November 29, 2018

Mr. John Michael Japp
DOE FFA Project Manager
Oak Ridge Office of Environmental Management
U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box 2001
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Dear Mr. Japp

Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation Request for Backup Information Used in the Development of the Cost Estimates for the Comparison of Disposal Alternatives Associated with Oak Ridge Reservation CERCLA Waste Disposal

The Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC), Division of Remediation Oak Ridge Office (DoR-ORO), requests the subject information in accordance with Section XXIX of the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) for the Oak Ridge Reservation. Questions and concerns have been raised prior to and during the EMDF public comment period about the DOE-estimated cost differentials between onsite and offsite disposal options. For example, in correspondence dated September 4, 2018, the City of Oak Ridge's Environmental Quality Advisory Board identified several concerns regarding the information DOE provided in the cost estimates.

Therefore, TDEC requests all information used in the development of the cost estimates presented in Appendix I of the most recent draft of the *Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Oak Ridge Reservation Waste Disposal (DOE/OR/01-2535&D5)*, including but not limited to assumptions, spreadsheets, and formulas. This information is being requested under authority of Tenn. Code Ann. Section 68-212-206(a)(4) and is supported by the waiver of sovereign immunity related to state CERCLA-type laws at Section 42 USC Section 9620 (a)(4). Furthermore, Section 6.1 of EPA's *Guide to Developing and Documenting Cost Estimates During the Feasibility* Study (EPA 540-R-00-002) describes the inclusion of the Detailed Cost Backup:

Detailed cost backup for remedial alternative cost estimates should be provided in an appendix to the FS report. This material can include cost calculation sheets, quantity calculation sheets, records of communication for vendor quotes, and conceptual design calculations. If cost estimating software is used to estimate all or part of the costs for remedial alternatives, input/output from these software applications should be provided as part of the detailed backup.

For each cost element or sub-element, a standard worksheet can be used to document the calculation of the total unit cost as shown in Exhibit 6-1 for the example of an SVE extraction well. This type of cost worksheet, together with quantity calculation sheets and other supporting information, can be used to trace each cost shown in the cost summary of an alternative to its underlying assumptions.

Based on our exchange of e-mails on this same issue, TDEC understands there are varying levels of detail in Appendix I. However, Section 3.2.1 does not provide full detail on costs and underlying calculations. Subsection 3.2.2.1, for example, does not provide dimensions for purchase of construction materials that are included in subsection 3.2.2.5. Yet, neither of these subsections provides the full basis for construction costs including labor and the calculations to get to the numbers presented in Table I-3 across all alternatives and for all elements. While DOE notes in email correspondence that Appendix I presents the basis and assumptions for offsite disposal cost estimates, TDEC requests all calculations supporting Table I-3, especially the onsite costs. TDEC is requesting information necessary to allow stakeholders to understand the cost estimates presented in the summary tables of the project record.

Questions or comments concerning the contents of this letter should be directed to Mike Higgins at (865) 220-6595.

Sincerely

Randy C. Young, FFA Manager

xc   Connie Jones, EPA
Pat Halsey, DOE
Jon Richards, EPA
Amy Fitzgerald, ORCCA
Shelley Kimel, SSAB
Ron Woody, ORRCA
Traci Cofer, ORRCA