KAISER•HILL
COMPANY

Buffer Zone
Sampling and Analysis Plan
FY04 Addendum #BZ-04-01
IHSS Group 900-11, IHSS 155 Inner Lip Area
and Associated Remediation Approach
Revision 1

• Environmental Restoration •
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

RECEIVED
MAY 11 2004
ADMIN RECORD

April 2004

1/33

Buffer Zone
Sampling and Analysis Plan
FY04 Addendum #BZ-04-01
IHSS Group 900-11, IHSS 155 Inner Lip Area
and Associated Remediation Approach
Revision 1

April 2004

2

Buffer Zone
Sampling and Analysis Plan
FY04 Addendum #BZ-04-01
IHSS Group 900-11, IHSS 155 Inner Lip Area
and Associated Remediation Approach
Revision 1

Approval received from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
April 27, 2004.
Approval letter contained in the Administrative Record.

April 2004

3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 IHSS GROUP 900-11 1
2.0 EXISTING CHARACTERIZATION INFORMATION 2
3.0 GRID CELL SAMPLING 2
3.1 Pre-screen Methodology 3
3.2 Confirmation Samples 4
4.0 DATA EVALUATION (KRIGING) 4
4.1 Kriging Results 5
4.2 Remediation Activities 5
4.3 Confirmation Sampling 5
5.0 REFERENCES 5

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 IHSS Group 900-11 Location Map 7
Figure 2 IHSS Group 900-11 Existing In Situ HPGe Surface Soil Sampling Results 8
Figure 3 IHSS Group 900-11 Grid Boundary Locations 9
Figure 4 IHSS Grou 900-11 Lower Lip Area Krig Boundary 10
Figure 5 IHSS Group 900-11 Lower Lip Area Confirmation Sample Locations 11

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 IHSS Group 900-11, IHSS 155 2

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Detailed description of Kriging

4

ACRONYMS

AL	action level
AOC	area of concern
BZ	Buffer Zone
BZSAP	Buffer Zone Sampling and Analysis Plan
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FY	Fiscal Year
HRR	Historical Release Report
IHSS	Individual Hazardous Substance Site
IM/IRA	Interim Measure/Interim Remedial Action
K-H	Kaiser-Hill Company, LLC
NFAA	no further accelerated action
OU	Operable Unit
PAC	Potential Area of Concern
pCi/g	picocuries per gram
PCOC	potential contaminant of concern
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RFCA	Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement
RFI/RI	RCRA Facility Investigation/Remedial Investigation
SAP	Sampling and Analysis Plan

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Buffer Zone (BZ) Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) (BZSAP) (DOE 2002) Addendum #BZ-04-01 includes Individual Hazardous Substance Site (IHSS) Group-specific information, sampling locations, and potential contaminants of concern (PCOCs) for IHSS 155 (Inner Lip Area) proposed for characterization during Fiscal Year (FY) 04. This BZSAP Addendum is a supplement to the BZSAP (DOE 2002).

The purpose of this SAP is to describe the pre-screen sampling, the confirmation sampling and remedial activities associated with the sampling.

1.1 IHSS GROUP 900-11

Respectively, IHSS Group 900-11 consists of the following IHSS Sites and Potential Area of Concern (PAC):

- 112 – 903 Pad
- 140 – Hazardous Disposal Area
- 155 – 903 Lip Area
- SE-1602 – East Firing Range

IHSS 112, the 903 Pad, has completed remediation and will be addressed via a separate closeout report. The bordering areas around IHSS 112 will be addressed via this BZSAP. IHSS Site 140, the Hazardous Disposal Area, was proposed for no further accelerated action (NFAA) in 1998 and in 2003 (DOE 1992-2002). PAC SE-1602, the East Firing Range, will be addressed via a separate SAP Addendum with characterization scheduled to begin in late Spring 2004. IHSS Site 155, the 903 Lip Area, will be addressed via two documents. This BZSAP Addendum (BZ-04-01) addresses the 903 Inner Lip Area, while the 900-11 Interim Measure/Interim Remedial Action (IM/IRA) will address the 903 Outer Lip Area.

The 903 Inner Lip Area (IHSS 155) is primarily an area east and south of the 903 Pad where wind and rain spread plutonium-contaminated soil from the 903 Pad Area. The locations of the IHSSs and PACs in the vicinity are shown on Figure 1.

Several limited excavations have removed some of the contaminated soil from the 903 Inner Lip Area. However, results from the Operable Unit (OU) 2 Phase II Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Investigation/Remedial Investigation (RFI/RI) sampling and analysis and the Site Characterization Report for the 903 Drum Storage Area, 903 Lip Area, and the Americium Zone (DOE 1995) confirm that radionuclide-contaminated soil remains. The contamination is primarily attributed to wind dispersion from the 903 Pad and stormwater-related surface soil erosion.

The PCOCs for IHSS 155 are listed in Table 1. Proposed new sampling locations are the starting point for IHSS Group characterization. After characterization starts, the number and type of samples may change based on sampling results. Changes to sampling specifications will be considered in consultation with the regulatory agencies.

6

Table 1
IHSS Group 900-11, IHSS 155

IHSS Group	IHSS/PAC/UBC Site	PCOCs	Media	Data Source	Sampling Method
900-11	IHSS 155	Radionuclides	Surface soil	HRRs (DOE 1992-2002) Process knowledge (IASAP [DOE 2001])	Composited grab

2.0 EXISTING CHARACTERIZATION INFORMATION

Existing information and data for this IHSS are available in Appendix C of the BZSAP (DOE 2002) and the Historical Release Reports (HRRs) (DOE 1992-2002). Existing gamma spectroscopy data associated with the IHSS 155 plutonium-239/240 activities are presented on Figure 2. These data represent the starting point for determining further characterization sampling. Pre-screen samples are currently being collected and analyzed.

3.0 GRID CELL SAMPLING

A grid cell approach will be utilized around the perimeter of the 903 Pad and the area immediately east of the 903 Pad due to the following:

- Historical information indicates fill material may be been placed and soil disturbance may have occurred, therefore, the potential contamination may not follow the pattern of typical erosion deposition;
- Limited and variable characterization data; and
- Proximity to the 903 Pad.

Grid sizes for this area of the 903 Inner Lip area are based on the geostatistical methods presented in the BZSAP (DOE 2002). The grid size for the 903 Inner Lip area will be 42-foot squares. The grid locations and orientation are located on Figure 3. Not all of the 903 Inner Lip area is included in the grid cell sampling approach. The portion south of grid cells AA12 through J12 and K11 through U11 of the 903 Inner Lip area is addressed using a kriging technique, described in a later section, that better accounts for the wind, rain, and erosional deposition that occurred in this area.

Note that the 903 Pad has completed remediation and confirmation sampling; therefore, no additional samples will be collected in this area.

The combination of previous characterization data and "pre-screen" characterization sampling effort will determine whether remediation activities are required within grid cell locations. If previous characterization sample data collected within a grid cell show soil concentrations above their respective action levels (ALs), as described in the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement (RFCA) Attachment 5, 2003 Modification, those specific grid cells will be remediated. If previous characterization sample data collected within a grid cell show soil concentrations below their respective ALs; those specific grid cells will be sampled using the "pre-screen" sample methodology described below. Radiological soils samples will provide sufficient data to determine whether the contaminant concentration exceeds ALs. On Figure 3, the boundary of the

7

grid illustrates the potential area of remedial action associated with the pre-screen methodology. The remaining portion south of grid cells AA12 through J12 and K11 through U11 will be addressed using the kriging technique.

3.1 Pre-screen Methodology

If there are no previous sample characterization data within grid cells or the previous characterization sample data shows activity levels below AL, composite pre-screen samples will be collected prior to the remedial action to document contamination levels in each grid cell. Where applicable, soil samples will be collected directly below the clean fill placed to support the 903 Pad remediation project. Remediation decisions will be based on the results of this prescreen sample. If radionuclide activities are below their respective ALs, as described in the RFCA Attachment 5, 2003 Modification, the consultative process will be invoked to develop a remedial approach for those specific grid cells. If radionuclide activities are above their respective ALs, those specific grid cells will be remediated.

Grid cells having existing characterization data indicating soil contamination that exceeds the AL at depths greater than 6 inches, will be excavated to the depths indicated in the Characterization Report for the 903 Drum Storage Area, 903 Lip Area, and the Americium Zone (K-H, June, 2000). Confirmation samples will be collected and analyzed to verify the grid cell has met the remedial objectives.

Each composite sample collected for radiological characterization will consist of five soil aliquots (grab samples) collected from the grid cell as shown below. One aliquot will be collected at the center point of the grid cell and the other four aliquots will be collected from 5 to 15 feet from the center point of the cell along the central axes of the cell. The vertical and horizontal location of the composite sample will be assigned to the center of the cell as surveyed.



Remediation for the grid cell areas will consist of removal of the upper 6 inches of native soil. A composite confirmation sample will be collected from each grid cell after the 6 inches of soil are removed to determine whether the remedial action objectives have been met or additional excavation and confirmation sampling will be necessary. If the composite confirmation analysis indicates the soil is below 50 pCi/g Pu, then the remedial action objectives have been met.

3.2 Confirmation Samples

Confirmation samples will be collected from each grid cell following the removal of the upper 6 inches of soil to verify that the site has met the remedial objectives. If radiological contamination is found above the action levels in the field screening gamma spectroscopy, additional soil will be removed from the grid cell and another confirmation sample will be collected.

Once the field screening indicates that the soil is below the action level, the sample will be sent to the onsite laboratory for gamma spectroscopy .Ten percent of the samples analyzed by gamma spectroscopy will be sent for alpha spectroscopy analysis (LIC ASP-A-003 or EAS-A-002).

Each composite confirmation sample collected for radiological characterization will consist of five soil aliquots (grab samples) collected from the bottom of the excavation in the same manner as the pre-screen sample. One aliquot will be collected at the center point of the cell and the other four aliquots will be collected from 5 to 15 feet from the center point of the cell along the central axes of the cell. The vertical and horizontal locations of the composite sample will be assigned to the center of the cell as surveyed.

All five aliquots will be placed into a disposable bowl and thoroughly mixed. A composite soil sample will be collected from the mixed soil and placed into a 500-cc plastic jar and analyzed by gamma spectroscopy. Field duplicate samples for gamma spectroscopy will be collected at a minimum frequency of one per every 10 grid cells. The field duplicate will be collected and analyzed just as the confirmation sample.

EPA has generated one random grid cell in each north-south column of grid cells from which Kaiser-Hill will provide approximately 50 grams of soil from the composited soils for the confirmation sample from the final depth for that particular cell. This sample will be known as the EPA split sample and will be taken from the following cells: K7, L10, M4, N2, O7, P9, Q4 R11, S11, T3, U2, V6, W7 and X4. At EPA's earliest convenience, it will take custody of the split sample and store it in a lockbox in the T124E sample cooler until shipping it to its Montgomery, Alabama laboratory for analysis by alpha spectroscopy.

4.0 DATA EVALUATION (KRIGING)

Kaiser Hill evaluated the southern portion of the 903 Inner Lip area containing extensive field HPGe characterization data to determine the limits of remediation. The area is bordered by the grid cells to the north and the existing road to the south and east. The western limits include the extent of the HPGe data, as shown on Figure 2.

The evaluation used geostatistical methods that have been widely applied in environmental characterization (Myers 1997). Geostatistical approaches customize the analysis to account for many of the unique features of the contaminant distribution at a particular site. The kriging process used in geostatistical studies uses optimal estimation (minimum error), which ensures a high quality to the model. In addition, geostatistical techniques provide a measure of the confidence in the estimations. Attachment A contains a detailed description of the kriging process.

9

4.1 Kriging Results

The kriging resulted in the generation of a map (Figure 4) identifying the limits of remediation with a 90-percent level of confidence that all of the plutonium-239/240 contamination greater than 50 pCi/g is contained within the kriged boundary.

4.2 Remediation Activities

The remediation area shown on Figure 4 will be remediated using standard excavation equipment including track hoes, loaders, etc. Soil contaminated above 50 pCi/g Pu will be removed in 1 to 6-inch lifts depending on the estimated thickness of the contamination. The excavated soil will be placed into intermodals for off site disposal. Due to the wind blown deposition and the topography of the area, the contamination is expected to be thinner as distance from the 903 Pad increases.

In general, excavation will be sequenced in a down-slope or cross-slope direction so that contaminated areas will not lie at elevations greater than that of remediated areas, thus minimizing the potential for recontaminating previously completed areas. This excavation sequence also mitigates safety issues related to personnel and heavy equipment working on slopes. Confirmation sampling will be conducted on a daily basis for areas excavated that day. If a confirmation sample result is greater than 50 pCi/g Pu (calculated), additional soil will be excavated from a 42-foot square area centered on the confirmation sample location, as shown on Figure 5. Another confirmation sample will be collected and analyzed after the additional excavation is completed. This process will continue until the confirmation sample result indicates that the contamination is below 50 pCi/g Pu (calculated). Completed confirmation samples will be tracked in the daily status reports. Regrading, as necessary, broadcast reseeding and degradable erosion matting will be installed at the completion of this process.

4.3 Confirmation Sampling

After excavation of soil greater than 50 pCi/g of plutonium-239/240 within the 3.8-acre remediation area of the Inner Lip as determined by the kriging, confirmation sampling will be conducted to demonstrate that the remediation objectives have been met. The confirmation sampling will include the 96 individual grab samples on a 42-foot interval as shown on Figure 5. The 42-foot interval for confirmation sampling is based on the geostatistical methodologies described in Section 4.5.2 of the BZSAP (DOE 2002). A soil sample will be collected at each location from the upper three-inches of soil and analyzed by gamma spectroscopy. Ten-percent of the samples will be sent off-site for alpha spectroscopy. K-H will provide a split alpha sample of approximately 50 grams of soil for EPA. Handling and storage will be similar to the description in Section 3.2.

5.0 REFERENCES

Rockwell International, 1989, Interim Status Closure Plan Solid Waste Management Unit 15, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado.

DOE, 1992-2002, Historical Release Reports for the Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado.

10

DOE, 1995. Final Phase II RFI/RI Report, 903 Pad, Mound, East Trenches Area, Operable Unit No. 2, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, Colorado.

DOE, 2001, Industrial Area Sampling and Analysis Plan, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, Colorado, June.

DOE, 2002. Final Buffer Zone Sampling and Analysis Plan, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, Colorado, March.

Myers, J.C. 1997. Geostatistical Error Management: Quantifying Uncertainty for Environmental Sampling and Mapping. http://www.gemdqos.com. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Attachment A
Detailed Description of Kriging

17

Geostatistical Analysis of the 903 Pad Lip Area at Rocky Flats

I. Introduction

Surface soils in the 903 Pad Lip Area (Lip Area) of the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS) have been sampled extensively. Sample results indicate that two types of areas exist: (1) those where the activity of $^{239/240}Pu$ exceeds the threshold action level of 50 pCi/g ("dirty"); and, (2) those where the $^{239/240}Pu$ activity does not exceed 50 pCi/g ("clean"). The activity in unsampled soils between clean and dirty locations must be assessed in order to determine the extents of excavation.

Two basic options exist for assessing the remedial requirements for unsampled areas. The first is to estimate the actual amount of activity in the soils using nearby sample data points. The second is to calculate the probability that the soils exceed the 50 pCi/g threshold, i.e. the probability that they are dirty.

The RFETS has selected and implemented the latter approach. RFETS has applied a geostatistical probability approach for remediation decision-making in order to ensure that a high level of confidence accompanies the clean up and removal of soils. Using geostatistical methods enables RFETS to base remedial decisions on a simultaneous assessment of the amount of activity in the soils as well as the amount of confidence in the decision.

II. Geostatistical Background

Geostatistical methods have been applied widely in environmental characterization to analyze the spatial distribution of contaminants in soils, groundwater, and air (Myers 1997, EPA 1987). Geostatistical approaches customize the analysis to account for the unique features of the contaminant distribution at a particular site so that a more representative model can be produced.

A geostatistical study is composed of two primary processes. First, *variogram* analysis assesses the unique spatial characteristics of the contamination in a quantifiable manner. Next, the spatial information derived by the variogram analysis is applied by a process called *kriging*. The kriging process used in geostatistical studies produces "best" or optimal estimation (minimum error), which ensures a high quality model for decision-making.

In addition, geostatistical techniques provide a measure of the confidence in the estimations and subsequent decision-making process, an attribute unique to geostatistics. The specific geostatistical approach used at a site is linked to the objectives required in the decision-making process.

18

III. Remedial Objectives in the Lip Area

For the RFETS Lip Area, the remedial objectives focus on the desire to achieve a 90 percent certainty that areas that do not undergo remediation have less than a 10 percent chance of having $^{239/240}$Pu activity greater than 50 pCi/g . Stated another way, the objective is not to remove areas with surface soils that have less than a 10 percent chance of exhibiting $^{239/240}$Pu activity greater than 50 pCi/g.

By removing areas where the chance of exceeding the 50 pCi/g threshold is greater than 10 percent (probability of 0.10), the result is a 90 percent confidence in the remedial effort. The geostatistical approach creates a model of the contamination that allows decision-making to proceed according to the confidence objectives, which themselves are related to the threshold level for maximum desired $^{239/240}$Pu activity.

IV. Data Input

A. Initial Data Input and Review

Surface soil data in the Lip Area were extracted from the Remedial Action Decision Management System (RADMS) database. For locations where more than one analytical value was available at a location, the sample with the highest activity was retained in order to provide a conservative estimate. Approximately 1700 sample data have been used so far in the analysis. Field sample data continue to be taken to define more accurately the extent of the contamination. These new data are added to the database as they become available.

Figure 1 displays the locations of the initial sample data points used in the initial phase of the geostatistical analysis. Sample locations shown in red indicate $^{239/240}$Pu activity in excess of 50 pCi/g. Sample locations shown in blue represent $^{239/240}$Pu activity less than 50 pCi/g. The mustard-colored background indicates the approximate extent of the Individual Hazardous Substance Site (IHSS) 155 (the 903 Pad Lip Area). The map indicates the locations where activity that exceeds 50 pCi/g has been bounded by samples that contain activity below this threshold cutoff as well as locations where exceedances are unbounded.

The purpose of the geostatistical analysis is to determine how far out into the clean zones the remediation needs to go in order to be 90 percent confident that soils do not exceed 50 pCi/g. Without samples with concentrations below 50-pCi/g, the kriging process will extend the excavation line (90 percent confidence) a relatively large distance from the samples above 50 pCi/g. This phenomenon will be seen in the Results section of this Appendix. Since no samples have been taken in these areas to demonstrate that they are below 50 pCi/g, the excavation line must follow the 90 percent confidence line of blocks until boundary samples become available.

B. Dynamic Field Characterization and Data Updates

Because sample data continue to be collected, the opportunity arises for the geostatistical kriged model to be updated with the latest sample information. This dynamic approach ensures that the maximum amount of sample information will be applied to the decision-making process, which subsequently increases confidence in remedial decisions. Dynamic work plans are encouraged by EPA's Technology Innovation Office (TIO) as part of the Triad Approach (Crumbling 2001, Crumbling et al. 2001, EPA 2001).

As excavation progresses in the field, additional soil samples will become available. These new samples will be added to the database and the kriged model will be updated. During this process, certain block probabilities may change category, either from above 0.10 to below 0.10 or from below 0.10 to above 0.10. Remedial excavation will be performed using the most up-to-date sample information and kriged model. Therefore, the final excavation imprint may be slightly different than the one shown in this report.

V. Geostatistical Analysis

A. Variogram Analysis

The sample data in the Lip Area were analyzed for spatial correlation using variogram analysis, which quantifies the degree to which nearby samples are more similar than samples located further from each other. During the variogram analysis, sample values greater than 50 pCi/g were set equal to one (1.0), while samples with values less than 50 pCi/g were set equal to zero (0.0). This type of data transformation is referred to as an *indicator* transformation. The variogram analysis was then performed on the zero and one values.

Figure 2 displays the indicator variogram graphs produced during the variogram analysis. The graphs for five directions are shown: (1) North-South; (2) Northeast-Southwest; (3) East-West; (4) Northwest-Southeast; and, (5) All directions (omni-directional). The fitted model to represent the variogram during kriging is shown in red.

The variogram graphs show very consistent and similar structures across the directions analyzed. A short-range structure is present at a distance of about 80 ft. A longer-range structure is also present, exhibiting a range of about 500 ft. In addition, a nugget effect (randomness parameter) equal to approximately 20 percent of the sill is present.

21



Figure 2 – Variogram Graphs of Indicator Data in the 903 Pad Lip Area

B. Kriging

In the 903 Pad Lip Area, indicator kriging was used to model the sample data. Indicator kriging is a powerful approach to environmental characterization in that it is able to combine the need to limit concentrations on contaminants left in soils with an high confidence that the limits have been achieved. This synthesis of $^{239/240}$Pu activity limits and uncertainty quantification address primary remedial and health concerns "at-a-glance" in the form of a risk-quantified map.

The dense sampling in the Lip Area permitted the use of a relatively small grid for estimation by the kriging process. A regular grid of 20x20 ft. areas was used for the kriging. Using sample data within or close to each cell area, the probability that the surface soil activity exceeds 50 pCi/g was calculated. Over 7000 cells were kriged in the Lip Area. Certain portions of the Lip Area were suppressed during the kriging process. The 903 Pad itself was not estimated because the remediation and confirmation sampling has already been performed. Just to the east of the 903 Pad lies an *Inner Lip Area*, which was omitted from the estimation. This area is being performed as a separate remediation under different criteria.

During the indicator kriging process, a value of one (1.0) is assigned to samples where the activity exceeds 50 pCi/g and a value of zero (0.0) is assigned to samples below 50 pCi/g. The geostatistical model that results contains the probability that any given area location has a $^{239/240}$Pu activity that exceeds 50 pCi/g.

22

Locations where the probability is 0.10 (10% chance) are 90% likely to have activity below the 50 pCi/g limit. This provides a 90% confidence that the location meets tolerable risk limits. Locations where the probability is between zero (0.0) and 0.10 (0-10% chance of exceeding the cutoff) will not be excavated. Areas where the probability of exceeding the cutoff is greater than 0.10 must be removed.

VI. Results

Figure 3 is a map of initial indicator kriging results for the initial sample data presented in Figure 1. Cell areas are color-coded in ten hues to indicate relative probability levels with the darkest hues indicating the most probable zones of contamination. Probability levels on the map range between zero and one, i.e. between zero and 100 percent. Black areas on the border of the map indicate zones that are either (1) outside the Lip Area or, (2) the 903 Pad (black square) which is being remediated under a separate effort.

Figure 3 – Probability Map of the 903 Pad Lip Area

Figure 3 shows that a number of areas exist where samples values above 50 pCi/g were not bounded by samples with activity below 50 pCi/g. Such areas exhibit relatively large extensions or concentric zones where probabilities of being above 50 pCi/g exceed 10 percent. These unbounded areas offer opportunities to improve remedial excavation efficiency through the dynamic field data collection activities.

Based on the results shown in Figure 3, additional field samples were collected in the unbounded areas. Approximately 50 new samples were obtained. Using these new data, a revised kriged model of the Lip Area was produced (Figure 4). Figure 4 reveals that the number of cell areas that exceed a probability of 0.10 has been reduced significantly and that a smaller footprint of excavation now applies.

23



Figure 4 – Probability Map of the 903 Pad Lip Area

Figure 4 also shows another feature. White areas correspond to either (1) areas outside the Lip Area; or, (2) areas that were not estimated during the creation of the model. The latter situation results from the kriging process. During kriging, the program searches for samples that are within a specified distance of the cell. If no samples are found, then the cell area is not estimated. Hence, these cell areas appear as blanks.

Sample data points are also posted on the figure. Sample locations where the $^{239/240}Pu$ activity exceeds 50 pCi/g are shown in yellow; locations where $^{239/240}Pu$ activity is less than 50 pCi/g are shown in blue. Areas shaded with the lightest hue represent areas where the confidence that $^{239/240}Pu$ activity does not exceed 50 pCi/g is 90 percent or greater. These areas do not require remediation. Areas containing other hues do not achieve a 90 percent confidence level. These areas require remediation.

It should be noted that certain areas contain a sample with activity below the threshold, yet display a value indicating that remediation is required. This is because certain areas may not achieve the desired level of confidence, whereas other portions of the area do meet the confidence requirements due to their proximity to samples above 50 pCi/g.

Figure 5 is a map showing the current estimated areas planned for excavation. Areas that have probabilities greater than 0.10 are shaded in red, with areas exhibiting probabilities

24

of 0.10 and below are shaded in pink. It is anticipated that most of the areas shown in red will be removed during the excavation.

As stated in Section IV, ongoing sampling efforts may provide additional information that may refine the probability values for blocks near the edge of the planned excavation, increasing the confidence that they are clean. Thus, the new sampling information may change the existing classification for certain cells, allowing them to remain undisturbed, yet meeting the stipulated confidence objectives.

Figure 5 – Estimated Zones of Remediation

VII. Uncertainty Analysis

A. Sample Data

The sample data values have been obtained through field sampling of surface soils. Samples were analyzed using a variety of analytical techniques including alpha spectroscopy, gamma spectroscopy, and high-purity germanium (HPGe). Each sample analysis has been subjected to rigorous tests to determine if the data quality meets RFETS standards. Only samples that meet the entire suite of QA/QC checks have been retained in for use in the geostatistical analysis.

Certain samples accepted into the geostatistical database have duplicate values associated with them. In these cases, the highest value was retained in order to be conservative.

However, in most cases it did not matter which value was retained, as both sample values were either below or above the 50 pCi/g threshold. Thus, when the indicator transform was applied, the result for a sample was identical to what the result for a duplicate would have been. For example, if a sample and its duplicate analysis indicated activity levels of 23.6 and 29.4 pCi/g, then either sample would suffice as both would be transformed to a value of zero during the geostatistical analysis.

Occasionally, sample values and their duplicates counterparts exhibited values both above and below the 50 pCi/g threshold. In these limited cases, the highest value was retained in order to be conservative. By preferentially omitting duplicate values below 50pCi/g, the geostatistical estimator has a greater chance of assigning a confidence value of less than 90 percent to a cell area. This method of retaining duplicate values decreases the chances that a cell area with activity exceeding 50 pCi/g will not be removed.

Sample data values represent estimates of the true activity in the soil material. Due to imperfections in any analytical process, there remains some uncertainty regarding the actual concentration of a particular mass of soil. It is possible sometimes to determine the uncertainty that surrounds the reported activity for an individual sample or group of samples.

For the geostatistical study, analytical uncertainty was not addressed. Because most of the duplicate sample analyses identical indicator classification, it is presumed that most of the sample data are classified correctly with regard to having activity above or below 50pCi/g. As discussed above, the retention rule for duplicates already imparts a level of conservativism to the geostatistical model.

B. Cell Area Estimation

Using samples to estimate cell areas results in a degree of uncertainty regarding the estimation. Tools are available to track and assess the quality of the geostatistical estimation. These tools are described below.

1. Misclassification Ellipse

The excavation boundary for the 903 Pad Lip Area has been defined by the techniques of indicator kriging, which identifies blocks that do not meet a 90 percent level of confidence. This means that numerous blocks with less than a 50 percent chance will be excavated, even though it is more likely than not that these blocks contain $^{239/240}Pu$ activity below the 50 pCi/g threshold. The impact of the decision-making rule can be examined visually.

Figure 6 is a Misclassification Ellipse (Myers 1997). The diagram tracks estimated values (such as those derived by kriging) on the x-axis. The diagram also tracks the true, but unknown, values on the y-axis. If an estimator, kriging or otherwise, were perfect, estimated values would equal true values and the plot would post as a 45 degree line

26

(Figure 6). Unfortunately, estimation is not perfect and a scatter of points, roughly elliptical, results.



Figure 6: Misclassification Ellipse

In environmental remediation, an action threshold is typically established. Such a threshold has been plotted as a vertical line on the x-axis and a horizontal line on the y-axis. These lines divide the ellipse into four quadrants, two of which are of concern and two of which are not.

In the lower-left corner, the estimated activity is below the threshold, 50 pCi/g for the 903 Pad Lip Area. The y-axis indicates that the actual value is in fact below the threshold. Thus, the area has been estimated appropriately (below-below or BB) and no excavation will be performed. Similarly, in the upper-right corner, the estimate is above the threshold and the actual value is as well (above-above or AA). In this case the correct decision to remediate the area will be made.

The first problem area resides in the lower-right corner of the ellipse. Here, the estimate indicates activity above 50 pCi/g, whereas the actual activity level is below. This block will be removed unnecessarily during the excavation. This is known as a Type I error or a false positive. Similarly, the area in the upper-left corner of the ellipse indicates the estimated activity to be below the threshold when, in actuality, it is above. In error, this area will not be excavated. This is a Type II error or a false negative.

27



Figure 7: Effect of 90 Percent Confidence on Misclassification Ellipse

The threshold value on the diagram (x_c) corresponds to a 50% probability that a block is above or below the threshold. As such, the Type I and Type II errors are equal in number. However, the excavation in the 903 Pad Lip Area will be performed to a 90 percent level of confidence. Figure 7 shows the Misclassification Ellipse after an adjustment has been made for the increased level of confidence.
In Figure 7, the threshold x_c for estimated values has been moved to a 10 percent chance of Type II error instead of a 50 percent chance. The area shown in red in Figure 7 is the remaining Type II error (10 percent). Note that by doing this, a 90 percent confidence has been achieved, but that the Type I errors have more than doubled, with a corresponding increase in area remediated unnecessarily.

Note also that the highest activity anticipated to be left unremediated has also been reduced significantly. At 50 percent confidence, the ellipse shows that cell areas with activities up to about 100 pCi/g might be left unremediated. By excavating to a 90 percent level of confidence, the maximum expected Type II error cell area would contain activity of only about 69 pCi/g.

Even though 69 pCi/g is above the threshold, risk goals can still be achieved as long as the average of the IHSS is below 50 pCi/g. It is acceptable under CERCLA to have

28

occasional areas above the threshold as long as the average is below the established risk level (Blacker and Goodman 1994a and 1994b).

2. Efficiencies of Sampling at the Threshold

Figure 8 is a Misclassification Ellipse that shows the effect of sampling along the action line (bounding samples). Based on initial samples and initial indicator kriging, samples locations with activities above 50 pCi/g that did not have samples below 50 pCi/g nearby (outside the plume area) were targeted for additional sampling in an attempt to bound the plume. These new samples were thus taken in the transition zone between above/below 50 pCi/g activity samples.



Figure 8: Effect of Action Line Sampling on Misclassification Ellipse

Because these new samples were taken approximately half-way between zones above and below the threshold, they can be viewed as samples taken at the 50 percent probability line, or x_c. This concentration of new information expressly at x_c reduces the width of the ellipse preferentially at x_c. The result is that the zones of Type I and Type II error shrink in size.

Figures 6 through 8 demonstrate that the uncertainty regarding the efficiency of the remediation has been reduced greatly. The error zones have been minimized, combined with a conservative decision rule that minimizes Type II error (potential contamination left behind). These approaches act in tandem to ensure that the remaining activity in the 903 Pad Lip Area has been minimized.

29

3. Effects of Error Minimization on Excavation Volumes

To demonstrate this minimization, Figure 9 displays the relative efficiencies achieved by the geostatistical approach. The x-axis displays the effect of increasing the amount of excavation from zero to 100 percent of the Lip Area. The y-axis shows either the percentage of the total $^{239/240}Pu$ mass associated with or the confidence related to a particular level of excavation.



Figure 9: Remedial Efficiency Curve

Three lines appear on the graph. The blue line shows the percent recovery of the total $^{239/240}Pu$ mass in the Lip Area. The graph shows that if no excavation were performed, then no $^{239/240}Pu$ would be recovered, as shown in the lower-left corner of the graph. Conversely, if the entire Lip Area were excavated, then all of the $^{239/240}Pu$ would be removed, as shown in the upper-right portion of the graph. Note that the pink and yellow symbols overlay, and thus block, the final blue point.

The pink line displays the systematic increase of potential probability in 2.5 percent increments, along with the associated confidence. Values start in the lower-left corner of the graph at zero (no confidence) and rise to a maximum (100 percent confidence) in the upper-right. Note that any particular level of confidence could have been selected for implementation during remedial activities.

30

Finally, the yellow line plots the percentage of the total number of 20x20 ft block areas that must be excavated in the Lip Area to achieve corresponding removal efficiencies as measured by the mass of $^{239/240}Pu$ recovered. In other words, this line graphs the percentage of blocks needed to remove a certain percentage of the total mass of $^{239/240}Pu$ in the soils in the Lip Area. A key feature of the yellow line is that is shows how large percentages of the $^{239/240}Pu$ mass can be removed with only a small amount of disturbance at the site.

The blue line (Pu mass recovery) indicates that with a minimal excavation, a significant proportion of the total mass of $^{239/240}Pu$ is removed. For example, by removing only the "hottest" 10 percent of the block areas, more than 50 percent of the total $^{239/240}Pu$ mass is remediated. By remediating to the 50 percent confidence/probability line ("best guess"), far more than one-half (about 83 percent) of the $^{239/240}Pu$ will be eliminated. By excavating to the 90 percent probability line, approximately 91.9 percent of the $^{239/240}Pu$ mass will be eliminated from the Lip Area soils.

The Pu mass recovery line demonstrates that there is great efficiency in excavating the hottest cells. After those cell areas are removed, the efficiency decreases steadily and much more area must be removed to achieve corresponding reductions in mass. For example, removing areas estimated between zero and five percent confidence, a five percent interval, results in 44 percent (almost half) of the mass being removed. However, removing areas between 90 and 95 percent confidence, another five percent confidence interval, only removes about 1.4 percent of the $^{239/240}Pu$ mass.

The Pu mass recovery line indicates a point of diminishing returns has been achieved by an excavation strategy focused on a 90 percent confidence for decision-making. The evidence on the graph supports the choice of using the 90 percent confidence level vs. higher confidence levels that would require much more soil to be removed to eliminate each remaining percent of the $^{239/240}Pu$ mass.

The mass recovery line increases at a relatively constant rate until approximately 35 percent of the block areas have been removed and a confidence of greater than 99 percent has been achieved. At that point, the graph jumps dramatically to 100 percent. In other words, to remove the last (approximately one percent) of the $^{239/240}Pu$ mass, planned excavation would need to almost triple.

VIII. Alternative Threshold Analysis

The Wildlife Refuge Worker (WRW) Action Level for $^{239/240}Pu$ in soil at RFETS is 116 pCi/g. This value is based on a 1×10^{-5} increased cancer risk, which represents an average exposure over a 300-acre exposure area. However, the RFCA parties agreed to use the lower, more conservative value of 50 pCi/g as the Action Level to guide soil remediation.

It is useful and informative to compare the results obtained using a threshold of 50 pCi/g vs. the results and excavation plan that would result from using the previous threshold of 116 pCi/g. The excavation plan using 50 pCi/g has identified 3853 block areas that need

to be removed. This contrasts with only 2226 blocks that would be removed using a threshold of 116 pCi/g.

The current plan will remove approximately 73 percent more blocks than would be removed under the previous threshold. This adds another level of conservativism and protectionism to the excavation plan. As seen in Figure 7, reducing the threshold (x_c) increases the amount of over-excavation.

IX. Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from the geostatistical analysis:

(1) The sample data in the 903 Pad Lip Area are appropriate for geostatistical analysis. The data are of sufficient density and display good spatial correlation.

(2) Indicator kriging can establish a firm decision rule for soils excavation based on an action level (50 pCi/g) and an agreed level of confidence.

(3) The geostatistical approach is efficient and protective of human health and the environment, as demonstrated by the Misclassification Ellipse. The combination of sampling in the transition zone and using an high level of confidence (90 percent) for excavation provide a conservative approach.

(4) The removal activities will eliminate the vast majority of the $^{239/240}$Pu mass. Should an area with activity exceeding 50 pCi/g be left unremediated, it is highly likely that the block will have an average activity close to 50 pCi/g. This means that the incremental risk associated with the decision error is minimal.

(5) With the vast majority of the $^{239/240}$Pu mass removed from the 903 Pad Lip Area, the overall risk for the excavation area will be below the established limits with a high degree of confidence, to the point of virtual certainty.

(6) A dynamic work plan incorporating ongoing field sampling with continual updates to the geostatistical model will provide the most precise estimate of the excavation line, which will achieve the efficiencies and degrees confidence listed above.

(7) The change in the Pu Soil Action Level, originally determined to be 116 pCi/g averaged over 300 acres, then lowered to 50 pCi/g averaged over 0.0092 acres (the size of each 20' x 20' grid cell), has increased the planned excavation area by approximately 73 percent. The additional excavation provides more confidence that acceptable risk levels are achieved.

32

References

Blacker, S., and D. Goodman. 1994a. *An Integrated Approach for Efficient Site Cleanup*. Environmental Science Technology (American Chemical Society).28(11).

Blacker, S., and D. Goodman. 1994b. Case Study: *Application at a Superfund Site*. Environmental Science Technology (American Chemical Society).28(11).

Crumbling, D.M., C. Groenjes, B. Lesnik, K. Lynch, J. Shockley, J. Van Ee, R. Howe, L. Keith, and J. McKenna. 2001. *Managing Uncertainty in Environmental Decisions*. American Chemical Society: Environmental Science & Technology. October.

Crumbling, D.M. 2001. *Current Perspectives in Site Remediation and Monitoring: Using the Triad Approach to Improve the Cost-Effectiveness of Hazardous Waste Cleanups*. EPA 542-R-01-016. August.

EPA 2001. *Improving Sampling, Analysis, and Data Management for Site Investigation and Cleanup*. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. EPA-542-F-01-030a. April.

EPA 1991. *Geostatistical Environmental Assessment Software*. EPA/600/8-91/008. Environmental Systems Monitoring Laboratory. Las Vegas, NV.

Myers, J.C. 1997. *Geostatistical Error Management: Quantifying Uncertainty for Environmental Sampling and Mapping*. Van Nostrand Reinhold/John Wiley & Sons: New York.



Figure 1
IHSS Group 900-11
Location Map

KEY

- IHSS
- PAC

Building

- Demolished
- Standing
- Paved road
- Dirt road
- Stream
- Lake
- Site Boundary

Disclaimer:
Neither the United States Government nor Kaiser-Hill, LLC, nor Dyncorp I&ET nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

N
W E
S

800 0 800 Feet

Scale = 1:14,500

State Plane Coordinate Projection
Colorado Central Zone
Datum: NAD 27

U.S. Department of Energy
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

Prepared by:

RADMS

Prepared for:

KAISER•HILL
COMPANY

File: w:\projects\fy2003\903lip\903liparea.apr Date: September 2003

12



Figure 2
IHSS Group 900-11
Existing Plutonium-239/240
Sample Locations

KEY

Plutonium Results (pCi/g)

- 0 - 50
- 50 - 17400

Building

- Demolished
- Standing
- IHSS
- Dirt road
- Paved road

Disclaimer:
Neither the United States Government nor Kaiser-Hill, L.L.C. nor Dyncorp I&ET nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

N W E S

100 0 100 Feet

Scale = 1: 2500

State Plane Coordinate Projection
Colorado Central Zone
Datum: NAD 27

U.S. Department of Energy
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

Prepared by:

RADMS

Prepared for:

KAISER•HILL COMPANY

File: w:\projects\fy2003\903lip\903lipareа.apr Date: September 2003



Figure 3
IHSS Group 900-11
Initial Grid Locations

KEY

56 x 56 ft Grid

42 x 42 ft Grid

Plutonium Results (pCi/g)

0 - 50

50 - 17400

Building

Demolished

Standing

IHSS

PAC

Dirt road

Paved road

Disclaimer:
Neither the United States Government nor Kaiser-Hill, LLC, nor Dyncorp I&ET nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

N W E S

100 0 100 Feet

Scale = 1: 2500

State Plane Coordinate Projection
Colorado Central Zone
Datum: NAD 27

U.S. Department of Energy
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

Prepared by:

RADMS

Prepared for:

KAISER•HILL COMPANY

File: w:\projects\fy2003\903iip\903iiparea.apr Date: September 2003

14



Figure 4
Krig Output
with 5ft Contours

Paved roads
Inner Lip Grid Cells
Building
Demolished
Standing
Dirt roads
90 Percent Confidence Boundary
Lower Inner Lip Boundary
Actual Sample Results => 50 pCi/g
Actual Sample Results < 50 pCi/g
5 ft Contours

Disclaimer:
Neither the United States Government nor Kaiser-Hill, LLC, nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

N W E S

100 0 100 Feet

Scale = 1: 2300

State Plane Coordinate Projection
Colorado Central Zone
Datum: NAD 27

U.S. Department of Energy
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

Prepared by: Date: 01.27.04

RADMS

Prepared for:

KAISER•HILL COMPANY

File: W:\Projects\Fy2004\900-11_IMIRA\krig\krigmaps.apr

15



Figure 5
Lower Inner Lip Confirmation Sampling

KEY

- Inner Lip Grid (Separate Remediation)
- Statistical Scenario #1079
- Lower Inner Lip Boundary
- Dirt roads
- 903 Pad
- Standing Structure
- Kriging Boundary

Disclaimer:
Neither the United States Government nor Kaiser-Hill, LLC, I&ET nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

N W E S

100 0 100 Feet

Scale = 1: 1300

State Plane Coordinate Projection
Colorado Central Zone
Datum: NAD 27

U.S. Department of Energy
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

Prepared by: Date: 01.27.04

R.A.D.M.S.

Prepared for:

KAISER•HILL COMPANY

File: W:\Projects\Fy2004\900-11_IMIRA\krig\krigmaps.apr

Attachment A
Figure 1.
Sample Locations and Relative Concentrations

KEY

- Geostatistical boundary
- Lakes
- Streams
- Paved roads
- Dirt roads

Sample Results (pCi/g)

- >50
- 0 - 50
- IHSS

Building

- Demolished
- Standing

Disclaimer:
Neither the United States Government nor Kaiser-Hill, LLC, nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

N W E S

200 0 200 Feet

Scale = 1: 4250

State Plane Coordinate Projection
Colorado Central Zone
Datum: NAD 27

U.S. Department of Energy
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

Prepared by: Date: 01.15.04

RADMS

Prepared for:

KAISER•HILL COMPANY

File: W:\Projects\Fy2004\900-11_IMIRA\krig\krigmaps.apr