NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION

KEITH J. CHARTERS, Chair NANCY A. DOUGLAS PAUL EISELE 'OB GARNER /ILLIAM U. PARFET .:RANK WHEATLAKE

JOHN ENGLER, Governor **DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES**

OFFICE OF PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

PO BOX 30448 LANSING Ml 48909-7948

REPLY TO:

STEVENS T MASON BUILDING, PO BOX 30028, LANSING Ml 48909-7528 WEBSITE: www.michigandnr.com

K. L. COOL, Director

September 4, 2001

Mr. Sam Nalluswami, Ph.D., P.E. Decommissioning Branch Division of Waste Management Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards U.S. Nuoleur Regulatory Commission Mail Stop T7F27 Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Mr. Nalluswami:

Enclosed for your information and review are two copies of the Final Characterization Survey Report (with Appendices) for the Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site (License SUC-1581). As noted in my telephone message on August 31, 2001, we would like to sit down with your staff in Washington on or about October 1, 2001, to discuss draft DCLG's and dose calculations. Prior to that meeting, we will be providing you with additional materials specific to that discussion.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to call me at the number noted below.

Sincerely,

Denise Gruben Program Manager Office of Property Management 517-335-4036

cc: Mr. Ed Kulzer, US NRC Mr. David Minnaar, MDEQ Mr. Tim Bertram, MDEQ Mr. Christopher Dobyns, MDAG Ms. Kelli Sobel, MDNR Mr. Rick Dunkin, HESE

FINAL DRAFT

HARACTERIZATION SURVEY REPORT

Tobico Marsh SGA Site Kawkawlin, Michigan

Prepared for:

Harding ESE, Inc. Under Contract Number 2004 to Michigan Department of Natural Resources

Prepared by:

Cabrera Services, Inc. 809 Main Street East Hartford, CT 06108

August 2001

809 Main Street • East Hartford, CT 06108 • Phone: (860) 289-1885 • Fax (860) 289-2261 • www.cabreraservices.com

FINAL DRAFT

CHARACTERIZATION SURVEY REPORT

Tobico Marsh SGA Site Kawkawlin, Michigan

Prepared for:

Harding ESE, Inc. Under Contract Number 2004 to Michigan Department of Natural Resources

Prepared by:

Cabrera Services, Inc. 809 Main Street East Hartford, CT 06108

August 2001

 \mathbf{r}

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site Final Draft Characterization Survey Report

 \sim

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 4-1 Gamma and Alpha Spectroscopy Results
- Table 4-2 Ratios of Th-230 to Th-232 Sample Results
- Table 6-1 Nal Gross Gamma 10-Second Duplicate Results
- Table 6-2 Nal Downhole Spectroscopy Duplicate Results
- Table 6-3 Gamma and Alpha Spectroscopy Duplicate Results
- Table 6-4 Comparison of NaI Spectroscopic and Laboratory Sample Results
- Table 6-5 Comparison of Nal Gross Counts Converted to Th-232 Concentration and Laboratory Sample Results

LIST OF FIGURES

- Regional Location Map Tobico Marsh SGA Site Figure 1-1
- Site Location Map Tobico Marsh SGA Site Figure 1-2
- 1969 Aerial Photograph and Map Tobico Marsh SGA Site Figure 1-3
- 1998 Aerial Photograph Tobico Marsh SGA Site Figure 1-4
- Figure 3-1 Site Map Tobico Marsh SGA Site
- Figure 4-1 Counts Contours - Maximum in Vertical Column
- Figure 4-2 Counts Contours - 591 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-3 Counts Contours - 590 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-4 Counts Contours - 589 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-5 Counts Contours - 588 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-6 Counts Contours - 587 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-7 Counts Contours - 586 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-8 Counts Contours - 585 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-9 Counts Contours - 584 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-10 Counts Contours - 583 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-11 Counts Contours - 582 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-12 Counts Contours - 581 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-13 Counts Contours - 580 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-14 Counts Contours - 579 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-15 Counts Contours - 578 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-16 Counts Contours - 577 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-17 Counts Contours - 576 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-18 Counts Contours - 575 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-19 Counts Contours - 574 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-20 Counts Contours - 573 Feet Elevation
- Figure 4-21 Cross Section Locations
- Figure 4-22 Cross Section A-A'
- Figure 4-23 Cross Section B-B'
- Figure 4-24 Cross Section C-C'
- Figure 4-25 Max Gross Gamma Count Contours
- Figure 4-26 Max Th-232 Sample Results with Max Gross Gamma Count Contours
- Figure 4-27 Max Th-232 Downhole in-situ Gamma Spectroscopy Results with Max Gross Gamma Count Contours
- Figure 4-28 Th-230 to Th-232 Ratio with Max Gross Gamma Count Contours
- Figure 5-1 Site Grid System and Initial Area Classification Tobico Marsh SGA
- Figure 5-2 Reference Area 10-Second Gross Gamma Counts Histogram
- Figure 5-3 Class 2 and 3 10-Second Gross Gamma Counts Histogram
- Figure 5-4 Class 1 10-Second Gross Gamma Counts Histogram
- Figure 5-5 Class 1 10-Second Gross Gamma Counts Histogram (Log Scale)

 \sim

....

 $\zeta_{\rm{tot}}$

 $\ddot{}$

LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix D Technical Memorandum No. 4 - Downhole NaI Efficiency Factor
- Appendix E-1 Tobico Reference Area Downhole 10- Second Counts
- Appendix E-2 Tobico Site Downhole 10- Second Counts
- Appendix F-I Tobico Reference Area NaI Spectroscopy Results
- Appendix F-2 Tobico Site Downhole NaI Spectroscopy Results

ACRONYMS

 \sim

 \leftarrow

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site characterization survey was performed to provide a radiological mapping of contaminants present in the MARSSIM Class 1, 2, and 3 areas on the Site. The mapping will provide the State of Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) with information necessary to plan and execute decommissioning. This action is one step in the process necessary to terminate MDNR's NRC license in accordance with Subpart E to Title 10, Part 20, of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

This characterization survey report was designed to:

- * document the Site radiological contamination results spatially (by depth and aerial extent), ultimately providing a graphical review and posting plot of the radiological contamination;
- provide sufficient detail to support finalization of the site-specific dose assessment, as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) analysis, development of the Site Decommissioning Plan, and determination of potential disposal options for remediated wastes; and
- document data of sufficient quality and quantity to provide the basis for the development of a final status survey in areas suspected to be free of contamination (i.e., Class 2 and Class 3 Survey areas).

During previous investigations and historical review, radioactive constituents of potential concern (RCOPCs) were developed. The RCOPCs used during the planning for The RCOPCs used during the planning for characterization are isotopes of thorium and their progeny; specifically, thorium-232 in secular equilibrium with its progeny and thorium-230 with small relative quantities of radium-226 and its progeny. Secondary RCOPCs include isotopes of uranium.

A Site conceptual model was developed based on the results of previous investigations and historical data reviews, and describes the assumed in-situ Site conditions. The design of the Site survey was based upon model expectations that include radioactive contamination present in the center of the Site. The contamination was assumed to reside in a horizontal layer between the bottom surface of the Site clay cap and the upper surface of the sand layer. No radioactive contamination was expected below a native clay layer present beneath the sand layer.

In-situ sodium iodide (NaI) gamma measurements were perforrmed to estimate the lateral and vertical extent of radioactive materials present in the Site, to provide an estimate of thorium-232 activity concentrations and to develop a three-dimensional rendering of Site radiological contaminants. GeoProbe® casings were driven to a depth equal to or greater than the upper boundary of the native clay layer at selected measurement locations. A 1" x 1" Bicron GI Nal crystal detector was inserted into the casing and provided thoriun-232 gross gamma and spectroscopic data. The gross gamma measurements were performed at one-foot intervals starting one foot below the ground surface (bgs), and continuing to the casing bottom.

Spectroscopic gamma measurements were collected at biased locations based on gross gamma counts.

Grab soil samples were collected and analyzed using contract laboratory gamma and alpha spectroscopy to correlate and verify gross gamma measurements for the radionuclides of concern. Soil samples were used to determine the levels of thorium-230, an alpha emitter not detectable by Nal analysis as well as to provide soil concentration estimates for radium-226 and isotopes of uranium. Soil and water samples were also used to measure site-specific hydrogeological parameters, water potability, and chemical waste characteristics of the soil. These are important parameters for pathway modeling and proper waste characterization.

The characterization survey gross gamma survey produced approximately 6,000 data points. These data were used to develop gross gamma count contours by vertical elevations to provide a three-dimensional view of the Site contamination. Based on this data, the majority of the site-contaminated volume was determined to be limited to approximately one nine-foot thick layer (587 feet to 579 feet above mean sea level (MSL)). Small amounts of radioactivity
in excess of background levels range to denths of about 22 feet bgs. All radioactive in excess of background levels range to depths of about 22 feet bgs. All radioactive
contamination regardless of depth remains within the Site Class 1 boundaries. No contamination, regardless of depth, remains within the Site Class 1 boundaries. radioactive contamination was found in the Class 2 or Class 3 survey areas.

Thorium-232 activity concentrations detected during the characterization survey ranged from background levels to approximately 2,000 pCi/g in one isolated area. The thorium-230 activity concentrations ranged from background levels to approximately 440 pCi/g. Radium-226 activity concentrations were co-located with elevated Th-230 and were approximately 3% of the thorium-230 activity concentration. The radium-226 levels ranged from background to 11 pCi/g. This radium-226 level is consistent with assumptions regarding the relationship of Th-230 and Ra-226 as documented in the Characterization Survey Work Plan (CABRERA 1999b). Overall uranium-234, -235, and -238 activity concentrations detected at the Tobico Site are present at concentrations typical of U.S. Soils and are present only at background levels.

The characterization survey gross gamma survey minimum detectable concentration (MDC) in soil is estimated as 1.3 pCi/g for thorium-232. The thorium-230 to thorium-232 activity ratios detected varied from 0.5:1 to 11:1. The thorium ratios do not vary widely over the Site but rather are clustered in areas by what appears to be different waste streams. Activity above background was found to be within the confines of the MARSSlIM Class I survey unit.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site (Site), also known as the SCAlHartley and Hartley Landfill, is a closed waste disposal Site listed on the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP). Inclusion on the SDMP resulted from past disposal of magnesium-thorium wastes at the Site. The State of Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), which owns a portion of the Site, has an NRC license, No. SUC-1581, to possess the radioactive material buried therein. The MDNR intends to terminate its license and release the Site in accordance with Subpart E to Title 10, Part 20, of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR 20) (NRC 1997a). To assist MDNR in this goal, the MDNR retained its contractor, Harding Lawson Associates (HLA) and HLA's subcontractors Cabrera Services, Inc. (Cabrera), Paragon Analytics, Inc. (Paragon), and Steams Drilling (Steams), Inc., to perform a characterization survey of the Site.

This characterization survey report describes the methodology employed and the results obtained during the characterization survey investigation of radiological and chemical The work performed for this Report is a subset of the Characterization Work Plan (CABRERA 1999b) and the QAPP (CABRERA 1999c and CABRERA 2000). This report's purpose is to document and report the radiological contamination measurement results, obtained from in-situ downhole gamma measurements and volumetric samples analyzed by gamma and alpha spectroscopy, with respect to source depth and isotopic source term. Chemical and physical characteristics of the Site including chemical constituents, Site geology, and geotechnical parameters, are also documented to support future reports detailing site-specific dose assessment, DCGL development, and the development of a Site Decommissioning Plan.

1.1 **Objectives**

The primary objectives of this characterization survey report are to:

- document the Site radiological contamination results spatially (by depth and aerial extent), ultimately providing a graphical review and posting plot of the radiological contamination;
- provide sufficient detail to support finalization of the site-specific dose assessment, as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) analysis, development of the Site Decommissioning Plan, and determination of potential disposal options for remediated wastes; and
- document data of sufficient quality and quantity to provide the basis for the development of a final status survey in areas suspected to be free of contamination (i.e., Class 2 and Class 3 Survey areas).

The characterization survey was also designed to provide information inputs recommended by the guidance contained in Draft Regulatory Guide DG-4006, *Demonstrating Compliance with the Radiological Criteria for License Termination* (NRC 1998), and NUREG-1575, *Multi-Agency Radiation Survey and Site Investigation Manual (MARSSIM)* (NRC 1997). NUREG-1727, *"NMSS Decommissioning Standard Review Plan"* (NRC 2000) was not released until 2000. However a draft of this document, released in 1999 for public review, was used to help determine possible regulatory requirements, scope, and direction for the characterization survey. These documents provide a framework that is acceptable to the NRC for designing final status surveys in support of NRC license termination. The data collected during this investigation will provide the basis for decisions on remedial actions, DCGL development, and subsequent final status surveys. The ultimate project objective is to demonstrate compliance with the license termination criteria contained in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 20, Subpart E, license termination criteria.

1.2 **Site Description**

The Site consists of a closed waste-disposal facility covered with a clay cap and surrounded by a bentonite slurry wall. The Site is part of a former industrial waste-disposal area, where an estimated 18,000 barrels of spent solvents, oils, and other liquid and solid wastes were disposed of during the 1960s and early 1970s. Low-level radioactive waste in the form of magnesium-thorium slag was also disposed of at the Site beginning late in 1970. The Site, which was opened in the mid-1950s, was originally operated by the Hartley family as part of the Hartley and Hartley Landfill. In a formal land exchange in 1973, the Hartleys conveyed the Site to the State of Michigan in return for lands bordering their landfill Site. Later that year, SCA, Inc. of Massachusetts acquired the larger Hartley and Hartley Landfill Site (which is south and east of the state Site), although the Hartleys continued to manage the facility. From this time on, the non-state site was referred to as the SCA Landfill. At the end of 1984, Waste Management, Inc. (WMI) acquired SCA, Inc. and became the owner of the Hartley and Hartley Landfill. In 1998, the Site changed hands again when WMI was purchased by USA Waste. The Site covers approximately three acres of land within the State of Michigan's Tobico Marsh State Game Area and is located within Kawkawlin Township, Bay County, Michigan (Figures 1-1, 1-2, and 3-1).

1.2.1 Physical Description

Approximately 50 to 100 feet of glacial till underlies the Site, forming the upper confining layer of a deep, brackish, confined aquifer. The till is composed of clay and silt and a trace of gravel. It is very dense, unstratified, and heterogeneous, and is reported to have a permeability of 5.4 x 10^{-8} cm/s (Appendix B). Post-glacial beach sand deposits 5 to 8 feet thick overlie the till. Thin peat laminations are encountered in the sand deposits. Peat deposits are thicker in natural topographic depressions and are reported up to four feet thick. In undisturbed areas near the Site, black highly organic topsoil has formed.

Swampy wetland conditions and ponded water prevail in the Tobico Marsh SGA. Artificial surface drainage patterns have been established with areal drainage by the Indian Town Drain *Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site*

(see Figure 1-2). The post-glacial beach sand deposits beneath the Site serve as an unconfined aquifer. This aquifer has a saturated thickness of up to 8 feet east of the Site and less than 1 foot west of the Site where the till layer surfaces. The unconfined aquifer is reported to have a permeability of about 6.4×10^{-3} cm/s (Appendix B). Due to its shallow depth, groundwater movement on the Site is directly influenced by the surface water drainage system, whether man-made or natural.

With the exception of the overlying sands, the geologic conditions are not conducive to vertical mobility of water between aquifers. The low conductivity glacial till underlying the sands is an impediment to vertical migration of groundwater and its contents.

1.2.2 Pre-operational Site History

A black and white photograph, taken April 11, 1954, portrays the area prior to the initiation of disposal operations by Hartley & Hartley, the original Site operators. A pond, currently located immediately north of the Site, is not visible on this photograph. In its place appears a raised area that is not marsh (probably a beach sand deposit). Surface water bodies currently located south and southwest of the adjoining SCA landfill are not present on the photograph.

The first invasive activity to take place on the parcel of land now occupied by the Site was the construction of a road in the late 1950s. The road was apparently constructed to provide access for the excavation of sand deposits located immediately north of the Site. This sand excavation appears to have created the pond currently located immediately north of the Site.

1.3 **Operational Site History**

The following list provides brief highlights of the Site's operational history. A more extensive historical account is provided in the Characterization Survey Work Plan (CABRERA 1999b).

- * Following construction of the access road in the late 1950s, waste disposals included foundry sands, drummed liquid chemicals, cutting oils, oil-field tank bottoms, and oil field brines. Records do not indicate subsurface burials.
- Routine inspection reports in February of 1969 show that dumping activities had extended onto what would become State of Michigan property. Total area of trespass was approximately three acres. A rudimentary road consisted of crushed drums was constructed. Illegal dumping continued into the early 1970s.
- An aerial photograph from July of 1969 depicts disposal activities of the time. Visible white and/or gray piles were tentatively identified as non-radioactive slag originating from a magnesium casting operation at a nearby Dow Chemical facility (Figure 1-3)
- During the period April of 1970 to July of 1970, a sand cover was installed over the extended portion of the disposal area. A 1973 aerial photograph shows the formerly

visible disposal areas covered with sand. Following the sand cover installation, limited disposal continued through approximately 1973, when the State of Michigan acquired the Site.

- During the period August 1970 to June 1971, Wellman Dynamics exchanged a series of letters with the Michigan Department of Public Health (MDPH), seeking permission to bury thorium-bearing wastes at the Hartley Site in accordance with AEC regulations. Due to AEC's refusal to allow non-licensed radioactive material disposal at the Hartley Site, MDPH rejected Wellman Dynamics' request.
- During these exchanges, and subsequent to the sand cover installation, radioactive waste in the form of magnesium-thorium slag was dumped on the surface at the Site. No data were located indicating subsurface burial of these materials. It should be noted that the magnesium-thorium (radioactive) slag is visually similar to the slag originating from magnesium (non-radioactive) casting operations. More detail on radioactive waste disposal at the Site is provided below.
- In 1983, following a geophysical survey by the State of Michigan to locate buried metallic materials, the Site's slurry wall (approximately three feet thick and keyed into the underlying glacial till) and clay cap (approximately two to five feet thick) were constructed, forming the currently existing waste cell. No evidence was found indicating that the sand cover was moved during installation of the cap and walls
- * Following slurry wall and cap installation, the Leachate Collection and Treatment System (LCTS) was constructed to remove water from the waste cell, treat it for nonradioactive contaminants, and discharge it to a sanitary sewer system. The LCTS has never been operated. As a result, the building and treatment components never came in contact with leachate from the Site. In 2000, the carbon units in the building were removed from the Site. Figure 1-4 is a 1998 aerial photograph showing the Tobico Marsh SGA Site. The Site borders, LCTS structure, and concrete wash pad are currently unchanged. Downhole characterization survey borings are not visible since this activity took place in 1999 and 2000.

Placement of the magnesium thorium slag on top of the sand cover is believed to have begun, in September of 1970, primarily on the road through the central portion of the Site or in areas immediately adjacent to the road where the surrounding marsh had been filled.

The probability of the migration of slag placed on the sand cover is very low. Since the magnesium-thorium slag is not readily soluble in water, the potential for the materials to dissolve in water and spread with the migration of either surface water or groundwater is limited. Physical transport of the materials after they were placed on the ground, however, may have occurred via runoff and subsequent disposal operations.

Disposal operations at the Site (including truck traffic, bull dozing, etc.) subsequent to the placement of radioactive material on the ground surface may have redistributed the material to a small degree. The extent to which this redistribution would have occurred is limited by the presence of the marsh (it is believed that heavy equipment did not travel routinely from the fill areas out onto the marshy areas).

With placement of the clay cap and the slurry wall, it is assumed that magnesium-thorium slag became encapsulated in the cell bounded by the low permeability clay till on the bottom, the slurry wall on the sides, and the clay cap on top. This encapsulation effectively ended any potential for further physical transport of the radioactive materials beyond the confines of the cell.

1.4 **Radioactive Constituents of Potential Concern (RCOPC)**

RCOPCs were developed during previous investigations and historical data review. The RCOPCs used during the planning for characterization are isotopes of thorium and their progeny; specifically, Th-232 in secular equilibrium with its progeny and Th-230 with small relative quantities of radium-226 and its progeny. Secondary RCOPCs include isotopes of uranium.

1.5 **Site Natural Background Radionuclide Concentrations**

Soil samples collected during a preliminary background assessment (ABB 1998) were compared with published average radionuclide concentrations for Michigan and the United States. It was found that the Site samples exhibited concentrations similar to or lower than the State and national averages for the majority of the analytes. Comparisons of background radionuclide concentrations for surface and subsurface soils are provided below.

Summary of Natural Background Radionuclide Concentrations (pCi/g)

(1) (Myrick 1983)

(2) (Lowder 1964)

(3) (UNSCEAR 1988)

 $^{(4)}$ values preceded by "+/-" represent the 95% confidence level of the reported average

(5) values reported in parentheses represent typical ranges of radionuclide concentrations

(6) NR indicates the trial value was not reported

1.6 Site Conceptual Model

Based on results of previous investigations and historical data reviews, a Site conceptual model was developed to describe the assumed in-situ Site conditions. Some points relevant to the Site characterization survey are:

- Radioactive contamination was expected to be found down the center of the Site, where surveys performed prior to cap placement identified radioactive contaminants.
- Radioactive contamination was expected to exist in a horizontal layer between the bottom surface of the clay cap and the top surface of the native clay.
- The native clay layer underlying the Site was expected to be encountered between 13 and 15 feet below ground surface (bgs).
- Radioactive contamination was not expected to be found below the native clay layer.

1.7 **Reference Coordinate System**

During the characterization survey, a Global Positioning System (GPS)-based system (grid) All sampling and measurement locations were established using the same GPS system.

2.0 **DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVES**

The data quality objectives (DQO) process is a tool by which the planning phase of the Data Life Cycle is carried out (NRC 1997). DQOs were developed for this survey and used in its design. The DQO process specific to this project is described in detail in the work plan (CABRERA 1999b). The resulting DQOs, as well as the survey results relating to each one, are discussed in Section 4.0 of this report.

3.0 **CHARACTERIZATION SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

Samples and radiological measurements were collected in accordance with approved Tobico Marsh SGA procedures and the Characterization Survey Work Plan (CABRERA 1999b). Measurement locations were posted on a map of the Site, included as Figure 3-1. Survey activities fall into two general categories: direct radiation measurements and sample collection and analysis. Each of these is discussed in the following sections.

Both gamma radiation measurements and samples were also collected in a background, or reference area, located approximately 0.25 mile from the Site.

3.1 Direct Gamma Radiation Measurements

As discussed in Section 0, radioactive material was expected to be encountered only below the Site's clay cap. Routine monthly walkovers of 100% of the Site using a gamma sensitive microrem meter verified that radioactive material present at the Site remained in a subsurface position. No changes to background levels were noted during routine walkovers that were conducted prior to, during, or after characterization surveys were performed. These results are the same as described by the previous Scoping Survey Report (HLA 1998a).

Characterization survey direct radiation measurements were obtained from subsurface areas. Access to these subsurface areas obtained through use of a 66-DT GeoProbe[®] unit that advanced steel casings into the ground under hydraulic power. The casings were 2.125 inches in outer diameter (OD) and 1.5 inches in inner diameter (ID). Radiological surveys were carried out in accordance with the Site license and approved Tobico Marsh SGA procedures, as well as lower tier procedures and work instructions prepared specifically to control Site characterization tasks. The methods and rationale used to determine numbers and locations of measurements is discussed fully in the work plan (CABRERA 1999b). Specific methodologies are described in the following sections.

3.1.1 Downhole Gross Gamma Measurements Using NalDetector

In-situ sodium iodide (Nal) gamma measurements were performed to estimate the lateral and vertical extent of radioactive materials and estimate Th-232 activity concentrations. At each selected measurement location, the drilling contractor inserted a GeoProbe® casing to a depth equal to or within the upper margin of the native clay layer beneath the marsh. Integrated measurements were performed at one-foot intervals starting one foot below the ground surface (bgs), continuing to the casing bottom. Measurements were made using a 1" \times 1" Bicron Gl Nal crystal coupled to a laptop computer-based spectroscopic analysis system. The detector was placed into a ripstop nylon sleeve and lowered into the steel casing by means of an attached cable. At each one-foot interval, gross gamma count rates over an energy range from approximately 20 keV to approximately 1,000 keV were recorded during the 10-second measurement period. Throughout the survey, the spectroscopy system's energy calibration was maintained to avoid non-radiological (e.g., weather, etc.) gain issues. Increments of 1 foot were chosen to provide sufficient vertical definition for the threedimensional rendering of the Site.

3.1.2 Downhole Spectroscopic Measurements Using NalDetector

The in-situ Nal gamma detection system described in Section 3.1.1, operating in spectroscopic mode, was used to quantify the Th-232 concentrations in subsurface soils. These measurements followed the gross gamma measurements and locations (i.e., depths) and were selected based upon field review of the gross gamma data to determine appropriate depths. Collection times for spectroscopic data were 300 and 900 seconds "live time" in duration.

At each downhole measurement location, a single 900-second spectroscopic count was taken at the location of highest gross gamma counts within that GeoProbe® casing. In addition, four or five 300-second spectroscopic counts were collected at other locations within that downhole casing at depths exhibiting higher gross gamma readings. The detected activities were compared to laboratory analytical results for sub-surface soil sample collected via a 66-DT GeoProbeg.

The measured activity concentrations of Th-232 results were based on the principle of secular equilibrium and the results of sample analyses. Data was analyzed by translating NaI net total absorption peak response into Th-232 activity concentration using the Canberra Genie 2000 software. Th-232 activity concentrations were quantified by measuring its radioactive progeny and assuming secular equilibrium in the thorium series. The Pb-212 progeny provided the best detection sensitivity, based on actual results, and was selected as the primary Th-232 surrogate. The Pb-212 and other Th-232 progeny that were evaluated, along with their associated gamma lines are listed below.

The NaI spectroscopy system was calibrated with a reference material in a configuration similar to that expected in the field in order to determine the efficiency of the instrument. The reference standard consisted of a six-gallon plastic bucket filled with monazite sand with a section of GeoProbe® casing inserted into the center of the bucket. The Th-232 activity concentration in the sand was quantified by laboratory gamma spectroscopy analysis of the sand by an NRC-licensed, analytical laboratory. Prior to laboratory analysis, the sand was thoroughly mixed. All sand was analyzed, in one-liter aliquots, prior to transfer into the reference standard. The Nal system was then calibrated using this reference standard by inserting the detector into the GeoProbeg casing and performing five ten-minute counts. Net peak count rates for each of the gamma lines listed above was recorded. The average net count rate and associated variance was entered into the Canberra Genie 2000 software to develop an efficiency curve and associated errors. This efficiency curve was used to quantify Th-232 activity concentrations during Site measurements.

3.2 **Sample Collection and Analysis**

Subsurface soil samples from the Site were collected and screened in the field and submitted to Paragon for laboratory analyses. Hyrogeological samples were analyzed by Materials Testing Consultants, Inc. (MTC) and ignitability analysis was provided by Severn Trent Laboratories Inc. (STL). Analyses performed fall into three general categories: radiological, chemical, and hydrogeological. Each of these categories is discussed in Sections 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5, respectively.

3.2.1 Sample Documentation

Collected samples were assigned a unique sample identification number and recorded in the field logbook. At a minimum, recorded information included the sample location, identification number, and date collected. If a sample could not be collected due to drilling conditions, weather conditions, or equipment failure, the information was documented in the field logbook and the Field Operations Leader was notified.

A chain of custody was maintained on samples collected during the characterization survey. The purpose of the chain of custody is to document sample possession from the time of collection to receipt at the analytical laboratory. The analytical laboratory was instructed that if complete chain of custody records did not accompany each sample shipment, the laboratory was not to analyze the sample(s). The Senior Radiological Engineer and/or the QA Engineer were responsible for reviewing, and ensuring the accuracy and completeness of, the chain of custody forms. Chain of custody (COC) forms included the following information for each sample:

- the sample identification number;
- date and time of sample collection;
- sample matrix (i.e., soil, sediment);
- required analyses; and
- special handling requirements, if any.

Additionally, chain of custody forms included signatures of individuals relinquishing and receiving sample custody and the associated date and time. The copy of the chain of custody forms included in laboratory data packages is considered the "official" custody record for the samples.

Samples collected during the characterization survey were temporarily stored on-site. Per the laboratory protocol, there are no specified holding time requirements for radiological samples. If a sample was slated to be analyzed for chemical parameters, the sample was kept on ice and analyzed within the appropriate holding time. Prior to shipment, the sample containers were surveyed for external loose contamination, decontaminated if necessary and released for shipment. Collected samples were properly packaged, documented, and released to a courier.

3.2.2 Sampling Methodology

Access to the subsurface areas, from which all project samples were obtained, was gained through use of a 66-DT GeoProbe[®] unit that advanced steel casings into the ground under hydraulic power. The casings were 2.125 inches OD and 1.5 inches ID. Samples were obtained using standard 66-DT GeoProbe® sampling accessories, including Macro-Core® and dual tube sampling tools. GeoProbe® borings were advanced using a GeoProbe® sampling system. Soil samples were collected continuously (for soil description purposes), and at discrete depths (for analytical testing) using either a 2-inch inner-diameter (I.D.), 2-foot-long core or a 3-inch I.D., 5-foot-long dual tube.

3.3 **Radiological Analyses**

Two types of radiological analyses were performed on characterization samples, gamma spectroscopy and alpha spectroscopy. The former was perforned both on-site, in the field laboratory, and off site at Paragon, while the latter was performed only at Paragon. The field laboratory was used as a screening tool for the majority of samples collected for both radiological and chemical analyses. Samples screened on-site during performance of the characterization survey data were used to estimate Th-232 activity concentration. The field screening techniques for determining when analyses would be performed on each sample are described in Section 3.9 of the Characterization Survey Work Plan (CABRERA 1999b).

A gamma library of natural radionuclides (i.e., the actinium, thorium, and uranium series and K-40) and Cs-137 was used for all gamma spectroscopic analyses. Based on analytical results and the assumption of secular equilibrium, Th-232 concentration was inferred from the activity concentration of its progeny.

Isotopic uranium and/or isotopic thorium alpha spectroscopic analyses were performed on selected samples. Isotopic uranium quantified U-234, U-235, and U-238, while isotopic thorium analyses quantified Th-228, Th-230, and Th-232.

3.4 **Chemical Analyses**

Soil samples requiring chemical analyses were submitted to Paragon and STL. These samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) using USEPA Method 8260 (with methanol preservation for total analysis samples only), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) using USEPA Method 8270, Metals (arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, lead, selenium, silver, and mercury) using USEPA Method 6061, and Pesticides and Herbicides using USEPA Method 8080. The samples were also analyzed for waste characterization parameters (Reactive Cyanide, Reactive Sulfide, Ignitability (Method 1030), and pH). A Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) extract for each sample was also analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, Metals, Pesticides, and Herbicides.

3.5 **Hydrogeologic Analyses**

Samples were specifically collected to determine the conductivity of the Site soils to fulfill one of the characterization survey's DQOs. The samples were collected in an unimpacted area within 1 mile of the Site and later submitted to Materials Testing Consultants, Inc. (MTC) in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Soil samples consisted of one clay sample and one sand sample. The clay sample was analyzed using ASTM Method D 5084, which measures the hydraulic conductivity of saturated porous materials. The sand sample was analyzed using ASTM Method D 2434, which measures the hydraulic conductivity on granular soils.

Another project DQO was to determine whether Site surface and subsurface waters are potable because this characteristic has impact on dose modeling. As such, both surface water and ground water samples were collected and analyzed. These samples were collected within a 1-mile radius of the Site in areas that were not anticipated to be impacted by the Site.

4.0 CHARACTERIZATION SURVEY RESULTS

This section presents results of characterization measurements and analysis of data. Basic results and summary statistics are presented, data presentation figures and tables are introduced, and some data anomalies are identified and data is qualified appropriately. Evaluation and analysis of these results relative to the Site Conceptual Model is presented in Section 5.7.

4.1 **Subsurface Gross Gamma Radiation Measurements**

As described previously subsurface gross gamma radiation measurements were performed in GeoProbe[®] casings using a Bicron G1 1" x 1" NaI detector coupled to a Canberra Inspector. At each measurement location, gross gamma measurements were performed at one-foot intervals in the casing using a count time of 10 seconds. Measurements were also performed in the Reference Area using the same technique.

Gross gamma results are assumed to be proportional to the Th-232 activity concentration at the measurement location, as other ROCs are either proportional to Th-232 activity concentration or do not have significant gamma emissions. The estimated efficiency of the detector for quantifying Th-232 in-situ gamma response is 500 net counts per minute (cpm) per pCi/g of Th-232 above background. The estimated detection sensitivity of the gross gamma measurements to quantify Th-232 in excess of background is approximately 1.3 pCi/g (see Appendix D for details).

4.1.1 Reference Area Results

The results of subsurface gross gamma measurements in the Reference Area are provided in Appendix E-1. Reference Area gross gamma measurements were performed at 375 locations in 40 casings. The maximum measurements depth was 14 feet bgs. The Reference Area gross gamma response averaged 137 ± 96 (2σ) counts per ten seconds with a minimum of 52 and maximum of 258.

4.1.2 Site Results

Site subsurface gross gamma measurement locations are identified on Figure 3-1. Only the bias measurement locations are labeled to maintain figure clarity. The remaining Class 1, Class 2, and Class 3 location identifiers are based on a systematic labeling system. The results of Site subsurface gross gamma measurements are provided in Appendix E-2. Site gross gamma measurements were performed at 5,926 locations in 397 casings. The maximum measurements depth was 29 feet bgs. The Site gross gamma response averaged 200 **±** 923 (2σ) counts per ten seconds. The range of observed values is 20 to 61,054 counts.

4.1.2.1 Gross Gamma Contours

The gross gamma data represents the largest single set of subsurface radiological data that has been collected at the Site to date. As stated previously, the thousands of measurements are presented in tabular form in Appendix E-2 along with the location of each measurement (i.e., easting, northing, and elevation). This positionally correlated data set was reduced using geospatial modeling techniques to present it in a more usable, graphical, manner that supports decision making. The following geospatial modeling approach was implemented:

- The data points were imported as three dimensional scatter points and a bounding grid of approximately 15 foot by 15 foot by 1 foot (in the northing, easting, and elevation coordinates, respectively) was placed around the extremes of the mass of points.
- The estimated values for counts per 10 seconds at each grid node were developed using a natural neighbors interpretation routine that considered only the 8 nearest points. In addition, distances in the vertical (elevation) dimension were scaled up by a factor of ten to account for the greater variability, and considerably larger density, of values in that direction.
- * Isosurfaces (3D contours) were developed for the grid data for the following values of counts per 10 seconds: 300, 500, 1,000, 2,000, and 5,000. This series of values was chosen to best depict the extent of just-above-background values and the areas of elevated radioactivity at the same time. It should be noted that all gross gamma count contours greater than 5,000, regardless of magnitude, are grouped in the 5,000 contour.
- Horizontal grid layers were isolated one by one and the resulting contours (of above values) were then exported to ESRI's ARCView and superimposed over a base map derived from an AutoCAD drawing.

As stated above, gross gamma count contours are presented in divisions of 300, 500, 1,000, 2,000, and 5,000 counts per 10 seconds. Based on the data analysis documented in Appendix D, which assumes that gross gamma response is directly proportional to Th-232 activity concentration, the estimated Th-232 activity concentration corresponding to each contour division are as follows:

The results of the geospatial modeling contours are presented in Figures 4-1 through 4-24. With the exception of Figures 4-22 through 4-24, which are cross sectional views, each figure shows prominent Site features, the Site grid system, and the final MARSSIM Class 1, 2, and 3 area divisions (following modifications as described in Section 5.7). The following area divisions (following modifications as described in Section 5.7). paragraphs briefly describe the figures. Interpretation of the results depicted in the figures relative to the Site Conceptual Model is provided in Section 5.7.

Figure 4-1 presents the maximum gross gamma count in each vertical column (i.e., casing) by horizontal location. This figure presents a two dimensional picture of radiological gross gamma count rates in excess of background levels and, thus, approximates the maximum horizontal extent of radionuclide contaminants.

Figures 4-2 through 4-20 present gross gamma count contours by elevation. Contours are provided in one-foot elevation increments from 591 feet above mean sea level (MSL) (Figure 4-2) to 573 feet above MSL (Figure 4-20). These figures present a two dimensional picture of radiological gross gamma count rates in excess of background levels at each elevation and thus approximate the maximum horizontal extent of radionuclide contaminants at each elevation.

Figures 4-22 through 4-24 present vertical cross sectional views of the gross gamma contours (i.e., easting or northing versus elevation). Figure 4-21 identifies the cross sectional view locations and direction of view. The intent of these figures is to provide estimates of the vertical extent of gross gamma count rates in excess of background levels.

Figure 4-25 presents a summary of all gross gamma data. Nine gross gamma count contour plots, grouped by elevation, are presented at a 10° viewing angle and stacked. Filled gross gamma contours are presented in two categories, 300 to 500 counts and greater than 500 counts. The maximum gross gamma count value for each measurement location in an elevation group was used to develop the contours. The intent of this figure is to provide a three dimensional estimate of the vertical extent of gross gamma count rates in excess of background levels. It should be noted that the geospatial modeling technique used to estimate contour divisions in Figure 4-25 is slightly different than the technique described above for Figures 4-1 through 4-24. This technique used a nearest neighbor geospatial model with a 15 foot bounding limit.

4.2 **Subsurface In-situ Nal Gamma Spectroscopy Measurements**

As described previously, subsurface in-situ gamma spectroscopy measurements were performed in GeoProbe^{Φ} casings using a Bicron G1 1" x 1" NaI detector coupled to a Canberra Inspector. Typically, subsurface in-situ gamma spectroscopy measurements were performed at six depths at each measurment location. Five measurements were performed using a five-minute counting interval and one measurement was performed using a 15-minute counting interval. Measurements depths were biased based on the results of gross gamma measurements in an attempt to quantify any observed elevated locations.

Subsurface in-situ gamma spectroscopy results provide estimates of the Th-232 activity concentration at the measurement location, the error associated with the estimate, and/or the minimum detectable Th-232 activity concentration (MDC). Activity estimates are provided for measurements where the net peak count rate exceeded the critical level at the 95% confidence level. When results did not exceed the critical level, only the MDCs are provided.

4.2.1 Reference Area Results

The results of subsurface in-situ gamma spectroscopy measurements in the Reference Area are provided in Appendix F-1. Reference Area in-situ gamma spectroscopy measurements were performed at 170 locations in 40 casings. The maximum measurement depth was 14 feet bgs. Only three of the 170 measurements identified Th-232 (i.e., had net count rates greater than the counting instrumentation critical level). These three positive detections averaged 1.8 ± 1.5 (2σ) pCi/g of Th-232 with a minimum of 1.6 and maximum of 2.2 pCi/g. It should be noted that the two sigma relative error associated with the three positive detections averaged approximately 80%. These positive results are suspected to be falsepositives based on anticipated and measured background activity concentrations of Th-232; although they could be true positives in light of their large relative error.

4.2.2 Site Results

The results of subsurface in-situ gamma spectroscopy measurements in Site areas are provided in Appendix F-2. Site in-situ gamma spectroscopy measurements were performed at 2,518 locations in 397 casings. The maximum measurement depth was 26 feet bgs. Of the 2,518 measurements performed, 131 identified Th-232 (i.e., had net count rates greater than the counting instrumentation critical level) resulting in a positive detection. These positive detections averaged 33 \pm 106 (2 σ) pCi/g of Th-232 with a minimum of 1.3 and maximum of 804 pCi/g.

4.2.2.1 Graphical Presentation - Postinz Plot

As stated previously, the thousands of measurements are presented in tabular form in Appendix F-2 along with the location of each measurement (i.e., easting, northing, and elevation). This positionally correlated data set was reduced by generating a posting plot to present it in a more usable, graphical, manner that supports decision making.

Figure 4-27 presents the maximum in-situ gamma spectroscopy Th-232 result in each vertical column (i.e., casing) by horizontal location. It should be noted that only results that exceed their associated MDC are reported. The figure also presents prominent Site features and contours of the maximum gross gamma count in each vertical column by horizontal location generated using nearest neighbor interpolation. The purpose of this figure is to provide estimates of Th-232 activity concentrations in areas where elevated gamma count rates were observed and to demonstrate that elevated Th-232 was not falsely identified in areas where elevated gross gamma count rates were not observed. Figure 4-27 shows only two locations where in-situ gamma spectroscopy Th-232 concentrations above background (2 pCi/g), were identified and where the gross gamma counts were not elevated. It is suspected that these results are false-positives, similar to those identified in the Reference Area. The gamma spectroscopy and gross gamma data agree well with each other.

4.3 **Results of Volumetric Sample Analyses**

Subsurface soil samples were collected, screened as necessary in the field and submitted to Paragon, MTC, or STL for analyses. Analyses performed falls into three general categories: radiological, hydrogeological, and chemical.

4.3.1 Radiological Sample Results

As discussed in Section 3.3, radiological samples were analyzed via gamma spectroscopy and/or alpha spectroscopy at Paragon Analytics. The alpha spectroscopic samples were analyzed for isotopic uranium and/or isotopic thorium, while gamma spectroscopy was performed to identify any gamma emitting natural series radionuclides and Cs-137. A total of 52 samples were analyzed: 34 receiving thorium alpha spectroscopy; 34 receiving uranium alpha spectroscopy; and, all samples receiving gamma spectroscopy. Five field duplicate samples were also collected and analyzed for QA purposes. Samples were collected at various depths throughout the Site. Complete radiological sample results are presented in Table 4-1. These results are summarized as follows:

4.3.1.1 Gamma Spectroscopv Results

All fifty-two samples were analyzed by Paragon Analytics using gamma spectroscopy. The following list summarizes gamma spectroscopic analytical results from all Site areas.

Results of Gamma Spectroscopic Sample Analysis by Radionuclide, pCi/g

Tob ico Marsh State Game Area Site Final Draft Characterization Survey Report

It should be noted that the statistical quantities above consider all sample results, regardless of their statistical validity (i.e., sample results less than the 95% critical level are included in the statistics). Although this is an appropriate technique for estimating average concentrations, it should be recognized that maximum concentrations and averages may have large relative errors.

Some sample results should be qualified based on review of the gamma spectroscopy results against alpha spectroscopy results and fundamental concepts of physics and gamma spectroscopy. The results of this review are summarized as follows.

- *** Ra-226 Results Potentially Overestimated:** Ra-226 results appear to be overestimated for the majority of the samples based on comparison of Ra-226 results to Pb-214 and Bi-214 results. This is because the gamma line used to quantify Ra-226, 186.2 keV, is not readily resolvable from the U-235 185.7 keV gamma line. Thus, U-235 in the samples contributed to the 186 keV peak resulting in an overestimate of Ra-226. Paragon Analytics' procedure included sealing of samples and a 21-day ingrowth period for Ra-226 daughters in order to establish Ra-226 shortlived daughter equilibrium. Thus, Pb-214 and Bi-214 results provide a more appropriate estimate of Ra-226 activity concentration.
- *** **U-235 Results Potentially Overestimated:** U-235 results appear to be overestimated for many of the samples based on comparison of gamma spectroscopy results to alpha spectroscopy results. This is because the gamma line used to quantify U-235, 185.7 keV, is not readily resolvable from the Ra-226 186.2 keV gamma line. Thus, Ra-226 in the samples contributed to the 186 keV peak resulting in an overestimate of U-235.
- *** Th-234 Results Potentially Overestimated in Samples with Elevated Ac-228:** Th-234 results appear to be overestimated for some of the samples based on comparison of gamma spectroscopy results to U-238 alpha spectroscopy results; Th-234 and U-238 are in secular equilibrium in the samples and thus should have equal activities. This potential overestimation is because one of the gamma lines used to quantify Th-234, 93 keV, is not readily resolvable from an x-ray emitted by Ac-228 at approximately the same energy.

*** Pa-234m Results Potentially Overestimated:** Pa-234m results appear to be overestimated for some of the samples based on comparison of gamma spectroscopy results to U-238 alpha spectroscopy results; Pa-234m and U-238 are in secular equilibrium in the samples and thus should have equal activities. An explanation for this potential overestimation was not identified.

4.3.1.2 Alpha Spectroscopy Results

The following list summarizes alpha spectroscopic analytical results from all Site areas. Thirty-four samples were analyzed by thorium and uranium alpha spectroscopy.

Results ofAlpha Spectroscopic Analysis by Radionuclide, pCi/g

Isotopic uranium results for sample E6NWSS0301 has a 66% relative error and should not be used quantitatively. The reported activity concentrations for this sample were as follow:

The large relative uncertainties associated with this measurement, Site historical data, and the lack of any credible evidence of enriched concentrations of U-235 being placed at the Site lead to the conclusion that U-235 is not present at the Site at concentrations above nornally occurring background levels. Only natural uranium is a RCOPC for the Site. It is concluded, therefore, that there was an error in the isotopic uranium analysis of this sample.

4.3.1.3 Graphical Presentation -Posting Plots

Positionally correlated Th-232 gamma spectroscopy results were reduced by generating a posting plot to present the data in a more usable, graphical manner that supports decision making.

Figure 4-26 presents the maximum gamma spectroscopy Th-232 result in each vertical column (i.e., casing) by horizontal location, based on quantification of Ac-228 and the assumption of secular equilibrium. The figure also presents prominent Site features and contours of the maximum gross gamma count in each vertical column by horizontal location

generated using nearest neighbor interpolation. The purpose of this figure is to provide estimates of Th-232 activity concentrations in areas where elevated gamma count rates were observed and to demonstrate that elevated Th-232 was not observed in areas where elevated gross gamma count rates were not observed.

4.3.1.4 Th-230 to Th-232 Ratio

Considering that Th-230 is essentially a pure alpha emitter and is not readily detectable in the field, one project goal was to use analytical sample results to develop a ratio of Th-230 to Th-232. This ratio could then be applied to in-situ measurements of Th-232 to offer an approximate Th-230 concentration for the same location.

The ratio of Th-230 to Th-232 activity concentrations are reported in Table 4-2 for each of the 34 samples that were analyzed for isotopic thorium by alpha spectroscopy. Th-230 to Th-232 ratios averaged 2.4 \pm 3.1 (2 σ):1 with a minimum of 0.5:1 and a maximum of 11:1. Such a large range of ratios was not anticipated. In order to better understand the variation of this ratio, a posting plot was generated.

Figure 4-28 spatially presents the Th-230 to Th-232 ratio for each sample analyzed. The figure also presents prominent Site features and contours of the maximum gross gamma count in each vertical column by horizontal location generated using nearest neighbor interpolation. As can be seen in the figure, Th-230 to Th-232 ratios are not widely variable across the Site. Instead, like ratios are clustered in what appear to be different waste streams, based on the spatial distribution of ratios relative to the areas of elevated gamma count rates.

One waste stream area encompasses a significant portion of the Site and includes the entire central, northeastern, and southeastern portions of the Site. The Th-230 to Th-232 ratio in these areas is approximately 1:1 with a range of *0.5:1* to 2:1. A second waste stream includes two areas, one in the northwest and one in the southwest portion of the Site. The Th-230 to Th-232 ratios in these areas ranges from 4:1 to 11:1.

4.3.2 Results of Hydraulic Conductivity Samples

The results of samples collected and analyzed for hydraulic conductivity are discussed in detail in Appendix B. Samples of both the sand and clay that underlie the Site were collected and analyzed. These samples were collected from Site areas containing sand and clay native to the area. The results of the sample analyses indicate that the hydraulic conductivity of the landfill soils are 5.4 x 10^{-8} cm/sec and 6.4×10^{-3} cm/sec for clay and sand components for soils, respectively.

4.3.3 Results of Water Potability Samples

The results of samples collected and analyzed for potability are discussed in detail in Appendix B. Analysis of groundwater and surface water samples collected to establish potability indicate that it is not possible to rule out the potential use of either as a source of potable water. The only drinking water standards exceeded were secondary Maximum

Concentration Levels (MCLs) for iron, total dissolved solids (TDS), chloride, and sulfate. Secondary MCLs are used only for aesthetic purposes (i.e., color, odor, taste, etc.)

4.3.4 Results of Waste (Chemical) Characterization Samples

The results of samples collected and analyzed for chemical waste characterization are discussed in detail in Appendix A. While various chemicals were detected in the soil, none of the TCLP concentrations exceeded the 40 CFR Part 216.24 "Maximum Concentration of Contaminants for Toxicity Characteristics". Reactive cyanide and reactive sulfide were not detected and there are no other apparent reasons to believe the waste soil is reactive as defined in 40 CFR 261.23. Also, because the pH is not less than 2.5 or greater than 12.5, this waste would not be considered corrosive as defined in 40 CFR 261.21. Based on the analytical results, none of the samples would be considered ignitable in accordance with 40 CFR 261.22.

Based on the analytical results currently available and generator knowledge, there are no indications that the soil containing radioactive and chemical waste material at the Site would be considered a hazardous waste, as defined in 40 CFR Part 261.

5.0 DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF SURVEY RESULTS

The purpose of this section is to collectively discuss and interpret the results of the characterization survey. Results are evaluated against specific DQOs established in the Characterization Survey Work Plan (CABRERA 1999b). In addition, results are compared against the assumptions and premises of the Site Conceptual Model upon which the characterization survey was, in part, designed.

5.1 **Site Source Term**

A principal DQO of the characterization survey was to better-define the Site source term (i.e., radionuclides present and their activity concentrations). Previous investigations identified isotopes of thorium and their radioactivity decay progeny as the primary RCOPCs. Uranium isotopes were also established as a RCOPC during previous efforts implemented by the NRC's contractor, Oak Ridge Associated Universities (ORAU). Subsequent sampling and analysis efforts implemented for the State of Michigan confirmed the presence of elevated concentrations of thorium isotopes and their radioactive decay progeny, but did not confirm the presence of uranium isotopes. Based upon the results of this characterization survey, RCOPCs are no different than previously established and documented in the conceptual model.

5.1.1 Thorium-232 and its Radioactive Progeny

Characterization survey in-situ gamma radiation measurements and sample analyses confirmed the presence of Th-232 and its radioactive progeny in secular equilibrium. Figures 4-26 and 4-27 provide posting plots of Th-232 activity concentrations measured by gamma spectroscopy sample analyses and in-situ gamma spectroscopy, respectively. Site Th-232 activity concentrations ranged from background levels to as high as approximately 2,000 pCi/g in one isolated area.

Analytical sample results are reported in Table 4-1. All samples were analyzed by gamma spectroscopy analysis and 34 samples were analyzed by alpha spectroscopy for isotopic thorium concentrations. In many cases, gamma spectroscopy and alpha spectroscopy results for the same sample are not in good agreement, especially when substantial concentrations of Th-232 were measured. Gamma spectroscopy uses a large sample mass (approximately 500 grams), whereas alpha spectroscopy uses a small sample mass (approximately 2 grams). As such, this poor agreement indicates that the thorium is not homogeneously distributed in small masses, such as a one-kilogram sample. Similar conclusions regarding the homogeneity of the waste were reached during analysis of scoping survey samples.

5.1.2 Thorium-230 and Radium-226

Characterization survey sample analyses confirmed the presence of Th-230 and Ra-226 in excess of background levels. Site Th-230 activity concentrations ranged from background levels to as high as approximately 440 pCi/g; Ra-226 activity concentrations ranged from background to as high as approximately 11 pCi/g. Elevated Ra-226 activity concentrations were co-located with elevated Th-230 and were approximately 3% of the Th-230 activity concentration. This is consistent with assumptions regarding the relationship of Th-230 and Ra-226 documented in the Characterization Survey Work Plan (CABRERA 1999b); elevated Ra-226 is therefore assumed to result from decays of Th-230, its direct parent radionuclide.

Figure 4-28 spatially presents the Th-230 to Th-232 ratios. As can be seen in the figure, Th-230 to Th-232 ratios are not widely variable across the Site. Instead, like ratios are clustered in what appear to be different waste streams, based on the spatial distribution of ratios relative to areas of elevated gamma count rates. Thus, a single Th-230 to Th-232 ratio is not applicable to the Site (unless a bounding conservative ratio is assumed).

5.1.3 Uranium Isotopes

Uranium isotopes were established as a RCOPC during previous efforts implemented by the NRC's contractor, ORAU, but were not identified during previous State of Michigan investigations. Characterization survey results confirm that the uranium activity concentrations are considerably lower than elevated thorium concentrations.

To assess the potential for the presence and quantity of uranium as a RCOPC, uranium alpha spectroscopy was performed on 34 samples collected at locations where the in-situ field measurements indicated the presence of elevated radioactivity. The laboratory analytical analysis indicated the presence of U-238 and U-234 at levels comparable to background values as described previously in Section 1.5. The average and standard deviation statistics for the measurement results of these isotopes were compared with the Tobico surface soils, Tobico subsurface soils, and U.S soils as listed in Section 1.5. Additionally, Th-232 and Th-230 to U-238 and U-234 ratios and their associated sample population standard deviations were calculated and compared. The measured U-235 values, being small, have relative errors

Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site

ranging from 30 to 200 percent (1 sigma). Consequently, U-235 concentrations at the Site are statistically indistinguishable from background concentrations. The overall concentration of uranium detected on the Tobico Site is present at concentrations typical of U.S. soils and are present only at background levels based on the following:

- * U-238 measurements in soils at Tobico exist at an average concentration of 0.68 *+/-* 0.54 (1 SD) pCi/g and are comparable to U.S soils ranging from 0.11-3.8 pCi/g U-238 (Section 1.5).
- * U-238/U-234 ratios were measured at approximately 1:1 ratios for the majority of the samples analyzed. Ratios ranged from 0.1 to 1.3.
- Uranium isotopes found with thorium isotopes at Tobico do not appear to be present at the Site as a result of magnesium-thorium slag placement since the ratios of Th-232:U-238, Th-230:U-238, Th-232:U-234, and Th-230:U-234 have large relative errors that exceed 170% at one standard deviation. Uranium isotopes present at the Site as a direct result of magnesium-thorium slag placement would be expected to have more consistent Th:U ratios if the uranium were present in the slag initially. It is concluded that the uranium present at Tobico is due to naturally occurring concentrations in the soil present at the Site.
- Measured U-235 concentrations are generally low and have large relative errors in the reported values associated with them. Sixteen of 33 samples showed U-235 reported values associated with them. concentrations above the MDC. Closer examination of these concentration values show large uncertainties in the reported value associated with the measurements on the order of 30-100%. One sample indicated a U-235 concentration of 1.1 pCi/g with a 66% relative error. Based on historical data, the lack of any credible evidence of enriched concentrations of U-235 being placed at the Site, and the large uncertainties associated with the measurements, it is concluded that U-235 is not present at the Site at concentrations above normally occurring background levels.

5.1.4 Potassium-40

Past Site investigations (ABB 1997) identified elevated K-40 in Site groundwater samples. Characterization survey sample analyses identified the presence of K-40 in excess of background levels in soil. Site K-40 activity concentrations in soil ranged from background levels to as high as approximately 141 pCi/g. K-40 in excess of background was measured in soil samples collected in the vicinity of monitoring well MW/RL-9.

The elevated K-40 is likely due to chemical contaminants disposed of at the Site. In addition, K-40 is naturally occurring radioactive material (NORM) and is not specifically regulated by the NRC.

5.2 **Three-Dimensional Extent of Radioactive Contamination**

A principal DQO of the characterization survey was to develop a three-dimensional model of Site contaminants. This was accomplished through performance of thousands of gross gamma radiation measurements, which are assumed to be proportional to Th-232 activity concentration. Figures 4-1 through 4-25 provide a graphical presentation of Site locations where gamma radiation levels, and thus Th-232 activity concentrations, are in excess of background levels.

Review of Figure 4-1, which presents the maximum gross gamma count in each casing, indicates that the horizontal extent of radioactivity in excess of background levels is limited to the center of the Site. Figures 4-2 through 4-20 provide estimates of the horizontal extent of contamination in one-foot elevation increments.

Figure 4-25 provides a summary of the three-dimensional contaminant model. The majority of the contaminated Site volume is limited to a nine-foot layer (elevation range of 587 feet to 579 feet above MSL). Radioactivity in excess of background levels was not identified above 590 feet MSL or below 570 feet MSL.

5.3 **Comparison of Reference Area Gross Counts to Site Area Gross Counts**

Comparisons of gross count histograms between the reference area and the Class 1, Class 2, and Class 3 areas can show differences between distributions which could be interpreted as one indication of the presence of potential radioactivity above background.

Figures 5-2 through 5-5 are histograms that depict 10-second gross counts for the reference area and the Site Class 1, 2, and 3 areas. These frequency distributions show a similar relationship between the reference area (Figure 5-2) and the Class 2 and 3 areas of the Site (Figure 5-3). The distributions of both of these histograms show a clear bimodal distribution. The peaks in both distributions are centered at 80 gross counts per 10-seconds and 170 -180 gross counts per 10-seconds. The reference area averaged 137 $+/-$ 96 (2 σ) counts for the 10second counts while the Site Class 2 and Class 3 areas averaged 155 $+/-$ 96 (2 σ) counts for the 10-second counts. No 10-second count values greater than 300 (equivalent to 1.6 pCi/g) were observed in either area. This shows that the reference area (background level of thorium) and the Class 2 and 3 areas are similar in their gross background counts and distribution of these counts. Class 2 and 3 areas do not appear to have radioactivity above background levels based on this comparison.

Figure 5-4 is a histogram depicting the 10-second gross counts from the Site Class 1 area. The distribution of data from this area shows only one peak and has 180 samples with 10 second counts greater than 300. This is significant in that the reference area had no values above 300 counts. The Site Class 1 area averaged 208 $+/-$ 1998 (2 σ) counts for the 10second counts. The maximum count in the Site Class 1 area is 61,054, well above any reference or Site Class 2 and 3 area values. This would indicate the presence of radioactivity in the Class I area at levels greater than seen in the reference area. Figure 5-5 presents the
same data as figure 5-4 but with a log scale to allow improved visualization of the number of measurements.

The data from the reference area and the Site Class 2 and 3 areas indicates that these locations appear to have the same natural background radioactivity and distribution. The Class 1 area shows clear indication of gross radioactivity greater than the reference area.

5.4 **Hydraulic Conductivity of Site Soils**

Samples of both sand and clay that underlay the Site were collected and analyzed. The results of the sample analyses indicate that the hydraulic conductivity of the landfill soils is approximately 5.4 x 10^{-8} cm/sec to 6.4 x 10^{-3} cm/sec for clay and sand components for soils, respectively. These hydraulic conductivities show that areas where clay exists are essentially impervious to the transmission of water and dissolved contaminants it may contain. The sandy components of the soil have a higher level of transmission and would not prevent significant transport of water-soluble contaminants. Appendix B provides additional detail.

5.5 **Groundwater/Surface Water Potability**

Analysis of groundwater and surface water samples collected to establish potability indicate that it is not possible to rule out the potential use of either as a source of potable water. Since the only drinking water standards exceeded were secondary Maximum Concentration Levels (MCLs) for iron, total dissolved solids (TDS), chloride, and sulfate, both groundwater and surface water may used as a source of potable water. Therefore, site-specific dose assessment models for the Site may include water pathways analyses that assume the potential utilization of water from the Site area. Appendix B provides additional detail.

5.6 **Chemical Characteristics of Radioactively Contaminated Materials**

Various chemicals were detected in the contents of landfill. The analytical results of these soils indicate that the waste materials present in the soil at the Site would not be considered a hazardous waste, as defined in 40 CFR Part 261. Appendix A provides additional detail of the chemical characteristics of the soil.

5.7 **Comparison of Results to Site Conceptual Model**

The Site conceptual model, as noted in Section 1.6, was developed based on results of investigations conducted prior to the characterization survey and historical data reviews. The characterization survey confirmed the conceptual model as described in Section 1.6.

5. 7.1 Lateral Extent and Location of Radioactive Contaminants

Based on the Site conceptual model, radioactive contamination was expected to be found down the center of the Site, where surveys performed prior to cap placement identified radioactive contaminants. Figure 5-1 identifies areas where the previous surveys identified radioactive contaminants and shows the boundaries of MARSSIM Class 1, 2, and 3 survey units established for the characterization survey.

The results of the characterization survey support the Site conceptual model assumptions regarding lateral extent and location of radioactive contaminants. Radioactive contamination was generally identified where historical information indicated it would be laterally (see Figure 4-1). It should be noted that the lateral extent was slightly greater than anticipated. As such, the Class 1 area was slightly increased during execution of the characterization survey as shown in Figure 3-1. This slight disagreement with the conceptual model is likely due to small scaling errors when transferring past survey data to current Site maps.

5.7.2 Vertical Extent of Radioactive Contaminants

Consistent with the conceptual model, radioactive contamination was not identified below the upper surface of the natural clay layer that underlays the Site. However, in some locations, the depth to the native clay layer was considerably greater than anticipated (as deep as 26' bgs). In addition, Th-232 as high as 100 pCi/g was identified in a clay depression at approximately 19' bgs.

Based on these observations, it was speculated that prior to sand cover installation and Site capping, there may have been some areas where excavations had occurred (presumably to support Site waste disposal activities). The presence of radioactive material near the bottom of one of these depressions indicates that radioactive disposal activities may have occurred prior to sand cover installation or pushed down during historical Site construction activities. This is contrary to the conceptual model.

Subsequent to the identification of the first depression containing an elevated radiological measurement, a search for depressions was enacted during the characterization survey field work (see Appendix C). The results of this search identified one other area where depth to clay was greater than previously anticipated (total of two depressions). However, no clay was greater than previously anticipated (total of two depressions). additional radioactive contamination at depths greater than anticipated was identified.

6.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE

A Quality Assurance program was first implemented during the Scoping Survey in accordance with the Tobico Marsh Quality Assurance Project Plan (OAPP). The OAPP accordance with the Tobico Marsh Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). specified requirements for general project management, sampling and analyses, documentation, data management, and data validation and verification. A Quality Assurance Engineer was responsible for independent oversight of the QAPP implementation. The Senior Radiological Engineer had overall responsibility for ensuring that the requirements of the QAPP were implemented on a day-to-day basis during performance of field work, during data review and evaluation, and during preparation of this report.

6.1 **General Project Management**

Personnel involved in the characterization survey activities were trained to ensure that they understood their work assignment(s), responsibilities, and work-related hazards. Individuals involved in performing the characterization survey attended a four-hour lecture on radiological fundamentals and successfully completed the associated examination. Personnel working on the Site were required to provide documentation of successful completion of a 40 hour HAZWOPER training course as required per OSHA standards in 29 CFR 1910.120. Project personnel were required to read the current Health and Safety Plan and the Characterization Survey Work Plan (CABRERA 1 999b), and to be trained in their requirements. In addition, on-the-job training was provided to personnel as needed, on a task-by-task basis. This type of training included, but was not limited to, implementation of and compliance with the following: procedures for use of instruments and performing the survey; the Radiation Safety Program; the Health and Safety Plan; and the QAPP.

6.2 **Instrumentation and Measurements**

6.2.1 Instrumentation

Instruments specified in the work plan (CABRERA 1999b) were used to make radiological measurements. The Senior Radiological Engineer ensured that individuals were trained in the use of instruments, verified that the instruments were in proper operating condition, and ensured that the instruments met the required detection sensitivity. The following instrument requirements delineated in Section 6.0 of the QAPP, were adhered to:

- Instrumentation had current calibration records;
- * Calibration records were kept on site during the characterization survey for review and inspection.
- Instrumentation were operated in accordance with either a written procedure or manufacturer's manual. The procedure and/or manual were used to provide guidance to field personnel on the proper use and to identify limitations of the instrument.
- * Prior to daily use, instruments used to obtain radiological data were inspected for physical damage and erroneous readings in accordance with associated procedures.
- Prior to daily use, instrumentation was response checked by comparing the instrument response to a designated source to instrument specific response check criteria obtained at the time of calibration, in accordance with the associated instrument procedure.
- Instrumentation that did not meet the specified requirements of calibration, inspection, or response check was removed from operation.

6.2.2 Measurements

Measurements were collected and documented in accordance with approved Tobico Marsh SGA procedures and the Characterization Survey Work Plan (CABRERA 1999b). Once

collected, measurements were documented on survey forms. At a minimum, the recorded information included instrument calibration date information, instrument model and serial number, date and time of survey, and name of individual(s) performing the survey. If a measurement was not collected due to drilling issues, weather concerns, or equipment failure, the Senior Radiological Engineer or designee was notified.

6.3 **Volumetric Samples**

6.3.1 Sampling Method

Volumetric samples were collected in accordance with approved Tobico Marsh SGA procedures and the Characterization Survey Work Plan (CABRERA 1999b). Sampling equipment and methodologies specified in approved procedures and/or the Work Plan were used. Collected samples were assigned unique alphanumeric identification numbers that were recorded in the field logbook. At a minimum, recorded information includes the sample location and depth, the alphanumeric identification number, and the date and time the sample was collected.

6.3.2 Sample Handling and Chain-Of-Custody

Chain of custody forms were maintained on volumetric samples collected during the characterization survey to document sample possession from the time of collection, to receipt at the analytical laboratory. The chain of custody forms were reviewed by the Senior Radiological Engineer and/or designee and accompanied each sample shipment to the analytical laboratory. Each chain of custody form included the signatures of the individuals that relinquished and received the samples and the associated date and time. The forms also included the following information for each sample: alphanumeric sample identification number; date and time of sample collection; sample matrix (i.e., soil or sediment); required analyses; and any special handling requirements.

Samples collected for laboratory analysis were temporarily stored on-site prior to shipment. At all times, samples were either in the possession of the characterization survey team, in view of the characterization survey team, or transferred to a secured (i.e., locked) location. Prior to leaving the Site for archive, the sample shipping containers were surveyed for external radiological contamination in accordance with applicable Tobico Marsh SGA procedures.

Samples slated to be analyzed for chemical parameters were kept on ice and analyzed within the appropriate holding time. Per the laboratory protocol, there are no specified holding time requirements for radiological samples.

6.4 **Field Instrument and Laboratory Quality Control Results**

Precision is a measure of agreement between measurements and is evaluated quantitatively based on objective performance criteria. Precision was evaluated by instrumentation response checks, control charts, duplicate measurements, and duplicate sample analyses.

6.4.1 Instrument Response Checks

Precision of field instrumentation was evaluated by performing daily source response checks and duplicate field measurements. The results of the daily response checks were evaluated against established QC response check criteria in accordance with approved Tobico Marsh SGA procedures. These response checks were performed by analyzing a radioactive source in a predetermined standard geometry and ensuring that the instrument response was within established control limits. Both gross gamma counts and energy specific counts were collected and evaluated.

To ensure satisfactory operation, the downhole NaI portable instrumentation gross gamma response was compared to established control limits, equal to +/- 20% of the expected response. Data was collected daily, entered on a control chart, and checked prior to use to ensure in-situ measurement instruments were operating properly. Figures 6-1 through 6-4 provide gross gamma control charts for the Nal instruments used to collect in-situ downhole characterization data. All data for these control charts fell within the +/- 20% control limit except for the following:

SN C443E on 10/4/99

The instrument in question was evaluated, found to be operating properly, and had a daily check performed a second time. The second instrument daily calibration check fell within established control limits and the instrument was considered operable. No collected data was invalidated.

The downhole Nal portable instrumentation spectroscopic response at the 239 keV energy (Pb-212) was examined on a daily basis to ensure satisfactory operability. The NaI gamma spectroscopy system was response checked daily in accordance with approved Tobico Marsh SGA procedures. Control charts were developed for each NaI detector used in the field with standard 2-sigma investigation and 3-sigma action levels. The 2-sigma level was used as an investigation trigger to initiate management evaluation of equipment operability. The 3 sigma level indicates an unacceptable level of performance that would result in the recalibration and redetermination of control chart action points or other evaluation and corrective action.

Figures 6-5 through 6-8 show control charts for the Nal instruments used to collect spectroscopic in-situ downhole characterization data. All data for these control charts fell within the 2-sigma investigation level except for the following:

- SN C443E on 10/26/99 and
- SN C641D on 5/15/00

The instruments in question were evaluated, found to be operating properly, and had a daily check performed a second time. The second instrument daily calibration checks fell within the 2-sigma investigation level and the instrument was considered operable. No instrument data exceeded the 3-sigma action level. No collected data was invalidated.

The analytical laboratory was responsible for ensuring that their instruments were response checked and responded within established acceptance criteria. Response check data associated with instrumentation quality assurance was documented by the laboratory, and reviewed by the Senior Radiological Engineer/designee.

The daily source checks and control chart data for both gross gamma counts and spectroscopic data indicated that the downhole NaI portable detection equipment was operating properly during use. Equipment not meeting standards was not used. No data was invalidated.

6.4.2 Duplicate Nal Gross Gamma Measurements

In order to evaluate the precision of *NaI* gross gamma measurement process, ten percent of the Nal detector measurements were re-performed in the same manner and location as the initial measurements, as specified in the QAPP. These duplicate measurements were typically performed by a different surveyor. Of the *5,926 NaI* gross gamma counts that were collected during the Nal gross *gamma* scan survey, *465* duplicate values were re-determined.

The duplicate gross gamma measurements were compared to each other using the relative percent difference methodology. The relative percent difference is computed using the following equation:

Relative % Difference =
$$
\frac{X_1 - X_2}{(X_1 + X_2)/2} * 100
$$

Where: $X1 = \text{value of initial measurement}$

 $X2 =$ value of duplicate measurement

The relative percent difference values for each downhole gross gamma duplicate measurement is presented in Table 6-1. A relative percent difference of less than or equal to 20% is considered to show good agreement.

The relative percent difference methodology works well for higher count values but fails more frequently when the count range value is small and runs below about *100* counts. This effect is due to counting statistics associated with the low counts. Poor correlation of duplicate measurements in areas of hot spots might also be expected due to the highly variable radiation field presented to the detection system from a hot spot. The poor comparison of a duplicate sample in these areas are likely to be due to small vertical positioning differences rather than an equipment variation.

Table 6-1 values demonstrate that downhole NaI gross gamma surveys counts exhibit an acceptable level of repeatability with 82% of all samples passing the acceptance criteria.

6.4.3 Duplicate In-Situ Gamma Spectroscopy Measurements

In order to evaluate the precision of in-situ gamma spectroscopy measurement process, approximately ten percent of the in-situ gamma spectroscopy measurements were reperformed in the same manner and location as the initial measurements, as specified in the QAPP.

Precision of the duplicate in-situ gamma spectroscopy measurements was quantitatively determined by calculating a Z-Score value for each data set. The premise of this statistical test is that the initial and duplicate measurements each provide a measure of the average radioactivity concentration in a volume of soil. Normal distribution statistics establish a level at which the probability of obtaining a difference of a specified magnitude is unlikely. The Z-Score equation is derived on this basis and establishes that a Z-score greater than 2.57 would only be observed 1% of the time if the only difference between the two measurements is the statistical nature of radioactive decay. It further establishes that there is a 99% probability that differences greater than 2.57 are due to differences in performance of the analysis and analytical equipment (e.g. slightly different locations, change in calibration).

The Z-Score value for the data set, is calculated using the following equation, and comparing it to a performance criteria of less than or equal to 2.57.

$$
Z = \frac{\left|I - D\right|}{\sqrt{\sigma_{1}^{2} + \sigma_{D}^{2}}}
$$

Where: I, D, = value of (1) mitial and (D) uplicate measurements; and,

 σ = one standard deviation associated with (I) nitial and (D)uplicate measurements.

The Z-Score value for the downhole Nal spectroscopic duplicate measurements are presented in Table 6-2. It is noted that many of the spectroscopic results are below detection limits. If one or more of the duplicate values are not detected, a Z-score cannot be calculated. Therefore a total of just 10 data sets for the downhole Nal duplicate spectroscopy results have Z-Scores computed with a corresponding pass/fail notation.

For those spectroscopic results below detection limits, it is noteworthy to observe that the detection system accurately identifies non-detectable values during the duplicate measurement process. Detectable activity was identified in only 8 of 139 measurement pairs where either the initial or the duplicate sample showed no detectable activity. This gives qualitative assurance that, at the threshold between no activity and low levels of activity, that false data is not generated.

Where duplicate Z-Scores were calculated there was agreement with 7 of 10 samples. Three measurements fell outside the Z-Score acceptance criteria. The 3 results that fell outside the Z-Score acceptance criteria are likely due to small changes in detector vertical positioning. These results are acceptable, with 70% of the samples passing the Z-Score acceptance criteria.

6.4.4 Laboratory Duplicate Gamma and Alpha Spectroscopy Analyses

The contractor radioanalytical laboratory performed duplicate analysis on *5* soil samples. Duplicated analysis was performed on gamma and alpha spectroscopy samples for the RCOPCs. The results were compared using the Z-Score analysis and presented in Table 6-3.

Approximately 86% of the duplicate samples pass the Z-Score test. The results are acceptable.

6.4.5 Comparison of Downhole NaISpectroscopy and Laboratory Samples

Table 6-4 is a comparison table showing downhole spectroscopic NaI results to volumetric soil samples analyzed by the laboratory. A total of 24 laboratory samples were analyzed for Th-232 by gamma spectroscopy and compared to the same downhole location spectroscopic Nal detector results. As described in Section 3.1.2, Pb-212 was used as the primary Th-232 surrogate due to detection sensitivity. In addition, gamma spectroscopy utilizes a larger soil mass (approximately 500 grams) than alpha spectroscopy (approximately 2 grams). The larger mass sample helps to eliminate errors associated with non-homogenity of soil samples that may occur when small samples are counted (see Section 5.1). Laboratory duplicate sample analyses also show similar improved correlation using gamma spectroscopy results rather than alpha spectroscopy for soil samples (Table 6-3).

The Table 6-4 Z-Score comparison shows 9 samples indicating good agreement with each other. Of the remaining 15 cases, 9 results show Th-232 concentrations based upon downhole Nal as being greater than the laboratory reported result. The remaining 6 samples show a lower reported value based upon the downhole NaI result.

It is likely that for those cases in which the laboratory result is lower than the downhole NaI result, that the soil volumetric sample missed the higher activity noted by the NaI detector. This is not entirely unexpected since soil samples were collected using a different casing. The soil collection casings were driven into the ground as close as practical (within 1 - 3 feet) to the downhole Nal detector casing. Since the casings used to collect soil are small compared to the sampling space detected by the downhole Nal detector, small pockets of activity could be more easily missed with a volumetric soil sample as opposed to the larger field that the Nal detector can identify.

Conversely, lower activity downhole NaI detector results than those identified by laboratory grab samples may be due to positioning differences between the downhole Nal measurement and the volumetric soil sample. As expected fewer of these results are noted because of the larger "sampling" area.

Seventy-five percent of the Nal downhole spectroscopic results are equal to or conservative with respect to the volumetric laboratory samples. This demonstrates that an in-situ downhole Nal detector contained within the probe boring (sealed from ground chemical contaminants), correlates well with the laboratory volumetric sampling analytical data. This counting method is a viable technique to characterize the Th-232 activity concentration in terms of both lateral and vertical extent at the Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site. Appendix D (Downhole Nal efficiency factor) provides the methodology through which downhole NaI gross gamma counts are converted to Th-232 soil concentration.

6.4.6 Comparison of Downhole NaI Th-232 Based on Gross Gamma and Laboratory Samples

Table 6-5 compares downhole NaI Th-232 activity fraction based upon gross gamma counts to volumetric soil sample laboratory results. A total of 24 laboratory samples were analyzed for Th-232 by gamma spectroscopy and compared to the same downhole location gross gamma results. The gross gamma results were converted to Th-232 concentrations above background utilizing the methodology described in Appendix D ("Downhole Nal efficiency factor").

Activity concentrations ratios computed for Table 6-5 are estimated from Th-232 based on NaI gross counts, NaI spectroscopic data, and NaI determined background from a nearby reference area. This allows the derivation of an efficiency factor that when applied converts the downhole gross gamma response to Th-232 equivalent activity concentration above background levels.

The best estimate values shown in Table 6-5 are generally conservative with respect to the laboratory soil sample analysis. The average ratio is 8.7 with several ratio values ranging from 30 to 73 times the laboratory reported value of Th-232. As described previously the differences are likely due to positioning which will have a more pronounced effect on volumetric samples as opposed to in-situ measurements. About 75% of the gross gamma results provide Th-232 activity concentrations equal to or greater than the volumetric sample

results. Six cases occurred in which the laboratory sample was higher than that reported based upon the gross gamma results.

The downhole Th-232 results based upon gross gamma response provide an effective means to identify Th-232 activity concentrations at the Site both laterally and vertically. The results have a conservative bias with respect to volumetric soil sampling.

6.4.7 Laboratory Spike and Blank Analyses

The laboratory evaluated analytical accuracy by performing laboratory spike analyses, as specified in their quality assurance procedures (PAI, 1997). Spike analyses consist of the laboratory adding a known quantity of radioactive material, or analyte, to representative media, analyzing the spiked media, and measuring the spike concentration. The results of the spike analysis are compared to the expected results based on the spike concentration. Laboratory spikes were performed and analyzed for each type of laboratory analysis that was performed (i.e., gamma spectroscopy, isotopic thorium alpha spectroscopy, isotopic uranium alpha spectroscopy, and gross alpha/beta).

Laboratory spike analyses were reviewed for completeness and validity. None of the measured spike values reported by the laboratory differed from the known spike values by more than +/-20 percent. The laboratory spike analyses results were also evaluated for bias, or a systematic error in one direction (i.e. positive or negative). Based on this evaluation, bias did not result in systematic errors.

6.4.8 Laboratory Blanks

Reports of laboratory blank analyses were reviewed for completeness and validity. Laboratory blank analyses results were less than the analytical detection sensitivity for the majority of the analyses performed. It should be noted that some alpha spectroscopy blank analyses were slightly above the analytical detection sensitivity. However, the magnitudes of the blank analyses that were above the detection sensitivity were small relative to concentrations of the radionuclides of concern in the field samples. Based on this review, sample results were not adversely affected by internal laboratory contamination, supporting the analytical accuracy of the results.

6.5 **Data Verification**

Data verification was used to ensure that the requirements stated in the planning documents (e.g., Characterization Survey Work Plan, Operating Procedures, and the QAPP), are implemented as required. Data verification is an ongoing process of assessing data and data collection activities for compliance with the planning documents. verification process began as part of the implementation (data collection) phase of the survey.

The individual responsible for data verification during the implementation phase of the survey was the Senior Radiological Engineer. All individuals performing field survey activities assisted in identifying and documenting problems and deficiencies as they were discovered.

Following the survey implementation phase, any individuals performing review and assessment of the survey data were responsible for data verification. Details on data verification activities are provided in the project QAPP.

Data verification, in general, is accomplished by reviewing and monitoring data and data collection activities for compliance with the requirements of the planning documents, and documenting and reporting any problems and/or deficiencies. The following activities and data, at a minimum, were continually assessed during the data life cycle. Problems and/or deficiencies were documented, reported to the Project Manager, and corrected as they occurred.

- Data collection activities that are governed by the requirements of an operating procedure were monitored by the Senior Radiological Engineer/Designee, who had knowledge of the associated requirements.
- The performance of field measurement systems was monitored by the Senior Radiological Engineer/Designee through the use of daily quality control checks of instrument background and response.

Verification of analytical laboratory data was accomplished by ensuring that results were returned for all samples, the proper analytical and field methods were used, analyses were performed for the desired radionuclide parameters using proper analytical methods, and the requirements of the laboratory were met.

Verification of field measurement data consisted of establishing that data was recorded correctly, field instruments were properly calibrated, and survey forms, chain of custody forms, and logbooks were accurate and complete. Any problems with data were documented, and the Project Manager took any necessary preventive and corrective actions.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

The Site characterization survey was extensive and complete -- meeting design objectives. This survey provides an inclusive and unambiguous record of the radiological status of the Site that details the extent of contamination. The design objectives were addressed through a comprehensive survey program that utilized downhole in-situ NaI detector gross gamma measurements spread laterally over the Site MARSSIM Class 1, 2 and 3 areas. These data, coupled with downhole in-situ NaI detector spectroscopic measurements and volumetric soil laboratory gamma and alpha spectroscopy analyses, provide a clear picture of the lateral and vertical extent of radioactive constituents of potential concern (RCOPCs) on the Site.

From the Site characterization survey data it is concluded that:

- Contaminant concentrations of Th-232 and Th-230 follow the Site conceptual model and are present in areas near the center of the Class 1 survey unit. All radioactive contamination was found to exist between the bottom of the clay cap and the top of the native clay layer underlying the Site. The lateral extent of the contamination remains within the bounds of the Site Class 1 survey area.
- Data from the reference area and the Site Class 2 and 3 areas indicates that these locations appear to have the same natural background radioactivity level and distribution.
- Radioactive contamination was found at vertical elevations deeper than anticipated in one native clay depression. This resulted in additional Site area investigation to search for other depressions in the native clay. The search identified one other area where the depth to native clay was greater than previously anticipated (total of two depressions). However, no additional radioactive contamination at depths greater than anticipated was identified. The Site radioactive contamination remains consistent with the conceptual model, in which radioactive contamination was not identified below the upper surface of the natural clay layer that underlies the Site.
- Th-230 to Th-232 activity ratios on the Site ranged from a minimum of 0.5:1 to a maximum of 11:1. The Th-230 to Th-232 ratios are not widely variable across the Site but instead, are clustered in what appears to be two different thorium waste stream areas.

The first waste stream area encompasses the majority of the Site, including the entire central, northeastern, and southeastern portions of the Site. The Th-230 to Th-232 ratio in these areas is approximately 1:1 with a range of 0.5:1 to 2:1. The second waste stream includes two areas, one in the northwest and one in the southwest portion of the Site. The Th-230 to Th-232 ratios in these areas ranges from 4:1 to 11:1.

- Analytical results for groundwater and surface water samples show drinking water exceedances only for secondary maximum concentration levels (MCLs) for iron, total dissolved solids, chloride, and sulfate. Groundwater and surface water in the vicinity of the Site can be considered a potential source of potable water.
- Various chemicals were detected in the soil, but none of the TCLP concentrations exceeded the 40 CFR Part 261.24 maximum concentration of contaminants for toxicity characteristics. The analytical results indicate that the soil containing The analytical results indicate that the soil containing radioactive and chemical waste material at the Site would not be considered a hazardous waste, as defined in 40 CFR Part 261.
- The Site characterization investigation method using NaI in a casing (sealed from ground chemical contaminants) correlates well with the laboratory volumetric sampling analytical data. The in-situ downhole NaI gross gamma counting method is a viable technique to characterize the Th-232 activity concentration in terms of both lateral and vertical extent at the Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site.

8.0 REFERENCES

- 1. ABB 1997 *Evaluation of Analytical Results, Groundwater/Leachate Samples from The Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site,* ABB Environmental Services, Inc., August, 1997
- 2. ABB 1997a *Scoping Survey Work Plan, Tobico Marsh State Game Area,* ABB Environmental Services, Inc., October, 1997.
- 3. ABB 1998 *Preliminary Background Assessment Report, Volume I,* ABB Environmental Services, Inc., April, 1998.
- 4. CABRERA 1998 *Proposal 98-002 for Radiological Consulting Services, MDNR - Tobico Marsh SGA Site,* Cabrera Services, Inc., July, 1998.
- *5.* CABRERA 1998a *Technical Memorandum, Waste Profile Issues Related to Waste Disposal Options for the Tobico Marsh SGA Site,* December, 1998.
- 6. CABRERA 1999 *Determination of Boundaries and Preliminary Classifications of Survey Areas for the Characterization Survey.* Cabrera Services, Inc., February, 1999.
- 7. CABRERA 1999a *Preliminary Dose Assessment, MDNR Tobico Marsh SGA,* Cabrera Services, Inc., April, 1999.
- 8. CABRERA 1999b *Characterization Survey Work Plan, Tobico Marsh SGA,* Cabrera Services, Inc., July 1999.
- 9. CABRERA 1999C *Quality Assurance Project Plan, Tobico Marsh SGA,* Cabrera Services, Inc., October 1999.
- 10. CABRERA 2000 *Quality Assurance Project Plan, Tobico Marsh SGA (rev. 1),* Cabrera Services, Inc., February 2000
- 11. HLA 1998 *Historical Site Assessment, Tobico Marsh State Game Area,* Harding Lawson Associates, July 1998.
- 12. HLA 1998a *Scoping Survey Report, Tobico Marsh State Game Area,* Harding Lawson Associates, October, 1998.
- 13. Lowder 1964 "Field Spectrometric Investigations of Environmental Radiation in the USA", Lowder, W. J. Condon, and H. L. Beck, *The Natural Radiation Environment, 1964.*

15. Myrick 1983 "Determination of Concentrations of Selected Radionuclides in Surface Soil in the U.S.", Myrick, B.A. and F. F. Haywood, *Health Physics Journal.*

- 16. NRC 1997 *NUREG-1575, Multi-Agency Radiation Survey and Site Investigation Manual* (MARSSIM).
- 17. NRC 1997a Subpart E to Title 10, Part 20, of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR 20), 1997.
- 18. NRC 1998 Draft Regulatory Guide DG-4006, *Demonstrating Compliance with the Radiological Criteria for License Termination,* August, 1998.
- 19. NRC 2000 NUREG-1727, *NMSS Decommissioning Standard Review Plan*
- 20. ORAU 1985 *Radiological Survey of the SCA Chemical Services, Inc. Landfill Site, Bay City, Michigan,* Oak Ridge Associated Universities, July, 1985
- 21. Shleien 1992 *The Health Physics and Radiological Health Handbook, Revised Edition,* Bernard Shleien, Ed., 1992.
- 22. UNSCEAR 1988 *Sources, Effects, and Risks of Ionizing Radiation,* United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, 1988.

TABLES

Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site

GAMMA AND ALPHA SPECTROSCOPY RESULTS (pCi/g)

Tables

 $00-073$

Tables

Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site

GAMMA AND ALPHA SPECTROSCOPY RESULTS (DCI/d)

Final Draft Characterization Survey Report

Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site

GAMMA AND ALPHA SPECTROSCOPY RESULTS (pCi/g)

TABLE 4-1

 $\frac{1}{0.086}$ 0.23 0.67 88
C MDC 0.11 $\overline{2.8}$ ∣ڥ $\overline{340}$ ్ల $\overline{5}$ $\frac{3}{4}$ c H7NWSS0302 $\overline{18.5 - 19.5}$ 132374.3 2103940. 0.15 0.19 |အ
|၁ $±0.75$ $\frac{5}{2}$ အိ Result $(1,3)$ င်ပ $\overline{61}$ $\overline{2.1}$ 200 $\frac{3}{2}$ $\frac{8}{10}$ ని $\frac{22}{5}$ ¦은 ೫ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{}$ H $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{+}$ \pm 0.081 16.8 0.55 0.75 -0.5 $\frac{0}{1}$ $\frac{3}{2}$ $\frac{8}{1}$ 8 $\frac{8}{3}$ $\ddot{\tau}$ Ŷ. ခြွ |ম G $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ 0.076 0.073 89 0.13 515 0.26 0.13 MDC¹ 0.21 $\frac{a}{z}$ 일의 lե $\frac{p}{Z}$ 1.4 $\frac{\mathsf{p}}{\mathsf{z}}$ Ω ္င H7NWSS020 $18.5 - 19.5$ 132374.3 2103940.1 0.19 0.15 0.64 Result (1.3) $\bar{4}$ 0.17 $\ddot{5}$ $\frac{\mathsf{p}}{\mathsf{p}}$ $\frac{4}{4}$ $\frac{\mathsf{p}}{\mathsf{z}}$ $\overline{2}$ ءِ ۽
ح $\frac{1}{\mathsf{C}}$ ₹ 눈 $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{+}$ 41 $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{}$ 41 $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{}$ 41 $\ddot{}$ \pm 3.49 $\frac{4}{4}$ 0.34 1.01 0.24 0.47 0.54 $\frac{1}{2}$ c.o $\frac{1}{2}$ $\overline{1}$ 읖 므 ø りっ 읖 -6.1 MDC⁽²⁾ 0.016 0.073 0.017 515 0.026 34 0.017 0.9 4.6 0.44 0.48 $\frac{2}{10}$ ខ្ព H7NWSS0102 GAMMA AND ALPHA SPECTROSCOPY RESULTS (pCi/g) $20.5 - 21.5$ 132374.3 2103940. $±0.015$ 0.29 0.46 0.45 0.32 $\frac{28}{5}$ 0.38 0.067 Result (1.3) 0.07 $\overline{0.08}$ $\frac{5}{6}$ $\frac{5}{1}$ 33
0.87 \dot{a} 8 \tilde{c} œ $\ddot{+}$ $+1$ ŧ Ĥ $\ddot{}$ 0.275 0.015 10.6 0.013 2.46 0.46 2.44 0.83 0.34 2.07 o.
O ್ವ $\ddot{\sim}$ ₹ MDC⁽²⁾ $\frac{1}{0.048}$ 0.034 0.031 $\frac{0.75}{5}$ 88.0 $\frac{9}{5}$ 0.43 0.15 0.12 0.071 0.071 0.59 <u>ი</u> 4.3 0.52 ភ្ន SS $\overline{5}$ **H7NWSS0101** $18.5 - 19.5$ 132374.3 2103940.1 0.044 0.069 0.052 0.02 0.25 0.42 0.23 0.57 $\frac{2}{3}$ 23 \$8 \subseteq Result (1,3) 3 $\ddot{}$ $\overline{1}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{+}$ $+1$ Ŧ <u>ခို</u> 0.163 0.131 101 0.93 86
28 0.73 0.017 $\frac{8}{3}$ 0.07 ෂි 0.52 ې $\frac{4}{9}$ -0.01 ကု ම 0.019 0.058 0.089 0.086 0.64 0.012 0.022 0.05 0.13 0.16 0.12 0.13 MDC¹ $\overline{5}$ 5.8 ခ္တ ွ **H7NWREF01A** 132374.3 21.5-22.5 2103940.1 0.06 Result (1.3) $\frac{0.02}{0.02}$ 0.42 $\frac{1}{2}$ ್ತ <u>ွ</u> ō.o ွ ි \sim ō $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{ }$ $\ddot{+}$ 245 41.6 12.4 0.03 |
ဒီ 37.4 2.16 0.69 0.19 107 က္ခ ₽ 5.6 $\ddot{\mathbf{c}}$ o 4 MDC $^{(2)}$ n nez 0.05 <u>ನ</u> 1.6 $\frac{2}{\sigma}$ こ
こ 5
O 의원의 의의 Ι£ 3 ះ 5 **H7NWREF01** 21.75-22.25 132374.3 2103940.1 $\overline{0.25}$ 515 0.48 0.45 l은 의의의 $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{5}{1}$ $\ddot{\mathbf{c}}$ ς. 의 le Result $(1,3)$ 32 $\frac{1}{\circ}$ r
C $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{+}$ $\ddot{}$ Ŧ $+1$ 44 $\ddot{}$ -0.13 $\frac{0.084}{$ 0.55 $\frac{8}{3}$ 2.09 82 ခြ |
ခြ ြင်း 14.7 le 의술 le $\frac{a}{Z}$ ١£ ယု $\overline{5}$ Depth (bgs):
Northing⁽⁵⁾:
Easting⁽⁵⁾: Sample ID: Th-232(alpha)
Th-230(alpha) Analysis⁽⁴⁾ J-235(alpha)
J-234(alpha) $h-228$ (alpha) -238 (alpha) $\frac{1}{2a-234m}$ **Ra-226** $\frac{1}{b-212}$ $h-234$ $\sqrt{6 - 228}$ P_{b-214} $h-232$ $1 - 208$ -235 Bi-214 $Cs - 137$ $\frac{4}{5}$

Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site

Š

TABLE 4-1

 $00-073$

CABRERA SERVICES, INC.

Final Draft Characterization Survey Report

Tables

Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site

TABLE 4-1

Final Draft Characterization Survey Report

Tables

Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site

GAMMA AND ALPHA SPECTROSCOPY RESULTS (pCi/g)

GAMMA AND ALPHA SPECTROSCOPY RESULTS (pCi/g)

VP Sample analysis not performed Notes:

(1) Errors reported at the 95% confidence level.

(2) Minimum detectable concentrations (MDCs) reported at the 95% confidence level.

⁽³⁾ Results listed as reported directly from the laboratory.

(4) The suffix "(alpha)" following radionuclide title represents performance of alpha spectroscopy analysis, if no "(alpha)" suffix, then gamma spectrosocopy analysis was performed.

(5) Northing and easting values are tied to the Michigan State Plane Coordinate System, North American Datum (NAD) 1983.

(6) For sample E6SWSS0201, Ra-226 activity was calculated directly from the 185.99 keV peak due to damaged container and subsequent lack of time for proper daughter nuclide ingrowth.

This sample was analyzed for disposal purposes. NA⁽¹⁾

NA⁽²⁾ This sample was analyzed for disposal purposes.

NA(3) This sample was analyzed for disposal purposes.

NA⁽⁴⁾ This result is a reference (background) area sample

TABLE 4-2

 $\ddot{}$

4

 $\frac{1}{\cdot}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

Į.

L

<u>.</u>

 $\overline{}$

 \leftarrow

 $\overline{}$

RATIOS OF Th-230 TO Th-232 SAMPLE RESULTS

⁽¹⁾ Errors reported at the 95% confidence level.

⁽²⁾ Minimum detectable concentrations (MDCs) reported at the 95% confidence level.

⁽³⁾ Northing and easting values are tied to the Michigan State Plane Coordinate System,
North American Datum (NAD) 1983.

(4) Results collected from Table 6-2 and are alpha spectroscopy analyses

Notes:

 $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$

Nal GROSS GAMMA 10-SECOND DUPLICATE RESULTS

 $\ddot{}$

 τ

Ť

Nal GROSS GAMMA 10-SECOND DUPLICATE RESULTS

÷

Nal GROSS GAMMA 10-SECOND DUPLICATE RESULTS

Notes: (1) MSL represents Mean Sea Level and is presented in units of feet

⁽²⁾ Northing and easting values are tied to the Michigan State Plane Coordinate System, North American Datum (NAD) 1983

(3) PASS means sample is less than or equal a 20% difference between the initial and duplicate value

Nal DOWNHOLE SPECTROSCOPY DUPLICATE RESULTS

 \sim $-$

 $\overline{}$

 $\overline{}$

 \sim

 \equiv

Nal DOWNHOLE SPECTROSCOPY DUPLICATE RESULTS

Nal DOWNHOLE SPECTROSCOPY DUPLICATE RESULTS

Notes: (1) Northing and easting values are tied to the Michigan State Plane

Coordinate System, North American Datum (NAD) 1983 (2) ft bgs represents feet below ground surface

ND Represents Not Detected NA Represents Not Applicable

NA(') Represents paperwork showing that a duplicate measurement was performed,

but measurement file has been corrupted therefore no results can be presented

Gamma and Alpha Spectroscopy Duplicate Results

Table 6-3

Tables

Tobico Marsh State Game Area Site

Paculte $\frac{1}{2}$ d Ainha Snactros

Table 6-3

Tables

CABRERA SERVICES, INC.

Gamma and Alpha Spectroscopy Duplicate Results

NA Represents Not Applicable Notes:

NP Represents sample analyses based upon laboratory gamma spectroscopy. $\hat{\epsilon}$

Errors reported at the 95% confidence level.

(2) Minimum detectable concentrations (MDCs) reported at the 95% confidence level.

(3) Results listed as reported directly from the laboratory.

(4) The suffix "(alpha)" following radionuclide title represents performance of alpha spectroscopy analysis, if no "(alpha)" suffix, then gamma spectrosocopy analysis was performed

Table 6-4

Comparison of Nal Spectroscopic and Laboratory Sample Results

Notes: (1)

Errors reported at the 95% confidence level. Minimum detectable concentrations (MDCs) reported at the 95% confidence level.

(2)

(3) Th-232 result inferred via Pb-212 activity concentration

Table 6-5

Comparison of Nal Gross Counts Converted to Th-232 Concentration and Laboratory Sample Results

Notes:

(1) Errors reported at the 95% confidence level

(2) Minimum detectable concentration (MDCs) reported at the 95% confidence level

(3) Th-232 result inferred via Pb-212 activity concentration

- **(4)** Best estimate values computed using formulation discussed in Appendix D
- **(5)** This result is sample overflow and cannot be traced to any particular sample gross count location

FIGURES

 ~ 10

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR **T] IAT** CAN BE VIEWED AT THE "1969 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH FIGURE, RECORD TITLED: FIGURE 1-3. AND MAP TOBICO MARSH SGA SITE"

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE

NOTE: Because of these page's large **file** size, it may be more convenient to copy the file to a local drive and use the Imaging (Wang) viewer, which can be accessed from the Programs/Accessories menu.

D-1

THIS PAGE IS AN OVERSIZED DRAWING OR FIGURE, THAT CAN BE VIEWED AT THE RECORD TITLED: FIGURE 3-1. "SITE MAP TOBICO MARSH SGA SITE"

WITHIN THIS PACKAGE

NOTE: Because of these page's large file size, it may be more convenient to copy the file to a local drive and use the Imaging (Wang) viewer, which can be accessed from the Programs/Accessories menu.

D-2

 $CO₂$

I

Ę

 $CO₁$

Ę

 CO^q

Ę

 $C|0$

 $C12$

 $C15$

 C/C

 C/T

 CQ

H

 $C21$

χ^{ει}

 \mathbb{Z} .

Figure 4-26 on gamma spectroscopy sample results Max Th-232 Sample Results with 300 to 500 Count Contour Max Gross Gamma Count Contours Tobico Marsh SGA Site **>500 Count Contour** Michigan Department of Natural Resources Vertex Control of Natural Resources Bay County, Michigan (Counts are 10 sec. response

Max Th-232 sample result (pCi/g) based
on gamma spectroscopy sample results

(Counts are 10 sec. response
of 1" x 1" Nal crystal detector)

C23

-ml I

Figure 4-27 spectroscopy result (pCi/g) Max Th-232 Downhole In Situ Gamma Spectroscopy 300tosoocountContour 300to SOOC 0.300to Results with Max Gross Gamma Count Contours **the Contom** of the state of $\frac{1}{300 \text{ t}}$ Tobico Marsh SGA Site Michigan Department of Natural Resources >500 Count Contour Bay County, Michigan (Counts ae 10 sec. response

- **ml I**

I

Figure 4-28
Th-230 to Th-232 Ratio with Max Gross Gamma Count Contours **Tobico Marsh SGA Site** Michigan Department of Natural Resources
Bay County, Michigan

Th-230 to Th-232 ratio based on alpha
spectroscopy sample results (#) 300 to 500 Count Contour >500 Count Contour (Counts are 10 sec. response
of 1" x 1" Nal crystal detector) $C25$

ិរដ្ឋ

 $\lesssim 22$

FIGURE **5-2** REFERENCE AREA 10-SECOND GROSS GAMMA COUNTS HISTOGRAM

FIGURE **5-3** CLASS 2 AND 3 10-SECOND GROSS GAMMA COUNTS HISTOGRAM

FIGURE 5-4 CLASS 1 10-SECOND GROSS GAMMA COUNTS HISTOGRAM

FIGURE 5-5 CLASS 1 10-SECOND GROSS GAMMA COUNTS HISTOGRAM (LOG SCALE)

Figure 6-1 Year 1999 Gross Gamma Control Chart for Downhole Nal SN: C443E

and the company of the a

 $-175 - 65$

 \bigcirc

Date

-SI S.

 \rightarrow

 \mathbb{R}^n . If \mathbb{R}^n

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $C27$

Figure 6-2 Year 2000 Gross Gamma Control Chart for Downhole Nal SN: C361G

 -1 α

 $\label{eq:1.1} \begin{array}{ll} \text{min} & \quad \text{if} \quad$

 \sim \sim \sim \sim

- 80

or the

particularly

-II

 $C28$

 $\epsilon_{\rm f}$

 λ

Figure 6-4
Year 2000 Gross Gamma Control Chart for Downhole Nal SN: C614D

 $c30$

 \rightarrow

Figure 6-6 Year 2000 Spectroscopic Control Chart for Downhole Nal SN: C361G

The Lines C33-

 ~ 40

I K

Figure 6-7 Year **2000** Spectroscopic Control Chart for Downhole Nal **SN:** C443E

SPECTACION

<u>Van Stor</u>

 $\label{eq:R1} \begin{array}{lll} \mathcal{E}^{(1)}(t) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{E}}(t) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{E}}(t) \end{array}$ $C33$

Figure 6-8 Year 2000 Spectroscopic Control Chart for Downhole **Nal** SN: C614D

 $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F} \times \mathbf{F}$

美工

CALCULATION C_2H

Ii