

PRNC191

PRNC ? 191

PUERTO RICO NUCLEAR CENTER

we

?THERMOLUMINESCENCE DOSIMETRY IN

NORTHWEST PUERTO RICO

By

Arthur MeB. Block

Richard G. Clements

Luis tvin Rosa

and

Felix Santos

July 1, 1975

OPERATED BY UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO UNDER CONTRACT

'NO. AT (40:1)1898 POR US ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

---Page Break---

THERMOLIMINESCENCE DOSIMEERY IN WORTEWEST PUERTO RICO

By

Arthur MeB. Block

Richard G. Clements

ale Ivan Rosa

and

Félix Santos

Terrestrial Ecology Progran

Puerto Rico Nuclear Center

Caparra Hgts. Sta.

San Juan, P.R.

With contributions from:

Mario D. Banus

Marine Biology Division

Puerto Rico Nuclear Center

Mayaguez A. & MN.

Mayaguez, P.R.-

Robert Munson and Jones Parrish

Isiote Project

Puerto Rico Nuclear Center

Mayaguez A. & Me

Mayaguez, P.R.

Bagardo Hernandez*

Rolando Mocquera*

and

Karl Prado

Radiological Health

Medical School

University of Puerto Rico

Medical Sciences Campus, U.P.R.

(Radiological Health Program)

Administered By

Dr. E.T. Agard

Puerto Rico Nuclear Center

Caparra Hgts. Sta.

San Juan, P.R.

Final fulfillment of requirements for the degree: Masters in Public

Health, Radiological Health Major.

---Page Break---

Dedication

Chapter I.

opp

Chapter IZ.

AL

3

ACKIONEDGDENTS

?The Radiological Survey

Introduction

Stations Descriptions

?Experinental Design

Retults and Discussion

Statistical Variation of CaF: Dy

Dosimeters (T1D-200) Response Under

Laboratory Conditions.

Introduction and Experimental Design

Rejection Parameters for Field Dose

Determinations.

Extrapolation and Interpolation of

Calibration Curve

Caveat Lector

Computer Program, TIDCAIC (FORTRAN TV)

for Dose rate Calculations, Pair Value

Rejections and Field Data Cross Referencing.

output Data from TEDCALC for

All Stations and Station Locations.

---Page Break---

Dedication:

This contribution is respectfully dedicated to Dr. F. G-

Loman, Associate Director, Puerto Rico Nuclear Center

for his help and advice in its formulation and execution,

ACTON LEDOIMERT

In a program of the scope described herein, there are many contributors, not all of whom can be considered directly responsible for the program, but without whom, the program could not have been

Developed to the scale described. Among these we cite the following:

Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority (PARA), Nuclear

Power Development Division directed by Dr. Juan Bonnet, and supporting
Giath Raul McClint, Rodolfo Gauthier and Engrs: Gramaiges and Mejiss
suggested helpful suggestions and provided interagency contacts. The
RRA provided all equipment, supplies and support for personnel for
the completion of this work.

ng. Daniel Lebrón Pitre, M. Nucl. Eng. helped in developing
techniques suitable for Local application and carried out some early
Development alternatives related to the technique. PRC, Dr. Aviva
Giteadl, Nuclear Engineering Department, made several helpful sug-
gestions and provided several important references for study.

Field station emplacement and instrumental security could not

have been established without the help of the following people:

1. Gilberto Inarraza, Puerto Rico Ports Authority, Port Director,
Arecibo Airport, Arecibo, Puerto Rico.

2. Engr's. John MacGregor, Glenn Marshall and Dr. Woody Harris,
Ferro Snginners, Barceloneta Temporary Station, P.O. 11427,
Barceloneta, Puerto Rico.

3. Field Mgr. Victor Candelaria, Puerto Rico Power and Light (Autori-
fai de Puentes Fluviales), Florida Adentro, Puerto Rico.

Eng. Rubén Ranos, Hydroelectric Power Station, Dos Bocas, Puerto Rico,

5. Engr's, Mercedo and Gil Serrano, Puerto Rico Aqueducts and Sewers
Authority, Arecibo and Charen Hondo Stations, Arecibo, Puerto Rico.

---Page Break---

Supervisors: Carlos Acevedo and Roberto Garefa, Puerto Rico Power
and Light (Autoridad de Puentes Fluviales), Quebradillas, Puerto
Rico.

Finally, we must acknowledge the high level of support in data

feived from Dr. Severino Ramos, Director,
o Piedras and several of bis operational ataft
Ms. Viva Marqués, Mr. Fatsto Verges, Mr. Miguel A. L pez and

processing work which we rec
Computer Center, UPR, Ric Pit
members:

---Page Break---

(CHAPTER

?THE RADIOLOGICAL SURVEY

yy

?avthur MoB. Block

Richard G. Clenents

Robert Munson

Janos Parrish

I. Rosa

ona

Félix Santos

---Page Break---

A, Introduction

Thermoluminescent dosimetry (TLD) has been described most succinctly by Cameron, Suntharalingam and Kenney (1968). The idea that ionizing radiation damage in doped crystal material could be used as a basis for radiation dosimetry appears to have originated with Dantels (1950). The basic physical phenomenon which is used for TLD can be adequately described by a simple crystal model as follows:

Ionizing radiation impinging upon certain crystalline material can create meta-stable states above the ground state (valence band) and below the conduction band and can liberate electrons which can populate these states. Subsequent annealing of the

material caus

?the electrons to return to the ground state (valence end). This repatriation of electrons is accompanied by the emission of visible Light of frequency determined by the energy difference between the metastable state (trap) and the valence band.

?Thus, the amount of radiation which has been received by the material can be inferred by measuring the amount of Light emitted (TL) by the material upon subsequent annealing. This technique has evolved through a series of studies using materials such as lithium fluoride (LiF) (Danieis soyd and Sanders, 1953), calcium fluoride containing small amounts (0.1%) of manganese (CaF₂:Mn) (Ginther and Kirk, 1957) and more recently, calcium fluoride doped with small amounts of

europium (CaF₂:Eu) (Lindeken, Jones and McMillen, 1971; Lebrén, 1974).

---Page Break---

In October, 1973, the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority sought the initiation of studies aimed at determining background radiological characteristics of the northwestern quadrant of Puerto Rico.

Some of the studies were required for supporting data for the environmental report submitted as part of the licensing procedure in the establishment of the nuclear electric power generation facilities in Barrio Isote, Arecibo, Puerto Rico. (Fig. 1). Previous studies of radiological characteristics of the area include the "Acro-radioactivity Survey and Geology of Puerto Rico (AM9-1)" (Mackallor, 1966) which consisted in mapping the radioactivity emanating from the surface of Puerto Rico using sodium iodide sensing equipment in an airplane flying at an altitude of 500 ft. The results are expressed in counts per second, and provide useful comparative levels for radioactivity observed in various sections of the Island.

The only thermoluminescent TL studies yet undertaken in Puerto Rico in conformance with Environmental Protection Agency requirements that the dose measurement be made at a height of 3 ft. were those undertaken for the environmental report of Aguirre, Puerto Rico (Westinghouse

Electric Corp., 1972), and the FRNC preliminary data evaluation for the

environmental report of Isote (Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, 1974), Estimates of human dose equivalents in Puerto Rico have also

been made and partially checked using TID (Lebrén, 1974).

---Page Break---

Station Descriptions

The stations elected for study were believed to be located in directions in which natural (or accidental) plant emissions from Isolate would travel. Thus, the preliminary data base could be useful as a baseline data for comparison with measurements obtained during nuclear plant construction at Isolate, or after such a plant were put into operation

the low-lying vegetation, tree bole direction as well as the directions assumed by wind-swept palm boles all indicated low elevation wind direction in the prevailing on-shore trade wind directions. Thus wind currents were assumed directed predominantly toward the western south western, and south-south western parts of the island. Subsequent wind rose data taken within the proposed exclusion zone have supported these observations in full, at all altitudes (Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, 1974).

The full station descriptions including the approximate distances from the proposed plant site at which dosimeter pairs were placed is shown in Table 1.1. All station locations except Barceloneta, Florida Adentro

?and Islote vere located in prevailing wind directions from lelote.

Barceloneta and Florida Adentro lie in directions off the principal wind vector @irections, but date from these areas can be useful for comparison with umusual climatological conditions or aberrations in the ?usial air mass flow, ?Thue virtually complete land-side dosimetry was carried out. ?The relative locations of the stations can be inferred from

Fig. IT.

---Page Break---

©. Experimental Design

?The comercially available Harshaw-2000 TLD reader was the

This instrument consists

asic instrument used with CaF: Dy dosimeters,

of two parte. The detector part has heating planchet on which the 3/4

x 1/k inch square dosimeter 1s heated for given period of time between

carefully paintained temperature Limits. In the experiments carried out

?the heating eyele wes for @ 30 second period, with initial heating of

?the platinum planchet from lo?C to 2ho"C in approximately 10 seconds

followed by approximate 20 ceconds at the 240°C temperature level. AI).

calibration and field dose T's received precisely the same temperature program described. The light emitted by the dosimeter upon heating is sensed by a photomultiplier tube.

The second part of the instrument measures the current from the photomultiplier tube and integrates it over the thirty second temperature program. Thus the TL read by the "integrating picoammeter" is in photomultiplier charge or current-time units. These current time units can only be related to the radiation dose received by the dosimeter if the machine is calibrated using dosimeters exposed to precisely known ionizing radiation doses before the field dose is accumulated.

The calibration of dosimeters was carried out using a Cs-137 source at a distance (75 inches) from the dosimeter which was packed in a black plastic bag. Details of the PRI Cs-137 standard source activity, determination can be obtained from Mr. Santiago Gómez, Health and Safety Division, Puerto Rico Nuclear Center. Inference of source dose was obtained

---Page Break---

From the fact that on Nov. 25, 197, the source dose at 75 inches was 7.8150 aR/hr

Dosimeters were calibrated by exposing them to the Cs-137

source for three different periods of time estimated to give doses which upon readout would show TL's in the range in which field exposed dosimeter TL's lay. Conventional exposure times were between 11 and 72 minutes, ALL TL readouts, both on field exposed and calibration exposed dosimeters were carried out with dry nitrogen gas purging of the detector system. This refinement is absolutely necessary when low dose (background) dosimetry is undertaken.

Alignment of dosimeters was necessary both before field placement and before readout. A typical exposure cycle was as follows. Each dosimeter was annealed for 1 hr. at 400°C and exposed to the first calibration dose. It was then maintained in lead shielding (1 1/2 inches) for 24 hours and then annealed at 80°C for 15 minutes. After cooling, it was readout over the 40°C - 240°C temperature program. The same cycle was repeated for calibration doses using two different Ce-137 source exposure times, each of which was different from the first exposure time. Then the dosimeters were annealed and placed in field mounts for a minimum field exposure duration of 2h days.

The field packs for mounting the dosimeters consisted of ultra low background polyethylene neutron activation vials. Two dosimeters separated by a short styrofoam plug were placed in each vial with an

piece of paper containing identification or cross referencing data. The

vial was tightly sealed and enclosed in a layer of black plastic electrician

9

---Page Break---

First, the CaF₂:Dy chip is not equally responsive to ionizing radiation of all types and all energies, and is mainly responsive to gamma and x-rays. Second, the TL emission of a CaF₂:Dy dosimeter tends to fade with time.

One alternative to the ionizing radiation energy problem is to enclose the CaF₂:Dy dosimeter vial in a lead sheath of .002 inches diameter and a tantalum sheath of .01 inches. This alternative could not be undertaken within the time permitted for the measurements, though a correction involving the ratio of TL for a typical TWD mm with and without the sheath has been written into the computer program. Thus all future data obtained using the sheathed configuration can be compared with the data presented herein.

A somewhat more conventional procedure is to assume that the energy distribution of gamma and x-rays in the environment is very nearly the same at the 3 ft. level over all time and that a simple factor multi-

plied by the measured Co-137 aR equivalent will correct for the change in energy response and stopping power of CaF₂:Dy when exposed to natural background radiation. Thus, multiplication of Cs-137 ek equivalents deduced from the observed TL after field exposure by the factor 2.5 yields the effective dose absorbed in mr (Lindeken, Jones and McMillen, 1971).

Two different approaches may also be used for the fading correction. Lebrin (1971) applied a 20% increase to the measured dose based on the signal loss observed when dosimeters were exposed for 1/2 of the standard time interval and then shielded in lead for the remainder of

a

---Page Break---

of the time, The measured "1/2-dose" was compared with the dose measured on dosimeters exposed for the full time interval.

Alternatively, one may use a fading correction which stays relatively constant after the first 24 hours, deduced from the fading data of Derhan, Kathren and Corley (1972). Their data indicates that for exposures in excess of 24 days a correction of 164 % is realistic for CaF₂:Dy. The field exposures were over periods in excess of 2 days, and

many were in excess

of the 33 day exposures by Lebron (1974). Thus the correction referred to as the "Denhan correction" in this report is an upward adjustment of 164 of the indicated dose,

Di Results and Discussion

The results are summarized in Tables 1.2 - 1.5. The measured dose rates which passed the rejection tests applied in computer program TUDCALC are grouped according to the station in which the pairs were located, these tables also give percent uncertainty in dose rate as calculated using the analysis in Chapter II. The mean dose rate for all dosimeter pairs associated with a particular station and the estimated uncertainty in the mean of the two values of each pair plus the mean estimated uncertainty for all the pairs is also given.

The values for Arecibo indicate rather low dose rates

Data

collection in Arecibo was difficult because of the amount of pilferage, vandalism, or other losses of dosimeter vials and dosimeters

were set out for extended periods. The area from which the data were

collected was approximately two square miles. Highest and Lowest, doses

were reasonably close and the standard deviation of the pairs over the

surveyed it not Large (Table 1.6).

we

---Page Break---

The four stations: Ielote, Arecibo, Arecibo Airport and Barce-

oneta gave substantially the same dose rate of 100-200 eps during the

AWS-1 survey (Mackallor, 1956), and within experimental error, the monn

up readings at the 3 ft. level reflect similar dose rates for those four

stations, the mean TLD reading for Florida Adentro, Charco Hondo and Dos

Bocas also are consistent with the ARMS-1 survey as are the Lares, San

Sebastián and quebradillas stations.

The Mayaguez station exhibits a dose rate which is still reasonable compared with ARUS-1 within the limits expressed by the mean standard deviation (Table 1.6), though slightly on the high side. It is suggested that this may be due to the fact that the area surveyed in Mayaguez was rather limited and a more widespread survey of the Mayaguez area such as the ARIS-1 survey might reveal a somewhat lower TLD dose than is indicated here.

It should be noted that the highest dose rate recorded during the TWD survey of Aguirre was at Sabana Liana (11.1-11.5 Micro-rad/hr) and the lowest was recorded at a dairy north of San Felipe in this region (7,107.5 Micro-rad/hr.). In no case did any of the data taken in the present study exceed about 17 Micro-rad/hr, with average values substantially below this value.

The TLD dose rate profile is, perhaps, better visualized by referring to Fig. 11. The route numbers of highways and secondary roads along

which dosimeters were placed are given in parentheses. The large type

---Page Break---

numbers beneath the station names are the mean doses for the stations

sampled, the areas encompassed by a station can be approximated by subtracting the values given for station sampling distances in Table 1.1.

Throughout this analysis, the fading correction preferred has been that given by Dexham, Kathren and Corley (1972) rather than Lebron (1974) because the following experiments indicated that even heavy lead

shielding unless:

used under well-controlled conditions, may not keep the

CaF₂:Dy dosimeters from being exposed.

At each station, three lead blocks were stacked up. Each

Lead block was cylindrical, 6 inches in diameter and 3 inches thick.

The center block had a small hole drilled through the center just

wide enough to contain a vial in which were two dosimeters. These

setups are referred to as "STD" in Appendix II. At the beginning of

a particular time interval, a pair of dosimeters was placed inside this

shielding and retrieved when the other dosimeters in the station were retrieved, Sometimes the indicated dose of these "shielded" pairs was as high as 1 Micro-rads/hr and was never less than 0.7 Micro-rads/hr, Thus, corrections based upon maintenance of dosimeters with lead shields after being exposed for 1/2 of the exposure period seem to be subject to some uncertainty.

These results also indicate that the assumption in the error analysis (Chapter 17) that at zero dose, zero TI, will be observed may not

be at all correct. It is clear that uncertainties in the lower dose

are

---Page Break---

measurements (approximately the same order as the measurements themselves)

indicate that regression data used to test higher measured field doses is

suspect when attempts are made to extrapolate

these for use at the lower

doses

In view of this observation, it is felt that future measurements ought to make use of statistical sorting of dosimeter pairs or trios such as that used by Lebrin (197), of ultra low dose data for error and rejection analyses should be taken.

6

---Page Break---

Fig. TZ. Map of Puerto Rico Showing the Location of Barrio Islote, the Proposed Nuclear Plant Site and Distance (in Km.) to Major Coastal Towns and Cities.

---Page Break---

PUERTO RICO WATER RESOURCES AUTHORITY

NORTH COAST NUCLEAR PLANT

UNIT NO. 1

BACKGROUND RADIOLOGICAL SAMPLING

LOCATIONS AND PROPOSED SITE

FG 281

---Page Break---

Fig. IT. Map of Northwest Puerto Rico Showing Approximate Station Locations, Rosds and Highways Along Which Dosimeters were Placed (in Parentheses), and Mesn T1D-Weacured Doserates (Large Type Beneath Station Names).

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

Table 1.1

Station

Arecibo

Arecibo Airport

Barceloneta

chareo Hondo

Dos Bocas

Florida Adentro

Islote

Laree

Mayacue,

Quobradiitas

San Sebastian

15-20

B22

an-e5

Direction from

woR0-1 Site

WWF

sw

BSE - 8

WoW = Si

SSW

ser -8

Within Exclusion Zone

sw

ww

«

wow

---Page Break---

able 1.2

cums, ae tie

St, Bie, ?SSE

min ar Ente, (ene

Arecibo + 3% 6.23 +h

2

21g

185

Airport 6.630 + 20% 8.09, +1

009

6.665 20h

7179 1h

13.634 1

9.598 16

8.7 1%

22.168 1h

ie 4

8.708 Wh

6.12 1S

6.057 1

6.089 1%

7.694 1%

?Barceloneta, 5.758 + 2m 6.

Bs

iB 8

6.269 ah

?+ Using the ndeken-Denban corrections to the measured do

---Page Break---

?Table 1.3

Estimated Mean Moan Estimated

Uncertainty Dose Rate ?Uncertainty

Dose Rate Micro Dose Rat

t 4 9.98 +i%

1%

ih

ah

Dos Hocus + 8.95 119%

Florida + m6 sam

Raentre

BRUSRRRSRLE BRARRA

+ Using the Lindeken - Denham corrections to the measured dose.

---Page Break---

?Table 1.4

Islote 10.607,

8.906

9.696

8.271 Wh

1.825 Gh

etd ct

8.260 a

81460 1%

9.429 1h

9.227 xg

11.507

4.221 2

Tares: 1-559 + 20% 10.74 41%

8.594 18

7.960 1b

11.29, ls

7.833 1%

kg 1

11.553, 1h

13.085 1

a0tli90 im

e225 cred

9.061 Ft

16.982 ws

Mayasues 8.612 ax 9.32 +186

1.235 2,

ek 20h

8.650 wh

nize i

io.t03 xm

12.463 a

4 sing the Mndeken - Denha corrections to the measured dose.

---Page Break---

able 1.5

Catcuited

Dose Rate®

Station Micro

uebraaitias

San

Sebastian asa

Estimated.

10.67

Mean Estimated

Uncertainty

Dose Rate

+t

« Using the Lindeken - Denhan corrections to the measured dose.

---Page Break---

a et (02-00T a6 conte seer onsasoy,

4 we ?00-008 Secor appret gear serryrezaerd

a Ag't 006-002 igor oeL"et oun? upriewaes os

a we 005-05 nurot EIT esgre soe

9 out 0-008 68 eoo'tt we'9 swo0g s0q

6 get 08-002 66 ert eh opto oozwuy

a eve ose-008 49° 196" 910"9 oxsuapy WPHOTS

4 60 03-00 19 6leh eres ?vouopeora,

x wre 008-00 60"e negret 1s0"9 qaodsty oarooxy

? ert (002-00T 9 mee art oayoery

a et 02-00% we wos" ee"h syorst

(voysar3ea)

SAAT THERE OFA gE OT TT OT Sea COFRTS

?380g Jo suoyyuaxosgg oTHUTS Jo /squmOD ?90H ?29m 9800 ?S9y 9800

oxyeg Jo "ou UOFaBTASG ?Pas WueR ?O8OT T-SHEY co *sa9 3800]

Ort ores

---Page Break---

(CHAPTER II

SOATISTIONL VARIATION OF CaP, Dy: DOSIMETER (710-200)

RESPONGE UNDER TABORATORY CONDITTONS

wy

Artinar MeB. Block

Marto D.banus

Bagardo Hernández uéendes?

Rolando Mosquera Moreno?

Karl P, Prado!

ant

Pélex Santos Hernández

ABxperimental work carried out in partial fulfilment of the
Master in Public Health Degree offered in Radiological Health,
Medical Physics Program, Dr. E. 7. Agard, Director.

---Page Break---

Introduction and Experiment Description

In order to determine the uncertainty associated with ^{222}Rn (11p-200) dosimeter data for non-statistically-sorted groups, the following experiments were carried out, A group of 10 dosimeters (5 pairs) were exposed to known doses of gamma radiation using the PRNC Co-137 source. The first dose selected was approximately 2.75 mR, the second 7.75 mR. and the third 13.25 mR. The 10 dosimeters were taken through the following cycle 5 times at each dose at 400% for 1 hour

prior to irradiation, 2. Irradiation, 3, Storage for 2b hours in lead shielding. 4, Anneal at 80°C for 15 sinutes prior to thermoluminescence readout. 5. Readout over @ 50°C to 2N0C temperature range. Since the dosimeters are Light sensitive, care was exercised to exclude visible Light during handling and processing.

?The variation within the group of 10 as a function of dose was then evaluated. The variation of dosimeter pair values vas also of interest since field measurments vere undertaken vith pairs of dosimeters rather than vith single chips. The mean response per dose of single dosineters and for dosimeter paire wat of interest at the three doses because field doses below the lovest dosimeter calibration dose value were inferred by Linear extrapolation from the low dose value to zero dose (zero TL).

Likewise the doses which were sbove the highest calibration dose were ?also inferred from extrapolation using the intermediate and the highest

dose thermoluminescence (TL) response points to obtain TL response vs dose slope. this slope wae preemed to hold at higher field doses provided ?the doses were not excessively high (i.e. less than twice the highest

calibration dose).

---Page Break---

?The raw TL responses for the 10 dosimeters in the five experi-ments at each dose are presented in Tables 1, 2 and 3. Dosineter pairs

are taken to be consecutively numbered (i.e., 1&2, 3&4 etc.). The arithmetic mean TL response of all 10 dosimeters, and the standard deviation on a single TL-response from the entire group at each exposure is also tabulated. Also, the reproducibility of M-response for all 10 dosimeters exposed 5 times to the same dose is evaluated by calculating the mean TL for the 5 equal dose exposures and the standard deviation of a single TL response at a given exposure in the 5 exposure series. This latter quantity is probably most important in determining whether or not Pairs of TL values for field exposures ought to be rejected on the basis

of failure to lie within reasonable statistically variable Limits:

B, Rejection Parameters for Field Dose Determination

Implicit in any criterion for rejection of pairs of T-values is an acceptance of some absolute calibration value or a group of absolute calibration values in the absence of a known scaling factor (Linear or non-linear). Our criterion for rejection of field dosimeter readings is based on the TL-indicated Cs-137 equivalent dose in aR and our assumption of absolute values involves an acceptance of the (2-137 standard source values given.

A cursory inspection of the standard deviations of single chips exposed to particular levels of radiation (Tables 1, 2 and 3) indicates that, with the possible exception of the highest dose, a simple differential propagation of uncertainties (Daniels et al, 1952; Pugh and Winslow,

2966) in the pair means is a slight over-simplification of the problem of

estimation of uncertainties were it not for the fact that no weighted

73

---Page Break---

function is used to calculate the pair means. A simple arithmetic function is used which does not imply differential multipliers other than unity.

The calculated propagated uncertainties in TL using pairwise averaging are given in Table 4 as a function of dose, with the average uncertainty for the pairs.

In practice the uncertainties calculated can be used by fitting

the dose to the TL values using a known functional dependence. In the low dosage region, this functional dependence is very nearly linear, thus the TL per unit dose are 0.52 and 0.49h for the doses of 2.71, 7.676 and 13.158 aR respectively. Assuming zero TL with zero dose, convenient, the equation for dose as a function of Tt is:

$T = a + bD^c$

in which D is the dose, T is the measured thermoluminescence and a, b, and c are constants. Using the dose and TL-values from Table 4, a, b, and c are 0.0075, -0.027871 and 2.225703 respectively.

of greater importance is the variation of uncertainty in T_f

Readings with dose changes and variations in uncertainty of indicated dose with changes in observed TL for the field-exposed dosimeter. In this case, a convenient equation which takes into account non-linear changes in uncertainties is a quadratic equation for ΔT_f , the deviation in thermoluminescence associated with an observed TL level. Expressing this uncertainty as a fraction of the measured TL, is somewhat more useful in the actual data analysis

The percent uncertainty in pair average for the three Cs-137

doses: 2.742, 7.676 and 13,158 aR are calculated to be: 22.09%, 14.90%

and 4,816 respectively from the data in Tables 1, 2 and 3.

---Page Break---

If the equation:

$\Delta T_f = a + b T_f + c T_f^2$

where a , b , and c are constants, is used, no assumption need be made for the uncertainty at

any TL level.

zero exposure (zero TL). the calculated values of d , ϕ and ψ from the data in Table are: 0.002783, -0.019297 and 0.249039 respectively.

the two regression equations - one for D and the other for ψ

Provide a basis for estimation of the uncertainty in sample dose of an empty dosimeter - AD.

thus if $D = D(TE)$,

(3) $a_0 - ?$ (4) O_m

recognizing that this is a first approximation to QD since the weighting function for AT: + (jt)

From equation (2),

in this case, is not unity.

(1) $Q_p = * G_a + 26T + c) AR.$

Pair values can now be rejected on the basis of whether or not the values of average dose of the pairs plus-or-minus some adjusted value of AD inferred from (1) overlaps the individual doses inferred from the measured TL values, the quantity AD with scaling factor of unity ought to be a

sufficient criterion provided that the coefficients a , μ , and ϕ and d , ϕ and f derived from experiments such as the one described are "double-blind" in nature, or that the dosimeters used to measure field dose are subjected to some sort of initial laboratory statistical selection before field use, by a single field investigator.

Assuming that the parameters char

acterizing the readout of

dosimeter TL i.e. heating cycle, nitrogen flow and annealment times are

---Page Break---

The same for both field and controlled exposure measurements the data in Tables 1, 2 and 3 is sufficiently general for field-correction applications such as pair value rejections,

Thus

(5) Ad = (021654 TH - wossthe H+ 2.205703). ATE

in which \bar{V} is the mean value for a dosimeter pair, V is calculated

from equation (2) and

$$V = \bar{V} - (HE)$$

As an illustration, consider what the estimated uncertainty

in D , AD , would be if a thermoluminescence of 1,245 resulted from the

mean of a field-pair measurement. From Table 4: TE

0.275 b

and ϕ are known, so AD of an inferred exposure is calculable. In

order to use this uncertainty data with other TE measurements on a

field-exposed dosimeter, the derivation of AD as a function of TE is

the most useful equation of all and it may be readily inserted in a

computer routine for testing the pattern of dosages calculated.

Thus Table 5 gives AD as a function of SL near three in om

dates. Using the same type of regression equation as before, a general

expression for the uncertainty in indicated dose

a function of indi

?gated dose may now be evaluated:

(Dad: = woe eg gt ry

{in Which the subscript J refers to dose indicated using the TL observed

for a field exposed dosimeter with? calibration data of TE as a function

of Yom dose. velusting the three constants from the data in Table 4,

(8) Ad; = .023835 ny? ~ cen Dy + 57655.

?This equation is the basis for estimated uncertainty in dose, when the

dose is derived ty interpolation of calibration dose vs TL points.

-6-

---Page Break---

C. Extrapolation and Interpolation of Calibration curves

?The inference of doses from ficld measurementns yielding TL values

which Lie between two know calibration points presents no serious obstacle,

Lebrén (1974) has used the statistics) sorting (selection) method with

dosimeter handling procedures currently in practics in the PRNC Terrestrial

Ecology laboratory facilities through it is unclear what statistical r

lection procedure was used in his work, Assuming Linear function of the

log of TL response versus calibration dose, his method has some advantage

relative rapidity with which many samples can be processed, and

his field dose uncertainty estimate:

are approximately 30%, not considered

@ large uncertainty for the type of field work which was carried out.

The data in Tables 1, 2 and 3 do show that a Linear interpol:

tion of calibration data can be used to derive unknown field doses from

measured TL's without introduction of excessive errors, provided doses

larger than approximately 15 mSv of Cs-137 equivalent are not encountered

Using @ standard 30-50 day 10^{-14} exposure for the characterisation of local

environmental radioactivity Cs-137 dose equivalents as high as 10 mSv have

been infrequently encountered. In areas of high dose rate, shorter field

exposure times can be used to maintain the lower uncertainties introduced by the Linear interpolation approximation, Another alternative in this case is to select chips which have lower sensitivity, since this characteristic can vary widely from chip to chip. Our experience indicates that overlong exposure times increase the risk of vandalism of dosimeters placed in field stations, Furthermore, long exposures may be impractical since

mp fs used

an environmental monitor under future Nuclear Regulatory

Commission (NRC) policy committee.

-T-

---Page Break---

Extrapolation of calibration dose versus TL curves to doses below

the lowest TL observed in the Ce-137 calibration is difficult. It is not

clear that the measurement techniques used in this study warrant the assumption of zero TL for zero dosage. Thus Linear or first order slope-correction derived curves from zero dose up to the lowest, calibration dose may be subject to errors in TL approaching the values of the indicated aoe. Some of the experiments described in chapter 1 suggest that an uncertainty of 100% is not unreasonable if the linear extrapolation is employed. The additional assumption that the lowest calibration dose point is fixed and absolutely correct for the purposes of zero-to- lowest-dose slope determination is not good. However, in the absence of reliable very low dose data, this approach has been used and the values which result should be regarded as trend indicators, unsuitable for all but the most qualitative of interpretations.

D. Caveat

The analysis presented above is a practical approach to a field research problem. The confidence which can be placed in single field Measurements carried out at different times (and frequently at different Locations) is never very great. There simply is no substitute for the classic F and t tests when data significance is at issue, Such tests generally need considerable data taken over the same period of time, using

substantially the same techniques in order to be conscientiously applied,

In this, the initial survey of Northwest Puerto Rico, resources of man power, instrumentation and (most important) time did not permit

more than a general description of radiation levels using TLD. Presumably,

+8.

---Page Break---

future measurements of background radioactivity will

be possible to build

upon the experience obtained herein, Analysis of variance using

accepted techniques

should be high on the list of priorities in such

future studies.

---Page Break---

?Table 1

2.741 ae

?TORETBORTE Tea oS Str ver

| Posineter # in Bogue 2 2 3 Swposures Single Exposure,

a 1.183 2.549 1,600 1.407 1.285 1.605 + 0.550

2 0.953 1.0ke 1.128 1.261 2.269 Las 5 0.238

3 L217 1.640 1.279 1.314 1.578 1.366 0.234

4 2.3MB 1.468 1.034 1.358 1.288 2.303 0.1m

5 2.040 2,626 1.438 1.157 1.289 1,310 £ 0.232

6 0.760 1.663 1.116 1.28 1.377 1.207 + 0.306

1 0.986 2.345 0.9m 1172 1.228 Lak + 0.261

8 1.065 1.302 1.089 1em 1.2 1.168 + 0.110

9 2.312 0.207 2.013 1.131 1.336 2.082 + Oto

do 1.47 2,001 1.073 1.151 1.359 12M 0.23%

Moan Response

(Intra-grou

Ton-sorted 10s. 1,383 1.207 1.26 1.298

St. Deviation

ofa single

Dosimeter

TL in the Group 40.176 £0.595 20.206 10.09% 40.131

---Page Break---

Table 2

Dove: 7.676 aR.

ILsReapanae aan of 3 Sea Deviation

Dosimeter # for Emomre 2 2 3b Brporures Single Exponure

a h.o6e 3.6 3.7 3.763 3.8868 3,770 ϕ 0.21h

2 3.979 2.577 Mobs 3.557 3.06 3.4m + 0.603

3 3.T15 2.730 3.936 3.296 3.203 3.356 + 0,48

4 3.904 2.65 3.977 3.658 3.608 3.564 40,534

5 3.716 2.596 3.910 3.376 3.176 3.359 + 0.538

6 3.705 2.593 4.013 h.o7e 3.637 3.660 + 0.643

1 3.s2 2.005 3.792 3.065 2.005 3.196 0.57

8 3.661 2.793 4.092 3,030 3.182 3.34 + 0.532

9 3.689 e7la 3.692 3.518 3.018 3.338 + 0.kes

10 3.754 eThr 3.815 4.00 3.b52 3.578 £0.58

Mean Response

Setar 3.706 2.722 3.908 3,601 3.306

Sta. Deviation

of & Single

Dosimeter TL

Am the Group

40.262 £0.45 40.134

0.368 40.315

---Page Break---

Th-Response Yeon of

Dosimeter # for Bposure 2 uw

L 5.646 5.638 5.832 5.405 5.79% 663,

2 5.899 5.551 5.631 5.337 5.797 5.643,

3 5.725 5.73 5.802 5.388 5.746 5.679

4 6.12 9.682 5.94 5.633 6.112 5.908

5 5.694 5.577 5.879 5.229 5.820 5.640

6 5.839 5.643 5.455 5.668 5.902 5.701 £0.176

7 5.521 5,386 5.620 5.797 5.534 5.572 +5 0.152

8 5.852 5.737 5.717 5.015 5.890 5.642 + 0.358

9 5.578 5.30 5.423 5.302 5.919 5.505 + 0.258

10 6.0N8 5.616 6.335 - 6.826 6.206 +2 0.508

Mean Response

(fon-sorted

Intragroup) 5.79 5.587 5.761 5.19 5.937

Sta. Deviation

of & Single

Dosimeter Ti

in the Group £0,200 20.2h2 40.263 40.043 10.353

---Page Break---

*dpy> pus 03 sommsodxe ot uodn posve

Sle-on6tlS ??RowronStaS?Slz"OnLog'S ?HBeroqtlg's ? GerregTEL'S «ce OGES's «geet
HS? OZNH'E nba OBS" E ZGGroole"E EBS *OZ60G"E gas rozO9H"E ?aSH"OFTAOTE hoe
S12 OySqe"T 2H rOGATT ? GETOFTNT'T ?aROGEOR"T ?ET-OSSEET ?Lomozage-y HR THL'2

TOE von Se vuta co Seek SONS =

ASETIATVLSNOM ?S°H'H CELVOWEONE RUIN SBOENAY HIVE I

4 ota

---Page Break---

Table 5

Dose a Az a > © a

a.ma 1.265 40.275 0.007238 -0.c27872 2.205703 40.606

1.616 34h 40.516 1.183

13.158 DMS 40.275 tong

---Page Break---

REFEREICES:

Cameron, J. R., Suntharalingam, N, and G. 1, Kenney, 1968.

"Thermoluminescent Dosimetry", Univ. Wisconsin Press, Madison,
Wisconsin,

Daniels, F., 1950. Thermoluminescence and related properties
of crystals, Symp. Chem. Phys. of Radiat, Dosimetry, Tech.
Command, U.S. Army Chem. Center, Maryland,

Daniels, F., Boyd C. A. and D. E., Saunders, 1953. Thermo-
luminescence as a research tool. Science 137, 33.

Daniels, F., Williams, J. W., Bender, P., Alberty, Re Ay and Cy
D. Cornwell, 1962. "Experimental Physical Chemistry", 6th
ed., Chap. 18, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York.

Denham, D. E., Kathren, R. L. and J. P. Corley, 1972. A CaF₂:
Dy thermoluminescent dosimeter for environmental monitoring.
Annual meeting Health Phys. Soc., Las Vegas, Nev., June 12-16,
BMWI-SA Publ, 4192,

Ginther, R. J. and R. D. Kink, 1957. "The thermo-luminescence
of CaF₂". J. Electrochem. Soc, 104, 365.

lebrén-Pitre, D., 1974. "Natural Radistion Exposure in Puerto Rico", M. Se. Thesis, Mayaguez, A. &M, University, Mayaguez, Puertd Rico.

Lindeken, C.L., Jones, D. E. and R. E. McMillen, 1971, Natural, ?terrestrial background variations between residencies, Univ. of calif. Doe. UCRLA72954,

Mackallor, J. A., 1966, "Aeroradioactivity Survey and Geology of Puerto Rico (ARMS-I)", U.S. Geological Survey and Div, Biol. Med., U.8,ABC Publ, CEX-61.7.2,

Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, 1974. ?Savironuental Report for North Coast Nuclear Plant flo. 1"; U.S. ABC Docket Wo. 50-376.

Pugh, E. M. and G. Hl. Winslow, 1966. "the Analysis of Physical Meastrenents", Chap, 11, Addigon-Wesley Publ, Reading, Nass.

Westinghouse Electric Corporation, 1972. "Puerto Rico ater Resources Authority Aguirre Pover Plant Complex Environmental

Report", Report No. WRA 46.

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

Lisaswwevatiainryass+ voowess+ opeUse + ooesereL MOR aT me ttaRtONeeeeHNe WOR LeHAS*

---Page Break---

4 °S9V19 = E LINI = 34x3 ONIRMIOZE ?= 9TEIVU == Bee LOFTS

aor

BHTL NETLNIINS S3LNRTW O2*2

Segaae HONNA LIOSAS 0

SOeCI3% AMINA INCAS HELEZ

van Susy) 61s

na= SOUASTAVIS 810 TI-eset ===

SNOLANDSxS Gna EZ HEF ZC Tee

lors2s91=3wrL 030K? 91V99T THO84aT we GOP TC

Rerzergtasdl) ? O3LeVIS TIVIUU Iss Bee FOR B6TZ7

asvn

---Page Break---

sigascanenea oo ton seeuayy

---Page Break---

225 sever iw ceae as « .

csr aatt Seva ae seus Alm

nas" aeron Sue tie fom tn

235 ester ww o 1 xo »

33s set ke fe Sar 3

335 thai Min 8 i bro ?

?asta? Seder? Chin wats Stoay

ati na Cte? ayo Mew S808 Ni

pesveree niNo 049

sooanetsoeaoicsisisas | Tete

et abe 7

oor eas Tues

---Page Break---

NOB ONY ROELOEINISIG AneDN2 N3ϕIONT_AHISA 21ϕPAEOME HII LYNAOS COT #100

(roses aos 3uhS0er?

wos awntoars

3 t100

Urey soy erga area

+900

?se00

se00

?e000

Fone

1505

40 ontovs wes snot 1334409 53

raSne3s801 Wangyn 3 nL

npWwaires 300 40.50"

nt Steak

Tefisvaw ded sLoaee> #09

~S00x3 01374, 341 Nt

¥ se o3a1393% 3500 dh S31vingIW9 Si49 seubt== 150-E2 NO TORR Ziv

43500 ¥9unos. L159 hd 30 INIW3WnSYSW ¥ S¥R vivo DanC ati "EKO

Mi sgavol (aa 341 A23e30 wAtalNI ui ca] ¥u2i¥3 If soTMm hows
+0mod3s"3NO-»31¥7 Bia OM ISI INO H2I M8) AUF EAL YO ORL S14s398
?31¥0 "(23999 OaviuNws *eid) nag 30 MOISALC AL29¥5 ONY. HAIN
mL Aa O31 dans "vivo. NOT ivwGLW) MAN Su¥O s3NLINOWERS 341535011
*Le1°83 40" Av230. ATI Wno390e LOL ALIAT ay a3e00s
noraveotwwa 361 susnroy e1}v9 cw¥vodea Nive MA a8 039N HY SONIL
YDunos"Leteso"anwe a 9wr sn on ivMa 9
?new woinn swaa¥1s00 sS0ax3-c%s1a wotewa vos
?whon ¥3a Sie¥O¥DIW NI Siveasou OwfdeD¥ave Si SSLYIAOWD 9920
WV) ahi ?5161 ?AWW ?5600 ?COTY Cu¥ane s¥EcaTE OTH
IOWSH 3170N6 AL 33H
\\DoveaTaeaad Gly Mt
ARSON Sem 520

wos \$1 20¥0

*SIOK Wawa. "¥9IN39 wyatOMN ODte OLeaN

30 Wausen aut 40 Anau VUNG. WI Lee

Harm SoLmYS 134 QNY 99018 "BOW BML

301s

1000 ove zoreeor corse = a1v0 aw 12 1aK97 6 AL weno

---Page Break---

2

Bea aye ae ok 3

nap weaned G41" t0932 JT 2

Vis" Sawn WOTLWAS SM OW 3

3

1200

Stoo

«200

00

2

wu 335_"3nso@y3 HOWE ¥O4 0 3

3

3

te

?

4 tere or NOL 193

4 wow897 ony NOL sD aM

seevi3a on No:

2000 39¥4 zorezsst wwe

TaA37 9 AL NHLHOS

---Page Break---

ors 0109 z400

fea

see

3

1N3363N INO Tow an) 33 3

agtowots39 ed OM 3

?sara anvne? 9k onoes 34409 3

3

3

?sontzase+zvasetenst rey

saonrzase tewse2vase: 900

2

3

oman w24aK1s00 3

movae \$319¥3N3 01 300 39K2953 2

?mITaIA31 sOWIND Him OD S313 TOO 3

Sa Vivo ahi 1334ve3 01 0250 e010 3

3

3

3

3

3

Hngaovie avat4 40 ava"? 3

1W3'G0 BIO IvO OMT SR NZIS SOND 3

S00

foe

2

angina 2H. wo) 3

tovaz = itm 3

?rena 330008" Mt 30 3

3

000 s0ve zorezsor coven = avo 12 1gA37 © AL Nero

---Page Break---

anvecnvasesetoro1=0730

e071 o1¥ang asz¥MsACn 41 SLNaM2NNS Yam AmL3¥ISO0 394325316N7

Jot eaiavii Nt OINI¥ANGD.38¥ NOTE

Sineisea ier

s039¥9 ani st 3800

ya ni No oasye ST

W35vn al vmtiS9 Mh

or2/1z2500¢12500)-0¥

HgS0o¢dvwosw us ?ean eee zanl Lee

Shea bur inowans oN

{raoy aavvasoo aauvocn ant ways sas opie Moonta Set oer. 283t

iva teetsopanivn Anna

(Savatieov3sSOn9

ISAvON ?A WONtW WOM OWONE AWOL WAWDTHO WI! IS IG! 11ND

6» 109 (ave 9702"

(sonnves veo

tsavarsawvar swat oworawoxteivxtan

saivo sollvatrayd a94f0\$ MON! ANa¥Eai10 Juv W03

StewvoN

Stoo

swoawws ry saves 161-5990 3190

?oes 0109 team Je=cewU IT

Bee nag teenieas" ive ladal

000 30¥8 zorezsor corse = 34v0 new ra

\$100

00

200

00

0

S00

Seo

£300

o%00

e608

too

?S00

Stoo

eee

100

e400

#00

oo,

soo

Soo

Soo

2aA27 9 AT NveLwos

---Page Break---

000 a9¥e

13 ntos

wetting

Spadine

Stnudesennee says

Ravoassenmscaive

foyoaesmnnee sive

Teaa3et atest Zine

vee uot teeaecavon dat

sano e3d Sove-o¥9IM OL NoTS Want

shron 2e1 9131

Isavontease s2ystezvosr tase tse 3

santovs 1M ane warog onted045:24¥9 M04 \$3500 341 493¥H03 5 «137 ROW

eR

1300s

ootoatee 1295

aka outsh*53300 e133 Wo

968 010%

zorezsor conse = atv0 stv w

ase

oe

ese

vast

ML nweswos

---Page Break---

ons coro

82-0109,

cortss)2i tan Sete

SPRIINOD 985 see

ie

ore

cite

Snutane> ez fete

eon ca ete

te o109 (29soors1-eee300 31 wre

toe t1asou-kortvegU}sT sere

eee

She

10

tere

one

9000 20" zoreeror sore, = a1ve save te 95037 9 AL NewS

---Page Break---

see

fu199 630813" eon

taraenewr'D) eee

Tordeianos013¥ e000

Seeniggese¥99 <0

poet co013¥ Seo

otal eo

t2-otev reese LlotieNt ton

seawo9 coy

cuanysq nato ?Ate A1snsenn 9.0 *oL?AoN-S2 \$C voLYWEE TED AIM ISU0 2

Movs Oquwoswsia) sv ?wise dv 9lve 3500 ¥1AIM 34s 1aN9 Baum 3

wee ye RSoudowel ine MT Save 38n0 SB1vINIVD erav2 AWTAADNS 2

tavaents2v1e1t¥9 a¥1aKOMIns 1620

1000 39%6 zorez/or const © aya aw tz waAT 8 AL wren aoa

---Page Break---

ee

Ceeususnecuanecs-03i

Ceca ether

erecennueuus

Cuepsumeennemss

fori 3h1unor

2 sv 2upmlW wae sueuvaows TK ML 2DHTOS. 161-89

Bats] Te dine wt AD¥eo3d ast" noes 09 1¥NIWD

x04 Sanywn NoLIVW@II¥9. 11 361. 40 ROLLY INGNSINT

sSunsoend 033

gonoove OL Awvesi99N Juri awnsoaes (tas St

° gh egigy 99Na0s301eCOwH BLS

SStnmik citi" 40 suns

Moaxa retes Of ang (etuterset iL) dled 341 40 S9NS283NIWOTOaNI

SRI sSunsoaus o131 4 wes T1SAaD Ba 4e WARE TIS aa uge TSA

ord?oasoaxs-a0¥n0S-F-89 ¥ CL INS WAIAMICIEI Hal SHUM SAD

2-orieewsy 1190 TeME

(500+ soe vasteatensszat2 ust Tar ised aT anOwNS

1000 30¥e zorezvor eetse = a4va sa a

S08

ezco.

stos

Feo

hee

S160

Stee

Stee

toe

tooo

5090

2000

21 AL vat wos

---Page Break---

1000 20ve

ceveattnist

fms etn

eeoKton

rorestnt

yor-eeetnt

Sarat

rersee=tint

Sito

"2 9109

erayeziee iat

Wom 6

Sharan)

10s

torte DRT

4 cxoe (oranetainy at

128 Vom) bm 3

cr cugwe?testieist

sau say34 vos a20079N1 34

wan 6997 ?Paeys SL Se AWW ZHY3K. GAY THEA

Shinow cigar) zavo #covasnausy 30 3

ronson CAN teva Mano 1

LIM Anant awe SAE NE TYANLINT S940

devak So tta0

gynds ait 4003

tonne

sepsenn tated

zorcesot cates = ave aive

te Rey © AY nena os

---Page Break---

2000 29"

F458

NEINOD 226 tice

Lute ties

226 (ap) torea=Abwh)sT ste,

oonte an cae an sive

Shartnoa ese Stes

feo

Hoe

us,

\$909

Pesaaree isco

Siwtines ere Seen

cee leaee soo

ofevodht S800

Saline) ete feo

me eine fee

ete c109 tor2N*23emIsT iweo

ter ztena abet aeN gone

?wen-stezsgew esco

ghatived Loe e600

ost 0109, 1600

YeeySnn seco

Snwtines 906 00

816 0109 for3NeT3¥NN ST S500

12h Sen) anes tam feo0

once 1200 eee

ore cico (2aentmrat too.

or O10 (1ensnrwi ay oreo

SOMTINGD 6oe foe

omot ico fos

% soo

0 0109 Cawe3NrMrN IST Se00

Soe Gina (ar aNeaN)3T oo

Certern done ae bso.

20rszv9r corse = 310 ave Teper enemas

---Page Break---

1000

ene

2

3

evoreantonrovains_ 04 vi 3

?NI UAST 3SNOMS IE AgHSW: 3

*aso0-081 3

x00 s+nowes7 sç- 0300" 3

he 3500 53 3 ooo

5 °

3

>

3

3

3

NOLLviove ONNGWSHOVE. 3M YN. DL 3

amrionayset ews Sayd'Mt Ovi¥InD WD \$500 «nsts Ami S193EEC ITE 3

tadon9*140e 341402 942401 94500) FOIE BAT INOS re00

1000 20¥4 zorezvor conse = 31v0 woo 12 9A37 9 AF NOLES

---Page Break---

APPENDIX TI

---Page Break---

Sivarecoe3t Se x

vow aie 2 eae Te ah Surges cunaavag o33ts Stasers

verse © wos Stmn53¥ APHaMISOO OL

---Page Break---

, Uidwe"" Sy7et/ Sinaiviae ae Te ae EOE ee

oe scr ergoneaat inn oø0°E sees ETITE ne orseezIRLLT MO

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

ew)

---Page Break---

SE Sea Sandouss ons. ease seven

eatftats 108 ty Suge niet tt no as0eet¥ 0813

---Page Break---

sai0n ©1814 OB1YSION a¥eMO oy 60300 p40 oro asau ote oat, LRH athe #8 ose

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

na OFT So lenaeT se 2ee7s ?Ehenaens

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

sree ote gt uh

REE tet ae a

---Page Break---

ess sg mninssce wos arte 6}

Sui tvd oiearteehacet2 abe

seopen43e 1800 ong 04 NMAIO 2a testers a

is

---Page Break---

corre ty enn misoo wos ascend ota getsad oy aeceand or

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

ats 3800 say 3500388 03123

se yarmesca wos steers oF

ase gunasco

oriie Hnasae

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

exe 2633 Wy ep antsnu wos sean om ty vause 7ee

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

Seaatase gure. 7etstnoesovts O70

NIE onbtd'ot bean sees iwoeats 260 2004

---Page Break---

Teron wives e"ebiaino T bevaind ?Gyessow anowo?? | GA7s1/e s¥anTeLaa © SIZE 74 uahamovie

Ovals Sut ye bande

---Page Break---

ast outa

caan0 suorst

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

one Wane ?a

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

TWAS HE Nanndes 2anoW Ath sokeactonen ee

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

"9 \$1 won42aexc9 outors sovaay ony o14D2 HO seta vraree

fh hor iBteaey saroes owes) eur mol neista sono woot aan givasea

---Page Break---

de en wae SLEEP TycGTE cgay. org czans oee-z azn ovpeezaant aes 26

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

Solanei iste Aowma Aseuent gulsn Siveasoo

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

---Page Break---

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal

liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any
Information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use
?would not infringe privately owned rights.?

---Page Break---