

Technical Review Package Content Sheet

TRP #: USQ-HTF-2015-00300

Rev: 0

Technical Review Package Title

Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4

Functional Classification: GS

Documents included in package

- ☒ DATR
- ☐ DATR Summary
- ☒ USQS
- ☐ USQE
- ☒ CHAPS
- ☐ TSQS
- ☐ TSQE
- ☐ MSBS
- ☐ MSBE

Other Documents Included (List)

USQ-HTF-2015-00300 Attachment
USQ-HTF-2015-00300 UWMQ Determination

CLASSIFICATION REVIEW

DC/RO: N/A

Date: 9/10/2015

Guidance / Exemption:

Design Authority Technical Review Report

Design Authority Technical Review Report No. USQ-HTF-2015-00300		Rev 0	Date 4/17/2015
Section 1.0 - Scope of Review			
Building 241916	System		Functional Classification GS
Title Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4			
Type of Modification OTHER		Modification Number SDDR 13182	
Brief Description of the Modification Being Reviewed See Attachment			
Listing of Documents Reviewed See Attachment			
Section 2.0 - Review Categories			
Section 2.1 - Facility Impacts			
Documents	Document Description No.	Doc. Change Request/Tracking No.	Completion Code

Design Authority Technical Review Report (Continued)

Design Authority Technical Review Report No. USQ-HTF-2015-00300	Rev 0	Date 4/17/2015
Section 2.0 - Review Categories (Continued)		
Section 2.2 - Technical Agency Reviews		
Are all Technical Agency Reviews identified and complete (i.e. Fire Protection, Safeguards and Security, HPT, Pressure Protection, etc.)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
If any of the questions below are answered "YES," an Environmental Evaluation Checklist is required. Will the proposed activity: result in a change in emissions, generation rates, or new discharge of hazardous, mixed, radioactive, asbestos, PCB, sanitary/industrial solid or liquid waste, petroleum substance, wastewater, or other pollutants from a facility or process? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No be located outside of a previously developed area? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No involve siting, construction, modification, renovation, closure or D&D of facilities or processes? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No potentially affect environmentally sensitive areas/resources such as flood plain/wetlands, archeologically or historically significant areas, threatened or endangered species and/or their habitat, special sources of water (e.g. aquifer)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No involve site characterization, environmental monitoring, or R&D program? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No involve any type of land disturbance, Underground Storage Tank (UST), or subsurface injection/extraction? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No involve a Site Evaluation (SE) area, RCRA/CERCLA area/facility, or associated 200 foot Buffer Zone? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
Section 2.3 - Safety Basis Review		
Is the Modification to a Nuclear Facility or will the Modification impact a Nuclear Facility? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <div>USQS No. <u>USQ-HTF-2015-00300</u></div>		
Section 2.4 - System Acceptability Review		
See Attachment		
Section 2.5 - System Interface Reviews		
Are all other impacted Design Authority reviews identified and complete (i.e. Electrical, Compressed Air, Domestic Water, etc.)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Is FOSC review required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
Section 3.0 - Approval		
Preparer	<u>VOEGTLEN, ROBERT O</u> (PRINT NAME)	<u>9/2/2015</u> (Date)
Contributing Reviewers	<u>N/A</u> <u>N/A</u> <u>N/A</u> <u>N/A</u> (PRINT NAME)	<u>9/2/2015</u> <u>9/2/2015</u> <u>9/2/2015</u> <u>9/2/2015</u> (Date)
Approver (Design Authority)	<u>VOEGTLEN, ROBERT O</u> (PRINT NAME)	<u>9/2/2015</u> (Date)

UNREVIEWED SAFETY QUESTION REVIEW (USQS)

USQ No. USQ-HTF-2015-00300 Rev. 0 Functional Classification GS
Title: Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4

Description of Proposed Activity:

See Attachment

Is the Proposed Activity a change to TSRs or JCO controls?

☐ Yes☒ No

Justification:

See Attachment

If "Yes", prior DOE approval through the TSR change process is required (see 11Q, 1.01), no further USQ screening or USQ Evaluation is required. If "No", continue with Screening.

Does the Proposed Activity permanently eliminate a DID/ITS or Degrade its safety Function as explicitly described in the Safety Basis?

☐ Yes☒ No

Justification:

See Attachment

If "Yes", prior DOE approval is required, no further USQ screening or evaluation is required. If "No", continue with Screening.

References:

See Attachment

Screening

Does the Proposed Activity involve a:

a. Change to the facility as described in the Safety Basis?

☐ Yes☒ No

b. Change to the procedures as described in the Safety Basis?

☐ Yes☒ No

c. Test or experiment not described in the Safety Basis?

☐ Yes☒ No

Justification:

See Attachment

Screening Conclusion

☒ All answers above are 'No' and a USQ Evaluation is not required.☐ Screening not performed or any answer above is 'Yes' and a USQ Evaluation is required.

Screen Originator:

VOEGTLEN, ROBERT O

Date:

9/2/2015

Screen Reviewer:

CHANDLER, TIMOTHY LEON

Date:

9/2/2015

Consolidated Hazard Analysis Process (CHAP) Screening

CHAP Screening No. USQ-HTF-2015-00300	Rev No. 0	Functional Classification: GS	Building/Location 241916	System
Title Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4				
Brief Description of the Proposed Activity (include reference to Modification Traveler number or other Engineering change document as applicable) See Attachment				
Part A -- CHAP Determination				
1. Is this a new facility, new process, process change, or physical modification to an existing facility that could potentially introduce new hazards or increase the consequence or frequency of a current hazard, thereby impacting safety basis controls?			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes If Yes, the CHA process is required. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If NO, CHA is not required. Provide justification for conclusion (required).	
Justification (consult with Nuclear Safety as needed to justify conclusion): See Attachment				
Part B -- DHAP Determination				
2. Is this a new facility, new process, process change, or physical modification to an existing facility that could potentially introduce new hazards, increase the consequence or frequency of a current hazard, or result in impacting the controls associated with a current hazard that may cause a worker fatality or serious injury, CW or FW Radiation exposure > 5 rem, CW or FW Toxic Material Exposure > PAC-2, loss of equipment or facilities > \$2,000,000, or loss of production > 6 months?			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes If Yes, the DHA process is required. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If No, DHA is NOT required Provide justification for conclusion (required).	
Justification (consult with Nuclear Safety or Design Engineering as needed to justify conclusion): See Attachment				

Review & Approval signatures:

- Preparer and Design Authority Engineer can be the same.
- Safety Basis Regulatory Authority. If the Part A screening is positive, obtain Safety Basis Regulatory Authority approval.
- If the Part A screening is negative, Design Authority Manager may substitute for Safety Basis Regulatory Authority.

*Number per Smartplant Foundation (SPF). If SPF not used, Numbers should be of the form: X-CHA-Y-seq # where X is the discipline code and Y is the facility designator (e.g., S-CHA-H-0001).

**This form is intended to address unmitigated process hazards for any system/unit operation, regardless of functional classification.

Reviewer Preparer VOEGLTEN, ROBERT O	Date 9/2/2015
Design Authority Engineer VOEGLTEN, ROBERT O	Date 9/2/2015
Safety Basis Regulatory Authority or Designee ARTHUR, GREGORY CLARK	Date 9/10/2015

USQ-HTF-2015-00300 Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4

Title:

Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4

Proposed Activity:

The Proposed Activity (PA) is the “use-as-is” disposition of Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4. The specification identifies the requirements for the production and delivery of Tank Closure Grout. Section 3.2.3.3 Item A - “Provide a Slag Cement that meets the requirements of ASTM C 989, Grade 100”. The Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 proposes an additional option to use ASTM C 989, Grade 120 Slag.

The PA has a Functional Classification of General Services “GS”.

There are no interim configurations during the execution of this work that will adversely impact credited SSCs.

References (USQ):

WSRC-IM-94-10, Section: 3.0, Rev. 332 – LWD/WS PROJECTS SAFETY BASIS MANUAL

SAFETY BASIS DOCUMENTS:

WSRC-SA-2002-00007, Rev. 16, June 2014, “Concentration, Storage, and Transfer Facilities Documented Safety Analysis.”

S-TSR-G-00001, Rev. 47, May 2015, “Concentration, Storage, and Transfer Facilities Technical Safety Requirements.”

SB Document Change Request Packages:

HLW-CRF-14007, Rev. 1 (8/13/14) “299-H WCT Flammability, Saltstone Facility Interface” (Change to DSA, Chapters 3 and 5)

HLW-CRF-14008, Rev. 0 (9/24/2014) “Tank 15 Rewet” (Change to DSA, Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5)

HLW-CRF-14009, Rev. 0 (2/5/2015) “2F Evaporator Ventilation Temp Mod Removal” (Change to DSA, Chapter 2)

HLW-CRF-14011, Rev. 1 (2/11/15) “Installation of New 254-13H Diesel Generator” (Change to DSA, Chapters 1, 4, and 5)

HLW-CRF-15002, Rev. 0 (2/11/15) “Recognizing Boundaries for Control Room Operators” (Change to DSA, Chapter 5)

USQ-HTF-2015-00300 Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4

HLW-CRF-15001, Rev. 0 (2/27/15) "Addition of CHA for Commercial Submersible Mixer Pumps (CSMPs)" (Change to DSA, Chapters 2, 3, and 5)

HLW-CRF-15004, Rev. 1 (4/28/15) "MCU Caustic Wash Once-Through System Modifications" (Change to DSA, Chapters 2 and 6)

HLW-CRF-15003, Rev. 0 (4/1/15) "No-MST Operations" (Change to DSA, Chapters ES, 2, 3, 5, and 6)

HLW-CRF-15007, Rev. 0 (8/13/15) "242-16F/242-16H Automatic Isolation Valve Modification" (Change to DSA, Chapter 2)

CONFIGURATION MANAGED DOCUMENTS:

S-TSR-G-00001, Rev. 2015-B, TBD "Concentration, Storage, and Transfer Facilities Technical Safety Requirements."

WSRC-SA-2002-00007, Rev. 17, June 2015, "Concentration, Storage, and Transfer Facilities Documented Safety Analysis."

S-TSR-G-00001, Rev. 2015-C, TBD "Concentration, Storage, and Transfer Facilities Technical Safety Requirements."

SB Document Change Request Packages:

HLW-CRF-15005, Rev. 0 (5/26/15) "242-16H (2H) Evaporator Chemical Cleaning Process Improvement" (Change to DSA, Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13)

HLW-CRF-15007, Rev. 1 (8/13/15) "242-16F/242-16H Automatic Isolation Valve Modification" (Change to DSA, Chapter 2)

Reviewed WSRC-SA-2002-00007, Rev. 16 (Including Pending CRFs and Revision 17) Sections E2.2.1, E.3, 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.5.3, 2.5.7, 3.3.3.3.2, 3.4.1.5.2, 3.4.1.5.3, Tables 3.3-10 and 3.3-22, 4.3.10, 4.4.27, Tables 4.3-1 and 4.4-1, 5.4, 5.4.3, and 16.3.4.

The sections (5.5.4.2.1, 5.5.4.2.4, 5.5.4.2.8, and 5.5.4.2.43) of Chapter 5 that align with the TSR sections reviewed have been reviewed.

DATR List of Documents Reviewed:

S-CHA-F-00010 Revision 2, "Waste Tank Grouting"

SRR-LWE-2014-00147, Revision 0, "Tank 12H Grout Strategy"

USQ-HTF-2015-00300 Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4

Environmental Evaluation Checklist (EEC) LWO-H-2014-0047, Revision 0, "Environmental Evaluation Checklist - Tank 241-912H Grout Strategy"

SRR-LWE-2014-00013, Revision 1, "Tank 16H Grout Strategy"

Environmental Evaluation Checklist (EEC) LWO-H-2014-0026, Revision 1, "Tank 16 Electrical and Ventilation Isolation and Closure"

N-ESR-G-00001, Revision 742, "High Level Waste Emergency Response Data and Waste Tank Data"

SRR-CWDA-2010-00128, Revision 1, "H-Area Tank Farm (HTF) Performance Assessment (PA)"

SRS-REG-2007-00002, Revision 1, "Performance Assessment (PA) for the F-Tank Farm at the Savannah River Site"

DOE/SRS-WD-2014-001, Revision 0, "Basis for Section 3116 Determination for Closure of H-Tank Farm at the Savannah River Site"

UWMQE-SRR-CWDA-2015-00088, Revision 0, "Use of Grade 120 Slag in Tank Closure Grout"

SRR-CWDA-2015-00057, Revision 1, "Evaluation of the Use of Grade 120 Slag Cement in Tank Closure Grout Verses Performance Assessment Assumptions"

U-DCF-H-00279, Revision 0, "Modify Waste Tank Grouting CHA, S-CHA-F-00010, Revision 2, "Waste Tank Grouting Consolidated Hazard Analysis (CHA)" to Remove Slag Grade Designation"

DATR – System Acceptability Review

The Proposed Activity (PA) is the additional option to use ASTM C 989, Grade 120 Slag in the tank closure grout. The specification (C-SPP-F-00055) identifies the requirements for the production and delivery of Tank Closure Grout. Section 3.2.3.3 Item A - "Provide a Slag Cement that meets the requirements of ASTM C 989, Grade 100". The Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 proposes an additional option to use ASTM C 989, Grade 120 Slag.

A USQS has been performed and found the PA to be acceptable. The Environmental Evaluation Checklists (EEC) LWO-H-2014-0013 "Tank 16 Grouting" and LWO-H-2014-0047 "Tank 241-912H Grout Strategy" are not impacted by the PA.

Because the PA alters the closure grout formulation a UWMQ Determination was performed and an UWMQ Evaluation was required. UWMQE-SRR-CWDA-2015-00088, "Use of Grade 120 Slag in Tank Closure Grout (USQ-HTF-2015-00300)" was approved and the PA was determined to be acceptable – the use of Slag Grade 120 in the bulk fill formulated per C-SPP-F-00055 will not compromise the conclusions of the Performance Assessment (SRR-CWDA-2010-00128) and the Waste Determination (DOE/SRS-WD-2014-001). Furthermore, SRR-CWDA-2015-00057 "Evaluation of the Use of Grade 120 Slag Cement in Tank Closure Grout Verses Performance Assessment Assumptions" assessed using Grade 100 Slag versus

USQ-HTF-2015-00300 Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4

assumptions contained in the Performance Assessments of F and H Tank Farms (SRS-REG-2007-00002 and SRR-CWDA-2010-00128 and concluded that the use of Grade 120 slag is acceptable.

The implementation of the PA will not have an adverse impact to the facility or its associated systems.

Screening Questions:

Is the Proposed Activity a change to TSRs or JCO controls?

Justification:

S-TSR-G-00001 "Concentration, Storage, and Transfer Facilities Technical Safety Requirements" was reviewed. The section 1.6 and Administrative Controls 5.8.2.1, 5.8.2.4, 5.8.2.8, and 5.8.2.43 were applicable. Waste Tank grouting is associated with Tanks in Closure Mode. There are no LCO controls associated with Closure Mode. The PA complies with the Administrative Controls stated above and does not change the TSRs. There are no JCOs associated with CSTF.

Does the Proposed Activity permanently eliminate a DID/ITS or Degrade its safety Function as explicitly described on the Safety Basis?

Justification:

Reviewed the CSTF Defense in Depth (DID)/ Important to Safety (ITS) SSCs in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3.3.3.2 and Table 3.3-22) of the DSA (WSRC-SA-2002-00007, Rev. 16). WSRC-SA-2002-00007 Rev. 16, Section 3.3.3.3.2 states that DID/ITS hazard controls are not required for CSTF locations in Closure Mode unless otherwise identified in Table 3.3-22. The Slag Grade or grout formulation is not identified as a CSTF Defense in Depth (DID)/ Important to Safety (ITS) SSCs. Therefore, the PA (additional option to use ASTM C 989, Grade 120 Slag) does not permanently eliminate a DID/ITS or degrade its safety function as explicitly described in the SB.

Does the Proposed Activity involve a:

- a. *Change to the facility as described in the Safety Basis? No*
- b. *Change to the procedures as described in the Safety Basis? No*
- c. *Test or experiment not described in the Safety Basis? No*

USQ-HTF-2015-00300 Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4

Justification:

- a. The Proposed Activity (PA) is the additional option to use ASTM C 989, Grade 120 Slag in the tank closure grout. The Safety Basis (SB) does not credit the grout formulation. The Safety Basis describes the grout formula; however, the alternative formula does not conflict with these elements.

- 1) Per S-CHA-F-00010 (U-DCF-H-00279, Revision 0) (Waste Tank Grouting Consolidated Hazard Analysis [CHA]), Section 2.3.1 "Facility Configuration" -

"Typical grout is composed of Type I/II Portland cement, quartz sand, granite aggregate, water, fly ash, slag cement, and additives to enhance processing and flowability. To facilitate placement from the tank top, closure grout is flowable, pumpable, and self-leveling with cohesive properties to minimize segregation."

When describing the grout formulation, the CHA states slag cement and does not specify the grade of the slag. Because the slag designation is not defined in the description, the alternative grout formula does not conflict with the CHA description.

- 2) DSA Sections 2.5.3 (Waste Removal), 2.5.7 (Waste Tank/Equipment Grouting), and 3.4.1.5.2 (Facility Configurations and Design Inputs) describes the grout to be used for Tank Closures as reducing, flowable, pumpable, self-leveling, and designed to not heat the waste to boiling.

When describing the grout formulation, the DSA does not describe the characteristics of the slag. The identified characteristics in the DSA will not be impacted by the alternative grade of slag (Ref. SRR-CWDA-2015-00057, Revision 1).

Additionally, UWMQE-SRR-CWDA-2015-00088, "Use of Grade 120 Slag in Tank Closure Grout (USQ-HTF-2015-00300)" was approved and the PA was determined to be acceptable – the use of Slag Grade 120 in the bulk fill formulated per C-SPP-F-00055 will not compromise the conclusions of the Performance Assessment (SRR-CWDA-2010-00128) and the Waste Determination (DOE/SRS-WD-2014-001).

There are no interim configurations during the execution of this work that will adversely impact credited SSCs.

The PA aligns with the facility as described in Documented Safety Analysis (DSA) (WSRC-SA-2002-00007, Rev 16).

USQ-HTF-2015-00300 Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4

- b. DSA Section 16.3.4 (Waste Tank and Ancillary Equipment Closure) states that the use of reducing grout is the most preferred environmental alternative and the least hazardous for closure of the waste tanks and associated equipment.

In addition, the PA ensures continued compliance with Configuration Management Program (DSA Section 5.5.4.2.8) as it (a.) ensures that changes to the technical baseline are properly developed, assessed, approved, issued, & implemented and (b.) complies with the facilities system for recording, controlling, and indicating the status of technical baseline documentation on a current basis.

Because the PA is in alignment with the facility's approved, SB related procedures and governing processes/programs, no changes to procedures as described in the SB will result from this PA. Therefore, the PA does not change procedures as described or implied in the SB.

- c. The PA does not change the facility nor does it require operating the facility in modes or conditions not previously analyzed in the DSA. The PA is not, and does not support, a test or experiment not described in the SB. The PA does not require equipment or SSCs to be operated in modes beyond which they were designed or previously evaluated in the Safety Basis. The PA is not a test or experiment that is not described in the Safety Basis.

Consolidated Hazard Analysis Process (CHAP) Screening

1. *Is this a new facility, new process, process change, or physical modification to an existing facility that could potentially introduce new hazards or increase the consequence or frequency of a current hazard, thereby impacting safety basis controls?*

Justification:

The PA is not a new facility, new process, process change, or physical modification. The Proposed Activity (PA) is the additional option to use ASTM C 989, Grade 120 Slag in the tank closure grout. The PA is within the scope evaluated by S-CHA-F-00010, Revision 2 "Waste Tank Grouting Consolidated Hazard Analysis" and U-DCF-H-00279, Revision 0, "Modify Waste Tank Grouting CHA, S-CHA-F-00010, Revision 2, "Waste Tank Grouting Consolidated Hazard Analysis (CHA)" to Remove Slag Grade Designation". This PA does not impact or invalidate any conclusions of this CHA. The PA does not add new hazards or increase the frequency of a current hazard.

USQ-HTF-2015-00300 Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number
13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4

2. Is this a new facility, new process, process change, or physical modification to an existing facility that could potentially introduce new hazards, increase the consequences or frequency of a current hazard, or result in impacting the controls, associated with a current hazard that may cause a worker fatality or serious injury, CW or FW Radiation exposure > 5 rem, CW or FW Toxic Material Exposure > PAC-2, loss of equipment or facility > \$2,000,000, or loss of production > 6 months?

Justification:

The PA is not a new facility, new process, process change, or physical modification. The Proposed Activity (PA) is the additional option to use ASTM C 989, Grade 120 Slag in the tank closure grout. No new hazards are introduced with this activity. The PA does not impact the consequences or frequency of a current hazard or control. The PA's unmitigated event consequences will not result in a worker fatality or serious injury, CW or FW Radiation Exposure > 5 rem, CW or FW Toxic Material Exposure > PAC-2, loss of equipment (>\$2,000K), facilities (>\$2,000K), or production (> 6 months). The interim and final configuration will be managed through implementation of the requirements of the Manual 1Y and 2S. Therefore, the DHA process is not required.

**FTF/HTF APPLICABILITY DETERMINATION FOR UNREVIEWED
WASTE MANAGEMENT QUESTION**

DATR Number: USQ-HTF-2015-00300;0

Date: August 28, 2015

Title: Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number 13182 - Deviation from Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Rev 4

Proposed Activity Description:

Per Procurement Specification C-SPP-F-00055, Revision 4, "Furnishing and Delivery of Tank Closure Grout".....
Section 3.2.3.3 "Slag Cement", a Slag Cement that meets the requirements of ASTM C 989, Grade 100 is to be.....
used in the waste tank stabilization fill grout formulation. However, due to a limited supply of Slag Cement Grade.....
100, an alternate grade of Slag Cement is proposed in Supplier Deviation Disposition Request (SDDR) Number.....
13182. The SDDR changes the specification to allow for the use of ASTM C 989, Grade 120 Slag Cement.....
.....
Therefore because it is a change to the waste tank stabilization formulation, a UWMQE is required.....
.....
.....

Fill out this checklist for proposed activities defined as applicable to Tank Closure Activities. If the answer is YES to any of the following questions, the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) group shall perform an Unreviewed Waste Management Question (UWMQ) Evaluation.

FTF/HTF UWMQ Applicability Determination

Does the proposed activity:		
(1) Change the waste tank or waste tank annulus structure?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No
(2) Impact the waste tank concrete vault integrity (waste tank top, side walls and basemat)?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No
(3) Change the waste tank stabilization fill grout formulation?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
(4) Introduce new material (liquid or solid) into the tank/annulus after residual sampling has begun?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No
(5) Change the final equipment configuration within the waste tank/annulus?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No

Note: use shift key to deselect radio buttons.

PDF completed form and attach to DATR in SPF.