DOCUMENT RELEASE FORM

(1) Document Number: RPP-36609		(2) Revision Number: 1	(3) Effective Date: 08/04/2010
(4) Document Type: ☐ Digital Image ☒ Hard copy ☐ PDF ☐ Video		(a) Number of pages (including the DRF) or 40 (JKB 8/9/10) number of digital images	
(5) Release Type: ☐ New ☐ Cancel		☐ Page Change	☒ Complete Revision
(6) Document Title: Construction Method Study for Installation of a Large Riser in a Single-shell Tank			
(7) Change/Release Description: Revision to initial release to update technology data and selection details.			
(8) Change Justification: New information is available to revise technology score cards. Expanded discussion of the technology selection.			
(9) Associated Structure, System, and Component (SSC) and Building Number:	(a) Structure Location: NA		(c) Building Number: NA
	(b) System Designator: NA		(e) Project Number: NA
(10) Impacted Documents:	(a) Document Type	(b) Document Number	(c) Document Revision
	NA	NA	NA
(11) Approvals:			
(a) Author (Print/Sign): Doug Adkisson <i>Doug Adkisson</i>		Date: 8/3/10	
(b) Responsible Manager (Print/Sign): Scott Saunders <i>E. J. Adkisson For E. J. Adkisson</i>		Date: 8/4/10	
(c) Reviewer (Optional, Print/Sign): NA		Date:	
(d) Reviewer (Optional, Print/Sign): NA		Date:	
(12) Distribution:			
(a) Name	(b) MSIN	(a) Name	(b) MSIN
WL Duffy	S7-83		
JS Conrad	S7-83		
RK Nielsen	H6-60		
SA Saunders	S7-83		
WB Barton	S7-90		
MR Landon	S7-90		
MS Miller	E6-30		
<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> AUG 9 2010 DATE: <i>#19</i> STA: <i>#19</i> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> HANFORD RELEASE </div> ID: <i>(15)</i> </div>			
(13) Clearance	(a) Cleared for Public Release ☒ Yes ☐ No	(b) Restricted Information? ☐ Yes ☒ No	(c) Restriction Type:
(14) Clearance Review (Print/Sign): <i>GE Bratton</i>		Date: 8/4/2010	

Construction Method Study for Installation of a Large Riser in a Single-Shell Tank

D.A. Adkisson

Prepared by Will Pickett, Columbia Energy and Environmental Services, Inc. for
Washington River Protection Solutions

Richland, WA 99352

U.S. Department of Energy Contract DE-AC27-08RV14800

EDT/ECN: DRF

UC:

Cost Center:

Charge Code:

B&R Code:

Total Pages: 40

(JKB 8/9/10)

Key Words: Large Riser Installation, Single-shell Tank, Construction Method, Vendor Selection

Abstract: This study evaluates and identifies a construction method for cutting a hole in a single-shell tank dome. This study also identifies and evaluates vendors for performing the cut.

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.

Release Approval

8/4/2010
Date

Release Stamp

Approved For Public Release

Tank Operations Contractor (TOC) RECORD OF REVISION		(1) Document Number: RPP-36609		Page 1
(2) Title: Construction Method Study for Installation of a Large Riser in a Single-Shell Tank				
Change Control Record				
(3) Revision	(4) Description of Change – Replace, Add, and Delete Pages	Authorized for Release		
		(5) Resp. Engr. (print/sign/date)	(6) Resp. Mgr. (print/sign/date)	
1 RS	Revision to initial release to update technology data and selection details.	Doug Adkisson 8/4/10	Eric LaRock for Scott Saunders 8/4/10	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	PURPOSE/SCOPE	1
3.0	ALTERNATIVE IDENTIFICATION AND INITIAL PRE-SCREENING	1
3.1	DIAMOND WIRE CUTTING	3
3.1.1	General Description	3
3.1.2	Maturity/Complexity.....	6
3.1.3	Waste Generation.....	7
3.1.4	Safety	8
3.1.5	Cost	8
3.1.6	Schedule	9
3.2	CORE DRILLING	9
3.2.1	General Description	9
3.2.2	Maturity/Complexity.....	10
3.2.3	Waste Generation.....	11
3.2.4	Safety	12
3.2.5	Cost	12
3.2.6	Schedule	13
3.3	ABRASIVE WATER JET CUTTING	13
3.3.1	General Description	13
3.3.2	Maturity/Complexity.....	15
3.3.3	Waste Generation.....	16
3.3.4	Safety	17
3.3.5	Cost	17
3.3.6	Schedule	18
4.0	LARGE RISER INSTALLATION EVALUATION CRITERIA	18
4.1	SCORING SYSTEM	18
4.2	SCORING CRITERIA.....	19
4.2.1	Technology Maturity/Complexity	19
4.2.2	Waste Generation.....	19
4.2.3	Safety (ALARA).....	20
4.2.4	Cost	21
4.2.5	Schedule	21
5.0	RISER INSTALLATION SCORING RESULTS	21
6.0	INSTALLATION VENDOR ALTERNATIVES.....	24
6.1	VENDOR DESCRIPTION	25

6.1.1	Previous Experience/Projects.....	26
6.1.2	Cost Estimate	26
6.1.3	Schedule	27
7.0	VENDOR EVALUATION CRITERIA	27
7.1	SCORING SYSTEM	27
7.2	SCORING CRITERIA.....	28
7.2.1	Cutting Method/History	28
7.2.2	Safety Record	29
7.2.3	Cost	29
7.2.4	Schedule	29
8.0	VENDOR SELECTION SCORING RESULTS	30
9.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	30

LIST OF APPENDICES

A	COST ESTIMATE.....	A-i
B	SCHEDULE.....	B-i

LIST OF FIGURES

1.	Example Diamond Wire Saw Set-Up	5
2.	Example Diamond Wire Cutting Assembly Cuts	6
3.	Example Hydraulic Core Drill Set-Up.....	10
4.	Abrasive Water Jet Cutting of 19+ Inches of Reinforced Concrete	14
5.	Water Jet Cutting Using a Custom Guide Track	15

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Alternative Pre-Screening	2
2.	Diamond Wire Cutting Rough Order of Magnitude Costs	9
3.	Core Drilling Rough Order of Magnitude Costs.....	13
4.	Abrasive Water Jet Cutting Rough Order of Magnitude Costs	17
5.	Scoring Importance Factors	18
6.	Diamond Wire Cutting Score.....	22
7.	Core Drilling Score	22
8.	Abrasive Water Jet Cutting Score.....	23
9.	Vendor Scoring Importance Factors	28
10.	AK Services Score	30

LIST OF TERMS

ALARA	as low as reasonably achievable
OSHA®	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
psi	pounds per square inch
SST	single-shell tank
UHP	ultra-high pressure

® OSHA is a registered trademark of Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Dept of Labor.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Single-shell tanks (SST) in the 241-C tank farm are currently being retrieved using various retrieval technologies (e.g., modified sluicing). The Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order require that the SSTs be retrieved to less than 360 cubic feet of radioactive waste. The current technologies identified and deployed for tank retrieval have not been able to retrieve waste in accordance with the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order. As such, alternative retrieval systems have been proposed and are currently under construction that will have the ability to retrieve waste to this defined level. The proposed retrieval systems will not fit down existing risers. New risers will need to be installed to provide the retrieval systems access to the inside of the SSTs.

2.0 PURPOSE/SCOPE

The purpose of this study is two-fold. The first objective is to identify multiple concrete cutting technologies and perform an initial pre-screening, evaluate the technologies identified for more in-depth analysis, and recommend a technology/methodology for cutting a hole in the tank dome. The identified/pre-screened methods will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Maturity/complexity
- Waste generation
- Safety
- Cost
- Schedule.

Once the preferred method is identified to cut the hole in the tank dome, the second objective is to identify, evaluate, and recommend a vendor for the technology selected that will perform the cutting process.

3.0 ALTERNATIVE IDENTIFICATION AND INITIAL PRE-SCREENING

For cutting a hole in the tank dome for installation of a large riser, six construction methodologies were identified and are listed below:

- High-pressure water coupled with a mechanical cutting device to remove the structural rebar
- Jackhammer to remove the concrete coupled with a mechanical cutting device to remove the structural rebar
- Circular concrete cutting saw

- Diamond wire cutting
- Core drilling
- Abrasive water jet cutting.

An initial pre-screening for each technology was performed by the project organization that included members from Engineering, RadCon, Operations, and Industry. The results of that screening are provided in Table 1. If any of the technologies resulted in an impact to the tank dome that was unacceptable (e.g., inconsistencies in the hole dimensions because of lack of precision or resulted in weakening of the tank dome) it was removed from further analysis. The pre-screening includes a brief description of each methodology as well as key attributes that were used to determine whether or not the technology would be considered for further evaluation.

Table 1. Alternative Pre-Screening. (2 Sheets)

Technology	Description	Key Attributes	Considered for Further Analysis
High-pressure water coupled with mechanical rebar cutting device	High pressure water is used to remove the concrete. The rebar is left behind undamaged. The rebar would be cut using remote shear device. Hydrodemolition is commonly used for highway or bridge re-decking where cost savings are realized by re-using the rebar.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All concrete debris would potentially go in tank. • Water management issues. • Tank waste exposed to atmosphere for extended time periods. • Inconsistencies in hole dimensions. 	No
Jackhammer coupled with mechanical rebar cutting device	Jackhammer on a mechanical arm is used to remove the concrete. The rebar is left behind. The rebar would be cut using remote shear device.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All concrete debris would potentially go in tank. • Multiple large equipment entries. • Personnel exposure. • Inconsistencies in hole dimensions. 	No
Circular concrete cutting saw	Diamond concrete saw would be used to make an octagonal cut in the tank dome.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel exposure. • Overlapping saw kerfs in the corners of each cut could potentially weaken the dome. 	No

Table 1. Alternative Pre-Screening. (2 Sheets)

Technology	Description	Key Attributes	Considered for Further Analysis
Diamond wire cutting	Diamond wire saw would be used to make an octagonal cut in the tank dome. Core drilled holes would be required in each corner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core drills can be performed remotely. • Diamond wire equipment installation and operation performed remotely. • Minimal time required to perform cuts. • Majority of core captured. 	Yes
Core drilling	A diamond core bit would be used to cut a round hole in the tank dome.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The core drill drive device may require mounting to the tank dome or a large bridge structure. • Core drill can be operated remotely. • Core capture method would need to be developed. 	Yes
Abrasive water jet cutting	High-pressure water with garnet is passed through a straightening nozzle. The extreme pressure of the accelerated water/abrasive particles erodes the concrete.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will require water and abrasive material be added to the tank. • System can be installed and operated remotely 	Yes

Each of the three selected methodologies/techniques are unique from one another. Detailed descriptions for each method and evaluation against the selected criteria are provided in the following subsections.

3.1 DIAMOND WIRE CUTTING

3.1.1 General Description

Diamond wire cutting is a relatively old technology which was used in stone quarries. The concept of diamond wire cutting consists of looping the diamond wire saw around the section to be cut and coupling the ends of the wire. The wire is then placed around rubber flywheels which are hydraulically driven at speeds up to approximately 80 feet per second.

A small rack and gear drive provides tension on the drive wheel which produces the cutting action. For performing diamond wire cutting, the following equipment is required:

- Cutting wire (consisting of cable with diamond cutters and springs sleeved over the wire). The wire is custom fabricated continuous looped diamond impregnated cable.
- Hydraulic power unit
- Flywheels and wire cutting assembly
- Electric power supply
- Ancillary equipment for core drilling the corners of the cut.

When the wire cannot be wrapped around the section to be cut (such as for cutting a hole in a SST dome), access holes are required in the corners of the area to be cut. The access holes are typically cut using a small core drill that is 6 inches in diameter. The diamond cutting wire is looped around two pulleys attached to the cutting assembly. The pulley's are pressed down through the 6-inch holes to make the cut. The process described above is repeated for subsequent cuts.

Diamond wire saws can cut at an approximate rate of 15 square feet per hour (e.g., a 4 foot by 4 foot concrete cross section can be through-cut in just over 1 hour). Typically on larger cuts, water is required for cooling of the diamond wire saw. For cuts with smaller cross sections, the cuts can be made dry. Idler pulleys can be used to transition the diamond wire saw to any plane, any change of direction, and to any height. The hydraulic power unit is connected to the drive pulley by hydraulic hoses which will allow for its operation a safe distance from the potentially high radiation areas. The standard crew size for set-up, operation, and demobilization of the diamond wire saw is two trained personnel. Example diamond wire saw set-ups are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

Figure 1. Example Diamond Wire Saw Set-Up.

Figure 2. Example Diamond Wire Cutting Assembly Cuts.

3.1.2 Maturity/Complexity

The maturity/complexity of diamond wire cutting has been broken up into three criteria: technology history and the ability to capture the core, site preparation complexity, and installation and operation complexity. Diamond wire cutting's applicability to each of these criteria is discussed in the following subsections.

3.1.2.1 Technology History/Core Capture. Diamond wire cutting has been utilized for decommissioning at multiple facilities in the nuclear industry. Listed below are examples of work that have been performed in the nuclear industry using diamond wire cutting.

- Diamond wire cutting was used to make an opening in the Reactor Head Stand in Units 1 and 2 at Catawba Nuclear Station.
- Diamond wire cutting was used to cut two walls to gain access for tank removal at Sequoyah Nuclear Plant.
- Diamond wire cutting was used to remove condensate booster pump and pump motor foundations at Browns Ferry Nuclear Power Plant.

- Diamond wire cutting was used to cut a 15.75 foot diameter shield plug on the refuel floor at Hatch Nuclear Plant.

When the wire cannot be wrapped around the section to be cut (such as for cutting a hole in a SST dome), pilot holes are required in the corners of the area to be cut. The pilot holes used on a SST dome will be 6 inches in diameter and would be made using a small core drill. For these pilot holes, the cores will be cut to a depth of approximately 10 to 12 inches and the partial cores removed. After the top portion of the core has been removed, the drill will complete the pilot hole and the remaining 3 to 5 inches of core dropped into the tank. Once the pilot holes are cut, the diamond wire saw assembly is positioned over the core drilled holes and pushed through the concrete. After each cut is made the assembly can be remotely indexed over the next set of pilot holes. The system can be fabricated such that two saws are running simultaneously and the entire system only indexed four times to make eight cuts. This method will allow for access above the dome while the cut is being made and connections to be made to the center of the existing riser core so that the riser and the large decoupled concrete dome core can be captured once the cuts are completed.

3.1.2.2 Site Preparation Complexity. For site preparation, diamond wire cutting is relatively simple. It requires no ancillary structures to span the tank and no unique provisions for equipment access to the cutting area. The only provision that is required for the diamond wire cutting method is for accessing the tank dome to make the cut.

3.1.2.3 Installation and Operation Complexity. The installation and operation of the diamond wire cutting equipment is relatively simple and consists of the following:

- Cut 6-inch pilot cores
- Install diamond wire saw assembly and indexing track
- Install containment (small tent structure) around cutting area for contamination control
- Connect hydraulic power unit to flywheel
- Commence cutting.

To perform the complete dome cut, eight separate cuts and eight core drills will be required. This study assumes that after the first full core drill is complete, the cutting area will be contaminated with wet concrete dust that has been in contact with the inside of the tank dome and the tank waste will be exposed. This will add a moderate level of complexity to the subsequent cuts.

3.1.3 Waste Generation

Waste Generation has been broken up into two criteria: water usage and contaminated equipment (consumables).

3.1.3.1 Water Usage. For typical diamond wire saw applications, water is used to cool the diamond wire during the cutting process. However, for smaller cuts, the cuts can be made dry. Discussions with diamond wire cutting contractors indicate that the large core in the tank dome could be cut dry. Cutting the dome dry will create dust which could be eliminated by use of small amounts of water. Based on discussions with a diamond wire cutting vendor, the amount of water required to drill the pilot cores can be approximated by the internal volume of the core bit. The pilot cores will require approximately 20 gallons to complete all eight. The vendor also

indicated the water used to lubricate and minimize dust during the diamond wire cutting would be approximately 150 gallons.

3.1.3.2 Contaminated Equipment. For this study, it is assumed that during the cutting process only the cutting assembly, core bits and hydraulic power unit will become contaminated and require disposal. The cutting assembly, core bits and hydraulic power unit required to make the cuts will be able to fit in one standard burial box (6 feet by 9 feet by 4 feet).

3.1.4 Safety

Safety has been broken up into three criteria: distance, time over the dome, and response/recovery from abnormal events.

3.1.4.1 Distance. For diamond wire cutting, both the small core drill required to cut the pilot holes, and the hydraulic power unit which turns the flywheel for the diamond wire cutting, can be operated remotely; however, the system must be manually indexed to make multiple cores and wire cuts. This results in the entire cut not being able to be performed remotely.

3.1.4.2 Time over Tank Dome. During the installation and demobilization of the components, personnel will be required to be located over the dome for the following activities:

- Installing the large core capture anchor bolts (3x)
- Mounting the core drill mast for pilot holes (1x)
- Installing the diamond wire cutting assembly (1x)
- Installing the necessary core capture rigging and containment structures over the cutting area (1x)
- Indexing the core cutting system for partial and completing core (8x)
- Indexing the cutting system (4x)
- Removal of the pulleys and support structure after the last cut is made (1x).

Installing the core capture anchor bolts will require approximately 15 minutes each. Based on discussions with diamond wire vendors, the diamond wire cutting assemblies and drill mast mount requires approximately 30 minutes; installing the core capture rigging and containment structures could be performed in approximately 4 hours and removal of the cutting assembly with core could be performed in approximately 15 minutes. Indexing the system will acquire approximately 30 minutes for each event. The approximate time frame that personnel will be required over the tank dome to perform these actions is 11 hours and 30 minutes.

3.1.4.3 Response/Recovery from Abnormal Events. With diamond wire cutting, at mid-cut the system has breached the dome containment and equipment can easily be removed.

3.1.5 Cost

Cost has been broken up into two criteria: costs to cut the hole in the tank dome (construction) and costs to procure equipment if it becomes contaminated (capital). Rough order costs associated with diamond wire cutting are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Diamond Wire Cutting Rough Order of Magnitude Costs.

Description	Cost	Applicability
Labor (2 man crew)	\$2,000 to \$2,250 per day	Construction
Equipment (while in use or idle)	\$750 per day	Construction
Consumables (diamond wire not free released)	\$50/lineal foot	Construction
Purchase Price of equipment if contaminated*	\$30,000	Additional Project Expense (Potential)
Approximate Cost**	\$46,200.00	—

*Equipment purchased includes the diamond wires, flywheels, hydraulic power unit and all ancillary equipment.

**Assumes 1 week duration (5 days) for mobilization, cutting hole and demobilization. Also assumes two 12-foot sections of diamond wire is used and cutting equipment becomes contaminated.

3.1.6 Schedule

This study considers two schedule criteria for cutting the hole in the tank dome: (1) can standard “off-the-shelf” equipment be used for performing the cut (lead time), and (2) how much time is required to perform the cut. Personnel training, work planning, work stoppages (e.g., weather related) are not factored into the time to perform the cut.

The diamond wire cutting equipment required to cut a hole in a SST dome is not standard “off-the-shelf” equipment and would require custom fabrication. Based on discussions with diamond wire cutting vendors, equipment could be fabricated, mobilized and installed, the cut could be made, and the equipment demobilized in approximately six weeks.

3.2 CORE DRILLING

3.2.1 General Description

Concrete core drilling is the process of drilling a round hole through concrete walls, floors and other concrete structures. Concrete core drills can be operated in any orientation: vertical, horizontal, or inverse vertical. For performing core drilling, the following equipment is required:

- Diamond core bit
- Hydraulic power unit (if hydraulic pump is used)
- Drill Motor (hydraulic or electric)
- Stationary mast (with mounting hardware)
- Electric power supply
- Water supply.

A concrete core drill bit consists of a steel tube with diamond segments brazed or laser welded on the drilling end. Diamond core bits range in size of 1/2-inch to larger than 48 inches. The core bits are mounted on a shaft which is rotated by either a hydraulic or electric drill. The drill is mounted on a stationary mast to guide the core drill relative to the position of the hole. For a vertical or horizontal hole, the base of the stationary mast is secured with drop in or wedge anchors to a base. Pressure can be applied to the core drill by a manual hand wheel or an auto feed drill. During the cutting process, water is required for bit lubrication and cooling. For

nuclear applications, hydraulic drills and auto feed masts are typically used to minimize personnel time in the radiological areas. An example core drill set-up is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Example Hydraulic Core Drill Set-Up.

3.2.2 Maturity/Complexity

The maturity/complexity of core drilling has been broken up into three criteria: technology history and ability to capture the core, site preparation complexity, and installation and operation complexity. Core drilling's applicability to each of these criteria is discussed in the following subsections.

3.2.2.1 Technology History/Core Capture. Core drilling has been utilized at multiple nuclear facilities. Listed below are examples of work that has been performed in the nuclear industry using core drills.

- 12-inch diameter holes were drilled in Hanford SSTs for installation of riser's.
- 6-inch and 8-inch diameter holes were cored 2 feet, 6 inches in depth at Watts Barr Nuclear Plant.
- 18-inch holes were core drilled in the Reactor Containment Dome at Watts Barr Nuclear Plant.
- Core drilling was used for sampling of hot cells for proposed decommissioning at Nycomed Amersham.
- Small diameter holes of exact dimension were core drilled through heavily reinforced shield walls for installation of new jib cranes at the South Texas Electrical Generating Station.

The core drill bit consists of a steel tube with diamond segments brazed or laser welded on the drilling end. A shaft connects to the bit and an electric or hydraulic drill which turns the bit and creates the cut. During the cutting process, the only direct access for core capture is through the shaft. Incorporating core capture into the core drilling process is not standard practice and would add overall complexity to the design.

3.2.2.2 Site Preparation Complexity. For site preparation, core drilling is moderately complex. One standard provision that is required for the core drilling method is for accessing the tank dome to make the cut. It also requires ancillary structures to span the riser encasement and the bit will require crane support for placement and removal. Additionally, the stationary mast on which the drill (electric or hydraulic) is mounted will need to be secured during the cutting process. It is not feasible to install a caisson large enough to provide access for mounting the mast to the tank dome. A temporary concrete or steel pad would be required at grade, outside of the caisson, to mount the stationary mast to which adds additional complexity to the site preparation.

3.2.2.3 Installation and Operation Complexity. Installation and operation complexities for core drilling are uncertain. Provisions for core capture will require additional design and evaluation. For this reason, the installation and operational complexity is considered high. The installation and operation of the core drilling equipment consists of the following:

- Make provisions for core capture (if feasible)
- Install temporary pad (concrete or steel) for mounting the stationary mast
- Install stationary mast with core drill and motor
- Connect water source for cooling
- Connect control system to mast (electric or hydraulic)
- Commence cutting.

3.2.3 Waste Generation

Waste generation has been broken up into two criteria: water usage and contaminated equipment (consumables).

3.2.3.1 Water Usage. For core drilling through concrete, water is required to cool the bit during the cutting process. The water source is typically connected to the shaft and feeds water inside the core drill bit. Based on discussions with a core drill vendor, a good approximation for water usage is the volume that the inside of the bit can hold. The core drill required to cut a hole for installation of the riser would be 55 inches in diameter and approximately 60 inches tall. A bit of this height would be required to not interfere with existing risers where the cut was being made. A bit of this size, negating any interference inside the bit during the cutting process, would require approximately 600 gallons of water for cooling during the cutting process that would dump inside the tank once penetration was made through the dome.

3.2.3.2 Contaminated Equipment. This study assumes that during the cutting process, the core drill bit and hydraulic power unit will become contaminated and require disposal. The core drill bit and hydraulic power unit will not fit into a standard burial box. At a minimum, one standard and one custom burial box will be required for disposal.

3.2.4 Safety

Safety has been broken up into three criteria: distance, time over the dome, and response/recovery from abnormal events.

3.2.4.1 Distance. Core drills have the capability to be operated with a manual hand wheel or an auto feed drill. For core drilling through a tank dome, an auto feed drill would be used which would allow for remote operations.

3.2.4.2 Time over Tank Dome. During the installation and demobilization of the core drill equipment, personnel will be required to be located over the dome for the following activities:

- Installing the support mast with drill and bit and aligning over the cut area (1x)
- Removal of the bit for disposal (1x)
- Removal of the support mast with drill (1x).

Based on discussions with core drill vendors, installation and alignment of the support mast, drill and bit could be performed in approximately four hours. Removal of the bit for disposal and removal of the support mast with the drill are assumed to take two hours each. The approximate timeframe that personnel will be required over the tank dome to perform these actions is approximately eight hours.

3.2.4.3 Response/Recovery from Abnormal Events. With core drilling, at mid-cut the system has not breached the dome containment and equipment (drill mast and bit) must be rigged and removed with a crane making it not easily removed.

3.2.5 Cost

Cost has been broken up into two criteria: costs to cut the hole in the tank dome (construction) and costs to procure equipment if it becomes contaminated (capital). Rough order costs associated with core drilling are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Core Drilling Rough Order of Magnitude Costs.

Description	Cost	Applicability
Labor (2 man crew)	\$2,000 to \$2,250 per day	Construction
Equipment (while in use or idle)	\$750 per day	Construction
Consumables (core drill bit not free released)	\$15,000	Construction
Purchase Price of Equipment if Contaminated*	\$30,000	Additional Project Expense (Potential)
Approximate Cost**	\$60,000	—

*Equipment purchased includes the hydraulic power unit, drill motor, and mast.

**Assumes 1 week duration (5 days) for mobilization, cutting hole and demobilization. Also assumes equipment becomes contaminated.

3.2.6 Schedule

This study considers two schedule criteria for cutting the hole in the tank dome: (1) can standard “off-the-shelf” equipment be used for performing the cut, and (2) how much time is required to perform the cut. Personnel training, work planning, work stoppages (e.g., weather related) are not factored into the time to perform the cut.

The core drill cutting equipment required to cut a hole in a single shell tank dome is standard “off-the-shelf” equipment. Based on discussions with core drill vendors, equipment could be mobilized and installed, the cut could be made, and the equipment demobilized in approximately two weeks.

3.3 ABRASIVE WATER JET CUTTING

3.3.1 General Description

Abrasive water jet cutting is a process in which high-pressure water is used for concrete and steel demolition. Abrasive water jet cutting works by forcing a volume of water through a small orifice or nozzle. The constant volume of water traveling through a reduced cross sectional area causes the particles to rapidly accelerate. The accelerated stream leaving the nozzle impacts the materials to be cut. The extreme pressure of the accelerated water/abrasive particles contacts small areas of the material and develops small cracks. The water jet washes away the material that “erodes” from the surface of the work piece. The crack caused by the water jet impact is now exposed to the water jet which causes the cracks to propagate until the material is cut through. Typical applications include cutting areas that have a risk of explosion or fire; cutting of mixed materials, concrete and rebar, steel with rubber lining, laminates, steel and refractory. Abrasives would be incorporated into the high-pressure water for cutting through both the concrete and rebar. The incorporation of abrasives into the high-pressure stream adds complexity to the system and decreases the life of the cutting equipment. The use of anything but garnet as an abrasive has been unsuccessful in cutting reinforced concrete. Abrasives tried

include silica sand and OK-110 silica sand. For performing abrasive water jet cutting, the following equipment is required:

- Ultra high-pressure pump
- Guide track system
- Cutting head
- Abrasive delivery system
- Controls
- Electric power supply
- Water supply
- Abrasives (garnet)
- High-pressure hoses.

The standard crew size for set-up, operation, and demobilization of the water jet cutting equipment is two trained personnel. Example water jet cutting set-up and cuts are shown in Figures 4 and 5, respectively.

Figure 4. Abrasive Water Jet Cutting of 19+ Inches of Reinforced Concrete.

Figure 5. Water Jet Cutting Using a Custom Guide Track.

3.3.2 Maturity/Complexity

The maturity/complexity of abrasive water jet cutting has been broken up into three criteria: technology, history, and ability to capture the core; site preparation complexity; and installation

and operation complexity. Abrasive water jet cuttings applicability to each of these criteria is discussed in the following subsections.

3.3.2.1 Technology History/Core Capture. Abrasive water jet cutting has been used in the K-Basin D&D (deactivation and decommissioning) project at the Hanford Site.

For performing a remote abrasive water jet cut, applications were identified where a portable track could be mounted on the object to be cut. Mounted on the guide track are the cutting heads. The guide track system uses a cog drive to move the cutting head along the track. Using a similar methodology for cutting a hole in an SST will allow access above the dome while the cut is being made. The access will allow for connections to the center core so that the existing riser and large decoupled concrete dome core can be captured once the cut is complete.

3.3.2.2 Site Preparation Complexity. For site preparation, abrasive water jet cutting is relatively simple. It requires no ancillary structures to span the tank and no unique provisions for equipment access to the cutting area. A location would be required for storage of approximately 2,000 pounds of abrasive material (garnet).

3.3.2.3 Installation and Operation Complexity. The installation and operation of the abrasive water jet cutting equipment is relatively simple and consists of the following:

- Install guide track in existing caisson (the cutting heads would be attached to the guide track prior to installation) and center and level the guide track.
- Couple abrasive delivery system/ultra high-pressure pump to cutting head.
- Install containment (small tent structure) around cutting area for contamination control.
- Commence cutting.

3.3.3 Waste Generation

Waste generation has been broken up into two criteria: water usage and contaminated equipment (consumables).

3.3.3.1 Water Usage. For abrasive water jet cutting, water with abrasives is the cutting medium. Discussions with water jet cutting vendors indicate that for cutting through the 15-inch thick concrete and 3/4-inch rebar, an approximate 3.3 gallon per minute flow rate would be required. They also indicated that approximately 1.6 pounds per minute of garnet would be required and that the cut would take approximately 1,260 minutes. During the cutting process, the total volume of additional waste generated would include an estimated 4,158 gallons of water and 2,016 pounds of garnet. As with any addition of water during tank retrieval, the added volume must be made in accordance with the applicable Tank Waste Retrieval Work Plan (TWRWP) or Function and Requirements (F&R) document.

3.3.3.2 Contaminated Equipment. This study assumes that during the cutting process, the guide track, and hoses connected to the cutting heads will become contaminated and require disposal. The track, cutting heads and hoses will be able to fit in one standard burial box (6 feet by 9 feet by 4 feet).

3.3.4 Safety

Safety has been broken up into three criteria: distance, time over the dome and response/recovery from abnormal events.

3.3.4.1 Distance. Abrasive water jet cutting has the capability to be operated remotely. For cutting through a tank dome, a remote control system would be used which would allow for remote operations.

3.3.4.2 Time over Tank Dome. During the installation and demobilization of the components, personnel will be required to be located over the dome for the following activities:

- Installing the large core capture anchor bolts (3x)
- Installing the guide track (including centering and leveling the guide track)
- Installing the necessary core capture rigging and containment structures over the cutting area
- Removal of the guide track and core.

Installing the core capture anchor bolts will require approximately 15 minute each. Based on discussions with abrasive water jet vendors, typical times for installations include 30 minutes for installing and leveling the track assembly, 4 hours for installing the core capture rigging and containment structure and 30 minutes for removing the track assembly and core.

The approximate time frame that personnel will be required over the tank dome to perform these actions is 5 hours and 45 minutes.

3.3.4.3 Response/Recovery from Abnormal Events. With abrasive water jet cutting, at mid-cut the system has breached the dome containment and equipment can easily be removed.

3.3.5 Cost

Rough order costs associated with abrasive water jet cutting are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Abrasive Water Jet Cutting Rough Order of Magnitude Costs.

Description	Cost	Applicability
Labor (2 man crew) and cutting gear	\$400 per hour	Construction
Consumables (garnet)	\$1 per pound (2,016 pounds)	Construction
Purchase Price of Equipment if Contaminated*	\$175,000	Additional Project Expense (Potential)
Approximate Cost**	\$193,016.00	—

*Equipment purchased includes the ultra high-pressure pump, guide track system, guide track motion system, cutting head, abrasive delivery system, and controls.

**Assumes 1 week duration (5 days) for mobilization, cutting hole and demobilization. Also assumes equipment becomes contaminated.

3.3.6 Schedule

This study considers two schedule criteria for cutting the hole in the tank dome: (1) can standard "off-the-shelf" equipment be used for performing the cut (lead time), and (2) how much time is required to perform the cut. Personnel training, work planning, work stoppages (e.g., weather related) are not factored into the time to perform the cut.

For cutting the hole in the tank dome, "off-the-shelf" equipment will be utilized. Based on discussions with an abrasive water jet cutting vendor, equipment could be mobilized and installed, the cut could be made, and the equipment demobilized in 4 days. The approximate cutting time will be approximately 1,260 minutes.

4.0 LARGE RISER INSTALLATION EVALUATION CRITERIA

This study evaluates and scores the alternatives identified to cut the hole in the top of the tank dome. The evaluation/scoring process estimates cutting method performance in the following functional areas:

- Technology maturity/complexity (Section 4.2.1)
- Waste generation (Section 4.2.2)
- Safety (Section 4.2.3)
- Cost (Section 4.2.4)
- Schedule (Section 4.2.5).

These evaluation criteria are described in greater detail in the following subsections.

4.1 SCORING SYSTEM

The scoring process assigned an importance or weighting factor between 1 and 3 to each criterion based on its relative importance (I). A score of 1 indicates less importance. A score of 3 indicates great importance. The importance factors are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Scoring Importance Factors.

Functional Area	Criteria	Importance (I)
Technology Maturity/Complexity	Technology History/Core Capture	3
	Site Prep Complexity	2
	Installation and Operation Complexity	3
Waste Generation	Water Usage	2
	Contaminated Equipment (Consumables)	2
Safety (ALARA)	Distance (Remote Operations)	3
	Time Over Dome	3
	Response/Recovery from Abnormal Events	3
Cost	Construction	3
	Capital	2
Schedule		2

ALARA = as low as reasonably achievable

The scoring process also assigned a score between 0 and 10 to each method to cut the hole based on its performance (P) in each criterion. A score of 0 indicates the method does not satisfy the criteria. A score of 10 indicates it perfectly meets the objective or criteria. Each method receives a score (S) for each criteria equal to $I \cdot P$. The sum of all scores (S) indicates the overall scoring of the construction method.

4.2 SCORING CRITERIA

4.2.1 Technology Maturity/Complexity

The scoring process considered three criteria for the technology maturity and complexity: technology history and ability to capture the core, site preparation complexity, and installation and operation complexity.

The technology history and ability to capture the core received an importance (I) score of 3. Methods which have been previously used in radiological environments and would allow for core capture (without adding an excessive amount of added complexity) received a performance (P) score of 7. Methods which have not been previously used in radiological environments but would allow for core capture (without adding an excessive amount of added complexity) received a performance (P) score of 5. Methods which have been previously used in radiological environments but would not allow for core capture (without adding an excessive amount of added complexity) received a performance (P) score of 3. Methods which have not been previously used in radiological environments and would not allow for core capture (without adding an excessive amount of added complexity) received a performance (P) score of 1.

Site preparation complexity received an importance (I) score of 2. Methods with a high level of complexity (relative to other methods) for site preparation received a performance (P) score of 3. Methods with a moderate level of complexity (relative to other methods) for site preparation received a performance (P) score of 5. Methods with a low level of complexity (relative to other methods) for site preparation received a performance (P) score of 7.

Installation and operation complexity received an importance (I) score of 3. Methods with a high level of complexity (relative to other methods) for installation and operation received a performance (P) score of 3. Methods with a moderate level of complexity (relative to other methods) for installation and operation received a performance (P) score of 5. Methods with a low level of complexity (relative to other methods) for installation and operation received a performance (P) score of 7.

For each criteria, the performance (P) will be multiplied by the importance factor (I) to determine each score (S_1 , S_2 , and S_3). The overall score (S) for the technology maturity/complexity will be determined by averaging the three scores ($S = (S_1 + S_2 + S_3)/3$).

4.2.2 Waste Generation

The scoring process considered two criteria for waste generation: water usage and contaminated equipment.

Water usage received an importance (I) score of 2. Methods which require minimal amounts of water (<50 gallons) received a performance (P) score of 7. Methods which require moderate amounts of water (50–150 gallons) received a performance (P) score of 5. Methods which require excessive amounts of water (>150 gallons) received a performance (P) score of 3.

Contaminated equipment received an importance (I) score of 2. Methods which require less than or equal to one standard burial box to dispose of contaminated equipment received a performance (P) score of 7. Methods which require between one and three standard burial boxes to dispose of contaminated equipment received a performance (P) score of 5. Methods which require more than three standard burial boxes to dispose of contaminated equipment received a performance (P) score of 3. Note that only consumables for each method are included for this evaluation criterion.

For each criteria, the performance (P) will be multiplied by the importance factor (I) to determine each score (S_1 , and S_2). The overall score (S) for the waste generation will be determined by averaging the two scores ($S = (S_1 + S_2)/2$).

4.2.3 Safety (ALARA)

The scoring process considered three criteria for safety: distance, time over the dome, and response/recovery from abnormal events.

Distance from the radiological source received an importance (I) score of 3. Methods which could be operated remotely received a performance (P) score of 7. Methods which require personnel on the tank dome during the cutting process received a performance (P) score of 3.

Time required over the tank dome during the mobilization, operation, and demobilization of equipment received an importance (I) score of 3. Methods in which equipment mobilization, performing the cut and equipment demobilization could be performed in one or less eight hour shifts received a performance (P) score of 7. Methods in which equipment mobilization, performing the cut and equipment demobilization could be performed between two and four eight hour shifts received a performance (P) score of 5. Methods in which equipment mobilization, performing the cut and equipment demobilization could be performed in more than five 8-hour shifts received a performance (P) score of 3.

Response/recovery from abnormal events received an importance score of (I) of 3. Methods were evaluated for recovery from a mid-cut off-normal event that results in stopping the cutting process and returning the tank to a safe condition for recovery planning. Methods in which the tank could be placed in an interim safe condition with low complexity (e.g., mid-cut has not breached dome containment and equipment easily removed) received a performance (P) score of 7. Methods in which the tank could be placed in an interim safe condition with moderate complexity (e.g., mid-cut has breached dome containment and equipment easily removed or mid-cut has not breached dome containment and equipment not easily removed) received a performance (P) score of 5. Methods in which the tank could be placed in an interim safe condition with high complexity (e.g., mid-cut has breached dome containment and equipment not easily removed) received a performance (P) score of 3.

For each criteria, the performance (P) will be multiplied by the importance factor (I) to determine each score (S_1 , S_2 , and S_3). The overall score (S) for safety will be determined by averaging the three scores ($S = (S_1 + S_2 + S_3)/3$).

4.2.4 Cost

The scoring process considered two cost criteria: costs to cut the hole in the tank dome (construction) and costs to procure equipment if it becomes contaminated (additional project expense).

Costs to cut the hole in the tank dome received an importance (I) score of 3. Rough order of magnitude costs will be obtained for each method. For the purposes of this study, the only rough order of magnitude costs used to evaluate the construction methods include subcontractor labor and equipment rental. The method with the lowest cost will receive a performance (P) score of 10. The performance (P) scores for the remaining two (higher cost) methods will be calculated by dividing the lower cost (\$) by the cost of the method and multiplying that number (ratio of the two costs) by 10.

Additional project expenses received an importance (I) score of 2. The method with the lowest capital cost will receive a performance (P) score of 10. The performance (P) scores for the remaining two (higher cost) methods will be calculated by dividing the lower cost (\$) by the cost of the method and multiplying that number (ratio of the two costs) by 10.

For each criteria, the performance (P) will be multiplied by the importance factor (I) to determine each score (S_1 , and S_2). The overall score (S) for cost will be determined by averaging the two scores ($S = (S_1 + S_2)/2$).

4.2.5 Schedule

Schedule time required to implement the method and perform the cut received an importance (I) score of 3.

Methods which do not require unique equipment (e.g., off-the-shelf) and can perform the cut in five days or less received a performance (P) score of 7. Methods which do not require unique equipment (e.g., off-the-shelf) and can perform the cut in more than five days received a performance (P) score of 5. Methods which require unique equipment (design and fabrication) regardless of the time required to perform the cut received a performance (P) score of 3.

5.0 RISER INSTALLATION SCORING RESULTS

The scoring results for diamond wire cutting, core drilling, and water jet cutting are presented in Tables 6 through 8, respectively.

Table 6. Diamond Wire Cutting Score.

Functional Area	Criterion	Importance (I)	Performance (P)	Score (S=I*P)
Technology Maturity/Complexity	Technology History/Core Capture	3	7	21
	Site Preparation Complexity	2	7	14
	Installation and Operation Complexity	3	5	15
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2+S_3)/3)$				16.7
Waste Generation	Water Usage	2	7	14
	Contaminated Equipment (Consumables)	2	7	14
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2)/2)$				14
Safety (ALARA)	Distance (Remote Operations)	3	3	9
	Time Over Dome	3	5	15
	Response/Recovery from Abnormal Events	3	5	15
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2+S_3)/3)$				13
Cost	Construction	3	10	30
	Additional Project Expense	2	10	20
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2)/2)$				25
Schedule		2	3	6
Total Score				74.7

Table 7. Core Drilling Score.

Functional Area	Criterion	Importance (I)	Performance (P)	Score (S=I*P)
Technology Maturity/Complexity	Technology History/Core Capture	3	3	9
	Site Preparation Complexity	2	5	10
	Installation and Operation Complexity	3	3	9
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2+S_3)/3)$				9.3
Waste Generation	Water Usage	2	3	6
	Contaminated Equipment (Consumables)	2	5	10
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2)/2)$				8
Safety (ALARA)	Distance (Remote Operations)	3	7	21
	Time Over Dome	3	7	21
	Response/Recovery from Abnormal Events	3	5	15
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2+S_3)/3)$				19
Cost	Construction	3	5.4	16.2
	Additional Project Expense	2	10	20
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2)/2)$				18.1
Schedule		2	5	10
Total Score				64.4

Table 8. Abrasive Water Jet Cutting Score.

Functional Area	Criterion	Importance (I)	Performance (P)	Score (S=I*P)
Technology Maturity/Complexity	Technology History/Core Capture	3	7	21
	Site Preparation Complexity	2	7	14
	Installation and Operation Complexity	3	7	21
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2+S_3)/3)$				18.7
Waste Generation	Water Usage	2	3	6
	Contaminated Equipment (Consumables)	2	7	14
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2)/2)$				10
Safety (ALARA)	Distance (Remote Operations)	3	7	21
	Time Over Dome	3	7	21
	Response/Recovery from Abnormal Events	3	5	15
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2+S_3)/3)$				19
Cost	Construction	3	9	27
	Additional Project Expense	2	1.7	3.4
Overall Score $((S_1+S_2)/2)$				15.2
Schedule		2	7	14
Total Score				76.9

Tables 6 through 8 provide the scorecards for the three technologies that were selected for further consideration. With a score of 76.9, abrasive water jet cutting is the preferred technology. Abrasive water jet cutting offers advantages over diamond wire cutting in technology maturity, safety, and schedule, but falls short on water usage and cost.

Both abrasive water jet cutting and diamond wire cutting are mature technologies, but the installation complexity of the diamond wire cutting system, due to the contamination by wet concrete dust after the first core is breached, yields an advantage to abrasive water jet cutting. Safety is the driving consideration for selecting the abrasive water jet cutting technology. For abrasive water jet cutting, installation of the cutting assembly is performed before operations are started when the tank dome is intact. For diamond water cutting, two segments on opposite sides of the hole are cut simultaneously, resulting in four distinct cutting operations. Prior to cutting the segments, core holes are drilled through the dome to position the cutting equipment. During cutting, an operator enters the radiological zone to index the cutting tool three more times, reducing the distance from the breached dome during cutting. In addition to indexing the cutting equipment during cutting operations, drilling eight cores into the tank dome may expose an operator to the radiological zone above a breached dome as subsequent cores are drilled. Core drilling over open holes in the tank dome can be minimized by first drilling and recovering the top section (upper 12 inches) of the cores in all eight locations prior to coring the bottom penetrating the tank dome in the first location. However, this would extend the duration over the dome as the coring equipment would be positioned twice at each of the eight core locations.

The advantages that diamond wire cutting offer over abrasive water jet cutting pertain to equipment costs if the equipment becomes contaminated and water usage. Although diamond wire cutting scores slightly better in construction costs, the differences are not significant.

Equipment costs for the diamond wire cutting, ~\$30,000, are considerably less than the costs of the abrasive water jet cutting equipment (~\$175,000). However, given the increased safety cost of the diamond wire cutting technology, the increased equipment cost does not warrant the selection of a technology that could increase worker exposure to the radiological environment. Water usage during cutting activities is a concern because it adds additional volume to the tank waste that will be retrieved.

In addition to the guidelines presented for scoring the selected technologies, other considerations are inherently included in the down select. Although the shape of the hole was not given direct consideration, a round hole may be better for riser fabrication. It is anticipated that the riser would be fabricated by a segment of a cylindrical pipe and a round hole ensures that the distance from the edge of the hole to the riser is nearly uniform. As such, it would be easier to fabricate a skirt to cover the opening between the edge of the round hole and the riser casing compared to an octagon hole, where the distance between the edge of the hole and the riser casing varies along the perimeter of the hole. If an octagon shaped riser casing were required, to minimize the gap between the tank dome and the riser casing, the installation complexity would increase as placement would need to consider the orientation of the riser as it was installed. Regardless of the shape of the hole, the riser would be designed and fabricated according to the opening cut by the selected technology. The addition of garnet to the tank waste during abrasive water jet cutting may be a concern and the inclusion of the abrasive material in the tank waste should be given additional consideration. However, without garnet as an abrasive it has been demonstrated that the structural rebar will not be cut.

6.0 INSTALLATION VENDOR ALTERNATIVES

Five potential vendors were contacted on June 18, 2009 for requesting their expression of interest in providing information to support the cutting of the concrete dome for the large riser installation. Below is a list of the vendors contacted.

- **AK Services:** Founded in 1992 in Everett Massachusetts, AK Services, Inc. has served contractors and engineers throughout the United States and Canada utilizing a multitude of water jetting technologies.,
- **USI:** Founded in 1978 in Chattanooga, Tennessee, Universal Service Inc. offers a wide range of industrial services including industrial vacuuming, waterblasting, personnel support, dry ice blasting, and waste management.
- **Midwest Mobile:** Midwest Mobile Waterjet, L.L.C. is a Mendota Heights Minnesota based contractor specializing in applications from hydro demolition, hydroscarification, and waterjet cutting services as well as cleaning and water blasting utilizing ultra-high pressure water
- **TMR Associates, LLC,** is a privately held small business founded in 1996 with headquarters in Lakewood, Colorado providing hydrolasing processes that support a variety of remote-operated rotating water jet tools.

- MPW Industrial Services: MPW located in Hebron, Ohio are providers of Ultra-High Pressure (UHP) Water jet technology (40K pounds per square inch [psi]) to a variety of industries.

Each vendor noted above was provided a brief description for the scope of work. Each vendor was asked to provide the following information to support the evaluation:

1. Cutting Method and History
 - a. What is the proposed cutting method (e.g., how would the cut be performed, what equipment is required, operating pressure and flow rate, abrasive type and quantity, remote operations capability, etc.)?
 - b. Provide a list of other projects/cuts performed in a radiological contaminated area.
 - c. What is the business size of the company?
2. Safety Record
 - a. How many total crews are available for cutting?
 - b. How many Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA®) recordable injuries were recorded in calendar year 2008.
3. Cost
 - a. What is the unit rate for the proposed equipment (including use of equipment during cutting, costs for any specialized equipment required, and cost of equipment if equipment became contaminated.
 - b. What is the unit rate for the crew (including crew size required)?
4. Schedule
 - a. What is the mobilization/set-up time (including travel)?
 - b. What is the time required to make the cut (days or hours)?

AK Services, Inc. was the only vendor willing to provide information to support the vendor selection process.

6.1 VENDOR DESCRIPTION

AK Services personnel have been involved in water abrasion and water jet cutting since 1978. The company supports various industries and has performed work for the Department of Energy and commercial nuclear industry. AK Services currently generates approximately \$2.5M–\$3.0M worth of revenue in this business line. They have four crews and associated equipment available to support concrete cutting. In calendar year 2008, AK Services had zero OSHA recordable injuries.

For performing typical abrasive water jet cuts, AK Services uses the following sequence.

- Mobilize equipment in close proximity to cut site

® OSHA is a registered trademark of Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Dept of Labor.

- Run potable water to UHP water jet pump
- Hook up UHP hose to pump and on/off valve
- Flush system with potable water
- Set up circle cutter and motion device on cutting surface with cutting head
- Run UHP line from valve and abrasive line from hopper to the cutting head
- Set up control panel with control air to UHP valve, abrasive hopper, and motion device
- Drill pilot hole in cutting surface and locate the cutting head over the hole
- Open the UHP water valve, power the pressure up to 48,000 psi, start the flow of garnet to the cutting head, and engage the motion device.

AK Services performs their cutting at 48,000 psi and 3.3 gallons per minute. The garnet consists of 20 to 40 mesh particles and is delivered at 1.6 pounds per minute.

6.1.1 Previous Experience/Projects

AK Services, Inc. has performed work for the DOE complex at Los Alamos and at the Hanford Site. At Los Alamos, abrasive water jet cutting was used to cut through 16 to 30 inches of reinforced concrete. AK Services has performed two jobs at Hanford. The first was in support of Fluor Hanford for cesium remediation at the 105 K East Basin where cesium-contaminated concrete was removed from basin walls. In addition, the company performed some abrasive water jet cutting demonstrations for various onsite companies (Bechtel, CH2M HILL, Washington Group). Cutting techniques and mock-ups of using the technology were demonstrated and representative examples were displayed in the ALARA center as examples of an efficient radiation remediation technology. The second project at Hanford was part of the KE Sludge Project that utilized abrasive water jet cutting to perform a cut of the North Loadout Pit Door at the K East Basin. This project entailed cutting the Loadout Pit door two feet above the water filled basin floor. The work was performed in 17 feet of contaminated water by remote control and monitored by underwater camera.

6.1.2 Cost Estimate

For this study, the following cost elements were estimated to develop a rough order of magnitude cost estimate for performing the cut.

- Interface and system design
- Travel
- Training
- Equipment ship to Site
- Equipment mobilization
- Field work (perform cut)
- Equipment demobilization
- Equipment ship back
- Equipment value (only applies if equipment becomes contaminated).

A rough order of magnitude cost for AK Services to perform the cut is provided as Appendix A. The costs only apply to those incurred by AK Services, Inc. and do not include WRPS or other subcontractor costs.

6.1.3 Schedule

For this study, the following schedule elements were defined to determine an approximate duration for cutting the hole in the tank.

- Interface and system design
- Training
- Equipment shipping to Site
- Equipment mobilization/set-up
- Field work
- Equipment demobilization
- Equipment ship back to AK Services.

A draft schedule for performing the cut is provided as Appendix B.

7.0 VENDOR EVALUATION CRITERIA

This study evaluates and scores water jet cutting vendor(s) identified in Section 0 for cutting the hole in the tank dome. The evaluation/scoring process ranks the vendor(s) in the following functional areas:

- Cutting method/history (Section 7.2.1)
- Safety record (Section 7.2.2)
- Cost (Section 7.2.3)
- Schedule (Section 7.2.4).

These evaluation criteria are described in greater detail in the following subsections.

7.1 SCORING SYSTEM

The scoring process assigned an importance or weighting factor between 1 and 3 to each criterion based on its relative importance (I). A score of 1 indicates less importance. A score of 3 indicates great importance. The importance factors are listed in Table 9.

Table 9. Vendor Scoring Importance Factors.

Functional Area	Criteria	Importance (I)
Cutting Method/History	Proposed Cutting Method	3
	Radiological Cutting Experience/History	3
	Business Size	1
Safety Record	Total Crews Available	2
	Number of OSHA Recordable Injuries	3
Cost	Unit Rates for Equipment	2
	Unit Rates for Crew	2
Schedule	Set-up Time	3
	Time to Perform Cut	3

The scoring process also assigned a score between 0 and 10 for each vendor based on its performance (P) in each criterion. A score of 0 indicates the vendor does not satisfy the criteria. A score of 10 indicates the vendor perfectly meets the objective or criteria. Each vendor receives a score (S) for each criteria equal to $I \times P$. The sum of all scores (S) indicates the overall score for the vendor.

7.2 SCORING CRITERIA

7.2.1 Cutting Method/History

The scoring process considered three criteria for the cutting method and history: proposed cutting method, radiological cutting experience and history and business size.

The proposed cutting method received an importance (I) score of 3. Vendors which offer a technology that can be remotely operated; with remote operations experience in a radiological environment received a performance (P) score of 7. Vendors which offer a technology that can be remotely operated; without remote operations experience in a radiological environment received a performance (P) score of 5. Vendors which offer a technology that cannot be operated remotely received a performance (P) score of 3.

The vendor's radiological experience and history received an importance (I) score of 3. Vendors who have utilized their water jet cutting technology on more than 4 projects in a radiological environment received a performance (P) score of 7. Vendors who have utilized their water jet cutting technology on 1 to 4 projects in a radiological environment received a performance (P) score of 5. Vendors who have not utilized their water jet cutting technology in a radiological environment received a performance (P) score of 3.

Business size received an importance (I) score of 1. Vendors whose gross revenue was greater than \$3,000,000 for FY08 received a performance (P) score of 7. Vendors whose gross revenue was between \$1,000,000 and \$3,000,000 for FY08 received a performance (P) score of 5. Vendors with less than \$1,000,000 in gross revenue for FY08 received a performance (P) score of 3.

7.2.2 Safety Record

The scoring process considered two criteria for the vendor's safety record: total crews available and number of OSHA recordable injuries.

The total crews available received an importance (I) score of 2. Vendors with 4 or more crews available received a performance (P) score of 7. Vendors with between 2 and 3 crews available received a performance (P) score of 5. Vendors with 1 crew available received a performance (P) score of 3.

The number of OSHA recordable injuries received an importance (I) score of 3. Vendors who recorded 2 or less injuries to OSHA in CY08 received a performance (P) score of 7. Vendors who recorded between 3 and 5 injuries to OSHA in CY08 received a performance (P) score of 5. Vendors who recorded more than 5 injuries to OSHA in CY08 received a performance (P) score of 3.

7.2.3 Cost

The scoring process considered two cost criteria: unit rates for the equipment and unit rates for the crew.

The unit rates for the equipment received an importance (I) score of 2. Unit rates for the equipment will be obtained from each vendor for the equipment required to cut the hole in the tank dome. The vendor with the lowest cost will receive a performance (P) score of 10. The performance (P) scores for the remaining (higher cost) vendors will be calculated by dividing the lower cost (\$) by the cost of the vendor and multiplying that number (ratio of the two costs) by 10.

The unit rates for the crew received an importance (I) score of 2. Unit rates for the crew will be obtained from each vendor. The vendor with the lowest cost will receive a performance (P) score of 10. The performance (P) scores for the remaining (higher cost) vendors will be calculated by dividing the lower cost (\$) by the cost of the vendor and multiplying that number (ratio of the two costs) by 10.

7.2.4 Schedule

The scoring process considered two schedule criteria: set-up/mobilization time and time required to make the cut.

The set-up/mobilization time received an importance (I) score of 3. The vendor with the shortest mobilization and set-up time received a performance (P) score of 10. The performance (P) scores for the remaining (longer set-up/mobilization duration) vendors will be calculated by dividing the lower duration (time) by the set-up time of the vendor and multiplying that number (ratio of the two times) by 10.

The time required to make the cut received an importance (I) score of 3. The vendor which required the least amount of time to perform the cut received a performance (P) score of 10. The performance (P) scores for the remaining (longer cutting duration) vendors will be calculated by dividing the lower duration (time) by the cutting time of the vendors and multiplying that number (ratio of the two times) by 10.

8.0 VENDOR SELECTION SCORING RESULTS

The scoring results for the water jet cutting vendors are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. AK Services Score.

Functional Area	Criterion	Importance (I)	Performance (P)	Score (S=I*P)
Cutting Method/History	Proposed Cutting Method	3	7	21
	Radiological Cutting Experience/History	3	5	15
	Business Size	1	5	5
Overall Score ($S_1+S_2+S_3/3$)				13.7
Safety Record	Total Crews Available	2	7	14
	Number of OSHA Recordable Injuries	3	7	21
Overall Score ($S_1+S_2/2$)				17.5
Cost	Unit Rates for Equipment	2	10	20
	Unit Rates for Crew	2	10	20
Overall Score ($S_1+S_2/2$)				20
Schedule	Set-up Time	3	10	30
	Time to Perform Cut	3	10	30
Overall Score ($S_1+S_2/2$)				30
Total Score				81.2

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Abrasive water Jet cutting is the preferred technology for cutting the tank dome to install the large riser with a total score of 76.9. Diamond wire cutting with a score of 74.7 and core drilling with a score of 64.4 scored second and third, respectively. The preferred vendor for providing the water jet cutting services is AK Services, Inc. from Everett Massachusetts based on no responses provided from other potential vendors. It is recommended that a mock-up be performed of the cutting process that mimics the tank dome configuration in a non-hazardous environment using AK Services.

APPENDIX A

COST ESTIMATE

Table A-1. Cost.

Activity	Cost	Basis
Interface and System Design	\$40,000.00	Engineering judgment - interface definition, design, fabrication, meetings.
Travel	\$2,000.00	Assume two round trip flights @ \$1,000 each.
Training	\$24,738.00	Assume three weeks (15 days) required for training 2 technicians @ \$84/hr each. Per Diem for 21 days @ \$109/day each.
Equipment Ship to Site	\$7,000.00	Shipment of truck, pumps, and other required equipment.
Equipment Mobilization	\$23,090.00	Assume 5 days to mobilize/set-up equipment @ \$4,400/8 hr day plus 5 days per-diem each technician @ \$109/day.
Field Work (Perform Cut)	\$9,236.00	2 full shifts without delays @ \$4,400/day +2 days per diem each technician @ \$109/day.
Equipment Demobilization	\$23,090.00	Assume 5 days to demobilize/pack/decon/free-release equipment for shipment back @ \$4,400/8hr day plus 5 days each per-diem at \$109/day.
Equipment Ship Back	\$7,000.00	Shipment of truck, pumps, and other equipment used.
Total for Cut	\$136,154.00	Total assumes equipment is free-released.
Equipment Value	\$150,000.00	Cost of pump, hose and cutting set-up.
Total for Cut Plus Equipment	\$279,154.00	Total assumes equipment is not free released.

APPENDIX B

SCHEDULE

Figure B-1. Schedule.