

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Volume 1 of 2</u>	
1.0 Executive Summary	1-1
1.1 Background	1-1
1.2 Dose Modeling	1-2
Table 1-1 Industrial Worker Scenario Individual Radionuclide Decay Chain DCGL _{ws} for Soils	1-3
Table 1-2 Industrial Worker Scenario Individual Radionuclide Decay Chain DCGL _{ws} for Building and Component Surfaces	1-4
1.3 Summary of Decommissioning Activities	1-4
1.4 Summary of FSS Activities	1-5
2.0 Facility Operating History	2-1
2.1 Licensing Number/Status/Authorized Activities	2-1
2.1.1 License Number	2-1
2.1.2 Possession Limits	2-1
2.1.3 Authorized Activities	2-1
2.1.4 Site Operations	2-1
2.1.4.1 Groundwater Interceptor Trench	2-2
2.1.5 License Amendments	2-2
2.2 License History	2-4
2.2.1 License History and Possession Limits	2-4
2.2.2 Chemical Form of Radionuclides	2-5
2.2.3 Historical Process Activities	2-5
2.2.3.1 Area I – Pond Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9	2-6
2.2.3.1.1 Physical Description and Location	2-6
2.2.3.1.2 Description of Past Operations	2-6
2.2.3.2 Area II – Chemical “C” Process, Pond Nos. 2 and 3	2-7
2.2.3.2.1 Physical Description and Location	2-7
2.2.3.2.2 Description of Past Operations	2-7
2.2.3.3 Area III – Former Storage Areas and Pond No. 5	2-10
2.2.3.3.1 Physical Description and Location	2-10
2.2.3.3.2 Description of Past Operations	2-10
2.2.3.4 Area IV – Former Drum Storage Area	2-10
2.2.3.5 Area V – Chemical “A” Building, Process Water Treatment Plant, Former Pretreatment Pond Nos. 1S and 1N	2-10
2.2.3.5.1 Physical Description and Location	2-10
2.2.3.5.2 Description of Past Operations	2-11
2.2.3.5.2.1 Scrap Processing	2-11
2.2.3.5.2.2 Columbium Processing	2-11
2.2.3.5.2.3 Tantalum Processing	2-12
2.2.3.5.2.4 Sodium Reduction of K ₂ TaF ₇	2-12
2.2.3.5.2.5 Wastewater Treatment	2-13
2.3 Previous Decommissioning Activities	2-13
2.3.1 Northwest Property	2-13
2.3.2 Pond No. 1 Closure	2-15

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
2.3.3 Pond No. 2 Closure	2-15
2.3.4 Pond No. 5 Removal Activities	2-15
2.3.5 Groundwater Interceptor Trench Installation	2-15
2.4 Spills	2-16
2.4.1 Pond No. 3 Liner Failure	2-16
2.4.2 1999 Tornado	2-17
2.5 Prior On-Site Burials	2-18
 References	 2-19
 Tables	
Table 2-1 – Typical Analyses – Ores/Slags, Purchased Ores for Processing	
Table 2-2 – Typical Analyses – Ores/Slags, Purchased Slags for Processing	
Table 2-3 – Typical Composition, Pond Nos. 2, 3, and 5	
Table 2-4 – Typical Composition, Pond Nos. 8 and 9	
Table 2-5 – Dimensions and Construction of Settling Ponds	
 Figures	
Figure 2-1 – Site Plan (Dwg 6473420)	
Figure 2-2 – Historical Site Operations Map (Dwg 6473201)	
Figure 2-3 – Previous Locations of Radionuclide Use (Dwg 6473428)	
Figure 2-4 – Pond No. 3 (Dwg 6473203)	
 3.0 Facility Description	 3-1
3.1 Site Location and Description	3-1
3.1.1 Distance to Nearby Cities	3-1
3.1.2 Facility Description	3-1
3.1.3 Off-Site Wells	3-2
3.2 Population Distribution	3-2
3.3 Current/Future Land Use	3-3
3.4 Meteorology and Climatology	3-4
3.4.1 Routine Weather	3-5
3.4.1.1 Wind	3-5
3.4.1.2 Temperature	3-5
3.4.1.3 Precipitation	3-5
3.4.1.4 Relative Humidity	3-6
3.4.1.5 Evapotranspiration	3-6
3.4.2 Severe Weather	3-7
3.4.3 National Ambient Air Quality Standards Category	3-7
3.5 Geology and Seismology	3-8
3.5.1 Regional Geology	3-8
3.5.2 Site Geology	3-9

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
3.5.3 Regional Geologic Structures and Tectonics	3-12
3.5.4 Seismology	3-13
3.6 Surface Water Hydrology	3-14
3.7 Groundwater Hydrology	3-15
3.7.1 Regional Hydrogeology	3-15
3.7.2 Site Hydrogeology	3-16
3.7.2.1 Single-Well Aquifer Characterization	3-17
3.7.2.2 Single-Well Aquifer Characterization Tests	3-18
3.7.2.3 Multiwell Aquifer Characterization Test	3-19
3.8 Natural Resources	3-20
3.8.1 Mineral and Hydrocarbon Resources	3-20
3.8.2 Water	3-20
3.8.3 Ecology	3-21
3.8.3.1 Terrestrial	3-21
3.8.3.1.1 Flora	3-21
3.8.3.1.2 Fauna	3-22
3.8.3.2 Aquatic	3-22
3.8.3.3 Threatened and Endangered Species	3-22
References	3-24

Tables

Table 3-1 – Climatological Information for Muskogee County, Oklahoma
 Table 3-2 – Oklahoma Earthquakes Magnitude 3.5 or Greater
 Table 3-3 – Annual Peak Streamflow, Arkansas River Near Muskogee, Oklahoma
 Table 3-4 – Calendar Year Streamflow Statistics, Arkansas River Near Muskogee, Oklahoma
 Table 3-5 – Monthly Streamflow Statistics, Arkansas River Near Muskogee, Oklahoma
 Table 3-6 – Mean Estimates of Conventional Undiscovered Accumulations, 1995 Nation
 Oil and Gas Assessment, U.S. Geological Survey
 Table 3-7 – Threatened and Endangered Species of Oklahoma

Figures

Figure 3-1 – Site Location Map (Dwg 6473002)
 Figure 3-2 – Site Vicinity Map (Dwg 6473001)
 Figure 3-3 – Site Plan (Dwg 6473403)
 Figure 3-4 – Aerial Photograph (Dwg 6473003)
 Figure 3-5 – Soil Boring and Groundwater Well Location Map (Dwg 6473402)
 Figure 3-6 – Major Geologic Provinces and Subprovinces of Oklahoma (Dwg 6473204)
 Figure 3-7 – Shallow Groundwater Contour Map (Dwg 6473429)
 Figure 3-8 – Potentiometric Surface Map (Dwg 6473430)

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
Appendices	
Appendix A – Wind File Library Station Information	
Appendix B – Extreme Weather Events	
Appendix C – Flora of the Muskogee Area (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1974 and 1976)	
Appendix D – Oklahoma’s Vertebrate Species – Known or Likely to Occur in Muskogee County	
Appendix E – Fish Species Expected to be Found in the Fort Gibson Lake, Webbers Falls Reservoir, and the Arkansas River (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1976)	
4.0 Radiological Status of the Muskogee Site	4-1
4.1 Survey Descriptions	4-1
4.2 Impacted Structure and Component Characterization	4-2
4.2.1 Chemical “C” Building (Building No. 13)	4-4
4.2.2 Chemical “A” Building (Building No. 16)	4-6
4.2.3 Thermite Building (Building No. 9)	4-22
4.2.4 Sodium Reduction Building (Building No. 11)	4-24
4.2.5 R&D Laboratory Building (Building No. 15)	4-26
4.2.6 Groundwater Treatment Facility	4-34
4.2.7 Bertha Building (Building No. 12)	4-36
4.2.8 Weir Building (Building No. 10)	4-37
4.2.9 Ore Storage Pad	4-38
4.3 Surface and Subsurface Soil Contamination	4-39
4.3.1 Soil Surface Instrument Surveys	4-39
4.3.2 Surface and Subsurface Soil Sample Analyses	4-39
4.3.2.1 Soil Background Radioactivity	4-40
Table 4-1 Background Soil Radioactivity Concentrations of Radionuclides of Interest at the Muskogee Site (pCi/g)	4-41
4.3.2.2 Surface Soil Sample Results	4-42
Table 4-2 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Surface Soil	4-42
Table 4-3 Summary of 1993 Characterization Nuclide Ratio Results for Surface Soil	4-43
4.3.2.3 Subsurface Soil Sample Results	4-43
Table 4-4 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Subsurface Soil	4-43
Table 4-5 Summary of 1993 Characterization Nuclide Ratio Results for Subsurface Soil	4-43
4.4 Surface Water, Sediment, and Ponds Characterization	4-44
4.4.1 Ponds	4-44
4.4.1.1 Pond Nos. 2 and 3	4-44
Table 4-6 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Pond No. 2	4-45
Table 4-7 Summary of 1993 Characterization Nuclide Ratio Results for Pond No. 2	4-45

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
Table 4-8 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Pond No. 3	4-45
Table 4-9 Summary of 1993 Characterization Nuclide Ratio Results for Pond No. 3	4-45
4.4.1.2 Pond No. 5	4-46
Table 4-10 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Pond No. 5	4-46
Table 4-11 Summary of 1993 Characterization Nuclide Ratio Results for Pond No. 5	4-46
4.4.1.3 Pond Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9	4-46
Table 4-12 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Pond No. 6	4-47
Table 4-13 Summary of 1993 Characterization Nuclide Ratio Results for Pond No. 6	4-47
Table 4-14 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Pond No. 7	4-47
Table 4-15 Summary of 1993 Characterization Nuclide Ratio Results for Pond No. 7	4-47
Table 4-16 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Pond No. 8	4-48
Table 4-17 Summary of 1993 Characterization Nuclide Ratio Results for Pond No. 8	4-48
Table 4-18 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Pond No. 9	4-48
Table 4-19 Summary of 1993 Characterization Nuclide Ratio Results for Pond No. 9	4-48
4.4.2 Surface Water and Sediment Sampling	4-49
Table 4-20 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Sediment Samples	4-49
Table 4-21 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Surface Water Samples	4-50
4.5 Groundwater Characterization	4-50
4.5.1 1993 Remediation Assessment Activities	4-50
4.5.1.1 Unconsolidated Zone of Saturation (Shallow Wells)	4-50
Table 4-22 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Groundwater Samples	4-52
4.5.1.2 Bedrock Zone of Saturation	4-53
Table 4-23 Summary of 1993 Characterization Results for Bedrock Groundwater Samples	4-54
4.5.2 Recent Groundwater Monitoring Event Results	4-54
Table 4-24 Summary of 2002 Results for Groundwater Samples	4-55
Reference	4-56

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
Tables	
Table 4-1 – Surface Soil Sample Results	
Table 4-2 – Surface Soil Sample Results – Activity Ratios	
Table 4-3 – Subsurface Soil Sample Results	
Table 4-4 – Subsurface Soil Sample Results – Activity Ratios	
Table 4-5 – Pond 2 Residue Sample Results	
Table 4-6 – Pond 3 Residue Sample Results	
Table 4-7 – Pond 5 Residue Sample Results	
Table 4-8 – Pond 6 Residue Sample Results	
Table 4-9 – Pond 7 Residue Sample Results	
Table 4-10 – Pond 8 Residue Sample Results	
Table 4-11 – Pond 9 Residue Sample Results	
Table 4-12 – Summary of 1993 Characterization Results, Surface Water Samples	
Figures	
Figure 4-1 – Facility Layout, Boring and Well Location Plan (Dwg 6473425)	
Figure 4-2 – Chem-C Building Layout (Dwg 6473415)	
Figure 4-3A – Chem A Building 1st Floor (Dwg 6473416)	
Figure 4-3 B – Chem A Building 2nd Floor and 3rd Floor (Dwg 6473413)	
Figure 4-3 C – Chem A Building 3rd Floor Lab (Dwg 6473412)	
Figure 4-3D – Chem A Building 4th Floor (Dwg 6473414)	
<u>Volume 2 of 2</u>	
Figure 4-4 – White House, Machine Shop, Thermite Bldg., Groundwater Treatment Bldg. Layout (Dwg 6473407)	
Figure 4-5 – Weir Building Layout (Dwg 6473408)	
Figure 4-6 – R & D Lab Layout (Dwg 6473410)	
Figure 4-7 – Little Bertha, Sodium Reduction Bldg., Ore Storage Pad (Dwg 6473409)	
Figure 4-8 – Surface Gamma Survey (Dwg 6473007)	
Figure 4-9 – 1-Meter Gamma Survey (Dwg 6473006)	
Figure 4-10 – Background Determination Location Map (Dwg 6473426)	
Figure 4-11 – Pond Sample Locations (Dwg 6473427)	
5.0 Dose Modeling Evaluations	5-1
5.1 Unrestricted Release Using NRC Screening Criteria	5-2
5.2 Unrestricted Release Using Site-Specific Information	5-2
5.2.1 Unrestricted Release for Structures, Surface and Subsurface Soil Residual Radioactivity	5-3
5.2.1.1 Source Term	5-4
5.2.1.1.1 Configuration/Principal Radionuclides	5-4
Table 5-1 Fansteel Licensed Radioactive Material in Soil	5-5

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
5.2.1.1.2 Chemical Form	5-5
5.2.1.1.3 Residual Radioactivity Spatial Distribution	5-5
5.2.1.2 Critical Groups, Scenarios, and Pathway Identification and Selection	5-6
5.2.1.2.1 Scenario Identification	5-6
5.2.1.2.2 Critical Group Determination	5-6
5.2.1.2.3 Exposure Pathways	5-6
Table 5-2 Summary of Industrial Worker Exposure Pathways	5-7
Table 5-3 Key Parameters in the Industrial Worker Scenario	5-7
5.2.1.3 Conceptual Model	5-8
5.2.1.3.1 Relative Location and Activities of the Critical Group	5-8
5.2.1.3.2 Hydrologic and Environmental Transport Processes	5-8
5.2.1.3.3 Dimensions, Location, and Spatial Variability of the Source Term	5-9
5.2.1.3.4 Major Assumptions	5-9
5.2.1.4 Calculations and Input Parameters	5-9
5.2.1.4.1 Selection of Computer Model	5-9
5.2.1.4.2 Input Parameters	5-9
Table 5-4 Industrial Worker Scenario: Contaminated Zone Parameters	5-10
Table 5-5 Industrial Worker Scenario: Contaminated Zone Input Data	5-11
Table 5-6 Industrial Worker Scenario Soil (Dust) Inhalation and External Gamma Parameters	5-12
Table 5-7 Industrial Worker Scenario: Building Occupancy Parameters	5-12
5.2.1.4.3 RESRAD Soil Results	5-13
Table 5-8 Industrial Worker Scenario Individual Radionuclide DCGL _{w,s} for Soils	5-13
5.2.1.4.4 RESRAD-Build Results	5-15
Table 5-9 Industrial Worker Building Occupancy Individual Radionuclide DCGL _{w,s}	5-15
5.2.1.5 Uncertainty Analysis	5-17
Table 5-10 Industrial Worker Scenario Sensitivity Summary	5-18
5.2.1.6 Compliance with Radiological Criteria for License Termination	5-18
Table 5-11 Industrial Worker Scenario Individual Radionuclide Decay Chain DCGL _{w,s} for Soils	5-19
Table 5-12 Industrial Worker Scenario Individual Radionuclide Decay Chain DCGL _{w,s} for Building and Component Surfaces	5-19
References	5-20
Figure	

Figure 5-1 – DOSE: All Nuclides Summed, Component Pathways

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
Appendices	
Appendix 5-1 – RESRAD Summary Report	
Appendix 5-2 – RESRAD DCGL _{EMC} Values	
Appendix 5-3 – RESRAD-BUILD Summary Report	
Appendix 5-4 – RESRAD-BUILD DCGL _{EMC} Values	
6.0 Alternatives Considered and Rationale for the Chosen Alternative	6-1
7.0 Remedial Action ALARA Analysis Plan	7-1
7.1 Calculation of Benefits	7-2
7.1.1 Collective Dose Averted	7-3
7.1.2 Regulatory Costs Avoided	7-5
7.1.3 Changes in Land Values	7-5
7.1.4 Aesthetics and Reduction in Stakeholder Opposition	7-5
7.2 Calculation of Costs	7-5
7.2.1 Remediation Costs	7-6
7.2.2 Waste Packaging, Transport, and Disposal Costs	7-6
7.2.3 T&D Incident Costs	7-7
7.2.4 Worker Occupational Safety Incident Costs	7-8
7.2.5 Worker Dose Cost	7-8
7.2.6 Public Dose Cost	7-9
7.2.7 Other Costs	7-9
7.3 The ALARA Residual Radioactivity Level	7-10
7.4 Additional Considerations for Residual Radioactivity in Groundwater	7-10
7.5 Determination of “Net Public or Environmental Harm”	7-11
7.6 Demonstration of “Not Technically Achievable”	7-11
7.7 Demonstration of “Prohibitively Expensive”	7-11
7.8 ALARA Compliance Demonstration	7-11
7.8.1 Deterministic Approach	7-11
7.8.2 Performance-Based Approach	7-12
8.0 Planned Decommissioning Activities	8-1
8.1 Contaminated Structures	8-1
8.1.1 Summary of Remediation Tasks	8-1
8.1.1.1 Chemical “A” Building	8-1
8.1.1.2 Chemical “C” Building	8-2
8.1.1.3 White House Building	8-2
8.1.1.4 Thermite Building	8-3
8.1.1.5 Weir Building	8-3
8.1.1.6 Sodium Reduction Building	8-3
8.1.1.7 New Maintenance Building	8-3
8.1.1.8 R&D Lab Building	8-3

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

		<u>Page</u>
8.1.2	Remediation Techniques	8-4
8.1.2.1	Removable Contamination	8-4
8.1.2.2	Nonremovable Contamination	8-5
8.1.2.3	Disposal	8-5
8.1.2.4	Radiation Protection Methods	8-5
8.1.2.5	Procedures	8-6
8.1.2.6	Unique Safety or Remediation Issues	8-6
8.1.2.7	Dismantling of Structures	8-6
8.2	Contaminated Systems and Equipment	8-6
8.2.1	Summary of Remediation Tasks	8-6
8.2.2	Remediation Techniques	8-6
8.2.2.1	Cleaning	8-7
8.2.2.2	Disposition of Equipment	8-7
8.2.2.3	Summary of Equipment to be Removed	8-7
8.2.2.4	Radiation Protection Methods	8-7
8.2.2.5	Procedures	8-8
8.2.2.6	Unique Safety or Remediation Issues	8-8
8.3	Soil	8-8
8.3.1	Summary of Remediation Tasks	8-8
8.3.2	Remediation Techniques	8-9
8.3.2.1	Site Preparation	8-9
8.3.2.2	Excavation	8-9
8.3.2.3	Material Segregation	8-9
8.3.2.4	Backfilling	8-10
8.3.2.5	Off-Site Shipment	8-10
8.3.2.6	Site Restoration	8-10
8.3.2.7	Radiation Protection Methods	8-10
8.3.2.8	Procedures	8-10
8.3.2.9	Unique Safety or Remediation Issues	8-11
8.4	Surface and Groundwater	8-11
8.4.1	Summary of Remediation Tasks	8-11
8.4.2	Remediation Techniques	8-11
8.5	Schedules	8-11

Figures

Figure 8-1 – Excavation Plan (Dwg 6473423)

Figure 8-2 – Conceptual Site Restoration Plan (Dwg 6473424)

Figure 8-3 – Fansteel Muskogee, Oklahoma Decommissioning Plan

9.0	Project Management and Organization	9-1
9.1	Decommissioning Management Organization	9-1
9.1.1	Fansteel CPM	9-1
9.1.2	Plant Radiation Safety Officer	9-1
9.1.3	Site Project Manager	9-2

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
9.1.4 Health Physics Supervisor	9-2
9.1.5 Construction Supervisor	9-2
9.1.6 Quality Control Officer	9-3
9.1.7 HPTs	9-3
9.1.8 DM	9-3
9.1.9 Decommissioning Management Organization Chart	9-4
9.2 Decommissioning Task Management	9-4
9.2.1 Design and Construction Specifications	9-4
9.2.2 H&S Plans	9-4
9.2.3 E&S Plan	9-4
9.2.4 Contractor Work Plan	9-5
9.2.5 QA/QC Plan	9-5
9.2.6 FSSP	9-6
9.2.7 Other Plans and Permits	9-6
9.3 Decommissioning Management Positions and Qualifications	9-6
9.3.1 PRSO	9-6
9.3.2 SPM	9-6
9.3.3 HPS	9-6
9.3.4 CS	9-7
9.3.5 QCO	9-7
9.3.6 HPT	9-7
9.3.7 DM	9-7
9.4 Training	9-7
9.4.1 General Radiation Safety Training	9-8
9.4.2 Site Orientation	9-8
9.4.3 Site- and Job-Specific Training	9-8
9.4.4 Training Verification and Documentation	9-8
9.5 Contractor Support	9-9

Figure

Figure 9-1 – Decommissioning Management Organization (Dwg 6473004)

10.0 Radiation Health and Safety Program	10-1
10.1 Workplace Air Sampling Program	10-2
10.1.1 Sampling Requirements	10-2
10.2 Respiratory Protection Program	10-2
10.3 Internal Exposure Determination Method	10-3
10.4 External Exposure Determination Method	10-5
10.5 Summation of Internal and External Exposures	10-6
10.6 Contamination Control Program	10-7
10.7 Instrumentation Program	10-8
10.8 Nuclear Criticality Safety	10-9
10.9 Health Physics Audits, Inspections, and Record Keeping Program	10-9

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
11.0 Environmental Monitoring Program	11-1
11.1 Environmental ALARA Evaluation Program	11-1
11.2 Effluent Control Program	11-1
11.2.1 Effluent Concentrations	11-1
11.2.2 Effluent Sample Collection	11-2
11.2.3 EMP Reporting	11-3
11.2.4 EMP QA/QC Program	11-3
11.3 Effluent Control Program	11-3
11.3.1 Construction Management for E&S Control	11-3
11.3.2 EMP Action Level	11-4
11.3.3 Leak Detection Systems	11-5
11.3.4 Estimated Public Dose	11-5
12.0 Radioactive Waste Management Program	12-1
12.1 Solid Waste Management Program	12-1
12.2 Liquid Waste Management Program	12-2
12.3 Mixed Waste Management Program	12-3
13.0 QA Program	13-1
13.1 Organization	13-1
13.1.1 Fansteel CPM	13-1
13.1.2 PRSO	13-1
13.1.3 SPM	13-1
13.1.4 HPS	13-1
13.1.5 CS	13-2
13.1.6 QCO	13-2
13.1.7 HPTs	13-2
13.1.8 DM	13-3
13.2 QA Program	13-3
13.3 Document Control	13-6
13.4 Control of Measuring and Testing Equipment	13-7
13.4.1 Procedures	13-7
13.4.2 Source and Instrument Checks	13-7
13.4.3 Background Determination	13-8
13.4.4 Calibration	13-8
13.5 Corrective Action	13-8
13.6 QA Records	13-9
13.7 Audits and Surveillance	13-9
13.7.1 Maintenance of the QA Plan	13-9
13.7.2 Quality Assessments	13-9

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
14.0 Facility Radiation Surveys	14-1
14.1 Release Criteria	14-1
14.1.1 Building Release Criteria	14-1
Table 14-1 Industrial Worker Building Occupancy DCGL _{w,s} (dpm/100 cm ²)	14-1
14.1.2 Soil Release Criteria	14-1
Table 14-2 Industrial Worker Scenario Soil DCGL _{w,s} (pCi/g)	14-1
14.1.2.1 DCGL _{EMC}	14-2
Table 14-3 Floor Area Factors	14-2
Table 14-4 Wall Area Factors	14-2
Table 14-5 Land (Soil) Area Factors	14-3
14.2 Characterization Surveys	14-3
14.2.1 Building Classification	14-3
14.2.1.1 Definitions	14-3
14.2.2 Land Area Classification	14-4
14.2.2.1 Definitions	14-4
14.3 Remedial Action Support Surveys	14-4
14.3.1 Building and Component Surveys	14-4
14.3.1.1 Beta Ratemeter Scanning	14-5
14.3.1.2 Alpha Ratemeter Scanning	14-6
14.3.1.3 Static Counting Times Calculation	14-7
14.3.2 Open Land Areas Survey Instrumentation	14-7
14.4 FSS Design	14-9
14.4.1 Nonparametric Statistical Test	14-9
14.4.2 Null Hypothesis	14-9
14.4.3 Decision Error Rates	14-10
14.4.4 Survey Measurements	14-10
14.4.4.1 Open Land Area – Discrete Sampling	14-10
14.4.4.2 Open Land Area – Scanning	14-10
14.4.4.3 Structural Surfaces – Discrete Sample Point Measurements	14-11
14.4.4.4 Structural Surfaces – Scanning	14-11
14.4.5 Method to Determining Number of Samples	14-12
14.4.6 Number of Samples – WRS Test	14-12
14.4.7 Number of Samples – Sign Test	14-13
14.4.8 Method for Determining Grid Spacing	14-13
14.4.9 Adjustment of Number of Samples/Grid Spacing Based on Scan MDC	14-14
14.4.10 Structural Surface Area Smear Sample Laboratory Analysis	14-15
14.4.11 Open Land Area Soil Sample Laboratory Analysis	14-15
14.5 FSS Report	14-15
References	14-17
15.0 Financial Assurance Demonstration	15-1
15.1 Decommissioning Cost Estimate	15-1
15.1.1 Planning and Preparation	15-2

**Table of Contents
(Continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
15.1.2 Pond Nos. 2 and 3 WIP Residues	15-2
15.1.3 Pond Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 Residues	15-4
15.1.4 Radiologically Impacted Soils	15-5
15.1.5 Pond Nos. 2 and 3 Contaminated Soils	15-6
15.1.6 Radiologically Impacted Structures	15-8
15.1.6.1 Buildings	15-8
15.1.6.2 Equipment	15-8
15.1.6.3 Structures Cost Summary	15-8
15.1.7 Facility Radiological Survey and HP Support	15-8
15.1.8 MISC Costs	15-9
15.1.9 Summary of Costs	15-9
15.2 Key Assumptions	15-9
15.3 Financial Assurance Mechanism	15-11
15.4 Comparison of the Cost Estimate to the Current Level of Financial Assurance	15-12
15.5 Means for Adjusting the Cost Estimate and Associated Funding Level	15-12
 References	 15-13

Tables

Table 15-1 – Estimated Volumes and Quantities of Residues Associated with Pond Nos. 2 and 3
Table 15-2 – Costs Associated with Disposal (at IUC) of Pond Nos. 2 and 3 Residues Dry (80% Solids by Weight)
Table 15-3 – Estimated Volumes and Quantities of Residues Associated with Pond Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9
Table 15-4 – Costs Associated with Disposal (at WCS) of Pond Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 Residues Dry (80% Solids)
Table 15-5 – Estimated Volumes and Quantities of Radiologically Affected Soil Areas
Table 15-6 – Costs Associated with Disposal (at WCS) of Radiologically Affected Soil Areas
Table 15-7 – Estimated Volumes and Quantities of Contaminated Soils Associated with Pond Nos. 2 and 3
Table 15-8 – Costs Associated with Disposal (at WCS) of Pond No. 2 and Pond No. 3 Contaminated Soils
Table 15-9 – Costs Associated with Survey of Properties for Release Including Pond Areas and Buildings and Additional Health Physics Support
Table 15-10 – Summary of Total Estimated Decommissioning Costs

Appendix

Appendix 15-1 – NUREG-1727 Appendix F Cost Estimate

1.0 Executive Summary

This Decommissioning Plan (DP) has been prepared to describe remediation activities proposed for implementation at the Fansteel Inc. (Fansteel), Muskogee, Oklahoma facility located between Oklahoma State Route 165 and the west bank of the Arkansas River at River Mile 395. The Fansteel Muskogee plant is sited in an area zoned for industrial use. This industrial use restriction is expected to persist in the future in accordance with the updated Master Plan for industrial properties issued by the Port of Muskogee (Master Plan of Development for the Muskogee Port and Industrial Park, Muskogee City-County Port Authority, November 28, 1967). Implementation of this DP will make the site suitable for unrestricted release under an industrial use scenario.

1.1 Background

Fansteel's Muskogee plant produced tantalum and columbium metals. The Fansteel processing facility had been in operation for approximately 33 years until operations ceased in 1990. The raw materials used for tantalum and columbium production contained uranium and thorium as naturally occurring trace constituents. These radioactive species were present in the process raw materials at an approximate concentration of 0.1 percent uranium oxide and 0.25 percent thorium oxide. This concentration is sufficient to cause the ores and slags to be classified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) as source materials. Consequently, Fansteel operated under NRC License No. SMB-911 for the possession of source materials.

The ores and slags used for tantalum and columbium production were digested in a hydrofluoric acid (HF) solution. After the digestion step, a series of unit processes to separate the tantalum and columbium products was conducted. The byproduct of the separation steps (residues from the work in progress [WIP]) was disposed in Pond Nos. 2, 3, and 5. These ponds were called acidic ponds due to their acid constituent. Acidic and ammonia waters were stored in temporary holding Pond Nos. 1S and 1N respectively prior to treatment. Uranium and thorium in the raw materials were not extracted from the ores by the digestion process. The radioactive species remained in the residues from the WIP that were disposed in the East Plant Area. Process water, as well as the Pond No. 3 french drain supernatant, was treated and then passed on to Pond Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9 for solids precipitation prior to passing through a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) discharge outfall. These ponds are referred to as alkaline ponds. The residues from WIP disposed in the ponds as a result of the manufacturing process contain U_3O_8 and ThO_2 at similar concentrations either alone or in a calcium fluoride (CaF) precipitate matrix.

In June 1989, the west embankment of Pond No. 3 failed discharging supernatant from the pond into the surrounding area and ultimately into the Arkansas River. The discharge into the river was halted by the emergency construction of containment dikes. Fluids from ponds created by the temporary diking of supernatant were routed to the plant's water treatment system as directed by the NRC. Following treatment, this material was disposed in Pond Nos. 8 and 9. After its failure, Pond No. 3 did not receive the liquid residues from the WIP from ore/slag processing. Filter presses were put into operation to remove the solid wastes from the acidic process water stream before further processing. In addition, a groundwater interception trench installed east of Pond No. 3 is used to collect alluvial groundwater and minimize the potential for discharge of contaminated groundwater to the Arkansas River. Groundwater is collected in the trench and filtered through a filter press.

In 1993, a characterization survey was performed at the Fansteel Muskogee site to determine existing site conditions. Radiological survey activities were conducted over the interior and exterior of the site structures and the external open land areas of the Fansteel site. Buildings and equipment associated with the ore-processing activities include the Chemical "C" Building, the Chemical "A" Building, and the R&D Building. The Chemical "C" Building is contaminated throughout by radioactive ore residues. Isolated areas of radioactive contamination were also identified in some of the other site buildings.

Characterization surveys in 1993 identified the highest concentrations of radiological contaminants in Pond Nos. 2 and 3. The average concentration of radiological contaminants in Pond Nos. 2 and 3 ranges from 360 to 640 picocuries per gram (pCi/g) of U-238 and 360 to 440 pCi/g of Th-232. The average concentration of radiological contaminants in Pond Nos. 5 through 9 ranges from 14 to 53 pCi/g of U-238 and 2 to 26 pCi/g of Th-232. Survey data indicate that the Th-232 and U-238 are present with their radioactive progeny in secular equilibrium. The U-235 decay series is also present, because U-235 constitutes 0.7 percent by weight (approximately 2.3 percent by radioactivity) of naturally occurring uranium.

1.2 Dose Modeling

Dose modeling evaluations have been performed using RESRAD and RESRAD-Build computer code software to demonstrate compliance with the NRC final rule on "Radiological Criteria for License Termination," published in the Federal Register (FR) (62 FR 39058) which was incorporated as Subpart E to Title 10 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 20. The site will be considered acceptable for unrestricted use after decontamination has reduced the radioactivity levels as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA), and the residual radioactivity level will not result in a total effective dose equivalent (TEDE) exceeding 25 millirem per year (mrem/year) to an industrial worker.

The remediation ALARA analysis is an optimization technique to seek the proper balance of remediation costs and benefits to achieve a TEDE as far below 25 mrem as is reasonably. “Reasonably achievable” is judged by considering the state of technology and the economics of improvements in relation to all the benefits from these improvements.

Dose modeling has been used to calculate the concentration of radioactivity that if uniformly distributed throughout the site area would result in an annual TEDE of 25 mrem to an industrial worker at the site. These radionuclide-specific values are called Derived Concentration Guideline Levels (DCGL_{ws}) for relatively uniform distributions of residual radioactivity across a survey unit. RESRAD Version 6.21 has been used to derive the radionuclide-specific DCGL_{ws} for the residual radioactivity present in land areas at the time of the Fansteel site final status survey (FSS) and site release. RESRAD-Build Version 3.21 has been used to derive the radionuclide-specific DCGL_{ws} for the residual radioactivity present on building, structural, and component surfaces at the time of the Fansteel site FSS. Under the industrial worker scenario, the worker is assumed to spend 8 hours per day on the site. Of the 8 hours, 6 hours are spent indoors and the remaining 2 hours are spent outside.

External exposure to penetrating radiation, inhalation of soil dust (while outdoors and during building occupancy), and inadvertent ingestion of soil are the exposure pathways that were considered in deriving radionuclide-specific DCGL_{ws} for residual radioactivity in site soil. Exposure pathways considered in the derivation of radionuclide-specific DCGL_{ws} for residual radioactivity on building and component surfaces included direct external gamma exposure including submersion, inhalation of resuspended residual radioactivity, inadvertent ingestion of residual radioactivity from surface sources, and ingestion of deposited radioactivity resulting from resuspension. The computed DCGL_{ws} for residual radioactivity in soils and building surfaces is presented in Tables 1-1 and 1-2. Derivation of the DCGL_w incorporated the unity rule to assure that cumulative doses from Th-232, U-238, U-235, and their radioactive progeny do not result in a total annual dose that exceeds 25 mrem to an industrial worker.

Table 1-1 Industrial Worker Scenario Individual Radionuclide Decay Chain DCGL_{ws} for Soils

Radionuclide and Entire Decay Chain in Equilibrium	Industrial Worker DCGL_{ws} at Time Zero (pCi/g)	Time of Maximum Dose (yrs)
U-238 – Uranium Chain	14.1	0
U-235 – Actinium Chain	37	0
Th-232 – Thorium Chain	10	0

Table 1-2 Industrial Worker Scenario Individual Radionuclide Decay Chain DCGL_ws for Building and Component Surfaces

Radionuclide Decay Chain DCGL_w	Industrial Worker DCGL_ws at Time Zero (dpm/100 cm²)	Time of Maximum Dose (yrs)
U-238 – Uranium Chain	5,200	0
U-235 – Actinium Chain	840	0
Th-232 – Thorium Chain	3,160	0

The groundwater beneath the Muskogee site contains limited amounts of radioactive material attributed to historical operations at the site. Although on-site consumption of this groundwater is excluded from the industrial worker scenario, Fansteel will evaluate the necessity of including a groundwater ingestion dose component in the remediation alternative/option ALARA analyses.

1.3 Summary of Decommissioning Activities

Cleaning of building surfaces and facility components will be performed under controlled conditions in accordance with written procedures and restricted access. Decommissioning will include decontamination of buildings and components using appropriate solvents, cleaning solutions, high-power vacuum cleaners, pressure washers, vacuums, etc. It is expected that portions of the floor (10 percent) of the Chemical “A” and Chemical “C” buildings will have to be scabbled and disposed as low-level radioactive (LLR) waste. Portions of structures or building facilities and equipment that cannot be cleaned for unrestricted release will be size reduced for handling, shipping, and/or disposal purposes.

Radiologically impacted soils and residues from WIP are isolated to plant areas within and surrounding Pond Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, and areas to the east of the Chemical “A” and Chemical “C” plant buildings. Soil contamination was also detected to the east of the wastewater treatment ponds and Pond No. 5, however, at levels typically lower than that exhibited in the areas of the site associated with manufacturing and ore processing. The total impacted land area to be remediated encompasses an estimated area of 180,000 square meters (m²).

Approximately 16,000 tons (20 percent moisture content by weight) of residues from the WIP will be excavated from Pond Nos. 2 and 3 and shipped off site to a licensed uranium reclamation facility. An estimated 68,000 tons (20 percent moisture content) of impacted material will be excavated from the alkaline process water settling ponds which received CaF and process water from the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) (Pond Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9). Excavation and disposal of soil from the surrounding plant area and beneath the ponds will account for 15,855 tons (ambient moisture content). Above-criteria

soil will be transported (most likely by rail) to a licensed or permitted waste disposal facility(ies). The total quantity of soil and residue for off-site disposal is estimated to be approximately 99,855 tons.

The purpose of this DP is to decommission the facility safely and meet the NRC requirements for unrestricted use. Decontamination and excavation activities will be performed under controlled and monitored conditions with access restricted. Health Physics Technician (HPT) support will be used to monitor the soil and contaminated material removal; the surfaces and soil left in place; as well as workers, equipment, and loaded cars/containers leaving the site. Haul roads, drainage channels, culverts, berms, erosion and sedimentation (E&S) controls, and access controls will be constructed.

1.4 Summary of FSS Activities

A Final Status Survey Plan (FSSP) will be prepared in accordance with MARSSIM guidance to support remediation activities for the Fansteel site. A combination of scanning, direct measurements, and sampling for the radionuclides of concern and/or their progeny will be performed to ensure that remediation is complete. A nonparametric statistical test will be applied to the sampling data taken at distinct survey locations in each survey unit to determine whether the release criteria have been met. The nonparametric tests recommended in MARSSIM are the Wilcoxon Rank Sum (WRS) test and the Sign test.

Upon approval of this DP by the NRC, Fansteel will undertake preparation of designs and specifications. Subsequently, a construction contractor will be selected. Fansteel may choose to develop performance specifications and require the contractor to develop design details. Alternatively, Fansteel may opt to develop detailed designs/specifications. In either case, preconstruction activities are expected to take approximately 9 months.

Construction activities will not be conducted during the months of December through February. Therefore, remediation is anticipated to begin in March following completion of the design/contractor selection tasks and extend over a period of approximately 10 years. A detailed schedule will be prepared subsequent to NRC approval of the DP. This schedule will be updated as circumstances dictate.

Fansteel is seeking approval of this DP to authorize the activities described herein and NRC concurrence that if this plan is implemented as described, it will result in the property being suitable for unrestricted use. However, this remediation plan is premised on current knowledge of site conditions, regulatory

guidance, disposal, and reclamation market factors. Other alternatives to disposal such as reuse of CaF residues in the cement industry will be considered as the decommissioning project progresses.

w:\5427\rpt\decomplan\chapter-1.doc