DOE/RL-97-09
Revision 2
UC-630

Radioactive Air Emissions Notice of Construction Use of a Portable Exhauster on Single-Shell Tanks During Salt Well Pumping and Other Activities

Date Published
September 1998

**United States
Department of Energy**
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

Approved for Public Release

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.

This report has been reproduced from the best available copy.
Available in paper copy and microfiche.

Available to the U.S. Department of Energy
and its contractors from
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
(615) 576-8401

Available to the public from the U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161
(703) 487-4850

Printed in the United States of America

DISCLM-5.CHP (8-91)

RELEASE AUTHORIZATION

Document
Number:

DOE/RL-97-09, Revision 2

Document
Title:

Radioactive Air Emissions Notice of Construction Use
of a Portable Exhauster on Single Shell Tanks (SSTs)
During Salt Well Pumping

**This document, reviewed in accordance with DOE
Order 241.1, "Scientific and Technical
Information Management," and 241.1-1, "Guide to
the Management of Scientific and Technical
Information," does not contain classified or
sensitive unclassified information and is:**

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

V. L. Birkland

V. L. Birkland

1/18/99

Lockheed Martin Services, Inc.
Document Control/Information Clearance

Reviewed for Applied Technology, Business Sensitive, Classified, Copyrighted, Export Controlled, Patent, Personal/Private, Proprietary, Protected CRADA, Trademark, Unclassified Controlled Nuclear Information.

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. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof. This report has been reproduced from the best available copy.

Printed in the United States of America.

Available to the U.S. Department of Energy and its contractors from the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Scientific and Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831; Telephone: 423/576-8401.

Available to the public from the U.S. Department of Commerce National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161; Telephone: 703/487-4650.

INFORMATION CLEARANCE FORM

A. Information Category ☐ Abstract ☐ Journal Article ☐ Summary ☐ Internet ☐ Visual Aid ☐ Software ☐ Full Paper ☐ Report ☒ Other <u>NOC</u>		B. Document Number <u>DOE/RL-97-09 - Rev 2</u> C. Title <u>Radioactive Air Emissions Notice of Construction Use of a Portable Exhauster on SSTs During Salt Well Pumping</u>
		D. Internet Address <u>NA</u>

E. Required Information 1. Is document potentially Classified? ☒ No ☐ Yes (MANDATORY) <u>D. Carrell</u> Manager's Signature Required If Yes _____ ☐ No ☐ Yes Classified ADC Signature Required 2. Internal Review Required? ☒ No ☐ Yes If Yes, Document Signatures Below Counsel _____ Program _____ 3. References in the Information are Applied Technology ☒ No ☐ Yes Export Controlled Information ☒ No ☐ Yes		4. Does Information Contain the Following: (MANDATORY) a. New or Novel (Patentable) Subject Matter? ☒ No ☐ Yes If "Yes", Disclosure No.: _____ b. Information Received in Confidence, Such as Proprietary and/or Inventions? ☒ No ☐ Yes If "Yes", Affix Appropriate Legends/Notices. c. Copyrights? ☒ No ☐ Yes If "Yes", Attach Permission. d. Trademarks? ☒ No ☐ Yes If "Yes", Identify in Document. 5. Is Information requiring submission to OSTI? ☐ No ☒ Yes If Yes <u>UC-2000</u> and <u>B&R-EW3120072</u> 6. Release Level? ☒ Public ☐ Limited 7. Charge Code <u>N1WFB HN970361</u>
--	--	---

F. Complete for a Journal Article 1. Title of Journal <u>NA</u>	
---	--

G. Complete for a Presentation 1. Title for Conference or Meeting <u>NA</u> 2. Group Sponsoring <u>NA</u> 3. Date of Conference <u>NA</u> 4. City/State <u>NA</u> 5. Will Information be Published in Proceedings? ☒ No ☐ Yes 6. Will Material be Handed Out? ☒ No ☐ Yes	
---	--

H. Author/Requestor <u>Carl Grando</u> (Print and Sign) <u>Carl Grando 8/25/98</u>	Responsible Manager <u>Don Carrell</u> (Print and Sign) <u>Don Carrell 8/25/98</u>
---	---

I. Reviewers	Yes	Print	Signature	Public Y/N (If N, complete J)
General Counsel	☐	_____	_____	Y / N
Office of External Affairs	☐	_____	_____	Y / N
DOE-RL/E RASMUSSEN	☒	<u>See attached transmittal Letter # 98-EAP-491</u>	_____	☒ Y / N
Other	☐	_____	_____	Y / N
Other	☐	_____	_____	Y / N

J. If Information Includes Sensitive Information and is not to be released to the Public indicate category below.

☐ Applied Technology	☐ Protected CRADA
☐ Personal/Private	☐ Export Controlled
☐ Proprietary	☐ Procurement-Sensitive
☐ Business-Sensitive	☐ Patentable
☐ Predecisional	☐ Other (Specify) _____
☐ UCN

K. If Additional Comments, Please Attach Separate Sheet

Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

98-EAP-491

SEP 08 1998

Mr. A. W. Conklin, Head
Air Emissions and Defense
Waste Section
State of Washington
Department of Health
P.O. Box 47827
Olympia, Washington 98504

Mr. Jerry Leitch, Chief
Radiation and Indoor Air Section
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101

Dear Messrs. Conklin and Leitch:

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY ON THE RADIOACTIVE AIR EMISSIONS NOTICE OF CONSTRUCTION (NOC) USE OF A PORTABLE EXHAUSTER ON SINGLE-SHELL TANKS (SST) DURING SALTWELL PUMPING

The attached document serves as a NOC, pursuant to the requirements of Washington Administration Code 246-247-060, and as a request for approval to construct, pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations 61.07, portable exhausters for use on SSTs during saltwell pumping. Table 1-1 lists the 18 SSTs covered by this NOC. The NOC also addresses other activities that are performed in support of saltwell pumping but do not require the application of a portable exhauster. Specifically, this NOC analyzes three activities, which have the potential for increased emissions:

- Saltwell pumping utilizing existing passive breathing rates;
- saltwell pumping utilizing active ventilation provided by a portable exhauster; and
- use of a water lance on the waste to facilitate screen and pump installation into the waste utilizing existing passive breathing rates.

SEP 08 1998

Messrs. Conklin and Leitch
98-EAP-491

-2-

Should you have any questions, please contact Hector Rodriguez on (509) 376-6421 or
Dennis Bowser on (509) 373-2566.

Sincerely,

James E. Rasmussen, Director
Environmental Assurance, Permits,
and Policy Division

MSD:DWB

Attachment

cc w/attach:

J. R. Wilkinson, CTUIR
Donna Powauke, Nez Perce Tribe
Russell Jim, YIN
S. L. Dahl, Ecology
J. A. Bates, FDH
A. M. Umek, FDH
M. P. DeLozier, LMHC
B. G. Erlandson, LMHC

CONTENTS

1		
2		
3		
4	TERMS	v
5		
6	METRIC CONVERSION CHART	vi
7		
8	1.0 INTRODUCTION	1-1
9		
10	2.0 FACILITY IDENTIFICATION AND LOCATION (Requirement 1)	2-1
11		
12	3.0 RESPONSIBLE MANAGER (Requirement 2)	3-1
13		
14	4.0 TYPE OF PROPOSED ACTION (Requirement 3)	4-1
15		
16	5.0 STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (Requirement 4)	5-1
17		
18	6.0 PROCESS DESCRIPTION (Requirements 5 and 7)	6-1
19	6.1 INSTALLATION OF THE SALT WELL SCREEN	6-2
20	6.2 JET PUMP INSTALLATION	6-3
21	6.3 TRANSFERRING THE WASTE (SALT WELL PUMPING)	6-3
22	6.4 FLUSHING AND CLEANING PLUGS FROM TRANSFER LINES	6-3
23		
24	7.0 ANNUAL POSSESSION QUANTITY AND PHYSICAL FORM	
25	(Requirements 8, 10, 11, and 12)	7-1
26		
27	8.0 CONTROL SYSTEM (Requirement 6)	8-1
28		
29	9.0 MONITORING SYSTEM (Requirement 9)	9-1
30		
31	10.0 RELEASE RATES (Requirement 13)	10-1
32	10.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION	10-1
33	10.2 DISCUSSION OF SOURCE TERM USED TO CALCULATE EMISSIONS	10-2
34	10.3 POTENTIAL ANNUAL UNABATED EMISSIONS DURING SALT WELL	
35	PUMPING	10-3
36	10.4 POTENTIAL ANNUAL ABATED EMISSIONS DURING SALT WELL PUMPING ..	10-4
37	10.5 POTENTIAL ANNUAL UNABATED EMISSIONS DURING WATER LANCING ...	10-4
38	10.6 POTENTIAL ANNUAL ABATED EMISSIONS DURING WATER LANCING	10-4
39	10.7 POTENTIAL ANNUAL UNABATED EMISSIONS DURING WATER ADDITION	
40	TO THE WASTE	10-5
41	10.8 POTENTIAL ANNUAL UNABATED EMISSIONS DURING TRANSFER LINE	
42	FLUSHING AND PLUG REMOVAL	10-5
43		
44	11.0 OFFSITE IMPACT	11-1
45		
46	12.0 COST FACTORS AND FACILITY LIFETIME (Requirements 16 and 17)	12-1

CONTENTS (cont)

13.0 TECHNOLOGY STANDARDS (Requirement 18)	13-1
14.0 REFERENCES	14-1

APPENDICES

A TANK RADIONUCLIDE INVENTORIES	APP A-i
B EMISSION AND DOSE CALCULATIONS--SALT WELL PUMPING UNDER PASSIVE VENTILATION	APP B-i
C EMISSION AND DOSE CALCULATIONS--SALT WELL PUMPING UNDER ACTIVE VENTILATION	APP C-i
D EMISSION AND DOSE CALCULATIONS--WATER LANCING	APP D-i

FIGURES

2-1. Hanford Site	2-2
2-2. Location of the 241-AX Tank Farm Within the 200 East Area	2-3
2-3. Location of the 241-BY Tank Farm Within the 200 East Area	2-4
2-4. Location of Tank Farms Within the 200 West Area	2-5
8-1. Typical Single-Shell Tank Component Arrangement	8-4
8-2. Single-Shell Tank Breather Filter Components	8-5
8-3. Ventilation Control System Diagram--Plan View	8-6
8-4. Ventilation Control System Diagram--Elevation View	8-7
9-1. Components of Salt Well Exhauster Stack	9-2
9-2. Configuration of Shrouded Nozzle	9-3

TABLES

1-1. Single-Shell Tanks Covered by this Notice of Construction	1-2
2-1. Single-Shell Tank Locations.	2-6
7-1. Waste Tank Characteristics	7-2
13-1. Emissions Control Equipment Standards Compliance For Portable Exhausters.	13-1
13-2. Emissions Control Equipment Standards Compliance for Breather Filters.	13-2

TERMS

1		
2		
3	ALARA	as low as reasonably achievable
4	ANSI	American National Standards Institute
5	ASME	American Society of Mechanical Engineers
6		
7	BARCT	best available radionuclide control technology
8	Bq	becquerel
9		
10	CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
11	Ci	curie
12		
13	DCRT	double-contained receiver tank
14	DF	decontamination factor
15	DST	double-shell tank
16		
17	EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
18	Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
19		
20	GEMS	generic effluent monitoring system
21		
22	HEPA	high-efficiency particulate air
23		
24	ISVS	in-situ vapor sampling
25		
26	LFL	lower flammability limit
27	LANL	Los Alamos National Laboratory
28		
29	MEI	maximally exposed individual
30		
31	ND	not detected
32	NEPA	<i>National Environmental Policy Act of 1969</i>
33	NOC	notice of construction
34		
35	PCM	periodic confirmatory measurement
36		
37	RCRA	<i>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976</i>
38		
39	SAD	safety analysis document
40	SEPA	<i>State Environmental Policy Act of 1971</i>
41	SST	single-shell tank
42		
43	TEDE	total effective dose equivalent
44	Tri-Party	Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
45	Agreement	
46		
47	VSS	vapor sampling system
48		
49	WAC	<i>Washington Administrative Code</i>
50	WDOH	Washington State Department of Health

METRIC CONVERSION CHART

Into metric units

Out of metric units

If you know	Multiply by	To get	If you know	Multiply by	To get
Length			Length		
inches	25.40	millimeters	millimeters	0.0393	inches
inches	2.54	centimeters	centimeters	0.393	inches
feet	0.3048	meters	meters	3.2808	feet
yards	0.914	meters	meters	1.09	yards
miles	1.609	kilometers	kilometers	0.62	miles
Area			Area		
square inches	6.4516	square centimeters	square centimeters	0.155	square inches
square feet	0.092	square meters	square meters	10.7639	square feet
square yards	0.836	square meters	square meters	1.20	square yards
square miles	2.59	square kilometers	square kilometers	0.39	square miles
acres	0.404	hectares	hectares	2.471	acres
Mass (weight)			Mass (weight)		
ounces	28.35	grams	grams	0.0352	ounces
pounds	0.453	kilograms	kilograms	2.2046	pounds
short ton	0.907	metric ton	metric ton	1.10	short ton
Volume			Volume		
fluid ounces	29.57	milliliters	milliliters	0.03	fluid ounces
quarts	0.95	liters	liters	1.057	quarts
gallons	3.79	liters	liters	0.26	gallons
cubic feet	0.03	cubic meters	cubic meters	35.3147	cubic feet
cubic yards	0.76456	cubic meters	cubic meters	1.308	cubic yards
Temperature			Temperature		
Fahrenheit	subtract 32 then multiply by 5/9ths	Celsius	Celsius	multiply by 9/5ths, then add 32	Fahrenheit
Force			Force		
pounds per square inch	6.895	kilopascals	kilopascals	1.4504×10^{-4}	pounds per square inch

Source: *Engineering Unit Conversions*, M. R. Lindeburg, PE., Second Ed., 1990, Professional Publications, Inc., Belmont, California.

**RADIOACTIVE AIR EMISSIONS NOTICE OF CONSTRUCTION
USE OF A PORTABLE EXHAUSTER ON SINGLE-SHELL TANKS
DURING SALT WELL PUMPING**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document serves as a notice of construction (NOC), pursuant to the requirements of Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 246-247-060, and as a request for approval to construct, pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 61.07, portable exhausters for use on single-shell tanks (SSTs) during salt well pumping. Table 1-1 lists 18 SSTs covered by this NOC. This NOC also addresses other activities that are performed in support of salt well pumping but do not require the application of a portable exhauster. Specifically this NOC analyzes the following three activities that have the potential for emissions.

- Salt well pumping (i.e., the actual transferring of waste from one tank to another) under nominal tank operating conditions. Nominal tank operating conditions include existing passive breathing rates.
- Salt well pumping (the actual transferring of waste from one tank to another) with use of a portable exhauster.
- Use of a water lance on the waste to facilitate salt well screen and salt well jet pump installation into the waste. This activity is to be performed under nominal (existing passive breathing rates) tank operating conditions.

The use of portable exhausters represents a cost savings because one portable exhauster can be moved back and forth between SSTs as schedules for salt well pumping dictate. A portable exhauster also could be used to simultaneously exhaust more than one SST during salt well pumping.

The primary objective of providing active ventilation to these SSTs during salt well pumping is to reduce the risk of postulated accidents to remain within risk guidelines. It is anticipated that salt well pumping will release gases entrapped within the waste as the liquid level is lowered, because of less hydrostatic force keeping the gases in place. Hanford Site waste tanks must comply with the Tank Farms authorization basis (DESH 1997) that requires that the flammable gas concentration be less than 25 percent of the lower flammability limit (LFL). Safety analyses indicate that the LFL might be exceeded in some tanks during certain postulated accident scenarios. Also, the potential for electrical (pump motor, heat tracing) and mechanical (equipment installation) spark sources exist. Therefore, because of the presence of ignition sources and the potential for release of flammable gases, active ventilation might be required in some SSTs to reduce the 'time at risk' while salt well pumping. For this reason, portable exhausters will be installed as a precautionary measure and used when flammable gas concentrations exceed 25 percent of the LFL during salt well pumping.

Table 1-1. Single-Shell Tanks Covered
by this Notice of Construction.

Tank number
241-AX-101
241-BY-105
241-BY-106
241-S-101
241-S-102
241-S-103
241-S-106
241-S-107
241-S-109
241-S-111
241-S-112
241-U-103
241-U-105
241-U-106
241-U-107
241-U-108
241-U-109
241-U-111

2.0 FACILITY IDENTIFICATION AND LOCATION (Requirement 1)

The SSTs covered in this NOC are located at:

U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
Hanford Site
200 East and 200 West Areas
Richland, Washington 99352

Table 2-1 lists the area location and geodetic coordinates for tanks covered by this NOC.

Figure 2-1 shows the location of the 200 West and 200 East Areas within the Hanford Site.

Figures 2-2, 2-3, and 2-4 show the location of each tank farm within the respective area.

Figure 2-1. Hanford Site.

241-AX Single-Shell Tank Farm Site Plan

Figure 2-2. Location of the 241-AX Tank Farm Within the 200 East Area.

241-BY Single-Shell Tank Farm Site Plan

Figure 2-3. Location of the 241-BY Tank Farm Within the 200 East Area.

H96070161.376

Figure 2-4. Location of Tank Farms Within the 200 West Area.

Table 2-1. Single-Shell Tank Locations.

Tank number	200 Area location	Geodetic coordinates	
		North latitude	West longitude
241-AX-101	East	46°33'16"	119°30'59"
241-BY-105	East	46°33'58"	119°32'22"
241-BY-106	East	46°33'60"	119°32'22"
241-S-101	West	46°32'24"	119°37'43"
241-S-102	West	46°32'24"	119°37'44"
241-S-103	West	46°32'24"	119°37'46"
241-S-106	West	46°32'23"	119°37'46"
241-S-107	West	46°32'22"	119°37'43"
241-S-109	West	46°32'22"	119°37'46"
241-S-111	West	46°32'21"	119°37'44"
241-S-112	West	46°32'21"	119°37'46"
241-U-103	West	46°32'44"	119°37'45"
241-U-105	West	46°32'43"	119°37'44"
241-U-106	West	46°32'43"	119°37'45"
241-U-107	West	46°32'42"	119°37'42"
241-U-108	West	46°32'42"	119°37'44"
241-U-109	West	46°32'42"	119°37'45"
241-U-111	West	46°32'41"	119°37'44"

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1

Mr. J. E. Kinzer, Director
Tank Waste Remediation Division
U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352
(509) 376-7591.

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

1 **4.0 TYPE OF PROPOSED ACTION** (Requirement 3)
2
3

4 The proposed action represents an insignificant modification to an existing emission unit for all SSTs
5 listed in Table 1-1, except for SST 241-S-103, 107, and 112. The proposed action for these three tanks
6 represents a significant modification in accordance with WAC 246-247-030. All SSTs discussed in this
7 NOC are passively ventilated. The proposed modification is to install a portable exhauster on SSTs during
8 salt well pumping. The exhausters will be used when flammable gas levels exceed 25 percent of the LFL.
9 This NOC also addresses other activities that are performed in support of salt well pumping but do not
10 require the application of a portable exhauster.

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

5.0 STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (Requirement 4)

The *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) documentation for this project is adopted to satisfy *State Environmental Policy Act* (SEPA) process. Salt well pumping activities documented under NEPA as follows:

- *Waste Tank Safety Program, Hanford Site, Richland Washington, Environmental Assessment*, DOE/EA-0915, February, 1994, and
- *Tank Waste Remediation System, Hanford Site, Richland Washington, Final Environmental Impact Statement*, DOE/EIS-0189, August 1996, Volume 1.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) is the lead agency and Mr. Geoff Tallent (407-7112) of that office coordinates all SEPA activities for the Hanford Site.

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

6.0 PROCESS DESCRIPTION (Requirements 5 and 7)

Salt well pumping is a method used to interim stabilize SSTs. Interim stabilization is commenced once a salt well screen has been installed with its respective jet pump. Salt well pumping removes the gravity drainable liquid from the interstitial space between the solids that drain to the salt well screen. Salt well pumping uses pre-established routes to transfer the liquid either directly to a double-shell tank (DST) or to a staging double-contained receiver tank (DCRT) and subsequently to a DST.

Before transferring waste, several activities are performed that include:

- Verifying the waste chemistry to ensure that the waste to be transferred is compatible with the receiving tank waste
- Performing criticality safety analyses to ensure that stored waste will remain in a subcritical state
- Verifying equipment operability
- Developing a baseline material balance for both sending and receiving tanks. (The material balance also is reviewed periodically during the transfer to provide early leak detection and to avoid filling tanks above safe levels.).

Salt well pumping the drainable liquid waste includes the following activities:

- Initial planning including waste compatibility studies, criticality analysis, equipment specification, and tank material balance determinations as discussed previously
- Installation of salt well screen
- Jet pump assembly installation
- Transferring the liquid waste (via salt well pumping)
- Occasionally, additions of limited amounts of water are made to prevent plugging of the salt well screen and transfer line
- Flushing and cleaning plugs from transfer lines.

The jet pump intake is located at the bottom of the salt well screen and is suspended by supply and return lines connected to a centrifugal pump unit located above the tank in the pump pit. The motive power for the pumping process is provided by the centrifugal pump unit. The motor and centrifugal pump assembly are hermetically sealed and thus designed for pumping hazardous material. Pump pits are equipped with leak detectors to help detect any possible waste leakage. Salt well pumping is accomplished at very slow rates, approximately 15 liters per minute or less. Slow collection of liquid in the well often requires pumping at less than 4 liters per minute. After salt well pumping is complete, the jet pump will remain in the pit and the screen will remain in the tank for the foreseeable future.

A detailed description of the salt well pumping process and equipment is presented in HNF-DS-WM-BIO-001, "Tank Waste Remediation System Basis For Interim Operation", which is only referenced for additional information.

6.1 INSTALLATION OF THE SALT WELL SCREEN

A salt well screen is a mechanical device, approximately 11 inches in diameter, which normally extends from the top of the waste to within 2 inches of the tank bottom. The 400-mesh size holes in the screen allow liquid waste to pass through the screen (enter the pump cavity) while preventing solid waste from migrating to the jet pump.

Water lancing of the waste could be necessary to facilitate installation of the salt well screen. Water lancing normally uses up to 1,895 liters of hot (93°C) water at low pressure (1,034 kilopascals) to penetrate the crust on the waste and create a circular entry area large enough for the screen. The water lance is a long pipe, up to 7.62 centimeters in diameter with a nozzle at the end that is lowered into the tank, through a riser, via a mobile crane attached to a truck. A hose from a portable water tank is connected to the other end of the water lance. The flushing water to the water lance is turned on just before the lance reaches the waste surface to minimize water additions to the tank. The water lance withdrawal steps are essentially the reverse of the insertion sequence. The use of this water lance requires that the lance be raised and lowered into the waste multiple times so that a large enough hole can be formed in the waste to accommodate the screen. Alternately, a newer water lance design to accomplish the same task could be used. The new lance has an 28-centimeter diameter and multiple nozzles on the bottom to facilitate waste penetration, and is designed to create a hole in the waste large enough to accommodate the salt well screen with one insertion of the lance into the waste. This design requires less water volume and operates at higher pressure (20,685 kilopascals). During removal of a lance from a tank, portable water wands are used to wash waste residue from the outside of the water lance until radiation readings are within specified limits. The water lance is placed in a protective bag during the removal process.

The salt well screen is connected to a source of flushing water by a hose at the top of the screen. The screen also is rigged for lift by a mobile crane. The salt well screen assembly is lowered slowly into the pit and riser until the screen flange rests on the riser opening. The riser is capped until jet pump assembly is scheduled for installation.

The entire operation of installing a salt well screen, including water lancing, generally takes less than 8 hours. Radionuclide control is maintained mechanically by use of a spray ring that rests on top of the riser and allows the water lance to telescope through the ring. Although there is no physical contact between the lance outside diameter and the spray ring inside diameter, control of radionuclides is achieved by spraying water over this interface as the lance is lowered, which also helps to minimize the potential for sparking as well as controlling radionuclides. Additional radionuclide control is achieved by lowering the lance at a maximum speed of approximately 1 foot per second. Also, this operation is performed in accordance with formal procedures and radiation surveys during the actual work activity to ensure containment of radionuclides. Pre-job and post-job surveys are performed to verify containment. The actual water lancing time usually takes approximately 30 minutes to 2 hours.

As noted in Section 11.0, the analysis assumes water lancing operations will be performed under passive tank breathing rates for a period not to exceed 72 hours of actual water lancing. The 72-hour period will be controlled administratively.

6.2 JET PUMP INSTALLATION

Water lancing of the salt screen and waste inside the salt well screen might be necessary to facilitate jet pump assembly installation within the screen. If water lancing is required, this will be performed as discussed previously. The salt well pump assembly is brought to the tank farm in several pieces, and is assembled and tested before installation. Following preoperational checks of the complete jet pump assembly, the pump assembly will be raised to a vertical position by a mobile crane and slowly lowered into the salt well screen until the pump support plate rests on top of the salt well screen flange. A small amount of water is passed through the dip tubes while the pump is lowered into the screen to prevent plugging the dip tubes. The dip tubes are half-inch carbon steel tubes used as instrumentation to monitor waste level and specific gravity. Similarly, small amounts of water also are passed through the dilution tube to prevent plugging. The dilution tube allows water to be added to the tank to prevent plugging of the screen (discussed in Section 6.3). In some cases, instrumentation lines are installed as part of the salt well pump assembly; in other cases, instrumentation lines are installed after the assembly is installed.

The entire operation of installing a jet pump assembly generally takes less than 4 hours.

6.3 TRANSFERRING THE WASTE (SALT WELL PUMPING)

The discharge of the jet pump assembly will be connected to the tank farm transfer system by use of a flexible jumper assembly located within the pit. The pump pits are equipped with leak detectors to help detect liquid waste leaks. If leaking is detected, pumping automatically is stopped. Occasionally water will be added to the tank via a pipe from an outside storage tank to prevent plugging of or to remove plugs from the salt well screen and pump equipment. The water will be piped from a storage tank through a metering system at a rate of 280 liters per minute or less. Entry into the tank is made through the pump pit via an existing port on the pit cover and into the salt well screen.

The concrete or steel cover block is reinstalled before starting the pumping operation. The cover contains penetrations for the various valve handles, electric cables, and air, water, and sample lines. Following testing of the equipment, salt well pumping begins and could continue for several months to several years depending on the initial volume of waste to be pumped and the rate liquid drains to the salt well. Periodic surveillances and operational checks will occur during salt well pumping. A portable exhaustor will be available for use during the entire waste transfer period as a precautionary measure and will operate in the event that flammable gas levels exceed 25 percent of the LFL during the pumping campaign. The portable exhaustor will be isolated from the tank by an isolation valve when the exhaustor is not in use.

6.4 FLUSHING AND CLEANING PLUGS FROM TRANSFER LINES

The waste transfer operations involve the pumping of liquid waste that contains dissolved solids. These solids can precipitate out of solution anywhere in the transfer path and cause blockage. If blockage is detected in the system, flushing the affected components with hot water will be necessary. Other techniques to free blockages could include pressurization, and the use of heat tracing, temporary jumpers, and hydraulic scouring. The hot water will be introduced to the system to be flushed through a pressure manifold by piping connected directly to the jet pump, or bypassing the jet pump and connected directly to a jumper or nozzle. All piping connections are designed to be leak tight and the pit cover block will be installed before pressurization. If pressurization beyond that obtained from the tank farms water system or supply truck (i.e.,

1 approximately 1,034 kilopascals) is necessary to remove blockage, an engineering evaluation will be
2 performed to determine the maximum allowable pressure for operation. At a minimum, flushing will be
3 performed when the system is shut down for any length of time and at the end of a salt well pumping
4 campaign.

5
6 As in the case of water lancing, flushing of the transfer lines and/or plug removal will be performed in
7 accordance with operating procedures and radiation surveys during the actual work activity to ensure
8 containment of radionuclides. Pre-job and post-job surveys will be performed to verify containment. This
9 activity has been conducted previously without incident during and after waste transfers in actively and
10 passively ventilated SSTs and actively ventilated DSTs.

11
12 Flushing of transfer lines could be performed with or without an operating portable exhauster.

13
14 As discussed in Section 1.0 portable exhausters will be installed on SSTs during salt well pumping as
15 a precautionary measure and will be used when flammable gas levels exceed 25 percent of the LFL.
16

1 **7.0 ANNUAL POSSESSION QUANTITY AND PHYSICAL FORM**
2 (Requirements 8, 10, 11, and 12)
3
4

5 Table 7-1 summarizes the major characteristics for waste tanks covered by this NOC.
6

7 There are multiple sources of tank waste inventory information. Each of the inventory reports contain
8 the best inventory knowledge available at the time of publication. Some reports were based on previous work
9 established by others and incorporated current operational practices at the time, some were updated to reflect
10 sampling data, and others only updated inventories with respect to specific constituents being studied at that
11 time. There also exist computer models, based on historical data, that do not directly correspond to any of the
12 more recent inventory reports.
13

14 A task was initiated in 1996 to establish a standard inventory for chemicals and radionuclides in the
15 tank waste. The goal was to resolve differences among the many reported inventory values and to provide a
16 consistent, technically defensible and reproducible, inventory basis for all waste management and disposal
17 activities. Typical data sources reviewed included sample analyses, process flow sheets, waste transaction
18 records, computer modeling, reactor fuel data, and essential material records. The reconciliation process
19 resulted in inventories for 46 radionuclides and 30 nonradioactive components. The radionuclide inventories
20 for each tank covered in this NOC were obtained through this reconciliation process and are presented in
21 Appendix A.
22

23 The physical form of each radionuclide listed in Appendix A is a particulate solid, except for tritium
24 and carbon-14 that are liquids.
25

26 The source term used as a basis for this NOC is the radionuclide particulates present in the vapor
27 space of each tank expressed in terms of total alpha, total beta, and cesium-137. All the radionuclides
28 contributing 10 percent or more of the potential offsite exposure are in particulate form. Emission estimates
29 are based on the vapor space source term for each tank and are presented in Sections 10.0 and 11.0.

Table 7-1. Waste Tank Characteristics.

Tank number	Date in service	Date inactivated	Total waste* (thousands of liters)	Pumpable waste* (thousands of liters)	Maximum waste temperature (°C)	Tank integrity*	Watch list tank*
241-AX-101	1965	1980	2,827	1,281	54	Sound	Flammable gas
241-BY-105	1951	1974	1,906	819	44	Assumed leaker	No
241-BY-106	1953	1977	2,433	618	49	Assumed leaker	No
241-S-101	1953	1980	1,618	481	48	Sound	No
241-S-102	1953	1980	2,081	906	42	Sound	Flammable gas and organic salt
241-S-103	1953	1977	940	368	30	Sound	No
241-S-106	1953	1976	1,815	637	27	Sound	No
241-S-107	1952	1980	1,425	334	42	Sound	No
241-S-109	1952	1982	2,221	451	30	Sound	No
241-S-111	1952	1978	2,259	508	33	Sound	Flammable gas and organic salt
241-S-112	1952	1976	1,982	406	29	Sound	Flammable gas
241-U-103	1947	1978	1,774	777	30	Sound	Flammable gas and organic salt
241-U-105	1947	1979	1,584	728	32	Sound	Flammable gas and organic salt
241-U-106	1948	1977	857	322	27	Sound	Organic salt
241-U-107	1948	1980	1,539	694	27	Sound	Organic salt
241-U-108	1949	1979	1,774	792	31	Sound	Flammable gas
241-U-109	1949	1980	1,565	777	28	Sound	Flammable gas
241-U-111	1947	1980	1,316	489	27	Sound	Organic salt

* Reference: HNF-EP-0182-116.

8.0 CONTROL SYSTEM (Requirement 6)

Three types of exhausters will be available for use during salt well pumping.

- One type is rated for 17 cubic meters per minute. Three units of this design currently are available.
- Another type is rated for 34 cubic meters per minute. Two currently are planned for use.
- The third type is the existing portable exhauster currently located on tank A-101. This 17-cubic meter per minute exhauster was approved for salt well pumping use on tank A-101 in March 1996 (DOE/RL-96-24). This exhauster will be available for use on other tanks when no longer needed on tank A-101. The monitoring system will be updated to the requirements specified in Section 9.0 after use on tank A-101 but before use on any other tank covered by this NOC.

Portable exhauster designs essentially are identical with two notable exceptions: the absence of a demister in the 17-cubic meter per minute design and high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filter design, depending on flow capacity. The 17-cubic meter per minute exhauster HEPA filter size is 60.96 wide by 60.96 long by 14.92 centimeters thick and the 34-cubic meter per minute exhauster filter size is 60.96 wide by 60.96 long by 29.21 centimeters thick.

The major system components of a portable exhauster are listed as follows. The abatement technology for the emission unit will undergo routine maintenance, repair, and replacement-in-kind as defined in WAC-246-247-030(22) and (23)(a) and (b).

- Ductwork
- Isolation valves
- Glycol heaters and associated components
- Demister (34-cubic meter per minute design only)
- 1 prefilter and housing
- 2 HEPA filter test sections
- 2 HEPA filter and filter housing
- 1 exhaust fan
- Stack
- Condensate drain and seal pot system
- Insulation
- Instrumentation and controls
- Electrical system
- Support skid.

When a portable exhauster is required for salt well pumping or the performance of supporting activities, the exhauster will draw warm moist air from the tank, heat and filter the air, and release the air to the environment. During active ventilation, fresh air, drawn into the tank vapor space through a breather filter, will dilute and disperse any flammable gases present. During passive ventilation, the portable exhauster will be valved off and air will enter or exit the tank through the breather filter, depending on tank internal pressure relative to atmospheric pressure. Each breather filter will consist of a housing that contains a HEPA filter, an outlet screen, and a small seal loop. During passive ventilation, an isolation valve normally

1 will be open to allow air flow between the tank vapor space and the outside atmosphere through the filter. Air
2 flowing to and from the tank will pass horizontally through the filter and vertically through the downward-
3 facing exit weather hood. Seal loops, installed in the exhaust lines, are designed as a safety feature to prevent
4 a highly unlikely accident in which an over pressurization occurs when the HEPA filter is isolated for
5 occasional (infrequent) maintenance. Figure 8-1 shows breather filter configuration on a typical SST.
6 Figure 8-2 shows components of a typical breather filter.

8 Air from the tank will be heated to reduce the relative humidity to less than 70 percent before passing
9 through the prefilter. The air will pass through the prefilter, two HEPA filters in series, a fan and discharge
10 through a stack. The stack will contain a section that allows for the installation of air flow measuring and
11 temporary sampling devices. Any moisture that might accumulate inside the exhauster will be collected in a
12 drain system, routed to a seal pot, and returned to the tank.

14 All components and materials that are in direct contact with the air stream will be designed in
15 accordance with the applicable authorization basis requirements (HNF-DS-WM-BIO-001) for flammable gas
16 issues.

18 Flexible or rigid ductwork (depending on the design at each tank farm) will be used to connect the
19 exhauster inlet to the tank riser. Precautionary measures to protect the air pathway during connection of the
20 ductwork to the tank riser will include installation of an isolation valve in the riser to minimize the time tank
21 contents are exposed to the air, and will take into account abrasion, leakage, tear strength, tensile strength, air
22 stream temperature, and outdoor exposure conditions. All flexible ductwork will be bonded to ensure
23 electrical conductivity.

25 The prefilter will increase the life of the HEPA filters by trapping the larger airborne particles allowing
26 for a more economical operating system. As low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) concepts will be
27 applied to allow less frequent change out of the HEPA filters, thereby reducing exposure of personnel to
28 radiation sources.

30 The HEPA filters will meet the requirements of ASME AG-1, Section FC and will be tested annually
31 to requirements of ASME N510. The HEPA filters will be nuclear grade throw-away extend-media dry-type
32 in a rigid frame having minimum particle collection efficiency of 99.95 percent for 0.3 micrometer median
33 diameter, thermally-generated dioctylphthalate particles or other specified challenge aerosols. Pressure drop
34 of a clean filter will be a maximum of 1 inch water gauge at rated flow. The frame will be corrosion resistant
35 for the air stream design conditions. Each filter will have a gelatinous seal gasket material that will be on the
36 air inlet gasket surface.

38 The HEPA filter housing will provide a sealed barrier for the confinement of airborne radionuclides
39 and will serve to encapsulate and hold the HEPA filter. The filter housing will provide for the attachment of
40 pressure differential measurement components. Each filter housing will meet the applicable sections of
41 ASME N509 and the test requirements of ASME N510. The filter housings will be leak tested using the
42 pressure decay method in accordance with ASME N510. Leakage will not exceed 0.3 percent of the housing
43 volume per hour.

45 The test sections will provide a means for in place testing of the HEPA filters. Testing will confirm
46 that any airborne radionuclide particles are captured to the level of efficiency of the installed HEPA filter.
47 One test section will be placed downstream of the prefilter section and upstream of the first HEPA filter

1 section. The second test section will be placed between the first stage HEPA filter housing and the second
2 stage HEPA filter housing.

3
4 The exhaust fan will be constructed of non-sparking materials and will meet AMCA
5 Standard 99-0401-86 and be Type A construction. The fan will be a centrifugal type and be statically and
6 dynamically balanced as an assembly.

7
8 The exhaust stack houses the air velocity probe (for measurement of stack velocity) and the air
9 sampling probe. Flexible ductwork will be used to connect the fan outlet to the stack. The stack will be
10 approximately 3 meters high from the fan outlet and will be flange connected to facilitate removal during
11 transportation.

12
13 Stack identification will be assigned before startup and will be reported in the notification of
14 pre-operational testing per WAC 246-247-060 paragraph 4, and the notice of anticipated startup date
15 provided in accordance with 40 CFR 62.09.

16
17 Figures 8-3 and 8-4 show plan and elevational views of a portable exhausters' components.
18 Figure 8-3 shows the general arrangement of SST components including HEPA inlet breathing filters.
19
20
21

H97050013.R
W320

Figure 8-1. Single-Shell Tank Showing Air Inlet filter (breather filter).

Figure 8-2. Single-Shell Tank Breather Filter Components.

Figure 8-3. Ventilation Control System Diagram--Plan View.

Figure 8-4. Ventilation Control System Diagram--Elevation View.

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

9.0 MONITORING SYSTEM (Requirement 9)

The monitoring system used on all portable exhausters employed in the salt well pumping program will meet the regulatory compliance requirements specified in 40 CFR 61, Subpart H and its referenced requirements, for all tanks covered by this NOC regardless of whether each tank (stack) is designated as major or minor.

The system, identified as the generic effluent monitoring system (GEMS), has been subject to extensive testing (PNNL-11701) and shown to meet all applicable regulatory criteria for air sampling at nuclear facilities. The performance criteria addressed both the suitability of the air sampling probe location and the transport of the sample to the collection devices.

The system includes a stack section containing the sample probe and another stack section containing the airflow, temperature, and humidity sensors. The GEMS design features a probe with a single shrouded sampling nozzle, a short sample delivery line, and a sample collection system. The collection system includes a filter holder to collect the record sample and an in-line detector head for monitoring beta and gamma radiation-emitting particles. The record sampler will operate continuously during exhauster operation. The beta/gamma sensor could operate continuously in accordance with the authorization basis (HNF-DS-WM-BIO-001), but there is no environmental regulatory requirement to do so. An interlock is installed to shut down the exhaust fan if the beta/gamma sensor detects elevated emissions. Both the record sampler and the beta/gamma sensor will be calibrated and audited routinely.

Figures 9-1 and 9-2 show details of the stack and shrouded nozzle, respectively.

On those tanks salt well pumped in the passive ventilation mode, the current requirement for periodic confirmatory measurement (PCM) as specified in the draft air operating permit shall be performed. PCM will be conducted annually by verifying the levels of smearable contamination on the inside surface of the ducting downstream of the HEPA filter or on the outside of the screen covering the outlet of the vent, should one exist. Confirmation of levels below 10,000 disintegrations per minute per 100 square centimeters beta/gamma and 200 disintegrations per minute per 100 square centimeters alpha will be used to verify low emissions. Detected levels above these thresholds would result in further investigation and reporting if the cause was due to an airborne emission. The radiological survey reports will become the record for the PCM.

Figure 9-1. Components of Salt Well Exhauster Stack.

Figure 9-2. Configuration of Shrouded Nozzle.

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

10.0 RELEASE RATES (Requirement 13)

As discussed in Section 1.0, portable exhausters will be installed on SSTs during salt well pumping as a precautionary measure, for use when flammable gas concentrations exceed 25 percent of the LFL. This NOC also addresses other activities that will be performed in support of salt well pumping, but do not require the application of a portable exhauster. In the past, these support activities have been considered routine in accordance with WAC 246-247. This section evaluates the potential for emissions to occur during salt well pumping and also during performance of the support activities.

10.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A primary question in determining the unabated emissions that would result from salt well pumping and performance of the support activities involves the mechanism for formation of aerosols in the tank vapor space. Two mechanisms have been postulated to occur should operation of the exhausters become necessary during salt well pumping: the release of trapped gas and associated aerosol generation, and resuspension of dry particulate material because of air currents created by the exhausters. Information available to date shows that salt well pumping minimally disturbs the tank waste and vapor space.

This position is supported by modeling designed to predict gas release during intrusive activities, analysis of release scenarios conducted for the Tank Farm Final Safety Analysis Report, and operational experience gained from tanks SY-101 and AN-104. The following is a discussion of results from these activities.

Numeric modeling designed to predict gas release during salt well pumping is documented (PNNL-11310 and TWSFG 96.14). Results state that, as the retreating liquid exposes the trapped gas bubbles, the trapped gas is released by diffusing through the connected gas channels to the surface of the salt cake or sludge. Thus, during salt well pumping, gas release is characterized as a continuous, slow release process. The generation of additional aerosol radionuclides under these conditions is not foreseen.

Intrusion into the waste by water lancing, as described in Section 6.2, to install the salt well screen or the jet pump assembly offers the possibility of increased concentrations of aerosol radionuclides because of the initial action of high pressure water from the lance on the waste and the potential for more rapid gas release from intrusion of the lance into the waste. A conservative gas release analysis, based on release scenarios including salt well pumping, intrusion into the waste, and waste rollover, was performed (WHC-SD-WM-EMP-031). This study addressed flammable gas concentration changes in the vapor space as a function of release rates, and concluded that a rollover will release the largest amount of gas in a short time. The study also concluded that although a rollover is possible, a rollover is unlikely because changes in waste levels in SSTs have been small, which implies gas generation rates are balanced by gas release rates. The study also concluded that intrusion into the waste will release relatively small volumes of gas as compared to a rollover. The lowest gas release rates are characteristic of salt well pumping. Considering the operational experience gained during May 1990 to December 1994 for SY-101 tank, it is considered unlikely that salt well pumping or its support activities that intrude into the waste will cause gas releases that measurably will increase the radiological aerosol in the tank vapor space.

Operational experience with SY-101 tank suggests that more aggressive waste intrusive activities involving intermittent mixer pump operation and rollover would not contribute significantly to an increase in radionuclide aerosol concentration in the vapor space, due to the release of trapped gas to the surface. This is

demonstrated by nondestructive assay analysis of HEPA filters in service on the SY-101 tank from May 1990 to December 1994. The analysis indicates the potential offsite cumulative dose of 1.5 E-03 millirem for the 4.5-year period (WHC-SD-WM-EMP-031). The type of gas releases experienced from SY-101 is not expected to occur during salt well pumping or the performance of support activities. However, assuming a very conservative position that a rollover would occur, the experience with the SY-101 tank suggests a maximum increase in an annual dose of only 3.3 E-04 millirem per year, which has an insignificant affect on the dose analysis presented in Section 11.0.

Operational experience with the AN-104 tank shows episodic gas (hydrogen) release events occur approximately every 133 days. Although no monitoring of unabated emissions within the tank has occurred during these events, there is no evidence that abated emissions increased during these events.

Another potential source of an increase in the radiological aerosol concentration in the tank vapor space might be attributed to the dry waste surface believed to be present in several tanks. This scenario for potential increased emissions assumes a radiological source, in the form of dry particulates, has been deposited or has formed on top of the dry waste surface. When the exhauster is turned on, these particulates could become airborne. In-tank photography is not considered sensitive enough to verify the presence or absence of dry particulates. However, no mechanism is known for the generation or formation of such a condition. It is believed the dry surface in these tanks was formed by evaporation of liquid waste, which is expected to result in a hard surface on the resulting salt cake. Also considered unlikely is that air flow into the tank, because of exhauster operation, could generate sufficient turbulence to disturb particulates even if the particulates were present.

The action of a water lance on a potentially dry waste surface is not expected to contribute measurably to increased aerosols, as water from the water lance will wet the dry waste surfaces that might exist before lancing begins. As noted in Section 10.5, the resultant dose due to water lancing activities on a waste surface (wet or dry) has been increased by a conservative factor of 10. This accounts for the uncertainty regarding a potential increase in vapor space radionuclide particulates because of the use of the water lance on or in the waste.

Additional mechanisms for a potential increase in aerosol concentration in the tank vapor space include accident conditions associated with a flammable gas burn in the vapor space, waste collapse, and equipment drop scenarios. These mechanisms are not addressed in this NOC because the likelihood of occurrence is less than 1 E-06 per year (WHC-SD-WM-EMP-031).

10.2 DISCUSSION OF SOURCE TERM USED TO CALCULATE EMISSIONS

The emission estimates in this NOC are based on analyses of filter papers in sampling equipment used for vapor space sampling in support of worker health and safety issues. The vapor sample analysis did not include radionuclide analytes; therefore, analyses of the filter papers were used for this estimate.

Two types of vapor sampling systems were used: a truck mounted vapor sampling system (VSS) and/or a cart mounted in-situ vapor sampling system (ISVS). In both systems, filter papers were used to provide protection against radioactive contamination from reaching the sampling apparatus in the cart or truck. The filter papers have a minimum aerosol retention of 99.98 percent for particles of 0.3 microns median diameter. In the case of the VSS, the filters are mounted outside the tank while for the ISVS, the

filters are mounted in the tank. In both cases, the filter papers are upstream from the sampling apparatus. Additional details of the sampling effort are documented (PNNL 1997).

10.3 POTENTIAL ANNUAL UNABATED EMISSIONS DURING SALT WELL PUMPING

Potential annual unabated emissions for each tank during salt well pumping were estimated using the measured total alpha, total beta, and cesium-137 concentrations collected on filter papers used during vapor sampling of undisturbed vapor space in each tank (PNNL 1997). Most of the filter papers were analyzed from 1 to 4 days after the sampling occurred. Subsequent tests and analysis of the activity on the filter papers showed a half-life of approximately 10 days. Therefore, the activities measured on the filter papers are believed to be attributed to radon progeny (PNNL 1997 and WHC 1982).

10.3.1 Potential Annual Unabated Emissions During Salt Well Pumping Under Passive Ventilation Rates

Unabated emissions currently attributed to the tanks covered in this NOC are not expected to increase measurably as a result of salt well pumping because the act of lowering the waste level by slowly removing the liquid wastes minimally disturbs the tank vapor space and waste. An estimate of those emissions, using the measured total alpha, total beta, and cesium-137 concentrations noted previously is presented in Appendix B. This estimate assumes a tank (passive) breathing rate of 0.28 cubic meter per minute to calculate potential unabated emissions. The methodology justifying this breathing rate was developed and used to estimate emissions from SSTs (DOE/RL-95-07).

10.3.2 Potential Annual Unabated Emissions During Salt Well Pumping With a Portable Exhauster In Operation

During salt well pumping, the potential to emit would increase during operation of the exhauster. For conservatism, the emission calculations in Appendix C assume the exhauster was run at its maximum output of 34 cubic meters per minute, 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. (Planning schedules include a 60 percent pumping efficiency, which makes these calculations conservative.) The following is a sample calculation using the 241-S-109 tank alpha concentration data from the filter papers. (This tank was selected for exemplary purposes only, there is nothing unique about the tank.)

Unabated alpha emission =

$$\left(0.058 \frac{\text{pCi}}{\text{L}} \right) \times \left(10^{-12} \frac{\text{Ci}}{\text{pCi}} \right) \times \left(\frac{1,200 \frac{\text{ft}^3}{\text{min}}}{35.3 \frac{\text{ft}^3}{\text{M}^3}} \right) \times \left(10^3 \frac{\text{L}}{\text{M}^3} \right) \times \left(60 \frac{\text{min}}{\text{hr}} \right) \times \left(24 \frac{\text{hr}}{\text{day}} \right) \times \left(365 \frac{\text{days}}{\text{year}} \right) = 1.04 \text{ E-3 } \frac{\text{Ci}}{\text{year}}$$

10.4 POTENTIAL ANNUAL ABATED EMISSIONS DURING SALT WELL PUMPING

Potential annual abated emissions for each tank during salt well pumping at an active ventilation rate of 34 cubic meters per minute and under passive breathing conditions are calculated from the unabated emissions and the decontamination factor (DF) for the HEPA filters.

In the case of active ventilation, the DF for each HEPA filter is equal to:

$$\frac{1}{1 - \text{efficiency}} = \frac{1}{1 - .9995} = 2 \text{ E}+03.$$

The overall DF is determined by multiplying the DFs for each HEPA filter together, i.e., (2 E+03) times (2 E+03) equals 4 E+06 for the ventilation system. The abated emissions equal the unabated emissions divided by the overall DF. The potential annual abated emissions for each tank during active ventilation are presented in Appendix C.

In the passive breathing case, a breather HEPA filter emission adjustment factor of .01, per Appendix C of 40 CFR 61, is multiplied by the calculated unabated emissions. The potential annual abated emissions for each tank during passive breathing are presented in Appendix B.

10.5 POTENTIAL ANNUAL UNABATED EMISSIONS DURING WATER LANCING

Potential annual unabated emissions during water lancing operations to insert the salt well screen or the jet pump assembly in each tank also were estimated using the measured total alpha, total beta, and cesium-137 concentrations collected on filter papers used during vapor sampling of vapor space in each tank (PNNL 1997). However, as noted previously, use of a portable exhaustor is not required during lancing operations. Therefore, to determine potential emissions during this operation, a tank breathing rate of 0.28 cubic meter per minute (Section 10.3.1) was used to calculate total potential emissions. As discussed in Section 10.3.1, this methodology was developed and used to estimate emissions from SSTs reported in the draft air operating permit (DOE/RL-95-07).

The results are shown in Appendix D. (Note that the resultant dose has been increased by a conservative factor of 10 to account for uncertainty regarding a potential increase in vapor space radionuclide particulates because of the use of the water lance on the waste and intrusion of the water lance into the waste (Section 10.1.)

10.6 POTENTIAL ANNUAL ABATED EMISSIONS DURING WATER LANCING

Potential abated emissions from water lancing under passive ventilation rates were estimated by multiplying the unabated emissions by a breather HEPA filter emission adjustment factor. The adjustment factor, 0.01, was taken from Appendix D of 40 CFR 61. Results are presented in Appendix D.

1 10.7 POTENTIAL ANNUAL UNABATED EMISSIONS DURING WATER ADDITION TO THE
2 WASTE
3

4 Occasionally water will be added to the tank to prevent plugging of the salt well screen and the waste
5 line. The water will be piped from a storage tank through a metering system at an average rate of 280 liters
6 per minute or less. Entry into the tank is made through the pump pit via an existing port on the pit cover and
7 into the salt well screen. No mechanism for increasing the concentration of radionuclides in the vapor space
8 is foreseen as a result of this activity and therefore, no increase in the potential to emit is estimated.
9

10
11 10.8 POTENTIAL ANNUAL UNABATED EMISSIONS DURING TRANSFER LINE
12 FLUSHING AND PLUG REMOVAL
13

14 Flushing of transfer lines and cleaning plugs from transfer lines are accomplished as described in
15 Section 6.4. No mechanism for increasing the concentration of radionuclides in the vapor space is foreseen as
16 a result of these activities and therefore, no increase in the potential to emit is estimated.
17
18

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

11.0. OFFSITE IMPACT (Requirements 14 and 15)

This section presents information regarding the total effective dose equivalent (TEDE) to the hypothetical maximally exposed individual (MEI) resulting from unabated and abated emission estimates from salt well pumping with active ventilation and, the unabated emissions from water lancing and salt well pumping under passive tank ventilation rates.

For SSTs AX-101, BY-105, and BY-106, the MEI is located at the Hanford Site boundary, 24 kilometers east of the 200 East Area. All other tanks covered by this NOC are located in the 200 West Area where the MEI is at the Hanford Site boundary, 24 kilometers east of the 200 West Area. The unit dose factors used to calculate offsite dose were submitted previously to the Washington State Department of Health (WDOH). The information required to develop the unit dose factors from the Clean Air Assessment Package 1988 computer code is included in *Unit Dose Calculation Methods Summary of Facility Effluent Monitoring Plan Determinations* (WHC-EP-0498).

Potential unabated doses are calculated as the product of the unabated emissions and the applicable unit dose factor. These calculations assume the total alpha to be from americium-241, instead of radon 226 as indicated in Section 10.3, because americium provides the highest dose consequence of all alpha emitters, 7.79 millirem per curie versus 3.23 E-01 millirem per curie. The total beta activity is assumed to be from strontium-90.

Appendix B provides the potential annual unabated dose and abated dose for each tank during salt well pumping at passive tank breathing rates. The highest unabated dose expected is 1.38 E-02 millirem per year from tank S-112.

Appendix C provides the potential annual unabated dose and abated dose for each tank during salt well pumping assuming the most conservative case that the exhaustor is run 24 hours per day, 365 days per year, at the maximum flow rate. Under these conditions, the following tanks exceed the regulatory dose criterion of 0.1 millirem per year TEDE to the MEI emission points:

- 241-S-103 (1.30 E-01 millirem per year)
- 241-S-107 (4.15 E-01 millirem per year)
- 241-S-112 (1.68 E+00 millirem per year).

The remaining 15 tanks fall below the regulatory criterion of 0.1 millirem per year. However, as discussed in Section 9.0, the monitoring system used with all portable exhausters will be compliant with 40 CFR 61, Subpart H and the reference requirements.

Appendix D provides the potential annual unabated dose and abated dose for each tank during water lancing operations. The analysis assumes water lancing operations will be performed under passive tank breathing rates for a period not to exceed 72 hours of actual water lancing. The 72-hour period will be controlled administratively. Also note that the resultant dose has been increased by a conservative factor of 10 to account for uncertainty regarding a potential increase in vapor space radionuclide particulates because of using the water lance on the waste and from intrusion of the water lance into the waste (Section 10.1). The highest potential unabated dose expected during water lancing operations from tank S-112 is 1.13 E-03 millirem per year.

1 As discussed in Section 1.0, a portable exhauster also could be used to simultaneously exhaust more
2 than one SST during salt well pumping. Although the exact combination of tanks to be pumped or exhausted
3 simultaneously is not known at this time, preliminary planning includes simultaneous pumping of tanks
4 BY-105 and BY-106. Also, it is likely that some tanks within S Farm will be pumped simultaneously using
5 a single portable exhauster, and some tanks within U Farm will be pumped simultaneously using a single
6 portable exhauster. If requested, specific details regarding simultaneous pumping of tanks will be forwarded
7 to WDOH when available.

8
9 As provided in Appendix C, the maximum abated dose for pumping all 18 tanks at the same time is
10 conservatively estimated at $6.47 \text{ E-}07$ millirem per year. However, in actual practice, application of an
11 exhauster to the 18 tanks covered by this NOC is scheduled to occur from 1998 into the year 2002. Although
12 the exact schedule is not certain, it is extremely unlikely that all 18 tanks will be ventilated at the same time.

13
14 The TEDE resulting from all Hanford Site operations in 1997 was determined to be 0.026 millirem
15 per year (DOE/RL-98-33). The emissions resulting from water lancing and salt well pumping, in conjunction
16 with other current operations on the Hanford Site, will not violate the National Emission Standard of
17 10 millirem per year.
18

12.0 COST FACTORS AND FACILITY LIFETIME (Requirements 16 and 17)

It is proposed that the HEPA filtration systems portable exhausters, for the portable exhausters as described in Section 8.0, be approved as best available radionuclide control technology (BARCT) for salt pumping activities when active ventilation is required. The WDOH has provided guidance in the past that HEPA filtration is considered BARCT for particulate emissions. It also is proposed that the passive charcoal filters, also described in Section 8.0, be approved as low as reasonably achievable control technology (LRACT) for salt well pumping activities performed in the passive ventilation mode. As such, cost estimates for construction, operation, and maintenance of the control technology components and system have been provided.

The minimum design life of the portable exhauster equipment is 10 years. Each exhauster could be operated continuously or intermittently for the duration of the pumping campaign. Pumping operations could be in a continuous mode for up to 3 or more years. Operations will be conducted up to 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

13.0 TECHNOLOGY STANDARDS (Requirement 18)

During active ventilation, the emissions control equipment employed on the portable exhausters to be used on tanks included in this NOC adhere to the compliance standards as noted in Table 13-1. This table summarizes the compliance of emissions control equipment with the listed technology standards for tanks with a potential to emit greater than 0.1 millirem per year TEDE to the MEI as discussed in Sections 9.0 and 11.0.

In the passive breathing mode, none of the salt well activities have the potential to emit greater than 0.1 millirem per year TEDE to the MEI. Therefore, the design of the HEPA breather filters must meet, as applicable and to the extent justified by a cost/benefit evaluation, the technology standards listed under WAC 246-247-110(18). Table 13-2 summarizes the compliance of emissions control equipment listed with technology standards

Table 13-1. Emissions Control Equipment Standards Compliance For Portable Exhausters.

Standard	Does design comply	Notes
ASME/ANSI AG-1	Yes	
ASME/ANSI N509	Yes	Glycol heater will substitute for electric heater because of flammable gas concerns.
ASME/ANSI N510	Yes	
ANSI/ASME NQA-1	Yes	
40 CFR 61.93 (b)(3)	Yes	Shrouded probe via alternate method allowed per EPA (1994).
ANSI N13.1	No	
40 CFR 52, Appendix E	Yes	Design to be confirmed by running a 168 hour test.
40 CFR 60, Appendix A Test Methods:		
1, 1A		
2, 2A, 2C, 2D		
4	No	Design will be provided to regulator.
5, 17		

Table 13-2. Emissions Control Equipment Standards Compliance for Breather Filters.

Standard	Does design comply	Notes
ASME/ANSI AG-1	No	Filters installed meet AG-1. Housings were fabricated prior to AG-1.
ASME/ANSI N509	No/Yes	Open face design does not meet N509. G-1 housing design meets N509.
ASME/ANSI N510	Yes	
ANSI/ASME NQA-1	No/Yes	Open face design does not meet N509. G-1 housing design meets N509.
ANSI N13.1	No	Not required for periodic confirmatory measurement.
40 CFR 52, Appendix E	No	Not required for periodic confirmatory measurement.
40 CFR 60, Appendix A Test Methods:		
1, 1A		
2, 2A, 2C, 2D		
4		
5, 17		Not required for periodic confirmatory measurement.

14.0 REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4 Agnew, et al., 1997, *Hanford Tank Chemical and Radionuclide Inventories, HDW Model*, Rev. 4,
5 LA-UR-96-3860, Los Alamos Scientific Lab, Los Alamos, New Mexico.
6
7 AMCA Standard 99-0401-86, Air Movement Contractors Association, Chicago, Illinois.
8
9 DESH, 1997, *Hanford Site Tank Farms Facilities Interim Safety Basis*, WHC-SD-WM-ISB-001, Rev. 0-M,
10 dated January 7, 1997, Duke Engineering and Services, Hanford, Richland, Washington.
11
12 DOE/EA-0915, *Waste Tank Safety Program, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington, Environmental*
13 *Assessment*, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington,
14 February 1994.
15
16 DOE/EIS-0189, *Tank Waste Remediation System, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington, Final*
17 *Environmental Impact Statement*, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland,
18 Washington, August 1996.
19
20 DOE/RL-98-33, *Radionuclide Air Emissions Report for the Hanford Site, Calendar Year 1996*, June 1997,
21 U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
22
23 DOE/RL-96-24, *Radioactive Air Emissions Notice of Construction Use of a Portable Exhauster on*
24 *241-A-101 Tank During Salt Well Pumping and Other Routine Activities*, U.S. Department of
25 Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
26
27 DOE/RL-95-07, *Hanford Site Air Operating Permit Application*, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland
28 Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
29
30 EPA, 1994, Letter from M. Nichols, U.S. EPA to R Pelletier, U.S. DOE, "National Emission Standards For
31 Hazardous Air Pollutants, Alternate Method Using Shrouded Probe Accepted By EPA",
32 November 21, 1994.
33
34 HNF-DS-WM-BIO-001, *Tank Waste Remediation System Basis For Interim Operation*, Fluor Daniel
35 Hanford Company, Richland Washington.
36
37 HNF-EP-0182-116, *Waste Tank Summary Report for Month Ending November 30, 1997*, Fluor Daniel
38 Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
39
40 PNNL 11310, *Gas Release During Salt-Well Pumping: Model Predictions and Comparisons to*
41 *Laboratory Experiments*, dated September 1996, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland,
42 Washington.
43
44 PNNL-11701, *Generic Effluent Monitoring System Certification for Salt Well Portable Exhauster*, dated
45 September 1997, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
46

- 1 PNNL, 1997, "Assessment of Radiological Data Collected by VSS Sampling of SST Vapor Headspace",
2 cc:Mail, John Evans to Eric Veith, dated 1/6/97, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland,
3 Washington.
4
5 TWSFG 96.14, *Gas Release During Salt-Well Pumping: Model Predictions from the STOMP Hydrology*
6 *Simulator*, dated May 1996, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
7
8 WDOH, 1992, Letter, Air 92-107, A. W. Conklin, WDOH, to J. D. Bauer, RL, no subject, October 5, 1992.
9
10 WHC, 1982, "Characterization of Breathing, Single Shell Tank Radionuclide Releases", Report by
11 D. R. Ellingson, dated March 1982, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
12
13 WHC-EP-0498, *Unit Dose Calculation Methods Summary of Facility Effluent Monitoring Plan*
14 *Determinations*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
15
16 WHC-SD-WM-EMP-031, *Tank Farm Stack NESHAP Designation Determinations*, Westinghouse Hanford
17 Company, Richland, Washington.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX A

TANK RADIONUCLIDE INVENTORY

1
2
3
4

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-AX-101 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	0.943	E	
¹⁴ C	7.91	E	
⁵⁹ Ni	6.93	E	
⁶⁰ Co	700	E	
⁶³ Ni	681	E	
⁷⁵ Se	3.86	E	
⁹⁰ Sr	1.25 E+06	E	
⁹⁰ Y	1.25 E+06	E	Calculated from Parent
^{93m} Nb	14.3	E	
⁹³ Zr	16.7	E	
⁹⁹ Tc	458	E	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.030	E	
^{113m} Cd	35.5	E	
¹²⁵ Sb	0.919	E	
¹²⁶ Sn	6.20	E	
¹²⁹ I	0.103	E	
¹³⁴ Cs	0.111	E	
¹³⁷ Cs	604,000	E	
^{137m} Ba	571,000	E	Calculated from Parent
¹⁵¹ Sm	14,400	E	
¹⁵² Eu	3.61	E	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	84.9	E	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	221	E	
²²⁶ Ra	4.66 E-04	E	
²²⁷ Ac	0.0024	E	
²²⁸ Ra	2.11 E-09	E	
²²⁹ Th	3.51 E-07	E	
²³¹ Pa	0.0036	E	
²³² Th	2.85 E-11	E	
²³² U	9.31 E-08	E	
²³³ U	1.31 E-09	E	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-AX-101 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
²³⁴ U	3.90 E-04	E	
²³⁵ U	1.52 E-05	E	
²³⁶ U	2.57 E-05	E	
²³⁷ Np	0.0016	E	
²³⁸ Pu	5.42	E	
²³⁸ U	3.12 E-04	E	
^{239/240} Pu	5,020	E	
²⁴¹ Am	2,940	E	
²⁴¹ Pu	384	E	
²⁴² Cm	0.137	E	
²⁴² Pu	0.0023	E	
²⁴³ Am	0.0086	E	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0124	E	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.502	E	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based, Agnew et al. (1997a)

E = Engineering assessment-based.

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-BY-105 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E)	Comment
^3H	168	M	
^{14}C	43.7	M	
^{59}Ni	6.78	M	
^{60}Co	40.6	M	
^{63}Ni	653	M	
^{79}Se	3.68	M	
^{90}Sr	620,000	E	
^{90}Y	620,000	E	Referenced to ^{90}Sr
^{93}Zr	17.8	M	
$^{93\text{m}}\text{Nb}$	12.9	M	
^{99}Tc	243	M	
^{106}Ru	0.00810	M	
^{115}Cd	93.5	M	
^{125}Sb	182	M	
^{126}Sn	5.51	M	
^{129}I	0.470	M	
^{134}Cs	1.99	M	
^{137}Cs	522,000	E	
$^{137\text{m}}\text{Ba}$	494,000	E	Referenced to ^{137}Cs
^{151}Sm	12,700	M	
^{152}Eu	6.05	M	
^{154}Eu	686	M	
^{155}Eu	372	M	
^{226}Ra	1.94 E-04	M	
^{227}Ac	0.00255	M	
^{228}Ra	2.17	M	
^{229}Th	0.0501	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-BY-105 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
²³¹ Pa	0.0129	M	
²³² Th	0.0801	M	
²³² U	12.1	M	
²³³ U	46.3	M	
²³⁴ U	11.6	M	
²³⁵ U	0.497	M	
²³⁶ U	0.163	M	
²³⁷ Np	0.819	M	
²³⁸ Pu	3.24	M	
²³⁸ U	15.3	M	
^{239/240} Pu	122	E	
²⁴¹ Am	57.1	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	233	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.00702	M	
²⁴² Pu	0.00112	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00197	M	
²⁴³ Cm	1.44 E-04	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	3.23 E-04	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based, Agnew et al. (199)

E = Engineering assessment-based

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-BY-106 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	270	M	
¹⁴ C	70.1	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	8.84	M	
⁶⁰ Co	65.5	M	
⁶³ Ni	865	M	
⁷⁹ Se	5.90	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	496,000	S	
⁹⁰ Y	496,000	S	Referenced to ⁹⁰ Sr
⁹³ Zr	28.5	M	
^{93m} Nb	20.6	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	391	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.0131	M	
¹⁰⁶ Cd	120	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	294	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	8.82	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.756	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	3.20	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	704,000	S	
^{137m} Ba	666,000	S	Referenced to ¹³⁷ Cs
¹⁵¹ Sm	20,400	M	
¹⁵² Eu	9.43	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	1,110	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	574	M	
²²⁶ Ra	2.90 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	0.00404	M	
²²⁸ Ra	3.50	M	
²²⁹ Th	0.0808	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-BY-106 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
²³¹ Pa	0.0207	M	
²³² Th	0.129	M	
²³² U	19.5	M	
²³³ U	74.8	M	
²³⁴ U	5.32	M	
²³⁵ U	0.197	M	
²³⁶ U	0.176	M	
²³⁷ Np	1.31	M	
²³⁸ Pu	5.23	M	
²³⁸ U	11.1	M	
²³⁹ Pu	61.4	S	
²⁴⁰ Pu	32.1	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	376	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.00520	M	
²⁴² Pu	0.00181	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00317	M	
²⁴³ Cm	1.06 E-04	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	4.65 E-04	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based, Agnew et al. (1997)

E = Engineering assessment-based

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-101 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	273	M	
¹⁴ C	31.8	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	9.22	M	
⁶⁰ Co	<493	S	
⁶³ Ni	877	M	
⁷⁹ Se	5.18	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	525,000	S	
⁹⁰ Y	525,000	S	From ⁹⁰ Sr
⁹³ Zr	25.0	M	
⁹³ =Nb	19.2	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	229	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.00608	M	
¹¹³ Cd	25.0	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	142	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	7.89	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.440	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	2.69	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	291,000	S	
¹³⁷ =Ba	275,000	S	From ¹³⁷ Cs
¹⁵¹ Sm	18,400	M	
¹⁵² Eu	8.50	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	575	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	448	M	
²²⁶ Ra	6.48E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	0.00330	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.108	M	
²²⁹ Th	0.00255	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-101 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
²³¹ Pa	0.00703	M	
²³² Th	0.00697	M	
²³² U	0.559	M	
²³³ U	2.14	M	
²³⁴ U	2.72	M	
²³⁵ U	0.114	M	
²³⁶ U	0.0738	M	
²³⁷ Np	0.873	M	
²³⁸ Pu	6.94	M	
²³⁹ U	2.73	M	
²³⁹ Pu	404	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	59.0	M	
²⁴¹ Am	37.1	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	405	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.172	M	
²⁴² Pu	0.00190	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00285	M	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0120	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.107	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based (Agnew et al. 1997)

E = Engineering assessment-based.

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-102 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	241	M	
¹⁴ C	34.2	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	2.43	M	
⁶⁰ Co	37.6	M	
⁶⁵ Ni	237	M	
⁷⁵ Se	3.41	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	310,000	E	
⁹⁰ Y	310,000	E	From ⁹⁰ Sr
⁹³ Zr	16.7	M	
^{93m} Nb	12.1	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	244	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.00664	M	
^{113m} Cd	87.4	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	161	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	5.15	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.470	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	2.48	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	443,000	E	
^{137m} Ba	418,000	E	From ¹³⁷ Cs
¹⁵¹ Sm	12,000	M	
¹⁵² Eu	3.95	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	611	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	232	M	
²²⁶ Ra	1.61 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	9.85 E-04	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.131	M	
²²⁹ Th	0.00307	M	
²³¹ Pa	0.00420	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-102 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
²³² Th	0.00869	M	
²³² U	0.680	M	
²³³ U	2.61	M	
²³⁴ U	0.809	M	
²³⁵ U	0.0329	M	
²³⁶ U	0.0252	M	
²³⁷ Np	0.897	M	
²³⁸ Pu	1.47	M	
²³⁸ U	0.925	M	
²³⁹ Pu	54.2	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	8.98	M	
²⁴¹ Am	57.4	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	98.4	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.147	M	
²⁴² Pu	5.34 E-04	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00197	M	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0134	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.133	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based (Agnew et al. 1997)

E = Engineering assessment-based.

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-103 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	254	M	
¹⁴ C	36.5	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	2.86	M	
⁶⁰ Co	40.4	M	
⁶³ Ni	278	M	
⁷⁹ Se	3.64	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	143,000	E	
⁹⁰ Y	143,000	E	Referenced to ⁹⁰ Sr
⁹³ Zr	17.8	M	
^{93m} Nb	13.0	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	260	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.00717	M	
^{113m} Cd	0.4	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	173	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	5.49	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.501	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	2.74	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	195,000	E	
^{137m} Ba	184,000	E	Referenced to ¹³⁷ Cs
¹⁵¹ Sm	12,800	M	
¹⁵² Eu	4.41	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	655	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	258	M	
²²⁶ Ra	1.92 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	0.00114	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.151	M	
²²⁹ Th	0.00354	M	
²³¹ Pa	0.00452	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-103 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
²³² Th	0.010	M	
²³² U	0.776	M	
²³³ U	2.97	M	
²³⁴ U	0.876	M	
²³⁵ U	0.0356	M	
²³⁶ U	0.0274	M	
²³⁷ Np	0.952	M	
²³⁸ Pu	1.70	M	
²³⁸ U	1.01	M	
²³⁹ Pu	66.8	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	10.9	M	
²⁴¹ Am	61.8	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	113	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.164	M	
²⁴² Pu	6.10 E-04	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00214	M	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0148	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.145	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based (Agnew et al. 1996)

E = Engineering assessment-based.

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-106 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Isotope	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ^a	Comment
³ H	478	M	
¹⁴ C	58.4	M	
⁶⁰ Ni	3.82	M	
⁶⁰ Co	59.9	M	
⁶³ Ni	372	M	
⁷⁵ Se	6.05	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	322,000	E	
⁹⁰ Y	322,000	E	Based on ⁹⁰ Sr activity
⁹⁰ Zr	29.6	M	
⁹³ Nb	21.8	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	418	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.00981	M	
¹⁰⁹ Cd	149	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	246	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	9.15	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.805	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	2.92	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	458,000	E	
¹³⁷ Ba	433,000	E	Based on 0.946 of ¹³⁷ Cs activity
¹⁵¹ Sm	21,300	M	
¹⁵² Eu	5.34	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	978	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	306	M	
²²⁶ Ra	2.67 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	0.00161	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.0874	M	
²³² Th	0.00209	M	
²³¹ Pa	0.00724	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-106 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ^a	Comment
²³² Th	0.00603	M	
²³² U	0.547	M	
²³³ U	2.10	M	
²³⁴ U	3.16	M	
²³⁵ U	0.132	M	
²³⁵ U	0.0799	M	
²³⁷ Np	1.64	M	
²³⁸ Pu	5.04	M	
²³⁸ U	3.15	M	
²³⁹ Pu	267	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	39.4	M	
²⁴¹ Am	980	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	300	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.185	M	
²⁴² Pu	0.00143	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00296	M	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0166	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.186	M	

^aS = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based, Agnew et al. (1997)

E = Engineering assessment-based.

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-107 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total Inventory (G)	Basis (S, M, or E)	Comment
^3H	99.9	M	
^{14}C	13.1	M	
^{59}Ni	6.28	M	
^{60}Co	317	S	
^{63}Ni	591	M	
^{79}Se	1.74	M	
^{90}Sr	404,000	S	
^{90}Y	404,000	S	Referenced to ^{90}Sr
^{93}Zr	8.47	M	
$^{93\text{m}}\text{Nb}$	6.35	M	
^{99}Tc	93.0	M	
^{106}Ru	0.0036	M	
$^{113\text{m}}\text{Cd}$	36.9	M	
^{125}Sb	60.6	M	
^{125}Sn	2.65	M	
^{129}I	0.179	M	
^{134}Cs	1.46	M	
^{137}Cs	214,000	S	
$^{137\text{m}}\text{Ba}$	203,000	S	Referenced to ^{137}Cs
^{151}Sm	6,160	M	
^{152}Eu	4.91	M	
^{154}Eu	247	M	
^{155}Eu	252	M	
^{226}Ra	4.51 E-04	M	
^{227}Ac	0.00212	M	
^{228}Ra	0.0453	M	
^{229}Th	0.00106	M	
^{231}Pa	0.00224	M	
^{232}Th	0.00301	M	
^{232}U	0.235	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-107 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
²³³ U	0.895	M	
²³⁴ U	14.9	M	
²³⁵ U	0.587	M	
²³⁶ U	0.767	M	
²³⁷ Np	0.358	M	
²³⁸ Pu	71.6	M	
²³⁸ U	11.9	M	
^{239/240} Pu	2,200	S	
²⁴¹ Am	30.9	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	3,910	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.151	M	
²⁴² Pu	0.0223	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00119	M	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0110	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.152	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based (Agnew et al. 1997)

E = Engineering assessment-based.

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components
in Tank 241-S-109 (11/9/96).

Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ^{1,2}	Comments
³ H	490	M	
¹⁴ C	63.8	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	4.28	M	
⁶⁰ Co	65.2	M	
⁶⁵ Ni	416	M	
⁷⁵ Se	6.54	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	2.75 E+05	E	Based on calculations from dome space temperatures
⁹⁰ Y	2.75E+05	E	
⁹³ Zr	31.9	M	
^{93m} Nb	23.6	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	454	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	1.02E-02	M	
^{113m} Cd	157	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	269	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	9.90	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.875	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	2.86	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	1.06 E+05	E	Based on calculations from dome space temperatures
^{137m} Ba	1.00E+05	E	
¹⁵¹ Sm	2.31E+04	M	
¹⁵² Eu	5.84	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	1.04E+03	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	336	M	
²²⁶ Ra	3.01E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	1.82E-03	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.111	M	
²²⁹ Th	2.65E-03	M	
²³¹ Pa	8.07E-03	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components
in Tank 241-S-109 (11/9/96).

Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ^{1,2}	Comments
²³² Th	7.51E-03	M	
²³² U	0.676	M	
²³³ U	2.59	M	
²³⁴ U	2.30	M	
²³⁵ U	9.60E-02	M	
²³⁶ U	6.11E-02	M	
²³⁷ Nd	1.78	M	
²³⁸ Pu	3.46	M	
²³⁸ U	2.35	M	
²³⁹ Pu	161	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	24.7	M	
²⁴¹ Am	106	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	2.16	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.210	M	
²⁴² Pu	1.09E-03	M	
²⁴³ Am	3.05E-03	M	
²⁴³ Cm	1.89E-02	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.208	M	

Notes:

- S = Sample-based
 M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based
 E = Engineering assessment-based
 NR = Not reported

¹Sample data were not used because sample recovery was poor and samples were obtained from only the upper portion of the tank (see Appendix B). Model estimates taken from Agnew (1997).

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-111.¹

Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ²	Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ²
³ H	556	M	²²⁶ Ra	5.80E-04	M
¹⁴ C	71.5	M	²²⁸ Ra	0.154	M
⁵⁹ Ni	8.27	M	²²⁷ Ac	3.08E-03	M
⁶⁰ Co	74.9	M	²³¹ Pa	8.81E-03	M
⁶³ Ni	791	M	²²⁹ Th	3.66E-03	M
⁷⁶ Se	7.29	M	²³² Th	0.0108	M
⁹⁰ Sr	51,200	S	²³² U	0.869	M
⁹⁰ Y	51,200	S	²³³ U	3.33	M
⁹³ Zr	35.7	M	²³⁴ U	2.32	M
^{93m} Nb	26.2	M	²³⁵ U	0.0964	M
⁹⁹ Tc	511	M	²³⁶ U	0.0640	M
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.0125	M	²³⁸ U	2.42	M
^{113m} Cd	182	M	²³⁷ Np	1.96	M
¹²⁵ Sb	313	M	²³⁸ Pu	5.34	M
¹²⁶ Sn	11.0	M	²³⁹ Pu	281	M
¹²⁹ I	0.984	M	²⁴⁰ Pu	42.2	M
¹³⁴ Cs	3.91	M	²⁴¹ Pu	332	M
¹³⁷ Cs	4.18E+05	S	²⁴² Pu	1.65E-03	M
^{137m} Ba	3.96E+05	S	²⁴¹ Am	2,530	E
¹⁵¹ Sm	7.29	M	²⁴³ Am	3.75E-03	M
¹⁵² Eu	8.64	M	²⁴² Cm	0.287	M
¹⁵⁴ Eu	1220	M	²⁴³ Cm	0.0234	M
¹⁵⁵ Eu	482	M	²⁴⁴ Cm	0.243	M

Notes:

¹Radionuclides decayed to January 1, 1994.²S = sample-based, M = HDW model-based, E = engineering assessment-based

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-112, decayed to January 1, 1994 (effective January 31, 1997)

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	523	M	
¹⁴ C	66.8	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	4.73	M	
⁶⁰ Co	67.5	M	
⁶³ Ni	458	M	
⁷⁹ Se	6.97	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	340,000	E	
⁹⁰ Y	340,000	E	Referenced to ⁹⁰ Sr
⁹³ Zr	34	M	
⁹³ =Nb	25.2	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	476	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.0104	M	
¹¹³ =Cd	166	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	277	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	10.6	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.917	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	3.11	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	582,000	E	
¹³⁷ =Ba	551,000	E	Referenced to ¹³⁷ Cs
¹⁵¹ Sm	24,600	M	
¹⁵² Eu	6.18	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	1,080	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	354	M	
²²⁶ Ra	3.38 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	0.00202	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.118	M	
²²⁹ Th	0.0028	M	
²³¹ Pa	0.00867	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-S-112, decayed to January 1, 1994 (effective January 31, 1997)

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
²³² Th	0.00793	M	
²³² U	0.71	M	
²³³ U	2.72	M	
²³⁴ U	1.87	M	
²³⁵ U	0.0776	M	
²³⁶ U	0.052	M	
²³⁷ Np	1.89	M	
²³⁸ Pu	2.68	M	
²³⁸ U	1.94	M	
²³⁹ Pu	111	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	17.6	M	
²⁴¹ Am	113	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	173	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.219	M	
²⁴² Pu	9.14 E-04	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00315	M	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0194	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.213	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based, Agnew et al. (1997)

E = Engineering assessment-based.

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-U-103, Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	427	M	
¹⁴ C	92.7	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	4.09	M	
⁶⁰ Co	69.6	M	
⁶⁵ Ni	401	M	
⁷⁵ Se	6.23	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	311,000	E	
⁹⁰ Y	311,000	E	Referenced to ⁹⁰ Sr
⁹³ Zr	30.6	M	
^{93m} Nb	22.2	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	444	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.0126	M	
^{113m} Cd	161	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	301	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	9.42	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.856	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	5.09	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	411,000	E	
^{137m} Ba	389,000	E	Referenced to ¹³⁷ Cs
¹⁵¹ Sm	21,900	M	
¹⁵² Eu	7.46	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	1,130	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	443	M	
²²⁶ Ra	2.84 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	0.00175	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.292	M	
²²⁹ Th	0.00683	M	
²³¹ Pa	0.00784	M	
²³² Th	0.0192	M	
²³² U	1.49	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-U-103, Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
²³³ U	5.71	M	
²³⁴ U	18.2	M	
²³⁵ U	0.811	M	
²³⁶ U	0.155	M	
²³⁷ Np	1.61	M	
²³⁸ Pu	2.60	M	
²³⁸ U	18.7	M	
²³⁹ Pu	61	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	15.1	M	
²⁴¹ Am	1,910	E	
²⁴¹ Pu	176	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.285	M	
²⁴² Pu	9.67 E-04	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00379	M	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0264	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.257	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based (Agnew et al. 1997a)

E = Engineering assessment-based.

Best-Basis Inventory Estimate for Nonradioactive
Components in Tank 241-U-105 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (kg)	Basis (S, M, or C) ¹	Comment
Zr	84.9	S	%Mean RSD=31.7

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based (Agnew 1996)

C = Calculated by charge balance; includes oxides as hydroxides, not including CO₂, NO₂, NO₃, PO₄, SO₄, and SiO₂.Best-Basis Inventory Estimate for Radioactive Components in Tank
241-U-105 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	427	M	
¹⁴ C	62.9	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	4.08	M	
⁶⁰ Co	70.1	M	
⁶³ Ni	400	M	
⁷⁹ Se	6.25	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	154,000	S	%Mean RSD=9.24
⁹⁰ Y	154,000	S	Equilibrium value with ⁹⁰ Sr
^{93m} Nb	22.2	M	
⁹³ Zr	30.7	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	446	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.0127	M	
^{113m} Cd	161	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	303	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	9.44	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.86	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	5.09	M	
^{137m} Ba	383,000	S	Equilibrium value with ¹³⁷ Cs
¹³⁷ Cs	404,500	S	%Mean RSD=7.37
¹⁵¹ Sm	22,000	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimate for Radioactive Components in Tank
241-U-105 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
¹⁵² Eu	7.5	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	1,140	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	445	M	
²²⁶ Ra	2.84 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	0.00174	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.29	M	
²²⁹ Th	0.00679	M	
²³¹ Pa	0.00783	M	
²³² Th	0.0192	M	
²³² U	1.47	M	
²³³ U	5.65	M	
²³⁴ U	18.2	M	
²³⁵ U	0.81	M	
²³⁶ U	0.154	M	
²³⁷ Np	1.61	M	
²³⁸ Pu	2.61	M	
²³⁸ U	18.7	M	
²³⁹ Pu	89.5	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	15.2	M	
²⁴¹ Am	107	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	177	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.287	M	
²⁴² Pu	9.74 E-04	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00382	M	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0266	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.259	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based

E = Engineering assessment-based

NR = Not reported.

Table D4-2. Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in Tank 241-U-106 (January 31, 1997). (Decayed to January 1, 1994)

Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ^{1,2}	Comment
²²⁵ Th	3.91E-03	M	
²³¹ Pa	4.97E-03	M	
²³² Th	1.18E-02	M	
²³² U	0.830	M	
²³³ U	3.18	M	
²³⁴ U	14.4	M	
²³⁵ U	0.645	M	
²³⁶ U	0.115	M	
²³⁷ Np	1.07	M	
²³⁸ Pu	1.71	M	
²³⁸ U	14.8	M	
²³⁹ Pu	57.0	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	9.74	M	
²⁴¹ Am	<2,280	S	
²⁴¹ Pu	1.17	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.186	M	
²⁴² Pu	6.44E-04	M	
²⁴³ Am	2.56E-03	M	
²⁴³ Cm	1.74E-02	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.172	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based

E = Engineering assessment-based

²For more information about the origin and quality of the sample-based numbers in this table, refer to Appendix B, Section B6.0. For more information about the model-based numbers in this table refer to Agnew et al. (1997)

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-U-106 (January 31, 1997). (Decayed to January 1, 1994)

Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ^{1,2}	Comment
³ H	279	M	
¹⁴ C	42.0	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	2.57	M	
⁶⁰ Co	182	S	
⁶³ Ni	252	M	
⁷⁹ Se	4.07	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	1.06E+05	S	
⁹⁰ Y	1.06E+05	S	Based on ⁹⁰ Sr
⁹³ Zr	19.9	M	
^{93m} Nb	14.5	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	297	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	8.63	M	
^{113m} Cd	105	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	205	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	6.15	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.574	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	3.00	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	2.15E+05	S	
^{137m} Ba	2.00E+05	S	Based on ¹³⁷ Cs
¹⁵¹ Sm	14,300	M	
¹⁵² Eu	4.86	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	759	S	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	288	S	
²²⁶ Ra	1.82E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	1.10E-03	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.166	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimate for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-U-107 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	335	M	
¹⁴ C	48.3	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	3.13	M	
⁶⁰ Co	<41.6	S	
⁶³ Ni	307	M	
⁷⁹ Se	4.8	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	57.2	S	
⁹⁰ Y	57.2	S	In equilibrium with ⁹⁰ Sr
^{93m} Nb	17.1	M	
⁹³ Zr	23.6	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	344	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.00952	M	
^{113m} Cd	124	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	230	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	7.25	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.664	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	3.65	M	
^{137m} Ba	206,000	S	In equilibrium with ¹³⁷ Cs
¹³⁷ Cs	218,000	S	
¹⁵¹ Sm	16,900	M	
¹⁵² Eu	5.6	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	<190	S	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	<815	S	
²²⁶ Ra	2.06 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	0.0013	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.201	M	
²²⁹ Th	0.00472	M	
²³¹ Pa	0.00596	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimate for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-U-107 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective January 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
²³² Th	0.0134	M	
²³² U	1.03	M	
²³³ U	3.96	M	
²³⁴ U	5.41	M	
²³⁵ U	0.228	M	
²³⁶ U	0.13	M	
²³⁷ Np	1.26	M	
²³⁸ Pu	9.18	M	
²³⁸ U	5.49	M	
^{239/240} Pu	0.0059	S	
²⁴¹ Am	<1,360	S	
²⁴¹ Pu	531	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.211	M	
²⁴² Pu	0.00242	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00283	M	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0195	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.192	M	

¹S = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based, Agnew et al. (1997)

E = Engineering assessment-based.

Best-Basis Inventory Estimate for Radioactive Components in Tank 241-U-10S
Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M or E)	Comment
^{14}C	76.3	M	
^{59}Ni	4.7	M	
^{60}Co	< 61.5	S	Average solid segment data
^{63}Ni	462	M	
^{75}Se	7.31	M	
^{90}Sr	29,400	S	Average solid segment data
^{90}Y	29,400	S	Based on ^{90}Sr
$^{93\text{m}}\text{Nb}$	26	M	
^{93}Zr	35.9	M	
^{95}Tc	542	M	
^{106}Ru	0.0151	M	
$^{113\text{m}}\text{Cd}$	190	M	
^{125}Sb	368	M	
^{126}Sn	11.1	M	
^{129}I	1.05	M	
^{134}Cs	5.17	M	
$^{137\text{m}}\text{Ba}$	390,000	S	Based on ^{137}Cs
^{137}Cs	411,000	S	Average core segment data
^{151}Sm	25,700	M	
^{152}Eu	8.68	M	
^{154}Eu	< 241	S	Average core segment data
^{155}Eu	< 884	S	Average core segment data
^{226}Ra	3.04 E-04	M	
^{227}Ac	0.00192	M	
^{228}Ra	0.269	M	
^{229}Th	0.00634	M	
^{231}Pa	0.0089	M	
^{232}Th	0.0183	M	
^{232}U	1.4	M	
^{233}U	5.39	M	
^{234}U	8.72	M	
^{235}U	0.346	M	
^{236}U	0.423	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimate for Radioactive Components in Tank 241-U-108
Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total Inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M or E) ¹	Comment
²³⁷ Np	1.96	M	
²³⁸ Pu	21.5	M	
²³⁸ U	7.33	M	
²³⁹ Pu	615	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	102	M	
²⁴¹ Am	< 1,930	S	Average core segment data
²⁴¹ Pu	962	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.328	M	
²⁴² Pu	0.00314	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00438	M	
²⁴³ Cm	0.0305	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.303	M	

¹S=Sample-based

M=Hanford Defined Waste model-based

E=Engineering assessment-based

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-U-109, Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	559	M	
¹⁴ C	82.6	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	5.14	M	
⁶⁰ Co	504	M	
⁶³ Ni	92.2	M	
⁷⁹ Se	8.06	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	82,400	E	
⁹⁰ Y	82,400	E	Determined from ⁹⁰ Sr value.
⁹³ Zr	39.5	M	
^{93m} Nb	28.7	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	586	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.0167	M	
^{113m} Cd	209	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	399	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	12.2	M	
¹²⁹ I	1.13	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	6.04	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	339,000	E	
^{137m} Ba	321,000	E	Determined from ¹³⁷ Cs value.
¹⁵¹ Sm	28,400	M	
¹⁵² Eu	9.6	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	1,490	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	569	M	
²²⁶ Ra	3.46 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	2.14 E-03	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.280	M	
²²⁹ Th	6.62 E-03	M	
²³¹ Pa	9.79 E-03	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-U-109, Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ¹	Comment
³ H	559	M	
¹⁴ C	82.6	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	5.14	M	
⁶⁰ Co	504	M	
⁶³ Ni	92.2	M	
⁷⁵ Se	8.06	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	82,400	E	
⁹⁰ Y	82,400	E	Determined from ⁹⁰ Sr value.
⁹³ Zr	39.5	M	
^{93m} Nb	28.7	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	586	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.0167	M	
^{113m} Cd	209	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	399	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	12.2	M	
¹²⁹ I	1.13	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	6.04	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	339,000	E	
^{137m} Ba	321,000	E	Determined from ¹³⁷ Cs value.
¹⁵¹ Sm	28,400	M	
¹⁵² Eu	9.6	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	1,490	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	569	M	
²²⁶ Ra	3.46 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	2.14 E-03	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.280	M	
²²⁹ Th	6.62 E-03	M	
²³¹ Pa	9.79 E-03	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-U-111 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ^a	Comment
³ H	227	M	
¹⁴ C	32.3	M	
⁵⁹ Ni	2.82	M	
⁶⁰ Co	35.6	M	
⁶³ Ni	273	M	
⁷⁹ Se	3.24	M	
⁹⁰ Sr	221,100	E	
⁹⁰ Y	221,000	E	Based on ⁹⁰ Sr activity.
⁹³ Zr	15.9	M	
^{93m} Nb	11.6	M	
⁹⁹ Tc	230	M	
¹⁰⁶ Ru	0.00633	M	
^{113m} Cd	83	M	
¹²⁵ Sb	153	M	
¹²⁶ Sn	4.9	M	
¹²⁹ I	0.444	M	
¹³⁴ Cs	2.46	M	
¹³⁷ Cs	248,000	E	
^{137m} Ba	234,000	E	Based on 0.946 times ¹³⁷ Cs activity.
¹⁵¹ Sm	11,400	M	
¹⁵² Eu	4.05	M	
¹⁵⁴ Eu	580	M	
¹⁵⁵ Eu	235	M	
²²⁶ Ra	1.91 E-04	M	
²²⁷ Ac	0.0011	M	
²²⁸ Ra	0.128	M	
²²⁹ Th	0.00301	M	

Best-Basis Inventory Estimates for Radioactive Components in
Tank 241-U-111 Decayed to January 1, 1994 (Effective May 31, 1997).

Analyte	Total inventory (Ci)	Basis (S, M, or E) ^a	Comment
²³¹ Pa	0.00402	M	
²³² Th	0.00852	M	
²³² U	0.664	M	
²³³ U	2.55	M	
²³⁴ U	1.56	M	
²³⁵ U	0.0668	M	
²³⁶ U	0.0291	M	
²³⁷ Np	0.845	M	
²³⁸ Pu	1.64	M	
²³⁸ U	1.69	M	
²³⁹ Pu	69.0	M	
²⁴⁰ Pu	11	M	
²⁴¹ Am	54.9	M	
²⁴¹ Pu	108	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.148	M	
²⁴² Pu	5.75 E-4	M	
²⁴³ Am	0.00189	M	
²⁴² Cm	0.0131	M	
²⁴⁴ Cm	0.128	M	

^aS = Sample-based

M = Hanford Defined Waste model-based, Agnew et al. (1997)

E = Engineering assessment-based.

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX B

**EMISSION AND DOSE CALCULATIONS--SALT WELL PUMPING UNDER
PASSIVE VENTILATION**

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

[illegible]

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX C

EMISSION AND DOSE CALCULATIONS--SALT WELL PUMPING UNDER
ACTIVE VENTILATION

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

[illegible]

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX D

EMISSION AND DOSE CALCULATIONS--WATER LANCING

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

CONTAMINANT SYSTEMS CONTROLLED TO 1/2 HOURS MAXIMUM OPERATION IN EACH TANK															
VENTILATION FLOW RATE	0.28	METRIC ³ /MIN													
MEASURED HEPA EXHAUST ADJUSTMENT FACTOR	1.008	Per 48 CTR 51 APP D													
DOSE CONVERSION MREM/CURIE															
TOTAL ALPHA (4m-241)	200-EAST	200-WEST													
TOTAL BETA (4m-241)	13.1	7.79													
TOTAL BETA (4m-241)	4.38E-02	2.60E-02													
TOTAL BETA (4m-241)	2.39E-02	1.42E-02													
TANK	LOCATION	TOTAL ALPHA PCI/LITER	TOTAL BETA PCI/LITER	Cs-137 PCI/LITER	ALPHA PER YEAR, CI	BETA PER YEAR, CI	Cs-137 PER YEAR, CI	ALPHA PER YEAR, CI	BETA PER YEAR, CI	UNABATED EMISSIONS	UNABATED DOSE PER YEAR, mrem	CS-137 PER YEAR, mrem	TOTAL UNABATED PER YEAR, mrem	10X TOTAL UNABATED PER YEAR, mrem	DOSE PER YEAR, mrem
241-AZ-101	200-EAST	0.24	1.09	0.1	2.50E-07	1.37E-06	1.21E-07	2.90E-09	1.32E-08		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-BX-105	200-EAST	0.003	0.01	0.1	3.63E-09	1.21E-08	1.21E-07	3.63E-11	1.21E-10		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-BX-106	200-EAST	0.01	0.03	0.1	1.21E-08	4.63E-08	1.21E-07	1.21E-10	1.21E-10		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-C-101	200-EAST	0.258	1.99	26.9	3.12E-07	2.41E-06	3.25E-06	3.12E-09	2.41E-08		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-S-102	200-WEST	0.37	1.07	0.5	4.04E-07	2.99E-06	6.05E-05	4.04E-09	2.99E-08		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-S-103	200-WEST	0.86	8.12	21.9	1.04E-06	3.92E-06	2.49E-05	1.04E-09	3.92E-08		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-S-106	200-WEST	0.609	2.06	28	7.37E-07	2.49E-06	3.39E-05	7.37E-09	2.49E-08		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-S-107	200-WEST	2.91	2.63	12.4	1.02E-06	3.18E-06	3.52E-05	1.02E-09	3.18E-08		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-S-109	200-WEST	0.058	0.32	0.25	7.02E-08	3.87E-07	3.02E-07	7.02E-10	3.87E-09		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-S-111	200-WEST	0.5	0.8	0.1	6.05E-07	3.68E-07	1.21E-07	6.05E-09	3.68E-09		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-S-112	200-WEST	12	13	0.1	1.45E-05	1.57E-05	1.21E-07	1.45E-07	1.57E-07		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-U-103	200-WEST	0.21	0.01	0.1	2.54E-07	1.21E-08	1.21E-07	2.54E-09	1.21E-07		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-U-105	200-WEST	0.82	0.08	0.1	2.42E-08	9.68E-08	1.21E-07	2.42E-10	9.68E-10		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-U-106	200-WEST	0.17	0.17	0.5	1.81E-07	2.86E-07	6.05E-05	1.81E-09	2.86E-09		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-U-107	200-WEST	0.005	0.05	0.1	6.05E-09	6.05E-08	1.21E-07	6.05E-11	6.05E-10		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-U-108	200-WEST	0.03	0.16	0.1	3.63E-08	1.94E-07	1.21E-07	3.63E-10	1.94E-09		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-U-109	200-WEST	0.22	0.31	0.1	2.46E-07	3.75E-07	1.21E-07	2.46E-09	3.75E-09		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
241-U-111	200-WEST	0.05	0.2	0.1	6.05E-08	2.42E-07	1.21E-07	6.05E-10	2.42E-09		1.21E-09	2.89E-09	3.86E-06	3.86E-05	
The total dose is multiplied by a factor of 10 to account for uncertainty regarding a potential increase in vapor space rad concentration due to use of water lance in the waste (see Section 10.1).															

*The total dose is multiplied by a factor of
*water lance in the waste (see Section 10.1).

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

DISTRIBUTION

OFFSITE

MSIN

Mr. A. W. Conklin, Head
Air Emissions and Defense Waste Section
Division of Radiation Protection
State of Washington
Department of Health
P. O. Box 47827
Olympia, Washington 98504-7827

Mr. Jerry Leitch, Chief
Radiation and Indoor Air Section
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101

J. Wilkinson
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla
Indian Nation
P. O. Box 638
Pendleton, Oregon 97801

D. Powauke
Nez Perce Tribe
P. O. Box 365
Lapwai, Idaho 93540

R. Jim, Manager
Environmental Restoration/
Waste Management Program
Yakima Indian Nation
P. O. Box 151
Toppenish, Washington 98948

ONSITE

U.S. Department of Energy,
Richland Operations Office

D. W. Bowser
J. M. Clark
C. C. Haass
H. M. Rodriguez
Reading Room (2)

A2-22
S7-54
S7-51
A5-15
H2-53

DISTRIBUTION (cont)

MSIN

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

Hanford Technical Library

K1-11

Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc.

J. A. Bates

H6-36

B. D. Williamson

B3-15

Lockheed Martin Hanford Corporation

M. L. Dexter

R1-51

K. A. Elsethagen

S5-03

C. J. Grando

R1-51

P. C. Miller

T4-08

D. J. Saueressig

S8-05

Waste Management Federal Services of Hanford Inc.

E. M. Greager

H6-21

N. A. Homan

H6-25

J. J. Luke

H6-25

Air Operating Permit File

H6-25

Lockheed Martin Services, Inc.

Central Files

B1-07

DPC

H6-08

EDMC

H6-08