**Pacific Northwest
National Laboratory**

Operated by Battelle for the
U.S. Department of Energy

**Monitoring Guidance for Vadose
Zone Monitoring of Liquid Waste
Disposal Facilities for the Hanford
Groundwater Project**

D. G. Horton
S. P. Reidel
G. V. Last

August 1999

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy
under Contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or Battelle Memorial Institute.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORY
operated by
BATTELLE
for the
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
under Contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830

Printed in the United States of America

**Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the
Office of Scientific and Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831;
prices available from (615) 576-8401.**

**Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service,
U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161**

This document was printed on recycled paper.

Monitoring Guidance for Vadose Zone Monitoring of Liquid Waste Disposal Facilities for the Hanford Groundwater Project

D. G. Horton
S. P. Reidel
G. V. Last

August 1999

Prepared for
the U.S. Department of Energy
under Contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Richland, Washington 99352

Summary

This document is prepared by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory¹ in response to a U.S. Department of Energy request for a description of vadose zone monitoring of liquid waste disposal facilities that are not part of the Tank Waste Remediation System. This document includes the needs and objectives of vadose zone monitoring and provides a rationale and general framework for vadose zone monitoring of past-practice cribs, ditches, trenches and other disposal facilities. The monitoring described herein will be modified as necessary so as to be incorporated into the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project.

Vadose zone monitoring addressed in this document is part of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project. As such, the major objective of the monitoring is protection of groundwater. However, the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's vadose zone monitoring compliments the 200 Area soil remediation strategy developed by the Hanford Site's environmental restoration contractor. Most 200 Areas past-practice, liquid waste, disposal facilities are slated for remediation, ranging from complete cleanup to in-place management. The monitoring discussed in this document will track vadose zone contamination until remedial actions can occur. Also, if in some instances vadose contamination is managed in place, periodic monitoring to assess the effectiveness of that remedial decision may be necessary. It is expected that the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's vadose zone activities will undergo changes as the priorities and activities of the Hanford Site environmental restoration activities evolve.

This report has been issued in hard-copy and electronic formats. The electronic version of the hard-copy document is available on the Internet at <http://hanford.pnl.gov/groundwater> OK

¹Pacific Northwest National Laboratory is operated by Battelle for the U.S. Department of Energy.

Acknowledgments

This document benefited from the participation of K. R. Fecht, G. W. Gee, V. G. Johnson, A. J. Knepp, F. M. Mann, C. J. Murrey, R. J. Serne, R. M. Smith, M. D. Sweeney, A. L. Ward, and G. Whelen in the data quality objective process. Their comments, thoughts, and ideas contributed much to the authors' conceptual implementation of vadose zone monitoring.

Contents

Summary	iii
Acknowledgments	v
1.0 Introduction	1.1
1.1 Scope	1.3
1.2 Integration of Vadose Zone Monitoring with Other Hanford Site Activities	1.3
1.3 Document Organization	1.4
2.0 Vadose Zone Geology and Hydrogeology	2.1
2.1 Ringold Formation	2.1
2.2 Intervening Plio-Pleistocene Deposits	2.1
2.3 Hanford Formation	2.3
2.4 Holocene Deposits	2.3
2.5 Discontinuities	2.4
2.6 Vadose Zone Hydrology	2.4
3.0 Past Vadose Zone Monitoring at Hanford	3.1
3.1 Gross Gamma-Ray Monitoring	3.1
3.2 Spectral Gamma-Ray Logging	3.2
3.3 Neutron Logging	3.2
3.4 Compilations of Logging Data	3.3
3.5 Other Characterization and Monitoring Data Sources	3.3
3.6 Uses of Historical Data for Current and Future Monitoring	3.4

4.0	Data Quality Objectives Process.....	4.1
4.1	Introduction.....	4.1
4.2	Description of DQO Process and Limitations	4.1
4.3	Data Requirements and Regulatory Drivers	4.2
4.4	Statement of Problem	4.2
4.4.1	Conceptual Model Considerations.....	4.3
4.4.2	Resource Constraints	4.4
4.5	Decision and Expected Action.....	4.4
4.6	Decision Inputs	4.4
4.7	Study Boundaries.....	4.6
4.8	Decision Rule.....	4.7
4.8.1	Statistical Parameters of Interest.....	4.8
4.8.2	Action Level or Measurement Threshold	4.9
4.8.3	Alternative Actions	4.10
4.9	Limits on Decision Errors.....	4.10
4.10	Optimizing Sampling Design	4.11
4.11	Site-Specific Vadose Zone Monitoring Strategy	4.11
5.0	Site Prioritization	5.1
5.1	Prioritization Process	5.1
5.2	Prioritization Results	5.1
6.0	Monitoring and Analysis.....	6.1
6.1	Vadose Zone Monitoring.....	6.1
6.1.1	Facilities to be Monitored.....	6.1
6.1.2	Selection of Constituents of Concern	6.1
6.1.3	Selection of Monitoring Methods.....	6.2
6.1.4	Determine the Monitoring Network	6.3

6.1.5 Pre-Monitoring Activities	6.8
6.1.6 Acquire Monitoring Services.....	6.8
6.1.7 Data Reduction, Data Analysis, and Data Interpretation	6.10
6.1.8 Data Management.....	6.10
6.1.9 Reporting	6.11
7.0 References.....	7.1
Appendix A - Quality Assurance Project Plan	A.1
Appendix B - Site Prioritization	B.1
Appendix C - Available Spectral Gamma-Ray Logs from Liquid Waste Disposal Facilities	C.1

Figure

2.1 Suprabasalt Stratigraphy at the Hanford Site	2.2
--	-----

Tables

2.1 Summary of Lysimeter Data from the Hanford Site	2.5
2.2 Lithologies and Unsaturated Flow Parameters.....	2.6
4.1 Conceptual Model Parameters of Interest	4.9
4.2 Elements of Vadose Zone Monitoring	4.12
6.1 Cleanup Levels for Constituents of Concern	6.2
6.2 Monitoring Methods Applicable to the Constituents of Interest.....	6.4

1.0 Introduction

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE's) Hanford Site has the most diverse and largest amounts of radioactive waste in the United States. These radioactive wastes came from various sources: (1) plutonium and uranium recovery processing of approximately 100,000 Mtu of irradiated fuel, (2) tank waste processing for radionuclide recovery, and (3) miscellaneous sources (e.g., laboratories and reactor decontamination solutions). The neutralized wastes contained sodium nitrate, sodium hydroxide, sodium aluminate, sodium phosphate, large amounts of organic materials, and approximately 260 MCi of radioactivity.

Much of the radioactive waste was stored in 149 single-shell tanks and 28 double-shell tanks. However, the majority of the effluent volume was disposed to the soil column either to absorb the liquid and its hazardous or radioactive material (specific retention facilities) or to chemically react (adsorption/precipitation) with the materials (cribs, french drains, ponds, etc.).

DOE Order 5400.1, *General Environmental Protection Program*, specifies that environmental surveillance shall be conducted to monitor the effects of DOE activities on onsite and offsite environmental and natural resources. The environmental surveillance, in part, is to 1) verify compliance with applicable environmental laws and regulations and with commitments in environmental impact statements and environmental assessments; 2) characterize and define trends in the physical and chemical condition of environmental media; 3) establish a baseline of environmental quality; and 4) identify and quantify new or existing environmental quality problems. The *Environmental Monitoring Plan, United States Department of Energy Richland Operations Office* (DOE 1997a) defines the requirements for effluent monitoring and near-facility surface and groundwater monitoring necessary to accomplish goals of DOE Order 5400.1.

The Hanford Groundwater Project was started in 1997 to integrate the groundwater and vadose zone monitoring activities at Hanford in fulfilling the goals and objectives of the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* (RCRA), the *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980* (CERCLA), DOE Orders, and the Washington Administrative Code. Groundwater monitoring at that time was well established partly because of the emphasis placed on groundwater by environmental regulations. Vadose zone monitoring, which lacks a similar emphasis, was limited to geophysical monitoring at dry wells within single-shell tank farms and dry wells and groundwater wells at a few liquid effluent disposal facilities. No strategy for sitewide and source-specific vadose zone monitoring existed.

This document was prepared at the request of DOE/RL to provide a description of the Hanford Groundwater Project's vadose zone monitoring activities, how the vadose zone monitoring activities are integrated into the sitewide Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project, and how the data obtained from the vadose zone monitoring is to be used.

To that end, this document provides the rationale and general framework for the Hanford Groundwater Project's vadose zone monitoring activities. Elements of a site-specific vadose zone monitoring

strategy and the technical and administrative controls on vadose zone monitoring in support of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project are addressed in this document. Information obtained from implementing this and subsequent site-specific vadose zone monitoring plans will be integrated with other monitoring and technical activities within the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project, the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project, and current and future environmental remediation activities.

The dominant mission at Hanford is environmental remediation. One important connection between the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's vadose zone monitoring and the Hanford Site remediation activities is through the process identified in the 200 Area soil remediation strategy (DOE 1996). That strategy recognized that most 200 Areas past-practice liquid disposal facilities will undergo some form of remediation, ranging from complete cleanup to in-place management. The vadose zone monitoring done for the Hanford Groundwater Project tracks vadose zone contamination until those remedial actions can occur. Also, if in some instances vadose zone contamination is managed in place, periodic monitoring to assess the effectiveness of that remedial activity may be necessary. It is expected that the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's vadose zone monitoring activities will undergo changes as the priorities and restoration activities evolve.

As the vadose zone monitoring project discovers needs for baseline data against which to monitor, or needs based on existing borehole surveys, those needs can be passed to the 200 Areas soil investigations for consideration in appropriate limited field investigations. Any new characterization facility, such as boreholes, may then become additional monitoring points for vadose zone monitoring.

This document is not intended to delineate all the specific details of monitoring any particular site. That scope belongs to the site-specific monitoring plans that will be developed for each vadose monitoring task. Instead, this document is intended to provide a framework and general criteria to direct the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's site-specific vadose zone monitoring plans and to provide a path to achieve site-specific vadose zone monitoring.

A modified data quality objective (DQO) process was used as a major source of information to produce this document. The results of the DQO process and subsequent reviews of this document resulted in a road map leading from the general guidance of this document to the details necessary for a site-specific monitoring plan. Those results are presented in Section 4.0 "Data Quality Objectives Process" of this document.

It is recognized that vadose zone strategies at the Hanford Site are evolving and that this document will need revision to reflect new priorities and new information. Also, the conclusions and recommendations in this document are subject to the strategies and activities of the more broad, sitewide Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project.

This document is a revision of a proposal submitted for public review and comment in December 1998. Every attempt was made to address the comments and concerns raised during that review.

1.1 Scope

The scope of this document is the vadose zone monitoring activities that are part of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project. This includes vadose zone monitoring at all liquid waste disposal facilities having the potential to impact groundwater with two exceptions. First, vadose zone monitoring that is part of the Tank Waste Remediation Systems (TWRS) Program is not within the scope of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project and is not considered in this document.

Second, liquid disposal facilities that currently are undergoing remediation and facilities that are already remediated and do not require post-closure vadose zone monitoring are not considered by this document. Remediation efforts are currently directed at the 100 Areas so that vadose zone monitoring is not appropriate there until remediation is complete and a determination is made as to whether vadose zone monitoring is necessary to assess the success and performance of remediation activities. In the 300 Area, the source areas (e.g., 300-FF-1) are being remediated and the Record of Decision for groundwater allows for natural attenuation of contaminants. Thus, vadose zone monitoring in that area is not appropriate. Therefore, the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's vadose zone monitoring focuses on the 200 Areas because characterization and remediation in those areas was deferred.

Finally, conditions resulting in inordinate amounts of infiltration, such as water-line leaks and unplanned releases, are covered by this document when they are associated with past-practice, liquid waste disposal facilities and could have an impact on groundwater quality.

The basic purpose of the vadose zone monitoring described in this document is protection of groundwater. This is accomplished by time-series monitoring to identify changes in subsurface contamination and changes in soil characteristics that could lead to changes in contaminant distribution. Basic characterization activities are not considered as monitoring activities and are not part of the scope of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project. However, first-time data acquisition, using standard monitoring tools, can establish a baseline against which to monitor in the future. Such data are considered as the first time-series data points for assessing changes in contaminate distribution.

Also, although modeling is not part of the scope of the vadose zone monitoring, it is part of the broader Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project. The time-series monitoring of contaminants in the vadose zone can provide data to substantiate geochemical conceptual and numerical models.

1.2 Integration of Vadose Zone Monitoring with Other Hanford Site Activities

DOE/RL established the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project in 1997 to coordinate and integrate work that evaluates the impact of Hanford Site contamination on human health and the environment (DOE 1998). The Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project specifications (DOE 1998) documents the approach and process used to accomplish these goals. Vadose zone activities are one of several aspects under the auspices of the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project. As such, the

Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project participates in the coordination and integration efforts led by the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project to ensure effective use of Hanford Site resources in protection of groundwater and the Columbia River.

1.3 Document Organization

This document consists of four parts. The main part provides guidance for subsequent site-specific vadose zone monitoring plans and includes 1) background information consisting of a brief description of the Hanford Site vadose zone hydrogeology and existing monitoring data, 2) a description of the results of the DQO process used for the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's vadose zone monitoring, 3) a prioritization of waste sites that need vadose monitoring, and 4) general monitoring and analysis considerations.

In addition, this document contains three appendices. Appendix A is a general quality assurance project plan. This appendix and portions of the main document can serve as part of site-specific monitoring plans. Appendix B is a detailed description of the prioritization process used to rank liquid waste disposal facilities for vadose zone monitoring. This appendix will be updated as new information becomes available.

Appendix C contains references to existing spectral gamma-ray logs that can be used as baseline data for vadose zone monitoring. Previous revisions of this document contained a third appendix (Appendix C) which was to include site-specific information for those sites to be monitored during the upcoming fiscal year. That appendix has been deleted from this revision and the information which was to be included there (site-specific maps, inventories, constituents of concern, results of previous site-specific monitoring, existing site-specific subsurface access and contamination) will be included in the site-specific monitoring plans published separately.

2.0 Vadose Zone Geology and Hydrogeology

The stratigraphy of the Hanford Site vadose zone consists of the Ringold Formation, Plio-Pleistocene deposits, the Hanford formation, and Holocene fluvial and eolian deposits (Figure 2.1).

2.1 Ringold Formation

The Ringold Formation is a heterogeneous mix of variably cemented and compacted gravel, sand, silt, and clay. These strata record a history of alluvial and lacustrine sedimentation and pedogenic activity associated with the ancestral Columbia River system between 8.5 and 3.4 million years ago (Fecht et al. 1987). Braided streams and lacustrine settings dominated the depositional environment. Ringold Formation deposits on the Hanford Site represent an eastward shift of the Columbia River from the west side of the site to the east side.

Lindsey (1996) described the Ringold Formation in terms of five facies, consisting of fluvial gravels, fluvial sands, overbank-paleosol deposits, lacustrine deposits and basaltic alluvium. Using these facies, Lindsey (1996) then divided the Ringold Formation into three informal members: the Wooded Island, containing five separate intervals designated units A, B, C, D, and E; Taylor Flat; and Savage Island (Figure 2.1).

The Ringold Formation is up to 185 m (600 ft) thick in the deepest part of the Cold Creek syncline south of the 200 West Area. The Ringold Formation pinches out against Gable Mountain, Yakima Ridge, the Saddle Mountains, and Rattlesnake Mountain anticlines (Delaney et al. 1991). The Ringold Formation is mostly absent from the vadose zone in 200 East Area. In 200 West Area, the Ringold Formation part of the vadose zone consists primarily of a slightly silty coarse- to medium-grained sandy gravel (Ringold unit E).

2.2 Intervening Plio-Pleistocene Deposits

Locally the Ringold Formation and overlying Hanford formation are separated by informally defined, discontinuous late Pliocene to early Pleistocene deposits. These deposits include the Plio-Pleistocene unit and the pre-Missoula gravels.

The Plio-Pleistocene unit unconformably overlies the Ringold Formation in the western Cold Creek syncline near 200 West Area. The unit is up to 25 m (82 ft) thick and consists of basaltic gravels and pedogenic calcrete (Delaney et al. 1991). The upper part of the Plio-Pleistocene unit consists of up to 20 m (65 ft) of massive and compact silt and fine-grained sand that was formerly designated as the "early Palouse soil" (DOE 1988). This part of the Plio-Pleistocene unit occurs in the western Cold Creek syncline around the 200 West Area (DOE 1988). It is differentiated from overlying Hanford deposits by greater calcium carbonate content, massive structure, and high natural gamma response in geophysical logs (DOE 1988).

Figure 2.1. Superbasalt Stratigraphy at the Hanford Site

The eastern edge of the Plio-Pleistocene gravel facies occurs along the southwest boundary of 200 West Area. The Plio-Pleistocene unit appears to be correlative to other sidestream alluvial and pedogenic deposits found near the base of the ridges bounding the Pasco Basin on the north, west, and south.

The pre-Missoula gravels consist of quartzose to gneissic clast-supported pebble to cobble gravel with a quartzo-feldspathic sand matrix (Delaney et al. 1991). These deposits underlie the Hanford formation near

the 200 East Area. They are up to 25 m (82 ft) thick and are distinguished from the underlying Ringold deposits because they contain less basalt and have a distinctive bleached color. The nature of the contact between the pre-Missoula gravels and the Hanford formation is not well determined (Delaney et al. 1991).

2.3 Hanford Formation

The Hanford formation is an informally named unit that represents all the deposits of the cataclysmic floods of the Pleistocene epoch (1.8 Ma to 13 ka). The floods came from glacial Lake Missoula, Lake Bonneville, and other ice margin lakes associated with continental glaciers that spread south as far as the present Columbia Plateau. Glaciers damming the lakes may have given way as many as 40 times during late Wisconsin time, allowing impounded water to spread across eastern Washington and form the Channeled Scablands. These flood waters collected in the Pasco Basin and formed Lake Lewis, which rapidly drained through the small water gap in the Horse Heaven Hills called Wallula Gap.

Three principal types of deposits were left behind by the Lake Missoula floods: 1) high-energy deposits consisting of gravel; 2) low-energy, slackwater deposits (also known as the Touchet Beds) consisting of rhythmically bedded silt and sand; and 3) coarse to fine sand deposits representing an energy transition environment. The Hanford formation typically has been divided into a variety of sediment types, facies, or lithologic packages. Recent reports dealing with the Hanford formation (e.g., Delaney et al. 1991; Reidel et al. 1992), have recognized three basic lithofacies: 1) gravel-dominated, 2) sand-dominated, and 3) silt-dominated. These facies generally correspond to the high energy, coarse gravels, the transitional laminated sands, and the lower energy, graded rhythmites respectively (DOE 1988; Baker et al. 1991; and Delaney et al. 1991).

In the 200 West Area, the Hanford formation portion of the vadose zone consists of a sequence of the gravel-dominated facies overlying a sequence of sand-dominated facies. In 200 East Area, the Hanford formation has been subdivided into three sequences: 1) an upper gravel-dominated sequence, 2) a middle sand-dominated sequence, and 3) a lower gravel-dominated sequence. The gravel dominated sequences consist of cross-bedded, coarse-grained sand and granule-to-boulder gravel. They are generally uncemented and matrix poor (Lindsey and Reynolds, in Jones et al. 1998). The sand-dominated sequence consists of sand, silty sand, and slightly gravelly sand.

2.4 Holocene Deposits

Holocene surficial deposits consisting of silt, sand, and gravel form a thin (<5 m [16 ft]) veneer across much of the Hanford Site. These deposits resulted from recent fluvial processes along the Columbia River and sidestream channels and from eolian processes in the central part of the Hanford Site. These deposits are not everywhere present and have been removed from disturbed sites such as in the areas of cribs, ponds, and ditches

2.5 Discontinuities

Discontinuities in the vadose zone sediments can serve as preferential pathways or as barriers to liquids reaching groundwater. The major discontinuities are clastic dikes, faults, fractures, and joints.

Clastic dikes are a common geologic feature in the suprabasalt sediments at Hanford. Clastic dikes are generally vertical to subvertical sedimentary structures that cut across normal sedimentary layering. They are most common in the Hanford formation but also have been identified in the Ringold Formation, the Ellensburg Formation, and the Columbia River basalts. Clastic dikes exhibit a wide variation in their dimensions, internal structure, infilling material, and relationships with one another. The most important feature of clastic dikes is their potential to either enhance or inhibit (depending on textural relationships) vertical and lateral movement of contaminants in the subsurface. Black (1979) and Fecht et al. (1998) have compiled most of the information known about clastic dikes in the Pasco Basin.

Faults, fractures, and joints are structural discontinuities that can provide potential vertical pathways to groundwater. These features are most common in competent rock near anticlinal ridges but are not confined only to those areas. Faults have been observed throughout the Pasco Basin but are typically sparse away from the major anticlines. Joints and fractures differ from faults in that there is little to no relative movement on either side of the fractures. They are very common wherever competent, brittle deforming rock has undergone folding as in the Pasco Basin. The cemented rock of the Ringold Formation and caliche layers of the Plio-Pleistocene unit are typically broken by fractures and joints. The uncemented Hanford formation and ductile clay-rich beds of the Plio-Pleistocene unit are probably less susceptible to joints and fractures. However, shrinkage of clay-rich beds as they dry out will produce abundant joints and fractures.

2.6 Vadose Zone Hydrology

Recharge through the Hanford Site vadose zone has been measured at a number of lysimeter facilities during the past 25 years. Table 2.1 (modified from Jones et al. 1998) summarizes much of that data. The information in Table 2.1 shows that the amount of recharge at the Hanford Site varies over two orders of magnitude. Recharge at any particular site is highly dependent on the soil type and whether or not the site is vegetated; coarser grained sediments allow greater recharge than finer grained sediments and vegetation (evapotranspiration) inhibits recharge. Many past-practice liquid waste disposal sites have disturbed soil at the surface and some have been gravel covered to inhibit spread of contamination. Gravel covered sites are expected to experience increased recharge. Also, the use of herbicides to control vegetation over past-practice liquid waste disposal facilities is common at the Hanford Site and is expected to increase recharge.

The movement of naturally infiltrated moisture within the Hanford Site vadose zone generally occurs as uniform moisture movement through the soil, which causes older, preexisting water to be displaced downward by newly infiltrated water. Preferential flow along fractures, faults, clastic dikes, borehole casings and other preferred pathways is possible. However, under natural recharge conditions at the Hanford Site (i.e., low water fluxes) this type of movement probably does not occur or is at least greatly subordinant to uniform flow (Jones et al. 1998).

Table 2.1. Summary of Lysimeter Data from the Hanford Site (from Jones et al. 1998)

Facility ^(a)	Soil/Vegetation	Time	Recharge Estimate		Reference ^(b)
			(mm/yr)	(% of precipitation)	
200 East	Sand/tumbleweed	1971-1985	<2	<1	1
200 East	Sand/bare	1988-1989	90	43	2
BWTF	Sand/bare	1985-1986	111	48	2
BWTF	Sand/bare	1986-1987	102	55	2
BWTF	Sand/bare	1987-1988	40	29	2
BWTF	Sand/bare	1988-1989	42	24	2
BWTF	Sand/cheatgrass	1984-1986	62	35	3
BWTF	Sand/tumbleweed	1986-1987	1	5	2
BWTF	Sand/tumbleweed	1987-1988	0 ^(c)	0	2
BWTF	Sand/tumbleweed	1988-1989	10	6	2
ALE	Silt loam/sagebrush	1986-1990	0	0	4
ALE	Silt loam/bunchgrass	1986-1990	0	0	4

(a) 200 East = 18-m-deep, closed-bottom lysimeter.
 BWTF = Buried Waste Test Facility - 300 Area.
 ALE= Arid Lands Ecology Reserve Lysimeters.

(b) 1 = Routson and Johnson (1990).
 2 = Rockhold et al. (1990).
 3 = Gee (1987).
 4 = Gee et al. (1991).

(c) Zero value indicates no drainage occurred in lysimeters.

Man-induced recharge at past-practice liquid waste disposal facilities or recharge resulting from tank, basin, or pipeline leaks result in much larger water fluxes than the flux from natural recharge. Moisture movement resulting from man-induced recharge may follow preferential flow paths through the vadose zone. Man-induced recharge may also produce "fingered" movement of moisture through the vadose zone whereby heterogeneities in the sediment and/or the physical properties of the effluent cause fingers of moisture to extend to greater depths than the rest of the moisture mass.

Finally, textural heterogeneities (e.g., bedding) in the Hanford Site vadose zone sediments can result in inhibition of vertical movement of moisture and enhancement of lateral movement of moisture. Such movement is evident at some past-practice liquid disposal facilities where boreholes adjacent to the facilities encountered contamination.

Detailed hydrologic properties and transport parameters, and their variability, are necessary for accurate predictions of flow and transport in the vadose zone. Khaleel and Freeman (1995) compiled data on particle-size distribution, moisture retention, and saturated hydraulic conductivity of 183 samples from 12 locations in the 200 Areas. The moisture retention data and saturated conductivity values were

corrected for gravel content. After the data were corrected and cataloged, hydraulic parameters were determined by fitting the van Genuchten soil-moisture retention model to the data. Kincaid et al. (1998) established hydraulic parameters for each of the important lithologies in the vadose zone based on the data in Khaleel and Freeman (1995). Table 2.2 shows those parameters.

Table 2.2. Lithologies and Unsaturated Flow Parameters (after Kincaid et al. 1998)

Lithology	van Genuchten Alpha	van Genuchten n (1/cm)	Residual Water Content (cm ³ /cm ³)	Saturated Water Content (cm ³ /cm ³)	Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity (cm/s)	Bulk Density (g/cm ³)	Gravel (%)
200 East Hanford gravel	8.11E-03	1.58	0.0146	0.119	1.76E-03	1.97	41.7
200 East Hanford sand	1.30E-01	2.10	0.0257	0.337	1.19E-02	1.78	17.3
200 East Ringold	8.19E-03	1.53	0.0262	0.124	3.97E-04	2.04	43.3
200 West Hanford sand	1.44E-02	2.20	0.0519	0.382	3.98E-04	1.64	3.6
200 West compact silt and fine sand (early Palouse)	6.27E-03	2.53	0.0300	0.379	9.69E-05	1.68	2.0
Plio-Pleistocene	1.55E-02	1.78	0.0616	0.337	5.79E-02	1.65	8.4
200 West Ringold	3.14E-02	1.65	0.0236	0.226	5.76E-02	2.04	43.3

One of the most significant features in the 200 West Area that has potential to affect vadose zone transport is the fine-grained and carbonate-cemented Plio-Pleistocene unit. This unit represents an ancient, buried calcic paleosol. Because of the cemented nature of the unit, it is often considered impermeable, but it also contains many fractures that have formed since it developed. The degree of cementation varies considerably within the Plio-Pleistocene unit so that contaminants could pass through the unit through discontinuities in cementation or structure. Immediately overlying the Plio-Pleistocene unit is a compact silt and fine-grained sand that has a relatively high moisture-retention capacity and would tend to retard the downward movement of moisture and contaminants. The Plio-Pleistocene unit and the overlying compact silt and fine sand is not found beneath the 200 East Area.

3.0 Past Vadose Monitoring at Hanford

Traditionally, at the Hanford Site, vadose zone monitoring has consisted primarily of borehole geophysical logging using a gamma-ray sonde. The earliest logging was gross gamma-ray logging. Spectral gamma-ray logging has been used at the site since the late 1970s. Other, but less-often used, tools included neutron probes for moisture content, temperature probes for tracking the heat of radionuclide decay, and copper foils for alpha tracking. This chapter describes the historical monitoring that has been done at Hanford with particular emphasis on results that have been published and are available to serve as a baseline for future vadose zone monitoring.

3.1 Gross Gamma-Ray Logging

Gross gamma-ray logging started at the Hanford Site in the late 1940s to assess the performance of waste disposal facilities. The earliest, published gross gamma-ray logging studies were 1964 and 1969 and were done to evaluate the distribution, redistribution and decay of radionuclides discharged to the ground from crib facilities. The studies were based on scintillation probe profiles obtained from crib monitoring, well-logging operations between 1954 and 1968. The 1964 study (Raymond and McGhan 1964) discusses the disposition of radionuclides beneath most of the crib facilities in use up to 1963. The later study (Tillson and McGhan 1969) discusses only those crib facilities where changes or lack of changes in the gross gamma-ray profiles through 1968 were considered significant (Fecht et al. 1977).

Fecht et al. (1977) reported gross gamma-ray monitoring results from about 300 wells adjacent to approximately 100 crib facilities. Their purpose was to qualitatively measure the distribution of radionuclides beneath the facilities. They published the resulting gross gamma-ray profiles and compared those profiles to previous measurements. Additon et al. (1978a, 1978b) produced an updated catalogue of available gross gamma-ray profiles but included no interpretation of the data.

Most of the gross gamma-ray logs collected for the above studies were collected with the "third generation" logging system. The system sonde consisted of a 7-cm-diameter stainless steel container housing a preamplifier and a 5.1-cm by 5.1-cm NaI(Tl) crystal coupled to a photomultiplier tube. The equipment was not calibrated to today's standards but some calibration was done. Fecht et al. (1977) report that the system had a low detection limit of about 3 pCi (^{106}Ru - ^{106}Rh)/ml in water and about 3×10^{-4} millirems (^{226}Ra)/hr in air. The maximum meter count rate in air was 1,000,000 counts/min in a field of about 150 mr/hr. Maximum meter count rate in water occurred at a ^{106}Ru - ^{106}Rh activity of about 5000 pCi/ml (Fecht et al. 1977). These measurements were conducted in air and water and do not reflect conditions in cased boreholes.

A base calibration of the fourth generation gross gamma-ray logging system used to collect historic logs after about 1974 was made in 1989 (Brodeur and Koizumi 1989). Thus, logs collected after that data have some documented calibration. Logs collected before then do not. It is recognized that details (including calibration details) are not known about much of the historical data and that much of that data was collected in a manner that could not meet today's quality control standards. However, when properly

qualified, much of the older data can be used for qualitative comparisons with new information to examine changes in the distribution of subsurface gross gamma (not nuclide specific) contamination.

3.2 Spectral Gamma-Ray Logging

The Radionuclide Logging System (RLS) is a spectral gamma-ray logging system that can quantify some specific gamma-ray contaminants. The RLS was based on, but highly modified from, its predecessors the Mobile Radiation Analytical Laboratory II and Devan II which had been used at tank T-106 and other sites. The RLS uses logging tools with sodium iodide and intrinsic germanium gamma-ray detectors. This system, its associated software for quantitative analysis, and calibration facilities brought a degree of quantitateness not found in the earlier logs.

Since about 1990 approximately 450 Hanford Site boreholes have been logged at liquid waste disposal facilities with the RLS. Many, but not all, of the results of spectral gamma-ray logging with the RLS have been reported in topical publications, characterization studies, and unpublished letter reports. Appendix C lists published spectral gamma-ray logging results applicable to liquid waste disposal facilities. All spectral gamma-ray log data collected since 1990 at liquid waste disposal facilities have been cataloged into a database that is available through the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

Recently, a substantial logging effort was completed to determine the current extent of vadose zone contamination beneath single-shell tanks. Approximately 800 boreholes were logged and this represents the first comprehensive database of gamma emitting radionuclide concentrations associated with single-shell tank farms. Although vadose zone monitoring at single-shell tank farms is not part of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project, these logs may be useful in evaluating subsurface contamination at some past-practice liquid waste disposal facilities. References for the published logs from the tank farms are included in Appendix C.

3.3 Neutron Logging

A neutron soil moisture logging system was designed and fabricated in 1963 to delineate subsurface wetted zones adjacent to liquid waste disposal sites and for use in stratigraphic studies (Sheen et al. 1964). A well (699-11-45A) was drilled and cored specifically for calibration of the neutron probe. Core samples were analyzed for water content, and the well was logged with the neutron probe to relate probe response to water content of the subsurface geologic media. Use of the neutron probe was discontinued when more stringent radiation protection measures were implemented that made it difficult to shield operating personnel from the plutonium-beryllium source radiation. Many of the early neutron logs exist in files, but they have not been collected into a database or a comprehensive catalogue. No interpretation or compilation of early neutron logs has been published.

In 1995, Westinghouse Hanford Company adapted a commercially available moisture tool for use in vadose zone logging at Hanford. Since that time, nearly 50 wells have been logged, but most of the data

have not been published. Moisture calibration models were constructed in 1994 under a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (Engelman et al. 1995) and the models currently are available for use.

3.4 Compilations of Logging Data

Several compilations of borehole geophysical logs have been published over the years. These reports enumerated what data exist and referenced sources for their retrieval.

The first such report was by Blair et al. (1981). They cataloged the existing borehole geophysical data collected from about 800 wells between 1954 and 1980. Their report associates the type of log (gamma-gamma, neutron-gamma, neutron epithermal neutron, natural gamma, caliper, and sonic) with the date collected and source well.

Lewis and Pearson (1992) compiled a listing of over 1000 geophysical logs obtained from over 250 monitoring wells in the 100 Areas and adjacent 600 Area. They list, among other things, the type of log, the date collected, the well logged, and the physical location of the log.

Eight similar compilations were made in 1991 and 1992 as part of geologic data packages in support of the Aggregate Area Management Studies. One compilation was made for each of B Plant (Teel et al. 1992), C Plant (Chamness et al. 1992a), PUREX (Chamness et al. 1992b), S Plant (Teel 1992), T Plant (Chamness et al. 1991a), U Plant (Chamness et al. 1991b), Z Plant (Chamness et al. 1991c) and 200 N Area (Chamness et al. 1992c).

3.5 Other Characterization and Monitoring Data Sources

Several special studies have been done over the years at the Hanford Site that produced data and information that may be a suitable baseline for certain types of vadose zone monitoring.

Over 2,900 wells were constructed on the Hanford Site by 1985 (McGhan et al. 1985). Nearly all of these wells were installed to provide a means for monitoring the waste disposal sites both within the vadose zone and within the uppermost aquifer. Under waste management programs at the Hanford Site, numerous waste disposal facilities (including cribs, trenches, french drains, reverse wells, ponds, ditches, and burial grounds) were investigated and characterized to some extent beginning in the 1950s. Most of these investigations were primarily limited to the measurement of radionuclide distributions in the sediments around the facilities. Documentation of these studies exist primarily in topical reports and letter reports by Hanford Site contractors. It is beyond the scope of this document to compile and annotate each of those characterization efforts. As monitoring tasks are implemented, site-specific monitoring plans will be written and those plans will describe existing characterization data appropriate to compare with newly acquired monitoring data.

3.6 Uses of Historical Data for Current and Future Monitoring

The major use of historical information for vadose zone monitoring is as baseline information against which to compare new information. It is recognized that the pedigree of some older data is unknown and that some older data were not collected in a manner that could meet today's quality control standards. Nevertheless, much of the older data, when properly qualified, is useful for comparisons with new information to determine changes in subsurface contaminant distribution.

4.0 Data Quality Objectives Process

4.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses the relevant components of the general DQO process (EPA 1994) as they apply to vadose zone monitoring at the Hanford Site. This chapter describes the outcome of the DQO process as it was applied to the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's vadose zone monitoring. The authors of this document met with key individuals who have been involved with vadose zone activities across the Hanford Site in order to obtain a wide range of perspectives. These individuals were asked to discuss the vadose zone and their perspective on what should or should not be done, why it should or should not be done, and how it should be done. The individuals included geoscientists representing the projects concerned with the vadose zone at Hanford including the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project, the Tank Waste Remediation Systems Project, the Environmental Restoration Program, and the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project. Each participant had an opportunity to review earlier versions of this document during its preparation.

4.2 Description of the DQO Process and Limitations

The DQOs ensure that the type, quantity, and quality of environmental data used in the decision making process are appropriate for their intended applications and that such data are collected. The process for developing DQOs involves seven steps:

- statement of problem (Section 4.4)
- decision and expected action (Section 4.5)
- decision inputs (Section 4.6)
- study boundaries (Section 4.7)
- decision rule (Section 4.8)
- limits on decision errors (Section 4.9)
- optimize sampling design (Section 4.10).

The DQO process has both quantitative and qualitative aspects. The quantitative aspect seeks to use statistics to design the most efficient field investigation that minimizes the possibility of making an incorrect decision. The qualitative aspect seeks to encourage good planning for field investigations and complements the statistical design. The DQO process is designed to be both flexible and iterative.

This vadose zone monitoring document specifies the type, quantity, and quality of data needed to support decisions related to monitoring the vadose zone at hazardous waste sites.

4.3 Data Requirements and Regulatory Drivers

The principal driver for monitoring the vadose zone is protection of groundwater. Although there are no regulations requiring vadose zone monitoring, such monitoring is being considered as an alternative or an extension of groundwater monitoring for at least one RCRA-regulated facility, the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility. Declining water levels beneath the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility will soon render the current groundwater monitoring network non-compliant with established groundwater protection standards (40 CFR 265, WAC 173-303-645). Although neither the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) nor the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) has promulgated regulations relative to RCRA vadose zone monitoring, the DOE and Ecology have proposed vadose monitoring activities for the Hanford Site. An alternative monitoring strategy is necessary to maintain RCRA compliance at the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility, and vadose zone monitoring is considered to be one component of the strategy.

DOE Order 5400.1 specifies an environmental surveillance program designed to monitor the effects of DOE activities on onsite and offsite environmental and natural resources. At the Hanford Site, effluent monitoring and near-facility, surface and groundwater monitoring have been established to accomplish the goals of DOE Order 5400.1. Vadose zone monitoring is one of the approaches to augment near-facility and groundwater monitoring.

The DQO process participants concluded that, in spite of the absence of any regulatory driver for monitoring the vadose zone, such monitoring is in the best interests of DOE and the public because it represented the *best management practice* for the Hanford Site. Most of the waste disposed to the vadose zone remains in the vadose zone (compare inventories given in Kincaid et al. [1998] with contaminant quantities in groundwater [Hartman 1999]) and most groundwater plumes originated from waste disposed to the vadose zone. Once waste has reached the groundwater, the difficulty and expense of cleaning it up greatly increase. Thus, monitoring the vadose zone contributes to an early warning system that can head off potentially expensive groundwater remediation.

4.4 Statement of Problem

The overall goal of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's vadose zone monitoring is protection of groundwater through monitoring changes in subsurface contaminants. Vadose zone monitoring provides an early warning system with respect to hazardous material moving through the vadose zone to the groundwater. Early detection can save money on expensive corrective actions and protect natural resources. This goal is accomplished by periodic measurement of the concentration and distribution of vadose zone contaminants.

To develop the DQOs that adequately address vadose zone monitoring data needs, the overall performance objective or goal must be identified. One objective of monitoring is to support the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project by providing information on contaminant movement in the vadose zone before it reaches the water table. A second objective is to collect data that can be used to demonstrate that radiological and hazardous contaminants will or will not exceed applicable groundwater standards (e.g.,

WAC 246-290, WAC 173-200, 40 CFR 141, 40 CFR 143, and DOE Order 5400.5) or that contaminants will or will not cause unacceptable health risks (e.g., 100 mrem/yr to members of the public [DOE Order 5400.5]).

The first objective is the primary objective of the monitoring discussed in this document. The second objective requires an assessment of the amount and rate of movement of contaminants through the vadose zone and their impact on the groundwater. Such an assessment is within the responsibilities of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project but is not part of that project's vadose zone monitoring activities. However, vadose zone monitoring as described in this document is designed to collect data that can support both of these objectives.

As discussed above, there are no applicable regulatory standards for vadose zone monitoring. Therefore, the problem that vadose monitoring should address is

Will contamination in the vadose zone migrate to the groundwater and result in the exceedence of applicable groundwater standards or pose an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment?

4.4.1 Conceptual Model Considerations

Part of the first step in the DQO process is the development of a conceptual model of the processes to ensure that the type, quantity, and quality of monitoring data to be collected are appropriate for the intended use.

The principal element of a vadose zone model of the Hanford Site is the stratigraphy (see Section 2.0). The stratigraphic units of the vadose zone form a series of nearly horizontal layers across the site. The horizontal layering is cut locally by clastic dikes and by joints in the more competent units. Clastic dikes are vertical to subvertical sedimentary structures that cut across normal sedimentary layering. Both of these features have the potential to provide preferential pathways to the water table. In addition, poor borehole construction from past installations also may provide conduits to the water table. Finally, and although not directly related to the vadose zone stratigraphy, the high salt content of some disposed waste can also lead to preferential flow, or fingering, through the vadose zone.

Because of the limited information available for the subsurface, there is great uncertainty associated with the conceptual model. Boreholes are the main source of information followed by limited geophysical data. Some sites have just a few boreholes while others have many. Thus the uncertainty will vary from site to site and cannot be generalized for the Hanford Site vadose zone.

In the past, contaminants were directly discharged to the vadose zone with the intent that they would be immobilized due to the sorption properties of the soil. The capacity of the discharge areas varied, and some sites received more waste than could be captured by the soil column. In sites that exceeded their capacity the more mobile constituents reached the water table producing the present groundwater plumes.

At the low-volume sites, where much less effluent was discharged, the mobile constituents may be retained in the soil column and are slowly draining to the water table under either natural or artificial recharge conditions.

The important factors in this conceptual model identified during the DQO process include 1) the constituents disposed to the soil column, 2) the migration or exposure pathways, and 3) the driving force. Any combination of unfavorable factors could result in contaminants migrating to the water table and producing or adding to a groundwater plume. Therefore, the conceptual model that this DQO process addresses is one where the mobile and hazardous contaminants that were disposed to the vadose zone are migrating to the water table. The driving force is either natural or artificial recharge.

4.4.2 Resource Constraints

At this time, the principal resource constraints are 1) the lack of proven technologies to detect some of the constituents of interest in the soil or to detect them at the required level of detection, 2) budget constraints, and 3) the lack of a baseline for some sites.

4.5 Decision and Expected Action

The second step in the DQO process is to identify the key decisions that will be made with the monitoring data and any alternative actions that may be taken based on the findings of the monitoring program. The first decision to be made must be

Is there a need to monitor the vadose zone at a specific site?

The relevant decision that will be made using the vadose zone monitoring data is

Are contaminants migrating through the vadose zone and likely to reach the water table and exceed applicable drinking water standards, other applicable environmental standards, or pose unacceptable environmental risks?

The actions that may be taken depend on the answer to this question. If there is no impact then no action is required. If there is an impact then the action to be taken at a site depends on the level of the impact and the status of the site.

4.6 Decision Inputs

There are three main factors that need to be evaluated for each site in order to arrive at the correct answers to these questions:

1. What are the constituents of concern?

The constituents of concern that were disposed at a waste site are the most important factors to be considered for vadose zone monitoring. The vadose zone monitoring DQO process established the specific constituents of concern for the waste sites and categorized them into three groups: mobile constituents, long-lived radionuclides, and moisture (driving force).

Mobile constituents are those compounds or ions that can readily move through the soil column without being sorbed or reacting with the soil and being significantly delayed as they move downward through the vadose zone. Mobile constituents can be essentially non-reactive complexes or can move by colloidal transport. Long-lived nuclides are those that will not decay before reaching groundwater. A working definition of a long-lived nuclide is any radionuclide with a half-life of greater than 100 years (DOE 1988, Vol. 9).

Not all hazardous constituents disposed to the vadose zone are mobile or long-lived or even present in significant abundance. Under the right conditions, a relatively immobile radionuclide such as plutonium-239 could reach the water table before it has decayed and thus significantly affect the groundwater. A hazardous and mobile but low abundant constituent of concern, even if it is long lived, might not significantly affect groundwater if it does not reach the water table in high enough concentrations. Therefore, the abundance and mobility of a radiocontaminant must also be considered along with its half-life.

The DQO effort enumerated the important constituents of concern as the mobile contaminants (technetium-99, iodine-129, nitrate, uranium, chromium, carbon tetrachloride, cyanide, and soluble aluminum) and the immobile and/or moderate or long-lived radionuclides (plutonium, americium, and cesium). During the DQO process it was established that some constituents of concern are not readily detectable using standard monitoring techniques so surrogates may need to be used. Moisture was considered a constituent of interest because moisture may serve as a surrogate for mobile contaminants, and because moisture is the driver for contaminant movement in the subsurface. Therefore, moisture was included as a constituent of interest.

The identification of contaminants of concern was based on risk, considered mobility and long-lived contaminants. Cesium-137 was added as a moderate or long-lived radionuclide because of the recent discovery of cesium-137 at depths previously not anticipated. Additional constituents should be added to the list of constituents of concern if they pose a significant risk to groundwater.

2. What is the recharge rate?

Artificial or natural recharge is the driving force for migration of contaminants in the vadose zone and the next most important factor after constituents of concern. The amount of recharge is site dependent. Natural infiltration affects all waste sites, but the infiltration rates are greater where vegetation is lacking, no cover is present, or the overlying material is coarse grained. Artificial recharge historically has been the greatest source of recharge and can come from a variety of sources including other waste sites, broken water lines, and runoff from natural precipitation that has been channeled or otherwise concentrated in a

smaller area by surface features. Localized variations in recharge can have significant effects on the potential for constituent transport. Some sites have had many pore volumes of liquid added to the site, effectively flushing the mobile constituents down to the water table.

3. What are the flow paths through the vadose zone?

The dominant flow path through the vadose zone is the most difficult factor to quantify. The conceptual model for the vadose zone is one of horizontal layering with features such as clastic dikes or poorly constructed boreholes that might provide conduits to the water table. Horizontal layering will cause lateral spreading as it impedes downward movement of moisture; perched water is not uncommon at the Hanford Site. If these layers become saturated then horizontal layering can have little effect on slowing downward migration. The principal flow path for a site will be dependent on a combination of these factors and thus will be difficult to predict without detailed characterization.

4.7 Study Boundaries

This section identifies the spatial and temporal domain boundaries needed to address the decision rules. This step in the DQO process defines the set of boundaries covered by the decision(s) being put forth.

- *Spatial Boundaries.* The spatial boundaries for vadose zone monitoring should include the actual disposal site plus the area that could be impacted by migration from the disposal site. The area impacted is that area where lateral spreading could occur. At present there are established regulatory compliance boundaries only for RCRA regulated sites. Most past-practice liquid waste disposal sites are not covered under RCRA and, therefore, have no established regulatory boundaries.

The disposal site boundaries are well defined, but it is difficult to estimate the extent of lateral spreading. Characterization activities should define the extent of lateral spreading. However, the characteristics of each waste site will need to be considered in establishing the specific spatial limits of a site.

- *Temporal Boundaries.* The temporal boundary includes how often is it necessary to monitor and how long monitoring should be done. Infiltration rates are probably the dominant factor controlling the rate of contaminant migration. Unless a waste disposal site is an active site or near a site that is receiving effluent (e.g., B-Pond), downward migration could be assumed to be slow because natural recharge is low. Thus, infiltration rates can be used as a method for estimating the relative frequency needed for monitoring. The presence of long-lived constituents will be the controlling factor for how long it will be necessary to monitor a site.

The current status of a waste site is also a factor in defining temporal boundaries. All else being equal, inactive waste sites require less frequent monitoring than do active waste sites. Finally, sites with signs of recent contaminant movement should require more frequent monitoring than sites with a history of no contaminant movement.

4.8 Decision Rule

As described in the DQO guidance manual (EPA 1994), this step integrates previous steps into a statement that describes the logical basis for choosing among alternate actions. This involves specifying 1) the constituents of interest, 2) need for monitoring at a site and the site's priority level, and 3) the monitoring methods that could be employed. These elements are then combined into "if-then" statements that can be used for developing the decision rules that can then be applied to determine if a site needs to be monitored, its priority, and the appropriate monitoring techniques.

1. Is there a current threat imposed by site conditions on the environment? Are there known or suspected factors or conditions that would lead one to believe that the site is or could impact groundwater? If there is a current threat to the environment by the site, then the site should be given a higher priority for vadose zone monitoring.
2. Is there a regulatory reason to monitor? Are there applicable laws or regulations that require a site to be monitored? If there is no regulatory reason to monitor, then the site should be given a lower priority for monitoring.
3. Are there mobile contaminants at the site? If there are mobile contaminants at the site, then the site should receive a higher priority for monitoring.
4. Are there long-lived contaminants associated with the site? Are there constituents at the site that, even in small quantities, are so long lived that they could provide hazardous conditions in the future? If there are long-lived radionuclides, then the site should be given a higher priority for (but perhaps less frequent) monitoring.
5. Have mobile constituents been "flushed" from the vadose zone? Has the site received so much liquid that mobile constituents could have been completely removed from the soil column and flushed into the groundwater? Did past-practice activities dispose high volumes of liquid that could have remobilized the hazardous or radioactive waste and removed it from the soil column? If the site has had several pore volumes of liquid put through it that contained no hazardous, mobile or long-lived compounds, then mobile constituents may have been flushed from the site and there may be no reason to monitor the vadose zone. If, however, immobile and long-lived contaminants were disposed to the site, they may not have been flushed and vadose monitoring may be appropriate. If the site has been flushed of contaminants, then the site should be given a lower priority for monitoring.
6. Is there a potential for future impact to groundwater? Are their known conditions such as high recharge that would lead one to suspect that the site could impact groundwater in the future? If there are conditions that would likely exceed a groundwater limit, then the site should receive a higher priority for monitoring.
7. Are there vadose zone plumes associated with the sites? Has past monitoring or baseline characterization shown that there is a known vadose zone plume at the site? If there is a known vadose

zone plume at the site and if the magnitude of contamination could cause groundwater to exceed regulatory limits, then the vadose zone at the site should receive a higher priority for monitoring.

8. Is there a current impact to groundwater at a site? Is there a known groundwater contamination plume emanating from the site and is it above some applicable standard? If there is a current impact on groundwater at the site, then contaminants at the site are migrating into the groundwater and vadose zone monitoring cannot be used as an early warning system for groundwater contamination. However, vadose zone monitoring still can provide information on the rate of migration and how long the site may continue to impact the environment. If the site has already affected groundwater, then monitoring the site should receive a lower priority.
9. Is the site in an area that is currently receiving liquid effluent? Are facilities currently discharging hazardous or radioactive waste to the soil at the site? If the site is currently receiving liquid effluent, then the site should receive a higher priority for monitoring.
10. Are there driving forces external to the site? Is the site in an area where some conditions such as a nearby waste site that could result in driving mobile contaminants to the water table? If there are external driving forces, then the site should be given a higher priority for monitoring.
11. Are characterization and/or baseline data available? Has the site been adequately characterized so that potential pathways and soil conditions are known? Has a baseline survey been done at the site so that future monitoring can be compared to it? If a baseline exists then the site should be given a higher priority. If no baseline or characterization data are available but, if a baseline can be established using monitoring tools then the site should be given a higher priority. The baseline for these latter sites will consist of the first in a temporal line of monitoring events. If no baseline or characterization data are available and available monitoring methods can not establish a baseline, then the site should be given a lower priority for monitoring and recommendations should be made to complete a baseline survey and site characterization.

4.8.1 Statistical Parameters of Interest

The statistical term "population" refers to the total collection of objects or media to be studied and from which a sample is to be drawn. A sample refers to a collection of measurements taken from the population. For the vadose zone the population is the contaminant plume in the vadose zone and a sample is a collection of measurements made on the plume. The principal parameter to be measured is the change in concentration of constituents of concern at any point in the vadose zone. The principal problem is how to obtain a measurement of that parameter in the subsurface in an efficient and cost-effective manner, and is that measurement appropriate for statistical analysis?

For groundwater monitoring, appropriate statistical analysis is prescribed in the regulations. For vadose zone monitoring, analogous regulations do not exist so that the appropriate statistical analysis for vadose monitoring is that which helps answer the question "Will contaminants in the vadose zone adversely impact groundwater?" Table 4.1 lists the principal conceptual model elements and the statistical parameters of interest which are used to evaluate whether contaminants in the vadose zone will

adversely impact groundwater. In most data sets, there is a tendency for values to cluster. "Central tendency" referred to in Table 4.1 refers to the "middle" of the cluster (Bowen and Bennett 1988). The mean, the mode, and the median are measures of central tendency.

Table 4.1. Conceptual Model Parameters of Interest

Conceptual Model Element	Property or Parameter	Constituents of Interest	Sampled Population	Statistical Parameters
Constituents disposed to soil column	Half-life, mobility	Technetium-99, iodine-129, nitrate, uranium, chromium, carbon tetrachloride, cyanide, aluminum, americium-241, cesium-137, plutonium-239,240	Boreholes	Changes in central tendency
Driving force	Long-term recharge rate	Water (moisture)	Lysimeters, tensiometers, environmental tracers, other	Changes in central tendency
	Contemporary recharge rate	Water (moisture)	Lysimeters, tensiometers, environmental tracers, other	Changes in central tendency
Pathways	Site characterization	NA	NA	NA
NA = Not applicable.				

There are several ways to obtain information from the subsurface. Boreholes are a common method of taking subsurface measurements. Either new boreholes can be drilled and samples collected and analyzed or existing boreholes can be used and estimates of constituents of concern measured using some appropriate techniques. In addition, non-borehole techniques, such as lysimeters, excitation of mass, or surface geophysical methods can be used to locate moisture zones in the soil. Each technique has its own requirements and constraints, and each method has different ways of obtaining the principal parameter. In addition, each has its own cost associated with obtaining data using that method, and the DQO process is designed to take into account the cost of obtaining information.

4.8.2 Action Level or Measurement Threshold

This element is generally taken as a cleanup standard or other regulatory standard. Because there is no regulatory standard, the action level will be taken as the point where it can be conclusively demonstrated that contaminants from the vadose zone will impact the groundwater in such a way that an applicable groundwater standard may be exceeded.

4.8.3 Alternative Actions

Exceedence of the performance standard may require that some action be taken. The action may be remediation of the site, an alternative to remediation such as construction of a barrier over the site to decrease recharge, repair or maintenance of a leaking source that is impacting the site, maintenance of the site, or no action. The choice and implementation of alternative actions involving remediation are beyond the scope of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project but the decisions fall out of the "if-then" statements at the beginning of this section. A tentative "if-then" statement for alternative actions is

If waste from the vadose zone beneath a site is impacting, or will impact the groundwater, then monitoring should continue pending use of some engineering methodology to decrease or stop the driving force for the contamination or remove the source of contamination.

4.9 Limits on Decision Errors

This step of the DQO process specifies the limits on decision errors that are deemed tolerable. Errors related to input data acquisition consist of both sampling and measurement components. The combination of these errors is the *total study error*, which is directly related to the decision error.

A decision error occurs when the data lead the decision maker(s) to believe 1) the null hypothesis is false when it is actually true (a false positive) or 2) the null hypothesis is true when it is actually false (a false negative). To reduce such errors, an adequate estimate of key population parameters is needed. Reducing such error generally involves greater cost for sample collection and analysis. However, reducing decision error at an increased cost may or may not be the most desirable approach to take.

For site vadose zone monitoring, the statistical parameter of concern is the change in subsurface contamination as either an increase in concentration or a change in depth distribution. The main factors needing evaluation are the constituents of interest and recharge (see Table 4.1). (Flow paths are a third factor needing evaluation but that is part of characterization instead of monitoring.) Obtaining values for change in constituents of interest and recharge is dependent on the method of collecting the data. Direct drilling and sampling is one approach, utilization of existing boreholes is another approach, and surface surveys are a third approach.

The parameter of concern is change. Any change in concentration of a constituent of concern at a specific point in the subsurface is determined by comparing most recent monitoring data with previously collected data. A change in concentration at sites with sufficient past monitoring to establish a baseline is considered to be an increase or decrease in concentration of 2 sigma from the baseline value. At sites without sufficient baseline data, a change in concentration is considered to exist if the most recent monitoring value differs from the previous value by more than 2 sigma error on the measurement. For geophysical logging this is determined from counting statistics.

Calibration issues are dependent on the specific monitoring technology used for data collection. Likewise, measurement errors are dependent on the specific monitoring technology. These errors can be considered in site-specific monitoring plans after a monitoring method is chosen for an individual site.

Errors associated with sample acquisition are dependent on the method of collecting the sample and the variation in the environment being sampled. Direct drilling and sampling, using existing boreholes, and surface measurements are three possible ways to obtain data. Different monitoring methods can use each of these accesses to samples. Errors associated with sampling are to be discussed in site-specific monitoring plans where specific methodologies are delineated

4.10 Optimizing Sampling Design

This final step in the DQO process is intended to develop alternative environmental sampling designs and evaluate their efficiency at providing the data for meeting the overall performance objective. The purpose is to identify the most resource-effective sampling design. Application or implementation of the DQO process described in this and previous sections and additional operational details are described in Section 6.0 and in the respective site-specific sampling and analysis plans.

As indicated, the primary focus of the DQO process has been to obtain measurements to determine if the constituents of concern have migrated in the subsurface. The most resource efficient sampling design is the use of existing and readily available methodologies, that require a minimum of resources for data collection and data interpretation, and utilize available access to subsurface contamination (see Section 6.1.4.1 for a discussion of potential limitation on the use of existing boreholes).

4.11 Site-Specific Vadose Zone Monitoring Strategy

Table 4.2 summarizes the major elements of the strategy behind the development of site-specific vadose zone monitoring. It is recognized that the strategy for vadose monitoring at the Hanford Site is evolving and elements in this document will need to follow that evolution. However, Table 4.2 provides the overall process that is necessary to develop site-specific monitoring. The following sections elaborate on the elements in the table and provide the rationale for prioritizing waste sites, selecting the constituents of concern, and selecting monitoring methods.

Table 4.2. Elements of Vadose Zone Monitoring

Vadose Zone Monitoring Component	Element	Requirement or Procedure	Documentation
Assessment of liquid effluent disposal facilities	List of prioritized facilities	DQO process	This document
	Define data needs		
Site-specific vadose zone monitoring plans	Conceptual model		Site-specific plan
	Identify site-specific data needs		
	Evaluate site-specific data		
	Develop vadose zone monitoring network		
Site-specific monitoring	Sampling and analysis plan	Best management practice	Site-specific plan
	Obtain data collection services	Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project quality assurance project plan	Laboratory contract, logging contracts, statements of work
	Obtain field support services (health and safety and security)	Best management practice	NA
	Field inspection of facilities and boreholes	Best management practice	Field inspection forms, borehole completion reports
	Data collection	Vendor-specific quality assurance project plan, vendor-specific procedures, SW 846 (EPA 1986)	Chain-of-custody, sample field records, borehole survey data sheets, calibration certificates, laboratory analytical records, analytical data sheets
	Quality control	Vendor-specific procedures, Vendor-specific quality assurance project plan, Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project quality assurance project plan	Chain-of-custody, sample field records, borehole survey data sheets, calibration certificates, laboratory analytical records, analytical data sheets
Data analysis and interpretation	Comparison with past monitoring data	Best available technologies	Reports
Data management	Maintenance of data bases	Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project quality assurance project plan	Hanford Environmental Information System database, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory geophysics database
Reporting			Hanford Site groundwater monitoring reports, Hanford Site environmental reports

5.0 Site Prioritization

This section briefly describes the process used to prioritize liquid and solid waste disposal sites to determine the needs for vadose monitoring. A more complete description of the prioritization process is given in Appendix B.

5.1 Prioritization Process

The DQO process led to the following criteria to determine the need for vadose zone monitoring at each waste site (see Section 4.8).

1. Is there a current threat imposed by site conditions on the environment?
2. Is there a regulatory reason to monitor?
3. Are there mobile contaminants associated with the site?
4. Are there long lived constituents associated with the site?
5. Have mobile constituents been "flushed" from the vadose zone?
6. Is there a potential for future impact to groundwater?
7. Are there vadose plumes associated with the site?
8. Is there a current impact to groundwater at the site?
9. Is the site in an area that is currently receiving liquid effluent?
10. Are there driving forces external to the site?
11. Are characterization and/or baseline data available?

These criteria were applied to each waste site in the 200 Areas. The *Waste Site Grouping for 200 Areas Soil Investigations* (DOE 1997b) was used as a preprioritized list of sites. Positive responses to the criteria included the site on the highest priority list; negative responses relegated the site to a lower priority list. Decision rules were combined when possible. Sites remaining on the lists after all 11 criteria were applied were further prioritized according to the type of facility (e.g., specific retention, crib) and how recently the site had been monitored.

Criterion 3, "Are there mobile contaminants associated with the site?" considered technetium-99, iodine-129, nitrate, uranium, chromium, carbon tetrachloride, cyanide, and soluble aluminum as the mobile contaminants of concern. There were no data for aluminum available in the right format to include in this prioritization effort. Some data about aluminum inventories exist in some of the source aggregate area management study reports, and that data can be included in subsequent efforts.

5.2 Prioritization Results

The results of the prioritization effort are given in Appendix B. Table B.1 shows the highest priority sites. Seventy-four sites are on the high-priority list. These are the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility, the 100-KE Basin, and sites 1) with associated constituents of concern, 2) that have not had the mobile

constituents "flushed" from the soil column (sites at which 10 or less pore volumes of effluent were disposed [see Appendix B for rationale for 10 pore volumes]), and 3) that have data available to serve as baseline for monitoring.

Also Table B.2 lists the priority sites that have associated constituents of concern, less than or equal to 10 pore volumes but no associated baseline information for monitoring. Table B.3 shows the intermediate priority sites that have long-lived, relatively immobile constituents of concern but received greater than 10 pore volumes.

Within each of the tables in the Appendix B, sites are further prioritized as follows. First, the relative ranking of waste site groups has been retained from *the Waste Site Grouping for 200 Area Soil Investigations* (DOE 1997b). Then, within each waste site group, individual sites are ranked first by waste site type, second by amount of natural recharge, and third by the date that the site was last monitored. When ranking by waste site type, specific retention facilities were placed higher on the list than other sites. This essentially ranked the sites according to decreasing pore volume because effluent discharged to specific retention facilities was usually limited to 10% or less of the available pore volume between the facility and the groundwater.

6.0 Monitoring and Analysis

This section contains a general description of the rationale and general procedures for data collection and data analyses in support of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's vadose zone monitoring. It provides guidance for preparation of site-specific, vadose zone monitoring plans.

6.1 Vadose Zone Monitoring

The tasks involved in vadose monitoring include the following:

- determine facilities to be monitored
- identify constituents of interest
- identify monitoring techniques
- design the monitoring network
- pre-monitoring activities
- acquire monitoring data
- data handling
- data analysis
- data interpretation
- documentation
- data management
- reporting.

6.1.1 Facilities to be Monitored

Section 5.0 described the process and results of an initial prioritization of sites for vadose zone monitoring. Revisions to the prioritization will be required as new information becomes available, as new Hanford Site priorities develop, and as remediation efforts progress.

Monitoring for carbon tetrachloride is deferred at active carbon tetrachloride remediation sites in the 200 West Area. Two remediation activities for the carbon tetrachloride expedited response action are 1) the pump and treat operation at 200-ZP-1 Operable Unit and 2) the soil-vapor extraction operation at 200-ZP-2 Operable Unit. Monitoring for carbon tetrachloride at these sites may be implemented after remediation to support postremediation evaluation and long-term monitoring if needed.

6.1.2 Selection of Constituents of Concern

The constituents of concern were determined during the DQO process. They include the mobile species (technetium-99, iodine-129, nitrate, chromium, carbon tetrachloride, cyanide, aluminum, and uranium) and the immobile and/or long-lived radionuclides (plutonium, americium, and cesium).

In addition, moisture was repeatedly identified during the DQO process as a constituent of interest because it is a primary driving force for movement of contaminants in the subsurface. Also, no readily available method to monitor some of the mobile constituents of interest currently exists (technetium-99, iodine-129, and nitrate, for examples). Thus, moisture movement may provide an indication of movement of the more-mobile constituents.

6.1.3 Select Monitoring Methods

Selection of a monitoring method depends on technical, implementation, environmental and regulatory, and economic considerations. The most important technical consideration is whether the method can detect the constituents of concern/interest at the required levels.

As mentioned earlier, there are no regulatory standards for vadose zone monitoring. However, there are cleanup standards being used at the Hanford Site for soils. The records of decision (ROD 1995, 1996) for the 100-BC-1, 100-DR-1, 100-HR-1, 300-FF-1, and 300-FF-5 Operable Units have adapted the State of Washington Model Toxics Control Act (WAC 173-340) levels for organic and inorganic constituents of concern. For radioactive constituents of concern, both records of decision use interim regulatory guidance from the State of Washington Department of Health (WDOH 1997). The cleanup levels from those sources for the constituents of concern identified in this document are given in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1. Cleanup Levels for Constituents of Concern

Constituent of Concern	Cleanup Level ^(a)		Source of Level ^(b)
	Rural Residential	Commercial/Industrial	
Chromium (VI)	400 mg/kg	NA	100 Areas ROD
Cyanide	1,600 mg/kg	NA	100 Areas ROD
Nitrate	12,800 mg/kg	NA	100 Areas ROD
Americium-241	31 pCi/g	210 pCi/g	WA DOH
Cesium-137	6.2 pCi/g	25 pCi/g	WA DOH
Plutonium-239	34 pCi/g	245 pCi/g	WA DOH
Technetium-99	5.7 pCi/g	41,000 pCi/g	WA DOH
Uranium-234	160 pCi/g	1,200 pCi/g	WA DOH
Uranium-235	26 pCi/g	100 pCi/g	WA DOH
Uranium-238	85 pCi/g	420 pCi/g	WA DOH
(a) Values for radionuclides are those that will individually result in an annual total effective dose equivalent of 15 mrem/yr. For mixtures of radionuclides, the sum of the ratios of the actual activities to the guideline activities must be ≤ 1 .			
(b) 100 Areas ROD = Record of Decision (1995, 1996). WDOH = State of Washington Department of Health (1977).			
NA = Not available.			

For vadose zone monitoring designed in compliance with certain cleanup actions, the levels in Table 6.1 may be appropriate; therefore, the monitoring method chosen must have a minimum detection limit compatible with those levels. In some instances, however, vadose zone monitoring may be directed at detection of change in subsurface contaminant distribution. For those cases, detection limits lower than those in Table 6.1 may be appropriate. The minimum detection limit of the chosen monitoring method will be addressed in site-specific monitoring plans.

The availability of the method, its level of development, its complexity and reliability are also important technical considerations. The effort to implement the monitoring method depends on the availability of the method, appropriate access to the subsurface, level of maintenance, calibration considerations, and the time involved in actual monitoring.

Environmental and regulatory considerations pertinent to monitoring methods include

- whether permits are required to use the method, health, and safety risks during installation
- monitoring, maintenance, and calibration, generation of secondary wastes during monitoring
- any environmental effects remaining after monitoring is completed.

Economic considerations include the costs of installation, maintenance, and calibration as well as costs of monitoring, data analysis, and interpretation.

Table 6.2 lists some technically, environmentally, and economically viable monitoring methods for the constituents of interest. The information listed in Table 6.2 is abstracted from Lewis and Teel (1994), from Wilson et al. (1995), and from input received during the review process of this document. Lewis and Teel (1994) evaluated 32 technologies for use in leak detection at the Hanford Site. Some of the technologies they evaluated may also be applicable to vadose zone monitoring. Table 6.2 is not an exhaustive list of potential vadose monitoring technologies nor are all technologies listed equally feasible. Selection of a specific technology for monitoring will be a function of site-specific characteristics and will be documented in site-specific monitoring plans. Regardless of the method selected, it must provide reasonable coverage, be cost effective, provide early warning of contamination or contaminant migration, and be implementable at the Hanford Site.

6.1.4 Determine the Monitoring Network

6.1.4.1 Monitoring Points

Gilbert (1987), in discussing the important considerations in designing a monitoring network, states that the crucial point is defining the target population to achieve the study objectives. The statistical parameter of concern (i.e., the study objective) for vadose zone monitoring is change in contaminant concentration and distribution. Thus, the target population is defined as the vadose zone containing contamination. Monitoring, then, becomes collecting representative samples such that the suite of

Table 6.2. Monitoring Methods Applicable to the Constituents of Interest

Constituent of Interest	Monitoring Method	Comments
In Situ Measurement of Constituents of Interest		
Uranium, cesium-137, plutonium, americium	Gross gamma-ray logging	Reliable, easy and quick to operate; ease in data analysis; limited depth of investigation (about 20 cm [8 in.] radial distance from well); detection limit between 2 and 500 pCi/g (^{137}Cs); long history of use at Hanford; can use existing drywells; cannot distinguish among radionuclides.
	Spectral gamma-ray logging	Commercially available; more complex than gross gamma-ray logging; can resolve specific radionuclides (^{60}Co , ^{137}Cs , $^{152,154}\text{Eu}$, $^{235,238}\text{U}$, $^{239,241}\text{Pu}$, ^{233}Pa , ^{241}Am , and others); limited depth of investigation (about 20 cm [8 in.] radial distance from well); detection limit between about 0.2 and 5000 pCi/g (^{137}Cs) for 35% Ge detector; some detectors saturate at high count rates; can use existing boreholes; method has a history of use at Hanford.
Uranium, plutonium, americium	Prompt fission neutron logging	Not commercially available; limit depth of investigation (about 20 cm [8 in.] radial distance from well); lower detection limit about 1 nCi/g (^{239}Pu); can use existing boreholes; system cannot distinguish fissionable nuclides (U-233, U-235, Pu-239); system would be expensive to establish.
CCl_4 , aluminum	Pulsed-neutron logging	Commercially available with either scintillation or solid state detectors; more difficult to operate and to process and analyze data than other methods. System can detect H, Cl, C, O, Al, Si, Ca, S, and Fe. Detection limit is probably too low to be useful for CCl_4 at the Hanford Site.
CCl_4	Various mass, optical, and electrochemical sensors	Emerging technologies
Water content	Neutron-neutron logging	Commercially available; limit of investigation about 1.8 m^3 (4 ft ³), detection limits between about 1% and 40% H_2O ; can use existing steel-cased boreholes—if no annular seal is present.
	Electrical induction logging	Commercially available; can see up to 1.8 m (6 ft) into formation; detection limit about 5% to 100% fresh H_2O ; cannot operate in steel-cased boreholes.

Table 6.2. (contd)

Constituent of Interest	Monitoring Method	Comments
Water content	Pulsed-neutron spectroscopy	Commercially available with either scintillation or solid state detectors; more difficult to operate and to process and analyze data than other methods; limit of investigation between 1% and 40% H ₂ O.
	Electrical resistivity tomography	Commercially available; has been tested in the Hanford vadose zone environment; cannot use existing boreholes for most applications.
	Ground penetrating radar (including borehole)	Commercially available; surface antennae can scan large areas; detection limits are dependent on site specific calibration, independent local measurements may be required.
	Time domain reflectometry	Recently commercially available; point measurement; detection limit 1% to 40% H ₂ O; can use existing boreholes with modifications.
	Capacitance probes	Commercially available; detection limit dependent on site-specific calibrations and access borehole configuration; small zone of influence; repeatability better than 0.005 volumetric water content; large sensitivity to small changes in water content in dry soils; cannot use existing boreholes.
	Electromagnetic induction	Commercially available; quick and easy to operate; can provide estimates over large areas; does not require boreholes; can detect small variations in soil conductivity but calibration to water content is difficult.
	Resistivity blocks	Commercially available; work poorly in coarse-grained soils; point measurement; detection limit about -1 bar to -0.1 bar; can use existing boreholes with modifications.
	Resistivity blocks	Commercially available; work poorly in coarse-grained soils; point measurement; detection limit about -1 bar to -0.1 bar; can use existing boreholes with modifications.
Direct Sampling and Ex Situ Analysis		
All those above plus ⁹⁹ Tc, ¹²⁹ I, nitrate, chromium, and cyanide	Lysimeters (suction samplers)	Various samplers are commercially available; most samplers can not be used with existing boreholes; difficulties in dry soils (effective range 0-60 bars of suction); requires analytical laboratory facilities.
All those above plus technetium-99, iodine-129, nitrate, chromium, and cyanide	Membrane/filter samplers (e.g., SEAMIST) ^(a)	Commercially available; labor intensive; point measurements; difficulties in dry soils, can use existing boreholes with modifications; requires analytical laboratory facilities.

Table 6.2. (contd)

Constituent of Interest	Monitoring Method	Comments
	Core sampling	Various samplers are commercially available; labor intensive and expensive; point measurement; can not resample same point; requires analytical laboratory facilities.
	Active soil gas sampling	Commercially available; labor intensive; requires laboratory facilities; can use existing boreholes with modifications.
CCl ₄	Passive soil gas sampling	See above (Active soil gas sampling).
	Passive soil gas sampling	See above (Active soil gas sampling).
Measurement of Transport Parameters		
Matrix potential	Tensiometers (including deep/borehole tensiometers)	Commercially available; site must be fairly moist (i.e., tension <0.85 Bar); can use existing boreholes with modifications.
	Thermocouple psychrometers	Commercially available; applicable in very dry soils (with tensions up to 80 bars); must be individually calibrated and needs correction for diurnal temperature changes; can use existing boreholes with modifications.
	Heat dissipation sensors	Commercially available; work poorly in coarse-grained soils (effective range is 0-10 bars soil suction); must be individually calibrated and are susceptible to hysteresis; point measurement; can use existing boreholes with modifications.
	Osmotic sensors	Commercially available
	Water balance (drainage) lysimeters	Facilities exist throughout Hanford Site; must be properly designed to avoid edge and evapotranspiration effects; provides an integrated measurement at a particular location
Water flux	Composite in situ measurements	In use at Hanford; flux calculated from standard measurements of water content and matrix potential; requires biweekly to monthly measurements.
	Flux meter	Not commercially available.
(a) SEAMIST = Science and Engineering Membrane Instrumentation and Sampling Technique.		

samples gives an accurate picture of the contaminant plume. The problem now becomes choosing a sampling scheme to collect representative samples in a space-time framework.

Several sampling strategies are discussed in guidance by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (1994) and by Gilbert (1987). The choice of a sampling plan depends on the study objectives (change in concentration), variability in the target population (contaminant concentration and geometry), cost-effectiveness, the type of measurements to be made, and convenience (Gilbert 1987). Two situations exist for vadose zone monitoring: 1) a facility is to be monitored to detect discharges that will impact the environment and 2) a facility with specific and known contamination is being monitored to determine

change. A different sampling scheme is required for each of the two situations. A statistical sampling strategy probably will be most appropriate for monitoring a facility's impact on the environment. A biased or non-statistical sampling scheme probably will be most appropriate for monitoring changes in previously defined plumes.

The rationale for a specific sampling network is site dependent but monitoring points (e.g., well locations) should be located consistent with DQOs in the areas most vulnerable to contamination or contaminant migration. Site-specific sampling plans will describe the sampling scheme most appropriate for the specific situation given a set of constraints defined by 1) the objective of monitoring (i.e., surveillance versus plume tracking), 2) the facility design (including soil column storage properties), 3) the contaminants of concern, 4) the monitoring technique, and 5) the level of detection (uncertainty) that is acceptable.

6.1.4.1.1 The Use of Existing Boreholes

Most liquid disposal facilities at the Hanford Site have associated wells and boreholes. Use of existing boreholes should be strongly considered, if appropriate for the objectives of the site-specific monitoring, because they are existing access to subsurface contamination and because their use can be a substantial cost savings over emplacement of new monitoring points.

If existing boreholes are to be used for monitoring, a fitness-for-use evaluation that includes the following considerations are pertinent:

- *The location of the borehole with respect to the facility and to existing contamination.* Most existing boreholes were located to intercept known contamination. A review of historical data will indicate which boreholes have encountered contamination in the past. Existing plume maps should be checked and the location of boreholes relative to the plumes noted.
- *The construction and configuration of the existing boreholes.* Existing boreholes have been constructed using a variety of materials, methods, and specifications which may or may not conform with the objectives of site-specific monitoring. If existing boreholes are to be used, the impact of well casings, well seals, and screens must be evaluated to assure usability of the borehole and that required project tolerances can be met. Unknowns in the casing thickness and material and in well seal construction and material may mean large errors in monitoring results. Finally, drag down of contaminants during drilling may complicate data interpretation. Borehole configuration and construction information is available through the Environmental Restoration Contractor home page (<http://www.erc.rl.gov>); in databases maintained by Waste Management Federal Services Inc., Northwest Operations, and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory; and in data compilations such as *Hanford Wells* (Chamness and Merz 1993).

6.1.4.2 Monitoring Frequency

A second aspect of the sampling design is frequency of sampling. As with the selection of monitoring points, the selection of sampling frequency will depend on the objective of monitoring, the

contaminants of concern, the monitoring technique, and the acceptable level of uncertainty. A surveillance objective requires a relatively high sampling frequency; a trend monitoring objective requires less frequent but long sequences of sampling (Gilbert 1987). Mobile contaminants require more frequent monitoring than less mobile, long-lived contaminants. Sampling frequency will be described in the site-specific monitoring plans, and the examination of prior data should be factored into determining the frequency.

6.1.5 Pre-Monitoring Activities

Preparation activities necessary to begin a vadose monitoring project include the following:

- site-specific monitoring plan providing a strong technical basis for the site-specific monitoring
- logistical planning for field activities including access to boreholes and acquisition of support services such as health and safety and security
- procurement and deployment of monitoring services and equipment.

Activities in preparation for field operations are to be accomplished prior to monitoring. Activities to be considered include radiation control technologist support for generation of radiation work permits, access to radiation zones, swabbing of wells, removal of pumps and packers from wells, surveys of instrumentation as it is removed from wells or the site, and any special requirements. If existing boreholes are to be used, the boreholes must be evaluated to assure they meet project specification. Also, if existing boreholes are to be used, coordination must be established with projects (such as soil-vapor extraction operations) that are already using the boreholes scheduled for monitoring. Also, boreholes that have not been entered recently may need a field inspection and be swabbed for internal contamination. Finally, coordination with the facility owner or operator should occur to avoid conflicts with facility operations.

6.1.6 Acquire Monitoring Services

A detailed statement of work should be prepared prior to selection of an organization to perform monitoring. The statement of work should delineate the following:

- monitoring method
- constituents of interest including detection limits
- quality control parameters including precision, accuracy, and frequency of quality control samples
- calibration requirements
- document control requirements

- deliverables
- quality assurance requirements
- cost and schedule constraints
- administrative contacts and controls.

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory will maintain access to organizations capable of supplying required vadose zone monitoring services for the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project. Potential sources of services include Hanford Site contractors and subcontractors; subcontractors designated as pre-qualified by Hanford Site contractors; and evaluated, independent, private industry.

The Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project maintains contracted analytical laboratory services. Those services will be used as needed.

6.1.6.1 Monitoring Procedures

All vadose zone monitoring done for the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project will be conducted according to approved procedures. Specific technical procedures required will be designated in the statement of work but will include procedures for

- data acquisition
- calibration practices and standards
- quality control and acceptance criteria
- equipment maintenance and calibration
- data reduction, verification, and reporting
- data storage and security
- document control
- administrative procedures including personnel training, health and safety documentation, quality assurance/quality control program, change control, and control and disposition of secondary waste.

Only proven techniques with procedures adequate to control the quality of the data will be used. All software used in the acquisition of data, the reduction and analysis of data, and data interpretation will be reviewed to confirm that the software performs as expected and correctly.

6.1.7 Data Reduction, Data Analysis, and Data Interpretation

6.1.7.1 Data Reduction

The specifics of reducing monitoring data from initially obtained raw information (e.g., electrical pulses counted at a multichannel analyzer) are highly dependent on the specific monitoring technique and on the specific methods used by the service organization collecting the data. Data reduction should be carried out using methods appropriate to the Hanford Site borehole environment. It is important that any algorithms and software used during data reduction be verified and tested to assure that the results are accurate.

6.1.7.2 Data Analysis and Interpretation

The ultimate use of vadose zone monitoring data is comparison with past monitoring data to delineate any changes in the subsurface distribution or concentration of contaminants. This is achieved through time-series analyses (i.e., comparing data for a specific contaminant at a specific location with past data for that contaminant at the same location). When possible, past data should be adjusted to the same scale and same units as newly collected data prior to making quantitative comparisons; otherwise comparisons remain qualitative. Detection limits and analytical errors are available for more recently acquired monitoring data. Where this information is available for past data, quantitative or semi-quantitative comparisons may be possible. For much of the older data, however, quantitative comparisons probably will not be possible because associated errors, calibration information, and detection limits are generally not available. In such cases, qualitative or relative comparisons can be done.

Presentation of the results can be as graphs of depth versus concentration, maps of location versus concentration, tables of concentration values, or any other similar and applicable presentation. Where applicable, cross-sections and maps should be prepared showing changes in subsurface contamination. To the extent that "good" prior data exist, the format for data presentation should complement comparing new data to old data.

Available information that may be related to contaminant concentrations such as local geology, effluent discharge history, and chemical properties of contaminants, co-contaminants and host soils should be used to help understand contaminant distribution and changes in contaminant distribution.

6.1.8 Data Management

The data resulting from vadose zone monitoring should be assimilated in one of two ways, depending on the specific monitoring effort. First, if hard-copy data packages are available they should contain all pertinent header sheets, work sheets, control charts, monitoring results, quality control results, data summaries, calibration information, and narratives. Hard-copy data packages should be assembled and made available to all potential data users.

Second, electronic files of all raw data, processed data, quality control data and any other information should be collected and made available to users. Hard-copy data and/or electronic data should be placed

in appropriate databases and libraries for use. The original data or copies of the data obtained for the Hanford Groundwater Project will be managed according to Pacific Northwest National Laboratory data management procedures (see Appendix A).

6.1.9 Reporting

The results of vadose zone monitoring should be made available for Hanford Site use. Mechanisms include publication in topical reports and in the annual Hanford Site groundwater monitoring reports. All reporting will be peer reviewed. Topical reports will be issued according to Pacific Northwest National Laboratory procedures for information release which ensure technical review. The annual groundwater report also utilizes the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory information release system and undergoes extensive technical, peer review.

7.0 References

40 CFR 141, Title 40, Part 141. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "National primary drinking water regulations." *Code of Federal Regulations*.

40 CFR 143, Title 40, Part 143. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "National secondary drinking water regulations." *Code of Federal Regulations*.

40 CFR 265, Title 40 Part 265. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Interim status standards for owners and operators of hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities." *Code of Federal Regulations*.

Additon MK, KR Fecht, TL Jones, and GV Last. 1978a. *Scintillation probe profiles 200 East Area crib monitoring wells*. RHO-LD-28, Rockwell Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Additon MK, KR Fecht, TL Jones, and GV Last. 1978b. *Scintillation probe profiles 200 West Area crib monitoring wells*. RHO-LD-29, Rockwell Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Baker VR, BN Bjornstad, AJ Busacca, KR Fecht, EP Kiver, UL Moody, JG Rigby, DF Stradling, and AM Tallman. 1991. "Quaternary geology of the Columbia plateau." *The Geology of North America*, Vol. K-2, Quaternary Nonglacial Geology, Conterminous U.S.

Black RF. 1979. *Clastic dikes of the Pasco basin, southeastern Washington*. RHO-BWI-C-64, Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, WA.

Blair SC, LS Law, and JW Lindberg. 1981. *A catalog of borehole geophysics on the Hanford Site, 1958 to 1980*. PNL-3504, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Bowen WM and CA Bennett. 1988. *Statistical methods for nuclear material management*. NUREG/CR-4604, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C.

Brodeur JR and CJ Koizumi. 1989. *Base calibration of Pacific Northwest Laboratory's gross gamma borehole geophysical logging system*. WHC-EP-0246, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Chamness MA, RE Lewis, SS Teel, and AW Pearson. 1991a. *T plant geologic and geophysics data package for the 200 aggregate area management study*. WHC-SD-EN-DP-022, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Chamness MA, SS Teel, DL McAlister, AW Pearson, KRO Barton, RW Fruland, and RE Lewis. 1991b. *U-plant aggregate area management study geologic data package*. WHC-SD-EN-DP-019, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Chamness MA, SS Teel, DL McAlister, AW Pearson, KRO Barton, RW Fruland, and RE Lewis. 1991c. *Z-plant aggregate area management study geologic data package*. WHC-SD-EN-DP-020, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Chamness MA, SM Goodwin, SS Teel, and RE Lewis. 1992a. *Semi-works (C-Plant) aggregate area management study geologic data package*. WHC-SD-EN-DP-027, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Chamness MA, RE Lewis, SS Teel, RJ Brockman, DC Lanigan, and AW Pearson. 1992b. *PUREX aggregate area management study geologic data package*. WHC-SD-EN-DP-025, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Chamness MA, DL McAlister, JP McDonald, AW Pearson, and RE Lewis. 1992c. *200 North aggregate area management study geologic data package*. Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Chamness MA and JK Merz. 1993. *Hanford wells*. PNL-8800, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). 1980. Public law 96-150, as amended, 94 Stat. 42 USC 9601 et seq.

Delaney CD, KA Lindsey, and SP Reidel. 1991. *Geology and hydrology of the Hanford Site: a standardized text for use in Westinghouse Hanford Company documents and reports*. WHC-SD-ER-TI-003, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

DOE Order 5400.1, *General environmental protection program*. U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.

DOE Order 5400.5, *Radiation protection of the public and environment*. U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.

DOE. 1988. *Consultation draft, site characterization plan, reference repository location, Hanford Site, Washington*. DOE/RW-0164, Vols. 1-9, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.

DOE. 1996. *200 Areas soil remediation strategy - environmental restoration program*. DOE/RL-96-67, Rev. 0, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

DOE. 1997a. *Environmental monitoring plan, United States Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office*. DOE/RL-91-50, Rev. 2, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

DOE. 1997b. *Waste site grouping for 200 Areas soil investigations*. DOE/RL-96-81, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

DOE. 1998. *Groundwater/vadose zone integration project specification*. Draft A, DOE/RL-89-48. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

Engelman RE, RE Lewis, DC Stromswold, and JR Hearst. 1995. *Calibration models for measuring moisture in unsaturated formations by neutron logging*. PNL-10801, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1994. *Guidance for the data quality objectives process*. EPA QA/G-4, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

Fecht KR, GV Last, and KR Price. 1977. *Evaluation of scintillation probe profiles from 200 Area crib monitoring wells*. ARH-ST.156, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Fecht KR, SP Reidel, and AM Tallman. 1987. *Paleodrainage of the Columbia River system on the Columbia plateau of Washington State - a summary*. In, JG Schuster, ed., *Selected Papers on the Geology of Washington*. Division of Geology and Earth Resources Bulletin 77, Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, WA, p. 219-248.

Fecht KR, KA Lindsey, BN Bjornstad, DG Horton, GV Last, and SP Reidel. 1998. *An atlas of clastic injection dikes of the Pasco basin and vicinity*. BHI-01103, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, WA.

Gee GW. 1987. *Recharge at the Hanford Site: status report*. PNL-6403, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Gee GW, MD Campbell, and SO Link. 1991. *Arid site water balance using monolith lysimeters*. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Lysimetry*, RG Allen, ed., American Society of Chemical Engineers, New York, pp. 219-227.

Gilbert RO. 1987. *Statistical methods for environmental pollution monitoring*. Van Nostrand Reinhold Company Inc., New York.

Hartman MJ, ed. 1999. *Hanford Site groundwater monitoring for fiscal year 1998*. PNNL-12086, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Jones TE, R Khaleel, DA Meyers, JW Shade, and MI Wood. 1998. *Summary and evaluation of Hanford Site tank farm subsurface contamination*. HNF-2603, Rev. 0, Lockheed Martin Hanford, Richland, WA.

Khaleel R and EJ Freeman. 1995. *A compilation of hydrologic properties for low-level tank waste disposal facility performance assessment*. WHC-SD-WM-RPT-165, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Kincaid CT, MP Bergeron, CR Cole, MD Freshley, NL Hassig, VG Johnson, DI Kaplan, RJ Serne, GP Streile, DL Strenge, PD Thorne, LW Vail, GA Whyatt, and SK Wurstner. 1998. *Composite analysis for low-level waste disposal in the 200 Area plateau of the Hanford Site*. PNNL-11800, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Lewis RE and AW Pearson. 1992. *A catalog of borehole geophysics for the 100 Areas and adjacent 600 Area, Hanford Site, 1962 to May 1992*. PNL 8230, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Lewis RE and SS Teel. 1994. *A survey of existing and emerging technologies for external detection of liquid leaks at the Hanford Site*. PNL-10176, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Lindsey KA. 1996. *The miocene to pliocene Ringold Formation and associated deposits of the ancestral Columbia River system, south-central Washington and north-central Oregon*. Open File Report 96-8, Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, WA.

Lindsey KA and KD Reynolds. 1998 "Geology and stratigraphy of the tank farms." In, TE Jones, R Khaleel, DA Meyers, JW Shade, and MI Wood, *Summary and evaluation of Hanford Site tank farm subsurface contamination*. HNF-2603, Rev. 0, Lockheed Martin Hanford, Richland, WA.

McGhan VL, PJ Mitchell, and RS Argo. 1985. *Hanford wells*. PNL-5397, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Raymond JR and VL McGhan. 1964. *Scintillation probe results - 200 Area waste disposal site monitoring wells*. HW-a4577, General Electric Company, Richland, WA.

Record of Decision (ROD). 1995. *Declaration of the record of decision, USDOE Hanford 100 Area, 100 BC-1, 100-DR-1, and 100-HR-1 operable units, Hanford Site, Benton County, Washington*. State of Washington Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

Record of Decision (ROD). 1996. *Declaration of the record of decision for the 300-FF-1 and 300-FF-5, operable units*. State of Washington Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

Reidel SP, AM Tallman, VG Johnson, CJ Chou, SM Narbutovskih, and JP Kiesler. 1995. *Characterization plan for the proposed TWRS treatment complex*. WHC-SD-WM-PLN-109, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Reidel SP, KA Lindsey, and KR Fecht. 1992. *Field trip guide to the Hanford Site*. WHC-MR-0391, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). 1976. Public Law 94-580, as amended, 90 Stat. 2795, 42 USC 6901 et seq.

Rockhold ML, MJ Fayer, GW Gee, and MJ Kanyid. 1990. *Natural groundwater recharge and soil-water balance at the Hanford Site*. PNL-10508, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Routson RC and VG Johnson. 1990. *Recharge estimates for the Hanford Site 200 Areas plateau*. Northwest Science, vol. 64(3), pp. 150-158.

Sheen EM, WL Bunch, and MR Wood. 1964. *Neutron soil moisture monitor*. HW.82009, General Electric Company, Richland, WA.

Teel SS. 1992. *S-plant aggregate area management study geologic data package*. WHC-SD-EN-DP-021, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Teel SS, RE Lewis, MA Chamness, DC Lanigan, VL McGhan, and RJ Brockman. 1992. *B-plant aggregate area management study geologic data package*. WHC-SD-EN-DP-026, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Tillson DD and VL McGhan. 1969. *Changes in scintillation probe findings - 1963 to 1968, 200 Area waste disposal site monitoring wells*. BNWL-CC-2255, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). 1994. *Environmental quality requirements for the preparation of sampling and analysis plans*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Manual EM-200-1-3.

WAC 173-200. "Water quality standards for ground waters of the State of Washington." *Washington Administrative Code*. Olympia, WA.

WAC 173-303. "Dangerous waste regulations." *Washington Administrative Code*. Olympia, WA.

WAC 246-290. "Public water supplies." *Washington Administrative Code*. Olympia, WA.

WAC 173-340. "Model toxic control act—cleanup." *Washington Administrative Code*. Olympia, WA.

WDOH. 1997. *State of Washington Department of Health interim regulatory guidance. Hanford guidance for radiological cleanup*. WDOH/320-015, Washington State Department of Health, Olympia, WA.

Wilson LG, LG Everett, and SJ Cullen, eds. 1995. *Handbook of vadose zone characterization & monitoring*. Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, FL.

Appendix A

Quality Assurance Project Plan

Contents

A.1	Background Information	A.1
A.1.1	Quality Assurance Project Plan Applicability and Relationship to the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project Quality Assurance Program	A.1
A.2	Project Organization and Responsibilities	A.1
A.2.1	Technical Lead Responsibilities	A.1
A.2.2	Analytical Data Acquisition Systems.....	A.1
A.2.3	Health Physics.....	A.2
A.2.4	Support Contractors	A.2
A.3	Objectives for Measurements.....	A.2
A.3.1	General Precision and Accuracy Objectives	A.2
A.3.2	Monitoring Measurements	A.2
A.4	Measurement Procedures	A.3
A.4.1	Procedure Approvals and Control	A.3
A.4.2	Measurement Procedures	A.3
A.4.3	Procedure Changes.....	A.6
A.5	Handling.....	A.6
A.6	Calibration Procedures.....	A.6
A.7	Analytical Procedures	A.7
A.8	Data Reduction, Validation, and Reporting	A.7
A.9	Internal Quality Control.....	A.7
A.10	Performance and System Assessments	A.8
A.11	Preventive Maintenance.....	A.8
A.12	Corrective Action.....	A.8
A.13	Quality Assurance Reports.....	A.8
A.14	References.....	A.8

Table

A.1	Some ASTM Standard Tests and Guides for Measurement of Water Content, Matric Potential, and Water Flux in the Vadose Zone	A.5
-----	---	-----

Appendix A

Quality Assurance Project Plan

A.1 Background Information

Vadose zone monitoring activities are part of the overall objectives in support of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project. Thus, the quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) procedures for vadose zone monitoring shall be consistent with those of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project. The information in this appendix is intended to be used in site-specific monitoring plans as appropriate. Implementation of the QA/QC requirements in this section will insure that the vadose zone monitoring activities are carried out to achieve the specified data quality goals and that the quality of data gathered can be monitored and documented.

A.1.1 Quality Assurance Project Plan Applicability and Relationship to the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project Quality Assurance Program

This plan applies specifically to various activities performed for vadose zone monitoring in support of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project. It is part of the vadose zone monitoring plan prepared specifically for vadose zone monitoring support to the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project and is consistent with other environmental work and the overall quality program requirements at the Hanford Site. Distribution and revision control of this document including this QA/QC plan will comply with established Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) procedures.

A.2 Project Organization and Responsibilities

A.2.1 Technical Lead Responsibilities

The PNNL Applied Geology and Geochemistry Group has primary responsibility for the vadose zone monitoring aspects of the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project. The primary responsibility for the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project lies in the PNNL Field Hydrology and Chemistry Group.

A.2.2 Analytical Data Acquisition Systems

Data acquisition and analysis will be subcontracted to support organizations as described in Section 6.0 of this document. All data collection, data reduction, and data analyses activities shall be performed in compliance with PNNL reviewed QA plans and analytical procedures.

A.2.3 Health Physics

Because the nature of many of the sites to be monitored render them radiological contamination zones, radiation work permits and health physics support may be necessary.

A.2.4 Support Contractors

Procurement of any contracted activities shall be in compliance with the PNNL Standards-Based Management System. Statements of work are to be reviewed and signed by the project quality engineer prior to submittal to contractors. All work shall be performed in compliance with PNNL-reviewed QA plans and/or procedures and shall be subject to assessment activities. Applicable quality requirements shall be invoked as part of the approved procurement documentation or work order.

A.3 Objectives for Measurements

This project is a monitoring activity to obtain data that will be used to determine the subsurface configuration of contaminants. The overall data quality requirements to meet the intent of this document were determined as described in Section 4.0 of this document. Detailed and specific data quality requirements for individual waste sites will be documented in the site-specific monitoring plans. The general requirements are discussed in Sections A.3.1 and A.3.2.

A.3.1 General Precision and Accuracy Objectives

As an outcome of the data quality objective (DQO) process, the general requirement for precision and accuracy is intended to be such that changes in subsurface contaminant distribution or concentration can be documented. However, the individual site-specific monitoring plans take precedence in setting the specific specifications for precision and accuracy of the monitoring to be performed. The general guidance or objective may be accomplished differently for different monitoring methodologies. For example, geophysical logging may require relogging of specific repeat sections whereas moisture or vapor extraction techniques may require duplicate samples to meet the monitoring objective and/or to satisfy regulatory requirements or U.S. Department of Energy Orders.

A.3.2 Monitoring Measurements

Representative analyses are necessary for accurate determination of subsurface contaminant distribution. Accurate interpretations of the subsurface data form the framework for subsequent decisions concerning impacts or potential impacts to groundwater. Monitoring measurements provide information which can be included in cleanup decisions and modeling efforts.

A.3.2.1 Monitoring Points

Specific monitoring points are to meet site-specific DQOs and will be delineated in the site-specific monitoring plans.

A.3.2.2 Constituents to be Measured

The DQO process specified the constituents of concern/interest for vadose zone monitoring. Site-specific contaminants of concern are to be developed from the overall contaminants of concern and from site-specific inventories. They will be delineated in the site-specific monitoring plans.

A.4 Measurement Procedures

A.4.1 Procedure Approvals and Control

All procedures required for vadose monitoring activities supporting the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project shall be approved and shall comply with the requirements of the project. Where PNL-MA-567 (PNL 1994) procedures are referenced, equivalent procedures shall be used by subcontractors.

A.4.2 Measurement Procedures

This section describes procedures to collect monitoring data from boreholes and soil and pore fluid samples for the constituents of interest. Alternative measurement methods and procedures may be used but must be controlled and documented in accordance with the requirements in this QA/QC plan.

A.4.2.1 Uranium-233, 235, 238, Cesium-137, Plutonium-239, 241, and Americium-241

Two borehole geophysical logging techniques can be used to measure the activity of the gamma emitting isotopes of uranium, cesium, plutonium, and americium: gross gamma-ray logging and spectral gamma-ray logging. Gross gamma-ray logging gives a sum of the activities of all gamma emitting radionuclides whereas spectral gamma-ray logging gives activities for each individual radionuclide. These parameters are obtained by inserting gamma detectors into wells and boreholes. Borehole configuration specifics about casing type and seals must be known for quantitative corrections to gamma-ray measurements. Also, accurate determinations of reference points, usually the top of casing, must be known. Most well casing elevations are surveyed to within ± 0.3 cm (± 0.01 ft) and this accuracy is well within the requirements for vadose zone monitoring. Wells without accurate surveys, must have a survey completed prior to monitoring. Procedures for borehole gamma-ray logging are vendor specific but must conform to the requirements of this QA/QC plan.

Fissionable nuclides (uranium-233, uranium-235, and plutonium-239) can be measured by prompt fission neutron logging in boreholes. These systems are not currently available and are expensive to implement. The system cannot distinguish among the fissionable nuclides.

Gamma emitting radionuclides can also be quantified by gamma spectrometry in a laboratory. Discrete samples of pore fluid are necessary. Laboratory specific methods are used that are recognized as acceptable within the technical radiochemical industry (Gillespie 1998). Specific procedures are available through the PNNL technical contract administrator for the radiochemistry laboratory. The method involves direct counting using an intrinsic germanium or lithium-drifted germanium detector. Isotopes with gamma-ray energies from 60 to 2,000 KeV are detected.

In addition to gamma spectrometry, activities of alpha emitting isotopes of uranium, plutonium and americium can be measured in pore fluid samples by alpha spectrometry after isotopic separation by exchange resins. This method requires samples of pore fluid. Procedures are laboratory specific and recognized as acceptable within the technical radiochemical industry (Gillespie 1998).

A.4.2.2 Technetium-99 and Iodine-129

There are no readily available procedures to measure technetium-99 and iodine-129 in boreholes. However, laboratory procedures exist to measure technetium-99 and iodine-129 activities in discrete samples of pore fluid. The procedures are laboratory specific and conform to industry recognized practice. Technetium and or iodine are chemically separated from the sample and technetium-99 is measured by liquid-scintillation beta counting and iodine-129 by a low-energy photon detector (Gillespie 1998).

A.4.2.3 Chromium, Aluminum, Nitrate, Cyanide, and Carbon Tetrachloride

Various laboratory procedures are available for analysis of these constituents of concern in samples of pore fluid. Laboratory procedures for the analysis of chromium and aluminum include flame atomic absorption according to Method 218.2 (EPA 1982), graphite furnace atomic absorption according to Method 7191 (EPA 1986), and inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry by Method 6020 (EPA 1986).

Field methods are available for measurement of chromium as described in Method 7196 (EPA 1986). However, there are no readily available procedures for measurement of chromium in the vadose zone in boreholes.

Aluminum can be measured in boreholes by pulsed-neutron logging. Procedural methods are vendor specific. The use of pulsed-neutron logging for measurement of soluble aluminum probably is not practical at the Hanford Site because the technique will measure all aluminum around the borehole including that in alumino-silicate minerals.

Cyanide in pore fluid can be measured by Methods 1910 and 1912 (EPA 1986). There is no readily available procedure for measurement of cyanide in the vadose zone in boreholes.

Carbon tetrachloride is measured in the laboratory by gas chromatography per Method 8260 (EPA 1986). There are also several available methods for measurement of carbon tetrachloride in the field. The method currently used by the soil-vapor extraction project is infrared photoacoustic spectrometry following the manufacturers recommended procedure.

The laboratory procedures for the analysis of nitrate in pore fluid are ion chromatography (Method 300.0 or 9056 [EPA 1984, 1986 respectively]). Field methods are available for measurement of nitrate in water samples but there are no readily available procedures for measurement of nitrate in the vadose zone in boreholes.

A.4.2.4 Water Content, Matric Potential, and Water Flux

There are numerous methods for the measurement of these parameters (see Table 6.2 in the main text). Lewis and Teel (1994) evaluated the following methods as having potential at the Hanford Site. Borehole methods include neutron-neutron logging, pulsed-neutron spectroscopy logging, and electrical induction logging. Cross borehole methods include electrical resistivity tomography. In situ, soil moisture instrumentation methods include time-domain reflectometry and resistivity blocks. Lysimeters and membrane/filter samplers can collect pore fluid samples for either measurement of the soil moisture content or dissolved constituents. Analytical laboratory measurement of moisture is usually gravimetric.

Procedures approved by the Environmental Protection Agency do not exist for many of the techniques listed in Table 6.2 of the main document. Vendor specific procedures or manufacturers recommended procedures are available for most commercially available methods. Table A.1 list some standard tests and guides for measurement of water content, matric potential, and water flux in the vadose zone.

Table A.1. Some ASTM Standard Tests and Guides for Measurement of Water Content, Matric Potential, and Water Flux in the Vadose Zone

Method	Standard
Neutron-neutron logging	ASTM D5220-92, Standard Test Method for Water Content of Soil and Rock In-Place by the Neutron Depth Probe Method
	ASTM D3017-96e1, Standard Test Method for Water Content of Soil and Rock In-Place by Nuclear Methods [Shallow Depth]
	ASTM D6031-96, Standard Test Method for Logging In-Situ Moisture Content and Density of Soil and Rock by the Nuclear Method in Horizontal, Slanted and Vertical Access Tubes
Direct sampling and ex-situ analysis	ASTM D4700-91, Standard Guide for Soil Sampling from the Vadose Zone
	ASTM D4696, Standard Guide for Pore-Liquid Sampling from the Vadose Zone
	ASTM D2216, Percent Moisture Analysis
Soil gas monitoring	ASTM D5314-92, Standard Guide for Soil Gas Monitoring in the Vadose Zone
Field measurement of water content and hydrologic properties	ASTM D3404-91, Standard Guide for Measuring Matric Potential in the Vadose Zone Using Tensiometers
	ASTM D5126-90, Standard Guide for Comparison of Field Methods for Determining Hydraulic Conductivity in the Vadose Zone
	ASTM D3152-72(1994)e1, Standard Test Method for Capillary Moisture Relationships for Fine-Textured Soils by Pressure Membrane Apparatus
	ASTM D2325-68(1981)e1, Standard Test Method for Capillary Moisture Relationships for Coarse- and Medium-Textured Soils by Porous-Plate Apparatus
	ASTM D5093-90, Standard Test Method for Field Measurement of Infiltration Rate Using a Double-Ring Infiltrometer with a Sealed Inner Ring.

A.4.2.5 Other Procedures

If it is determined that other procedures are required that are not already identified in this QA/QC plan, they will be identified in the appropriate site-specific monitoring plan. Documentation requirements shall be addressed within individual procedures.

A.4.3 Procedure Changes

Deviations from established procedures must be documented in the project files. Should deviations from established procedures be required to accommodate unforeseen field situations, they may be authorized by the project lead for the site-specific monitoring concerned. They may be authorized in accordance with the requirements in the applicable statements of work, site-specific requirements, and the applicable vendor-specific procedures.

A.5 Handling

All data obtained during the course of vadose monitoring activities shall be controlled as required by this plan and the established PNNL groundwater monitoring project QA project plan. Chain-of-custody procedures shall be used that maintain sample integrity and identification throughout the analytical process. Chain-of-custody forms shall be initiated for returned residual samples. Results of analyses shall be traceable to original samples through unique code or identifier specified in the site-specific monitoring plan. In general, chain of custody is not required for borehole measurement techniques. However, header sheets containing location, dates, techniques and other information are required to be a permanent attachment to each geophysical log data set. All results of data analyses shall be controlled as permanent project quality records as required by standard PNNL procedures.

A.6 Calibration Procedures

All measuring and test equipment shall be calibrated in compliance with the requirements of applicable procedures. Equipment that requires user calibration or field adjustment shall be calibrated as required by standard procedures.

Borehole logging equipment will be calibrated to provide reliable data under conditions representative of the Hanford Site vadose zone in accordance with established calibration plans. Two calibrations are applicable to borehole logging: a depth calibration of the cable and cable hoist system and a calibration of the detector and associated electronics.

All calibration of laboratory measuring and test equipment shall meet the minimum requirements of the PNNL groundwater monitoring project QA project plan. Such requirements shall be invoked through PNNL procurement control procedures. All subcontractor QA plans shall address equipment to be calibrated and the calibration schedules.

A.7 Analytical Procedures

Analytical methods are identified and discussed in Section A.4 and in appropriate site-specific monitoring plans. All analytical procedures used to support the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project vadose zone monitoring shall comply with SW-846 where possible. All analytical procedures approved for use in vadose monitoring shall require the use of standard reporting techniques and units wherever possible to facilitate the comparability of data sets in terms of precision and accuracy. All approved procedures shall be retained in the project QA records and shall be available for review upon request.

A.8 Data Reduction, Validation, and Reporting

Data from monitoring activities will be used primarily to determine the presence and amounts of contaminants of interest in specified locations and intervals. The support organization responsible for acquiring the monitoring data shall be responsible for the examination and verification of results to the extent appropriate. The requirements discussed in this section shall be invoked, as appropriate, in procurement documentation prepared in compliance with standard PNNL procedures. Results from all monitoring measurements shall be summarized in required reports and supported by QC checks, equipment calibration data, spectra, or other verification data as appropriate.

Project records shall be managed according to the PNNL records management procedures. All reports and supporting data may be subject to a detailed technical review by a qualified reviewer. All reports, technical reviews, and supporting data shall be retained as permanent project QA records in compliance with referenced procedures.

A.9 Internal Quality Control

The quality of vadose monitoring data shall be subject to in-process QC checks in the field, during data reduction, or in the laboratory as appropriate. Minimum requirements are defined as specific field checks appropriate to the specific monitoring method. Unless otherwise specified in a site-specific monitoring plan, minimum field QC checks for borehole logging activities shall include the following:

- Pre- and post-monitoring detector verification using a known and documented source. Acceptance criteria are to be documented in applicable procedures.
- A minimum of 3 m (10 ft) in each borehole is to be relogged as a QC sample. The portion of the borehole to be relogged can be at the discretion of the log operator.

Internal QC checks performed by the analytical laboratories shall be in compliance with approved analytical procedure requirements.

A.10 Performance and System Assessments

Acceptable performance for vadose monitoring is defined as compliance with the requirements of this QA/QC plan, its implementing procedures, the associated site-specific monitoring plans, and other applicable PNNL QA program plans. All activities addressed by this QA/QC plan are subject to assessments of project performance and systems adequacy. Assessments shall be conducted in accordance with appropriate PNNL procedures and shall be scheduled at the discretion of the cognizant quality engineer or technical lead.

A.11 Preventive Maintenance

All measurement and testing equipment used in the field and in laboratories that directly affects the quality of the monitoring data shall be subject to preventive maintenance measures. These measures are designed to ensure the availability of instrumentation and the reliability of operation to prevent delays or loss of data. Subcontractors shall be responsible for performing or managing the maintenance of their equipment; maintenance requirements, spare parts lists, and instructions shall be included in individual methods or in subcontractor QA plans. All QA plans shall be made available to PNNL upon request.

A.12 Corrective Action

Corrective action requests required as a result of assessment reports shall be documented and dispositioned as required by standard PNNL corrective action procedures. Primary responsibilities for corrective action resolution are assigned to the project technical lead and the quality engineer.

Other measurement systems, procedures, or plan corrections that may be required as a result of routine review processes shall be resolved as required by governing procedures or shall be referred to the technical lead for resolution. Copies of all assessment documentation shall be routed to the project QA records upon completion or closure.

A.13 Quality Assurance Reports

Project performance shall be evaluated by the assessment process. Assessment documentation shall be routed to the project records upon completion or closure of the activity. A report summarizing assessment activity, as well as any associated corrective actions, shall be prepared by the QA coordinator at the completion of the project.

A.14 References

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1982. *Methods for chemical analysis of water and waste*. EPA-600/4-82-055, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1984. *Test method: the determination of inorganic anions in water by ion chromatography - method 300.0*. EPA-600/4-84-17, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1986. *Test methods for evaluating solid waste - physical/chemical methods*. SW-846 (3rd Edition), Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

Gillespie BM. Appendix C, Analytical Methods, in, MJ Hartman and PE Dresel. 1998. *Hanford Site groundwater monitoring for fiscal year 1997*. PNNL-11973, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Lewis RE and SS Teel. 1994. *A survey of existing and emerging technologies for external detection of liquid leaks at the Hanford Site*. PNL-10176, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Pacific Northwest Laboratory (PNL). 1994. *Procedures for ground-water investigations*. PNL-MA-567, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

SW-846. 1986. *Test methods for evaluating solid waste: physical/chemical methods, third edition*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, D.C.

Appendix B

Site Prioritization

Contents

B.1	Introduction.....	B.1
B.2	Prioritization Process	B.2
B.3	Prioritization Results.....	B.4
B.4	Monitoring Recommendation	B.12
B.5	References.....	B.12

Tables

B.1	Liquid Disposal Sites with Constituents of Concern, Less Than or Equal to 10 Pore Volumes, and Baseline Information.....	B.5
B.2	Liquid Disposal Sites with Constituents of Concern, Less Than or Equal to 10 Pore Volumes and No Baseline Information.....	B.8
B.3	Liquid Disposal Sites with Long-Lived Radionuclides and Greater than 10 Pore Volumes.....	B.10

Appendix B

Site Prioritization

B.1 Introduction

This appendix describes the process used to prioritize liquid waste disposal sites.

Eleven criteria resulted from the data quality objective (DQO) process (see Section 4.0 of this document). Each criterion was applied to each waste site to help determine potential need for vadose zone monitoring.

1. Is there a current threat imposed by site conditions on the environment?
2. Is there a regulatory reason to monitor?
3. Are there mobile contaminants associated with the site?
4. Are there long lived contaminants associated with the site?
5. Have mobile constituents been "flushed from the vadose zone?"
6. Is there a potential for future impact to groundwater?
7. Are there vadose plumes associated with the site?
8. Is there a current impact to groundwater at the site?
9. Is the site in an area that is currently receiving liquid effluent?
10. Are there driving forces external to the site?
11. Are characterization and/or baseline data available?

The waste sites evaluated for the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project's vadose zone monitoring were all the waste sites in the 200 Areas as reported in the *Waste Site Grouping for 200 Areas Soil Investigations* (Table A-1 in DOE 1997). Past-practice liquid waste disposal sites in the 100 Areas were not evaluated because remediation efforts are currently directed at those areas. Vadose zone monitoring is not appropriate there until remediation is complete and it is determined whether vadose monitoring is required to assess the remediation activities. Also, waste sites in the 300 Area were not evaluated because the source areas are being remediated and the Record of Decision for groundwater allows for natural attenuation of contaminants.

The *Waste Site Grouping for 200 Areas Soil Investigations* (DOE 1997) placed each of 662 waste sites into one of 23 waste site groups that were previously developed by the *200 Areas Soil Remediation Strategy - Environmental Restoration Program* (DOE 1996). The placement primarily was based on the chemical processes generating the waste streams disposed to the facilities. The waste site groups were then prioritized (as groups) on the basis of past, current, and potential future impacts to groundwater, contaminant types and contaminant chemistry, geographic location, representativeness, ease of remediation, and other parameters (DOE 1997). Many of the decision rules developed during the DQO process

for the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project prioritization are similar to the criteria used by the *Waste Site Grouping for 200 Area Soil Investigations* to prioritize waste site groups.

B.2 Prioritization Process

Criterion 1. Is there a current threat imposed by site conditions on the environment? No sites from Table A-1 in the *Waste Site Grouping for 200 Areas Soil Investigations* (DOE 1997) received a positive response to this question. However, one site in the 100 K Area (the 100 KE fuel storage basin) received a positive response to this question because it contributes potentially significant inventories of fission products and transuranics to the soil column (Johnson et al. 1995) and because of its proximity to the Columbia River. Thus, the 100 KE fuel storage basin is included on the priority list. However, the groundwater beneath the basin is currently being monitored by the Hanford Groundwater Monitoring Project so that no vadose zone monitoring is scheduled.

Criterion 2. Is there a regulatory reason to monitor? Although there are no Environmental Protection Agency or State of Washington Department of Ecology regulations requiring vadose zone monitoring at any of the facilities included in DOE (1997) vadose zone monitoring is being considered as an alternative or an extension of groundwater monitoring at the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility (LERF) because changes in the groundwater system beneath that facility will soon make the LERF non-compliant with established groundwater protection standards (40 CFR 265, WAC 173-303-645). For this reason, the LERF is included on the priority list. All the sites in the *Waste Site Grouping for 200 Areas Soil Investigations* are covered by DOE Order 5400.1.

Criterion 3. Are there mobile contaminants associated with the site? and Criterion 4. Are there long lived contaminants associated with the site?. These criteria determine whether there are constituents of concern associated with the sites. The constituents of concern are the mobile contaminants (technetium-99, iodine-129, nitrate, uranium, chromium, carbon tetrachloride, cyanide, and soluble aluminum), the immobile and/or long-lived contaminants (plutonium, americium and cesium), and the parameter moisture (driving force) (see Decision Inputs, Section 4.6 in the main text). DOE (1997) included inventories for all these constituents except technetium-99, iodine-129, aluminum, and moisture. Data for technetium-99 and iodine-129 were obtained from the Composite Analysis (Kincaid et al. 1998) and were included with the other data. It should be noted that in searching for this information, differences were found in reported quantities for technetium-99 and iodine-129 depending on the source examined. No data for aluminum was found in an electronic format to include in this evaluation. Some inventory data on aluminum in effluent do exist for some sites and will be compiled for inclusion in subsequent evaluations for potential vadose zone monitoring. Moisture is considered later where driving forces are evaluated.

Application of criteria 3 and 4 yielded over 200 sites that have associated constituents of concern. The vast majority of the sites without inventoried constituents of concern were unplanned releases, landfills and dumps, and septic tanks and drain fields.

Criterion 5. Have mobile constituents been "flushed from the vadose zone?," Criterion 6. Is there a potential for future impact to groundwater?, and Criterion 7. Are there vadose plumes associated with

the site?. The next step in the evaluation considered criteria 5, 6, and 7. It was assumed that sites where mobile contaminants have been flushed from the vadose zone have already impacted groundwater (criteria 8).

The number of pore volumes disposed to each facility was determined by dividing the effluent volumes by the pore volumes. The volume data used was that reported in DOE (1997). Less than or equal to 10 pore volumes was the delimiting volume for this evaluation. This was based on the fact that anything over 1 pore volume would have introduced mobile constituents to the groundwater. In such cases, vadose monitoring as an early detection system for protection of groundwater is "after the fact." Ten pore volumes was chosen as the conservative measure.

Forty-one sites did not have the volume information to calculate the number of pore volumes, 61 sites had more than 10 pore volumes disposed, and 114 had less than or equal to 10 pore volumes disposed to them. Data for the 41 sites with no volume information will be sought and, if available, included in subsequent evaluations. About half of the 41 sites are radioactive landfills and dumps.

Fifty-six of the 61 sites with greater than 10 pore volumes have associated long-lived, relatively immobile constituents of concern. Because the long-lived constituents of concern can remain in the soil column even after 10 pore volumes, those sites are retained as intermediate priority sites.

Criterion 9. Is the site in an area that is currently receiving liquid effluent? and Criterion 10. Are there driving forces external to the site?. Criteria 9 and 10 were considered next. Basically, three potential sources for a driving force were considered: 1) is the site actively receiving effluent, 2) is the site influenced by a known source of water recharge from man-made systems, and 3) natural recharge.

Except for LERF and the 100 KE fuel storage basin, none of the sites that received less than or equal to 10 pore volumes is an active site. Whether a site is influenced by a known source of water recharge from a man-made system is more difficult to answer. The *Waste Site Grouping for 200 Areas Soil Investigation* (DOE 1997) considered this aspect and concluded that none of the sites was within 30 meters of a known source of water recharge from man-made systems (DOE 1997, p. 5-6). An effort currently is underway to identify facilities that may be impacted by leaking or broken water lines, storm runoff systems, or other man-made facilities. Results of that effort will be incorporated in subsequent evaluations once they are available but until that time the conclusion of the waste site grouping (DOE 1997) is used.

The last aspect, natural recharge, was evaluated by plotting each of the 114 sites with constituents of concern and less than or equal to 10 pore volumes on an updated version of the Hanford Site recharge map produced by Fayer et al. (1996). For sites within disturbed areas, Fayer et al. (1996) estimated recharge assuming there were no plants and the soil type was what it was prior to Hanford Site operations. For sites outside of disturbed areas, they used the pre-Hanford soil type with the vegetative cover defined by the vegetation map of Downs et al. (1993). It is recognized that these assumptions may not represent actual cover on the waste sites. The application of natural recharge to the site prioritization can be updated as newer information becomes available. Also, any enhancement of infiltration due to local topographic features will be accounted for during evaluation of specific sites.

Most waste sites fell into the 50 to 100 mm/year areas on the recharge map because they lie in disturbed areas and Fayer et al. (1996) treated these areas as bare soil. All other facilities fell into the 0.5 to 5 mm/yr, 5 to 10 mm/yr or the 10 to 20 mm/yr recharge zones. Sites in higher recharge zones receive higher priority for vadose monitoring than do sites in lower recharge zones.

Criterion 11. Are characterization and/or baseline data available? This criterion was for comparison with new monitoring data. Several sources of past monitoring and characterization information were checked to see whether data were available and published. Most sources of historical monitoring data were gross gamma-ray and spectral gamma-ray log data. The major sources of baseline data are Fecht et al. (1977), Additon et al. (1978a, 1979b), Brodeur et al. (1993), and part of a very recently completed Pacific Northwest National Laboratory database of spectral gamma-ray logs that have been collected since about 1991. Numerous published characterization studies that report laboratory and field testing results can be found. Many of these reports probably contain data suitable for use as baseline for vadose zone monitoring. A thorough search for these reports was not made, however, because of the monumental effort that would be involved. Site-specific monitoring plans must consider this source of information.

Seventy sites with less than or equal to 10 pore volumes and with associated contaminants of concern also have identified baseline data (Table B.1). The 42 sites without baseline data (Table B.2) are recommended as sites for which some sort of characterization information is needed if future monitoring is to be done at those sites. These sites are retained as intermediate priority sites. In some instances, initial characterization data may also serve as initial monitoring data.

B.3 Prioritization Results

The results of this evaluation are shown in Tables B.1, B.2, and B.3. Table B.1 shows the 72 high-priority sites. These are the sites with associated constituents of concern, less than or equal to 10 pore volumes, and have associated baseline information for monitoring (LERF and the K-basins are also included on Table B.1).

Table B.2 shows the intermediate-priority sites that have associated constituents of concern, less than 10 pore volumes, but no associated baseline information for monitoring. Table B.3 shows the intermediate priority sites that have long-lived, relatively immobile constituents of concern but received greater than 10 pore volumes of effluent.

All sites have been further prioritized within each of Tables B.1, B.2, and B.3. First, the relative ranking of waste site groups has been retained from the *Waste Site Grouping for 200 Area Soil Investigations* (DOE 1997). Then, within each waste site group, sites are ranked first by waste site type, second by amount of natural recharge, and third by the date that the site was last monitored.

Specific retention facilities were designed to use the moisture retention capability of the soils to retain contaminants. Ideally, liquid disposed to specific retention facilities was to be limited to 6% to 10% of the pore volume between the facility and the groundwater so that the groundwater would not be impacted (Waite 1991). Specific retention facilities were used at the Hanford Site between 1951 and 1958 for tank

Table B.1. Liquid Disposal Sites with Constituents of Concern, Less Than or Equal to 10 Pore Volumes, and Baseline Information

Site	Facility Type	Mobile Constituents	Immobile and/or Long-Lived Constituents	Number of Pore Volumes	Natural Recharge (mm/yr)	Baseline Information
Potential Environmental Impact						
KE Basin	Fuel storage Basin				10 - 20	
LERF	RCRA TSD				0.5 - 5	
Scavenged Waste Group						
216-B-20	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-21	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-22	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-24	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-25	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	50 - 100	1984, 1987
216-B-27	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	50 - 100	1984, 1987
216-B-23	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	50 - 100	1984, 1987
216-B-42	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	10 - 20	1978
216-B-26	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-28	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-29	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-31	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I		0.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-34	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-B-30	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1987
216-B-32	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1984, 1987
216-B-33	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1984, 1987
216-B-52	Specific retention crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.5		1984, 1987
216-B-17	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.2	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-43	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.2	10 - 20	1977, 1978, 1991
216-B-16	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-B-15	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-19	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-47	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	10 - 20	1977, 1978, 1991, 1997
216-B-48	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	10 - 20	1977, 1978
216-B-14	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.5	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-B-18	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.5	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-B-45	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.5	10 - 20	1977, 1978, 1991
216-B-44	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.6	10 - 20	1977, 1978, 1991, 1996

Table B.1. (contd)

Site	Facility Type	Mobile Constituents	Immobile and/or Long-Lived Constituents	Number of Pore Volumes	Natural Recharge (mm/yr)	Baseline Information
216-B-46	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.7	10 - 20	1977, 1978, 1991
216-B-51	French Drain	NO3		0.0	10 - 20	1977, 1993
Plutonium/Organic-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-Z-1A	Tile field	Tc, CCl4, NO3, I	Pu, Am, Cs	0.1	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1994, 1998
216-Z-18	Crib	CCl4, NO3, I, Tc	Pu	0.3	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-Z-9	Enclosed trench	U, Tc, CCl4, NO3, I	Pu, Am, Cs	1.6	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993, 1998
Gable Mountain/B Pond and Ditch Cooling Water Group						
216-A-40	Trench	NO3		0.1	50 - 100	1978
300 Area Chemical Laboratory Waste Group						
216-B-58	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.1	50 - 100	1984, 1987
216-B-53A	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	50 - 100	1984, 1987
216-T-35	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978, 1993
216-T-34	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	2.8	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978
Miscellaneous Waste Group						
216-A-4	Specific retention crib	U, Tc, NO3, Cr, I	Pu, Cs	6.6	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978
216-T-33	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	2.8	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978
216-A-27	Crib	U, Tc, Cr, I	Pu, Cs	4.6	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978, 1993
Uranium-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-A-1	Specific retention crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.0	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-A-18	Specific retention crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.0	50 - 100	1978
Organic-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-A-31	Specific retention crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	0.0	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978
216-A-2	Specific retention crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	0.2	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978
216-S-13	Specific retention crib	U, Tc, NO3, Cr, I	Pu, Cs	1.9	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-A-7	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	1.5	50 - 100	1978
Tank Waste Group						
216-B-35	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.2	10 - 20	1984, 1987
216-T-14	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.2	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978
216-T-15	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.2	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978
216-T-17	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.2	0.5 - 5	1993
216-B-41	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	10 - 20	1977, 1978
216-B-38	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.3	10 - 20	1993
216-B-36	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	10 - 20	1977, 1978, 1993

Table B.1. (contd)

Site	Facility Type	Mobile Constituents	Immobile and/or Long-Lived Constituents	Number of Pore Volumes	Natural Recharge (mm/yr)	Baseline Information
216-B-37	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.8	10 - 20	1984, 1987
216-T-18	Specific retention crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	1.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-T-5	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	2.7	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-T-21	Trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.1	50 - 100	1978
216-T-22	Trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1978
216-T-23	Trench	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1978
216-B-9	Crib and tile field	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	1.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-B-8	Crib and tile field	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.5	10 - 20	1977, 1978
Steam Condensate Group						
216-T-36	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	0.1	50 - 100	1977, 1978
200 Areas Chemical Laboratory Waste Group						
216-B-10B	Crib	Tc, I	Cs	0.1	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-T-8	Crib	U, Tc, Cr, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	1978
216-Z-7	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	2.6	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
General Process Condensate and Process Waste Group						
216-C-5	Specific retention crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	0.1	50 - 100	1977
216-C-10	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	2.3	50 - 100	1977
216-S-22	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	0.2	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-S-23	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	5.7	50 - 100	1977, 1978
Fission Product-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-B-50	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	5.5	10 - 20	1977, 1991
216-S-9	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	3.3	50 - 100	1977, 1978
Sources of Baseline Information Fecht et al. 1977. Additon.et al. 1978a and 1978b. Brodeur et al. 1993. All other information is from PNNL database.						

Table B.2. Liquid Disposal Sites with Constituents of Concern, Less Than or Equal to 10 Pore Volumes and No Baseline Information

Site	Facility Type	Mobile Constituents	Immobile and/or Long-Lived Constituents	Number of Pore Volumes	Natural Recharge (mm/yr)	Baseline Information
Scavenged Waste Group						
216-B-49	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	0.7	10 - 20	
Plutonium-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-Z-4	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	0.1	50 - 100	
216-A-6	Crib	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	0.2	50 - 100	
216-Z-8	French drain	I, Tc	Pu, Am	0.9	50 - 100	
Gable Mountain/B Pond and Ditch Cooling Water Group						
216-B-2-2	Ditch	I, Tc	Pu, Cs	0.7	50 - 100	
216-C-9	Pond	I, Tc	Pu, Cs	5.3	50 - 100	
S Ponds/Ditches Cooling Water Group						
216-S-17	Pond	U, NO ₃ , I, Tc	Pu, Cs	4.2	50 - 100	
200 North Pond Cooling Water Group						
216-N-5	Crib	Tc, I	Cs	4.4	0.5 - 5	
216-N-7	Crib	Tc, I	Cs	4.9	0.5 - 5	
216-N-3	Crib	Tc, I	Cs	5.1	0.5 - 5	
216-N-4	Pond	U, I	Pu, Cs	7.3	0.5 - 5	
216-N-6	Pond	U, I	Pu, Cs	9.7	0.5 - 5	
300 Area Chemical Laboratory Waste Group						
216-B-53B	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	0.0	50 - 100	
216-B-54	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	0.2	50 - 100	
T Pond/Ditches Cooling Water Group						
216-T-1	Ditch	U, I, Tc	Pu, Cs	4.7	0.5 - 5	
Miscellaneous Waste Group						
216-U-13	Trench	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	0.0	50 - 100	
216-S-12	Trench	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	0.0	50 - 100	
Uranium-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-B-60	Crib	U, Tc, I		0.0	50 - 100	
216-A-28	Crib	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I		0.2		
216-A-20	Trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	0.8	50 - 100	
216-A-19	Trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	0.9	50 - 100	
216-S-8	Trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	1.0	50 - 100	
216-U-5	Trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I		1.4	50 - 100	
216-U-6	Trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I		1.4	50 - 100	
216-A-3	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	3.2	50 - 100	

Table B.2. (contd)

Site	Facility Type	Mobile Constituents	Immobile and/or Long-Lived Constituents	Number of Pore Volumes	Natural Recharge (mm/yr)	Baseline Information
Organic-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-U-15	Trench	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	0.1	50 - 100	
216-C-4	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	
Tank Waste Group						
216-T-16	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	0.2	0.5 - 5	
216-B-39	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	0.3	10 - 20	
216-B-40	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	0.3	10 - 20	
216-T-24	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	0.4	50 - 100	
216-T-25	Specific retention trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	1.1	50 - 100	
200 Areas Chemical Laboratory Waste Group						
216-U-4	Dry well	NO ₃ , I, Tc		0.0	50 - 100	
216-U-4B	French drain	Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	3.0	50 - 100	
216-S-19	Pond	U, I, Tc	Pu, Cs	5.2	10 - 20(?)	
General Process Condensate and Process Waste Group						
216-C-7	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	0.1	50 - 100	
216-T-20	Trench	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Cs	0.3	50 - 100	
216-U-17	Crib	U, I	Am	1.0	50 - 100	
216-A-45	Crib	U, Tc, I	Am, Cs	1.8	50 - 100	
216-C-3	Crib?	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	4.1	50 - 100	
216-S-4	French drain	NO ₃	Pu, Cs	6.7	50 - 100	
Fission Product-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-C-6	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	1.1	50 - 100	

Table B.3. Liquid Disposal Sites with Long-Lived Radionuclides and Greater than 10 Pore Volumes

Site	Facility Type	Mobile Constituents	Immobile and/or Long-Lived Constituents	Number of Pore Volumes	Natural Recharge (mm/yr)	Baseline Information
Scavenged Waste Group						
217-T-26	Crib	U, Tc, CN, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	17.6		1977, 1978, 1993
Chemical Sewer Group						
216-S-11	Pond	U, I, Tc	Pu, Cs	20.4	50 - 100	
216-S-10D	Ditch	U, I, Tc	Pu, Am, Cs	192.2	50 - 100	
216-B-63	Trench	U, I, Tc	Pu, Am, Cs	658.1	50 - 100	
Plutonium/Organic-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-T-19	Tile field/crib	Tc, CCl ₄ , NO ₃ , I	Pu, Am, Cs	36.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-Z-12	Crib	U, Tc, CCl ₄ , NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	187.3	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-A-3	Crib	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	409.2	50 - 100	1977, 1978
Gable Mountain/B Pond and Ditch Cooling Water Group						
216-A-9	Crib	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	48.9	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-3	Pond and ditches	U, I, Tc	Pu, Am, Cs	105.1	50 - 100	
216-A-25	Pond	U, I, Tc	Pu, Am, Cs	445.2		
216-B-2-1	Ditch	I, Tc	Pu, Am, Cs	1338	50 - 100	
200 North Pond Cooling Water Group						
216-N-2	Crib	Tc, CCl ₄ , NO ₃ , I	Cs	10.3	0.5 - 5	
300 Area Chemical Laboratory Waste Group						
216-T-27	Crib	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	10.6	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-T-28	Crib	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	62.2	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
T Ponds/Ditches Cooling Water Group						
216-T-12	Trench	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	23.4	0.5 - 5	
Miscellaneous Waste Group						
216-U-3	French drain	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	20.3	50 - 100	
216-A-21	Crib	U, Tc, NO ₃ , Cr, I	Pu, Cs	32.8	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978
U Pond/Z Ditches Cooling Water Group						
216-U-10	Pond	U, I, Tc	Pu, Am, Cs	91.7	50 - 100	
216-Z-20	Crib	Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Am, Cs	172.7	50 - 100	
Uranium-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-A-36A/B	Crib	U, Tc, Cr, I	Pu, Am, Cs	19.5	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978, 1993
216-S-1&2	Crib	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	26.6	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-12	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	28.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-C-1	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	29.8	50 - 100	
216-U-8	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	34.1	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-S-7	Crib	U, Tc, NO ₃ , I	Pu, Cs	46.6	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-U-12	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Am, Cs	107.1	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-A-10	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Am, Cs	114.4	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978, 1993

Table B.3. (contd)

Site	Facility Type	Mobile Constituents	Immobile and/or Long-Lived Constituents	Number of Pore Volumes	Natural Recharge (mm/yr)	Baseline Information
216-U-1&2	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	115.5	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-A-5	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	557.3	0.5 - 5	1977, 1978
Organic-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-A-24	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	15.2	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-A-8	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	32.6	50 - 100	1977, 1978
Tank Waste Group						
216-T-32	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	11	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-T-7	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	12.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-T-6	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	34.5	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-B-7A&B	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	78.1	10 - 20	1977, 1978, 1993
Steam Condensate Group						
216-S-25	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	30	10 - 20	1977, 1978
216-A-37-2	Crib	U, Tc, I	Am, Cs	35.7	50 - 100	
216-S-5	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	55.6	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-B-55	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Am, Cs	67.5	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-S-6	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	127.3	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-A-6	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	147.7	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-A-30	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Am, Cs	223.9	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
200 Areas Chemical Laboratory Waste Group						
216-Z-17	Trench	U, Tc, I	Pu	11.1	50 - 100	
216-B-10A	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, Cr, I	Pu, Cs	21.5	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-S-20	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	22.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-S-26	Crib	NO3, I, Tc	Am, Cs	23.4	50 - 100	
216-U-4A	French drain	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	27.3	50 - 100	
216-Z-16	Crib	Tc, I	Pu	44.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-B-6	Reverse well	Cr		4285.7	50 - 100	
General Process Condensate and Process Waste Group						
216-A-37-1	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Am, Cs	23.7	50 - 100	
Fission Product-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-S-3	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, Cr, I	Pu, Cs	12.6	50 - 100	
216-B-62	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Am, Cs	24.4	50 - 100	1977, 1978, 1993
216-B-57	Crib	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	14.6	10 - 20	1977, 1978, 1993
216-B11A&B	Reverse wells	U, Tc, I	Pu, Cs	174.9	10 - 20	1977, 1978, 1993
Plutonium-Rich Process Condensate/Process Waste Group						
216-Z-5	Crib	U, Tc, NO3, I	Pu, Cs	64.6	50 - 100	1977, 1978
216-Z-10	Reverse well	NO3, I, Tc	Pu, Am	1000	50 - 100	

waste. Because of their history and intended use, specific retention facilities are considered higher priority than the other facility types on the tables. (There is discrepancy among sources as to the name and type of many of the liquid waste disposal facilities at the Hanford Site.) By placing specific retention facilities higher on the list than other sites, most sites with fewer than 1 pore volume are at the top of the lists.

B.4 Monitoring Recommendation

Two recommendations are made concerning sites for potential vadose zone monitoring. First, the priority sites listed on Table B.1 should be considered first for future monitoring. Particular emphasis should be placed on specific retention facilities. Second, because of their use and history, specific retention facilities included on Table B.2 should receive second priority despite there being no baseline data.

B.5 References

40 CFR 265, Title 40, Part 265, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. "Interim status standards for owners and operators of hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities." *Code of Federal Regulations*.

Additon MK, KR Fecht, TL Jones, and GV Last. 1978a. *Scintillation probe profiles 200 East Area crib monitoring wells*. RHO-LD-28, Rockwell Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Additon MK, KR Fecht, TL Jones, and GV Last. 1978b. *Scintillation probe profiles 200 West Area crib monitoring wells*. RHO-LD-29, Rockwell Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Brodeur JR, RK Price, RD Wilson, and CJ Koizumi. 1993. *Results of spectral gamma-ray logging of select boreholes for the 200 Aggregate Area management study*. WHC-SC-EN-TI-021, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

DOE Order 5400.1. *General Environmental Protection Program*. U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.

DOE. 1996. *200 Areas soil remediation strategy - environmental restoration program*. DOE/RL-96-67, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland, WA.

DOE. 1997. *Waste site grouping for 200 Areas soil investigations*. DOE/RL-96-81. U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

Downs JL, WH Rickard, CA Brandt, LL Cadwell, CE Cushing, DR Geist, RM Mazaika, DA Neitzel, LE Rogers, MR Sackschewsky, and JJ Nugent. 1993. *Habitat types on the Hanford Site: wildlife and plant species of concern*. PNL-8942, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Fayer MJ, GW Gee, ML Rockhold, MD Freshley, and TB Walters. 1996. "Estimating recharge rates for a groundwater model using a GIS." *Journal of Environmental Quality*, v. 25, pp. 510-518.

Fecht KR, GV Last, and KR Price. 1977. *Evaluation of scintillation probe profiles from 200 Area crib monitoring wells*. ARH-ST.156, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Johnson VG, CJ Chou, and JW Lindberg. 1995. *Groundwater monitoring and assessment plan for the 100-K Area fuel storage basins*. WHC-SD-EN-AP-174, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Kincaid CT, MP Bergeron, CR Cole, MD Freshley, NL Hassig, VG Johnson, DI Kaplan, RJ Serne, GP Streile, DL Streng, PD Thorne, LW Vail, GA Whyatt, and SK Wurstner. 1998. *Composite analysis for low-level waste disposal in the 200 Area plateau of the Hanford Site*. PNNL-11800, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA.

WAC 173-303. "Dangerous waste regulations." *Washington Administrative Code*, Olympia, WA.

Waite JL. 1991. *Tank wastes discharged directly to the soil at the Hanford Site*. WHC-MR-0227, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Appendix C

Available Spectral Gamma-Ray Logs from Liquid Waste Disposal Facilities

Appendix C

Available Spectral Gamma-Ray Logs from Liquid Waste Disposal Facilities

This list of documents contains existing and published spectral gamma-ray logs obtained from boreholes monitoring past-practice liquid waste disposal facilities. The data are available for use as baseline logs for future spectral gamma-ray monitoring of the vadose zone at the Hanford Site. Also included in the list are references to the recently published spectral gamma-ray logs constituting the recently completed baseline logging of most single-shell tank farms.

DOE/ID/12584-268, GJPO-HAN-4. 1996. *Vadose zone characterization project at the Hanford tank farms, SX tank farm report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office and Grand Junction Office for Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

GJO-97-13-TAR, GJO-HAN-11. 1997. *Hanford tank farms vadose zone, TX tank farm report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office and Grand Junction Office for Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

GJO-97-1-TAR, GJO-HAN-8. 1997. *Vadose zone characterization project at the Hanford tank farms, U tank farm report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office and Grand Junction Office for Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

GJO-HAN-6. 1997. *Vadose zone characterization project at the Hanford tank farms, BY tank farm report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office and Grand Junction Office for Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

GJO-HAN-12. 1997. *Vadose zone characterization project at the Hanford tank farms, AX tank farm report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office and Grand Junction Office for Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

GJO-97-30-TAR, GJO-HAN-16. 1998. *Hanford tank farms vadose zone, TY tank farm report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office and Grand Junction Office for Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

GJO-97-31-TAR, GJO-HAN-17. 1998. *Hanford tank farms vadose zone, S tank farm report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office and Grand Junction Office for Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

GJO-98-39-TAR, GJO-HAN-18. 1998. *Hanford tank farms vadose zone, C tank farm report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office and Grand Junction Office for Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

GJO-98-40-TAR, GJO-HAN-19. 1998. *Hanford tank farms vadose zone, BX tank farm report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office and Grand Junction Office for Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

GJO-98-64-TAR, GJO-HAN-23. 1999. *Hanford tank farms vadose zone, A tank farm report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office and Grand Junction Office for Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA.

Brodeur JR, RK Price, RD Wilson, and CJ Koizumi. 1993. *Results of spectral gamma-ray logging of selected boreholes for the aggregate area management study*. WHC-SD-EN-TI-021, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Horton DG and RR Randall. 1998. *Results of 1998 spectral gamma-ray monitoring of boreholes at the 216-Z-1A tile field, 216-Z-9 trench, and 216-Z-12 crib*. PNNL-11978, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA.

Johnson VG. 1993. *Groundwater impact assessment report for the 216-Z-20 crib*. WHC-EP-0674, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Kos SE. 1995. *Report of spectral gamma-ray surveys acquired for the 100-UP-1 project*. WHC-SD-EN-TI-297, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Kos SE. 1995. *Report of spectral gamma-ray surveys acquired for the 100-UP-2 project*. WHC-SD-EN-TI-298, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Mitchell RM, KA Bergstrom, CJ Chou, DL Edwards, DG Horton, VG Johnson, BM Markes, TH Mitchell, RK Price, SP Reidel, KD Reynolds, and WR Thackaberry. 1998. *TWRS phase I privatization site preconstruction characterization report*. HNF-2067, Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc., Richland, WA.

Price RK. 1992. *Spectral gamma-ray log report for 200-BP-1 borehole surveys*. WHC-SD-EN-ES-029, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Price RK. 1993. *Spectral gamma-ray log report for 100 Area borehole surveys*. WHC-SD-EN-TI-123, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Price RK. 1993. *Spectral gamma-ray log report for radionuclide surveys acquired for 100-NR-1 operable unit*. WHC-SD-EN-TI-189, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Price RK. 1996. *Spectral gamma-ray logging for the 100-N Area; Hanford, Washington*. WHC-SD-EN-TI-261, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Price RK. 1996. *Spectral gamma-ray logging report for the six new characterization boreholes in the 100-FR-1 operable unit.* WHC-SD-EN-TI-258, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Singleton KM and KA Lindsey. 1994. *Groundwater impact assessment report for the 216-U-14 ditch.* WHC-EP-0698, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Szwartz GJ. 1996. *Spectral gamma-ray logging report for the 216-B-57 crib groundwater impact assessment.* WHC-SD-EN-TI-257, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, WA.

Distribution

No. of Copies

OFFSITE

J. Berwick¹
U.S. Department of Energy
Grand Junction Office
2597 B ¾ Road
Grand Junction, CO 81503

R. Buck, Jr.¹
Wanapum Indian Band
P.O. Box 878
Ephrata, WA 98823

S. Harris¹
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian
Reservation
P.O. Box 638
Pendleton, OR 97801

- 2 Nez Perce Tribe¹
Nez Perce Tribal Department of
Environmental Restoration and
Waste Management
P.O. Box 365
Lapwai, ID 83540-0365
Attn: D. Powaukee
S. Sobczyk

W. Riggsbee¹
Yakama Indian Nation
Environmental Restoration/Waste
Management Program
P.O. Box 151
Toppenish, WA 98948

No. of Copies

- 6 U.S. Department of Energy¹
Forrestal Building
1000 Independence Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585
Attn: J. S. Bachmaier (3)
M. K. Harmon (3) EM-44

ONSITE

11 DOE Richland Operations Office

E. M. Bowers ¹	S7-55
B. L. Foley ¹	H0-12
M. J. Furman ¹	H0-12
R. D. Hildebrand ¹	H0-12
R. A. Holton ¹	H0-12
P. E. LaMont ¹	A0-21
R. W. Lober ¹	A2-22
D. E. Olson ¹	H0-12
J. A. Poppiti ¹	S7-54
G. L. Sinton ¹	S7-55
K. M. Thompson ¹	H0-12

4 Bechtel Hanford, Inc.

K. R. Fecht	H0-02
B. H. Ford	H0-12
M. J. Graham	H0-21
G. B. Mitchem	H0-17

2 CH2M Hill Hanford, Inc.

V. J. Rohay	H9-02
C. D. Witreich	H9-03

¹Hard-copy distribution has been made to these individuals. Distribution to all other individuals was made electronically through <http://hanford.pnl.gov/groundwater>

**No. of
Copies**
**No. of
Copies**
Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc.
**Waste Management Federal Services, Inc.,
Northwest Operations**

J. D. Williams H0-21

J. E. Meisner H1-13

2 Fluor Daniel Northwest, Inc.
34 Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

F. M. Mann R1-04

R. W. Bryce K6-75

M. I. Wood H6-06

J. G. Bush K6-96

IT Corporation

M. J. Fayer K9-33

G. W. Gee K9-33

G. R. Holdren K6-81

D. A. Myers R1-04

D. G. Horton (10)¹ K6-81

V. G. Johnson K6-96

2 Lockheed Martin Hanford Corporation

G. V. Last¹ K6-81

L. F. Morasch¹ K6-86

E. A. Fredenburg R1-04

C. J. Murray K6-81

A. J. Knepp H0-22

T. L. Page K9-18

S. P. Reidel¹ K6-81

MACTEC-ERS

R. J. Serne K6-81

R. M. Smith K6-96

J. F. Bertsch B1-42

M. D. Sweeney K6-81

A. L. Ward K9-33

**3 State of Washington Department of
Ecology**

G. Whelan K9-36

B. A. Williams K6-81

Information Release Office (7) K1-06

L. J. Cusack B5-18

S. L. Dahl-Crumpler B5-18

D. N. Goswami B5-18

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

T. C. Post B5-01

¹Hard-copy distribution has been made to these individuals. Distribution to all other individuals was made electronically through <http://hanford.pnl.gov/groundwater>