

United States Government

Department of Energy
Office of River Protection

memorandum

DATE: **AUG 26 2009**

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: ORP:TRW 09-ORP-014

SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2011 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT BUDGET
REQUEST SUBMITTAL FOR THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE),
OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION (ORP)

TO: Inés R. Triay, Assistant Secretary
for Environmental Management, EM-1, HQ

ORP is requesting \$1,092 M for FY 2011 budget funding. This request is consistent with the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement [TPA]) 2011 milestone dates.

ORP's planning represents its efforts to align the challenges, both technical and fiscal, with its commitment to make significant cleanup progress at the Hanford Site and reduce the active cleanup footprint. In summary, with this baseline budget request ORP will:

- maintain safe and compliant facilities and essential services;
- reduce overall lifecycle cost and project risks;
- improve readiness for Waste Feed Delivery;
- continue to make progress on the goal of completing C-Farm retrievals by FY 2014, including continued bulk retrieval and hard heel activities;
- complete 242-A Evaporator campaigns to support retrievals;
- ensure tank integrity through tank sampling and analysis, ultrasonic testing and double shell tank (DST) System Pit Integrity, and the continued implementation of the single shell tank (SST) Integrity Expert Panel recommendations';
- develop and deploy technologies to support Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) operations in FY 2019;
- conduct Pretreatment Engineering Platform (PEP) Phase II testing;
- continue closure demonstration activities;
- maintain WTP focus on project performance and increased accountability;
- bring the overall project completion of the WTP above 65%; and
- maintain open and effective communication with regulators and stakeholders.

In accordance with the TPA, Paragraph 148, and DOE's commitment to seek, collect and consider input in the development of the budget, we provided budget briefings and information to Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Hanford Advisory Board during ORP's budget development process. In addition, ORP and the DOE Richland Operations Office (RL)

AUG 26 2009

jointly held a public meeting to discuss the proposed FY 2011 budget request and cleanup priorities.

The majority of the themes we heard from the regulators, public, and others were consistent with the overarching priorities of ORP which include:

- budget consistency during the implementation of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds;
- job stability following the completion of ARRA projects;
- continued safe tank retrievals;
- reliable waste feed to WTP by FY 2019;
- safe maintenance and characterization of the tank farms;
- completion of critical upgrades to the tank farms to ensure tank waste can be transferred to the WTP and the plant can operate at full capacity; and
- completion of WTP.

A significant differing priority between ORP, the regulators and the stakeholders is the issue of a decision timeframe for Supplemental Treatment technologies. ORP's stakeholders and the public generally believe a decision needs to be made before the 2015 timeframe described in the November 2008 report by the External Technical Review of System Planning for Low-Activity Waste Treatment at Hanford. ORP is focusing its current efforts and resources on preparing for WTP operations in 2019 by making critical upgrades to the tank farms and completing construction of the WTP.

The comments received by the regulators and from the public to date, were transmitted to you by RL via letter 09-FMD-0161, dated August 3, 2009. In addition to the regulator and public comments transmitted to you by RL, a summary of comments and questions regarding ORP scope from the public budget meeting are attached. These comments are also available electronically on the Hanford website at www.hanford.gov.

We are available for further discussion of our baseline cost, schedule and technical assumptions. ORP is ready to initiate baseline follow-up discussions with your office, EPA, tribal nations, and the stakeholders and look forward to coordinating these next steps with your staff.

If you have any questions, please contact me, or your staff may contact Tom L. Toon, Director of Project Administration, (509) 376-8515.


for Shirley J. Olinger, Manager
Office of River Protection

Attachment

cc w/attach: See page 3

Ineś R. Triay
09-ORP-014

-3-

AUG 26 2009

cc w/attach:

J. A. Hedges, Ecology

D.A. Faulk, EPA

C.D. West, EM 3.2

M. L. Sykes, EM-30

C. M. Flohr, EM-31

J. H. Luczak, EM-31

**FY 2011 Budget Workshop
Comments/Questions
July 22, 2009**

Questions for:

Ecology

- Why do we still have a funding gap when there is \$2 billion in stimulus funds?
- Regarding retrieval shipment, remote handling and Pre - 70 is not on the priority list, why?
- WTP conceptual package for new facility potential for a blending facility and capacity needs regarding retrieval and storage are not a priority, why?
- How will you get capacity for remote handling?
- Work plan SW-2 has a huge list of trenches, cribs, etc. with transuranic waste in them without any characterization. Will funding be set aside to characterize this waste?

EPA

- Is EPA in sync with Ecology's list of priorities?

DOE - ORP

Morning Session

- Do the low figures for the planning budget in FY11 in BOF, Analytical Lab, LAW indicate that these projects are nearly done/?
- Has there been any thought to upgrade or enhance any monitoring activities?
- When will System Plan 4 be available to look at?
- The tanks that have been emptied, is there any work being done on them, monitoring?
- Is there a funding scenario that is predicated on not having enough DST space to support retrievals and WTP operations?
- Are you confident that the 222-S lab will be able to support the analytical needs? Is there a backup for the 222-S lab? Can 222-S be a bottleneck for the vitplant?
- Will the shortfall of pensions affect ORP?
- Will there be any enhancement for worker safety through surveillance, monitors and maintenance?
- Ops/surveillance monitoring and maintenance- are we doing the same things we've done before, or are we enhancing it?
- When making a reduction, is work based on allocated funding? Do the regulators realize the reduction is due to less work being done?
- Pleased to see that PEP Phase II is funded.
- Are there better cost controls or projections for the T-Farm barrier?
- What is the scale of SX Farm compared to T-Farm?
- Is the obsolete SX Farm equipment going to ERDF?
- If successful with C-Farm in 2014, is there enough DST space to move forward?
- Will we need to do more evaporator runs?

- Are you going to have a way to avoid flammable gas buildup in tanks in the waster due to high sheer resistance?
- Will we have some new ventilation process?
- In pretreatment, what is between the 56' and 77' levels?
- When is CD2 being finished? CD1?
- Are constraints for CD0 and CD2 "showstoppers"?
- What will happen in 2011 with the Canister Storage Building? Does it require capital funding? Will we have to get supplemental FY2010 funds for CSB? Will constraints on waste disposal (Yucca Mtn.) be show-stoppers? Where do you hope to be by the end of FY11? Is it in the FY10 budget?
- How big is tank C-301?
- For record, HAB thinks 2015 is too late to begin supplemental treatment studies.
- Have you begun to develop priorities within the \$50M for technology development? Is there a separate priority list for the \$50M that will be set aside for tech development? Is there a list of these currently? What are some of those individual developments?
- Technology development isn't really part of the IPL because it is specially allocated \$\$\$. Money can't be used toward anything but EM-21. Are spending priorities being developed yet? Can DOE share some of the possible technology priorities it is considering? Is cementation barrier part of the priorities for tech development?

DOE – ORP

Afternoon Session

- What upgrades are funded through ARRA?
- Is there a split change in the 4 categories, TF Infrastructure, Waste Feed Infrastructure, Facility Upgrades and Other Infrastructure? What is the split change in the \$326 million (ARRA)?
- On the jobs created, are they FTEs?
- What was removed from the ARRA workscope since the HAB was briefed?
- Are the 207 ARRA jobs full time or part time?
- Is DOE concerned it is not taking steps to ensure PT isn't a bottleneck for vitrification?
- New Bechtel targets for WTP Pre-treatment process. Math equals 30 year lifespan. Is there anything that is not being taken advantage of? Is Pre-treatment a bottle neck that can't be advanced?
- Seems to be lots of loose ends in PT facility messing with the tank farms retrieval process.
- Is 2019 the date for landfill closure?
- On Waste Feed Delivery Flowsheet, are issues addressed by HAB TWC being considered in DOE's priorities?
- Have the melter requirements and waste characterizations been reconciled?
- Have the feed chemistry been taken into consideration with the melters?

- Is ARRA ST money limited to waste form studies?
- Clarification on ERTF references on ARRA slide
- Wants breakdown of Tank Operations block for HAB (\$\$)
- Funding for ST- is it too slow to meet Ecology's goal?
- ST is a TPA negotiation issue
- We need to get a funding profile on the activities that will be included for the next 4-5 years
- Early LAW would be a factor in ST assumption
- Clarification- is there a funding profile for ST?
- Concern over the timing of advice. IPL will be submitted to HQ before HAB will have a chance to draft a letter of advice
- HAB asking for a funding profile of ST to review before August 6 BCC meeting
- On WTP funding profile, how are you using carryover funds?

Integrated Priorities List

- Can tank operations funds be broken down to specifics?
- Supplemental treatment- is funding too slow for Ecology's work speed?
- 2015 is too late to make a decision on supplement technology. Recommend start time approximately 2012. If it needs to be up and running when WTP is finish, it should be completed approximately 2112.
- 2015 is way too late for sodium mitigation adjustment
 - o Supplemental Alternative treatment needs to start earlier.
 - o Can it be moved up?
 - o What would the possible consequences of moving the process forward be?
 - o Is there a funding profile too look at for what is going to happen in 2015 and on?
 - o More than a profile chart to help make decisions?