**INEUEXT-97-00148** 

**April 1997** 

*Idaho Nationaf Engineering Laboratory* 

*Preliminary Evaluation of a Fluorescence and Radioisotope Nuclear Smuggling Deterrence Tag* - *Final Report (lL500E)* 

*S. D. Hartenstein R. Aryaeinejad J. R. Delmastro P. L. Tremblay* 

BECEIVED **JUN 0 9 1997 OSTI** 



# **PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF A FLUORESCENCE AND RADIOISOTOPE NUCLEAR SMUGGLING DETERRENCE TAG** - **FINAL REPORT (IL500E)**

**S. D. Hartenstein R Aryaeinejad J. R Delmastro P. L. Tremblay** 

**Published April 1997** 

**Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory Lockheed Idaho Technologies Company Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415** 

**DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS U** 

**MASTER** 

**Prepared for the** 

**U.S. Department of Energy Office of Non-Proliferation and National Security (NN-20) Under DOE Idaho Operations Office Contract DE-AC07-941D13223** 

## **DISCLAIMER**

**This report** was prepared **as an** account of work sponsored **by an** agency of the United States Government. Neither the **United States** Government nor **any** agency thereof, or **any** of their employees, makes **any** warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of *any* information, apparatus, product, or process **disclosed,** or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service **by** trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its enforcement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. **The** views **and** opinions of authors **expressed** herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the **United** States Government of any agency thereof.

**1** 

# **PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF A FLUORESCENCE AND RADIOISOTOPE NUCLEAR SMUGGLING DETERRENCE TAG** - **FINAL REPORT (IL500E)**

**INEL/EXT-97-00148 April 1997** 

investigators:

Steven D. Hartenstein, Principal Investigator

R. Ayeungary

Rahmat Aryaeinejad, Advisory Scientist

Joseph R. Delmastro, Staff Scientist

ası $\bigcirc$ 

Paul L. Tremblay, Staff Engineer

 $4 - 7 - 97$ Date

 $417/97$ **Date** 

 $4/7/97$ 

**Date** 

Date

### **ABSTRACT**

This report summarizes the efforts completed in identifying candidate fluorescence compounds and radioisotopes for a developing tagging system. The tagging system is being developed as a deterrent to nuclear smuggling, by providing a means **OF.** 1) tracing materials and pilferers to the facility of origin for any recovered special nuclear materials, 2) inventory control of long-term stored items containing special nuclear materials, and **3)** tracking materials transferred between facilities. The system uses three types of materials to cover a range of applications intended to prevent the pilfering of special nuclear materials. One material, fluorescent compounds which are invisible without ultraviolet or near-infrared detection systems, is marked on controlled items with a tracking pattern that corresponds to a specified item in a specified location in the data control system. The tagging system uses an invisible, fluorescent dusting powder to mark equipment and personnel who inappropriately handle the tagged material. The tagging system also uses unique combinations of radionuclides to identify the facility of origin for any special nuclear material. This report also summarizes the efforts completed in identifying hardware that will be used for the tagging system. This hardware includes the devices for applying the tagging materials, the commercially available fluorescence detection systems, and gamma ray detection systems assembled from existing, commercially available technologies.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This document represents the final deliverable for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laborato\$s **Warhead Dismantement/SSpecia1** Nuclear **Materials** Control **Program** (IL500) **Task** E "Radioisotope Cocktail for Nuclear Smuggling Deterrence." This project is funded through the Department of Energy Office of Nonproliferation and National Security's Office of Research and Development (NN-20). The purpose of this project is to develop a tag which will deter the pilfering and illegal trafficking of special nuclear material (SNM). The deterrence to pilfering of SNM is achieved by using the **tag** to improve the accountability of SNM and providing *readdy* traceable forensic evidence. The described **tag** is **being** developed for use by the international nuclear **community.** 

This report describes the justification for **this** project, the technical requirements of the materials and **methods, the tagging methods,** and the candidate materials for the tag. The tagging system is composed of three types of tags: 1) a fluorescent **tag,** 2) a radioisotope tag, and 3) fluorescent and radioisotopic tampering tag. These **tags'** relative importance and function **are** determined by their respective applications. **In** combination, the tags will uniquely identify the facility of origin for materials and their storage containers, will uniquely tag each container for inventory control, and will provide forensic information to assist in the identification of equipment and personnel involved in the handling or **transport** of pilfered SNM. The tag is based on the ability *of* solvents, containing fluorescent compounds and radionuclides, to become embedded into the SNM *or* metal storage *containers* **as the** solvent penetrates into the **metal's** surface microcracks. The tag will be colorless under normal lighting conditions and will be detectable by: 1) a gamma detector, 2) an ultraviolet light, or 3) a near **infrared** camera.

Design criteria for the tagging system cover the materials to be tagged, location of use, and physical *chsnacteristcs of* the tag. The tagging *system* will be designed to tag components and containers of at least 500g of plutonium and uranium metals and salts; warhead components; unirradiated nuclear fuel rods; and storage containers. The tags will be applied in normal process areas **at SNM** handling facihties and be detectable with portable equipment throughout the **handling** facility and transport processes. The tag wili be designed to be difficult to remove **all** traceable evidence of the **tag** fiom the **SNM** and the personnel and equipment used to remove the tag. Currently, **18** long-lived radioisotopes, 38 short-live radioisotopes, and 10 fiuoreseent compounds have been selected **as** candidate materials for the tagging system.

Detection of the tag is **based** on the concept that fluorescent indicators and gamma emitting isotopes *can*  be applied to a surface and then detected by their characteristic emissions. The uniqueness of the tag is established by assigning unique patterns of fluorophores and unique combinations of radioisotopes to each facility. Advantages **of this** tag are: 1) it can be detected and read with simple detector technology, 2) parts of the **tag** will be detectable for a minimum of twenty years, 3) very small quantities of the tag can be detected, **4) materials** inside **storage** *containers* and packaging can be identified without opening the container, and 5) efforts to remove the tag will leave significant forensic residues.

**This** report contains the design criteria for and a preliminary design description of the hardware that will be **used** for the tagging *system.* This hardware includes the devices necessary to apply the tagging materials, the detection **systems** for the fluorescence compounds, and the detection systems for the gamma-emitting radioisotopes. The **design** criteria describe the **capabilities** that the hardware must meet to implement an effective tagging *system* within **the** limitations unposed by *the* program sponsor **and** the facilities potentialIy using the tags.

**1v** 

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Portions** *of* **this document** *axmy* **be illegiile in electronic image produdr.** *Images* **are produced** from **the best available** *original*  **document.** 

### **DISCLAIMER**

<span id="page-7-0"></span>This report **was** prepared **as** an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, make any **warranty,** express or implied, or **assumes** any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, appa**ratus, product,** or process disclosed, **or** represents that its use would not infringe privately owned **rights.** 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. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

The criteria address issues such safety, adaptability, sensitivity, and portability. Upon continuation of further funding, **prototype** tagging **application** and **detection systems** will **be constructed and demonstrated on SNM and storage containers.** 

**V** 

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{i}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}),\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}))$ 



# **CONTENTS**



 $\bar{t}$ 







 $\bar{\beta}$ 

# **FIGURES**





# **TABLES**



<span id="page-17-0"></span>

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ 

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

# **ACRONYMS**



## **I. INTRODUCTION**

<span id="page-19-0"></span>*This* document represents the final deliverable for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory's Warhead Dismantlement/Special Nuclear Materials Control Program (IL500) Task E "Radioisotope *Gxktail* for Nuclear Smugghg **Deterrence." This** project is fuuded through the Department of Energy *Oflice*  of Nonproliferation and National Security's **Office** of Research and Development (NN-20). The purpose of **this**  project is to develop a tagging system to deter the pilfering and illegal tracking of special nuclear material (SNM). The deterrence to pilfering of SNM achieved by using the tag will be realized by enabling the SNM handling community to: 1) improve the accountability of materials being prepared or stored at facilities; 2) provide readily available forensic information related to the facility of origin for materials recovered from smugglers; and 3) provide traceable safeguarding measures and forensic evidence to detect personnel pilfering (or attempting to pilfer) **SNM.** 

This report describes the justification for **this** project, **the** technical requirements **driving** the selection of candidate tagging materials and methods, and the proposed tagging methods. Also described are the candidate **fluarescence** compounds, candidate **radioisotope** cumpounds, candidate application solvents needed to effectively apply the tagging **materials, candidate** hardware necessary to apply the tagging materials, and candidate hardware to detect *the* fluorescent and radioisotope tags.

## **2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

## **2.1 Purpose**

<span id="page-20-0"></span>The purpose of **this project is** to develop **tagging methods** for *SNM,* dismantled nuclear weapon **components**  and their containers to **determine unambiguously the point** of *origin* of interdicted smuggled materials and to deter pilfering of these materials by personnel fi-om facilities missioned with manufacturing, dismantling, or **storing**  these materials.

## **2.2 Participants**

This project is funded through the United **States Department** of Energy's **Office** of Non-Proliferation and National **Security** (NN-20) and is being performed at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) by Lockheed Idaho Technologies Company, Managing and Operating contractor under DOE Idaho Operations **Office** Contract DE-ACO7-94ID13223.

## **2.3 Policy Drivers**

Federal **sponsorship** of **this** research **is justified through** congressional charter, Section 1502 of the **FY** <sup>1995</sup> National Defense Authorization Act **(NDAA).** The **NDAA** directs the Counter proliferation Program Review Committee, chaired by the Secretary of Defense and composed of the Secretary of Energy, Director of Central Intelligence, and the Chairman of the Join Chiefs of Staff to "identify and review existing and proposed capabilities and **technologies** for **support** of U.S. nonproliferation and Counter proliferation policy." The DOE's initiatives address *enhanced* programs **in:** material protection, control **and** accounting for the physical protection of Russian nuclear materials, expansion of the **DOE's** support to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), strengthening of support to U.S. and international commerce, preventing a black market in nuclear materials, and providing additional intelligence products in support of U.S. Intelligence. Within these initiatives, **DOE** is sponsoring research to build the technical foundation for a national capability to detect and track illicitly transported weapons of mass destruction (WMD) materials, including the ability to identify the source of materials and the participants in nuclear smuggling incidents.<sup>1</sup>

# **2.4 Technology Users**

The described tag **is** being developed for use by the international nuclear **community** as a deterrent to pilfering of **SNM.** The **tag** will be applied **directly** to **SNM** and storage containers **so** that the facility of origin of the materials *can* be idded, storage containers can be inventoried, and individuals improperly handling the materials can be detected. Facilities using the **tag** include those producing usable forms of SNM (metals, fuel rods, and salts), those dismantlig nuclear weapons, and those preparing and monitoring **SNM** for long-term *secured* **storage.** *Once* developed, it **is** envisioned that the tagging methodology wiII be available (potentially via **the** IAEA) to each **country** handling SNM. Each facility handling SNM will be assigned its unique tagging materials and patterns and be able to obtain the instrumentation necessary to apply and detect the tags.

## **3. BACKGROUND**

<span id="page-21-0"></span>Since the first known incident of illegal trafficking of radioactive materials in 1966, DOE has provided support to law enforcement personnel in many cases. Most of these cases occurred during this decade.<sup>2</sup> This trend becomes significantly alarming in that the trend is not localized in one area but is spreading throughout the international (Russia, Germany, Poland, etc.,) marketplace. As an example, the number of cases of illegal transfers of radioactive and fissile material to Germany **has grow** fiom four cases in 1990 to more than 500 cases over the next four years.<sup>3</sup>

Even though most of the *cases* of nuclear smuggling involve **scams,** there are a significant number of incidents involving actual radioactive materials. Of the cases in Germany, forty-six cases resulted in the recovery of radioactive materials and fifteen cases involved fissile material.' The fissile material recovered generally included small quantities of natural or low-enriched uranium. Some cases have involved the recovery of plutonium and americium **fiom** smoke detectors. However, smuggling incidents can involve quantities of materials that indicate an active market for nuclear proliferation materials. One of the most significant of these cases involved the recovery of 2.7 kg of 88% enriched **U-235** powder in Prague."

This incident, in combinations with claims that 150 kg of plutonium **has** been transferred from Russia and stored in Switzerland,<sup>2</sup> indicate that there is an increasing demand to secure existing stockpiles of SNM. Improved methods of **security** and accountability are **needed** to make it more difficult to gain **access** to fissile material and increasingly **dangemm** to handle **the SNM.** These deterrence measures can be realized by improving the chance that a person pilfering material is more likely to be caught during the act of pilfering or eventually tracked down using the forensic information gleaned **fiom** recovered materials.

Because of the inherent similarities of SNM throughout the international nuclear **community,** deterrence from forensic data has significantly lagged behind deterrence accomplished through security and accountability measures. This lack of forensic information has been recognized and is being addressed through international conferences **and** technolosy development activities. The tagging system described in this report is one of the measures underway to provide more usable forensic information to deter the pilfering of **SNM.** 

## **4. DESCRIPTION OF TAGGING SYSTEM**

<span id="page-22-0"></span>The developing tagging system for **this** project is composed of three types of **tags:** 1) a fluorescent **tag,** 2) a **radioisotope tag, and** 3) a **tamperhg tag.** These **tags'** relative importance and function **are** determined by their respective applications. **In** combination, **the tags** will **uniquely** identify the facility of origin for materials and their storage containers, will uniquely tag each container for inventory control, and will provide forensic information to **assist** in the identification of equipment and personnel involved in the handling or transport of pilfered **SNM.**  The tags are based on the application of a solvent containing a mixture of radionuclides and fluorescent wmpounds to **the** surfice of **the metal.** The solvent, **radionuclides,** and fluorescent compounds become embedded into the metal as they penetrate into the microcracks normally present in metal surfaces. The components of the tag will be colorless under normal lighting conditions and will be detectable by: 1) a gamma detector, 2) an ultraviolet light, or 3) a near infrared camera.

## **4.1 Intended Applications for the Tagging System**

To design a tagging *system* **that meets its mtended** purposes, there must be an understanding of the intended applications for **the** tagging *system.* For this **tagging** system, there are four intended applications: **1)** identifjing **the** *facility* of *origin* for **SNM** recovered fiom *smugglers,* 2) **idenwg** materials for inventory control, 3) tracing the transfer of materials between facilities, and **4)** identifpg personnel that improperly handle controlled materials. More detail describing these applications is provided as follows:

#### **4.1.1 identifying Point of Origin for Recovered Materials**

In most incidents in which interdicted SNM **has been recovered,** the **source** of the smuggled material is difficult to **determine.** Currently, many **national** and international efforts are devoted to forensic analysis of these recovered materials to **establish the** facility from which the material was taken and possibly the people, vehicles, and locations involved in the transporting of the material. The purpose of a **tag** which identifies the facility of **origin** of the material will **minimize** the need for the current extensive practice of particle, residue, and isotopic analyses. Developing a tag which identifies the facility of origin achieves the following benefits: 1) the tag provides evidence which *may* **assist** in the arrest of personnel responsible for pilfering the material and 2) the tag improves safeguarding and accountability at the facility from which the material was pilfered.

#### **4.1.2 Verifying inventory of Stored Material**

A significant aspect of safeguarding SNM is controlling the inventory of material that is placed in storage. Currently it is planned that enriched **uranium** and weapons grade plutonium that was prepared for or removed from nuclear weapons will be packaged in metal cans and stored in secure facilities. **An** integral part of sdeguarding these stored materials will be periodic (potentially *every* day) inventory checks to determine if the stored material is in the storage container and if the storage container has been disturbed. One low **risk,** low exposure **means** of performing **this** inventory check may be robotic sensor systems that are controlled remotely for operation in limited **access** *storage* bunkers. To use *such* a **system,** the sensor system will have to detect either unique signatures from the SNM and storage containers or unique signatures from a tag embedded on the SNM and storage containers.

<span id="page-23-0"></span>Because there is a strong possibility that the **SNM and** containers at a specific storage facility will have **similar** shapes, chemical composition, isotopic composition, and contaminant composition, resolution of traditional detectable signatures (neutron or gamma spectra and intensities) will be difficult to interpret to establish the identity and position of individual items. Therefore a unique tag placed on the **SNM** and on the storage container will offer an opportunity to develop a remotely controlled sensor system that can verify the unique identity of the material and its locations. Use of a unique tag would improve safeguarding of the **SNM by** making a remote inventory monitoring system more practical. Benefits of having an implementable remote inventory system based on unique tags would then be realized through: 1) minimizing personnel access opportunities to **the** *storage* bunker, 2) minimizing radiation exposure to personnel performing the inventory, and 3) increasing the rate of periodic/random inventories.

#### **4.1.3 Tracing Material Movement Between Facilities**

Another important feature of safeguarding SNM is the ability to verify the unique identity of materials that **are** shipped and received between facilities. **This** verification is done with a variety of methods which include: 1) administrative documentation, 2) stamped markings, 3) mass, **4)** energetic spectral measurements, and *5)*  **laboratory analysis** of **samples. A tag which identifies @c** shipments or containers that have been transferred will reduce the time and expense of the verification process if the tag: 1) uniquely identifies the material; 2) can be **read** with inexpensive, non-labor intensive instruments; and 3) requires **minimum** unpacking and handling of the shipment material.

#### **4.1.4 Identify Tampering with Materials in Process**

**Because** materials have been pilfered from SNM facilities, known weaknesses of material safeguarding are **the** vulnerability of **materials that are handled** manually in high traffic areas and those left in storage in low traffic areas. Normally, the handling of **SNM** *is* performed in *a* glove **box** or secured room where accesslexit is controlled. However, the large number of personnel in combination with the complex operations and equipment in these areas, provide opportunities for personnel to improperly tamper with or even remove materials from these facilities. Therefore, the **known** presence of a tagging material which would mark personnel or equipment will deter personnel **from** improperly entering a controlled area or improperly handling a controlled material.

## **4.2 Functional Features of Tagging System**

The tagging system must be designed to meet **all** the functional needs for the above described tagging applications. These functions (shown in Figure 4-1) **are** achieved by using the physical and chemical characteristics of the materials used in the tag; the sensitivity and resolution of the detectors for the tagging materials, and the flexibility and control features of the data acquisition system. The tag materials (a combination of fluorescence compounds and radioisotopes) provide the uniqueness and traceability necessary to identify individual components and storage containers, facilities of ownership, tampering efforts, and forensic evidence. The detectors provide the means to verify the existence and identity of the tag. The data acquisition system assigns the tag, controls **the** application *systems,* **interprets** detection data, and tracks the location of tagged items.

<span id="page-24-0"></span>

Figure 4-1. Functional features of tagging system.

## **4.3 Description of System Components**

**The tagging** system **is** *composed* of **several hardware and software subsystems which** must **be integrated to complete the development of the tagging system. A schematic of these subsystems is shown in** [Figure](#page-25-0) **4-2. The tagging system consists** *of* four **major subsystems: 1) the fluorescence compounds, radioisotopes, and solvents that** will **be the constituents** of **the tag, 2) the method of applying the tag to the SNM, 3) the method of detecting the tag, and 4) the database system for tracking the use of the tag.** 

<span id="page-25-0"></span>

Figure **4-2.** Tagging system components.

#### **4.3.t Tagging Materials**

The **tags** will **consist** of a variety of materials which when applied in combination will provide a system for all of the intended applications. The **materials** include fluorescent compounds and radioisotopes that will be applied to **SNM** or container surfaces. The utility of these materials is derived from the phenomena of these *tagging* materials to adhere **to** the **mrfiice** *or* become *embecMed* into the microcracks normally present on surfaces. For all of the intended purposes, the fluorescence compounds will be either a dye or pigment in a quick drying solvent carrier or **as a** *dry* **dusting** powder. The purpose of the dye or pigment will be to form a readable pattern which can be used for **SNM** identification for inventory control. The purpose of the dusting powder will be to transfer a traceable tag to equipment or personnel handling the **SNM.** The radioisotope tag will be dissolved in **<sup>a</sup>**solvent carrier which canies **the** radioisotopes with the **surface** of the **SNM.** The purpose **of the radioisotope**  tag is to provide a more permanent *tag* which is difficult and hazardous to remove and which can be detected through packaging containers.

The solvent matrix for each type of tagging material may vary. The solvent for the fluorescent identification *tag* will be similar to **a** lacquer or polymer coating which will cure when applied to the surface of the material. This Coating will serve two functions: 1) provide *the* stability to form a readable pattern and 2) provide a solution matrix which allows the compounds to maintain their fluorescence sensitivity. The solvent for the fluorescent dusting powder may include air or volatile solvent propellents. The solvent for the radioisotopes will perform like a penetrating solvent. Solvents for the removal of the tag are also included in **this** subsystem.

**7** 

#### **4.3.2 Application Method**

The application method subsystem includes the hardware to remotely or manually apply the tagging materials and **the** software to control **the remote** appIication *system.* **This** subsystem also considers: 1) the safety **issues that** wilI be necessary to consider when manufacturing, transporting, and handling the **tagging** materials, *application* solvents, and the removal solvents; 2) methods to remove the tag when it is inappropriately applied *or* needs updated by the processing facility and methods to **minimize tag** removal when pilferers attack the tag; and 3) issues to be addressed when disposing of unused tag materials, tagged materials, and tag removal solvents and supplies.

#### **4.3.3 Detection Method**

The detection **subsystem** includes the hardware to remotely or manually detect the applied **tags** and the software to interpret the collected data. The hardware will address the following methods: 1) remote and portable detection methods that can be used to validate the application of the tag and verify the identification of unadulterated tags and 2) detection methods necessary to identify SNM and personnel that have tampered with the **tag.** This subsystem will also **consider the** *safety* issues that may arise when **handling** the **SNM** and detection equipment during **tag** detection efforts.

#### **4.3.4 Data Control Subsystem**

The database subsystem will address the issues associated with **securing** and controlling the unique identification features of **the tags.** This control will be necesssny to ensure that: 1) facilities maintain the integrity of **their** *unique* **tags** between facilities; 2) a facility *can* **maintain** the integrity of unique tags within a facility; 3) facilities *can* **track** the transfer of materials between facilities; and **4)** a facility can track the transfer of material within the facility.

## **5. DESIGN CRITERIA FOR THE TAGGING SYSTEM**

<span id="page-27-0"></span>Using the description of the conceptualized tagging system and the intended applications, a series of design criteria can be composed to establish specifications for the eventual development of the tagging system. The design criteria **address** the *expectationS* of the **system** and can be used to establish system level specifications for development, testing and verification. **This** section provides a description of the criteria that apply to the design of the overall tagging system. The design criteria and selection status for the fluorescence compound and radioisotopic components of the tagging **system** are provided in Section 6 and Section **8,** respectively.

## **5.1 Material to be Tagged**

There **are** wide variety of candidate **materials** that should be tagged. However, the **types** of material to be tagged will be dependent **upon** the **risks** associated with the loss of the material. A listing of materials *from*  highest to lowest priority includes the following materials:

- **1)** weapons grade plutonium metal, enriched uranium metal, partially dismantled warhead components containing **SNM** (i.e., including their storage containers);
- 2) unirradiated nuclear fuel elements and irradiated nuclear fuel elements;
- **3)** tritium containers, unirradiated nuclear fuel elements, containers of plutonium salts, containers of enriched *uranium* salts, and cylinders of enriched uranyl gas;
- **4)** depleted and natural **uranium, beryllium** metal, heavy water containers, enriched 6Li, dismantled **warhead components not containing SNM, and containers of specialty radioisotopes (e.g., <sup>60</sup>Co, <sup>90</sup>Sr,** and **I3'Cs).**

To balance *cost* and **handling** and risk, the tag will be designed to tag components and containers of **at** least 500 g of plutonium metal; enriched uranium metal; plutonium or enriched uranium salts (solid oxides, chlorides, and nitrates); warhead components containing SNM; unirradiated nuclear fuel rods; and containers of plutonium, *enriched* uranium, and *tritium* **liquids** and gases. **Even** though tagging of irradiated fuel elements, especially those under IAEA control, is considered important, the cost of application and detection of the tags is considered prohibitive. The *storage* containers **are** *expected* to be **constructed** of aluminum, carbon steel, or stainless steel.

## **5.2 Facilities Applying the Tag**

Because the purpose of using the tag is to deter the pilfering of SNM, facilities missioned with producing refined **process** quantities of SNM, assembly/disassembly of weapons, storage of **SNM** stockpiles, or preparation of *SNM* for storage will be **considered** for use of the **tag.** It is not expected that the different processing locations or building within a facility (localized complex) will apply different tags. Because the tag's primary objective is to relate reoovered **SNM** to the facility in which it was **taken,** the tag must provide sufficient uniqueness to be traced *to* **the** last kility responsible for the material. The **number** of facilities needing the *tag* is projected to be at least one hundred based upon the number of proliferant countries and the number of facilities in the United **States** and Former Soviet Union block countries. Therefore, to ensure that each participating facility **has** a unique tag, the tag will be designed to accommodate at least one hundred unique facilities.

## **5.3 Process Location for Applying the Tag**

<span id="page-28-0"></span>To **maximize** the deterrence impact of the tag, the tag should be applied directly to **th SNM** just prior t or during its initial exposure to manual **handling.** Therefore, the tag will be designed **so** that the tag *can* be *applied* upon receipt of the material **at the** faciiitY, reapplied whenever the processing of the material sigmficantly alters **the** detection of **the** previous tag (e.g., after machining, dissolution, recasting, or washing), prior to placing the SNM or container in long term storage, and before transferring the container to another facility.

## **5.4 Process Location for Detecting the Tag** '

To **minimize the** transfer and handling of **the tagged materials, the** tag should be detectable in the area where the **SNM is** received, immediately *after* the **tag** is applied, in **SNM** transfer areas, and in **SNM** storage **areas.**  Because **the** tagged mnponent will be hazardous and *securely controlled,* **access** to the material should be avoided whenever possible. Therefore **the** tag will be designed to have components that will be:

- 1) **Detectable in the presence of storage containers and packaging, which may include, but is not limited <b>1** to 0.6 *cm* **(1/4")** stainless steel, 2.5 *cm* paper, or 1 *cm* plastic; **and**
- **2)** Detectable with technology **consisting** of commercially available instrumentation **that** is hand-held **and** adaptable for remote **handling.**

## **5.5 Tag Removal**

The purpose of the tag it to deter pilfering of material as individuals will be less inclined to steal material that can be traced back to themselves. However because the presence of the tag will be publicized, personnel pilfiering the tagged **material** *may* take actions **to** eliminate the trail of evidence which traces the SNM back **to** the pilferer and facility. Therefore, the tag will be designed to be difficult to remove all traceable evidence of the tag. The traceable evidence may include **a** residue of the **tag on** the tagged material and residue of the tag on the pilferer and removal equipment. Difficult to remove is defined **as:** 1) leaving a residue on the tagged material after the tag has been subjected to cleaning with water, soap, or readily available volatile organic solvents or petroleum products **and** 2) needing sophisticated equipment and facilities to prevent hazardous contamination **&r** machining or etching **the** tagged material.

## **5.6 Retention of Components Functional Properties**

The safe handling, performance, stability, and security of SNM components are based on rigorous standards for composition and configuration. Therefore the tag will be designed such that it does not alter the physical and fimctional properties of the **SNM.** These physical and functional properties include but are not limited to: 1) the shape; 2) the mass; 3) the SNM radioactive spectrum; 4) the criticality function  $(K_{\text{effective}})$ ; and 5) the material **strength.** 

# **5.7 Release of Information Related to the Composition and Shape of the Tagged Material**

**3** 

**For** *some* of the wmponents to be tagged, the composition and the shape of the **SNM** will be controlled **as**  classified infdon. To protect **this** information, the tag will be designed so that detection of the tag does not **reveal** additional infmtion about the *shape* **and** composition of the **material** being tagged. If necessary, features *can* be incorporated **into** the detection *or* data acquisition subsystems to prevent the release of the **SNM's** gamma spectra.

## **5.8 Implementation Costs**

The tag needs to be inexpensive to implement, because there will be **a** significant effort to get **all** facilities **handling** *SNM* to use **the** tag and because *there* will be a large number of items to be tagged. Therefore, the *tag*  will be designed so that each tag will cost less than \$500, each tag application device will cost less than \$10K, and each tag detection *system* will cost less **than** \$1 **OOK.** 

## **5.9 Method** *of* **Application**

Because there will be a significant effort to get **all SNM** that may be pilfered tagged, the equipment and tasks necessary to apply the tag should not prohibit its use. Therefore, the tag will be designed so that it can be quickly applied by hand or automatically during the normal processing activities.

## **5.10 Lifetime of the Tag**

Because the materid being **tagged** is hazardous to handle and *may* be placed in storage for extended periods of time, the tag should have a detectable lifetime that covers the intended storage time. Therefore, the tag will be designed with a signature that is detectable for 20 years.

## **5.1** I **Regulatory Compliance**

The components of the tag and the materials tagged will be **handled,** shippec, **stored,** and disposed of in facilities complying with International, Federal, and State regulations. Therefore, the tag will be designed so that it can be used in compliance with fderd regulations. **This** would include *NRC* and **DOE** requirements for radioactive materials; **DOT** requirements for shipping; EPA requirements for **waste** disposal and material handling; and **DOE, OSHA,** and FDA requirements for personnel safety.

## <span id="page-30-0"></span>**6. SELECTION OF CANDIDATE FLUORESCENCE COMPOUNDS**

The fiuorescence **tag is** based *on* **the** concept **that** an invisible dye or pigment can be applied to a surface **and**  then detected by the characteristic fluorescence emission of the dye. The uniqueness of the tag can be determined by assigning a specific dye or combination of dyes to each user facility. The tag could also be used to individually identify each container if it is applied in a unique pattern such as a bar code or serial number. Advantages to this type of tag are that it can be detected and read with simple detector technology, a large variety of *dyes* and pigments are commercially available at low cost, and very small quantities of the material can be detected. Because small quantities can be detected, efforts to remove the tag have a significant probability of leaving forensic detectable residues behind on the tagged material, the individual removing the tag, and the equipment used to move **the tag.** This type **of** tag **has the** following disadvantages: 1) the tag cannot be detected if the tag **is** enclosed in a secondary container or wrap; 2) organic fluorescent compounds make the tag susceptible *to*  deterioration or evaporation from **the** radiation **emitted by** the tagged **SNM;** and 3) organic fluorescent **compounds are** soluble @e., *can* be **removed** ) in *readily* available solvents such **as** acetone, alcohols, or petroleum products.

There are two **types** of fluorescence tags addressed in the overall tagging system. These types of tags include the invenkxy control tag and the **tampering** tag. A description of the design criteria for each type of tag is **addressed** in *Section* 6.1 and **the process** of selecting candidate fluorescence **compounds** is provided in Section 6.2.

## **6.1 Design Criteria for Fluorescence Tag**

#### **6.1.1 Safety**

Because workers with the material will have the potential to be marked inadvertently with the tagging material, the **amount** of fluorescence compound in each tag will be limited to ensure worker safety. The tag will be designed *so* **that amount** of fluorescence material in each inventory tag will be less than the established shortterm allowable exposure limit.

#### **6.1.2 Visibility**

To ensure that a pilferer will have difficulty removing all traceable portions of the tag, the location of the fluorescent tag should be difficult to identify. To increase the level of difficulty in identifying the location of the **tag,** the fluorescent **compounds** for both the inventory and tampering tag will be designed to be colorless in the visible spectrum yet have detectable fluorescence in the ultraviolet, visible, or near infrared. Each tag will contain a combination of **compounds and** require that at least two independent excitation sources are necessary to detect the entire fluorescence signature.

#### **6.1.3 Solubility**

To be easy to apply in a well-resolved pattern, the fluorescent compounds for the inventory tag will be designed to be soluble in the rapidly **drymg** solvent **matrix** that adheres to the material to be tagged. These <span id="page-31-0"></span>fluorescent **wmpounds** also will be **designed** to be difticut to remove from metal, ceramics, cIoth, and **skin** using soap and water.

#### **6.1.4 Sensitivity**

**6.1.4.1** *Inventory Tag.* To ensure that the pattern of the inventory fluorescence tag can be identified with **minimal** *exposure, the* **fl-** of *an* intact **tag** will be manually readable *fiorn* a reasonable viewing **distance**  with **an** excitation *source* held above the surface of the material. To ensure, traceability to the facility of origin, the amount of fluorescent material present in the original application of the tag will be sufficient so that 0.01% of the material originally present in the tag can be identified using optimized laboratory analysis techniques.

**6.1.4.2 Tampering Tag.** To ensure that personnel improperly contacting material dusted with the tampering tag can be **detected,** the presence of a small amount of the tampering fluorescence *matexid* will **be**  manually detectable from a reasonable viewing distance with **an** excitation **source** held above the surface of the material. To **ensure** forensic traceability of personnel to *any* recovered SNM, one microgram of the tampering tag fluorescent material will be sufticient for identification by an optimized laboratory analysis technique.

#### **6.1.5 Uniqueness** *to* **Facility**

To uniquely idem@ a facility of **origin,** the inventory **tag** will be **designed** to provide sufficient combinations to identify at least one hundred facilities.

#### **6.1.6 Uniqueness of Tag**

To identify **an** individual that has improperly **handled** tagged SNM, that tag will **contain** a fluorescence material that can be transferred readily to the **skin** *or* **handling** equipment upon touching the tag. Because the number **of** fluorescence materials meeting the requirements for the tampering **tag** is limited, it is expected that the material for the tampering **tag** will be **common** to **all** facilities.

#### **6.1.7 Traceable Across** *Facilities*

Because it is *expected* that materid will be transferred between several facilities using the tag, the tag will be designed to encode the chronological history of the movement of the SNM between facilities. This chronological tracing will be accomplished using the pattern of the fluorescence tag in combination with the electronic tracking of the data control system hardware.

#### **6.1.8 Size and Pattern**

To uniquely identify each SNM component or container, the inventory fluorescent tag will be designed to have a unique pattern and be of sufficient **size** to provide the **necessary** resolution so that the fluorescence response can be read from a video **screen.** The **maximum size** for the tag is expected to be 2 *crn* **x** 2 **cm** and consist of at least five alphanumeric or shape characters (yields more than  $10<sup>7</sup>$  combinations).

 $\lambda$ 

#### <span id="page-32-0"></span>**6.1.9 Composition** *of* **Tag**

The **fluorescence compounds as** received from the manufacturer wiil be soluble in the application solvent, concentrated enough to meet **sensitivity** requirements, not contain detectable **quantities** (when part of a **tag)** of impurities that may impact fluorescence compounds used in other facilities' inventoy tags.

#### **6.1.10 Viewability**

Because the fluorescence tags are present to provide uniqueness for inventory control and tamper resistance, the fluorescence **compounds** are not expected to be detectable **through** additional packaging.

#### **6.1.1 1 Detection Instrumentation**

To **minimize the** cost of **the** tagging system, **the tag** wiU be designed to be detectable with **existing** automated instrumentation **at** locations including but **not limited to:** I) immediately after the tag is applied, 2) shipping and receiving areas, **and** 3) **remote** storage **iocations. Based** on the proposed *tagging* concept the tag will be designed to have suilicient fluor- and **adequate spectral** resolution so that **an** unadulterated tag can be detectable by its surface reflectance with a fluorescence probe constructed from readily available commercial instrumentation (i.e., includes **source,** monochromators, optical probes, and detectors). It is expected that absolute verification of the facility of origin for material that has been recovered may require a higher resolution fluorescence detection system.

#### **6.1.12 Lifetime**

It **is** *expected* **that the** inventory fluorescence **tag** will be simple and inexpensive to apply and therefore can be replaced on a routine basis. However **because** of the **security** control and hazards associated with handling the stored materials, the inventory tag will be designed to have a readable life of at least one year.

÷,

#### **6.1.13 Disposition** *of* **Tag**

It is not the intent of **the tag that** it will be removed. However, provisions need to be available in situations when there are inappropriate applications of the tag or when it is necessary to replace a **tag.** Therefore, the **tag**  will be designed so that the removal process does not generate any waste that cannot be disposed of **through**  existing procedures. Also, the process of removing the tag will be designed so that there are no **hazards** in addition to those inherent to handling

## **6.2 Candidate Fluorescence Compounds**

#### **6.2.1 Material Suppliers**

Commercial suppliers of liquid and powder fluorescent compounds were contacted for products which might meet **the** projected needs **far the tags.** Based on **this** search, several dyes were purchased or received **as** samples. These materials represent a significant portion of the **variety** *of* materials that are available or can be modified to meet the majority of the specifications for the inventory and tampering tags. A list of the fluorescence **compounds** being evaluated is provided in Table *6-* **1.** 



#### <span id="page-33-0"></span>Table 6-1. Listing of candidate fluorescence compounds.

#### **6.2.2 Visibility**

The color of the fluorescence *compouuds* is an important criterion in evaluating the candidate fluorescence compounds because the presence of a visible color will readily indicate the location of the **tag** and *may* provide **an** adequate visual cue to monitor the removal of the **tag.** Even though all of the compounds in Table 6-1 are detectable in the powder form, their visibility is dictated by their absorbance in the visible light **spectral** range **(400** nm to **700** nm). **Based** on **this** criterion, a **small** amount of each of the compounds was dissolved in **isopropanol** and *scanned* with **an** ultraviolet/visible *(UVMS)* spectrophotometer. The spectra of the **compounds**  were evaluated for visible absorbance peaks. From these **spectral** scans, only **HM-704 (440 nm)** ( Figure 6-1) **and &27A (450 nm)** had significant peaks in the visible spectral region. The **other** compounds, had multiple peaks in the ultraviolet below **400** nm (e.g., Figure 6-2 for compound D-282). IR-125, a NIR fluorescence compound, [\(Figure 6-3\)](#page-35-0) had it most significant absorbance peak at **790** nm. A description of the conditions for obtaining the spectra and the absorbance spectra for the candidate compounds are provided in Appendix **A.** 



<span id="page-34-0"></span>**Figure 6-1. Absorbance spectrum €or HM-704 in isopropanol.** 



**Figure** *6-2.* **Absorbance sgectnun for D-282 in isopropanol.** 

<span id="page-35-0"></span>

Figure **6-3.** Absorbance spectrum of **IR- 125** in isopropanol.

Of additional importance from the absorbance spectra are the wavelengths of maximum absorbance. These peak absorbance wavelengths **are used** to excite the fluorescence of the compounds. **When** there is a **strong**  absorbance **peak** in **the** W and **no** peak in the visible spectrum for a candidate compound, the compound meets the criteria of being invisible under normal lighting but visible under a UV source. Similarly for IR-125, the compound **has** no absorbance peaks in the visible **spectrum** but a significant peak in the *NIR* These spectral characteristics indicate that the compound is invisible under **normal** lighting but will detectable with a simple detector under a *NIR* source.

#### **6.2.3 Fluorescence in Solution**

*After* the visual inspection of the sample **materials,** a fluorescence evaluation was completed by viewing the isopropanol **solutions** of **the** fluorescence materials **under** W radiation. **This was** done by holding a 4-watt W lamp **over** the isopropanol solutions and **recording the** visible color of the solutions for both 254-nm and 365-nm *UV* lamps. Under the *UV* lamp, the compounds demonstrated sufficient sensitivity to be **seen** easily with the unaided eye **at concentrations** of less *than* 0.01% with the lamp held at a distance greater than 20 *cm.* The color of **the** visible fluorescence fiom each compound is summarized in [Table 6-2.](#page-36-0) Of the candidate compounds, the **IR-125** was the only dissolved compound that did not produce visible fluorescence under the W lamps. **This**  lack of response was expected, because IR-125 does not have a significant absorbance peak in the UV.


<span id="page-36-0"></span>

Solution colors are for **<O.** 1% of compound **in** isopropanol **0-282** , PMI-B-W, and Bonn No. 191 required a small amount of water to dissolve in the isopropanol).

Surface colors are for an aliquot of the commercial product dried on a stainless steel surface. The compounds received **as a** powder were applied to the surface **as** isopropanol solutions.

The isopropanol solutions used in the absorbance evaluations were scanned **using** a spectrofluorometer to obtain fluorescence spectra of the candidate compounds. The scans were performed **using** a **365-nm** excitation source for all compounds except IR-125. The IR-125 solution fluorescence spectrum was obtained using a 750**nm** excitation source. A description of the conditions for obtaining the fluorescence spectra and the fluorescence *spectra* for the candidate *compounds* **are** provided in Appendix B. Conclusions for the selection of the candidate compounds from the absorbance and fluorescence spectra follow:

**6.2.3.7** *D-282.* Day-Glo's W Blue D-282 compound has **some** absorbance structure with W **peaks** at 220 **nm,** 240 nm, **280** nm, **and 350** nm (Figure **6-2). This** structure is slightly apparent in the fluorescence spectrum [\(Figure](#page-37-0) *6-4)* but is not well resolved under the **365-nm** excitation sowce with 10-nm bandwidth. However, there are indications of **peaks** at **420** nm, **440** nm, and 470 **nm.** The combination of *UV* absorbance peaks, no visible absorbance peaks, and the visible fluorescence **peaks** provides indications that this compound should be considered **as** a candidate compound for the fluorescence tagging compound. The fluorescence spectrum for **D-282** is similar in shape to compounds **1-2120,** Bonn-Trace 191, and **PMI-B-WB.** 

<span id="page-37-0"></span>

Figure 6-4. Fluorescence spectrum of D-282 under 365 nm excitation.

*6.2.3.2 D-298.* Day-Glo's Columbia Blue D-298 compound **has** some absorbance structure with *UV*  **peaks** at 2 10 *nm,* 245 *mn,* 375 nm. This *structure* is **not** apparent in the fluorescence spectrum with the one large *smooth* **peak** at **445 mn.** The cornbination of *UV* absorbance peaks, no visible absorbance peaks, and the visible fluorescence peaks provides indications that **this** compound should be considered as a candidate compound for **the** fluom **tagging** *compound.* The **fluorescence** *spectnrm* for D-298 is **similar** in shape to compounds W2- D3F and HM-704.

**6.2.3.3 W2-D3F and HM-704.** DUBL-CHEK W2-D3F and HM-704 appear to have the same absorbance and fluorescence *spectra* **except** for **the** visible absorbance **peak** at **450 nm** €or **HM-704** (Figure **6-1).**  This visible peak provides a significant difference in the **observed** color of the fluorescence between the two candidate compounds. With the addition of the visible yellow peak of **the** HM-704, the fluorescence **from** the **HM-704** appears white rather than **the** violet *seen* with W2-D3F [\(Table 6-2\).](#page-36-0) The combination *of* W absorbance peaks, no visible absorbance **peaks,** and **the** visible fluorescence peaks provides indications that W2-D3F should be considered as a candidate compound for the fluorescence **tagging** compound. However, the visible yellow color of HM-704 should eliminate this compound as a candidate for the fluorescence tag.

*6.2.3.4 IR-125.* Exciton's IR-125 has a small absorbance peak in the *UV* at 220 **nm** and absorbance **peaks** at 720 nm **and** *795* nm. The absorbance **peaks** intheNIRwereused **to** obtain a **NIR** fluorescence **spectrum**  using **an** excitation wavelength of 755 nm [\(Figure](#page-38-0) **6-5).** IR-125 was included in the list of candidate fluorescence compounds because its characteristic **NIR** fluorescence may provide a **tagging** compound that yields a fluorescence *response* in a spectral region not readily measured by a pilferer. From the spectral observations of **IR-125's** W absorbance peak, no visible absorbance peaks, and the *NIR* fluorescence peak, **this** compound should be considered **as** a candidate compound for the fluorescence **tag.** 

<span id="page-38-0"></span>

Figure **6-5.** Fluorescence spectrum of IR-125 under **755** nm excitation.

**6.2.3.5** *f-Hydmxjppne.* Molecular Probes' 1-hydroqpyene compound **has** a complex absorbance structure with multiple **peaks** below **400** nm. This complicated structure is repeated in its fluorescence **spectrum**  with peaks *at* **390** nm, **4** 10 nm, and **440** nm. The combination of W absorbance peaks, no visible absorbance peaks, and the visible fluorescence peaks provides indications that **this** compound should be considered a candidate **compound** for the fluorescence tagging compound. In addition, the complexity of the fluorescence *spectnun* **makes** l-hydroxypyene **an excellent** candidate to add **to** other candidate compounds to provide a unique fluorescence spectral signature for a **tag.** 

**6.2.3.6** *ZL-27A.* Mapaflux's AL-27A **has** both W and visible absorbance peaks and a large fluorescence *peak* at 525 **nm.** Even though this compounds bright yellow-green fluorescence would make a *unique spectral* contribution when *in* combination with the other candidate *compounds,* the visible yellow color of SG27A should eliminate this compound **as** a candidate for the fluorescence **tag.** 

*6.2.3.7 1-2120, Bonn-Trace 191, and PM1-5WB.* Shannon's 1-2120, Bonneau's No. 191, and Spectrohe's PMI-B-WB **all** have similar *UV* absorbance **spectra** and visible fluorescence spectra and similar fluorescence spectra to **D-282.** These similarities may indicate that they are the same compound or slight modifications to the same organic-base structure. The combination of *UV* absorbance peaks, no visible absorbance peaks, and the visible fluorescence **peaks** provides indications that these compounds should be considered **as** candidate compounds for the fluorescence tagging compound

#### **6.2.4 Fluorescence from a Metal Surface**

After observing the fluorescence of the isopropanol solutions, the fluorescent compounds dissolved in a commercial matrix were brushed directly onto a 3 16-stajnless steel surface. Compounds received **as** a powder were dissolved in isopropanol and were aliquoted onto the stainless steel surface. After the solutions had **dried, the surfaces** were exposed to the W lamps. For most of the compounds, the fluorescence from the greater than **4** *cm2* **spots was** visible **when** the lamp was held from at least 20 *cm* from **the** metal surface. *Of* the **compounds** 

deposited, only IR-125 and 1-hydroxypyrene did not produce a visible fluorescence response. The lack of fluorescence for **I-hydroxypyme** was **due** to the absence of **an** organic *matrix* to support the fluorescence of the solvated compound (i-e., the *dry* compound is not fluorescent and needs **an** organic substrate to produce visible fluorescence). The **D-282** and **D-298,** even though present **as** *dry* powders after the isopropanol evaporated, continued to be naturally fluorescent in the powder state. The fluorescent colors of the compounds deposited on the **steel surface** are listed in [Table](#page-36-0) **6-2.** 

### **6.2.5 Fluorescence in Coating**

**Some** of the fluorescence materials were received in a matrix which **leaves** a shellac *or* polymeric residue. **This** matrix serves three **functions:** 1) it provides a solvent to carry the fluorescence compound into the application *surface,* 2) it provides a coating substrate which binds the fluorescence compound to the application **surface,** and 3) it provides a **matrix** to support the fluorescence of the compounds. Generally, this matrix leaves a colorless transparent coating with an apparent darkened surface caused by a change in the reflectivity of the application surface.

This *impact* of **the** *matrix on* the fluorescence is *seen* in several ways. Without the matrix, 1-hydroxypyrene was no longer visibly fluorescent. *Other* compounds exhibited changes in the visible color and intensity of the fluorescence. The most significant observation about the fluorescence from the coated surfaces is that the **compounds** with a supplied *matrix emitted* a more sensitive fluorescence response. The reason for this behavior is that most fluorescence organic compounds are dependent upon **a** solvent to distributelabsorb excess energy to allow fluorescent transitions to occur.

**Based** *on* these observations, the organic fluorescent compounds that will be **used** as an inventory tag will **need** a solution **matrix** that will remain with the compounds throughout the life of the fluorescent tag. For the tampering tag, the fluorescent compounds chosen will have to be fluorescent in the powder form.

#### **6.2.6 Continuing Efforts for the Candidate Fluorescence Compounds**

The current observations in the selection of candidate fluorescence compounds require continued evaluation of the materials **as** tagging candidates. These additional efforts should focus on providing conclusions for the or the materials as tagging candidates. These additional errorts should locus on providing conclusions for the<br>fluorescence inventory tag by determining if: 1) the candidate compounds can be resolved from each other when present in combinations; **2)** the compounds will retain their fluorescence properties when combined with the selected application solvent; 3) the compomds *can* survive for the intended lifetime of the tag in **the** presence of the background radiation from the tagged SNM; and 4) the compounds will penetrate into and respond from the **microcracks** of metal **surfaces.** 

# **7. SELECTION OF CANDIDATE APPLICATION SOLVENTS**

The **tagging** *system* is based *on* **the** ability of solvents, containing fluorescent **compounds** and radionuclides, to become **embedded** into **the** *SNM* or **metal** storage containers **as** the solvent **penetrates** into the metal's surface microcracks. Design criteria for the application solvent are addressed **in** Section 7.1, whereas the selection process for candidate solvents is provided in Section 7.2.

# **7.1 Design Criteria for Application Solvent**

The design criteria **are listed** to describe the capabilities of the solvent needed **to** effectively apply the **tagging** materials within the limitations **imposed by** the facilities using the **tags.** The criteria address issues such safety, solubility, drying time, and stability.

#### **7.1.1 Safety**

*7.f.7.7 Personnel Exposure.* Exposure to the application solvent will not exceed the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists' recommended threshold limit value time weighted average. The use of any carcinogens, if necessary, will be controlled to prevent personnel confamination during normal **tag** application operations.

*7.7.7.2 Facility Hazads.* The application solvent will not introduce physical hazards (i.e., fire) beyond the design specifications of the normal working environment for handling **SNM.** 

*7.7.7.3 SNM Reactions.* The application solvent will not react chemically with the **tagged** SNM.

### **7.1.2 Visibility**

To ensure that a pilferer will have difficulty removing **all** traceable portions of the **tag,** the location of the tag should be difficut to identify. To increase the level of **difficulty** in identifjmg the location of the **tag,** the application solvent for both the fluorescence **compounds** and radioisotopes will be colorless in the visible spectrum **under** ambient and ultraviolet lights.

#### **7.1.3 Resolution**

To **maintain** the applied pattern in a readable **state,** the application solvent will allow sufficient resolution between characters using either a manual implement (e.g., a marking pen) or **an** automated printing device. **For the** radioisotopic **tags,** the application solvent will **allow for** resolution between at least three **3mm** x 10 mm strips **(bars)** of **tagging materials.** For the fluorescent **tag,** the application solvent will allow for imprinting at least five alphanumeric characters, which have a minimum characher size of five characters per cm, in the 4-cm<sup>2</sup> pattern space.

## **7.1.4 Drying Time**

**To maintain the integrity** of the information designed into the pattern of the tag, the application solvent(s) will permit normal material handling rates at the facilities using the tag. The solvent matrix will be nonsmearable within 20 minutes after applying the tag.

## **7.1.5 Composition**

**7.1.5.1 Impurities.** To maintain with the fluorescence and radioisotope signatures, the solvent matrix will be of sufficient purity that it will not interfere with the detection of the fluorescence compounds and radioisotopes used in the tags.

*7.7.5.2 Residue.* The amount of organic residue remaining on the tagged **SNM** from the cured tag will conform to the SNM specification for loss-on-ignition (i.e., <0.5% total combustible mass/total mass of SNM).

*7.7.5.3 Binding.* To maintain specifications of the **SNM** being stored, the application solvent will **minimize** the **binding between** particles coated with the application solvent.

## **7.1.6 Solubility**

*7.7.6.7 Application of Tag.* Because of the variety of applications for the tags, there may be **two**  different application solvents, one for fluorescent compounds and one for radioisotopes. The application solvent(s) will have sufficient solubility to contain the necessary quantities of fluorescent compounds or radioisotopes in the solvent volume applied to the **SNM surface.** 

*7.7.6.2 Disposifion* **of** *Tag.* The **tag** must be difficult to remove to deter pilfering but possible to remove for appropriate processing purposes (e.g,, transfers **between** facilities, inadvertent physical mishandling, aged tags, etc.,). Therefore, the application solvent will ensure that any residue from the application solvent that binds the tagging **materials** to **the SNM** will be difficult to remove when **subjected** to: 1) cleaning with soap and water *or* 2) rinsmg with readdy available volatile *organic* solvents or petroleum products. However, the solvent residue will be removable using a rinsing, chemical, or physical process that can be performed safely in a protective controlled environment. This removal process also will generate a radiological or chemical hazard to personnel removing the tag in **an** unprotected environment.

## **7.1.7 Volume**

To **minimize** hazardous/mked waste generaiion, the volume of solvent for each tag will be sufficiently large that the concentration of heavy metals or toxic organic compounds are below the **Resource** Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) hazardous waste limits.

## **7.1.8 Lifetime**

The inventory fluorescence tag will be simple and inexpensive to apply. Because of the destructive nature of radiation *on* organic compounds **fiom** the **natural** radioactive decay of the SNM, the fluorescence compounds will **need** *to* be replaced periodically. However, because of the **security** control and hazards associated with hading the stored **materials, the** application solvent for **the** fluorescent compounds will survive at least one **year.**  Because the radioisotopic *tag* will be applied directly to **SNM,** which potentially could be sealed *in cans*  indefinitely, the lifetime of the application solvent for the radioisotopes **has** not **been** determined.

# **7.2 Candidate Application Solvents**

Because the fluorescence **tag and** radioisotopic **tag** have different functions, there could be **two types** of application solvents. Most organic fluorescent compounds only will fluoresce when they are in the presence *of*  a solvent *matrix* whereas the radioisotopes wilI continue to decay in any matrix. Because of *this* difference, the application solvent for fluorescence compounds will consist **of:** 1) a liquid component which will quickly evaporate to provide for controlled application to a surface and 2) a solid residue component both to bind the fluorescent compound to the SNM and to provide a solvated environment for enhanced fluorescence. The application solvent for the radioisotopes will consist of a liquid component that can carry the radioisotopes into **microcracks** on the **surface** of **the SNM. The** need **for** the application solvent to deposit a solid residue that binds the radioisotopes to the SNM has not been established.

### **7.2.1 Material Suppliers**

connnercial suppliers of application solvents were **contacted** for products which **might** meet the projected needs for the **tags.** Based on **this** *search, several* solvents were purchased or received **as** samples. These materials represent a significant portion of the variely of **materials** that **are** available or can be modified to meet the majority of the specifications for the tags. A list of the solvents being evaluated is provided in Table **7- 1.** 

Manufacturer	Product Color	Commercial Use
Dykem Company	white	layout dye
Dykem Company	purple	layout dye
Magnaflux Inc	transparent, colorless	cleaner, remover
<b>Leander Lubricants</b>	transparent, colorless	lubricant, penetrant
Sherwin, Inc.	transparent, colorless	penetrant
Sherwin, Inc.	yellow-green	penetrant
Loctite Company	transparent, colorless	adhesive
<b>Shannon Luminous</b> Materials, Inc.	transparent, colorless	marking ink
Bonneau Dye Corp	transparent, colorless	marker dye
Spectronics Corp	transparent, amber	marking ink

Table **7-1.** Listing of candidate application solvents.

**<sup>a</sup>**The solvents for both Dykem products are the same, the color is provided by an additive.

<sup>b</sup> The solvent as received from the manufacturer contains a candidate fluorescent compound.

#### *1.2.2* **Visibility**

The color of *the* **application** solvents is an important **criterion** in evaluating the **candidate** solvents because **the** presence of **a** visiile **color** will readiIy *indicate* the location of the **tag** and *may* provide an **adequate** visual *cue*  **to monitor** the removal **of** the **tag. To evaluate** this *&&on,* **a** *small* **aliquot of each** solvent **was** dropped onto an aluminum metal plate and viewed under ambient (Table 7-1) and ultraviolet light. Of the colorless candidate sol-, *only* **Spectroline's PMI-B-WB** marking **ink** left behind **a** colored residue. **The** visibility **of this** residue *can* **be reduoed** siguificidy **by** mhhizing the **thiclcness** of **the** applied solvent. The other products with visible color (Dykem layout *dyes* and Dubl-Chek **HM-704** penetrant) **were visible** due **to** the **~igneats** added **by** the **marmfacturer** for **the intended** purposes of the products. **In** these *cases,* it is *expectd* **that** the solvent without pigment could be purchased or the pigment could be removed through filtration, centrifugation, or column adsorption.

### **7.2.3 Patternability**

**The** ability to control the location of **the** solvent when it is applied to **a** surface (pattemability) will determine **the** amount of information that **an be** *extmctd* hm **the** tag. *As* an example, if **the** application solvent **disperses**  over **the** *entire* **4** *d* **area** allowed for the tag, the **only information** available from the tag will be the fluorescent or **gammaenergy spectra** from the **materials** in the tag. Therefore, the *only* infomtion that can be extracted from the tag would be the facility assigned the unique combination of materials in the tag. If a resolvable pattern of five of **a** *set* **of twentyfive** *uniquely shaped characteas can* be patterned into the dowable space, a set of nearly **10'** combinations of the patterns *can* be **used as** a traceable code to a **data** base which **contains** specliic information about the tagged **material.** 

With **this** criterion **as a** *skating* point, observations about **the** pattemability of the application solvents were **perf' by** dropping 25 **to 50 pL** aliquofs of **the** solvents **onto** *5 cm* **x** *5 cm* plates of aluminum. Observations made for the materials are summarized in Table 7-2. From this set of experiments, the materials more patternable **and** easier to control (transfer *cleanly* and spread **evenly) were** those with a rapid drying time. These patternable solvents **are candidates** *for* the fluorescent tagging **materials.** The solvents that quickly and evenly spread over the metal, leave diflicult to **see** residues, and *dry* quickly are candidate solvents for the radioisotopic tag.

#### **7.2.4 Composition**

*7.24.f Fluomscent Response.* To optimize the use of the fluorescent *compounds* used **to** tag **SNM,**  the application solvent cannot interfere with the fluorescence of the tagging materials. Therefore, the composition of each **candidate** solvent **was** reviewed for **potential** fluorophores and dried aliquots *of* the **various** candidate added **as** part of the product composition had any significant fluorescence. solvents were viewed under an ultraviolet light. Of the candidates, only those with fluorescent compounds already





\* The solvents for both **Dykem** products are the **same,** the color is provided **by in** additive.

The solvent **as** received **from** the manufacturer contains a candidate fluorescent **compound.** 

7.2.4.2 Hazardous Components. Beyond the hazards associated with the normal handling of liquid chemicals, the candidate solvents represent several hazards which must be considered prior to their use. Most of **the** solvents use a rapidly **evaporaikg** flammable solvent to **facilitate drying. For** the candidates, these solvents include xylene **(considered** a carcinogen), acetone, light alcohols, butyl acetate, toluene, **and** ketones. **Most** of these solvents **are** flammable hazardous **materials whose** use in gloveboxes is not recommended. These solvents **also are** considered RCRA hazardous waste **PO01 waste)** in their pure *state* or RCRA characteristic flammable waste (D001) as mixtures. Because of these hazards and the potential to generate mixed waste when using the solvents, the **amount** of application solvent **needed per** *tag* and the configuration of the stock material will be closely controlled.

## **7.2.5 Retention**

One significant criterion for the application solvents is in establishing that their use must make it difficult to remove the tagging materials **fiom** the *SNM* or containers being tagged, Ideally, the material would be impossible to remove without complicated chemistry or equipment. In reality, the task is to identify an application solvent that will leave detectable residues **behind** even **though** most of the **tag** *can* be removed with readily available solvents.





\* Approximately **50 pL** of application solvent was spread over 2 to **4** *cm2,* **dried,** and then were subjected to a 2 **mL** rinse **(as** consecutive drops over 1 minute).

Some removal evident, but more than **than** 90% of the tagged **material** remained.

 $\alpha$  A significant amount of material visibly removed ( $>50\%$ ) with detectable residue remaining.

<sup>d</sup> No material visibly removed.

To evaluate the candidate solvents for retention during removal activities, aluminum plates with dried aliquots of the solvents were rinsed with a variety of solvents **to** estimate their retention properties during **rinse operations.** The application solvents evaluated included only **those** that left behind a **dried** organic residue that binds the fluorescent material to the **metal.** During almost all of the tests, the rinsing solvents removed only a portion of the tag. The amount of the tag removed increased with Iarger volumes of the rinse solvent and with more physical wiping of the tag with the solvent. More **specific** results\*for the application solvents versus the rinsing solvents are provided in Table **7-3.** 

### **7.2.6 Continuing Efforts for the Candidate Application Solvents**

**Further** evaluation of **two** candidate application solvents, Spotcheck **SKC-HF** - a naptha **type** solvent, and Prism 454 - a cyanoacrylate adhesive, was performed to determine if : 1) the necessary quantity of tagging materials can be dissolved in the small quantity of application solvent used to apply the tag; 2) the application solvent *can* bind **the** tagging **materiais** sufficiently well to **minimize** inappropriate removal; and 3) the fluorescent compounds stili fluoresce in the dried residue that binds them to metal surfaces.

Six fluorophores were tested with these two application solvents. Four of the fluorophores: *UV Blue D-282*, Columbia Blue **I)-298,** l-hydmxypyme, and IR-125 had been characterized **and used** in **our** studies. The other **two** fluorophores selected for **this** *study* were both inorganic materials: yttrium vanadate doped with europium and zinc sulfide doped with traces of copper, aluminum, and gold.

7.2.6.1 Dissolution/Adhesion Tests with SKC-HF. One milliliter of SKC-HF was pipetted into each of si **6-mL** vials and a *small* **quantity** of each of the six fluorophores added to each and mixed thoroughly. The *only* fluorophores which appeznedto be even **slightly** soluble in **this** solvent were 1-hydroxyppene, **IR-125,** and 0-282. Fifty **microliter** aliquots of each of these solutions were pipetted on to stainless steel substrates and allowed to *dry.* The dried deposits were examined **under** W illumination at both 254 nm and **356 nm.** The colors observed under these conditions are summarized below in Table 7-4.

.

Fluorophore	Surface Color(254nm)	Surface Color(356nm)	Observations
$\text{YVO}_4$ ; Eu	Ruby red	Pale pink	Localized small spot
ZnS; Cu, Al, Au	Green	Green	Small green spot
1-hydroxypyrene	None	None	
IR-125	None	None	
D-298	Pink/rose-large area	Blue halo	Halo on perimeter
D-282	Pink-localized specks	Blue halo	Halo on perimeter

**Table 7-4.** Observations of fluorophores dissolved in SKC-HF on **stainless** steel substrates.

The lack of fluorescence for 1 -hydroxypyrene apparently is due to the absence of an organic matrix to support the fluorescence. The localized spots for most of these fluorophores is an additional indicator **of** the limited solubility of **the two** inorganic fluorophores and the D-282 in **SKC-HF.** IR-125 does not fluoresce in the W. Solutions of IR-125 fluoresce in the *NIR;* however we obtained some background fluorescence from the stainless steel substrate in this region when we scanned **this** substrate with **a** fluorimeter.

This experiment was repeated using pastes prepared by adding a small quantity of each bulk fluorophore to **50 pL** of SKC-HF on a clean stainless steel substrate and **then mixing** thoroughly to **form** a **''pasts''** of the **mixture. The** *colors* of the various deposits were observed while still wet at 254 nm and **356** nm and with room light after they had **dried.** These observations are **summarized** below in Table 7-5.





The substrates were examined again under *UV* irradiation after the solvent had evaporated. The colors were the *same* **as** for the wet deposits. The **adhesion** of the *dry* deposits to the stainless steel substrates was tested initially **by** tapping *each* substrate on edge three times. A significant quantity of the D-282 was removed by **this**  treatment **and** some of **the crystals** of 1-hydroqpyrene was also removed. All of the other fluorophores appeared to **remain** *on* **the** substrates. **This** treatment was repeated **a** second time with similar results. It appears that the D-282 *can* be removed *easily* by tapping the substrate on edge. The bulk of the other deposits was easily removed from the substrates by brushing the substrate **gently** with **a** Q-tip or *dry* cotton swab or by brushing gently and then tapping the substrate on its edge. A *dry* Kimwipe was then used to wipe the surface of each substrate. Traces of the doped **yttrium** vanadate and the D-298 were still quite evident on the substrate while there were lesser **amounts** of the doped zinc sulfide and the D-282. All traces of the fluorophores could be removed **from** 

<span id="page-47-0"></span>the substrates by wiping with **a** Q-tip soaked in 2-propanol. Therefore none of these fluorophores when used in **SKC-HF** solvent is a durable tagging marker.

7.2.6.2 Dissolution/Adhesion Tests with Prism 454. A small quantity of each of the six fluorophores was dispersed with Prism **454,** a cyanoacrylate adhesive, on clean stainless steel substrates. The edge of a clean razor blade was used to *mix* two drops of the Prism **454** with several **milligrams** of each fluorophore. Although the deposits were nonuniform and contained undissolved particles, fluorescence was observed **when the** wet deposits were irradiated with *UV* fight at **254** nm or **356** nm. The **colors** were **similar** to those obtained with the **SKC-HF.** Neither the 1-hydroxypyrene *or* the IR-125 exhibited fluorescence with excitation **at** either of these wavelengths. **All** these substrates were observed again with **254** nm and **356 nm**  excitation after drymg overnight. The **colors** were **similar** to those observed with the SKC-HF fluorophore "pastes" except that the 1-hydroxypyrene fluoresces a weak blue-green in the *dry* deposit **at** both wavelengths and the **D-298** fluoresces a **lighter** shade of blue than with **SKC-HF.** 

Attempts were made to obtain more uniform deposits by two different techniques: (1) speading a thin layer of Prism **454** on the substrate before adding the solid fluorophores and (2) applying a solution of the fluorophore dissolved in SKC-HF, allowing it to *dty,* and then applymg **a** coating of Prism **454** over the deposited fluorophore. Neither of these techniques was successful in obtaining homogeneous deposits for any of the fluorophores although better success was obtained with the 1-hydroxypyrene and the D-298. They **are** more soluble in the **Prism 454** than are the other fluorophores investigated.

*All* of these deposits were more durable than those obtained with SKC-HF. None of the material was removed by tapping the substrates *on* edge. Gentle wiping with a Kimwipe did not remove any material although some of the fluorophore could be detected on the Kiwipe after wiping briskly. Wiping with sufficient pressure to abrade away the fluorophore which was not thoroughly covered by the **film** of **Prism 454** still left sufficient material on the substrate *to* fluoresce strongly. Each substrate was scrubbed *twice* with **50-pL** aliquots of 2-propanol and a clean Kimwipe. Although some fluorescent material was detected on the Kimwipe, the bulk of the deposit *on* each substrate remained intact. Although fluorescence from the 1-hydroxypyrene was weaker than for the other **four** *UV* excited fluorophores, it remained essentially unchanged *after* this cleaning procedure. It is likely that *the* material removed by cleaning with 2-PrOH *is* still the fluorophore which is not covered by *or*  dissolved in the **Prism 454.** Some of the D-298 was transferred to clean areas of the substrate by the 2-PrOH cleaning procedure, which is probably due *to* the **high** solubility of *this* fluorophore in **2-PrOH.** 

The cleaning/removal procedure was repeated with 50  $\mu$ L of acetone instead of 2-PrOH. The cyanoacrylate film was readily attacked by acetone and no trace of the doped ZnS or 1-hydroxypyrene remained *on* the **substrates** where **they** had been deposited; only small, isolated patches of the other fluorophores remained *on* the substrates. Attempts to *quantify* **the amount** of material removed by each of these treatments by weighing the substrates after each step were unsuccessll because of **the** small quantities initially present.

Of the *six* fluorophores **studied,** I-hydroxypyrene and D-298 produced the most uniform, durable deposits with Prism 454. This is primarily due to their greater solubility. The quantity of fluorophore deposited in a film of Prism **454** *may* **be** increased **by** initally dissolving the fluorophore in a polar solvent such **as** acetone. Although acetone attacks fifms of Prism **454,** it does not prevent **the** polymerization of **this** adhesive. **D-298** is highly soluble in acetone *so* several **milligrams** were dissolved in acetone and then a small aliquot deposited on **an** aluminum substrate. *Several* drops of Prism **454** were deposited adjacent to **this** solution and the two mixed.

Although the two were not readdy miscible, **they** were *mixed* **and** dispersed over most of the substrate. The Prism **454 dried** without **tackiness and** the resulting film fluoresced an intense bright blue. **Some** of the fluorophore was readily **removed by touching** the surface; enough to contaminate fingertips or gloves, but the bulk of the deposit remained intact.

**7.2.6.3** *VisibiIm and Paitemabjlity of Bonn-Trace* **787** *Solveni* Earlier **studies had** indicated **that** Bonn-Trace **191** Contains a fluarescent compound but leaves a residue on metal substrates which is visible under normal light. Attempts were made to reduce the visibility of the residue by diluting with several solvents with which it is at least partially miscible. The MSDS for this product indicated it contains approximately 14% toluene, **11%** xylene, and 36% acetone. **SKC-HF** and **several** of these diluents were selected for investigation in an attempt to reduce the visibility of deposits and retain the patternability of Bonn-Trace **19** 1. **Initially** Bonn-Trace **191** was *mixed* in *several* different ratios **(1: 1,1:2,** and **1 :9)** with **SKC-HF** and then small quantities were pipetted **on** to aluminum and **stainless** steel substrates. *All* three mktures dispersed well **on** the substrates and the more dilute *mixtures* were significantly less visible **on** the substrates when viewed with room lighting. The **1:9** mixture was **nearly** invisible **on** aluminum substrates and showed only small changes in color near the outer edge of the deposits. The **1:l** and **1:2 mktures** deposited *on* stainless steel substrates consisted of two concentric rings, an inner ring which was nearly unaffected in appearance and an outer ring which made the substrate look grayer **than** the uncoated substrate.

The deposits **on** all substrates **fluoresced** a bright blue with stronger fluorescence at **365** nm than at **254** nm. The Bonn-Trace **191** was not entirely miscible with **SKC-HF** in a **1** *:9* volume ratio. Bonn-Trace **191**  was then **diluted 1: 10** with toluene, acetone, and 4-methyl-2-pentanone (MIBK) **and** used to test its pattemability **on** aluminum and stainless steel substrates.

**Masks containing block letters or numbers 0.625 cm high were created from 3.75 cm by 5 cm Post-It** notes by cutting the pattern into the adhesive-backed portion of the Post-It note with a razor blade or Exacto knife. Then neat Bonn-Trace 191 and the various 1:10 mixtures of Bonn-Trace 191 and toluene, SKC-HF, acetone, and **MIBK** were applied to the masks by rolling a Q-tip over the surface of the masks. Two different exposure techniques were used: **(1)** allowing the *mixtures* to *dry* **on** the masks before removing them **from** the substrates and (2) removing the **masks** from the substrates immediately after applying the fluorophore. The deposits were allowed to dry and then examined under normal room lighting and with UV illumination at 356 nm. **The** results of these experiments are summarized in [Table](#page-49-0) **7-6.** 

The undiluted Bonu-Trace **191** produced more distinct pattern images for short exposure times. Thinning with acetone or MIBK clearly yielded better images for long exposure *times* with stainless **steel**  substrates. If the mask is removed immediately **after** application of these mixtures to stainless steel, these solvents transport the fluorophore away from the region where it was originally applied, yielding a less distinct image. The aluminum substrates have a much higher degree of surface roughness than the stainless steel substrates and the diluted Bonn-Trace 191 behaves differently. The surface roughness allows the Bonn-Trace **191** diluted with acetone or MIBK to diffuse **under** the mask and transport the fluorophor away from **the** point of application, resulting in a very diffuse image (or no image at all). Bonn-Trace 191 diluted with toluene yielded the most distinct *image* patterns **on both** substrates for long exposure times and these were **among** the best image produced in these experiments.

Mixture <sup>a</sup>	Substrate	Exposure Time <sup>b</sup>	Observations at 356nm
<b>BT 191</b>	Aluminum	Long	Indistinct pattern; all letters smudged
<b>BT 191</b>	<b>Stainless Steel</b>	Long	Wide line widths; letters smudged
			Narrower line widths than for long exposure.
<b>BT</b> 191	Aluminum	<b>Short</b>	Pattern of letters visible
			Narrower line widths than for long exposure.
			Distinct pattern of letters visible. Image also visible
<b>BT</b> 191	<b>Stainless Steel</b>	Short	with room lighting.
<b>BT 191</b>			
<b>SKC-HF</b>	Aluminum	Long	Clear pattern of all letters visible
<b>BT 191</b>			
<b>SKC-HF</b>	Stainless steel	Long	No pattern of letters visible
<b>BT 191</b>			Pattern visible. Dim outline of letters visible with
Toluene	<b>Stainless Steel</b>	Long	room lighting.
<b>BT 191</b>			Pattern visible. Wider line widths than for dilution
Toluene	Aluminum	Long	with SKC-HF.
			Pattern visible but of poorer quality than on
<b>BT 191</b>			aluminum substrate (wider line widths, weaker
Toluene	<b>Stainless Steel</b>	Short	pattern.)
BT 191			Three of four letters clearly visible with narrow line
Toluene	Aluminum	Short	widths.
<b>BT 191</b>			
Acetone	<b>Stainless Steel</b>	Long	Distinct pattern of all four numbers.
<b>BT 191</b>			
Acetone	Aluminum	Long	No pattern of numbers visible
<b>BT</b> 191			
Acetone	<b>Stainless Steel</b>	Short	None of numbers are distinct - all smudged.
<b>BT</b> 191			
Acetone	Aluminum	Short	Numbers not distinct; virtually illegible.
<b>BT 191</b>			
<b>MIBK</b>	<b>Stainless Steel</b>	Long	Only two of four numbers legible.
<b>BT 191</b>			Only two of four numbers legible; wider line
<b>MIBK</b>	Aluminum	Long	widths than with stainless steel.
<b>BT 191</b>			Only two of four numbers legible; poorer image
<b>MIBK</b>	<b>Stainless Steel</b>	Short	than for long exposure.
<b>BT 191</b>			
<b>MIBK</b>	Aluminum	<b>Short</b>	None of numbers legible.

<span id="page-49-0"></span>Table **7-6.** Patternability **tests** of Bonn-Trace 191 (BT 191) on aluminum and **stainless** steel substrates.

**<sup>a</sup>**First **four des are** for undiluted Bonn-Trace 19 1; all others are **1** : 10 (v/v) **dilutions** of Bonn-Trace 19 1 with solvent listed.

**bLong** exposure denotes mask left in place until mixture **dried** on mask; short exposure denotes **mask** removed immediately **after** applying mixture **to mask.** 

The outline of images created on stainless steel **are** still visible with room lighting. **This** is clearly undesirable, especially if the tag consisted of numbers or letters, because it would alert a pilferer of SNM that the material is marked and show them the location of the tag. One alternative to using a tag consisting of numbers *andor* letters would be to **use** a pattern composed of a series of **small dots** which create a readable pattern which is much less obvious **as** a tag.

A series of **masks,** *containing* a pattern consisting of small holes created with **a** fine hypodermic needle, were prepared in the adhesive-backed portion of 3.75 by 5 cm Post-It notes. The spacing between adjacent holes in a row was **0.5** cm and the holes in the adjacent rows were offset by 0.25 *cm.* **These** masks were applied to stainless steel and aluminum substrates and the neat Bonn-Trace 191 or Bonn-Trace diluted 1:10 with acetone, **MBK,** or toluene applied to **the masks** with a Q-tip using one of these two techniques: **(1)** rolling the **Q-tip** over the entire surface of the mask or (2) applying the fluorophor only to the holes in the mask. The Bonn-Trace 19l/acetone and BOnn-Trac;e 19l/MIBKmixtures were applied to the entire surface of the **masks** and the masks allowed to dry before removing the masks from stainless steel substrates. When illuminated at  $365$  nm, the hole pattern could notbe detected **although** some **areas** of the substrate contained bright **spots** of the fluorophur. Application of **Bonn-Trace** 191 and Bam-Trace 191 diluted 1: 10 with toluene by rolling the Q-tip over the entjre *sur6xe* of the *mask* and then immediately removing the **masks** fiom the stainless steel **substrates** replicated only a part of the **mask** pattern. The rest of the pattern was indistinct.

Application of Bonn-Trace 19 1 and Bonn-Trace 191 diluted with toluene to aluminum and **stainless** steel substrates by using a Q-tip to deliver the fluorophor directly on to each hole **and** then immediately removing the mask **from** the surface of the substrate yielded more satisfactory **results. The** dot pattern fiom the mask **was almost** totalEy replid by **the** undiluted **Bonn-Trace** 19 1 but *only* part of *the* pattern was replicated by the Bonn-Trace 19 1 diluted with toluene. Some of the pattern observed with the diluted Bonn-Trace 19 **1** was totally missing and some dots were not bright, well-formed, or distinct. The desired resolution of **0.5** *cm* between adjacent dots **and 0.25** *cm* between rows was achieved with the undiluted Bonn-Trace 19 1. **This** pattern of dots **was** invisible on aluminum substrates with room light. However, the pattern on the stainless steel substrate was still visible with room light, due to the change in refractive index of the surface.

# **8. SELECTION OF CANDIDATE RADIOISOTOPE COMPOUNDS**

The radioisotope tag is based on the concept that unique isotopes can be applied to a **surface** and then detected by their characteristic gamma decay. The uniqueness of the tag will be established by assigning unique **combinations** of **the radioisotopes** to *each* **user facility.** *Advantages* of **this** tag are that it can be detected and **read**  with simple detector technology, the tag will be detectable for a minimum of twenty years, very small quantities of the tag can be detected, and **materials** inside storage containers and packaging can be tagged and identified without opening the container. As with the fluorescent tag, efforts to remove the tag will leave significant forensic detectable residues. This radioisotopic will have several disadvantages: **1)** the special precautions and handling procedures required when using the radioisotopes; 2) the cost of the **limited** number of available radioisotopes; and 3) the potential detection difficulty of the radioisotopes in the presence of the background radiation from the SNM. Design criteria for the radioisotopic tag is addressed in Section 8.1. The selection process for candidate radioisotopes is provided in Section 8.2.

# 8.1 Design Criteria for Radioisotopic Tag

## **8.1.1 Safety**

The tag will be designed to limit the radioactive dose fiom the applied tag to add less than a few percent to the existing background of the tagged **SNM** and will not *cause* **an** unacceptable exposure during normal handling **operations.** *Any* radioisotope that may be taken **into** the **body** of *an* individual handling the tag will provide a less-than-lethal dose, have well-defined biological uptake processes, and be treatable with established methods.

## **8.1.2 Uniqueness to Facility**

To provide capabilities to identify each facility handling SNM, the number of useful tagging radioisotopes will be suflicient to identify uniquely *at* least one hundred facilities.

### **8.1.3 Uniqueness of Tampering Tag**

To identify an individual that has improperly handled tagged SNM, that tag will be designed to contain a radioisotope that can be taken up by a person, has a long residence time, and normally is not found at the targeted handling facilities. Because the number of radioisotopes with these characteristics is limited, it is expected that the tampering tag will be common to all facilities.

## **8.1.4 Traceable Across Facilities**

Because it is expected that material will be transferred between facilities using the tag, the tag will be designed to contain a component or pattern that will allow the material to be tagged chronologically **so** that the history of the tag *can* be traced. This may be accomplished by monitoring the intensity ratio between isotopes **as** *they* decayy using short-lived isotopes that will survive long **enough** *to* cover the transport time, or by **using encoding** information into the pattern in which the isotopes are applied.

### **8.1.5 Lifetime**

Because **the** *SNM* to be tagged may be sealed in long-term storage **containers,** the radioisotope tag will be designed to be detectable over at least *twenty years*. A short-lived isotopic tag for interfacility transfer will be designed to be detectable for at least 30 *days.* 

### **8.1.6 Size and Pattern**

To accommodate the expected size of materials to be tagged, the maximum **size** for the tag is *expected*  to be  $2 \text{ cm} \times 2 \text{ cm}$ . To provide uniqueness between tags, the radioisotopes may be applied in resolvable patterns.

#### **8.1-7 Composition of Tag**

The radioisotope **as** received fiom the manufacturer will be in a chemical form that is soluble in **the**  application solvent, sufficiently concentrated to meet sensitivity requirements, and sufficiently pure to not contain detectable quantities of other tagging radioisotopes.

### **8.1.8 Detection Instrumentation**

To minimize the cost of the tagging **system,** the **tag** will be detectable with existing portable instrumentation at locations including **but** not limited **to: 1)** immediately after the **tag** is applied, 2) shipping **and**  receiving **areas,** and 3) **remote** *storage* **locations.** Based on **the** proposed tagging concept the tag wiII be designed to have dcient activity and adequate separation **between** emission lines so that the tag **can** be detectabie with a conventional sodium iodide and/or germanium gamma detector. It is expected that the detector will consist of a standard 5-cm diameter crystal, the type found in commercially available hand held detection systems, and will be adequate for detecting unadulterated **tags** that have recently **been** applied. It is also expected that absolute verification of the facility of **origin** for material that **has** been recovered may require a **higher** resolution, low background germanium detection **system.** 

## **8.1.9 Detection of Recently Applied Tag**

To verify the existence of an unadulterated tag, the tag will be designed to be detected from a reasonable and safe **distance through** 0.6 cm of stainless steel, with **an** average count time of **15** minutes. The tag will be considered detectable if the count rate is statistically significant when compared to the background of the *SNM*  being **tagged.** 

#### **8.1.10 Detection of Adulterated Tag**

To verify the existence of a tag that has been through a 99.9% removal effort, the tag will be designed to provide **at** least one count per minute **(CPM)** above background with a **high** resolution, low background, a germanium detector *exposed* directly to the tag **fiom as** close **as** reasonably possible. The maximum count time for **this** type of detection is estimated to be 600 minutes.

## **8.1.1 1 Disposition** *of* **Tag**

It is not the intent of the tag that it will be removed. However, provisions **need** to be available in case inappropriate applications of the tag occur. For this reason, the tag when embedded will not consist of any quantity of hazardous material **kyond the** *expected* radioactive hazards if physical methods of removal are used. The dissolution of the tag will be possible using a solvent that can be disposed of with available mixed waste treatment technology.

# **8.2 Candidate Radioisotopes**

The tagging *system* will use three different sets of radioisotopes for three different tagging applications: 1) long-lived **high** gamma energy radioisotopes for the identification of the facility of origin, 2) short-lived, biologically active radioisotopes for **tagging** an individual involved in proliferation of **SNM,** and 3) short-lived **high** gamma energy radioisotopes for tracing the transfer of **SNM** from one facility to another facility. Each of these applications requires the tagging materials to meet specific criteria identified in Section 5. How the candidate radioisotopes were evaluated against these criteria is described throughout this section. **The** criteria evaluated in **this** *Section* include the half-life, gamma-ray energy, gamma-ray branching ratio, and the number of gamma-rays. These criteria are **described** in Sections 8.2.1 **through** 8.2.8. The candidate radioisotopes are presented in Section 8.2.9.

#### **8.2.1 Half-life**

8.2.1.1 Tracing Facility of Origin. To have a tag that will identify the facility of origin for the SNM *or* its containers for **at** least 20 years, *gamma* **emitting** radioisotopes with a half-life of 5 years to 1500 years were identified for further evaluation. **This** selection criterion ensured that at least 5% of any isotope in the original tag will remain 20 years after being applied. This half-life selection range also ensures that none of the candidate **radionuclides** *can* be part of the natural decay chain of uranium or plutonium isotopes and that the tags will need only a minimal amount of mass to achieve the requisite activity.

8.2.1.2 Tracking *Interfacility Movement*. To have a tag that can be used to track the facility of *origin* while **materials are** transferred **from** one facility to another, gamma emitting radioisotopes with half-lives from two weeks to three months were identified. This range provides a wide choice of lifetimes to allow a choice of a specific **half-life** which is long *enough* to finish the processing and transferring tasks, yet short **enough** to not require **tag** removal when **the** transfe is complete. This range of half-lives ensures that at least 5% of the tag will remain for transfers completed within 10 to 50 weeks and 99.9% of the tag to decay away for transfer times ranging from 20 to 120 weeks. Because the short half-life will **minimize** exposure hazards to contaminated **pilferers, this** identified *group* of short-lived isotopes also was used to select eligible biologically active isotopes for the tampering tag.

#### **8.2.2 Isotope Decay Mode**

The **candidate radioisotqes** were chosen to avoid the natural decay chain for uranium and plutonium to minimize ambiguity between the background radiation **fiom** the **SNM** and the radioisotopes in the tag. In addition, the mode of *decay* of *each* **candidate** radioisotope and its daughter, if **they** exist, was limited to gamma*rays* from short-lived daughters formed fiom parent beta- or alpha-decay. Gamma-rays were chosen to provide sufficient energy to detect the tag through containers. The gamma emitters were chosen to avoid ambiguity with *any* background radiation that *may occur* during **spontaneous** fission from the **SNM** and to eliminate **hazards** from *any* impacts due to neutron emission. If a candidate isotope had a **coexisting** spontaneous fission decay mode, the candidate isotope was selected only if the branching ratio for this mode was less than 10<sup>-30</sup>%.

## **8.2.3 Gamma-ray Energy**

To **make** the tagging *system* more tamper-proof, a part of the tag must be applied directly onto the **SNM and** be detectable through a typical storage container or shielding materials. Therefore, a calculation was completed to identify which gamma-ray emissions would have sufficient energy to be detectable through  $1/4"$ (6 mm) *stainless* **steeL The** percent of transmission of different gamma-ray energies through **1 ft** (30 *cm) of* **air and 1/4" (0.625** *cm)* of **stainless** steel is shown in Table **8-1. This** calculation indicates that the candidate radioisotopes should have gamma-ray energies of at least **200** keV to be detectable **(>40%** transmission) inside a 6 mm thick **stainless steel** container.



### **8.2.4 Branching Ratio**

Because it will be difficult and expensive to embed a sipficant mass of the radioactive **tag** into the **SNM,** the efficient **use** of each radioisotope **tagging** component will be essential. For this reason, not only is the effective transmission of each gamma-ray important, the effective conversion of each decay of the radioactive **isotope into** *a* detectable gamma-ray (branching ratio) is also important. A **higher** branching ratio will result in a higher achievable count rate (ie., **less** material **needed** to be detected or less time needed to detect). To achieve **an** acceptable count rate **(the true** measure of **the detectability** of the **tag)** for each isotope, there must be a balance between the mass of isotope, half-life, the energy of decay, branching ratio, and *counting* time.

#### **8.2.5 Mass of Radioisotope in the Tag**

The amount of radionuclide used in the **tag** is mainly determined by the solubility of each individual isotope. It is **currently** estimated that the amount of a radioisotope soluble in the application solvent will be **100** ng in the projected volume of **tag** applied (e.g., **25 pL** of solution). **This conresponds** to **4** parts per million (ppm) of *isotope* in the solvent and **maintains** the concentration of any toxic heavy metal isotope below the usual *5* ppm characteristic **hazardous waste** concentration limit. Even though, non-hazardous metals could exceed **100** ng **and** not be categorized **as** hazardous waste, the 100 ng of material per **tag** was used **as an** upper limit of **material** in a tag for estimating a count rate. In some cases, the mass of the isotope may have to exceed **100** ng to achieve the appropriate count rate.

<span id="page-55-0"></span>

Figure 8-1. CPM versus gamma-ray energy.

## **8.2.6 Count Rates for Candidate Radioisotopes**

**As stated** above, a primary criterion for selecting candidate isotopes is the estimated count rate. The count rate can be estimated using several factors: 1) the energy efficiency of the isotope **through** the packaging Container (Table **8-** l), 2) the efficiency of a decay *to* generate a detectable gamma-ray (branching ratio), 3) the mass of isotope in the tag (100 ng), **4)** the number of *decays* **per** unit time (half-life ranging from 5 to 1500 years), 5) the amount of time available *to* detect the isotope (count time limited to 15 minutes), and 6) the efficiency of the detector to detect a gamma-ray (based on detector type, spatial orientation, and **distance).** To **obtain** good statistics in detecting an interrogated gamma-ray **peak,** the detector must record at least 500 counts **(4% uncertainty** in the total counts).

To **select** candidate isotopes for the tag, the above parameters were used *to* calculate a theoretical CPM of each emitting gamma-ray for 100 ng of each candidate radioisotope. The calculations for count rates were based on measurements made with an 11.7-µCi <sup>152</sup>Eu source placed 12 cm away from a 25%-efficient Ge detector m-type Ge *crystal* with a 5 *cm* (2") diameter and thickness). The efficiency curve **was** obtained by counting the <sup>152</sup>Eu source for 10 minutes. The resulting intensities were then converted to represent the expected intensities fiurn **a** 1 **pCi** *source counted* **for** *one* **minute** (Figure **8-** 1). From **this** curve, **the** expected CPM **was** estimated for a l-pCi source of **a** specific energy gamma-ray for each candidate isotope at 100% branching ratio **and** 12 *cm*  distance. The calculated CPM value then was **adjusted** for the actual branching ratio of the gamma ray, the measurement **distance** (32 *cm),* **and** the **mass** *of* **isotope** (100 ng).

#### **8.2.7 Count Rates Through a Storage Container for the Candidate Radioisotopes**

The above measurements of the 11.7- $\mu$ Ci <sup>152</sup>Eu source were used to complete the CPM calculations for each of the candidate radioisotope. The effect of the 6 mm of stainless steel fiom a storage container **was**  determined using the total photon attenuation cross-sections for iron<sup>5,6</sup> plotted as a function of gamma-ray

*energies* (Figure **8-2).** These data were then fitted **using** a two-exponential decay **method** to derive the formula for calculating the attenuation:

$$
Y = Y_0 + A_1 * exp(-(X - X_0) / T_1) + A_2 * exp(-(X - X_0) / T_2)
$$

Where  $Y =$  photon cross-section in barns X = gamma-ray *energy* in keV

and the values for the other parameters were equal **to:** 





Figure **8-2.** Photon attenuation **versus** *energy.* 

#### **8.2.8 Interference of Gamma-ray Energies from Other Candidate Radioisotopes**

**To** *ensure* no **ambiguity** between the **gamma-ray** signatures of **tags** fiom Merent facilities, **a** radioisotope **tag must** not contain radioisotopes that have gamma-ray energies that overlap with radioisotopes of another **tag.**  However, an interference between gamma-rays of two different isotopes will not be significant if each radioisotope **has** at least one unique (non-overlapping) gamma-ray peak among all of the gamma-rays emitted **fiom** other radioisotopes in the tag. **For the** purposes of selecting candidate radioisotopes, a germanium detector with gamma-ray resolution of **2.0** keV at the **1332** keV gamma-ray of *6oCo* **was** assumed.

However, *since* a **7.5** *cm* x **7.5** *cm* **(3"x3")** NaI *or* CsI detector with about 7% resolution **(662** keV **13'Cs)**  *can* **only** resolve two gamtna-rays if they **are** separated by approximately 50 keV, other overlapping gamma-ray **energies** *may* eliminate candidate radioisotopes. Another potential **source** of interferences, to be evaluated later, will be the gamma-ray energy background fiom the Compton events of radiation emitted fiom both the **SNM**  and other tagging radioisotopes.

### **8.2.9 List of Candidate Radioisotopes.**

After the elimination of radioisotopes not meeting **all** the *Criteria,* lists for both long- and short-lived radionuclide were **compiled,** These candidate isotopes are **summarized** in Table 8-2 and 8-3, respectively. **This**  Tables 8-2 and 8-3 also include an indication of the methods of production, the number of gamma rays **(>200**  kev) available for detection, the **number** of potentially interfering gamma rays fiom the other candidate isotopes (if **all** *other candidate* **isotopes** were present simultaneously), and the count rate for the most intense gamma-ray (with no wnflicting gamma-ray) of the isotope. The parent isotope is **listed as** the long-lived candidate isotope when a gamma-ray is emitted by a short-lived daughter isotope. *An* example of **this,** is Cs-137 which decays 100% by beta and produces a short-lived Ba-137m daughter which produces the gamma-ray. The candidate **isotopes** meet all **the** criteria fiom **Sections** 8.2.1 through 8.2.8, except for Nb-94. Nb-94 has a half-life outside the 1500 year limit, but meets the specification for count rate because of its gamma-ray energy and branching ratio. tables list isotopes with acceptable half-lives, gamma-ray energies of  $\geq 200$  keV, and branching ratios  $\geq 1\%$ <sup>7,8,9</sup>

The detailed list of information about the candidate **isotopes,** including **all** gamma-ray energies, conflicting gamma rays, and estimated CPM for each gamma ray **through** air and a 1/4 inch stainless steel *Container* **are given** in Appendices C and D. There are **18** long-lived radionuclides which can be used **as** tagging isotopes for identifying the facility of origin. There are 38 short-lived isotopes which can be used for monitoring **SNM** transferred between user facilities.

## **8.2.10 Biological Tampering Tag**

There are several short-lived radioisotopes such as <sup>95m</sup>Tc, <sup>203</sup>Hg, <sup>105m</sup>Ag, <sup>114m</sup>In, and <sup>85</sup>Sr in Table 8-3 which can be used to trace and identify the individual tampering with the tag.<sup>10</sup> Under normal working conditions, authorized **workers** handling **the tags** in the controlled environment **would** be protected **fiom** contamination with the tagging materials. However, unauthorized handling would expose the worker to these isotopes and consequently to eventual uptake of the isotopes by direct touching. This list contains isotopes which have long enough half-lives to insure traceability over time and yet short-enough half-lives to provide non-lethal doses to the individual. The methods for neutralizing the biological uptake fiom accidental exposure would be defined and available.

#### *8.2.1* **1 Continuing Efforts for the Candidate Radioisotopes**

The current list of candidate isotopes for the tagging systems will require further evaluation to complete the selection of the isotopes that *can* be **used** in the **fmal** tagging system. **Efforts** to complete **this** selection are: **1) an** evaluation of the cost of production of the candidate isotopes; 2) an evaluation of the gamma-ray energies versus *the* background radiation from the **SNM** that will be tagged; 3) a review *of* the exposure to authorized personnel handling **the** radioisotopes; **4)** a review of the biological uptake properties for the candidate isotopes; **and** 5) **an** evaluation of the actual *expected* **count** rate with *respect* to the detection system chosen for the detection system.

Isotope	<b>Half Life</b> (y)	Production Reactions <sup>*</sup>	# gamma rays $( > 200 \text{keV})$	# conflicting gamma-rays	(keV)	Non-conflicting gamma with highest CPM Energy CPM (air)
Ag-108m	418.0**	T, C	3	$\mathbf{1}$	433.70	503
Ba-133	10.54	T, F	4	$\mathbf{I}$	355.86	12828
<b>Bi-207</b>	31.54	$\mathbf C$	3	none	569.67	3122
<b>Bk-247</b>	1380.0	$\mathbf C$	$\mathbf{I}$	none	265.0	31
Cf-249	351.0	T	3	$\bf{l}$	387,95	206
Cf-251	898.0	T	1	none	285.0	$\mathbf{2}$
$Cm-243$	29.1	T	3	$\mathbf{1}$	228.19	618
$Co-60$	5.27	T, F	$\mathbf{1}$	none	1173.23	39478
$Cs-137$	30.07	T, F, I	$\mathbf{1}$	none	661.62	3861
Eu-150n	36.9	C, F	15	$\overline{\mathbf{4}}$	439.39	3522
Eu-152	13.54	T, F	11	3	344.30	3895
Eu-154	8.6	T, F, I, C	10	1	1274.80	3111
Ho-166m	1200.0	T, F	5	$\overline{\mathbf{3}}$	810.31	49
Hf-178n	31.0	T, C	13	$\overline{2}$	213.44	6110
Nb-94	20300.0	T, I	$\overline{2}$	1	702.50	10
Pm-146	5.53	$\mathbf C$	4	3	747.40	7230
Po-209	102.0	$\mathsf{C}$	$\mathbf{2}$	none	260.50	4
Tb-158	180.0	F, C	5	$\overline{2}$	944.20	225

Table **8-2.** Long-lived candidate **radioisotopes.** 

\* T: Thermal neutron activation, F: **Fast** neutron activation, C: Charge particle reaction, I: **Fission** product, P: Photon reaction

# Conflicting gamma-ray is the **only** one present

Isotope	Half Life	Production	$#$ gamma rays	# conflicting	Non-conflicting gamma with highest CPM Energy	
	(y)	Reactions <sup>*</sup>	$(>200 \text{keV})$	gamma-rays	(keV)	CPM (air)
Ag-105	41.29	P, C	12	8	331.50	295
As-74	17.77	F, P	3	1	595.70	9195
Cd-115m	44.6	T, F, I	1	1	933.60#	37
$Cm-241$	32.8	$\mathbf C$	$\overline{c}$	1	474.50	2904
$Co-56$	77.27	$\mathbf C$	8	2	846.75	3632
$Co-58$	70.82	C, F	$\boldsymbol{2}$	1	810.75	3906
$Cr-51$	27.7	T,F	l	1	320.07#	2168
Eu-147	24.1	$\mathbf C$	8	$\overline{\mathbf{4}}$	677.60	623
Fe-59	44.5	T, F	$\overline{2}$	none	1099.22	2788
Hf-175	70.1	T, F	$\overline{2}$	$\mathbf{2}$	343.40#	2109
Hf-179n	25.05	T, F, C	8	$\overline{2}$	453.70	3650
Hf-181	42.39	T, F	$\boldsymbol{2}$	l	482.16	2623
Hg-203	46.61	T, F	1	1	279,17#	2948
$In-114m$	49.51	T, F	$\mathbf{2}$	1	558.27	176
Ir-192	73.83	T, F	9	5	468.06	877
$Nb-91m$	60.86	$\mathbf C$	1	none	1205.00#	75
Nb-95	34.98	I, T, F	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}% _{i}\left  i\right\rangle =\mathbf{1}_{i}\left  i\right\rangle$	765.82#	5027
Pm-148m	41.29	F, I	13	$\boldsymbol{7}$	550.20	3174
<b>Rb-83</b>	86.2	P, F	3	1	520.35	2758
<b>Rb-84</b>	32.77	F, P	$\overline{\mathbf{2}}$	l	881.50	3941
<b>Rb-86</b>	18.63	T, F	l	1	1076.63#	729
Re-183	70.0	C, F	3	1	291.72	86
Re-184	38.0	$\mathbf F$	5	1	792.07	896
Rh-99	16.1	$\mathbf C$	8	5	352.6	5678
Ru-103	39.2	T, I, F	$\overline{c}$	1	497.08	4871
$Sb-124$	60.2	T, F	11	5	1691.04	646
$Sc-46$	83.79	T, F	$\bf{l}$	none	889.26	3346
$Sr-85$	64.84	T, F, C	1	none	513.99	4018
Tb-160	72.3	T, F	13	5	298.57	766
$Tc-95m$	61.0	$\mathbf C$	$\overline{\mathcal{L}}$	$\overline{\mathbf{4}}$	582.15	1272
Te-121	16.7	T, F, C	$\overline{\mathbf{3}}$	none	543.08	8059
Te-129m	33.6	T, F, I	1	none	695.98	121
$Tm-168$	93.1	F, C	12	$\boldsymbol{4}$	815.95	474
$V-48$	15.97	P, C	5	$\overline{\mathbf{c}}$	983.50	18446
Xe-127	36.34	T, F, C	$\overline{2}$	$\mathbf{I}$	374.96	1090
$Yb-169$	32.03	T, F	1	1	307.68#	653
$Zr-88$	83.4	$\mathbf C$	1	l	392.85#	3464
$Zr-95$	64.02	I, T, F	$\overline{c}$	l	756,72	1539

Table 8-3. Short-lived **candidate** radioisotopes.

\* T: **Thermal neutron** activation, F: Fast neutron activation, C: Charge particle reaction, I: Fission product, P: Photon reaction

# Conflicting gamma-ray **is** the only one present

*8.2.11.1 Persistence of Cesium and Stmntium Salt Residues on Metal Substrates.*  Earlier experiments indicated that SKC-HF dries without leaving a residue on metallic substrates. To determine if sufficient quantities of cesium and strontium salts dissolved in **this** solvent would penetrate **the** surface of substrates and survive various removal **techniques,** the following experiments were perfmed with **the non**radioactive salts. Stable **Cs** and Sr salts were used for ease of handling although the quantities required for detection by chemical analysis are many orders of magnitude more than the quantities determinable radiochemically. Due to the limited solubility of cesium and strontium chlorides in pure SKC and their moderate solubility in ethanol, we initially planned to dissolve these salts in EtOH and then dilute with SKC. However **EtOH and** SKC **are** immiscible, whereas 2-PrOH and 4-methy1-2-pentanone **(MIBK) are** each miscible with SKC when mixed in **a** 1: 1 volume **ratio. These two** solvents were each **used** to dissolve small quantities of cesium and strontium chlorides and SKC was then added in a 1:1 volume ratio.

Small quantities of the salts were **also** added to pure Bonn-Trace 191, which is another excellent penetrating solvent. The solubility of **both** salts in each of these **three** solvent mixtures (SKC/Z-PrOH, **SKC/MIBK, and Bonn-Trace 191) was still quite limited so that the concentrations of these solutions could not be determined directly.** The concentrations were determined by analyzing the solutions resulting from leaching deposits of 25-pL quantities of each salt/solvent mixture **on glass** microscope slides. These deposits were allowed to *dry* and then leached for **48** hr in a **known** volumes of DI water. These leachates were analyzed for **Cs** and Sr **by** ICP-MS. The same volumes of these three solutions were pipetted **on** to **stainless** steel and aluminum substrates and allowed to dry. The following sequence of removal techniques was then used sequentially *on* these substrates.

**Dry wipe step.** The **surface** of each substrate **on** which the salt was deposited was wiped with half a *dry*  laboratory Kimwipe (actual size 10.6 by 11.3 cm) and then the material removed was rinsed from this wipe by placing it in a small polyethylene funnel and slowly passing 20 **mL** of DI water through the wipe and collecting it in a **30-mL** poly bottle. The excess water was removed from **the** Kimwipe by pressing it with the bulb of a disposable **poly** dropper.

**Wet wipe step. Half** a **standard** Kimwipe was wetted with 200 **pL** of water **and** then the **surface** of each **substrate** *on* which the salt had **been** deposited **was** wiped with **this** wet Kimwipe. The material removed **fiom**  each substrate was **rinsed** fiom the wipe by placing it in a small polyethylene funnel and then slowly passing 20 mL of **DI** water through the wipe. The rinsings from wiping each substrate were collected in 30-mL poly bottles. The excess water was removed from the Kimwipe by pressing it with the bulb of a disposable dropper.

**Static 15-min leach.** Each substrate was placed with **the** deposit side up in 20 **mL** DI water in a plastic weighing boat and allowed to remain for 15 min. Then the leachate from each substrate was transferred to 30-mL poly bottles.

**Static 24-hr leach.** Each substrate was placed, with the side **on** which the material had originally been deposited facing up, in a plastic weighmg boat **Containing** 20 **mL** of DI water. The substrate was allowed to remain in the boat for 24 hr and then the leachate was transferred to 30-mL poly bottles.

All samples were acidified with nitric acid to a concentration of 1% **HNO,** and then most of the samples were **anaiyzed by ICP-MS.** The samples generated by leaching **Cs** and Sr fiom the **glass** microscope **slides** were analyzed in order *to* estimate the *total* quantity of material **oripally** deposited on each substrate. Both the cesium and strontium chlorides were sipficantly more soluble in the 1 : 1 mixture of **2-PrOH** and **SKC than** in the other two solvents. *All* the analysis results are presented below in Tables **8-4** and *8-5.* Table **8-4** includes **all** the results for stainless steel substrates while Table *8-5* presents only the results for the **SKC/2PrOH and SKCiMIE3K mirrtureS** on aluminum **substrates.** The **aluminum** substrates *on* which the Cs and **Sr** salts dissolved Bonn-Trace 1 9 **1** were deposited were not analyzed because the solubilities were very low in **this** mixture.





"calculated from concentrations determined by **ICP-MS** and dilution factor.

**bDenotes measured** detection limit for the determination of **Cs** by **ICP-MS.** 

"Denotes **measured** detection limit for the determination of Sr by **ICP-MS.** 

Solvent	SKC/2-PrOH	<b>SKC/MIBK</b>	SKC/2-PrOH	<b>SKC/MIBK</b>
Solute	$Cs$ ng/mL	$Cs$ ng/mL	$Sr$ ng/mL	$Sr$ ng/mL
Glass slide <sup>a</sup>	330	3.5	a۹	20
Dry wipe	-61	~1.3	3.7	2.9
Wet wipe	270		42	
15 min leach	29	1.8	16	< 0.87
24 hr leach	2.6		14	$\overline{<}0.87$

Table **8-5.** Concentrations of **Cs** and Sr Deposited **On and** Removed *from* **Aleum** Substrates

Symbols for footnotes are the same **as** for Table **8-4.** 

These results indicate that although the **bulk** of the cesium and **strontium** is removed in the *dry* wipe and wet wipe procedures, there are still **nanogram** quantities remaining on the substrates which are difficult to remove and require additional washing or leaching. **This** is most evident for the results **obtained** with **SKC/2- PrOH** where the quantities deposited are significantly greater than for the other *mixtures.* (The **actual**  nanogram quantities of **Cs** and Sr removed from the 5 cm **x** 5 cm substrates are **twenty** times the tabulated concentrations because the leachate volumes for all **surface** treatments was **20 mL.)** These **results** indicate that it would be **difficult** to remove all traces of radioisotopic Cs **and** Sr **tags** from metal surfaces.

# **9. SELECTION OF CANDIDATE TAGGING MATERIAL APPLlCATlON SYSTEM**

The fluorescence inventory tag and the radioisotope identiiication tag will be applied to the **surfaces** of **SNM** and the **SNM** storage containers. Because of **the** *cost* for application technology, the potential need for **high**  throughput, and the potential hazards associated with the tagging material% the tagging material application system will require both manual and automated techniques to 'paint" the tagging materials onto the tagged materials. *Section* 9.1 **describes the design** criteria for **the** application techniques and Section 9.2 describes some candidate technologies for applying the tag.

# **9.1 Design Criteria for the Tag Application Technology**

#### **9.1.1 Safety**

The taggant supply to the printing or painting mechanisms will minimize a worker's exposure to the hazards of the taggant and solvent materials. The refill of taggant reservoirs will be via sealed containers or solid encapsulant.

#### **9.1.2 Compatibility with Taggant Materials**

The materials of construction for the tagging application technologies will not degrade when exposed to the taggant materials,

## **9.1.3 Waste Generation**

The **taggant** application systems will lessen waste generation through designs that **minimize dry-out** of taggant reservoirs **and** excessive dispersal of **solvents.** 

### **9.1.4 Size Constraints**

**9.1.4.1 Size of Tag.** The taggant application systems will be designed to apply the necessary tagging material patterns within **an** area of 2 cm x 2cm.

*9.1.4.2 Size of Material to be Tagged.* The taggant application systems will be designed to paint tags on metals and powders. For metals, the tagged surface is expected to vary **from** flat surfaces to spherical surfaces. It is not expected that resolvable patterns will be deposited onto powders.

### **9.1.5 Lifetime of Components**

The taggant application systems wilI be designed for maximum life with modularity of critical elements.

## **9.2 Candidate Mechanical Printing Methods**

In its simplest forms, the tag application system will be a set of manually operated pens containing the individual taggant species in a volatile *carrier* solvent. More complex printing mechanisms for automatedremote use in process boxes will be designed for hazardous environments or extensive processes with multiple types of items to be tagged.

#### **9.2.1 Manual Tagging Application System**

To minimize cost and for ease of application, the option to manually apply the tagging materials to surfaces must be available. To accomplish this, the tagging material could be applied as a solvent and painted onto the surface or sprayed onto the surface as an aerosol. However, *this* option would introduce several significant safety issues. Painting on the surfaces with a brush probably would require the use of open reservoirs of flammable solvents. Spraying of the tagging materials would lead to widespread contamination and exposure throughout the operating environment. For these reasons, the manual tagging application will use a system similar to an ink marking pen for metals.

Hand manipulated pens containing individual species of taggants will provide flexibility in an out-of-process environment for tagging. Pen types suitable for handling taggants in a volatile solvent include fountain, drafting, ball point, and fiber tipped, all of which, when constructed of suitable materials, will accommodate any desirable solvent. Fountain pens, the

oldest technology in this set, are likely to leak solvent and use a hardened applicator tip which could permanently mar the surface to be marked. Ball point and drafting pens have similarly hardened tips. Fiber tipped pens, similar to the commercially available "Sharpie"<sup>®</sup>, use a fiber wick applicator and **are** unlikely to leak solvent or mar surfaces. Examples of commercially available models containing visible and invisible inks are shown in Figure 9-1. One pen contains a thick resin ink that **is** squeezed onto a surface, another is a wax crayon, and the other is a marking pen Figure 9-1. Examples of containing a rapidly drying solvent.



manual marking devices.

#### **9.2.2 Mechanical Tagging Application System**

Because the nuclear tagging system will **use** a variety of tagging materials, the mechanical tagging application system is envisioned to be similar to those systems that **are** used for automated color printing. However, the tagging application system will *differ* from the commercial systems in that the inks will be invisible or radioactive and the printing surfaces will be metal.

There are four different mechanisms in the current state-of-the-art of color printing which are candidate methods for applying the tags. These methods have proven themselves in the marketplace, and they differ significantly from the historical methods of relief, intaglio, surface, and stencil processes common to commercial printing. These methods include: **1)** bubble (or wax) jet, 2) laser eIectrostatic, **3)** toner jet and **4)** wax transfer <span id="page-64-0"></span>systems. Of these, the bubble jet systems offer the **only** practical solution for mechanized application systems, because they require neither configured substrates nor accessory materials.

**The** pumping mechanism (Figure 9-2) for bubble jet printers relies on a thermal **process** which forms a minute bubble of gas within a chamber of the nozzle.<sup>11,12</sup> Expansion of the gas drives a picoliter sized drop of liquid out of the nozzle. All of the bubble jet systems can print densities well within the five characters per 4 cm<sup>2</sup> constraint assigned in the design criteria. This process has the potential disadvantage of sequestering taggant materials within the bubble chamber resulting in unsatisfactory variation  $\otimes$ of taggant concentrations on the tagged surfaces.

As an alternative to the thermal process, the bubble jets can use a piezoelectric pump. The piezoelectric pump uses mechanical force to propel small quantities of the ink onto surfaces. This process does not separate solvent and **ink** additives and therefore avoids concentration variability. Another significant advantage of the piezoelectric pump



models is that there are three nonexclusive taggant options available with a piezo-pumped system: water-based taggants, volatile organic solvent-based taggants, and solid encapsulant materials (waxes).

## *9.2.2.1 Solvent Resistance Tests for Print Cartridges and Printing Mechanisms.*

Sample **ink-jet** systems from Hewlett-Packard and Canon were tested for their resistance to the solvents expected to be used with the fluorescent and radioisotope taggants. The ink cartridges were tested by applying a  $10$ - $\mu$ L aliquot of each solvent tested to a readily accessible surface of the ink-jet cartridge and continually observing the surface until the solvent had completely evaporated. Both brands of ink-jet cartridges resisted attack from SKC-MF, a xylol-based solvent, **for** a minimum of 5 min. Close examination of the Hewlett-Packard cartridge revealed that the main bladder is made of neoprene rubber, which may not resist this solvent for long periods of time. The Canon cartridge is made of molding grade polyethylene and should be resistant to most organic solvents below 50°C. When tested with Bonn-Trace 191, the surface of the *HP* cartridge melted immediately upon challenge with this solvent/solids **mixture.**  None of the deposit could be removed from the



Figure 9-3. Sketch of Canon ink-jet cartridge **and** print head mechanisms.

surface after the Bonn-Trace 191 had dried. The Canon cartridge resisted the Bonn-Trace 191 entirely. The solids deposit containing the **UV** fluorescent material could be removed completely by simply peeling it off the surface with a fingemail. No traces of fluorescence were detectable on the cartridge after the deposit was peeled off. No further testing of the *HP* system **was** perfomed because the cartridge did not have adequate solvent resistance.

The Canon ink-jet printing mechanism **is** composed of a different type of plastic than the ink cartridge so it **was** necessary to also test its solvent resistance. It appeared resistant to **SKC-HF** for a longer time than was required for complete evaporation of this solvent. The area where the  $10-\mu L$  aliquot was deposited was inspected more carefully under **SOX** magnification and revealed no evidence of damage. Testing of this mechanism with Bonn-Trace 191 revealed a slight attack at the periphery of the solvent blot, where traces of fluorescent material were detected **with** a *UV* lamp after removal of the dried deposit. Under **50X** magnification, this attack appeared **as** filled-in arm between **asperities** of the surface molding markings. No dye was fould in the area where the bulk of the solvent aliquot was initially deposited. This may be due to a differential created in the solvents by the positive meniscus at the periphery. This would result in the more volatile components of the mixture escaping in this region and thus having a greater effect on the plastic body with concomitant transport and deposition of the fluorescent material.

[Figure 9-3](#page-64-0) illustrates the Canon ink-jet cartridge and print head mechanisms. It is annotated to indicate the locations where the solvents were applied for the tests described above.

*9.2.2,3 Modification of Canon BJC-240 Printer for Use*  **with Taggant Materials.** Following successful solvent resistance tests of **the** Canon printing system, a Canon **BJC-240** printer was procured for follow-on testing. This device would be reasonably simple to modify for process **marking** of components with taggant materials. Figure 9-4 shows the printer as received. Figure 9-5 illustrates the modifications necessary to remove and replace the manufacturer's **ink** with the selected taggant/solvent. Two  $1/8$  in. holes are drilled into one of the ink chambers(in this case, the yellow dye chamber). These are threaded for 8-32 screws to preclude leakage and drying of the ink following replacement. [Figure](#page-66-0) **9-6** illustrates the method of removing and replacing the ink in a **Figure** *9-4.* Canon BJC-240 printer.

cartridge chamber. The pipette is **used** to pierce a foam filter within the *:-e*  cartridge on the left side allowing removal and replacement of the **commercial ink.** There is 8 mL of ink in each chamber. It is composed of approximately 70% isopropyl alcohol, **26%** glycerine and 4% of an oil based colorant. The replacement ink used in the tests was D-298 fluorescent dye dissolved in isopropanol. Figure 9-7 illustrates the placement of the ink cartridge within the printer. Use of flat headed screws would allow all three chambers of the cartridge to be used for dye replacement. Figure 9-8 shows an experimental placement of test coupons for test printing. The colors are individually addressable by the software provided with the printer, so printing from one or a combination of chambers is possible. Observation of the printing process reveals that a **Figure 9-5.** Unmodified and modified a mixture of colors to produce black is accomplished in multiple passes of Canon ink cartridges.





<span id="page-66-0"></span>

Figure 9-6. Filling ink cartridge.

ink cartridge within the printer. for printing.

Figure 9-7. Placement of modified Figure 9-8. Placement of coupons

the cartridge with a minute translation of the printed surface between passes. This complicates the modification of this particular printer for use with mixed colors on production line blocks of metal **as** the means of translation of the blocks for correct registry to each color head would have to be accomodated.

*9.2.2.4 Test Results with Canon BJC-240 Printer.* The printer **was** cycled through a test program provided by the manufacturer which paints a full page of a rotating alphabet, numerals and punctuation Characters for *each* phase of **the** testing. Following replacement of 1.5 mL of ink with **D-298,** fluorescence firom the characters printed was not observed after several pages of various papers had been printed. With one exception, it was found that paper and the transparency films tested contained a fluorescent dye apparently used for brightening. Its spectrum matches **D-298** and would seem to be nearly ubiquitous in papers, cloth and projection films.

After a paper was identified (a black construction paper) that had not been treated with a UV fluorescent brightener, it was determined **that** the lack of fluorescence of **the** characters was due to interference by the original ink remaining in the cartridge. Replacement of greater proportions of **ink** with the taggant dye resulted in successful excitation of the **D-298** characters under *UV* challenge.

Tests were performed on aluminum foil "pages" as well as the coupons shown above. Without modification, the printer does not accept samples greater than 25 mils in thickness. Presence of any of the original colorant prevents the printed characters from **drying** on a metal surface. Any trace of oil (from even a fingerprint) on the surface of the metal will result in a beading up of the characters so as to become unreadable. If the metal surface is free of oil, the characters are clear and *sharp.* 

**9.2.2.5 Conclusions from Work with the Canon Printer.** The Canon BJC-240 is a simple 3-color printer, easily modified to accept solvent-based dyes for various tagging applications. It was not tested against multiple solvent taggants such as Bonn-Trace **19** 1. It **would** have to be extensively modified to print characters on production line blocks of metal. More appropriate commercial printing systems using the same heat driven ink jet are available which are confgured for this task.

<span id="page-67-0"></span>While it appears that it **could** be modified to overcome its liabilities, **the Canon BJC-240** *system* **is**  *inadequate* in its present form for use **as** *a* production line tagging **device. Its** printing mechanism **would** have to be **modified to ascanmodate** materials thicker than **25 mils.** A taggant material which is not **normally** present **in** substrate materials must **be** used with **an ink-jet** printer system. Metal **surfaces** to be **tagged** must be **free from all** traces **of** *0%* **wbich Mire** with the correct formation and registry **of** characters. Suitable roughening of the surface **of** metal substrates may enable more **successfid** tagging with imprinted letters **and** characters. A tagging/solvent system which dries more rapidly than the D-298 must be used to minimize smudging of the printed tag.

# **10. SELECTION OF FLUORESCENT TAG DETECTION SYSTEM**

The fluorescence detection system includes the hardware to detect the applied tags manually, remotely, and forensically. The hardware will address the following methods: 1) remote and portable detection methods that can be used to validate the application of the tag and verify the identification **of** unadulterated tags and 2) detection methods necessary to identify **SNM** and personnel that have tampered with the tag.

## **10.1 Design Criteria for Fluorescence Tag Detection System**

## **10.1.1 Safety**

*10.1.1.1 Personnel Radiation Exposure.* The configuration of the fluorescence detection system will minimize personnel exposure to the ionizing radiation characteristic of the materials being tagged. This will be accomplished by minimizing the time needed to collect the fluorescence information, maximizing the distance (remoting) and **barriers** (shielding) between operators and tagged materials.

*10.1.7.2 Personnel Light Exposure.* The configuration of the fluorescence detection system **will**  minimize personnel exposure to the fluorescence excitation energy needed **to** generate the fluorescence response.

*10.1.1.3 Facility Harards.* The detection system will not **introduce** physical hazards (i.e., energy source, neutron moderator) beyond the design specifications of the normal SNM working environment.

#### **10.1.2 Configuration**

Based on the variety **of** planned uses of the fluorescence tags, there will have to be several types of fluorescence detector mnfgurations. These **configurations** include systems for: **1)** detection in process locations;

2) detection in storage locations, and 3) detection of forensic evidence. **A** sketch of how **this** detection hardware may appear is **shown** in Figure **10-1.** For implementation in process locations or storage locations, the detection probe could be held manually or scanned robotically, with the fluorescence pattern read manually or automatically from a video screen. For forensic evidence, **the** residual tamper detection fluorescence dusting powders or residual amounts of fluorescent compounds will be detectable with a hand-held probe or with a commercially available fluorescence spectrometer.



**Figure 10-1.** Fluorescence Detection System.

*10.1.2.1 Process Validation of Tag Application.* The configurations of the fluorescence detection systems will allow for both automated and hand-held detection of the applied fluorescence tag at a processing location (i.e., **glovebox)** to validate the application of the fluorescence tag and to track the movement of material **through** a facility's processes.

*70.7.2.2 lnvenfoty Control.* The configurations of the fluorescence detection systems will allow for both automated and manual detection of the applied fluorescence tag in a storage area (i.e., bunker or vault) to inventory the tagged material.

10.1.2.3 Forensic Detection of Tagging Materials. The configurations of the fluorescence detection systems will allow for both field and laboratory identification of fluorescence residue serving as forensic evidence.

## **10.1.3 Spectral Regions**

To ensure that the number of fluorophores available for use as tags is not limited by the system's hardware, the fluorescence **detection** *systems* will **have the** flexibility to excite *or* **detect** ultraviolet, visible and near infrared fluorescence.

## **10.1.4 Resolution**

The detection system will resolve a fluorescence pattern of at least five alphanumeric characters, which have a minimum character size of five characters per cm, in a **4-cm2** pattern space. **This** resolution will allow for visual reading of the pattern **by** directly observing the tag and by imaging on a video screen.

#### **10.1.5 Detection Surfaces**

The fluorescence detection *system* will be able to resolve the fluorescence pattern **of** the tagged material from a flat or rounded metal surface. Even though there will be no pattern on tagged powders, the detection systems will be designed to identify the presence and composition of the fluorescence tagging material.

#### **10.1.6 Sensitivity**

*70.7.6.7 lnvenfory Tag.* To ensure that the pattern of the inventory fluorescence tag can be identified with minimal personnel exposure and no radioactive cross-contamination, the process and inventory control fluorescence detection *systems* will have *&cient* sensitivity to read a tag without contacting the tagged surface. **Because** it is expected that the radiation from the **SNM** will degrade the intensity of the fluorescence inventory tag's emission, the detection system will have sufficient sensitivity to read a tag that contains at least 5% of the original tagging material.

*70.7.6.2 Forensic Evidence.* To ensure traceability to **the** facirity of **origin** when a tag **has been tampered** with, the forensic fluorescence detection system will have sufficient sensitivity to detect and identify the fluorescent compound when at least 0.01% of the fluorescent material is present.

#### **10.1.7 Availability to Users**

To ensure that all potential users of the tagging *system can* obtain the **fluorescence** detection *systems,* no component in the detection systems will be limited by export restrictions.

## **10.2 Fluorescence Detection Systems**

To provide detection of the fluorescence materials there will be three types of detection systems. These systems include: 1) hand-held devices for quick, manual detection of the fluorescence pattern or fluorescence contamination, 2) remote imaging systems for fluorescence pattern recognition and recording, and 3) laboratory fluorescence systems for forensic evaluation. To limit the development costs of the tagging system, the fluorescence detection systems will be based on commercially available hardware with limited modifications as necessary.

## **10.2.1 Hand-held Fluorescence Detection Systems**

The hand-held detection systems provide an inexpensive option for verifying the application of fluorescence tags to surfaces, performing manual inventories, and **screening** areas and personnel for tampering. These systems would be used if the implementing facility chooses to have personnel manually observing and recording the tagging information. To cover **both** the ultraviolet and near infrared spectral regions, two types of systems will be necessary.

*10.2.1.1 Ultraviolet Fluorescence.* Ultraviolet (UV) lamps will be used as the excitation source to Cause the fluorescent tags to emit visible light. This **light** will be detected by personnel via direct observation of

the illuminated area. These lamps are readily available in a variety of hand-held configurations (Figures 10-2 and 10-3). Generally a 4-Watt lamp **costing** less **than** \$200 can excite visibly detectable fluorescence both in solutions containing high parts **per** million levels of fluorophores and in microgram quantities of fluorescing powders. For glovebox applications, a free standing lamp using a 15-Watt bulb will allow the tag to be read from a greater distance and **also** will **free** an operator's hands for manipulation of the tagged material. This hand-held hardware is inexpensive, flexible, and readily available. However, its disadvantages include:

1) the use of mercury lamps to generate ultraviolet excitation light may result in the generation of mixed waste if the device becomes contaminated. 2) Manual detection of the fluorescence tags will result in increased radiation doses to personnel, because of the decreased distance between personnel making the measurement and the material with the tag, 3) The ultraviolet light used to excite the visible fluorescence may result in increased safety hazards such as UV exposure to the eyes, degradation of organic materials in gloveboxes, or a spark/ignition source.

10.2.1.2 Near Infrared Fluorescence. Near Infrared *(NIR)* excitation sources will be used to excite NIR fluorescence that will be detectable via a monitoring screen. This screen's hardware or software will convert the *NIR* image into a visible display. **A Figure 10-3.** Standing 15-Watt *UV* lamp.



Figure 10-2. Hand-held 4-Watt UV lamp.



detection system with properties **similar** to the system needed for the **tagging** system is commerciaUy available **for** aligning lasers, viewing activities in **dark** rooms, etc. The hand held units **cost** less **than** \$2000 per unit and **are** very light and portable. For **this** type of detection **system,** the units would have to be **modified** to include an appropriate *NIR* excitation **source.** 

10.2.1.3 Examples of Hand-held UV Lamp Applications. The extent of the use of a hand-held lamp detection system is demonstrated for several of the candidate fluorescence materials in Figures 10-4, 10.5, and 10-6. The sensitivity and manual readability of a hand-written fluorescence image is **shown** by comparing **two metal** coupons (one with **an** invisible fluorescence tag and one without) *under* room light **and under** a *UV*  lamp (Figure **10-4).** The ability to detect small quantities of tamper indicating dusting powders on parts is **depicted in Figure 10-5.** In **this** figure, milligram quantities of **three** different fluorescence powders were dusted onmetal *coupans* **and then** compared against **a** blank coupon under room and W light. The ability to identify personnel or equipment **that** is contaminated by **contacting** material coated with a dusting powder or trying to remove a tag with **a** solvent is demonstrated in Figure 10-6. In **this** figure, a glove that is **contaminated** with several dusting powders and a glove that **has** been contaminated with a fluorescent dye while **trying** to wash a **tagged** material are compared with an unused glove.




**Figure 10-4. Tagged and** untagged **metal coupons exposed to** room **light (top) and** W **light (bottom).** 



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



Figure 10-5. Metal coupons with small quantities of tamper indicating dusting powders exposed to room light (top) and UV light (bottom). A different dusting powder is on each coupon except the blank coupon on the right.





**Figure 10-6. Rubber gloves exposed to room light (top) and** *UV* **light (bottom). The left glove has a different dusting powder** on **each finger, the center glove is uncontaminated, and the right glove was contaminated by removing a tag with isopropanol.** 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

### **10.2.2 Remote Fluorescence Detection Systems**

The hand-held detection systems provide the simplest option for detecting the fluorescence tags; but a remoted and automated detection system will minimize radiation exposure to personnel. Remote detection system will be designed to be used in a glovebox or in a automated surveillance system. The detection system will be constructed from: 1) a fiber optic probe that transmits excitation light to the tagged surface and returns the emission image, 2) a **video** display of the emission image for manual confirmation of the tag, and 3) a pattern recognition program for reduction of the fluorescent image.

As described, this type of detection system is a combination of commercially available systems for remote inspection of metal or electronic components and bar code reading systems. The expected cost of the detection system *can* range from **\$3K** for a remote camera that can transfer a manually read image from a video screen to **\$50K** for a boroscope system that can collect and store electronic digitized images. Examples of two Commercially available systems that may be used for the remote detection system are shown in Figure 10-7 and Figure **10-8.** 

The first system (Figure **10-7),** Majik-Cam manufactured by Dynatron, is a miniature video camera connected to **high** resolution monitor or standard video cassette recorders. For the **SNM** tagging system, this device system would have to be modified: 1) to incorporate a UV and NIR excitation source with either an excitation lamp placed in the glovebox or excitation light transmitted through fiber optics to the viewing area. The second system (Figwe **10-8)** is a boroscope manufactured by Olympus Industrial. This system **(\$>4oK)** is designed for viewing the inside of hard-to-reach areas **and** is available with a W source for metal fatigue analyses. **An** add-on capability which allows for electronic storage of images is available.



**Figure 10-7.** Majik-Cam video imager.



**Figure 10-8.** Olympus boroscope imaging system.

### **10.2.3 Laboratory Fluorescence Forensic Evidence Detection Systems**

The hand-held and remote detection *systems* provide the **capabilities** *necessary* to track material for materid control and accountability. However, these *systems* **lack** the flexibility and sensitivity to evaluate forensic evidence from personnel or materials involved in smuggled SNM. When these situations occur, it is expected

both that the recovered material will have trace quantities of the tagging materials remaining and that the individuals illicitly handling the **SNM** will have been tagged with trace quantities of the tagging materials. Therefore to trace the facility of *origin* of **the** SNM using the fluorophores, it will be necessary to have detection equipment which can identify the chemical composition of the tag.

An example of how an analytical-grade fluorometer could be used is demonstrated in Figures 10-9 and 10-10. The set of candidate fluorescence compounds, currently under evaluation for the tagging system, contains several compounds **that** *emit* a blue fluorescence **when** exposed to W light. The manually observed fluorescence indicates that all of the compounds **are** equivalent. However, when some of these compounds are evaluated with a spectrofluorometer, the observed spectra indicate that there are at least two distinct compounds (Figure 10-9). Additionally, after scanning the compounds with a different excitation wavelength, there appears to be at least three different compounds in the **set**  (Figure 10-10). **This** ability to discriminate between compounds *even* at the ppm level will allow analysis of



Figure **10-9.** Fluorescence spectra for four of the candidate **tagging** materials, **excitation** with *254* **nm.** 



residues to assist in the determination of the facility of origin **Figure 10-10.** Fluorescence spectra for four<br>for recovered SNM.  $\frac{154}{254}$ **candidate** tagging materials, *excitation* at **254** nm.

To adequately provide the necessary forensic infomation for the range of materials and applications, the analytical-grade instruments will be designed to scan the W, visible, and *NIR* **spectral** regions and have the capabilities to collect fluorescence spectra from solutions and solid surfaces. Typical instruments needed for the tagging system are commercially available fiom a variety of U.S. and international analytical instrumentation vendon at *costs* ranging from **\$15K** to **\$30K.** Detection of fluorescence fiom solutions *can* be accomplished at ppm concentrations using standard methods and equipment. Most analytical-grade **instruments are** modifiable to use fiber optic probes for surface reflectance measurements. Depending upon the spectral region needed for some of the candidate NIR fluorescence compounds, a separate *NIR* emission reflectance instrument may be necessary.

# **11. SELECTION OF CANDIDATE RADIOISOTOPE TAG DETECTION SYSTEMS**

The radioisotope detection system includes the hardware to detect the applied tags, to validate the application of the tag, and to verify the identification of unadulterated tags. The radioisotopic tagging process involves depositing a series of small marks **(three** *or* more) on the **SNM** with each mark **containing** a different *gamma* **emitting radioisotope. Each facility handliry:** *SNM* will have a unique marking sequence of radioisotopes specifically to identify their site. Because each radioisotope has an independent gamma ray signature, gammaray detectors can identify each radioisotope and the sequence of radioisotopes to verify the facility of origin for the tagged SNM.

This section describes the design criteria and preliminary design for the radioisotopic detection systems that will be used for the **tagging** system. Also included are some prelimmay test results which demonstrate the capabilities of the detection system to identify a radioisotope **tag.** 

### **11.1 Design Criteria for Radioisotope Tag Detection System**

### **11.1.1 Safety**

*11.1.1.1 Personnel Radiation Exposure.* The configuration of the radioisotope detection system will **minimize persormel** exposure to the ionizing radiation characteristic of the materials being tagged. **This** will be accomplished by maximizing the distance and barriers **between** operators and tagged **materials.** 

*71.1.1.2 Facility Hazards.* The detection system will not introduce physical hazards (i.e., energy source, neutron moderator) beyond the design specifications of the normal **SNM** working environment.

### **11.1.2 Security**

Because of the nature of the material being tagged, the system will be designed to not report any size, shape, or isotopic composition of the **tagged** material.

#### **11.1.3 Configuration**

Based on the potential uses of the radioisotope *tags,* there will be two types of radioisotope detector configurations. These configurations include systems for: 1) a high resolution detector for absolute verification of the *tag's* composition; 2) a low resolution detector for rapid verification of the *tag's* application or process monitoring. Both *systems* will be designed to be portable for relative ease of use in a variety of **locations** at a processing or storage facility.

### **11 .1.4 Spectral Regions**

To ensure **that** the **maximum** number of **radioisotopes** available for use **as tags** is not limited by the systems' hardware, the radioisotope detection systems will have the resolution and sensitivity to detect gamma rays with energies greater **than** 100 keV for the candidate radioisotopes.

### **1 I .I .5 Resolution**

*1 I. 1.5.1 Resolution Between Isotopes.* The detection *system* will have gamma ray resolution capabilities of **4.5** keV (at **1332** kev) for the **high** resolution detector and **(10%** (at *662* kev) for the low resolution detector.

*11.7.5.2 Resolution Between Tag and SNM.* The detection *system* will have the capabilities to resolve > **1% of an** unadulterated tag against the background of *5* kg of **SNM.** 

### **1 1.1.6 Detection Surfaces**

The radioisotope detection system will resolve the radioisotope pattern of the *tagged* **material fiom** a flat or rounded **metal** surface. Even though there will be **no** pattern **on** tagged powders, *the* detection **systems** will identify the presence and composition of the radioisotope tagging material.

#### **11 .1.7 Sensitivity**

*17.1.7.1 Unadulterated Tag.* To **minimize** the cost and the radiation exposure resulting from the radioisotope **tag, the** detection system will detect **as** little **as** 10 nCi of the radioisotope directly fiom the surface of the tagged material.

*11,1.7.2 Tagged Material in Storage.* To **minimize** the direct handling of stored material, *the*  **detection** *system* will detect **an** unadulterated tag **through** 0.6 *cm* of **stainless** steel from a distance of *25 cm* with a **count** time **of 15 minutes.** 

11.1.7.3 Adulterated Tag. The radioisotope detection system will identify a tag that has been through a 99.9% removal effort. For **this type** of detection, the system will be designed for **counting** the tagged object directly (no storage container) for a maximum of 600 **minutes.** 

#### **1 1.1.8 Availability to Users**

To *ensure* that **all** potential users of the tagging system can obtain the radioisotope detection systems, **no**  component in the detection systems will be limited **by** export restrictions.

### **I I .2 Radioisotope Detection Systems**

**Detection** of **the** radioisotope tag on the **SNM** or on the inside of a **storage** container will be accomplished by using a **high** resolution Ge detector or low resolution NaI scintillator in combination with **a** multi-channel **analyzx (MCA)** and a **laptop** *computer.* These components of the detection systems use existing, commercially available technologies.

#### **11.2.1 High Resolution Ge Detection System**

Thehigh resolution *Ge* **detection** *system* shown in [Figure](#page-79-0) **11-1** consists **of: 1) a** portable 25%-efficient Ge detector with a *5-cm* **diameter, and 5.h thickness, and a** 3-liter liquid **nitrogen** dewar capacity to last **48** hours,

<span id="page-79-0"></span>2) a NOMAD **MCA** with up to 9 hrs of battery life and a fast and high resolution **ADC (8K);** 3) a **MAESTRO**  data acquisition software compatible with the **MCA;** and **4)** a laptop computer.



**Figure** 11-1. Ge **high** resolution detection system.

### **11.2.2 Low Resolution Nal Detection System**

The low resolution detection system based on an inorganic scintillator (NaI or **CsI)** shown in Figure 11-2 consists of: 1) a detector with dimensions of 3 inches **x** 3 inches (no need for liquid nitrogen); 2) a **micro**  NOMAD **MCA,** with dimensions of 3 inches **x** 3 inches **x** 9 inches powered with 8 AA alkaline batteries providing a **full** 8 hours of field operation; 3) a **MAESTRO-LITE** data acquisition software compatible with the **MCA,** and **4)** a laptop computer.



Figure 11-2. NaI detection system.

### **11.3 Demonstration Measurements with the Detection Systems**

Before the radioisotopic *tag can* **be** implemented successfully, several detection issues must be resolved. These issues are focused on whether the background radiation from **uranium** or plutonium is too large to adequately identify **tagging** radioisotopes on the surface of **SNM.** To resolve these issues, a set of experiments was completed using various detection systems, radioisotope sources and SNM materials.

### **1 I .3.1 Experimental Process**

The basic sequence of experimental steps to test and resolve the issues consisted of placing **SNM**  sources 12" from the detectors with various radioisotopes placed in front of the SNM source. Gamma ray spectra were **collected** for each *configutation,* with **and** without the radioisotope source. After the spectra collection, the spectnun with **the SNM** source **was** subtracted from the spectrum from the **SNM** with radioisotope source. Ideally, the resulting subtracted spectrum would only contain the gamma ray signature information from the radioisotope source. **A** more detailed experimental procedure is shown in **[Figure](#page-81-0)** 11-3.

**The** radioactive sources **used** for various tests are listed **in Table** 11 -1. Among them the *57C0* was the weakest source **(130** nCi or 0.015 ng) tested, emitting two gamma rays at **122-** and 136-keV. Measurements **with** this radioisotope were **used** to evaluate **the** detection systems' sensitivities. If this weak radioisotope source with low *energy* gamma **rays** could be **detected** above **the SNM** sources, **then** all other radioisotope sources would be easily detectable. Because **the** '%I source (530 nCi or **3.04** ng) emits several gamma rays between 100-1500 keV, it was **used** to evaluate the detection systems' capabilities in the presence of a **SNM** gamma ray field over a wide energy **range.** 



<span id="page-81-0"></span>**Figure 11-3. Experimental procedure followed to test the detectability of radioisotope** tags.

A variety of *SNM* samples were used to **perfarm** the tests. These **samples** consisted of 500 *g* of depleted uranium, 47 g of 9% enriched <sup>235</sup>U, 25 g of 26% enriched <sup>235</sup>U, 25 g of 52% enriched <sup>235</sup>U, 9 g of 89% enriched <sup>235</sup>U, and 14 g of a mixture of <sup>239</sup>Pu (94%) and <sup>240</sup>Pu (6%).



### **11.3.2 Experimental Results**

The gamma ray information **from** the radioisotope **sources** is obtained by subtracting the **spectrum** of the **SNM source** alone **from** the **spectrum** of both the **SNM** and radioisotope source, *so* that the resulting subtracted **spectrum only** contains information **fiom** the radioisotope source. With appropriate **software** that aukmatically **perfirms this** subtraction, the detection **system** will meet the important criteria that **SNM** isotopic **information** in *the* **SNM** is not revealed.

Experimental observations were **made** during four distinctive **sets** of laboratory analysis simulations. The first *set* of observations *came* fiom the Ge detector and **the SNM** uranium sources. **The** second set **came fiom**  the NaI detector and the **SNM** uranium **sources and** the third set came from the Ge detector and the **SNM**  plutonium source. Finally, the fourth set came **fiom** the **NaI** detector and the **SNM** plutonium **source.** Some representative *spectra* **coIlected** in *our* measurements are shown in Appendix E. The results of **data** analysis and the interpretation of **data** are discussed in the following subsections.

*11.3.2.1 Uranium Measurements with a Ge Detector.* **Both depleted uranium**  $(^{238}U)$  **and** enriched uranium  $(^{235}U)$  have very long half-lives of about  $\sim 10^9$  years which result in very low gamma-ray  $b$ ackgrounds from the uranium isotopes. Therefore, measurements with the SNM uranium samples did not need the **collimators** shown in [Figure 11-1](#page-79-0) and 11-2.

Results of gamma scans collected from 500 g of depleted uranium with <sup>152</sup>Eu and <sup>57</sup>Co sources using a Ge gamma-ray detector are shown in the plots in Appendix E. The labeled peaks in Figure E-1 are energies in keV of the two gamma rays emitted from <sup>235</sup>U/<sup>238</sup>U and gamma rays emitted from the <sup>152</sup>Eu and <sup>57</sup>Co sources. Spectra E-1 .a and E- 1 **.c** are the total spectra of depleted **uranium** plus the radioisotope sources.

Spectra E-1.b and E-1.d are after the depleted uranium spectra were subtracted. In the latter spectra, only gamma rays from the radioisotope **sources** are seen, indicating both that the **SNM** signature can be protected and that the radioisotope **tag** can be resolved.

The results for the 9 g sample of 89% enriched uranium are presented in Figure E-2 for  $152$  Eu and  $57$ Co. As was the case with depleted uranium, both subtracted spectra show only gamma rays emitted from the radioisotope **sources.** The same results were observed for other enriched uranium samples.

Because the enriched samples were such small quantities relative to what would be experienced in a processing facility, the original pure spectra for these small sources were scaled to 500 g. Then a <sup>152</sup>Eu spectrum was added to the scaled spectra. An evaluation of the summed spectra indicated that the <sup>152</sup>Eu gamma-ray peaks remained distinguishable for different enriched Uranium samples (Figure E-3). **This** particular **scaling** method can be interpreted is a **"worst** case **scenario"** since gamma ray fields do not scale directiy with **mass.** In other words, the effect of the **SNM** uranium samples probably is overestimated.

**11.3.2.2 Uranium Measurements with a Nal Detector.** The above experiments were repeated **using a** low resolution NaI detector. The results for using **500 g** of depleted uranium in combination with Is2Eu and *"Co* radioisotopes **are** shown in [Figure](#page-112-0) **E-4.** Although the gamma rays emitted from the **sources** are barely distinguishable from *the* gamma rays of the depleted uranium in **spectra** E-4.a and E-4.q they can be easily identified in the subtracted **spectra** of E-4.b and E-4.4 respectively. The low energy Compton edge, **as** well **as**  gamma rays emitted from uranium, have completely disappeared in the latter spectra. These results indicate that the NaI detector can be used to identify the tag as long as each radioisotope has at least one gamma ray that is distinct fiom the other radioisotopes.

11.3.2.3 Plutonium Measurements with a Ge Detector. Measurements for plutonium samples were done using **14** g of plutonium **(consisting** of **14 NAD's,** each **containing** a **1** g mixture of **94%** and 6% <sup>240</sup>Pu). Since plutonium isotopes have shorter half-lives than uranium isotopes (about 10<sup>4</sup> years as compared to lOgyears), plutonium *isotopes* produce a larger *gamma* ray field, **gram** for **gram,** when compared to the **SNM**  uranium **isotopes. In** addition to **the** plutonium *gammarays,* there is a significant amount of **24\*Am** present in any *SNM* plutonium sample. This americium isotope **has** a very short half-life of 14 years, decays predominately by 60 keV **gamma** ray, and accounts for more than **70%** of the total gamma decay of **SNh4** plutonium.

Without **an** absorber (gamma *ray* filter) in front of the detector, the **gamma** ray field from the **SNM** and its americium impurity will increase the detector dead time (time **the** detector is not available to record a decay) to **70%** *or* **higher** ami produce **a** pileup *spectrum* To overcome **this** problem, **thin** sheets of Cu and Cd were placed in fkont of **the** detector. The combination of the cadmium and copper sheets works **as** gamma *ray* filter by using the cadmium to absorb **the** americium *gamma* ray. Upon absorbing the gamma ray, the cadmium giving *off*  resulting **x-rays** which are then absorbed by the copper. The metal sheet filters reduced the 60 keV gamma ray **intensity** by 90% and effectively improve the dead time down to *5.5%* for the NaI detector and down to **4%** for the Ge detector.

In addition to using an absorber to attenuate the 60 keV gamma ray, a lead collimator **was** placed *between* the detector and the **SNM Pu** sample. The purpose *of* the *collimator* **was** to reduce the amount of **Pu mfke area** viewed by the detector while maintaining the maximum view of the radioisotope sources. As each

**test** was coducted, **two** collimators *were* placed in fkont of the SWradioisotope sources. Three types of spectra were taken: one spectrum without collimation, **one** spectrum with a 2" Pb brick that had a 1" hole, and one *spectrum* with the 1/4" hole in the Pb brick. The position of the Pb collimator can be **seen** in [Figures 11-1](#page-79-0) and 11-2.

The results of tats conducted *on* the 14 g of **the SNM** plutonium sample with the '52Eu and 57C0 **sources**  using the Ge gamma-ray detector are shown in Figure E-5. The peaks in the <sup>152</sup>Eu and <sup>57</sup>Co sources, as well as some **peaks** in the **SNM** sample, are labeled according to their gamma-ray energies in keV. Spectra E-5.a and E-5.c are **the total** *spectra* of the plutonium plus the radioisotope **sources.** Spectra E-5.b and E-5.d are the **totals**  after the **SNM** plutonium spectra **were** subtracted. As expected, in the latter spectra only gamma rays fiom **radioisotope sources** are **seen** and **all** the other gamma rays fiom the **SNM,** inchding the Compton background at a low and **high** *energy* regions, **have disappeared** *One* of **the** important aspects of the **PU** measurements is that *even* with a **huge** Chmpton background below 500 keV, the 122 keV gamma **ray emitted** from a very weak *57C0*  source is detectable.

**11.3.2.4 Plutonium Measurements with a Nal Detector.** The results for measurements conducted with a **low** resolution NaI detector using a 1/4" collimator are shown in Figure E-6. None of the gamma rays emitted from the <sup>152</sup>Eu and <sup>57</sup>Co sources can be identified in spectra E-6.a and E-6.c. However, the **peaks can be seen in the subtracted spectra E-6.b and E-6.d. These results signify that the NaI detector can also** be used, in some cases, to identify the tag on a SNM plutonium source.

*11.3.25 SNM Surface Area Effects on the Detection System.* The effect of the **SNM** surface **area** exposed to **the** detection **system** was evaluated using the SNM plutonium source. These tests revealed that the detector's count rate is dependent on the surface area of the source. To quantify this effect, the 14 g of plutonium *were* arranged *so* that the NaI and Ge detectors were exposed to the **SNM** and then to **twice as** much **surface area** of the plutonium **source.** Doubling the *exposed* **surface** area increased the SNM-related count rate 1.7-fold and increased the Ge dead time to 7%. **For** the NaI detector, the count rate increased by 1.5-fold and the dead time increased to 9%. Therefore, the effect of increasing the surface area exposed to the detector indicates that a collimator will be necessary to ensure more sensitive and resolvable spectra when dealing with **SNM** plutonium sources.

To evaluate an appropriate design for a collimator, several gamma ray measurements were performed using the plutonium source, no collimator, a 1" collimator and 114" collimator. The results are illustrated in Figure E-7. As can be seen from these spectra, the effect of collimation allows the <sup>152</sup>Eu gamma ray peaks to be better resolved **fkom** the background. The best result was obtained with a 1/4" of lead collimator. Similar results were *observed* **for the** weak **57C0** source. In these tests, the collimator decreased the detectors' dead time to 0.7% and **0.5%** for the NaI and Ge detectors, respectively.

**11.3.2.6 Pattern Recognition with the Detection System.** To establish whether the detection systems' configurations could be **used** to recognize a radioisotope Pattern **as** part of a **tag,** four radioisotope sources (<sup>57</sup>Co, <sup>133</sup>Ba, <sup>54</sup>Mn, and <sup>137</sup>Cs) were placed in order on a depleted uranium sample. The sources were placed sequentially 1/2" from each other in a line on the 500 g sample of depleted SNM uranium. Then, several **gamma** *ray* spectra were collected **as** the Ge detector with a 1/4" collimator **was** passed across the sample. The results of these testes are summarized in [Table 11-2.](#page-85-0) The four positions listed in [Table 11-2](#page-85-0) correspond to where

<span id="page-85-0"></span>**a** *spectrum* was taken **(each** position tmxqods **to a position above one of the four radioisotope sources).** These **results demonstrate that the sequence of the** sources **correspond to the level of responses detected.** 



### **12. REFERENCES**

- 1. Report on Activities and Programs for Countering Proliferation, May 1995, Counter proliferation Program Review Committee.
- 2. **R.H. Smith, Presentation "Analysis of Illicit Transactions in Nuclear Material", International Conference** onNuclear Smuggling Forensic **Analysis,** Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, **November** 7,1995.
- **3.** Lecture on Nuclear Trafficking, London Medical Action for Global Security, February 14,1995.
- **4.** P. Williams and P. Woessner, Scientific American, **January** 1996, p.40.
- *5.* Wm. J. Veigele, Photon Cross Sections **fiom** 0.1 keV to 10 MeV for **Elements** *2* = **1** to *2* = 94, Atomic Data, Vol. 5, 51 (1973).
- *6.* Brookhaven National Laboratory Data **Base,** NNDC Online Data Service, Word Wide Web address @ <http://necsO>1 **.dne.bnl.gov/htmI/n.ndc.htmI.**
- **7.** Brookhaven National Laboratory, NNDC Nuclear Wallet Card, July 1995.
- 8. **R B. Firestone,** S. Y. Chu, V.S. Shirley, Table of Radioactive Isotopes, Lawrence Berkely Laboratory, John **Wiley** & **Sons,** 1986.
- 9. Table of **Isotopes** CD-ROM Eighth **Edition,** Version 1.0, Lawrence **Berkley** Laboratory, March 1996.
- 10. Principle of Nuclear Medicine, **Edited** by **Henry** N. Wagner Jr., published by W. B. Saunders Company 1968.
- **11. R&D** Magazine, Vol. 38, No.5, April 1996,pp 23-25, "Color Printing's Pallette of Technologies".
- 12. The MacMillan Visual Desk Reference, para. 5631, "Methods of Production in Printing".

# **Appendix A Absorbance Spectra for Candidate Fiuorescence Compounds**

**The following absorbance spectra were obtained using a Hewlett Packard Hp8452A diode** *array*  spectrophotometer. The candidate fluorescence compounds were dissolved in Fisher electronic grade isopropanol **(2- propanol) and scanned using a 10-mm quartz cuvette. The compounds were dissolved as received in** the **isopropanol at concentrations yielding absorbance of less than 1.5 absorbance** units.



The absorbance spectrum for Day-Glo Color Corporation's UV Blue D-282:





The absorbance spectrum for Sherwin Incorporated DUBL-CHEK W2-D3F:

The absorbance spectrum for Sherwin Incorporated DUBL-CHEK HM-704:







The absorbance spectrum for Molecular Probe Incorporated 1-hydroxypyrene:



The absorbance spectrum for Magnflux Incorporated SpotCheck ZL-27A:



The absorbance spectrum for Shannon Luminous Materials Incorporated I-2120:



The absorbance spectrum for Bonneau Dye Corporation Bonn-Trace No. 191:



 $A-6$ 

# **Appendix B Fluorescence Spectra for Candidate Fluorescence Compounds**

**The following fluorescence spectra were obtained using a Photon** Technology **Incorporated Alphascan**  *spectrofluorometer* modified with **a** fiber **optic dip probe. The candidate fluorescence compounds were dissolved in Fisher electronic grade 2-propanol (isopropanol) and scanned using a 365 nm excitation wavelength.** The **fluoresame** *spectrum* **for** *conpound* **IR-125** was **obtained using an excitation wavelength of 750 nm to measure**  its NIR fluorescence. The intensity of the fluorescence peaks are in units of relative count rates for the detector.



The **fluorescence spectnun for Day-Glo Color Corporation's** W **Blue D-282:** 



**The fluorescence spectrum for** Day-Glo **Color Corporation's Columbia Blue D-298:** 

**Wavelength** (nm)



**The fluorescence** *spectrum* **for Sherwin Incorporated DUBL-CHEK W2-D3F:** 

**The fluorescence spectrum for Sherwin** Incorporated **DUBL-CHEK HM-704:** 





**The fluorescence spectrum for Molecular Probe Incorporated 1 -hydroxypyme:** 





The fluorescence spectrum for Magnaflux Incorporated SpotCheck ZL-27A







**The fluorescence** spectrum **for Bonneau Dye Corporation Bonn-Trace No. 191:** 



# **Appendix C Long-Lived Candidate Radionuclides**

The following provides a listing of the properties of the candidate radioisotopes. The information<sup>7,8,9</sup> also includes an estimated gamma-ray (>200keV) count rate for 100 ng of radioisotopes through the air and 1/4" of stainless steel.







 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

c-3

# **Shor L= Candidate Radionuclides Appendix D**

The following provides a listing of the properties of the candidate radioisotopes. The information<sup>7,8,9</sup> also includes **an** estimated gamma-ray (>200keV) **count** rate for 100 ng of **radioisotopes through** the air **and** 1/4" of **stainless** steel.













 $D-6$
## **Appendix E**

**Gamma Ray Spectra Collected with Radioisotope Detection Systems** 













