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ABSTRACT

A graded approach to flow and transport modeling has been used as a cost effective solution to evaluating potential groundwater risk in support of Deactivation and Decommissioning activities at the United States Department of Energy’s Savannah River Site. This approach incorporates both simple spreadsheet calculations and complex numerical modeling to evaluate the threat to human health posed by contaminants leaching from decommissioned concrete building slabs. Simple spreadsheet calculations were used to produce generic slab concentration limits for a suite of radiological and non-radiological contaminants for a chemical separations area at Savannah River Site. These limits, which are based upon the United States Environmental Protection Agency Soil Screening guidance, were used to eliminate most building slabs from further risk assessment. Of the more than 58 facilities located in the area, to date only one slab has been found to have a contaminant concentration in excess of the area specific slab limit. For this slab, a more rigorous numerical modeling effort was undertaken reducing the conservatisms inherent in the spreadsheet calculations.
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Using the more sophisticated numerical model, it was possible to show that the remaining contaminant of concern would not likely impact groundwater above drinking water standards.
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**INTRODUCTION**

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Savannah River Site (SRS) is an 800 km$^2$ DOE reservation in southwestern South Carolina. Five nuclear reactors were constructed in the 1950s to produce nuclear materials for national defense, primarily tritium and plutonium-239. Supporting facilities included two chemical separations plants, a heavy water extraction plant, a nuclear fuel and target fabrication facility, a tritium extraction facility, and waste management facilities. Today the SRS is primarily engaged in the processing of legacy nuclear wastes, environmental cleanup, nonproliferation activities, tritium recycling, and deactivation and decommissioning (D&D) of legacy facilities.

D&D is a major emphasis at the SRS with 700,000 m$^2$ of radiological and chemical facilities slated for demolition by 2025. Most buildings will be demolished leaving behind only the concrete slab that formed the building foundation. It is necessary to demonstrate that risk-based criteria have been met for the concrete slab end state. Slabs that pose unacceptable risk are subsequently scabbled or removed entirely to reduce or eliminate the associated risk. Typically, the limiting component of the risk assessment is to determine the potential impacts to groundwater from contaminants leaching from the concrete slabs.
SRS has employed a graded approach as a cost effective solution to evaluating potential groundwater impacts which incorporates both simple spreadsheet calculations and complex numerical modeling to cost effectively evaluate the threat to human health posed by potential impact to groundwater. The simple spreadsheet calculations produce generic derived guideline concentration levels (DCGLs), or slab limits, based upon the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) soil screening guidance protocol for comparison to subsequent end state verification sampling results. For this analysis, the DCGL may be defined as the maximum allowable contaminant concentration in the concrete that will not exceed the groundwater Safe Drinking Water Act Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) or EPA Region IV preliminary remedial goals (PRGs) within a 1000 y time period.

In most cases, no further analysis is required. However, when concentrations are found that exceed the slab limit for a given analyte, a more rigorous modeling effort is undertaken reducing the conservatisms inherent in the simple screening calculation. In most cases, the more rigorous modeling exercise shows risk levels to be acceptable allowing the concrete slab to be left in place.

This paper describes the graded approach employed at SRS and provides an overview of the screening and rigorous methods used to evaluate potential impacts to groundwater. A case study is presented where the graded approach was successfully used to evaluate potential groundwater impacts from a chemical separations facility at SRS.
METHODS

The graded approach to flow and transport modeling used at SRS incorporates both screening level spreadsheet calculations and complex, numerical modeling. The premise of this approach is that simple spreadsheet calculations can be used to eliminate most building slabs from further, more complicated and time consuming analysis. For this analysis, VZCOMML© (Rucker 1999 and 2004) was used to develop DCGLs for potential impacts to groundwater from metals, inorganic compounds, volatile organic compounds, and radionuclides leaching from concrete slabs in F-Area of SRS. In the case where a contaminant was found at a concentration in excess of the DCGL established using VZCOMML©, more detailed analysis was conducted using the PORFLOW™ simulation package.

VZCOMML© is a conservative spreadsheet based model that can be used as a preliminary tool to evaluate the potential for vadose zone contamination to impact groundwater. The model simulates transport in the vadose zone by steady-state one-dimensional flow and represents average flow conditions over the period of interest. The analysis approach employed within the VZCOMML© suite is consistent with the approved Contaminant Migration Protocol of the Federal Facility Implementation Management Plan and EPA Soil Screening Guidance (EPA 1996).

The conceptual model for the spreadsheet calculations assumes that complex building geometries and contaminant distributions can be represented as simple slabs with uniformly distributed contamination. The general conceptual
model for VZCOMML© is presented in Figure 1. The model allows up to four layers to describe the vadose zone in addition to the source layer and aquifer layer. Thickness, porosity (total and effective), and hydraulic conductivity are specific for each layer.

The spreadsheet model 1) estimates the theoretical peak groundwater concentration for an analyte at the surface of the water table and 2) predicts the time to maximum groundwater concentration at a down gradient receptor by application of a dilution factor. The nature of the input data and the analytical model assumptions are such that the estimated groundwater concentrations are conservative. Analytes with maximum concentrations predicted to occur within 1000 y are then compared to the MCL or PRG. A time limit of 1,000 y is used to determine if constituents have the potential to pose a future leachability risk based upon the SRS Contaminant Migration Protocol.

There are several simplifying assumptions associated with the model. The most significant is that the concrete slab may be represented as soil. This is a conservative assumption because concrete would be expected to delay the release of contaminants to the environment due to its low hydraulic conductivity and diffusion coefficient compared to most soils. Other assumptions include the contaminants are homogenously distributed throughout the subsurface, the system is at equilibrium, and soil/water partitioning is reversible, instantaneous, and linear in the contaminated zone. VZCOMML© assumes that the receptor well is located at the edge of the source and screened within the plume. Dispersion is not
incorporated into the vadose zone flow estimate because in most cases it minimally affects the maximum groundwater concentration.

Lithologic data from F-Area was used to establish the four vadose zone layers allowed by VZCOMML©. Table 1 lists the inputs for the vadose zone layers used in the model setup. The parameters used to describe the saturated zone (i.e. water table aquifer) are given in Table 2.

\textit{\textsuperscript{129}I PORFLOWTM Analysis}

Of the more than 58 facilities in F-Area, only one building slab has been found to have a contaminant concentration in excess of the area specific slab limit determined using VZCOMML©. The contaminant of concern for this slab was \textsuperscript{129}I. For this slab and contaminant, a more detailed analysis was conducted using the PORFLOW\textsuperscript{TM} simulation package (ACRI, 2000). PORFLOW\textsuperscript{TM} is a numerical code used to solve problems involving transient and steady-state fluid flow, heat and mass transport in multi-phase, variably saturated, porous or fractured media with dynamic phase change. PORFLOW\textsuperscript{TM} has been widely used at the SRS and in the DOE complex to address major issues related to the groundwater and nuclear waste management.

PORFLOW\textsuperscript{TM} Version 5.97.0 was chosen for the more rigorous simulation of flow and transport in the vadose zone for the F-Area \textsuperscript{129}I analysis. Several conservative assumptions inherent to VZCOMML© were eliminated using the more sophisticated PORFLOW\textsuperscript{TM} model. Facility specific input parameters were used including building geometry, slab thickness, material properties, and depth to water table. Unlike with VZCOMML©, in PORFLOW\textsuperscript{TM},
the source layer was represented as concrete and the main mechanism for
contaminant transport from the slab was diffusion rather than advection.

The conceptual model for the F-Area PORFLOW™ analysis considered
the movement of water and contaminants through the facility and vadose zone in
two dimensions. The two dimensional model represents a transverse slice through
the facility and surrounding porous media (Fig. 2).

The selection of appropriate physical and chemical parameters is an
important step in the process of simulating the movement of water and
contaminants through the vadose zone. For most parameters, a wide range of
applicable values are reported in the literature with only limited SRS specific data
available. In general, a conservative but realistic approach was used in the
selection of input parameters for this analysis. Material properties and parameter
values used in the PORFLOW™ vadose zone flow and transport model are listed
in Tables 3 and 4.

PORFLOW™ requires that boundary conditions be defined in order to
solve the equations for flow. The top of the model domain was established as a
constant flux boundary. Because the model domain extends laterally beyond the
facility, a portion of the upper boundary is concrete and the remainder is soil.
PORFLOW™ can accommodate variable flux assignments to boundary elements
and two infiltration rates were used to define the flux for this boundary. The
bottom of the model domain was established as a constant head boundary
maintained by the presence of the water table. The left and right boundaries were
set as no flow boundaries.
Boundary conditions for the mass transport simulations were set as follows for the model domain. The left and right boundaries were established as no flux boundaries consistent with the no flow boundaries used in the flow simulations. For the upper boundary, the infiltrating water was assumed to have a concentration of zero. For the bottom boundary, the concentration gradient normal to the boundary was set to zero. This boundary condition sets the diffusive flux across the boundary equal to zero and allows contaminant mass to be removed from the model domain by advection only.

RESULTS

VZCOMML® was used to calculate DCGLs for 96 contaminants including 41 radionuclides. Of these contaminants, only $^{129}$I has been measured in a F-Area slab at concentration exceeding the screening level DCGL of 0.035 Bq g$^{-1}$. This slab was further evaluated using the PORFLOW™ simulation package.

Flow and transport simulations were conducted using the PORFLOW™ simulation package to refine the DCGL for $^{129}$I. The steady state saturation profile and groundwater velocity fields are given in Figures 3 and 4. These figures show that the movement of water through the model domain is consistent with the boundary conditions selected. Flow near the left and right model boundaries is essentially vertical as controlled by the no horizontal flow boundary conditions for each scenario. The saturation profile (Fig. 3) shows that the facility is partially filled with water due to a small amount of infiltration through the vault cap as well as a small amount of seepage through the sides of the vault. The water level in the facility is approximately 5.5 m at steady state. The velocity
vectors through the model domain are consistent with the boundary conditions and material types (Figure 4). The vector field clearly shows that advective flow through the facility is minimal. Outside the facility, the velocity vectors are parallel to the concrete structure but the vectors bend tightly around the corner at the bottom. Flow at this point accelerates and sweeps along the bottom of the vault bending downwards toward the water table. This figure shows that contaminant release from the slab will be predominantly the result of diffusion and that once this contaminant reaches the soil beneath the facility it will be transported to the water table via advection by infiltrating rain water.

A total of five concrete samples were collected from the facility slab and analyzed for $^{129}$I. The measured concentrations were used to determine an area weighted average concentration of $^{129}$I of 0.039 Bq g$^{-1}$ for input into the mass transport simulations. The mass transport simulations were run for a 2000 y time period based upon the steady state flow field from the flow simulations. Results from the analysis showed the maximum $^{129}$I concentration in a down gradient receptor well to be 0.025 Bq L$^{-1}$ which is below the MCL of 0.037 Bq L$^{-1}$. The screening level DCGL of 0.035 Bq g$^{-1}$ is increased to 0.059 Bq g$^{-1}$ when impacts to groundwater are based on the more rigorous PORFLOW™ analysis, thereby yielding no potential impacts to groundwater for the contaminated slab.

CONCLUSION

In the graded approach to flow and transport modeling, the VZCOMML© model is used to establish screening level conservative slab limits for comparison to measured concentrations of contaminants of concern. If the measured
concentration of a contaminant exceeds the slab limit, a more sophisticated numerical model such as PORFLOW™ can be used and often demonstrates that there is no potential impact to groundwater above drinking water standards. The graded approach to assessing groundwater risk due to contaminants leaching from concrete slabs has been successfully used at SRS to reduce costs and to accelerate the decommissioning schedule.
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Table 1. Vadose zone parameters used in VZCOMML© for F-Area calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thickness, m</th>
<th>Effective Porosity (Looney et al. 1987)</th>
<th>Total Porosity (McDowell-Boyer 2000)</th>
<th>Hydraulic Conductivity, m y⁻¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>0.15ᵃ</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>5ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃA source layer thickness of 0.05 m was used for radionuclides (except tritium).
ᵇThe hydraulic conductivity of clay was used for the source layer, which was the lowest available conductivity in VZCOMML© Version 3.01.
Table 2. Aquifer parameters used in VZCOMML© for F-Area calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slab length parallel to groundwater flow, m</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>Site ArcGIS coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infiltration rate, m y⁻¹</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Looney et al. 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquifer hydraulic conductivity, m y⁻¹</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>Flach and Harris 1999; Flach 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquifer thickness, m</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Flach and Harris 1999; Flach 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydraulic gradient, m m⁻¹</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td>Hiergesell 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Material Properties used in the Facility Specific PORFLOW™ Vadose Zone Flow and Transport Simulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Gravel</th>
<th>Native Soil</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturated hydraulic conductivity, $K_{xx}=K_{yy}$</td>
<td>1.0x10^{-10}</td>
<td>1.0x10^{-2}</td>
<td>1.0x10^{-3}</td>
<td>cm sec^{-1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porosity, $\eta$</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle density, $\rho_s$</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>g cm^{-3}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Parameter Values used in the Facility Specific PORFLOW\textsuperscript{TM} Vadose Zone Flow and Transport Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slab Apparent diffusion coefficient, $D_a$</td>
<td>$5.01 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>cm$^2$ sec$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Apparent diffusion coefficient, $D_a$</td>
<td>$5.01 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>cm$^2$ sec$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal dispersivity, $\alpha_L$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse dispersivity, $\alpha_T$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution coefficient ($K_d$) for the native soil material type</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>ml g$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution coefficient ($K_d$) for the concrete material type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ml g$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilution Attenuation Factor (DAF)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>Unitless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{129}$I half life</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infiltration rate over soil</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>m y$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infiltration rate over concrete</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>cm y$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCL</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>µg L$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Results from the Facility Specific PORFLOW\textsuperscript{TM} $^{129}$I Transport Simulation for a Water Table Receptor Well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time to Peak (y)</th>
<th>Peak Concentration (Bq L$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>DCGL (Bq g$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Table Boundary</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.0195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptor Well</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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