARA process to all routine radiological activities to further reduce (optimize) radionuclide releases and resulting doses to the extent possible.
Table 2-5. Radiation Protection Standards for the Public and the Environment from All Routine DOE Operations.\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Pathways (DOE O 458.1)</th>
<th>Total Effective Dose\textsuperscript{c}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mrem/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine public dose</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary public dose\textsuperscript{b}, under special circumstances with specific authorization and justification</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Pathway Dose Constraints** (40 CFR 61 Subpart H, WAC 173-480, WAC 246-247) See Section 2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions of radionuclides shall not cause any member of the public to receive an effective dose equivalent of 10 mrem/yr</th>
<th>Effective Dose Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mrem/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water Pathway Dose Constraints** (40 CFR 141, WAC 246-290) See Section 2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The annual dose equivalent to the total body or to any organ shall not exceed 4 mrem/yr, based on average annual concentrations</th>
<th>Dose Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mrem/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protection of Biota.** (DOE O 458.1, DOE-STD-1153-2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radiological activities must be conducted to protect populations of aquatic animals, terrestrial plants, and terrestrial animals</th>
<th>Absorbed Dose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rad/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic animal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian animal</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial plant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial animal</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Radioactive Waste Dose Constraint** (DOE O 458.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure from radioactive waste management, storage, and disposal activities shall be ALARA and meet the dose constraint.</th>
<th>Total Effective Dose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mrem/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public dose constraint</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Release and Clearance of Property** (DOE O 458.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure from release of real (land and buildings) and personal property shall be controlled to be ALARA and meet dose constraints.</th>
<th>Total Effective Dose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mrem/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public dose constraint from real property</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public dose constraint from personal property</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Routine DOE operations imply normal, planned activities and do not include actual or potential accidental or unplanned releases.

\textsuperscript{b} DOE-RL may request specific authorization from DOE-HQ for a temporary public dose limit greater than 100 mrem/yr (1 mSv/yr). It may be no more than 500 mrem (5 mSv)/yr and cannot exceed an average of 100 mrem/yr (1 mSv/yr) over 5 contiguous years. The request must document the justification, alternative considered, and the application of the ALARA process.

\textsuperscript{c} Dose units are those in the cited regulation, order or standard. DOE uses the most up-to-date dosimetry system of any United States agency.

ALARA = as low as reasonably achievable

CFR = Code of Federal Regulations

DOE-HQ = U.S. Department of Energy, Headquarters

mrem = millirem

mSv = millisievert

mGy = milligray

WAC = Washington Administrative Code

\textsuperscript{NOTE:} Radiation doses received from natural background, residual weapons testing and nuclear accident fallout, medical exposure, and consumer products are excluded from the implementation of these dose limits.

\textsuperscript{NOTE:} International dose units shown in italics are not provided in the order or rules but are provided for information.
2.3.3 DOE O 435.1, Radioactive Waste Management

I. Siddoway, G Pyles

The purpose of DOE O 435.1 is to establish requirements to manage high-level waste, transuranic waste, and low-level waste, including the radioactive component of mixed waste (high-level waste, transuranic waste, and low-level waste containing chemically hazardous constituents) in a safe manner that is protective of the worker, public health, and the environment. DOE O 435.1 takes a cradle-to-grave approach to managing waste and includes requirements for waste generation, storage, treatment, disposal, and post-closure monitoring of facilities.

Radioactive waste shall be managed such that the requirements of other DOE orders, standards, and regulations are met, including 10 CFR 835, “Occupational Radiation Protection”; DOE O 440.1B, Worker Protection Program for DOE (Including the National Nuclear Security Administration) Federal Employees; and DOE O 458.1, Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment. For facilities undergoing CERCLA removal actions or CERCLA remedial actions, DOE O 435.1 may not be an Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement as defined in Section 121(d) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980.

2.4 Air Quality Statutes and Regulations

RA Kaldor

Below is information on federal, state, and local statutes applicable to the Hanford Site air quality program.

2.4.1 Clean Air Act

The federal Clean Air Act was enacted to protect and enhance air quality and is the legal basis for federal, state, and local air quality regulations. Originally passed in 1963, the law has been revised extensively on numerous occasions. The most recent revision, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 provides the framework for a significant portion of current federal air quality regulations. The Washington Clean Air Act, which parallels and supplements federal law, has been revised periodically to keep pace with federal changes. EPA provides high-level programmatic oversight of the air quality program on the Hanford Site and has delegated authority for implementing applicable Clean Air Act regulations to designated state and local regulatory agencies.


Prevention Provisions”; and 40 CFR 82, “Protection of Stratospheric Ozone”; as well as the state requirements in WAC 173-400, “General Regulations for Air Pollution Sources”; WAC 173-460, “Controls for New Sources of Toxic Air Pollutants”; WAC 173-480, “Ambient Air Quality Standards and Emission Limits for Radionuclides”; and WAC 173-491, “Emission Standards and Controls for Sources Emitting Gasoline Vapors.” Criteria and toxic air pollutant emissions are often referred to as nonradioactive air emissions at the Hanford Site. Criteria pollutants are particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, carbon monoxide, lead, and volatile organic compounds. Toxic air pollutants are other chemical contaminants as regulated by Washington State. Ecology also regulates demolition and asbestos renovation activities at the Hanford Site in accordance with federal requirements in 40 CFR 61, Subpart M, “National Emission Standard for Asbestos.”

The Benton Clean Air Agency regulates outdoor burning activities at the Hanford Site in accordance with state requirements in WAC 173-425, “Outdoor Burning.”

### 2.4.2 Air Permits Required by Regulations

*RA Kaldor, SA Szendre*

Hanford Site contractors evaluate each proposed new or modified emission unit using the new source review requirements of radioactive air emissions (WAC 246-247) and criteria and toxic air pollutants (WAC 173-400-110, “New Source Review (NSR) for Sources and Portable Sources,” and WAC 173-460-040, “New Source Review”) to determine whether a notice of construction application must be submitted to the WDOH and/or Ecology (as applicable) for approval before construction or operation of the proposed source.

Hanford Site radioactive air emission sources are operated in accordance with the Radioactive Air Emissions License for the DOE-RL Hanford Site, License FF-01 issued by the WDOH. The FF-01 license is a compilation of all applicable radioactive air emission requirements and is renewed every 5 years. For each emission unit, the FF-01 license includes either an approval to modify/construct or an operating license. Overall, Hanford Site radioactive air emissions are controlled to sufficiently low levels to ensure the resultant exposure to any offsite individual remains well below the 10 mrem (100 microsievert [µSv])/yr specified in 40 CFR 61.92, “Standard.” Hanford Site radioactive air emissions data are published annually in the radionuclide air emissions report for the Hanford Site (DOE/RL-2019-09, *Radionuclide Air Emissions Report for the Hanford Site, Calendar Year 2018*).

As a major source of air pollutants, the Hanford Site is subject to the air operating permit requirements in 40 CFR 70, “State Operating Permit Programs,” and WAC 173-401, “Operating Permit Regulation.” In coordination with WDOH and the Benton Clean Air Agency, Ecology issued Renewal 2 of the Air Operating Permit for a period of 5 years, effective April 1, 2013. Renewal 2 was issued to incorporate new WDOH and Ecology air emission licenses, approval orders, and updated regulatory requirements. An application for renewal of the Air Operating Permit was submitted to Ecology in September 2017 and determined by Ecology to be complete in November 2017. A draft renewal 3 Air Operating Permit was issued for public comment in December 2017 and then again in July 2018. The current permit will continue to be in effect until a renewed permit is issued. The Air Operating Permit is a compilation of applicable Clean Air Act requirements for both radioactive and criteria/toxic air pollutant emissions, including the radioactive air emissions license FF-01 issued by WDOH and Notice of Construction Approval Orders issued by Ecology. The Air Operating Permit requires the submittal of semiannual reports to the regulatory agencies documenting the status of required monitoring and permit deviations. In addition, an annual report documenting the compliance status of Hanford Site emission
sources against applicable Clean Air Act requirements and an annual report that documents total emissions of criteria and toxic pollutants is also required.

The WDOH, Ecology, and the Benton Clean Air Agency conduct inspections of Hanford Site emission sources to verify compliance with applicable Clean Air Act requirements. Hanford Site contractors and DOE actively work to resolve any potential compliance issues identified during these inspections. During 2018, regulatory agencies conducted 39 Clean Air Act inspections on the Hanford Site. There was one Notice of Violation issued by WDOH requiring action involving airborne radioactive materials pertaining to license requirements and filing annual certificates at Tank Farms.

2.5 Water Quality Permits, Statutes, and Regulations

M Kamberg

This section provides information on federal, state, and local requirements and permits for water quality protection.

2.5.1 Federal Permit – Discharges to Columbia River

The Clean Water Act, as amended, applies to discharges to surface waters in the United States. At the Hanford Site, regulations are applied through 40 CFR 122, “EPA Administered Permit Programs: The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.” DOE does not currently have any discharges to the Columbia River requiring permits.

2.5.2 State Waste Discharge Permit – Discharges to the Soil Column/Groundwater

Ecology’s Wastewater Discharge Permit program regulates discharges to state waters, including groundwater. Four Ecology state waste discharge permits, all held by DOE, were in effect during 2018: ST0004500, ST0004502, ST0004511, and ST0045514. Ecology’s wastewater discharge permits page is located at https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/nwp/permitting/WWD/index.html. WDOH issues annual permits to DOE to operate Hanford Site onsite sewage systems, which include some holding-tank sewage systems. Most onsite sewage systems (septic systems) operate under permits issued by the WDOH.

Two Ecology general permits for sand and gravel were in effect (and issued to Bechtel National Inc.) during 2018: WAG-50-5180 and WAG-50-5181.

2.5.3 Local Discharge Permit – Discharges to the City of Richland Sewer

The City of Richland regulates industrial wastewater discharges to its sewer collection system in accordance with City of Richland Code Chapter 17.30, Richland Pretreatment Act. DOE holds Permit No. CR-IU010, which allows discharges from the 300 Area facilities. The current Permit was renewed in 2018 and will expire March 6, 2023.

2.5.4 Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974

BR Stenson

The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (SDWA) established a cooperative program among local, state, and federal agencies to institute drinking water regulations applicable to all public water systems in the United States. States were granted primary responsibility (known as primacy) for administering and enforcing the SDWA. To obtain primacy, states were required to meet certain criteria, including adoption of regulations equal to or more stringent than EPA regulations.
Washington State was awarded primacy in 1978; the State Board of Health and WDOH became partners in developing and enforcing state drinking water regulations. Hanford Site water systems were designated as public in 1986 and became formally registered as public under WDOH jurisdiction in 1987.

The SDWA was amended in 1986 and 1996. Although 1986 amendments included provisions that emphasized treatment to ensure safe drinking water, 1996 amendments focused on source water protection, water system improvements funding, operator training, public information, and strengthening EPA’s scientific work including a risk and cost benefit analysis in establishing drinking water standards. Between 1975 and 2006, these amendments resulted in the development of 18 new drinking water regulations. Post-1996 regulations have included more complex compliance determinations and more advanced treatment technologies. Based on site-specific conditions, many public water systems are either using or investigating new treatment technologies to comply with the increasingly complex requirements.

The EPA’s microbial and disinfection byproduct rules include nine drinking water regulations, address acute threats from microbial contamination, and address chronic threats from disinfectant residuals and disinfection byproducts. Disinfection byproducts are sometimes formed when an oxidizing agent like chlorine is added to water during the water treatment process to kill or inactivate harmful organisms that may cause various diseases. Chlorine is a very active substance and reacts with naturally occurring substances, like organic material and bacteria, to form compounds known as disinfection byproducts. These rules limit disinfectant residuals and disinfection byproducts in the distribution systems while improving particle removal in the drinking water treatment plants. In 2018, all but one of the affected Hanford Site water systems demonstrated compliance with the filtration and disinfection treatment technique requirements and limits for disinfectant residuals and disinfection byproducts.

To protect worker health using public water supplies on the Hanford Site, water systems were monitored during 2018 for microbiological, chemical, physical, and radiological constituents. There were no microbiological detections during the 2018 monitoring cycle and all eight water systems had chemical concentrations in drinking water that were well below the maximum contaminant levels established by EPA. Table 2-6 provides selected drinking water standards. System-specific information and analytical results for 2018 radiological monitoring are summarized in Section 7.1.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Drinking Water Standard (^a)</th>
<th>Agency (^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antimony</td>
<td>6 µg/L 0.006 ppm</td>
<td>EPA, WDOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic</td>
<td>10 µg/L 0.01 ppm</td>
<td>EPA, WDOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>7 million fibers/L 7 million fibres/L</td>
<td>WDOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barium</td>
<td>2,000 µg/L 2 ppm</td>
<td>EPA, WDOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryllium</td>
<td>0.4 mg/L 0.004 ppm</td>
<td>WDOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromate</td>
<td>10 µg/L 0.010 ppm</td>
<td>EPA, WDOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>5 µg/L 0.005 ppm</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon tetrachloride</td>
<td>5 µg/L 0.005 ppm</td>
<td>EPA, WDOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trihalomethanes (^c)</td>
<td>80 µg/L 0.08 ppm</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium</td>
<td>100 µg/L 0.1 ppm</td>
<td>EPA, WDOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorite</td>
<td>1000 µg/L 1.0 ppm</td>
<td>EPA, WDOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cis-1,2-Dichloroethene</td>
<td>70 µg/L 0.07 ppm</td>
<td>EPA, WDOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>1,300 µg/L 1.3 ppm</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) established by the EPA.

\(b\) Agencies responsible for enforcing the standards, as indicated by their acronyms.

\(c\) Trihalomethanes include bromoform and chloroform.
### Table 2-6. Selected Drinking Water Standards. (2 Pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Drinking Water Standard</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyanide</td>
<td>200 µg/L</td>
<td>0.2 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoride</td>
<td>4 mg/L</td>
<td>4 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haloacetic Acids</td>
<td>60 µg/L</td>
<td>0.060 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>15 µg/L</td>
<td>0.015 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury (inorganic)</td>
<td>2 µg/L</td>
<td>0.002 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylene chloride</td>
<td>5 µg/L</td>
<td>0.005 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>0.1 mg/L</td>
<td>0.1 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate, as NO₃⁻</td>
<td>10 mg/L</td>
<td>10 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrite, as NO₂⁻</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selenium</td>
<td>50 µg/L</td>
<td>0.05 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetrachloroethene</td>
<td>5 µg/L</td>
<td>0.005 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thallium</td>
<td>2 µg/L</td>
<td>0.002 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichloroethene</td>
<td>5 µg/L</td>
<td>0.005 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antimony-125</td>
<td>300 pCi/L d</td>
<td>11.1 Bq/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta particle and photon activity</td>
<td>4 mrem/yr e</td>
<td>40 µSv/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon-14</td>
<td>2,000 pCi/L d</td>
<td>74.1 Bq/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesium-137</td>
<td>200 pCi/L d</td>
<td>7.4 Bq/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobalt-60</td>
<td>100 pCi/L d</td>
<td>3.7 Bq/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iodine-129</td>
<td>1 pCi/L d</td>
<td>0.037 Bq/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenium-106</td>
<td>30 pCi/L d</td>
<td>1.11 Bq/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strontium-90</td>
<td>8 pCi/L d</td>
<td>0.296 Bq/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technetium-99</td>
<td>900 pCi/L d</td>
<td>33.3 Bq/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total alpha (excluding uranium)</td>
<td>15 pCi/L d</td>
<td>0.56 Bq/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tritium</td>
<td>20,000 pCi/L d</td>
<td>740 Bq/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uranium</td>
<td>30 µg/L</td>
<td>0.03 ppm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Maximum contaminant level for drinking water supplies.
c Standard is for total trihalomethanes.
d EPA DWSs for radionuclides were derived based on a 4-mrem/yr dose standard using maximum permissible concentrations in water specified in National Bureau of Standards Handbook 69 (U.S. Department of Commerce 1963, as amended).
e Beta and gamma radioactivity from anthropogenic radionuclides. Annual average concentration shall not produce an annual dose from anthropogenic radionuclides equivalent to the total body or any internal organ dose greater than 4 mrem/yr. If two or more radionuclides are present, the sum of their annual dose equivalents shall not exceed 4 mrem/yr. Compliance may be assumed if annual average concentrations of total beta, tritium, and strontium-90 are less than 50, 20,000, and 8 pCi/L, respectively.

Bq = Becquerel
CFR = Code of Federal Regulations
DWS = drinking water standards
EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
L = liter
Mg = milligrams
MSv = millisievert
pCi = picocuries
ppm = parts per million
µg = micrograms
WAC = Washington Administrative Code
WDOH = Washington State Department of Health
yr = year
2.5.5 Surface Water Standards
Washington State has established surface water quality standards to protect public health and public enjoyment of the waters and for the propagation and protection of fish, shellfish, and wildlife. The standards apply to all surface water and water courses within the jurisdiction of Washington State. For the Hanford Site, this primarily encompasses the Columbia River. The standards are contained within WAC 173-201A.

2.6 Natural and Cultural Resources

This section provides information on federal statutes and assessments related to ecological and cultural resource compliance at the Hanford Site.

2.6.1 Ecological Compliance

KL Cranna
The DOE/RL-96-32, Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan (BRMP) requires that all Hanford Site projects with the potential to adversely affect biological resources conduct an ecological compliance review before the project starts. DOE uses the review to determine if the project will comply with the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA), and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, as well as Executive Order 11988 and Executive Order 11990, “Protection of Wetlands.” The review also addresses whether other significant resources such as Washington State-listed species of concern, wetlands, and native shrub-steppe habitats are adequately considered during the project planning process. When adverse effects are identified, mitigation actions are prescribed. Mitigation actions may include avoidance of significant resources, minimization of effects, and rectification or compensation if resources are affected.

There were 153 ecological compliance reviews requested during FY 2018 from 17 functional departments on the Hanford Site. Departments with a significant number of requests include Water and Sewer Utilities (27), Soil and Groundwater (25), Remediation (21), Reliability Services (20), and Electrical Utilities (11).

2.6.1.1 Endangered Species Act of 1973. Several protected species of plants and animals exist on the Hanford Site and along the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River. Upper Columbia River Steelhead trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) and spring-run Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) are listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 as either threatened or endangered (50 CFR 17, “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants,” Subpart B) and occur onsite. Critical habitat for these species has been designated within the Hanford Reach. The bull trout (Salvelinus confluentus) is also listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and may occasionally occur in the Hanford Reach; critical habitat for bull trout was designated in the Hanford Reach in 2010 (USFWS 2010). The DOE/RL-2000-27, Threatened and Endangered Species Management Plan: Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull Trout, is in place for all three fish species. Two plant species, the Umtanum desert buckwheat (Eriogonum codium) and White Bluffs bladderpod (Physaria douglasii ssp. tuplashensis) are listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Other species on the Hanford Site are listed by the Washington State Natural Heritage Program and/or the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife as endangered, threatened, or sensitive (see Section 11.2).
2.6.1.2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The MBTA prohibits taking or disturbing listed migratory birds or their feathers, eggs, or nests. Over 200 species of birds that regularly occur on the Hanford Site are protected under the MBTA. All Hanford Site projects with a potential to affect federal or state-listed species of concern complied with the requirements of the MBTA by using the ecological compliance review process as described in the BRMP (DOE/RL-96-32). When applicable, ecological reviews produce recommendations to minimize adverse impacts to migratory birds, such as performing work outside of the nesting season and minimizing the loss of habitat. Hanford Site biologists maintain migratory bird permits issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) that allow for certain MBTA-related actions. An Annual Permit Activity Form summarizing all activities conducted under this permit is provided to the USFWS each year.

2.6.1.3 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act provides for the protection of the bald eagle and golden eagle by prohibiting, except under certain specified conditions, the taking, possession, or commerce of such birds. DOE/RL-94-150, Bald Eagle Management Plan for the Hanford Site, South Central Washington, directs Hanford Site activities in accordance with current federal and state regulations and guidelines. This management plan outlines seasonal access restrictions around documented nesting and communal roosting sites at the Hanford Site and establishes guidelines for the protection of perches, roosts, and nest sites. When applicable, ecological reviews have produced recommendations to minimize adverse impacts to bald eagles, including performing work outside of the winter season; staying out of established buffer areas; or entering buffer areas at mid-day, minimizing impacts by avoiding eagle roosting periods.

2.6.1.4 Executive Orders 11988 and 11990. Executive Order 11988 and Executive Order 11990 require federal agencies to minimize the loss or degradation of wetlands on federal lands and account for floodplain management when developing water- and land-use plans, respectively. DOE implements the requirements of these two executive orders through 10 CFR 1022, “Compliance with Floodplain and Wetlands Environmental Review Requirements.” It is DOE policy to 1) restore and preserve natural and beneficial values served by floodplains; 2) minimize the destruction, loss, or degradation of wetlands; and 3) preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial value of wetlands. Compliance with these executive orders, as well as the wetland provisions of the Clean Water Act, are implemented at the Hanford Site through the ecological compliance review process in conjunction with the appropriate site environmental compliance officers. The compliance process includes the identification, protection, and, when necessary, mitigation of wetlands and floodplains on the Hanford Site.

2.6.2 Cultural Resource Compliance
CD Currie

7, Protection of Archaeological Resources”; and 43 CFR 10, “Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation and Regulations.”

Executive orders applicable to cultural resources include Executive Order 11593, “Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment”; Executive Order 13007, “Indian Sacred Sites”; Executive Order 13175, “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments”; Executive Order 13287, “Preserve America”; and Presidential Proclamation 7319, “Establishment of the Hanford Reach National Monument” (65 FR 37253). Refer to Section 11.3 for details regarding the Hanford Site Cultural and Historic Resources Programs.

There were 94 NHPA Section 106 compliance reviews completed on Hanford Site in 2018. There were 13 archaeological sites monitored under the NHPA Section 110 Site Conditions Monitoring Program. For additional information, see Section 11.3.1.

2.7  Sustainability

The federal government is committed to avoiding the depletion of natural resources. Federal requirements and guidance have been initiated for agencies to follow. The following are additional statutes implemented at the Hanford Site.

2.7.1  Chemical Management Systems

ML Hermanson

Each Hanford Site contractor maintains a formal program to manage chemicals used by their respective contracts. These chemical management programs apply to the acquisition, use, storage, transportation, and final disposition of all chemicals used at the Hanford Site. A central sitewide information system (The Safety Data Sheets-Material Safety Data Sheets [SDS-MSDS] Database), used by all Hanford Site contractors, maintains an inventory of chemical product SDS and MSDS. The SDS-MSDS Database is available to all Hanford Site employees with access to the Hanford Local Area Network. An information only copy of the SDS-MSDS Database has been made available outside the Hanford Local Area Network in a public domain. This public domain copy makes the manufacturers SDS and MSDS documents available to public emergency responders, should the need arise, when any chemicals managed by a Hanford Site contractor are shipped offsite. The SDS-MSDS Database is also the information point of entry for the Hanford Site’s Chemical Inventory Tracking System (CITS).

Each chemical product is entered into the CITS Database and is profiled identifying information such as the percentage of pure chemical constituents; Specific Gravity; flash point; physical state; National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 704 classification; Occupational Safety and Health Administration 29 CFR 1910.1200, “Hazard Communication”; hazard class; and category. Codes are applied to each chemical constituent that identify reporting requirement categories.

Hanford Site contractors assign personnel to enter information into CITS to track the inventory of their company’s chemicals from acquisition, use, storage, and transportation through final disposition. Using the CITS inventory quantity and location data combined with the chemical product profile information, data sets are generated to support company hazard communication and required reporting such as EPCRA Toxic Release Inventory, NFPA 1 Maximum Allowable Quantity limitations, and DOE Sustainable Environmental Stewardship goals.
2.7.2 Pollution Prevention Program

MM Oates

The \textit{Pollution Prevention Act of 1990} requires that pollution be prevented or reduced at the source whenever possible, and pollution that cannot be prevented be recycled or treated in an environmentally safe manner. The \textit{Hanford Site Sustainability Plan} (HNF-54800) was created to promote sustainability, ecological and cultural resource preservation, and the integration of sustainable practices into management functions and mission activities. DOE-RL is responsible for the Hanford Site Sustainability Plan and provides the Site Sustainability Guidance to Hanford Site contractors to build a comprehensive approach to site sustainability. This plan provides goals and expectations for the implementation of energy conservation opportunities, water conservation initiatives, greenhouse gas emission reductions, waste minimization, and pollution prevention.

DOE O 436.1, \textit{Departmental Sustainability}, establishes pollution prevention and environmental stewardship requirements. In accordance with these requirements, pollution prevention and waste minimization activities are documented, tracked, and reported. Table 2-7 summarizes Hanford Site pollution prevention and waste minimization quantities recycled in FY 2018.

Note: Antifreeze (fleet) and used engine oil (fleet) quantities are included in antifreeze and used oil totals, respectively, and are not included in the regulated solid wastes subtotal. Lead acid batteries (fleet) quantities are not included in lead acid batteries and are an addition to the regulated solid wastes subtotal.

2.7.2.1 Pollution Prevention and Waste Minimization Awards. The Hanford Site received one DOE, federal agency, state agency, or industry-sponsored award for pollution prevention and waste minimization accomplishments in CY 2018. The Green Electronics Council notified The Hanford Site that they received a five-star 2019 Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool (EPEAT) Purchasers Award for the combined application MSA submitted on behalf of MSA, CHPRC, and WRPS for CY 2018 (Figure 2-1). The goal of the EPEAT Purchaser Awards is to recognize excellence in the procurement of green and sustainable electronics among a wide range of organizations. The EPEAT-registered product categories are computers and displays, imaging equipment, televisions, and mobile phones with rating tiers of gold, silver, and bronze. EPEAT Purchasers earn one star for each product category for which they have a written policy in place that requires the purchase of EPEAT-registered electronics registered in the EPEAT green-rating system. Collectively, the Hanford Site reduced the use of primary materials by 377 metric tons, avoided the disposal of 3.3 metric tons of hazardous waste, eliminated 20.0 metric tons of solid waste, and avoided 2.4 metric tons of water pollutant emissions. These efforts saved 1,410 MWh of electricity, reduced 777 metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions, and generated $137,990 in lifetime cost avoidance.
Table 2-7. Recycle Quantities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>FY 2018 Total (metric tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-hazardous Solid Wastes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activated Carbon</td>
<td>22.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum Cans</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardboard</td>
<td>81.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI Shredded Paper</td>
<td>457.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>29.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrous Metal</td>
<td>128.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>118.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>37.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ferrous Metals</td>
<td>25.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic Bottles</td>
<td>41.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires</td>
<td>38.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformers</td>
<td>38.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Pallets</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1075.08</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulated Solid Wastes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerosol Cans</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antifreeze</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballasts</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batteries</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorescent Bulbs</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamps - Mercury Containing</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Acid Batteries</td>
<td>65.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformer Oil &lt;50ppm</td>
<td>9.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toner Cartridges</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Engine Oils (Fleet)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Oil</td>
<td>39.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>138.34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2-1. The 2019 Five-star EPEAT Purchaser Award presented by Green Electronics Council.
2.7.2.2 Accomplishments. The Hanford Site contractors recycled 50% of non-hazardous solid waste, excluding construction and demolition (C&D) debris. In 2018, 1,075 metric tons of non-hazardous (i.e., plastic, aluminum, cardboard, paper, wood, and metal), and 138.34 metric tons of universal waste (i.e., batteries and lamps), and other regulated (i.e. antifreeze and used oils) wastes were recycled through Hanford Site programs administered through the Mission Support Contract. Along with material recycling and diversion, the Hanford Site strives to reduce greenhouse gases Scopes 1, 2, and 3. There was a 42% reduction in Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions for the Hanford Site in FY 2018 from the FY 2008 baseline; emissions in FY 2018 were 24,108 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, whereas emissions in FY 2008 were 41,427 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent. Greenhouse gas emissions from employee commuting, business travel, offsite wastewater treatment, and contracted solid waste disposal are primarily dependent on work locations and the number of workers employed at the Hanford Site.

During FY 2018, contractors at the Hanford Site continued to divert C&D debris from landfill disposal. The Hanford Site diverted approximately 26% (473.6 metric tons) of C&D debris from the inert landfill. The Hanford Site contractors continue to make efforts to divert C&D materials suitable for reuse and recycle from landfills. The following are some ongoing Hanford Site projects and operations expected to increase the generation of C&D debris in FY 2019:

- Upgrading electrical in future support to WTP
- Land clearing operations for construction
- Reducing Hanford Site footprint
- Reducing waterline pipe size and runs
- Excessing Project Technical Services old equipment
- Maintaining site infrastructure and utilities.

2.7.3 DOE O 436.1, Departmental Sustainability

MM Oates

DOE O 436.1, Departmental Sustainability, requires developing a Site Sustainability Plan integrated with the Hanford Site operational plans. In addition, DOE O 436.1 requires submittal of sustainability goal data and reports as well as EPCRA reporting. Implementation of DOE orders and executive orders by Hanford Site contractors is addressed in Section 3.0.

In addition, DOE O 436.1 requires that an Environmental Management System be established as the platform for managing environmental goals, as well as other impacts to the environment from Hanford Site operations and establishing environmental objectives.

As the Hanford Site services and infrastructure contractor, MSA updated the sustainability plan (HNF-54800) for the Hanford Site in 2018 with input from DOE and Hanford Site contractors. The plan describes the energy management program and identifies planned energy efficiency, water conservation, transportation fleet management, and sustainable buildings activities, as required by DOE O 436.1. Environmental objectives developed in 2010 were maintained in 2018, as were plans for recycling, environmentally preferred procurement management, and electronic asset stewardship (see Section 3.0).
Environmental performance objectives are established to meet requirements provided by DOE O 436.1 and directed guidance for some Executive Orders. Executive Order 13834, Efficient Federal Operations, superseded Executive Order 13693, Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade, and established a policy for federal agencies to meet statutory requirements in a manner that increases efficiency, optimizes performance, eliminates unnecessary use of resources, and protects the environment. It allows agencies to conduct legally, environmentally, economically, and fiscally sound environmental and energy-related activities in an integrated, efficient, continuously improving, and sustainable manner.

2.8 Occurrence Reporting and Processing of Operations Information

ME Mills

Releases of radioactive and regulated materials to the environment are reported to DOE and other federal and state agencies as required by law. The specific agencies notified depend on the type, amount, and location of each release event. This section addresses releases or potential releases to the environment that may not be documented by other reporting mechanisms during the reporting period. All Hanford Site occurrences are reported to the Hanford Emergency Operations Center Shift Office and subsequently recorded in the Occurrence Reporting and Processing System. This system is a DOE electronic database that tracks occurrence reports across the DOE complex. Occurrence Reporting Criteria were based on DOE O 232.2, Occurrence Reporting and Processing of Operations Information, from January 2018 through October 2018. Since October 2018, Occurrence Reporting Criteria are based on DOE O 232.2A, Occurrence Reporting and Processing of Operations Information, and associated Supplemented Contract Requirements Document. The Reporting Criteria provides a set of requirements that must be used to identify reportable occurrences. Report Levels provide a means to reflect the impact associated with a given occurrence in terms of health, safety, and security to personnel, the public, the environment, and the operational mission. The three report levels are: High (H), Low (L), and Informational (I). The following sections summarize occurrences that may have impacted the Hanford Site environment in 2018.

2.8.1 High-Level Report

Occurrences in this category meet any of the following conditions: Impact to worker or public safety and health, environmental harm, regulatory compliance, or potential for mission interruption. There were no Hanford Site Environmental High-Level Report occurrences.

2.8.2 Low-Level Report

Occurrences in this category are those that do not meet High-Level Report occurrences but involve personnel injury, environmental releases, equipment damage, or hazardous circumstances; additional time is appropriate for written notifications. There were no Hanford Site Environmental Low-Level Report occurrences.

2.8.3 Informational Level Report

Occurrences in this category are those that do not meet High- or Low-Level Report occurrences and generally meet the following conditions:

- Determined to be a safety, environmental, or mission concern
- Provide potential learning opportunities for others.
Discovery of legacy contamination is an “Informational Level Report” occurrence. There were 45 documented occurrences of legacy contamination from January 1, 2018, to December 31, 2018. Section 2.8.3.1 provides further details into legacy contamination spread from environmental conditions.

2.8.3.1 Discovery of Legacy Contamination. Each year on the Hanford Site, legacy contamination is spread from environmental conditions. Some contamination is discovered during routine survey work. Biological vectors also spread contamination; tumbleweeds, rodents, and birds are all common biological vectors. Tumbleweeds have a deep taproot that can sequester contamination from below the soil surface into the plant body on the surface. Rodents eat vegetation located in contaminated areas and deposit contaminated feces outside of the contaminated area. Birds build nests and occasionally use materials from contaminated areas, resulting in contamination transfer to uncontaminated areas. Of these three biological vectors, contaminated tumbleweeds occur most frequently and have the potential to transfer contamination the farthest distance from the original locations. High winds may contribute to the spread of legacy contamination beyond posted areas. Reports of legacy contamination that are discovered throughout the year are consolidated into quarterly reports.

2.9 Environmental Permits

JK Perry, RA Kaldor, M Kamberg, JW Wilde

Hanford Site operations must be performed in accordance with environmental permit requirements. A general description of the primary environmental permits applicable to Hanford Site operations are listed in Table 2-8. Some of these permits are discussed throughout this section in more detail.

Table 2-8. Environmental Permits. (3 Pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dangerous Waste Permit (RCRA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanford Facility RCRA Permit (WA7890008967) was issued on September 27, 1994, and has undergone several revisions. The permit expired on September 27, 2004; however, Permit WA7890008967, Rev. 8C remains in effect until a new permit is issued. Ecology issued a draft permit for public review and comment, from May 1, 2012 through October 22, 2012 (Ecology 2012). Ecology received more than 4,000 comments on the draft permit, including approximately 1,800 comments from the public and 3,000 comments from the DOE. Because information and arguments brought up during the comment period raised substantial new questions, Ecology plans to revise the draft permit and reopen the comment period (see Section 2.1.2.1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanford Site Air Operating Permit 00-05-006, Renewal 2, covers operations on the Hanford Site having a potential to emit airborne emissions. This permit was effective on April 1, 2013, and expires March 31, 2018. A permit renewal application was submitted to Ecology in August 2017 and determined to be complete by Ecology in November 2017. As such, Renewal 2 will remain in effect until Renewal 3 is issued. The permit is intended to provide a compilation of applicable Clean Air Act requirements for radioactive and non-radioactive emissions at the Hanford Site. It will be implemented through federal and state programs (see Section 2.3.2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Radioactive Air Emissions License for the Department of Energy Richland Operations Office Hanford Site (License FF-01) is issued to DOE-RL by WDOH. The current permit was effective October 20, 2017, and expires October 20, 2022. The FF-01 license is a compilation of all applicable radioactive air emission requirements and is incorporated into the Hanford Site Air Operating Permit as an Attachment, pursuant to WAC 246-247-060(7). |
Drinking Water Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Issuing Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00177</td>
<td>J is a permit to operate the 100-KArea drinking water system. WDOH issues the permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00100</td>
<td>4 is a permit to operate the 200-West Area drinking water system. WDOH issues the permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41840</td>
<td>8 is a permit to operate the 300 Area drinking water system. WDOH issues the permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41947</td>
<td>0 is a permit to operate the 400 Area drinking water system. WDOH issues the permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wastewater Permits

Permit CR-IU010, 300 Area Industrial Wastewater Discharge Permit, is issued to DOE-RL by the City of Richland. Permit CR-IU010 governs the discharges from the 300 Area facilities into the City of Richland sewer collection system. This permit expires March 6, 2023.

HAN002 through HAN075 permit onsite sewage systems to operate on the Hanford Site. WDOH issues these permits.

Permit ST-0004500, State Waste Discharge Permit, allows treated wastewater from the Effluent Treatment Facility to be discharged to the State-Approved Land Disposal Site. This permit is effective until December 31, 2019.

Permit ST0004502, State Waste Discharge Permit, allows treated effluent from the 200-East and 200-West Areas to be discharged to the 200 Areas Treated Effluent Disposal Facility. This permit expired June 30, 2017. ST0004502 required reapplication for permit renewal by June 30, 2016. The permit renewal application was verified as having been received by Washington State Department of Ecology on June 28, 2016. A letter was received from Ecology on May 24, 2017, in which they accepted the permit application as complete and extended the term of the current permit for up to 5 years while the new permit is being drafted.

Permit ST0004511 is a Categorical State Waste Discharge Permit that authorizes the discharge of wastewater from maintenance, construction, and hydro testing activities and allows for cooling water, condensate, and industrial stormwater discharges at the Hanford Site. This permit expired December 31, 2018. A permit renewal application was submitted to the Washington State Department of Ecology on July 24, 2018, and was received by Ecology on July 25, 2018. A letter was received from Ecology on November 7, 2018, accepting the permit application as sufficiently complete and extended the term of the current permit for up to 5 years while the new permit is being drafted.

Permit ST0045514, State Waste Discharge Permit, is for the 200-West Area Evaporative Sewage Lagoon, a domestic wastewater treatment facility located northeast of the 200-West Area. The facility consists of double-lined evaporative lagoons and is designed to have no liquid discharge to the ground. The system provides domestic wastewater treatment for the 200-West and 600 Areas, and treatment for domestic wastewater hauled from the 200-East Area and other locations within the Hanford Site. This permit expired June 30, 2017. A permit renewal application was submitted to the Washington State Department of Ecology on April 3, 2017, and was received by Ecology on April 10, 2017. A letter was received from Ecology on June 22, 2017, accepting the permit application as sufficiently complete and extended the term of the current permit for up to 5 years while the new permit is being drafted.

Permit WAG-50-5180, Washington State Sand and Gravel General Permit for the Concrete Batch Plant in the 200-East Area. The Concrete Batch Plant supports construction of WTP; its primary function is making concrete. The permit provides coverage for discharges of process water and stormwater associated with Ready Mix Concrete operations. Bechtel National is the permit owner. This permit expires March 31, 2021.

Permit WAG-50-5181, Washington State Sand and Gravel General Permit for Pit 30 Quarry in the 200-East Area. Ecology issued the permit to Bechtel National, Inc. as owner/operator. The Pit 30 Quarry supports the construction of the WTP, and the primary function is making construction sand and gravel. This permit expires March 31, 2021.

Wildlife Permits

Permit MB60138B-1, Federal Fish and Wildlife Permit, issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to DOE-RL, authorizes the collection of migratory birds for ecological monitoring, and danger to human safety and health including control of contamination. This permit expired March 31, 2018. The permit was extended and reissued as Permit MB60138B-0; the permit expired on March 31, 2021.
Table 2-8. Environmental Permits. (3 Pages)

| Review Reference Number 13260-2009-I-0121, Federal Fish and Wildlife Section 10.0 Review, issued to Environmental Assessment Services in July 2009, for the potential of incidental take of salmonids during fishing activities in the Columbia River. This review has no expiration listed. |
| Review Reference Number 13260-2011-I-0080, Federal Fish and Wildlife Section 7.0 Review, issued to DOE in July 2011 for the potential of incidental take of bull trout during fishing activities in the Columbia River. This review has no expiration listed. |
| Permit 17-190, Scientific Collection Permit issued by WDFW to MSA for May 2017 through June 2018, authorizes food fish, shellfish, game fish, and wildlife collection for research purposes. This permit is renewed annually. |
| Permit 18-113, Scientific Collection Permit issued by WDFW to MSA for May 2018 through June 2019, authorizes the collection of food fish, shellfish, game fish, and wildlife for research purposes. This permit is renewed annually. |

Agency Contact Information

| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Migratory Bird Permit Office 911 NE 11th Ave. Portland, OR 97232-4181 | Washington State Department of Health P.O. Box 47890 Olympia, WA 98504-7890 | |

DOE = U.S. Department of Energy
DOE-EL = U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
Ecology = Washington State Department of Ecology
MSA = Mission Support Alliance
RCRA = Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
WDFW = Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
WDOH = Washington State Department of Health
WTP = Waste Treatment Plant

2.10 Environmental Enforcement Actions

SA Szendre

Hanford Site operations are affected and, in many cases, regulated by numerous federal and state agencies enforcing legal requirements that address environmental compliance. The EPA has delegated authority to Ecology and WDOH to implement state laws and regulations in lieu of RCRA, the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Water Act. State laws and regulations requiring licenses or permits apply to activities at the Hanford Site. Examples of such permits are Hanford Site Radioactive Air Emissions License, the RCRA Permit, the Air Operating Permit, and several State Waste Discharge Permits.

In general, the laws, regulations, and other requirements applicable to Hanford Site operations include, but may not be limited to, those that address the following:

- Environmental quality
- Air quality and noise
- Water resources
- Hazardous waste and materials management
- Radioactive waste and materials management
• Ecological resources
• Cultural and paleontological resources
• Worker safety and health
• Radiological safety and radiation protection
• Transportation
• Emergency planning
• Pollution prevention and conservation
• Environmental justice.

It is DOE’s policy to carry out its mission in a regulatory compliant and sustainable manner to maximize energy and water efficiency; minimize chemical toxicity and harmful environmental releases; promote renewable and other clean energy development; and conserve natural, cultural, and ecological resources while sustaining assigned mission activities.

This section discusses the environmental noncompliances alleged by regulatory agencies at the Hanford Site during 2018.

2.10.1 Enforcement Actions by Regulatory Program Area
During 2018 there were 22 regulatory agency compliance actions filed against the DOE and its contractors for alleged violations of regulatory requirements or other enforceable agreements. 21 compliance actions were issued by Ecology, and one by WDOH. Twenty of the 22 compliance actions resulted from regulatory agency inspections of DOE facilities on the Hanford Site (Section 2.1.2.2). The inspection reports also contained 70 concerns. In 2018, WDOH issued a warning letter to DOE for a process description in the licenses for two emission units in the 241-SY Tank Farm did not match the actual current status.

Table 2-9 summarizes the alleged environmental noncompliance notices by program area. Table 2-10 summarizes the 22 alleged environmental noncompliances notices cited against the DOE and its contractors during 2018 including a short description of the alleged noncompliances. Figure 2-2 shows alleged environmental noncompliance concerns, violations, and associated fines.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAA = Clean Air Act
CERCLA = Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CWA = Clean Water Act
RCRA = Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Alleged Noncompliance Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2019-06</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER BASED ON INSPECTION OF 222S LABORATORY COMPLEX</td>
<td>Alleged non-compliances for labeling of containers and container inventory. Concerns were for waste codes, major risk labeling, and sample exclusion process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2019-05</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER BASED ON INSPECTION OF 216-S-10 POND AND DITCH</td>
<td>Alleged area of non-compliance was for not sampling for phenol at well 699-33-75 in 2017. No further action was required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDOH</td>
<td>2019-04</td>
<td>WDOH WARNING LETTER FOR THE 296-S-26 AND 296-S-27 EMISSION UNITS AT THE 241-SY TANK FARM</td>
<td>The process description in the licenses does not match the actual status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2019-01</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER BASED ON INSPECTION OF 400 AREA WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT GROUP 16</td>
<td>Alleged non-compliances for designation, facility inspections, water intrusion, waste acceptance, and overpacked reactive waste. Concerns were for waste dispensation, treatment, retention of records, and operating records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-27</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER BASED ON INSPECTION OF THE SINGLE SHELL TANK SYSTEM</td>
<td>Inadequate signage at A Tank Farm and intrusion into Catch Tank 241-TX-302C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-26</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER BASED ON INSPECTION OF LOW LEVEL BURIAL GROUNDS TRENCHES 31 AND 34</td>
<td>Alleged non-compliance for manifest issues and one concern for not conducting “significant storm inspections” in February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-24</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER BASED ON INSPECTION AT THE 242-A EVAPORATOR</td>
<td>Alleged non-compliance was for inadequate inspections. The concern was for inadequately monitoring drains in the loading room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-23</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER BASED ON INSPECTION AT THE T-PLANT COMPLEX</td>
<td>Alleged non-compliances were for inadequate labeling and inspections. The compliance report states that the concern was for excessive time taken designating an unknown waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-22</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER BASED ON INSPECTION OF THE B PLANT COMPLEX</td>
<td>Alleged non-compliance for not designating a white residue on the floor of the canyon building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Document Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Alleged Noncompliance Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-20</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER FOR THE DOUBLE SHELL TANK SYSTEM AND 204-AR</td>
<td>Alleged Non-Compliance for labeling, written inspection schedule, and integrity assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-18</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER BASED ON INSPECTION OF RELEASES FROM ERDF CANS</td>
<td>Discharges of wastewater from roll-on/roll-off containers do not meet the requirements for authorized discharges in Permit ST4511.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-17</td>
<td>ECOLOGY WARNING LETTER BASED ON DANGEROUS WASTE COMPLIANCE INSPECTION AT THE 222S LABORATORY</td>
<td>Inadequate Major Risk labeling, inspection records and Operating Records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-14</td>
<td>ECOLOGY NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANCE FOR CIRCUIT BOARDS AT 2703E</td>
<td>Inadequate designation and mismanagement of electronic circuit boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-10</td>
<td>NOTICE OF VIOLATION DOCKET #215420 PERTAINING TO FEDERAL AND STATE AIR EMISSION REGULATIONS</td>
<td>Failing to modify their FF-01 RAEL license, failing to provide accurate information in support of an ALARACT demonstration, failure to obtain a license for a modification, filing an inaccurate annual AOP certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>2018-09</td>
<td>EPA/ECOLOGY CREATION OF DANGER STOP WORK LETTER FOR THE PFP DEMOLITION PROJECT (TPA XXXII)</td>
<td>Non-compliances were not cited; however, Ecology and EPA determined, and allege, that recent contamination events at the PFP are creating a danger to the health or welfare of the people on the Hanford Site and to the environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations**

- ALARACT = As Low As Reasonably Achievable Control Technology
- AOP = Air Operating Permit
- Ecology = Washington State Department of Ecology
- EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- PFP = Plutonium Finishing Plant
- WDOH = Washington State Department of Health
To avoid litigation expense and to settle administrative or judicial claims or causes of action a regulatory agency may have against them, DOE and its contractors, without admitting fault or liability, may enter into Agreed Orders and other negotiated regulatory agreements to resolve regulatory agency allegations asserted therein. Nothing in the agreements or in the execution and implementation of the terms and conditions of the agreements shall be taken as an admission of liability by DOE and its contractors, and DOE and its contractors neither admit nor deny the specific factual allegations contained therein. Regulatory agencies progress through a variety of tools to gain compliance, usually starting with a warning letter or letter of noncompliance. If the warning does not result in compliance, then enforcement actions can escalate to notices, orders, or civil penalties issued by the Washington State Attorney General. Although DOE and its contractors may receive warning letters from regulatory agencies, such letters do not constitute formal enforcement actions represented by notices, orders, or civil penalties issued by the Washington State Attorney General that may be appealed.

### 2.10.2 Wastewater Permit Deviations

*J Russell*

During CY 2018, there were 22 non-compliances reported to regulatory agencies for wastewater permit deviations. Nine of the events involved Large Onsite Sewage System permits and 13 involved State Waste Discharge Permits. In all cases, action was taken to repair and correct the non-compliant conditions and regulatory notifications were made in accordance with permit requirements. Table 2-11 shows the dates of non-compliance, applicable Permit Numbers, Regulatory Agencies, and Reasons for each deviation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Permit Number Deviated</th>
<th>Reported To</th>
<th>Reason(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 10</td>
<td>HAN013</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Sewage tank at MO596 building overflowed to the ground due to a continuously flushing toilet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 14</td>
<td>ST0004502</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Small leak at Pump Station 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>HAN054</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Approximately 30 gal of sewage were released to the ground at the 2607-E-10-LS1 lift station near the grout processing facility in 200-East due to a failure of the dosing pump.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 16</td>
<td>HAN049</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Approximately 500 gal of sewage was released to the ground at the 2607-EL Lift Station in 200-East near MO294. The affected area was disinfected with sodium hypochlorite and the affected asphalt parking area was flushed with chlorinated water and twice treated with UV light equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>HAN054</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A toilet or sink was left running while the 2607-E10 lift station pump was under repair resulting in an untreated sewage release to the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7</td>
<td>ST0004502</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Small leak in Pump Station 1                                                                imento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26</td>
<td>ST0004511</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>A potable water leak occurred near MO2522 at an approximate rate of 1 gal/min. The leak occurred within 300 ft of WIDS sites 216-A-29 ditch and 200-E-286 swamp and ditch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>HAN054</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Approximately 5 gal of sewage was released to the ground from lift station 2607-E10. The area was disinfected with a sodium hypochlorite solution and pumper trucks were used until repairs were completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>ST0004502</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Grab sample taken instead of a required composite sample because of problems with the sampler unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20</td>
<td>HAN011</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A stuck valve resulted in approximately 10 gal of sewage being released adjacent to the 2607-Z1 lift station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5</td>
<td>ST0004502</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Leaking vacuum-relief valve in the TEDF line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9</td>
<td>HAN039</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Overflow of 50 to 75 gal of sewage from septic vaults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 3</td>
<td>ST0004511</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>A potable water leak occurred southwest of 283W at Fire Hydrant 8W when the pressure gage was removed and the hydrant broke. A total of approximately 11,000 gal was discharged to the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 15</td>
<td>HAN071</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A power outage in 200-East resulted in a release of approximately 15 gal of sewage to the ground from the 2607-11 Lift Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21</td>
<td>HAN049</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Approximately 1 gal of sewage was released to the ground as a result of a 2-in. pipe break during Project L-853 construction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 12</td>
<td>NA (No permit required)</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Wastewater discharge valve in MO173 leaked approximately 5 gal of sewer water onto the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2</td>
<td>ST0004502</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Small leak in air relief valves on the transfer line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17</td>
<td>ST0004511</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>A potable water leak occurred adjacent to 216-A-29 ditch at a rate of 0.5 gal/min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-11. CY 2018 Wastewater Permit Deviations. (2 Pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Permit Number Deviated</th>
<th>Reported To</th>
<th>Reason(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 5</td>
<td>ST0004502</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Small leak in air relief valves on the transfer line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3</td>
<td>ST0004502</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Total dissolved solids result for November exceeded the permit monthly average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4</td>
<td>ST0004502</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Grab samples were taken instead of composite samples due to failure of the composite sampler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5</td>
<td>ST0004511</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>A potable water leak occurred at the intersection of 4th Street Loop and Grout Drive. The estimated rate was 5 to 10 gal/min and approximately 300 gal discharged within 300 feet of two inactive WIDS sites (ditches 216-A-29 and 200-E-286).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11</td>
<td>ST0004502</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Grab samples were taken instead of composite samples due to failure of the composite sampler.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ecology = Washington State Department of Ecology  
Health = Washington State Department of Health  
TEDF = Treated Effluent Disposal Facility  
UV = ultraviolet  
WIDS = Waste Information Data System
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