





10/19

Use Of In-Situ Gamma Spectrum Analysis To Perform  
Elevated Measurement Comparisons In Support Of Final Status Surveys

YA-REPT-00-018-05

**Approvals** (Print & Sign Name)

---

Preparer: Greg Astrauckas/		Date: 10/19/05
Preparer: Gordon Madison, CHP/		Date: 10/11/05
Reviewer: Jim Hummer, CHP/		Date: 10/18/05
Approver (FSS Manager): Dann Smith, CHP/		Date: 11/4/05

## Technical Report YA-REPT-00-018-05, Rev. 0

Use Of In-Situ Gamma Spectrum Analysis To Perform  
Elevated Measurement Comparisons In Support Of Final Status SurveysTABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Report .....	2
1.1	Introduction.....	2
1.2	Discussion.....	2
1.2.1	Detector Description .....	2
1.2.2	Traditional Approach.....	3
1.2.3	Innovative Approach.....	4
1.2.4	Investigation Level.....	4
1.2.5	Detector Sensitivity.....	8
1.2.6	Area Coverage .....	8
1.2.7	Moisture Content in the Soil Matrix .....	9
1.2.8	Discrete Particles in the Soil Matrix .....	10
1.2.9	Procedures and Guidance Documents .....	10
1.2.10	Environmental Background .....	11
1.2.11	Quality Control .....	11
1.2.12	Data Collection .....	12
1.2.13	Efficiency Calibration.....	13
1.2.14	Data Management .....	13
1.3	Conclusions/Recommendations.....	14
1.4	References.....	14
<u>Attachments</u>		
	Attachment 1, ISOCS® Detector System Photos.....	15
	Attachment 2, Field-Of-View Characterization.....	16
	Attachment 3, Typical Grid Pattern For In-Situ Gamma Spectroscopy.....	18

## 1.0 REPORT

### 1.1 Introduction

The ISOCS In-Situ Gamma Spectrum detector system manufactured by Canberra Industries is being employed to perform elevated measurement comparison (EMC) surveys in support of the Final Status Surveys at Yankee Atomic's Yankee Rowe facility. This system uses an HPGe detector and specialized efficiency calibration software designed to perform in-situ gamma-spectroscopy assays. The ISOCS system will primarily be employed to evaluate survey units for elevated measurement comparisons. The ISOCS system can obtain a static measurement at a fixed distance from a pre-determined location. Count times can be tailored to achieve required detection sensitivities. Gamma spectroscopy readily distinguishes background activity from plant-related licensed radioactivity. This attribute is particularly beneficial where natural radioactivity introduces significant investigation survey efforts. Additionally, background subtraction or collimation can be employed where background influences are problematic due to the presence of stored spent fuel (ISFSI).

This technical report is intended to outline the technical approach associated with the use of ISOCS for implementing a MARSSIM-based Final Status Survey with respect to scanning surveys for elevated measurement comparisons for both open land areas and building surfaces. While the examples and discussions in this report primarily address open land areas, the same approach and methodology will be applied when deriving investigation levels, grid spacing and measurement spacing for evaluating building surfaces.

Validation of the ISOCS software is beyond the scope of this technical report. Canberra Industries has performed extensive testing and validation on both the MCNP-based detector characterization process and the ISOCS calibration algorithms associated with the calibration software. The full MCNP method has been shown to be accurate to within 5% typically. ISOCS results have been compared to both full MCNP and to 119 different radioactive calibration sources. In general, ISOCS is accurate to within 4-5% at high energies and 7-11% at 1 standard deviation for low energies. Additionally, the ISOCS technology has been previously qualified in Yankee Atomic Technical Report YA-REPT-00-022-04, "Use Of Gamma Spectrum Analysis To Evaluate Bulk Materials For Compliance With License Termination Criteria."

### 1.2 Discussion

#### 1.2.1 Detector Description

Two ISOCS-characterized HPGe detectors manufactured by Canberra Industries have been procured. Each detector is a reverse-electrode HPGe

detector rated at 50% efficiency (relative to a NaI detector). Resolution for these detectors is 2.2 keV @ 1332 keV. As the project progresses, other ISOCS detectors (e.g. standard electrode coaxial), if available, may be used to increase productivity. The key element regarding the use of other types of ISOCS<sup>®</sup> detectors is that specific efficiency calibrations will be developed to account for each detector's unique characteristics.

The HPGe detector is mounted on a bracket designed to hold the detector / cryostat assembly and associated collimators. This bracket may be mounted in a wheeled cart or in a cage-like frame. Both the wheeled cart and frame permit the detector to be oriented (pointed) over a full range from a horizontal to vertical position. The frame's design allows the detector to be suspended above the ground. Photographs of the frame-mounted system are presented in Attachment 1. During evaluations of Class 1 areas for elevated radioactivity, the detector will generally be outfitted with the 90-degree collimator. Suspending the detector at 2 meters above the target surface yields a nominal field-of-view of 12.6 m<sup>2</sup>.

The InSpector (MCA) unit that drives the signal chain and the laptop computer that runs the acquisition software (Genie-2000) are mounted either in the frame or on the wheeled cart. These components are battery powered. Back-up power supplies (inverter or UPS) are available to support the duty cycle. A wireless network has been installed at the site so that the laptop computers used to run the systems can be completely controlled from any workstation at the facility. This configuration also enables the saving of data files directly to a centralized file server. Radio communication will be used to coordinate system operation.

### 1.2.2 Traditional Approach

With respect to Class 1 Survey Units, small areas of elevated activity are evaluated via the performance of scan surveys. The size of the potential area of elevated activity affects the DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> and is typically determined by that area bounded by the grid points used for fixed measurements. This area in turn dictates the area factor(s) used for deriving the associated DCGL<sub>EMC</sub>.

These scan surveys are traditionally conducted with hand-held field instruments that have a detection sensitivity sufficiently low to identify areas of localized activity above the DCGL<sub>EMC</sub>. Occasionally, the detection sensitivity of these instruments is greater than the DCGL<sub>EMC</sub>. In order to increase the DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> to the point where hand-held instrumentation can be reasonably employed, the survey design is augmented to require additional fixed-point measurements. The effect of these additional measurement points is to tighten the fixed measurement grid spacing, thus reducing the area applied to deriving the DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> and increasing the detection sensitivity criteria.

b

Background influences (from the ISFSI) and natural terrestrial sources further impact the sensitivity of these instruments. To address these impacts, the fixed-point grid spacing would again need to be reduced (requiring even more samples) in order to increase the  $DCGL_{EMC}$  to the point where hand-held instrumentation can be used. Generally, the collection of additional fixed measurements (i.e. samples) increases project costs.

Survey designs for Class 2 and Class 3 survey units are not driven by the elevated measurement comparison because areas of elevated activity are not expected. In Class 2 areas, any indication of activity above the  $DCGL_W$  requires further investigation. Similarly, in Class 3 areas, any positive indication of licensed radioactivity also requires further investigation. Because the  $DCGL_{EMC}$  is not applicable to Class 2 or Class 3 areas, adjustments to grid spacing do not occur. However, the increased field-of-view associated with the in-situ gamma spectroscopy system improves the efficiency of the survey's implementation.

### 1.2.3 Innovative Approach

In-situ assays allow fixed-point grid spacing to be uncoupled from the derivation of applicable investigation levels. In contrast to the traditional approach where the  $DCGL_{EMC}$  (based on grid size) determines both investigation levels and detection sensitivities, the use of this technology provides two independent dynamics as follows:

- Detection sensitivity is determined by the  $DCGL_{EMC}$  associated with the (optimal) fixed-point grid spacing.
- Investigation levels are based on the detector's field-of-view and adjusted for the smallest area of concern (i.e. 1 m<sup>2</sup>).

### 1.2.4 Investigation Level

Development of the investigation (action) levels applied to in-situ assay results is a departure from the traditional approach for implementing a MARSSIM survey. Examples are provided for both open land areas (i.e. soil) and for building surfaces, however the approach for both is identical.

To support the use of in-situ spectroscopy to evaluate areas of elevated activity the HPGe detector's field-of-view was characterized. Attachment 2 presents data from the field-of-view characterization for a detector configured with a 90-degree collimator positioned 2 meters from the target surface. Alternate configurations will be evaluated in a similar manner before being employed. As exhibited in Attachment 2, when the detector is positioned at 2 meters above the target surface the field-of-view has a radius of at least 2.3

meters. This value was rounded down to 2.0 meters for implementation purposes, introducing a conservative bias (approximately 9%) in reported results. The example provided in this technical report assumes a 2-meter source-to-detector distance, yielding a nominal field-of-view surface area of 12.6 m<sup>2</sup>.

Occasionally, alternate source-to-detector distances (using the 90-degree collimator) may be employed, particularly in a characterization or investigation capacity. In such cases, the detector's field-of-view will be calculated by setting the radius equal to the source-to-detector distance, thereby maintaining the conservative attribute previously described. If alternative collimator configurations are used to perform elevated measurement comparisons, then specific evaluations will be documented in the form of a technical evaluation or similar. Associated investigation levels will be derived using the same approach and methodology outlined below in this section.

After the detector's field-of-view is determined, an appropriate investigation level is developed to account for a potential one-meter square area of elevated activity. DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> values for a one-square meter area are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1, SOIL DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> FOR 1 m<sup>2</sup>

	Soil DCGL <sub>w</sub> (pCi/g) (NOTE 1)	Soil DCGL <sub>w</sub> (pCi/g) (NOTE 2)	Area Factor for 1 m <sup>2</sup> (NOTE 3)	DCGL <sub>EMC</sub> for 1 m <sup>2</sup> (pCi/g) (NOTE 4)
Co-60	3.8	1.4	11	15
Ag-108m	6.9	2.5	9.2	23
Cs-134	4.7	1.7	16	28
Cs-137	8.2	3.0	22	66

NOTE 1 – LTP Table 6-1

NOTE 2 – Adjusted to 8.73 mRem/yr

NOTE 3 – LTP Appendix 6Q

NOTE 4 – Soil DCGL<sub>w</sub> (adjusted to 8.73 mRem/yr) for a 1 m<sup>2</sup> area

The <sup>1m<sup>2</sup></sup>DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> values listed in Table 1 do not account for a source positioned at the edge of the field-of-view. Therefore, the <sup>1m<sup>2</sup></sup>DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> values are adjusted via a correction factor. To develop this correction factor, a spectrum free of plant-related radioactivity was analyzed using two different efficiency calibrations (i.e. geometries). The first scenario assumes radioactivity uniformly distributed over the detector's 12.6 m<sup>2</sup> field-of-view. The second scenario assumes radioactivity localized over a 1 m<sup>2</sup> situated at the edge of the detector's field-of-view. The resultant MDC values were compared to characterize the difference in detection efficiencies between the two scenarios. As expected, the condition with localized (1 m<sup>2</sup>) radioactivity at the edge of the detector's field-of-view yielded higher MDC values. The ratio between the reported MDC values for the two scenarios is used as a correction factor. This correction factor is referred to as the offset geometry

adjustment factor. The investigation levels for soils presented in Table 2 were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Nuclide Investigation Level (pCi/g)} = (\text{DCGL}_{\text{EMC}}) * \text{CF}$$

Where:  $\text{DCGL}_{\text{EMC}} = (\text{DCGL}_{\text{W}} \text{ or } \text{DCGL}_{\text{SURR}}) * \text{AF}_{(1 \text{ m}^2)}$ , and  
 $\text{CF} = \text{Mean offset geometry adjustment factor}$

TABLE 2, SOIL INVESTIGATION LEVEL DERIVATION

	MDC pCi/g (NOTE 1)	MDC pCi/g (NOTE 2)	RATIO (NOTE 3)	DCGL <sub>EMC</sub> for 1 m <sup>2</sup> (NOTE 5)	INVESTIGATION LEVEL pCi/g (NOTE 6)
Co-60	0.121	1.86	0.0651	15	1.0
Ag-108m	0.184	2.82	0.0652	23	1.5
Cs-134	0.189	2.90	0.0652	28	1.8
Cs-137	0.182	2.78	0.0655	66	4.3
<b>Offset Geometry Adjustment Factor</b> (NOTE 4)			<b>0.0653</b>		

NOTE 1 – Assumed activity distributed over the 12.6 m<sup>2</sup> field-of-view.

NOTE 2 – Efficiency calibration modeled for a 1 m<sup>2</sup> area situated (off-set) at the edge of the detector's field-of-view. The model assumes that all activity is distributed within the 1 m<sup>2</sup>.

NOTE 3 – Ratio = (12.6 m<sup>2</sup> MDC ÷ 1 m<sup>2</sup> MDC).

NOTE 4 – The mean value of the ratios is applied as the off-set geometry adjustment factor.

NOTE 5 – DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> values for 1 m<sup>2</sup> (from Table 1)

NOTE 6 – Investigation levels derived by applying of the off-set geometry adjustment factor (e.g. 0.0653) to the DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> for a 1 m<sup>2</sup> area for each radionuclide.

With respect to building surfaces, the development of the investigation level is identical to that for soil surfaces. The one-meter square DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> for building surfaces are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3, BUILDING SURFACE DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> FOR 1 m<sup>2</sup>

	Bldg DCGL <sub>W</sub> (dpm/100m <sup>2</sup> ) (NOTE 1)	Bldg DCGL <sub>W</sub> (dpm/100cm <sup>2</sup> ) (NOTE 2)	Area Factor For 1 m <sup>2</sup> (NOTE 3)	DCGL <sub>EMC</sub> For 1 m <sup>2</sup> (dpm/100cm <sup>2</sup> ) (NOTE 4)
Co-60	18,000	6,300	7.3	46,000
Ag-108m	25,000	8,700	7.2	62,600
Cs-134	29,000	10,000	7.4	74,000
Cs-137	63,000	22,000	7.6	167,000

NOTE 1 – LTP Table 6-1

NOTE 2 – Adjusted to 8.73 mRem/yr

NOTE 3 – LTP Appendix 6S

NOTE 4 – Building DCGL<sub>W</sub> (adjusted to 8.73 mRem/yr) for a 1 m<sup>2</sup> area

Using the same approach described for soils, a correction factor to account for efficiency differences due to geometry considerations is developed the one-meter square DCGL<sub>EMC</sub>. ISOCS efficiency calibrations for activity distributed over the detector's field-of-view and for activity within one-square meter located at the edge of the detector's field-of-view were developed. The MDC values for these two geometries were compared to characterize the difference in detection efficiencies. As expected, the condition with localized (1 m<sup>2</sup>)

radioactivity at the edge of the detector's field-of-view yielded higher MDC values. The ratio between the reported MDC values for the two scenarios is used as the offset geometry adjustment factor. The MDC values, the associated ratios, and the derived investigation level for building surfaces are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4, BUILDING SURFACE INVESTIGATION LEVEL DERIVATION

	12.6 m <sup>2</sup> MDC (dpm/100cm <sup>2</sup> ) (NOTE 1)	1 m <sup>2</sup> MDC (dpm/100cm <sup>2</sup> ) (NOTE 2)	RATIO (NOTE 3)	DCGL <sub>EMC</sub> For 1 m <sup>2</sup> (dpm/100cm <sup>2</sup> ) (NOTE 5)	BUILDING SURFACE INVESTIGATION LEVEL (dpm/100cm <sup>2</sup> ) (NOTE 6)
Co-60	785	12,400	0.0633	46,000	2,900
Ag-108m	839	13,000	0.0645	62,600	3,900
Cs-134	900	14,200	0.0634	74,000	4,700
Cs-137	922	14,600	0.0632	167,000	10,600
<b>Offset Geometry Adjustment Factor</b> (NOTE 4)			<b>0.0636</b>		

NOTE 1 – Assumed activity distributed over the 12.6 m<sup>2</sup> field-of-view.

NOTE 2 – Efficiency calibration modeled for a 1 m<sup>2</sup> area situated (off-set) at the edge of the detector's field-of-view. The model assumes that all activity is distributed within the 1 m<sup>2</sup>.

NOTE 3 – Ratio = (12.6 m<sup>2</sup> MDC ÷ 1 m<sup>2</sup> MDC).

NOTE 4 – The mean value of the ratios is applied as the off-set geometry adjustment factor.

NOTE 5 – DCGL<sub>EMC</sub> values for 1 m<sup>2</sup> (from Table 3)

NOTE 6 – Investigation levels derived by applying of the off-set geometry adjustment factor (e.g. 0.0636) to the one-square meter DCGL<sub>EMC</sub>.

In summary, effective investigation levels for both open land areas (i.e. soils) and for building surfaces can be derived and applied to in-situ gamma spectroscopy results. Note the MDC values associated with the detector's field-of-view were well below the derived investigation levels.

The investigation levels presented in Table 2 and Table 4 do not address the use of surrogate DCGLs. Use of surrogate DCGLs will be addressed in Final Status Survey Plans, particularly where it is necessary to evaluate non-gamma emitting radionuclides on building surfaces. When surrogate DCGLs are employed, investigation levels will be developed on a case-by-case basis using the approach outlined in this document. Similarly, the offset geometry adjustment factor presented in Table 2 and Table 4 will vary for different geometries. Although unlikely, if different geometries are employed, this value will be determined on a case-by-case basis using the methodology reflected in Table 2 and will be documented in the applicable Final Status Survey Plan.

For both open land areas and for building surfaces, when an investigation level is encountered, investigatory protocols will be initiated to evaluate the presence of elevated activity and bound the region as necessary. Such evaluations may include both hand-held field instrumentation as well as the in-situ HPGe detector system. After investigation activities are completed,



subsequent (follow-up) scanning evaluations will most likely be conducted using the in-situ gamma spectroscopy system.

#### 1.2.5 Detector Sensitivity

For Class 1 scan surveys, the minimum detectable concentration is governed by the  $DCGL_{EMC}$  associated with the grid area used to locate fixed-point measurements. The system's count time can be controlled to achieve the required detection sensitivity. Therefore, the grid spacing for the fixed-point measurements can be optimized thus eliminating unnecessary increases to the number of fixed-point measurements while ensuring that elevated areas between fixed measurement locations can be identified and evaluated.

Based on preliminary work, it has been determined that a count time of 900 seconds will yield an acceptable sensitivity for many areas on the site. This count time provides MDC values well below the investigation levels presented in Table 2 and Table 4. Count times will be adjusted as necessary as survey unit-specific investigation levels are derived or where background conditions warrant to ensure that detection sensitivities are below the applicable investigation level. Since each assay report includes a report of the MDC values achieved during the assay, this information is considered technical support that required MDC values were met.

#### 1.2.6 Area Coverage

Based on the nominal 12.6 m<sup>2</sup> field-of-view, a 3-meter spacing between each survey point will result in well over 100% of the survey unit to be evaluated for elevated activity. This spacing convention typically employs a grid pattern that is completely independent from the grid used to locate fixed-point measurements. An example of the grid pattern and spacing is presented in Attachment 3.

Alternate spacing conventions may be applied on a case-by-case basis. For instance, spacing may be decreased when problematic topographies are encountered. Note that decreased grid spacing in this context is not associated to the fixed-point measurements. Occasionally it may be necessary to position the detector at one meter or less from the target surface to evaluate unusual (e.g. curved) surfaces or to assist in bounding areas of elevated activity. In cases where it may be desirable to increase the field-of-view via collimator or source-to-detector distances, grid-spacing conventions (and applicable investigation levels) will be determined using the approach described in this document.

### 1.2.7 Moisture Content in the Soil Matrix

In-situ gamma spectroscopy of open land areas is inherently subject to various environmental variables not present in laboratory analyses. Most notably is the impact that water saturation has on assay results. This impact has two components. First, the total activity result for the assay is assigned over a larger, possibly non-radioactive mass introduced by the presence of water. Secondly, water introduces a self-absorption factor.

The increase in sample mass due to the presence of water is addressed by the application of a massimetric efficiency developed by Canberra Industries. Massimetric efficiency units are defined as [counts per second]/[gammas per second per gram of sample]. Mathematically, this is the product of traditional efficiency and the mass of the sample. When the efficiency is expressed this way, the efficiency asymptotically approaches a constant value as the sample becomes very large (e.g. infinite). Under these conditions changes in sample size, including mass variations from excess moisture, have little impact on the counting efficiency. However, the massimetric efficiency does not completely address attenuation characteristics associated with water in the soil matrix.

To evaluate the extent of self-absorption, (traditional) counting efficiencies were compared for two densities. Based on empirical data associated with the monitoring wells, typical nominally dry in-situ soil is assigned a density of 1.7 g/cc. A density of 2.08 g/cc, obtained from a technical reference publication by Thomas J. Glover, represents saturated soil. A density of 2.08 g/cc accounts for a possible water content of 20%. A summary of this comparison is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5, COUNTING EFFICIENCY COMPARISONS

keV	Efficiencies		Deviation due to density increase (excess moisture)
	1.7 g/cc	2.08 g/cc	
434	3.3 E-6	2.7 E-6	-18.7%
661.65	2.9 E-6	2.4 E-6	-17.5%
1173.22	2.5 E-6	2.1 E-6	-15.4%
1332.49	2.4 E-6	2.1 E-6	-14.8%

In cases when the soil is observed to contain more than "typical" amounts of water, potential under-reporting can be addressed in one of two manners. One way is to adjust the investigation level down by 20%. The second way is to reduce the sample mass by 20%. Either approach achieves the same objective: to introduce a conservative mechanism for triggering the investigation level where the presence of water may inhibit counting efficiency. The specific mechanism to be applied will be prescribed in implementing procedures.

The presence of standing water (or ice or snow) on the surface of the soil being assayed will be accounted for in customized efficiency calibrations applied during data analysis activities.

#### 1.2.8 Discrete Particles in the Soil Matrix

Discrete particles are not specifically addressed in the License Termination Plan. However, an evaluation was performed assuming all the activity in the detector's field-of-view, to a depth of 15 cm, was situated in a discrete point-source configuration. A concentration of 1.0 pCi/g (Co-60), corresponding to the investigation level presented in Table 2, correlates to a discrete point-source of approximately 3.2  $\mu$ Ci. This activity value is considered as the discrete particle of concern. Since the presence of any discrete particles will most likely be accompanied by distributed activity, the investigation level may provide an opportunity to detect discrete particles below 3.2  $\mu$ Ci.

Discrete particles exceeding this magnitude would readily be detected during characterization or investigation surveys. The MDCs associated with hand-held field instruments used for scan surveys are capable of detecting very small areas of elevated radioactivity that could be present in the form of discrete point sources. The minimum detectable particle activity for these scanning instruments and methods correspond to a small fraction of the TEDE limit provided in 10CFR20 subpart E. Note that the MDC values presented in Table 2 are significantly lower than those published in Table 5-4 of the License Termination Plan.

When the investigation level in a Class 1 area is observed, subsequent investigation surveys will be performed to include the use of hand-held detectors. The detection sensitivities of instruments used for these surveys have been previously addressed in the LTP. Furthermore, discrete point sources do not contribute to the uniformly distributed activity of the survey unit. It is not expected that such sources at this magnitude would impact a survey unit's ability to satisfy the applicable acceptance criteria.

Noting that Class 2 or Class 3 area survey designs do not employ elevated measurement comparisons, associated investigation levels are based on positive indications of licensed radioactivity above the DCGL<sub>LW</sub> or above background. Because such areas are minimally impacted or disturbed, potential discrete particles would most likely be situated near the soil surface where detection efficiencies are highest.

#### 1.2.9 Procedures And Guidance Documents

General use of the portable ISOCS system is administrated by departmental implementing procedures that address the calibration and operation activities as well as analysis of the data. These procedures are listed as follows:

- DP-8869, "In-Situ (ISOCS) Gamma Spectrum Assay System Calibration Procedure."
- DP-8871, "Operation Of The Canberra Portable ISOCS Assay System."
- DP-8872, "ISOCS Post Acquisition Processing And Data Review."

Where the portable ISOCS<sup>®</sup> system is used for Final Status Surveys, the applicable FSS Plan will address detector and collimator configurations, applicable (surrogated) investigation levels, MDC requirements, and appropriate Data Quality Objectives, as applicable.

A secondary application of the portable ISOCS<sup>®</sup> system is to assay surfaces or bulk materials for characterization or unconditional release evaluations. Use of the portable ISOCS<sup>®</sup> system for miscellaneous evaluations will be administrated under a specific guidance document (e.g. Sample Plan, etc.). Operating parameters such as physical configuration, efficiency calibrations, count times, and MDCs will be applied so as to meet the criteria in the associated controlling documents. Such documents will also address any unique technical issues associated with the application and may provide guidance beyond that of procedure AP-0052, "Radiation Protection Release of Materials, Equipment and Vehicles."

#### 1.2.10 Environmental Backgrounds

If background subtraction is used, an appropriate background spectrum will be collected and saved. Count times for environmental backgrounds should exceed the count time associated with the assay. In areas where the background radioactivity is particularly problematic (e.g. ISFSI), the background will be characterized to the point of identifying gradient(s) such that background subtractions are either appropriate or conservative. Documentation regarding the collection and application of environmental backgrounds will be provided as a component of the final survey plan.

#### 1.2.11 Quality Control

Quality Control (QC) activities for the ISOCS system ensure that the energy calibration is valid and detector resolution is within specifications. A QC file will be set up for each detector system to track centroid position, FWHM, and activity. Quality Control counts will be performed on a shiftly basis prior to the system's use to verify that the system's energy calibration is valid. The Na-22 has a 1274.5 keV photon which will be the primary mechanism used for performance monitoring. If the energy calibration is found to be out of an acceptable tolerance (e.g. greater than  $\pm 4$  channels), then the amplifier gain may be adjusted and a follow-up QC count performed. If the detector's resolution is found to be above the factory specification, then an evaluation

will be performed to determine if the detector should be removed from service and/or if the data is impacted. Evaluations associated with QC counts shall be documented. Such documentation may be limited to a remark directly on the applicable QC report or in a logbook if the resolution does not render the system out of service. Otherwise the evaluation should be separately documented (e.g. Condition Report, etc.) so as to address the impact of any assay results obtained since the last acceptable QC surveillance.

Where it is determined that background subtraction is necessary, a baseline QC background will be determined specific to that area or region. When background subtraction is required, a QC background surveillance will be performed before a set of measurements are made to verify the applicability of the background to be subtracted. Due to the prevailing variability of the background levels across the site, the nature and extent of such surveillances will be on a case-by-case basis and should be addressed in the documentation associated with the applicable survey plan(s).

In addition to the routine QC counts, each assay report is routinely reviewed with respect to K-40 to provide indications where amplifier drift impacts nuclide identification routines. This review precludes the necessity for specific (i.e. required) after-shift QC surveillances. It also minimizes investigations of previously collected data should the system fail a before-use QC surveillance on the next day of use.

#### 1.2.12 Data Collection

Data collection to support FSS activities will be administered by a specific Survey Plan. Survey Plans may include an index of measurement locations with associated spectrum filenames to ensure that all the required measurements are made and results appropriately managed. Personnel specifically trained to operate the system will perform data collection activities.

Data collection activities will address environmental conditions that may impact soil moisture content. Logs shall be maintained so as to provide a mechanism to annotate such conditions to ensure that efficiency calibration files address the in-situ condition(s). In extreme cases (e.g. standing water, etc.) specific conditions will be addressed to ensure that analysis results reflect the conditions. As previously discussed with respect to water, when unique environmental conditions exist that may impact analysis results, conservative compensatory factors will be applied to the analysis of the data.

### 1.2.13 Efficiency Calibration

The central feature of the portable ISOCS technology is to support in-situ gamma spectroscopy via the application of mathematically derived efficiency calibrations. Due to the nature of the environment and surfaces being evaluated (assayed), input parameters for the ISOCS efficiency calibrations will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure the applicability of the resultant efficiency. Material densities applied to efficiency calibrations will be documented. In practice, a single efficiency calibration file may be applied to the majority of the measurements.

The geometry most generally employed will be a circular plane assuming uniformly distributed activity. Efficiency calibrations will address a depth of 15 cm for soil and a depth up to 5 cm for concrete surfaces to account for activity embedded in cracks, etc. Other geometries (e.g. exponential circular plane, rectangular plane, etc.) will be applied if warranted by the physical attributes of the area or surface being evaluated. Efficiency calibrations are developed by radiological engineers who have received training with respect to the ISOCS<sup>®</sup> software. Efficiency calibrations will be documented in accordance with procedure DP-8869, "In-Situ (ISOCS) Gamma Spectrum Assay System Calibration Procedure."

### 1.2.14 Data Management

Data management will be implemented in various stages as follows:

- An index or log will be maintained to account for each location where evaluations for elevated activity are performed. Raw spectrum files will be written directly or copied to a central file server.
- Data Analysis – After the spectrum is collected and analyzed, a qualified Radiological Engineer will review the results. The data review process includes application of appropriate background, nuclide libraries, and efficiency calibrations. Data reviews also verify assay results with respect to the applicable investigation levels and the MDCs achieved. Data reviews may include monitoring system performance utilizing K-40. When the data analysis is completed, the analyzed data file will be archived to a unique directory located on a central file server.
- Data Reporting – The results of data files whose reviews have been completed and are deemed to be acceptable may be uploaded to a central database for subsequent reporting and statistical analysis.

- Data Archiving – Routinely (daily) the centralized file server(s) where the raw and analyzed data files are maintained will be backed up to tape.

### 1.3 Conclusions/Recommendations

The in-situ gamma spectroscopy system is a cost-effective technology well-suited to replace traditional scanning survey techniques to evaluate areas for elevated radioactivity. The static manner in which this system is operated eliminates many variables and limitations inherent to hand-held detectors moving over a surface. This system provides a demonstrably lower detection sensitivity than those offered by hand-held field instruments. This attribute qualifies this system as an alternative technology in lieu of hand-held NaI field instruments in areas where background radiation levels would prohibit the use of such detectors to evaluate for elevated gross activity. The MDC to which this system will be operated satisfies (or exceeds) criteria applied to traditional scan surveys using hand-held field instruments.

Effective investigation levels for both open land areas (i.e. soils) and for building surfaces can be derived and applied to in-situ gamma spectroscopy results. Where surrogate DCGLs are employed, investigation levels will developed on a case-by-case basis using the approach outlined in this document.

The manner in which investigation levels are derived employs several conservative decisions and assumptions. Additionally, adequate spacing applied to scanning survey locations yields an overlap in surface coverage providing 100-percent coverage of Class 1 areas and redundant opportunities in a significant portion of the survey area to detect localized elevated activity.

### 1.4 References

1. YNPS License Termination Plan, Revision 1
2. Multi-Agency Radiation Survey And Site Investigation Manual (MARSSIM) Revision 1, 2000
3. Canberra User's Manual Model S573 ISOCS Calibration Software, 2002
4. Decommissioning Health Physics - A Handbook for MARSSIM Users, E.W. Abelquist, 2001
5. Canberra's Genie 2000 V3.0 Operations Manual, 2004
6. In-Situ (ISOCS) Gamma Spectrum Assay System Calibration Procedure DP-8869, Revision 0
7. Operation of the Canberra Portable ISOCS Assay System DP-8871 Revision 0
8. Technical Ref., by Thomas J. Glover.

Attachment 1  
Portable ISOCS® Detector System Photos





Attachment 2  
 Field-Of-View Characterization

Generally, the HPGe detector will be outfitted with a 90-degree collimator situated at 2 meters perpendicular to the surface being evaluated. Note that characterizing the detector's field-of-view could be performed without a source by comparing ISOCS-generated efficiencies for various geometries. If a different collimator configuration is to be employed, a similar field-of-view characterization will be performed.

To qualify the field-of-view for this configuration, a series of measurements were made at various off-sets relative to the center of the reference plane. The source used for these measurements was a 1.2  $\mu\text{Ci}$  Co-60 point-source with a physical size of approximately 1  $\text{cm}^3$ . Each spectrum was analyzed as a point source both with and without background subtract. It was observed that the detector responded quite well to the point source.

Figure 1 presents the results with background subtraction applied. Note that there is a good correlation with the expected nominal activity and that outside the 2-meter radius of the "working" field-of-view (i.e. at 90 inches) some detector response occurs. This validates that the correct attenuation factors are applied to the algorithms used to compute the efficiency calibration.

FIGURE 1






Figure 2 shows the effect of plant-derived materials present in the reference background, which indicates an increasing over-response the further the point source is moved off center. Detector response outside the assumed (i.e. 2-meter) field-of-view would yield conservative results. Normally, source term adjacent to the survey units should be reduced to eliminate background interference.

16

FIGURE 2



Attachment 3  
Typical Grid Pattern For In-Situ Gamma Spectroscopy



⊗ = Scan Point Location

○ = Scan Area Footprint  
(4m dia. for 2m scan height)