

RMIS View/Print Document Cover Sheet

This document was retrieved from the Documentation and Records Management (DRM) ISEARCH System. It is intended for Information only and may not be the most recent or updated version. Contact a Document Service Center (see Hanford Info for locations) if you need additional retrieval information.

Accession #: D196008609

Document #: SD-EN-TI-307

Title/Desc:

105DR LARGE SODIUM FIRE FACILITY SOIL SAMPLING
DATA EVALUATION REPORT

Pages: 20

JAN 28 1996
Sta. 21

ENGINEERING DATA TRANSMITTAL

2. To: (Receiving Organization)	3. From: (Originating Organization) WHC RCRA CLOSURES, 01821	4. Related EDT No.: N/A
5. Proj./Prog./Dept./Div.: 105-DR LSFF/RCRA CLOSURES/ES/PSO	6. Cog. Engr.: J. G. ALDER B6023	7. Purchase Order No.: N/A
8. Originator Remarks: This document transmits the data evaluation report for the soil sampling at the 105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility. The report is used to evaluate the amount, if any, of dangerous waste in the soil relative to closing the unit.		9. Equip./Component No.: N/A
11. Receiver Remarks:		10. System/Bldg./Facility: 105-DR LSFF
		12. Major Assm. Dwg. No.: N/A
		13. Permit/Permit Application No.: N/A
		14. Required Response Date: N/A

15. DATA TRANSMITTED					(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)
(A) Item No.	(B) Document/Drawing No.	(C) Sheet No.	(D) Rev. No.	(E) Title or Description of Data Transmitted	Approval Designator	Reason for Transmittal	Originator Disposition	Receiver Disposition
1	WHC-SD-EN-TI-307		0	105-DR LARGE SODIUM FIRE FACILITY SOIL SAMPLING DATA EVALUATION REPORT	E	1	1	

16. KEY					
Approval Designator (F)		Reason for Transmittal (G)		Disposition (H) & (I)	
E, S, Q, D or N/A (see WHC-CM-3-5, Sec.12.7)		1. Approval	4. Review	1. Approved	4. Reviewed no/comment
		2. Release	5. Post-Review	2. Approved w/comment	5. Reviewed w/comment
		3. Information	6. Dist. (Receipt Acknow. Required)	3. Disapproved w/comment	6. Receipt acknowledged

(G)	(H)	17. SIGNATURE/DISTRIBUTION (See Approval Designator for required signatures)								(G)	(H)
Reason	Disp.	(J) Name	(K) Signature	(L) Date	(M) MSIN	(J) Name	(K) Signature	(L) Date	(M) MSIN	Reason	Disp.
1	1	Cog. Eng. J. G. ADLER	<i>J. G. Adler</i>	1/18/96							
1	1	Cog. Mgr. F. A. RUCK II	<i>F. A. Ruck II</i>	1/18/96							
		QA									
		Safety									
1	1	Env. F. A. RUCK II	<i>F. A. Ruck II</i>	1/18/96							
1	1	P. C. MILLER	<i>P. C. Miller</i>	1/22/96							

18. Signature of EDT Originator <i>J. G. Adler</i> Date: 1/18/96	19. Authorized Representative for Receiving Organization Date	20. Cognizant Manager <i>F. A. Ruck II</i> Date: 1/18/96	21. DOE APPROVAL (if required) Ctrl. No. <input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Approved w/comments <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved w/comments
--	--	--	--

105-DR LARGE SODIUM FIRE FACILITY SOIL SAMPLING DATA EVALUATION REPORT

J. G. Adler

Westinghouse Hanford Co., Richland, WA 99352
U.S. Department of Energy Contract DE-AC06-87RL10930

EDT/ECN: 622835 UC: 630
Org Code: 01821 Charge Code: B6023
B&R Code: EX7003000 Total Pages: 17


Key Words: RCRA, closure, 105-DR, sodium, soil, sampling, analysis, data evaluation, data validation

Abstract: This report evaluates the soil sampling activities, soil sample analysis, and soil sample data associated with the closure activities at the 105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility. The evaluation compares these activities to the regulatory requirements for meeting clean closure. The report concludes that there is no soil contamination from the waste treatment activities.

TRADEMARK DISCLAIMER. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof or its contractors or subcontractors.

Printed in the United States of America. To obtain copies of this document, contact: WHC/BCS Document Control Services, P.O. Box 1970, Mailstop H6-08, Richland WA 99352, Phone (509) 372-2420; Fax (509) 376-4989.

V. L. Burkland 1/23/96
Release Approval Date



Approved for Public Release

105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility Soil Sampling Data Evaluation Report

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Environmental Restoration and
Waste Management



Management and Operations Contractor for the
U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC06-87RL10930

Approved for Public Release

CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	SUMMARY OF RESULTS	1
1.2	REGULATORY BACKGROUND	1
1.3	TREATMENT UNIT INFORMATION	2
2.0	SAMPLING	3
2.1	SAMPLE LOCATIONS	3
2.2	SAMPLE COLLECTION	3
2.3	FIELD QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL	4
3.0	PERFORMANCE STANDARDS	4
3.1	HANFORD SITE BACKGROUND	5
3.2	HEALTH-BASED LEVELS	5
4.0	ANALYSES	6
5.0	DATA VALIDATION	6
6.0	DATA EVALUATION	7
7.0	CONCLUSIONS	7
8.0	REFERENCES	7
8.1	DOCUMENTS	7
8.2	FEDERAL AND STATE ACTS	8
8.3	REVISED CODE OF WASHINGTON AND WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE	8

FIGURES

1	A Schematic of 105-DR Reactor Building Including the Large Sodium Fire Facility	F1
2	A Schematic of the Overall Large Sodium Fire Facility Exhaust System	F2
3	Soil Sampling Location at the 105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility	F3
4	Soil Random Sample Location for Closure Area 7	F4

TABLE

1	105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility Closure Area 7 Soil Results, Metals Analysis	T1
---	--	----

LIST OF TERMS

1		
2		
3		
4	CERCLA	<i>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and</i>
5		<i>Liability Act of 1980</i>
6	DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
7	DQO	Data Quality Objective
8	Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
9	EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
10	HEIS	Hanford Environmental Information System
11	IRIS	Integrated Risk Information System
12	LSFF	Large Sodium Fire Facility
13	MTCA	Model Toxics Control Act
14	RCRA	<i>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976</i>
15	SAP	sampling and analysis plan
16	Tri-Party	
17	Agreement	<i>Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order</i>
18	TSD	treatment, storage, and/or disposal
19	WAC	<i>Washington Administrative Code</i>
20		

105-DR LARGE SODIUM FIRE FACILITY
SOIL SAMPLING DATA EVALUATION REPORT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes and evaluates the soil sampling and soil sample analysis performed in support of the closure of the 105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility (LSFF). The evaluation is based on the validated data included in the data validation packages (DOE-RL 1995a) for the 105-DR LSFF. The results of this evaluation will be used in assessing contamination for the purpose of partially closing the 105-DR LSFF as described in the *105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility Closure Plan*, DOE/RL-90-25 (DOE-RL 1995b).

The scope of this report is the evaluation of the analytical results for the constituents of concern from the six soil samples taken to represent the unit soil. This report does not describe analytical methodology, nor does it provide raw analytical data or the sampling validation report. The sampling plan is presented in the *105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility Closure Plan*. The sampling plan was discussed and agreed to by all parties during the Data Quality Objective (DQO) process. All analytical data were validated according to *Data Validation Procedures for Chemical Analysis* (WHC 1993). The data validation packages (DOE-RL 1995a) already have been transmitted to Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology).

1.1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

To meet the criteria for clean closure of the 105-DR LSFF, analytical results must verify that the concentration of all treatment residues contained in the soil are at or below the action levels as specified in Chapter 6 of the closure plan. The concentration of the constituents of concern in the soil were to be well below the action levels (see Table 1). Therefore, the findings presented in this report will support partial clean closure of the 105-DR LSFF in accordance with Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-303-610 without further sampling or remediation activities in Closure Area 7.

1.2 REGULATORY BACKGROUND

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Ecology jointly administer the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* (RCRA) in the state of Washington. The EPA retains oversight authority while delegating to Ecology the enforcement of a state program that is consistent with or more stringent than the corresponding Federal program. The implementing regulations are in WAC 173-303, "Dangerous Waste Regulations." Ecology's authorization includes administering closure of dangerous waste treatment, storage, and/or disposal (TSD) units.

1 The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), EPA, and Ecology have entered into
2 an agreement called the *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*
3 (Tri-Party Agreement [Ecology et al. 1995]). This agreement affects
4 environmental regulation on the Hanford Facility. One purpose of this
5 agreement is to ensure that environmental impacts associated with past
6 activities are investigated and appropriate response actions taken, as
7 necessary, to protect human health and the environment. The agreement seeks
8 to promote this goal, in part, by identifying TSD units, identifying which
9 units will undergo closure, and promoting compliance with relevant RCRA
10 permitting requirements.
11

12 13 1.3 TREATMENT UNIT INFORMATION 14

15 The 105-DR LSFF occupied the former ventilation supply room on the
16 southwest side of the 105-DR Reactor facility in the 100-D Area of the Hanford
17 Site (Figure 1). The 105-DR LSFF operated from about 1972 to 1986. The LSFF
18 was established as a research laboratory to investigate fire fighting and
19 safety associated with alkali metal fires. This effort was in support of the
20 liquid metal fast breeder reactor facilities. In addition to its alkali metal
21 fire research, the unit also was used to treat alkali metal waste. All of the
22 alkali metal burned in the 105-DR LSFF was nonradioactive material.
23

24 Alkali metal fires were conducted in three different rooms: the Large
25 Fire Room, the Small Fire Room, and the Exhaust Fan Room. The Large Fire Room
26 houses the Large Test Cell, which consists of a steel cubical that is
27 110 cubic meters (3,700 cubic feet) in volume. The Small Fire Room contains a
28 Small Test Cell consisting of a steel cylindrical pressure vessel with a
29 dished top. Both test cells could be purged with nitrogen or argon to
30 maintain a controlled atmosphere. In the Exhaust Fan Room, alkali metal
31 reactions were conducted at atmospheric pressure. An overall schematic of the
32 exhaust system for the 105-DR LSFF is presented in Figure 2.
33

34 Adjacent to the Large Fire Room is the Sodium Handling Room. The Sodium
35 Handling Room contained a sodium storage tank that serviced the Large Fire
36 Room. Other rooms provided office space and storage for nondangerous
37 material. The storage areas contained primarily new materials including
38 stainless steel tubing, small-diameter piping made of stainless and carbon
39 steel, electrical supplies, new process equipment, fans, blowers, metal
40 sheeting, new light bulbs, lighting equipment, portable lights, new
41 containers, various fire extinguishing materials, lubricating grease, and
42 lubricating oil. The office area contained papers, operating records, a few
43 tools, and some small portable monitoring instruments.
44
45
46

2.0 SAMPLING

1
2
3
4 Soil sampling was performed on July 18, 1995, following the sampling and
5 analysis plan (SAP) described in *105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility Closure*
6 *Plan* (DOE-RL 1995b). The SAP provides justification for exclusion of certain
7 closure areas from sample. The SAP identifies Closure Area 7 as being the
8 only area to be sampled for closure determinations. All other closure areas
9 either will be deferred to reactor decontamination and decommissioning
10 activities of the 105-DR Reactor (Closure Areas 2, 4, 5, and 6) or will be
11 decontaminated as described in the closure plan (Closure Areas 1 and 3). With
12 the sampling approach developed in the SAP, leachable or windblown
13 constituents of concern in the vicinity of the past treatment activities would
14 be detected.
15
16

2.1 SAMPLE LOCATIONS CLOSURE AREA 7

17
18
19 Closure Area 7 is north and west of the 117-DR HEPA filter building.
20 This area was used to rinse the burn pans used in the test sodium and lithium
21 metal fires. A total of six soil samples were collected at the LSFF as
22 follows: three random samples were collected (two samples and one co-located
23 duplicate) and three extra authoritative samples in Closure Area 7. Figure 3
24 shows the locations of the soil samples and Figure 4 shows the specific
25 locations of the random samples. The samples consisted of soil that had been
26 collected over an interval of 0 to 20 centimeters.
27

28 The three extra authoritative samples were taken at three locations near
29 burn pans to the south of the 105-DR LSFF. These areas, chosen by the Field
30 Team Leader, were used to rinse burn pans that had been used in activities
31 associated with the 105-DR LSFF. At the time of sampling, these locations
32 were seen as likely areas of contamination and were select accordingly to
33 ensure areas of contamination were not overlooked by the random generated
34 sampling locations. These samples also consisted of soil collected over an
35 interval of 0 to 20 centimeters.
36
37

2.2 SAMPLE COLLECTION

38
39
40 The six samples collected on July 18, 1995, were samples that had been
41 assigned Hanford Environmental Information System (HEIS) numbers. The random
42 samples were assigned the following HEIS numbers: Random Sample Number 1 is
43 BOG979, Random Sample 2 is BOG980, and Duplicate Random Sample 2D is BOG981.
44 The extra authoritative samples were assigned the following HEIS numbers:
45 Authoritative Sample 1 is BOG983, Authoritative Sample 2 is BOG984, and
46 Authoritative Sample 3 is BOG982.
47

48 The soil samples were collected using clean hand tools at each closure
49 area. Samples were taken from the interval 0 to 20 centimeters, as specified
50 in the SAP. Each sample was labeled and placed into a plastic bag. All
51 samples were cooled to 4 °C during storage and transportation to the offsite
52 laboratory. All samples were analyzed within the holding time requirement.

1 The sampling equipment was cleaned and decontaminated prior to use at the
 2 1706 KE Laboratory in accordance with Environmental Investigation
 3 Instruction 5.5, "Laboratory Cleaning of RCRA/*Comprehensive Environmental*
 4 *Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980* (CERCLA) Sampling Equipment"
 5 (WHC 1988). There was no equipment decontamination in the field.

6
 7
 8 **2.3 FIELD QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL**

9
 10 Duplicate Sample BOG981 was collected in Closure Area 7. This duplicate
 11 corresponds to Sample Number BOG980. Duplicate samples are collected as close
 12 as possible to the same point in space and time; however, they are stored in
 13 separate containers and analyzed independently. Duplicates are used to
 14 estimate the precision of the sampling process.

15
 16
 17
 18 **3.0 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

19
 20
 21 The performance standards for closure of the 105-DR LSFF are defined in
 22 Chapter 6 of the closure plan and are based on the requirements of
 23 WAC 173-304-610(2)(b). This section references the use of parts of
 24 WAC 173-340, "Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) Cleanup Regulations," to define
 25 the numerical cleanup standards for the soils. Also, WAC 173-340 allows the
 26 use of soil background values in addition to the health-based values. The
 27 soil background values on the Hanford Site are defined in the *Hanford Site*
 28 *Background: Part 1, Soil Background for Nonradioactive Analytes*, DOE/RL-92-24
 29 (DOE-RL 1995c). The higher of the WAC 173-340 health-based value or the
 30 sitewide soil background will be used to determine clean closure.

31
 32 The MTCA health-based values require calculations that use information
 33 from the EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) database (EPA 1994).
 34 An examination of the IRIS database found that there are no oral reference
 35 dose values for sodium and no oral reference dose or carcinogenic potency
 36 factors for lithium.

37
 38 Since it is not possible to calculate the MTCA health-based values for
 39 lithium or sodium using information from the IRIS database, the soil
 40 background values will be used for the performance standard. The Hanford Site
 41 Background soil values are as follows:

- 42
 43
 - Sodium 1910 mg/kg
 - Lithium 37.2 mg/kg.

44
 45
 46 Both the Hanford Site Background and the MTCA calculations are further
 47 discussed in Section 3.1 and Section 3.2 respectively.

1 3.1 HANFORD SITE BACKGROUND

2
3 The background action levels used in this report are based on a sitewide
4 approach to determining background levels presented in *Hanford Site*
5 *Background: Part 1, Soil Background for Nonradioactive Analytes* (DOE 1995c).
6 This approach was developed as an alternative to local unit-based background
7 determinations. Using local background for each TSD unit can lead to
8 different definitions of contamination and different assessments of
9 remediation goals and risk for various TSD units. The Hanford Site Background
10 approach is based on the premise that (1) the waste management units are
11 located on or in a common sequence of vadose zone sediments, and (2) the basic
12 characteristics that control the chemical composition of these sediments are
13 similar throughout the Hanford Site. The range of natural soil compositions
14 is used to establish a single set of soil background data. Use of the Hanford
15 Site Background for environmental restoration on the Hanford Site is
16 technically preferable to the use of the unit-based background because the
17 former more accurately represents the natural variability in soil composition
18 and also provides a more consistent and efficient basis for evaluating
19 contamination in soil.

20
21 The Hanford Site soil background threshold is the concentration level
22 that defines the upper limit of the background population. Background
23 thresholds are based on a tolerance interval approach. The calculated
24 threshold levels depend on the confidence interval and percentile used in the
25 calculation. The WAC 173-340-708(11)(d) specifies a tolerance coefficient of
26 95 percent and a coverage of 95 percent. The Hanford Site Background
27 threshold levels are based on this 95/95 confidence interval. Statistical
28 calculations are described in the source document (DOE-RL 1995c).

31 3.2 HEALTH-BASED LEVELS

32
33 The MTCA calculated health-based cleanup levels are from the equations,
34 risk levels, and exposure assumptions found in the MTCA Method B
35 (WAC 173-340-740 [3][a][iii]). For noncarcinogens, the principal variable is
36 the oral reference dose. The oral reference dose is defined as the level of
37 daily human exposure at or below which no adverse effect is expected to occur
38 during a lifetime. For carcinogens, the cancer slope factor is the basis for
39 determining human health effects; it is a measurement of the risk per unit
40 dose. The oral reference dose and the cancer slope factor are chemical-
41 specific and are obtained from the IRIS database (EPA 1995), if available.
42 Secondary sources for these toxicity values are from EPA or Ecology.

1
2
3
4 **4.0 ANALYSES**

5 All samples were analyzed using SW-846 Method 6010, "Inductively Coupled
6 Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectroscopy" (EPA 1986). Use of Method 6010 had been
7 established during the DQO process for the 105-DR LSFF. All samples were sent
8 to Quanterra Incorporated in St. Louis, Missouri, for chemical analysis. All
9 analytical data were validated according to *Data Validation Procedures for*
10 *Chemical Analysis* (WHC 1993) (refer to Section 5.0). The analytical data for
11 the constituents of concern are presented in Table 1.
12

13
14 **5.0 DATA VALIDATION**
15

16
17 Data validation was performed by Los Alamos Technical Associates, Inc.,
18 in accordance with Level D as defined in *Data Validation Procedures for*
19 *Chemical Analysis* (WHC 1993). Level D validation includes evaluation and
20 qualification of results based on analytical holding times, method blank
21 results, matrix spikes and duplicates, surrogate recoveries, and analytical
22 method blanks.
23

24 The criteria and limits for the validation procedures are listed in the
25 source document. Results of the data validators' review of the quality
26 control that was applied in this sampling event were transmitted to the
27 regulators with the validated data packages (DOE-RL 1995c).
28

29 The data validation procedure establishes the following qualifier and
30 definition to describe the sodium data:
31

- 32 J Indicates the compound or analyte was analyzed for and detected.
33 The associated concentration is an estimate, but the data are usable
34 for decision-making purposes.
35

36 The reason for assigning this qualifier to the sodium data is that a matrix
37 spike for sodium was not performed.
38

39 The data validation procedure establishes the following qualifier and
40 definition to describe the lithium data:
41

- 42 B Indicates that the analyte concentration is less than the contract
43 required detection limit, but greater than the instrument detection
44 limits.
45

46 The reason for assigning this qualifier to the lithium data is given in the
47 definition of the qualifier.
48
49

1
2
3
4 **6.0 DATA EVALUATION**

5 The closure plan proposed the comparison of concentrations in soil to
6 health-based action levels for the constituents of concern. Any analytical
7 data below the detection limits are considered to signify that no
8 contamination is present. The health-based action levels will be based on the
9 Hanford Site Background threshold levels for soil (see Section 3.0). If the
10 constituent of concern is found in concentrations greater than the health-
11 based level, then further evaluation will be required.

12 The analytical data are summarized in Table 1. All but one sample
13 (BOG984) were reported with the lithium analysis qualified as 'B'. This
14 indicates that the lithium values in all but one sample are less than the
15 contract required detection limit but greater than the instrument detection
16 limit. All reported sodium analysis are qualified as 'J'. This indicates
17 that the sodium values are estimated values but are considered useable for
18 evaluation purposes.

19 The analytical values for lithium and sodium were compared to the Hanford
20 Site Background threshold levels (Table 1). The maximum lithium value of
21 23.7 mg/kg is below the Hanford Site Background lithium value of 37.2 mg/kg.
22 The maximum sodium value of 273 mg/kg is well below the Hanford Site
23 Background sodium value of 1910 mg/kg.
24
25
26
27

28 **7.0 CONCLUSIONS**

29
30
31 The analytical results for the 105-DR LSFF soils verify that the
32 concentrations of all treatment activity residues (sodium and lithium) are
33 below action levels. No constituents of concern were found in concentrations
34 indicating contamination of the soil at the 105-DR LSFF (i.e., concentrations
35 above action levels). This supports the proposition that the 105-DR LSFF can
36 be clean closed.
37
38
39

40 **8.0 REFERENCES**

41
42
43 **8.1 DOCUMENTS**

44
45 DOE-RL, 1995a, Letter, J. E. Rassmussen, RL, and W. T. Dixon, WHC, to
46 M. N. Jaraysi, Ecology, and J. J. Witczak, Ecology, "Submittal of
47 Validated Data for the 105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility Sampling
48 (T-1-1)," dated December 13, 1995, 95-PCA-054, U.S. Department of Energy,
49 Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
50

- 1 DOE-RL, 1995b, *105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility Closure Plan*, DOE/RL-90-25,
2 Rev. 1, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland,
3 Washington.
4
- 5 DOE-RL, 1995c, *Hanford Site Background: Part 1, Soil Background for*
6 *Nonradioactive Analytes*, DOE/RL-92-24, Rev. 3, U.S. Department of Energy,
7 Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
8
- 9 Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1995, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent*
10 *Order*, 2 vols., Washington State Department of Ecology,
11 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy,
12 Olympia, Washington.
13
- 14 EPA, 1986, *Test Methods for the Evaluation of Solid Waste: Physical/Chemical*
15 *Methods*, SW-846, as amended, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
16 Washington, D.C.
17
- 18 EPA, 1994, *Integrated Risk Information System*, (online information system,
19 updated periodically), Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office,
20 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, Ohio.
21
- 22 WHC, 1988, *Environmental Investigations and Site Characterization Manual*,
23 WHC-CM-7-7, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
24
- 25 WHC, 1993, *Data Validation Procedures for Chemical Analyses*,
26 WHC-SD-EN-SPP-002, Rev. 2, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland,
27 Washington.
28

30 8.2 FEDERAL AND STATE ACTS

- 31
32 *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980*,
33 as amended, 42 USC 9601 et seq.
34
- 35 *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*, 42 USC 6901 et seq.
36
37
38

39 8.3 REVISED CODE OF WASHINGTON AND WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

- 40
41 WAC 173-303, "Dangerous Waste Regulations," *Washington Administrative Code*,
42 as amended.
43
- 44 WAC 173-340, "The Model Toxics Control Act Cleanup Regulations," *Washington*
45 *Administrative Code*, as amended.

1
2

105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility





Figure 1. A Schematic of 105-DR Reactor Building Including the Large Sodium Fire Facility.

F1







39003103.1

1
2

Figure 2. A Schematic of the Overall Large Sodium Fire Facility Exhaust System.


F2



H9508018.1

1
2

Figure 3. Soil Sampling Location at the 105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility.



1 Figure 4. Soil Random Sample Location for Closure Area 7.

Table 1. 105-DR Large Sodium Fire Facility
 Closure Area 7 Soil Results, Metals Analysis.

Sample Number	Constituent	
	Lithium mg/kg	Sodium mg/kg
BOG979	6.6 B	273 J
BOG980	6.6 B	154 J
BOG981	6.9 B	175 J
BOG982	9.5 B	183 J
BOG983	10.2 B	182 J
BOG984	23.7	117 J
Hanford Site Background 95/95 Threshold in Soil	37.2	1910
Hanford Site Background Maximum Concentration in Soil	38.2	6060

DISTRIBUTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Number of copies

ONSITE

2

U.S. Department of Energy -
Richland Operations Office

E.M. Mattlin

A5-15

D.H. Chapin

N2-36

1

GSSC

S.K. Johansen

B1-42

6

Westinghouse Hanford Company

J.G. Adler

H6-23

P.C. Miller

N2-57

S.M. Price

H6-23

F.A. Ruck, III

H6-23

Central Files

~~L8-04~~ A3-88