

November 4, 2021

**VIA e-mail to**

Administrator Michael S. Regan  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
[Regan.Michael@epa.gov](mailto:Regan.Michael@epa.gov)

**RE: Request for Update Regarding the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Review of the Radionuclide Pollution Decision and for a Revised Proposed Plan Regarding Environmental Management Disposal Facility at the Oak Ridge Reservation**

Dear Administrator Regan:

The Southern Environmental Law Center, Advocates for the Oak Ridge Reservation, Tennessee Chapter of the Sierra Club, and Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning (Community Groups) write to inquire regarding the status of the review by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Agency or EPA) of the decision issued by former EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler regarding the discharge to surface water of wastewater generated at the existing Environmental Management Waste Management Facility (EMWMF) and proposed Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF) at the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Oak Ridge Reservation site in Oak Ridge, Tennessee (Radionuclide Pollution Decision). We also write to underscore the importance of disclosing radionuclide pollution limits and other missing information in a revised proposed plan for public comment prior to considering approval of any revised Record of Decision (ROD) for the EMDF.

**I. Request for Update Regarding EPA Review of Radionuclide Pollution Decision**

On May 26, 2021, Community Groups requested that EPA review the Radionuclide Pollution Decision under Executive Order 13990.<sup>1</sup> On June 9, 2021, EPA confirmed that it was undertaking that review.<sup>2</sup> After reviewing EPA's comments on DOE's third revised wastewater focused feasibility study,<sup>3</sup> Community Groups wrote to EPA again on August 2, 2021, to

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Amanda Garcia et al., SELC, to Michael Regan, EPA, re: Request to Review the December 31, 2020 Radionuclide Pollution Decision Regarding Discharge of Radioactive Wastewaters at the Oak Ridge Reservation Facility in Oak Ridge, Tennessee (May 26, 2021).

<sup>2</sup> Letter from Lawrence Starfield, EPA, to Amanda Garcia et al., SELC, re: Request to Review December 31, 2020, Radionuclide Pollution Decision (Decision) Regarding Discharge of Radioactive Wastewaters at the Oak Ridge Reservation Facility in Oak Ridge, Tennessee (June 9, 2021).

<sup>3</sup> U.S. ENV'T PROT. AGENCY, EPA Comments on the Focused Feasibility Study for Water Management for the Disposal of CERCLA Waste on the Oak Ridge Reservation, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, (DOE/OR/01-2664&D3) (July 22, 2021),

emphasize the importance of reviewing and revising the Radionuclide Pollution Decision prior to taking any additional action regarding the EMDF.<sup>4</sup> Now, having reviewed EPA's comments on the draft ROD for the EMDF (DOE/OR/01-2794&D1),<sup>5</sup> and other recent announcements and correspondence from DOE, we are concerned that your administration has adopted the legally flawed and erroneous interpretation of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) set forth in the previous administrator's Radionuclide Pollution Decision.

Community Groups appreciate the Agency's detailed comments on the draft ROD and agree with EPA's overall conclusion that the draft ROD and accompanying administrative record as currently compiled do not meet CERCLA and National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) threshold requirements. EPA Comments, 4. However, EPA repeatedly references the Radionuclide Pollution Decision as the framework that applies to the establishment of radionuclide wastewater limits at the EMDF and does not expressly address whether DOE will be required to comply with technology-based effluent limits (TBELs) or the State of Tennessee's antidegradation policy.<sup>6</sup> Because EPA directs DOE to provide a revised focused feasibility study and record of decision that address EPA's comments, it is difficult for Community Groups not to infer that EPA has adopted the Radionuclide Pollution Decision as it stands. This inference is further supported by recent correspondence from DOE which indicates, without reference to any ongoing review by EPA of the Radionuclide Pollution Decision, that DOE will address comments on the wastewater focused feasibility study "30 calendar days following the date the radiological discharge limits are agreed upon by the three parties."<sup>7</sup>

---

[https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/environment/remediation/documents/oakridgereservation/emdf-documents/rem-73212\\_EMDF\\_Wastewater\\_FFS\\_EPA\\_07\\_22\\_2021b.pdf](https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/environment/remediation/documents/oakridgereservation/emdf-documents/rem-73212_EMDF_Wastewater_FFS_EPA_07_22_2021b.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Amanda Garcia et al., SELC, to Michael Regan, EPA, re: Concerns Regarding the U.S. Department of Energy's Recent Actions During the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Review of the December 31, 202- Radionuclide Pollution Decision for the Oak Ridge Reservation Facility in Oak Ridge, Tennessee (Aug. 2, 2021).

<sup>5</sup> U.S. ENV'T PROT. AGENCY, EPA Comments on the Record of Decision for Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Oak Ridge Reservation Waste Disposal at the Environmental Management Disposal Facility, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, (DOE/OR/01-2794&D1) (Oct. 6, 2021),

[https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/environment/remediation/documents/oakridgereservation/emdf-documents/rem\\_73212\\_EMDF\\_ROD\\_D1\\_EPA\\_10\\_06\\_2021.pdf](https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/environment/remediation/documents/oakridgereservation/emdf-documents/rem_73212_EMDF_ROD_D1_EPA_10_06_2021.pdf) (EPA Comments).

<sup>6</sup> See e.g., EPA Comments, 1 ("The D1 ROD does not clearly state that the [CWA] is an ARAR for radiological discharges, per the wastewater dispute decision (Wheeler, 12/31/20). Please address this oversight and state that the CWA is an ARAR for radiological discharge as appropriate throughout the document."); see also *id.* at 2-5, 14, 24, 27, 43-44.

<sup>7</sup> Letter from Brian Henry et al., DOE, to Constance Jones et al., EPA, re: Focused Feasibility Study for Water Management for the Disposal of CERCLA Waste on the Oak Ridge Reservation, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, (DOE/OR/01-2664&D4) (Oct. 28, 2021),

As Community Groups have previously noted, reinstating TBELs and the State of Tennessee's antidegradation policy as applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) for radionuclides is in accordance with CERCLA's stated preference for technology-based solutions; would clarify many of the remaining unresolved issues being negotiated by DOE, EPA, and the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC); and would provide maximum protection for the surrounding environment and local community. The Agency's silence, coupled with the hurried steps taken by DOE to finalize its preferred remedial alternative, appear to be an implicit denial of Community Groups' request that EPA review and revise the Radionuclide Pollution Decision.

As we explained in our May 26 and August 2 letters, the Radionuclide Pollution Decision is contrary to the remedial purpose and goals of CERCLA and the Clean Water Act—statutes your agency is charged with administering. If left as it stands, the Decision will continue to unreasonably limit EPA's authority to require a remedy at Oak Ridge that is protective of human health and the environment as required by CERCLA. To make matters worse, the Decision's impact will not be limited to Oak Ridge, notwithstanding former Administrator Wheeler's assertion to the contrary. If the Decision remains effective, DOE and other potentially responsible parties will be able to use it to support remedies that eschew technology-based treatment and state use designations for rivers and streams affected by radionuclide pollution.<sup>8</sup>

For all of these reasons, we respectfully request an update on the status of EPA's review of the Radionuclide Pollution Decision.

## **II. Request for Revised Proposed Plan for Proposed EMDF**

When an agency publishes a proposed remedial plan, CERCLA requires that the plan and its accompanying notice and analysis "shall include sufficient information" to provide the public with "a reasonable explanation" of the proposed remedy as well as the other alternatives which were considered. 42 U.S.C. § 9617(a). DOE's initial proposed remedial plan for the EMDF fell far short of this statutory mandate. As EPA notes in its comments on the draft ROD, when DOE issued its Proposed Plan for public comment in 2018, several portions of the administrative record were incomplete. EPA Comments, 7. At that time, DOE had yet to finalize a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS), wastewater focused feasibility study (FFS), waste acceptance criteria (WAC), list of complete ARARs, or to present the public with sufficient information regarding the geology and hydrology of the selected site. In sum, the 2018 Proposed Plan was not the culmination of an effective fact-gathering and evaluative process but rather set

---

[https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/environment/remediation/documents/oakridgereservation/emdf-documents/rem-73212\\_EMDF\\_FFS\\_DOE\\_10\\_28\\_2021.pdf](https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/environment/remediation/documents/oakridgereservation/emdf-documents/rem-73212_EMDF_FFS_DOE_10_28_2021.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> John McGahren et al., *EPA Announces Review of Trump Administration Decision on Nuclear Cleanup*, JDSUPRA (June 30, 2021), <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/epa-announces-review-of-trump-8819693/> ("While Administrator Wheeler's decision only applied to ORR, it is still seen as setting a precedent by rejecting the use of technology-based effluent limits to develop PRGs for radionuclide-contaminated water discharges.").

forth a pre-selected remedy accompanied by overtures that the agency would later fill in the necessary informational and analytic gaps.

Community Groups appreciate that both EPA and TDEC recognize in their comments on the draft ROD that further opportunity for public participation is necessary.<sup>9</sup> However, EPA appears to stop short of requiring DOE to issue a revised proposed plan as required by CERCLA and implementing regulations. And DOE appears to have full confidence that it will be allowed to move forward with the EMDF regardless of the extensive missing information or any forthcoming public input. On October 26, 2021, DOE's Office of Environmental Management announced that it has awarded a contract for, among other things, "design, construction, and operation of the new onsite disposal facility, Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF)."<sup>10</sup> This latest announcement from DOE merely continues the pattern it has established of putting the cart before the horse in pre-selecting a remedy at Oak Ridge.

DOE's award of construction contracts for the EMDF at this point in the remedial selection process signals that DOE is prioritizing shovels in the ground over compliance with the law. Yet EPA must comply with the substantive and procedural requirements of CERCLA prior to approving a record of decision for the EMDF.<sup>11</sup> Given the extensive amount of information missing from the administrative record at the time the 2018 Proposed Plan was issued, CERCLA requires DOE to issue a revised proposed plan. As EPA correctly notes, "[u]nder the NCP, new information should be made available for public review and comment consistent with 40 CFR 300.430(f)(3)" before issuance of a final ROD. EPA Comments, 18. That regulation mandates that an agency "shall" issue "a revised proposed plan" when new, unanticipated information is made available to the public after a previous proposed plan is put forth but before a ROD is finalized. 40 CFR 300.430(f)(3). The revised proposed plan should include "appropriate

---

<sup>9</sup> EPA Comments, 7–8; Letter from Randy Young, TDEC, to Roger Petrie, DOE, re: TDEC Comment Letter: *Record of Decision for Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Oak Ridge Reservation Waste Disposal at the Environmental Management Disposal Facility, Oak Ridge Tennessee* (DOE/OR/01-2794&D1), 2, 8 (Oct. 8, 2021), [https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/environment/remediation/documents/oakridgereservation/emdf-documents/rem\\_73212\\_EMDF\\_ROD\\_D1\\_TDEC\\_10\\_08\\_2021.pdf](https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/environment/remediation/documents/oakridgereservation/emdf-documents/rem_73212_EMDF_ROD_D1_TDEC_10_08_2021.pdf) (TDEC Comments).

<sup>10</sup> U.S. DEP'T OF ENERGY, *DOE Awards Oak Ridge Reservation Cleanup Contract* (Oct. 26, 2021), <https://www.energy.gov/em/articles/doe-awards-oak-ridge-reservation-cleanup-contract>.

<sup>11</sup> In recent correspondence, three members of Congress allege, in reference to our advocacy, that "special interests" are causing delay in the remedial process at Oak Ridge. Letter from Charles Fleishmann et al., to Michael Regan, EPA (Sept. 22, 2021), [https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/environment/remediation/documents/oakridgereservation/emdf-documents/rem\\_73212\\_EMDF\\_Congress\\_EPA\\_07\\_22\\_2021a.pdf](https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/environment/remediation/documents/oakridgereservation/emdf-documents/rem_73212_EMDF_Congress_EPA_07_22_2021a.pdf). To the contrary, Community Groups simply request that EPA implement the requirements imposed by CERCLA. The fact that DOE issued a grossly inadequate proposed plan in 2018 and has sought to evade straightforward procedural and environmental protections should not be blamed on Community Groups. Nor should the public be deprived of its legal right to participate in the remedial process as a result of DOE's short-sighted actions.

supporting material that provides the necessary engineering, cost, and risk information” absent from the first proposed plan and its supporting analysis, and should further discuss how the updated selected alternative “compares to the other alternatives with respect to the nine evaluation criteria [in 40 CFR 300.430(e)(9)].” U.S. Env’t Prot. Agency, *A Guide to Preparing Superfund Proposed Plans, Records of Decision, and Other Remedy Decision Documents*, 4-4 (July 1999).<sup>12</sup>

By requiring substantial new and unanticipated information to be compiled into a revised proposed plan and analyzed anew, CERCLA ensures that agencies substantively reevaluate selected remedies in response to new and significant information, and that both the information and analysis are presented in a consolidated way for the public to review. Given the amount of new information that must be compiled, analyzed, and reviewed prior to finalizing a ROD in this case, DOE must issue a revised proposed plan.<sup>13</sup>

The severe informational deficiencies, which hobbled the public’s ability to provide meaningful and informed comments on the Proposed Plan in late 2018 and early 2019 must now be addressed. As EPA has determined, further public involvement is necessary and warranted before any issuance of a final ROD. EPA Comments, 2, 31. This new period of public comment is necessary to allow the public to comment on the significant new information that has been made available to the public since January 2019—when the public comment period closed—including new technical reports analyzing the geology and groundwater elevation at the proposed site location. *See* EPA Comments, 2, 7, 18. DOE must also finalize and make public a completed RI/FS, wastewater FFS with preliminary remedial goals, WAC, and limits for radionuclides and mercury in surface water **before** any period of public comment is reopened and **before** any final record of decision may be approved. *See id.* Without this information, the public will lack the “sufficient information” necessary to understand whether DOE’s continued fealty to its pre-selected remedial alternative is reasonable and meets the threshold criteria for record of decision approval under CERCLA. Without this information, the public will not be able to comment in an informed manner on basic and important agency decisions such as the type of waste that will be accepted at the landfill and how much pollution from that waste will be allowed to discharge into the surrounding community.

---

<sup>12</sup> Available at [https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-02/documents/rod\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-02/documents/rod_guidance.pdf).

<sup>13</sup> Community Groups incorporate by reference the concerns outlined in a letter and accompanying attachment recently sent to EPA by several former TDEC employees which provides context on the history and operation of the EMWMF and the proposed EMDF, highlights inconsistencies in the draft EMDF ROD which must be addressed in a revised proposed plan, and shows how the current administrative record does not support a finding that the threshold criteria of protectiveness of public health and the environment and compliance with non-waived ARARs will be met. *See* Att. 1, Letter from Steve Goins et al., to Michael Regan, EPA, re: Misinformation concerning the Department of Energy (DOE) Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR) Environmental Management Waste Management Facility (EMWMF) and the proposed Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF) that affects the EMDF Record of Decision (ROD), Oak Ridge, Tennessee (Nov. 4, 2021).

DOE must also include in this analysis, for the first time, information regarding the potential impacts of climate change on its preferred remedy. Although the draft ROD evaluates the amount of greenhouse gas emissions that could result from offsite disposal of the hazardous waste, DOE is notably silent on the impacts climate change could have on its preferred onsite disposal alternative. As EPA notes, DOE must address this deficiency because its selected remedy could be impacted by “potential changes in rainfall, storm events and hydrologic conditions,” EPA Comments, 1; “increase in flood events,” *id.* at 9; and the area’s increasing historical average rainfall, *id.* at 31. *See also* TDEC Comment Letter, 43 (noting that historically high average annual rainfall levels “are no longer extreme events, but rather the norm, and this must be taken into consideration for storage treatment and design”).

Coupled with the new, alarming information that has come to light regarding the high groundwater levels at DOE’s preferred disposal site, DOE must analyze how increasingly wet weather conditions in Oak Ridge might affect its preferred onsite disposal plans. It is worth noting, in this regard, that the contact water holding ponds at the existing EMWMF have come close to failing in the past during heavy rain events, and as a result, thousands of gallons of untreated wastewater containing radionuclides and other hazardous pollutants have been discharged from EMWMF into Bear Creek.<sup>14</sup>

DOE must also supplement the information currently contained in the draft ROD about the impacts its selected remedy will have on environmental justice communities. Community Groups applaud EPA’s comments on the draft ROD regarding the inadequacy of DOE’s current environmental justice analysis. EPA notes that a screening-level analysis of the preferred remedy’s potential impacts on and existing risks to minority, low-income, and indigenous populations is needed. EPA Comments, 18. The importance of these measures is underscored by the close proximity of the Scarboro community to DOE’s preferred disposal location, as well as the anecdotal information Community Groups have provided to EPA Region 4 regarding fishing practices of nearby low-wealth Latino communities.

As EPA so aptly notes, “there currently is no factual basis in the D1 ROD or the Administrative Record for this ROD” to justify DOE’s assertion that DOE’s preferred remedy at the ORR site “will meet [remedial action objectives], will protect human and ecological receptors, and will prevent adverse impacts to surface water.” EPA Comments, 27. DOE must address these deficiencies before issuing a revised proposed plan for public comment. EPA should facilitate this process by revising the Radionuclide Pollution Decision so that DOE can issue a revised wastewater focused feasibility study, proposed plan, and record of decision that are consistent with CERCLA’s requirements and afford the community around the Oak Ridge Reservation the participation, and ultimately, the environmental protection, they deserve under the law.

---

<sup>14</sup> *See, e.g.*, Att. 2, Plea Agreement, *United States v. Duratek Federal Services*, No. 3:06-cr-00172-CCS (E.D. Tenn. 2006); Att. 3, Factual Basis at 2–3, *United States v. Duratek Federal Services*, No. 3:06-cr-00172-CCS (E.D. Tenn. 2006).

Sincerely,



Amanda Garcia  
Stephanie Biggs  
Attorneys  
Southern Environmental Law Center  
[agarcia@selctn.org](mailto:agarcia@selctn.org)  
[sbiggs@selctn.org](mailto:sbiggs@selctn.org)

Jimmy Groton  
President  
Advocates for the Oak Ridge Reservation

Axel Ringe  
Water Quality Chair  
Tennessee Chapter Sierra Club

Sandra Goss  
Executive Director  
Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning

Virginia Dale  
Land Management Chair  
Tennessee Chapter Sierra Club

Cc: Carlton Waterhouse, Deputy Assistant Administrator, EPA Office for Land and  
Emergency Management, [Waterhouse.Carlton@epa.gov](mailto:Waterhouse.Carlton@epa.gov)  
Melissa Hoffer, EPA Principal Deputy General Counsel, [Hoffer.Melissa@epa.gov](mailto:Hoffer.Melissa@epa.gov)  
Dimple Chaudhary, EPA Deputy General Counsel for Nationwide Resource Protection  
Programs, [Chaudhary.Dimple@epa.gov](mailto:Chaudhary.Dimple@epa.gov)  
Avi Garbow, Senior Counselor to the Administrator, [garbow.avi@epa.gov](mailto:garbow.avi@epa.gov)  
Leif Palmer, Regional Counsel, EPA Region 4, [palmer.leif@epa.gov](mailto:palmer.leif@epa.gov)  
Matthew Lee-Ashley, Acting Chief of Staff, White House Council on Environmental  
Quality, [Matthew.G.Lee-Ashley@ceq.eop.gov](mailto:Matthew.G.Lee-Ashley@ceq.eop.gov)  
Roger B. Petrie, Federal Facility Agreement Project Manager, [Roger.Petrie@ettp.doe.gov](mailto:Roger.Petrie@ettp.doe.gov)  
Brian T. Henry, Portfolio Federal Project Director, [Brian.Henry@orem.doe.gov](mailto:Brian.Henry@orem.doe.gov)  
John A. Mullis II, Acting Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory  
and Policy Affairs, [Jay.Mullis@orem.doe.gov](mailto:Jay.Mullis@orem.doe.gov)  
Laura Wilkerson, Manager, Oak Ridge Office of Environmental Management,  
[Laura.Wilkerson@orem.doe.gov](mailto:Laura.Wilkerson@orem.doe.gov)

**From:** Amanda Garcia <[agarcia@selctn.org](mailto:agarcia@selctn.org)>

**Date:** November 4, 2021 at 4:43:37 PM EDT

**To:** "Regan, Michael" <[Regan.Michael@epa.gov](mailto:Regan.Michael@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** "Waterhouse, Carlton" <[Waterhouse.Carlton@epa.gov](mailto:Waterhouse.Carlton@epa.gov)>, "Hoffer, Melissa" <[Hoffer.Melissa@epa.gov](mailto:Hoffer.Melissa@epa.gov)>, "Chaudhary, Dimple" <[Chaudhary.Dimple@epa.gov](mailto:Chaudhary.Dimple@epa.gov)>, [garbow.avi@epa.gov](mailto:garbow.avi@epa.gov), "Palmer, Leif" <[Palmer.Leif@epa.gov](mailto:Palmer.Leif@epa.gov)>, [Matthew.G.Lee-Ashley@ceq.eop.gov](mailto:Matthew.G.Lee-Ashley@ceq.eop.gov), [Roger.Petrie@ettp.doe.gov](mailto:Roger.Petrie@ettp.doe.gov), [Brian.Henry@orem.doe.gov](mailto:Brian.Henry@orem.doe.gov), [Jay.Mullis@orem.doe.gov](mailto:Jay.Mullis@orem.doe.gov), [Laura.Wilkerson@orem.doe.gov](mailto:Laura.Wilkerson@orem.doe.gov), [virginia.dale4@gmail.com](mailto:virginia.dale4@gmail.com), Ellen Smith <[smithellen@comcast.net](mailto:smithellen@comcast.net)>, onyxfarm <[onyxfarm@bellsouth.net](mailto:onyxfarm@bellsouth.net)>, [sandra@sandrakgoss.com](mailto:sandra@sandrakgoss.com), Jimmy Groton <[groton87@comcast.net](mailto:groton87@comcast.net)>

**Subject:** Attachments re: Request for Update Re: Review of the Radionuclide Pollution Decision and for a Revised Proposed Plan Re: EMDF at the Oak Ridge Reservation

Dear Administrator Regan:

Please find attached the attachments referenced in the letter emailed to you today from Southern Environmental Law Center, Advocates for Oak Ridge Reservation, Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning, and Tennessee Chapter Sierra Club requesting an update regarding your review of the Radionuclide Pollution Decision and further requesting that a revised proposed plan be prepared and issued for public comment regarding the proposed EMDF at the Oak Ridge Reservation.

Sincerely,  
Amanda

Amanda Garcia (she/her/hers)  
Director, Tennessee Office  
[agarcia@selctn.org](mailto:agarcia@selctn.org)<<mailto:agarcia@selctn.org>>

Southern Environmental Law Center  
1033 Demonbreun Street, Suite 205  
Nashville, TN 37203

Office (615) 921-9470

[southernenvironment.org<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fsouthernenvironment.org%2F&data=04%7C01%7CPalmer.Leif%40epa.gov%7Ceec74480ddf04780917e08d99fd3c1bb%7C88b378b367484867acf976aacbeca6a7%7C0%7C0%7C637716554171250193%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=%2FjzIW1elrkVkf%2FBbLwYIIObCwLKMq1ozl7n52lxI%2FE%3D&reserved=0>](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fsouthernenvironment.org%2F&data=04%7C01%7CPalmer.Leif%40epa.gov%7Ceec74480ddf04780917e08d99fd3c1bb%7C88b378b367484867acf976aacbeca6a7%7C0%7C0%7C637716554171250193%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=%2FjzIW1elrkVkf%2FBbLwYIIObCwLKMq1ozl7n52lxI%2FE%3D&reserved=0)



**VIA e-mail to**

Administrator Michael S. Regan  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
[Regan.Michael@epa.gov](mailto:Regan.Michael@epa.gov)

RE: Misinformation concerning the Department of Energy (DOE) Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR) Environmental Management Waste Management Facility (EMWMF) and the proposed Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF) that affects the EMDF Record of Decision (ROD), Oak Ridge, Tennessee

Dear Administrator Regan,

Before retiring from the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC), the cosigns were involved in numerous Superfund issues at the Department of Energy (DOE) Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR), Department of Defense sites, and private sector sites. We found that evaluating multiple lines of evidence was important to good decision making and that misinformation hinders that process.

We are aware of misinformation concerning the DOE ORR Environmental Management Waste Management Facility (EMWMF) and the proposed Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF). Attached is a document based on the administrative record identifying some of the misinformation. Several key points include:

1. EMWMF is not indicative of a future EMDF. K-25 (East Tennessee Technology Park or ETTP), Y-12, and X-10 (Oak Ridge National Lab or ORNL) have different radionuclide and Clean Water Act (CWA) pollutant waste profiles. Wastes from Y-12 and ORNL proposed to be disposed in a future EMDF are orders of magnitude more contaminated with CWA pollutants (e.g., mercury) and radionuclides than wastes from ETTP disposed in the EMWMF. Concentrations of mercury and radionuclide activity concentrations in EMDF landfill wastewater are also projected to be orders of magnitude greater than mercury concentrations and radionuclide activity concentrations measured in EMWMF landfill wastewater.
2. EMWMF was not always operated consistent with federal law. The EMWMF Record of Decision (ROD) did not authorize discharge of landfill wastewater to surface water as part of the remedial action. An EMWMF contractor had an unauthorized release of landfill wastewater containing radionuclides to Bear Creek during 2002 to avert a pond failure and pled guilty in federal court to unlawfully discharging EMWMF refuse (e.g., landfill wastewater containing radionuclides) into a waterway without a permit. EMWMF wastewater has been discharged to Bear Creek surface water for over 18 years and the EMWMF ROD has not been amended to (1) authorize the discharge of landfill wastewater with radionuclides and Clean Water Act pollutants and (2) establish legally compliant and protective discharge criteria. The Focused Feasibility for Water Management (FFS) was intended to address this failure. The D3 draft of the FFS submitted by DOE after EPA Administrator Wheeler's final dispute decision did not incorporate Administrator Wheeler's decision. It also failed to utilize (or waive) applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) to set discharge criteria for CWA pollutants (e.g., mercury and PCBs) and radionuclides and did not demonstrate overall protection of human health and the

environment. These are threshold criteria that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) requires must be met for an alternative to be eligible for selection as a remedial action.

3. There were high groundwater table issues under EMWMF, and installation of the underdrain created a landfill inconsistent with at least two ARARs listed in the EMWMF ROD. EMWMF documents state the underdrain will collect a significant fraction of leachate and direct it to Bear Creek. EMWMF documents also stated that channeling leachate to Bear Creek reduces radionuclides in groundwater and supports expanding the EMWMF from 4 to 6 cells without exceeding waste acceptance criteria (WAC) for any of the constituents with an approved WAC.
4. The Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF) is proposed to be authorized for disposal of Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) waste including polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). If laboratory method detection limits and reporting limits for PCBs at a future EMDF are consistent with those used at EMWMF (i.e., detection limits are greater than recreational use water quality criteria), then, pursuant to legally applicable antidegradation rules, discharge of landfill wastewater from a future EMDF cannot be authorized to surface water listed on the 303(d) list for PCBs.
5. The EMDF D1 ROD may include ARARs and then not apply the ARARs. For example, even though the EMDF D1 ROD included Tennessee antidegradation rule 0400-40-03-.06(2)(a) as an ARAR, it did not propose discharge criteria for mercury and PCBs consistent with the ARAR. Similarly, even though the D3 FFS included stream flows required by Tennessee Water Quality Criteria to calculate discharge criteria as an ARAR, calculation of discharge criteria in the FFS did not use the required stream flows to calculate proposed discharge criteria.
6. EMWMF WAC included a limited set of radionuclides and are likely not protective of human health associated with future groundwater use. Unlimited amounts of radionuclides without WAC may be disposed and those radionuclides are not tracked and used to determine if the landfill is in overall compliance with waste acceptance criteria. The WAC proposed in the D1 ROD for a future EMDF did not include protection of human health from future groundwater use or consumption of fish caught downstream as exposure pathways in WAC development. Inadvertent intrusion into the landfill at a cancer risk level greater than would be allowed by CERCLA and Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Class C limits were used to develop the EMDF D1 ROD WAC. WAC proposed in the D1 ROD was not demonstrated to be protective of human health and are not consistent with relevant and appropriate requirements.
7. The EMDF D1 ROD includes an ARAR waiver or exemption from TSCA 40 CFR 761.75(b)(3), related to hydrologic conditions, including waiving or exempting “*There shall be no hydraulic connection between the site and standing or flowing surface water.*” Without laboratory method detection limits capable of measuring release of PCBs to surface water at the recreational use water quality criteria, it is not demonstrated protective of human health to waive or exempt this requirement. Isolation of the site from surface water is needed during landfill operations, closure, and post closure to protect human health and the environment from PCB pollution.
8. The EMDF D1 ROD includes an ARAR waiver or exemption for TDEC 0400-20-11-.17(1)(h): “*The hydrogeologic unit used for disposal shall not discharge groundwater to the surface within the disposal site.*” This waiver or exemption has not been demonstrated to be protective of human health since the waiver or exemption is partially based on WAC in the D1 ROD. WAC in the D1 ROD are based on inadvertent intrusion and NRC Class C limits instead of human health protection based on future groundwater and surface water use.

Some of the information needed to understand and correct misinformation was added to the administrative record after the EMDF Proposed Plan and public comment period. This premature and incomplete Proposed Plan was issued to the public in 2018 as part of a dispute resolution. Instead of resolving State concerns before the 2018 Proposed Plan, the Proposed Plan included a discussion of the seven key unresolved State concerns. The Proposed Plan did not include WAC and discharge criteria that would protect public health and comply with ARARs which are threshold criteria. ROD development for a CERCLA remedial alternative where the selected alternative does not clearly meet CERCLA threshold criteria for a remedial alternative to be eligible for selection warrants a pause on the ROD process until those information gaps are resolved and its clear threshold criteria are met.

We request that EPA work with DOE to ensure those information gaps are corrected before DOE issues a revised Proposed Plan and provides the associated public comment opportunity.

Cosigns for this letter include retired TDEC employees with a cumulative of over 127 years of service to the State of Tennessee, over 145 years of combined environmental experience, and over 67 years of experience with the DOE ORR. Two of the cosigns served as former TDEC Division of Remediation (TnDoR) directors and one cosign served as deputy director of the former TDEC Division of Department of Energy Oversight (TnDOEO). TDEC's Division of Remediation is functionally equivalent to EPA's Division of Superfund.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Steve Goins, CPA  
Former TnDoR Division Director

Andy Binford  
Former TnDoR Division Director and Environmental Fellow

Juan Dale Rector, MS Biology, Aquatic  
Former TnDOEO Deputy Director

Sid Jones, PhD, P.E., P.G.

Michael Higgins, P.E.

E-mail Copy:

Secretary Jennifer Granholm, DOE  
[The.Secretary@hq.doe.gov](mailto:The.Secretary@hq.doe.gov)

Laura Wilkerson, DOE  
[Laura.Wilkerson@orem.doe.gov](mailto:Laura.Wilkerson@orem.doe.gov)

Commissioner David Salyers, TDEC  
[David.Salyers@tn.gov](mailto:David.Salyers@tn.gov)

Carrol Monell, EPA Region 4  
Monell.Carol@epa.gov

Amanda Garcia, SELC  
agarcia@selctn.org

1. Waste disposed in a new Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF) will not be like waste disposed in EMWMF. K-25 (ETTP), Y-12, and ORNL (X-10) have different waste profiles both in radionuclides present and their abundance (inventory). K-25 (ETTP) has been the major focus for many years and is the source of most of the waste disposed in the Environmental Management Waste Management Facility (EMWMF). The EMDF Performance Assessment<sup>i</sup> and EMWMF/EMDF Composite Analysis<sup>ii</sup> show that waste disposed in EMWMF is not indicative of future waste proposed to be disposed at EMDF. DOE proposes to dispose a significantly greater inventory of radionuclides at EMDF than EMWMF.<sup>iii</sup> Further, average leachate activity concentrations projected in the EMDF Performance Assessment at landfill closure are significantly greater than maximum leachate and contact water activity concentrations measured at EMWMF from October 2015 through June 2021.<sup>iv</sup> During disposal of wastes from specific areas, radionuclides<sup>v</sup> and Clean Water Act Pollutants<sup>vi</sup> in contact water and leachate will be a function of what was disposed in the past and what is being disposed at the time. The EMDF Performance Assessment is also useful in identifying radionuclide inventory that DOE anticipates disposing in the landfill from the various remedial areas. The greater the number of curies of a radionuclide from an area, the greater the inventory of that radionuclide disposed in the EMDF landfill from that area.<sup>vii</sup>
2. The Environmental Management Waste Management Facility (EMWMF) has not always been operated in compliance with federal law. The EMWMF Record of Decision (ROD) did not authorize discharge of landfill wastewater (e.g., contact water) to surface water as part of the remedial action. An EMWMF contractor had an unauthorized release of contact water containing radionuclides to Bear Creek during 2002 to avert a failure of the ponds and pled guilty in federal court to unlawfully discharging EMWMF refuse (e.g., contact water containing radionuclides) into a waterway without a permit.<sup>viii</sup>
3. The EMWMF ROD was not amended to (1) authorize discharge of contact water with radionuclides and Clean Water Act pollutants to Bear Creek and (2) establish legally compliant and protective discharge criteria.<sup>ix</sup> Yet since 2003, the Department of Energy (DOE) has routinely discharge EMWMF contact water containing radionuclides and other pollutants to Bear Creek surface water.<sup>x</sup> For example, during FY 2020, DOE reported discharging 17,635,000 gallons of contact water to Bear Creek.<sup>xi</sup>
4. Even though EMWMF has released contact water to Bear Creek since 2003, fish samples from Bear Creek and lower East Fork Poplar Creek were not analyzed to evaluate levels of radionuclides in fish that people may eat until after U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Wheeler's December 31, 2020, final dispute decision.<sup>xii</sup> Analyzing fish for radionuclides in the Poplar Creek embayment where it is documented that people fish and some people consume fish caught<sup>xiii</sup> was also not done from 2003 through 2019.<sup>xiv</sup> The frequency of radionuclide analysis and radionuclides to be analyzed in future fish sampling is unclear.
5. The focus of the ORR cleanup during much of the EMWMF operational period has been K-25 (ETTP) instead of ORNL (X-10). If ORNL waste instead of K-25 waste had primarily been disposed in EMWMF, then without treating all EMWMF discharges of radionuclides to surface water, radionuclides in discharges to surface water over the past 18 years would likely have been significantly different.<sup>xv</sup>
6. In 2003, there was an "Engineering Feasibility Plan for Groundwater Suppression" at EMWMF<sup>xvi</sup> that did not include evaluation of applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) listed in the EMWMF ROD as criteria for remedy evaluation and selection. Installation of the underdrain under EMWMF landfill Cell 3 created a landfill inconsistent with at least two ARARs listed in the EMWMF ROD<sup>xvii</sup>. This feasibility study

- specifies the underdrain will increase contaminant dilution to the hypothetical groundwater user. A 2010 addendum to the EMWMF Remedial Design Report clarifies that the underdrain will collect a significant fraction of leachate and direct it to Bear Creek.<sup>xviii</sup>
7. EMWMF discharges landfill wastewater (i.e., contact water) into Bear Creek. Bear Creek and downstream surface waters are included on the 303(d) list of impaired and threatened waters for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Analysis and reporting of PCBs in EMWMF wastewater discharges to surface water are insufficient<sup>xix</sup> to determine whether recreational use water quality criteria are exceeded or whether there is a correlation between EMWMF discharges and levels of PCBs in fish in Bear Creek.<sup>xx</sup>
  8. The Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF) is proposed to be authorized for disposal of Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA) waste including PCBs. If laboratory method detection limits and reporting limits for PCBs at a future EMDF are consistent with those used at EMWMF and are greater than the recreational use water quality criteria, pursuant to Tennessee Rule 0400-40-03-.06(2)(a)<sup>xxi</sup> discharge of wastewater from a future EMDF cannot be authorized to surface water listed on the 303(d) list for PCBs.
  9. Bear Creek is also listed on the 303(d) list of impaired and threatened waters for mercury. EPA Comment 104 on the EMDF D1 ROD states *“In order to meet the CWA requirements and be consistent with the NCP, the discharge must meet the most stringent of either the [Technology Based Effluent Limits (TBEL)] (which has yet to be determined), a [Water Quality Based Effluent Limit (WQBEL)], or an antidegradation-based limit.”*
  10. Tennessee antidegradation regulations<sup>xxii</sup> specify that new or increased discharges of unavailable parameters, such as mercury, shall not be authorized if the discharge would cause measurable degradation of surface water for mercury. Bear Creek is included on the 303(d) list for mercury and a 95% UCL mercury concentration of 5.17 ng/L (ppt) with a median of 3.3 ng/L (ppt) can be calculated in Bear Creek surface water near the proposed EMDF.<sup>xxiii</sup>
  11. Tennessee antidegradation rules also require that discharges of bioaccumulative parameters, such as mercury, will not be authorized if they cause additional loading of the unavailable parameter (e.g., mercury). Neither the FFS for Water Management<sup>xxiv</sup> nor the EMDF D1 ROD include loading analysis that verifies proposed discharge criteria do not increase mercury loading to Bear Creek. Loading calculations using mercury concentrations obtained with EPA method 1631 or 1631E and flow data in OREIS suggest loading of mercury to Bear Creek from EMWMF has been minimal. A competent mercury loading analysis is needed.
  12. Beginning with the EMWMF discharge sample collected on August 27, 2019, laboratory analysis for mercury changed from a method with a reported laboratory detection limit of 0.2 to 1 ng/L (ppt) to a method with a detection limit of 67 ng/L and a DOE reporting limit of 200 ng/L.<sup>xxv</sup> This change in analytical methodology with corresponding increased method detection limits and reporting limits complicates analysis of loading of mercury released to Bear Creek from EMWMF.
  13. It is likely EMWMF Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) does not protect future groundwater users. The East Bear Creek Valley (EBCV) Site is adjacent to EMWMF. In the D4 version of the EMDF Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS)<sup>xxvi</sup>, the hypothetical or modeled groundwater point of compliance well was moved to a location near the projected highest concentration beyond a 100-meter buffer zone<sup>xxvii</sup> surrounding the waste consistent with requirements in DOE G 435.1-1<sup>xxviii</sup>. The EMDF D4 RI/FS substituted preliminary administrative limits that do not comply with the CERCLA carcinogenic risk range or relevant and appropriate requirements for 28 of the 32 radionuclides evaluated.<sup>xxix</sup> TDEC’s May 16, 2016, comment letter includes WAC calculated using methodology DOE presented in the EMDF D4 RI/FS consistent with the CERCLA carcinogenic risk range and remedial action objectives presented in the EMDF D4 RI/FS. Preliminary administrative limits were

based on a 500 mrem/year EDE where the ARAR (TDEC Rule 0400-20-11-.16(2) and equivalent 10 CFR § 61.41) is roughly equivalent to 10 mrem/year EDE. Both WAC limits presented in TDEC's comment letter and dividing EMDF D4 RI/FS preliminary administrative limits by 50 give order of magnitude WAC limits based on methodology in the EMDF D4 RI/FS. When comparing these WAC levels with the EMWMF WAC, there are striking differences. For example, EMWMF carcinogenic WAC for Uranium-238 is 1,200 pCi/g and D4 EMDF carcinogenic WAC for Uranium-238 based on 10 mrem/year EDE<sup>xxx</sup> and  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  cancer risk<sup>xxx</sup> is on the order of 55 to 63 pCi/g. EMWMF WAC for plutonium-239 is 720 pCi/g and the D4 EMDF carcinogenic WAC based on 10 mrem/year EDE and  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  cancer risk is 19 to 42 pCi/g. Further, the EMWMF WAC includes a shorter list of radionuclides.<sup>xxxii</sup>

14. The D5 version of the EMDF RI/FS includes a placeholder WAC. EMDF D5 RI/FS<sup>xxxiii</sup> Figure 6-91<sup>xxxiv</sup> shows the WAC and WAC compliance Plan will incorporate the EMDF Performance Assessment and would be verified and appropriately documented under CERCLA before the EMDF ROD. The EMDF Performance Assessment deferred the WAC to the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) parties. Deferring the WAC to CERCLA should cause the exposure point concentration to evaluate the impact on human health from future groundwater use to be in the core/center of the plume as terms exposure point concentration, core/center of the plume, and contaminant plume are defined in OSWER Directive 9283.1-42 "Determining Groundwater Exposure Point Concentrations." The proposed WAC in the EMDF D1 ROD are not based on protection of human health from groundwater use and are not based on protection of future generations that may consume fish caught downstream. The EMDF D1 ROD WAC do include protection from inadvertent intrusion at a 100 mrem/year EDE which is an order of magnitude greater than both the cancer risk allowed by CERCLA and a relevant and appropriate requirement. The footnote includes a table comparing the EMDF D1 ROD WAC with the EMDF D4 RI/FS WAC corrected from a 500 mrem/year dose to a 10 mrem/year dose to be consistent with relevant and appropriate requirement 10 CFR § 61.41.<sup>xxxv</sup> The 2018 Proposed Plan<sup>xxxvi</sup> states: "*The purpose of WAC is to allow the disposal of only those wastes that could be protectively managed within the facility and ensure protection of human health and the environment. Wastes that do not meet the WAC will require offsite disposal or receive treatment. The final WAC will be attached to the Record of Decision (ROD) prior to signature and will be one of many factors used by DOE to assure protection of human health and the environment.*" It has not been demonstrated that the EMDF D1 ROD WAC achieves the WAC purpose stated in the Proposed Plan.
15. The EMDF D1 ROD includes an ARAR waiver or exemption from TSCA 40 CFR 761.75(b)(3), relating to hydrologic conditions, including waiving or exempting "*There shall be no hydraulic connection between the site and standing or flowing surface water.*" Without laboratory method detection limits capable of measuring release of PCBs to surface water at the recreational use water quality criteria, it has not been demonstrated protective of human health to waive or exempt this requirement. Isolation of the site from surface water is needed during landfill operations, closure, and post closure to protect human health and the environment from PCB pollution. Installation of the underdrain at EMWMF was also inconsistent with this requirement.
16. The EMDF D1 ROD includes an ARAR waiver or exemption to TDEC 0400-20-11-.17(1)(h): "*The hydrogeologic unit used for disposal shall not discharge groundwater to the surface within the disposal site.*" The ROD justification includes discussion that "*Limiting the acceptance of radionuclides during operations and limiting the final inventory of those*

*contaminants allowed at closure of the facility will also provide a significant measure of protectiveness. Determination of these limits for the proposed site take into account site-specific conditions and consider failure scenarios and their outcomes, to ultimately set limits that ensure human and environmental protectiveness are met per RAOs.*” This discussion sounds good, but the expressed methodology was apparently not used in determining what may be disposed. Failure scenarios other than having inadvertent intrusion are not included. WAC included in the EMDF D1 ROD were not based on protecting future groundwater use and were not based on protecting future surface water use. Further, even though the EMDF D1 ROD WAC is based on inadvertent intrusion, it used risk criteria of 100 mrem/year EDE which is a cancer risk about 10 times greater than cancer risk levels allowed by CERCLA. If the ARAR is waved and, in the future, someone builds a farm pond on one of the tributaries with groundwater discharging to surface water adjacent to EMDF, heaven help them. Installation of the underdrain at EMWWMF was also inconsistent with this requirement.

17. Cost analyses for EMDF are incomplete. Costs presented for the remedial action are based on what may be theoretically disposed onsite without knowing WAC that protect future groundwater and surface water uses and associated volumes of waste that would be accepted in EMDF. WAC<sup>xxxvii</sup> appears to maximize waste disposal in the future landfill instead of identifying what wastes may be disposed while also protecting human health and the environment. Even the hybrid alternative with the combination of onsite and offsite disposal assumed all wastes that could theoretically be disposed onsite are disposed onsite and after the landfill is filled, wastes are disposed offsite<sup>xxxviii</sup>. The unapproved EMDF RI/FS drafts did not estimate overall cost of disposal, where wastes that meet protective WAC are segregated and disposed onsite and a significant amount of waste do not meet WAC requirements and are disposed offsite. Landfill operations have an annual cost, and the length of landfill operation affects the overall cost. Whether the landfill operates until 2045 or 2070 influences the cost evaluation.<sup>xxxix</sup> It is undetermined whether operating a landfill with a protective WAC and legally compliant and protective discharge criteria is more cost effective than offsite disposal.
18. The State Acceptance section in the EMDF Proposed Plan<sup>xl</sup> includes a list of items and data gaps that need resolved.

<sup>i</sup> Performance Assessment for the Environmental Management Disposal Facility at the Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (UCOR-5094/R2)

<sup>ii</sup> Composite Analysis for the Environmental Management Waste Management Facility and the Environmental Management Disposal Facility, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (UCOR-5095/R2)

<sup>iii</sup>

Radionuclide Inventory Identified for Disposal in EMDF is Significantly Greater than Radiological Inventory Disposed at EMWWMF			
	EMDF/EMWWMF Composite Analysis Table B.1		EMDF Performance Assessment Table B.6
Isotope Name	Reported EMWWMF Activity at FY 19 (Curies)	Composite Analysis Estimated Waste Inventory Activity at EMWWMF Closure (Curies)	EMDF Estimated Waste Inventory Activity at closure (Curies decayed to 2047)
Am-241	20.2	25.5	<b>152</b>
C-14 <sup>^</sup>	2.77	3.5	<b>7.43</b>
Cm-244	-----	-----	<b>326</b>
Cs-137	-----	-----	<b>3040</b>
Eu-152	-----	-----	<b>74</b>
Eu-154	-----	-----	<b>16.7</b>



Attachment to 11/4/2021 Letter to EPA Administrator Michael S. Regan

H-3 <sup>^</sup>	12.1	15.3	<b>28.8</b>
I-129 <sup>^</sup>	0.00115	0.00145	<b>1.05</b>
K-40	-----	-----	<b>8.46</b>
Ni-63	-----	-----	<b>1740</b>
Np-237	1.4	1.77	0.837
Pb-210	-----	-----	<b>9.5</b>
Pu-238	-----	-----	<b>242</b>
Pu-239/240	14	18	<b>310</b>
Pu-241	-----	-----	<b>525</b>
Pu-242	-----	-----	<b>0.445</b>
Ra-226	-----	-----	<b>2.07</b>
Sr-90	-----	-----	<b>496</b>
Tc-99 <sup>^</sup>	170	215	7.23
Th-229	-----	-----	<b>14.7</b>
Th-230	-----	-----	<b>4.94</b>
Th-232	-----	-----	<b>9.07</b>
Th-234*	-----	-----	-----
U-232	-----	-----	<b>26.3</b>
U-233/234	433	547	<b>1727</b>
U-235/236	42	53	<b>125.2</b>
U-238	258	326	<b>983</b>

<sup>^</sup>Radionuclides that EMDF PA Table G.9 adjusts for activity loss due to leaching during the 25-year operational period.

\*Th-234 is in secular equilibrium with U-238.

<sup>iv</sup> Comparison of projected leachate activity concentration at EMDF and maximum measured leachate and contact water concentrations in EMWMF from October 2015 through June 2021 show EMDF will have orders of magnitude more radionuclides in leachate than EMWMF. EMDF Performance Assessment Table C.5 at T=0 gives the projected average leachate activity concentration for several selected radionuclides including all waste and clean fill.

<b>Comparison of Maximum Measured Activity Concentration in EMWMF Leachate and Contact Water for the period of October 2015 to June 2021 with the Average Leachate Activity Concentration Projected in EMDF at Closure.</b>			
	Maximum Activity Concentration Measured from October 2015 through June 2021 and Reported in OREIS Data		EMDF Projected Leachate Activity Concentrations at EMDF Landfill Closure
Isotope Name	EMWMF Leachate (pCi/L) Activity concentration >1 rounded to a whole number	EMWMF Contact Water (pCi/L) Activity concentration >1 rounded to a whole number	EMDF Performance Assessment Table C.5. at T=0 (pCi/L)
Am-241	0.708	0.245	29
C-14	20	22	2,450
Cm-244	Undetected at 0.473	Undetected at 0.201	6,230
Cs-137	5	Undetected at 5.89	787
Eu-152	14	16	1,420
Eu-154	9	6	321
H-3	10300	4,790	21,000
I-129	3	2	158
K-40	65	67	215
Ni-63	65	53	673
Np-237	Undetected at 0.207	0.685	16
Pb-210	2	0.987	73
Pu-238	Undetected at 0.457	Undetected at 0.458	4,640
Pu-239/240	Undetected at 0.235	Undetected at 0.364	5,950
Pu-241	Undetected at 47.5	Undetected at 18.6	10,100

Attachment to 11/4/2021 Letter to EPA Administrator Michael S. Regan

Pu-242	Undetected at 0.476	Undetected at 0.286	9
Ra-226	1	1	0.5
Sr-90 / radioactive strontium	44 (Sr-90)	8 (radioactive strontium - total)	12,600 (Sr-90)
Tc-99	2120	28,500	2,690
Th-229	Undetected at 0.503	Undetected at 0.241	4
Th-230	2	0.586	1
Th-232	0.201	0.361	2
Th-234*	28	41	
U-232	0.455	Undetected at 0.263	404
U-233/234	2200	676	26,650
U-235/236	226	48	1,926
U-238	100	41	15,100

\*Th-234 should be in secular equilibrium with U-238. Therefore, leachate activity concentration in EMDF should be the same as U-238 leachate concentration.

<sup>v</sup> The following table from the EMDF Performance Assessment gives an indication of levels of radionuclides that DOE anticipates disposed from major cleanup areas. The EMDF Performance Assessment page B-20 states *“Activity concentrations are adjusted for radiological decay to the assumed year of EMDF closure (2047) based on radioisotope half-life and the year of data collection.”*

Table B.5. Arithmetic average activity concentrations for EMDF waste streams

Radioisotope	EMDF waste stream average activity concentration (pCi/g)					
	ORNL D&D	ORNL RA	Y-12 D&D Alpha-4 and Alpha-5	Y-12 D&D Biology	Y-12 D&D Remaining Facilities	Y-12 RA
Ac-227	3.88E-02					
Am-241	2.10E+02	6.14E+02	1.61E-02	1.82E-01	5.96E-02	6.86E-01
Am-243	2.73E+00	3.95E+01				
C-14	8.53E+00	2.55E+01		4.18E+01		
Cf-249	1.44E-05					
Cf-250	9.82E-05					
Cf-251	2.79E-06					
Cf-252	1.74E-06					
Cm-243	5.18E+00	5.65E-01				
Cm-244	1.67E+03	1.40E+01	3.93E-03			
Cm-245	5.08E-01					
Cm-246	2.11E+00					
Cm-247	1.38E-01					
Cm-248	7.43E-03					
Co-60	2.18E-01	4.38E-02	6.47E-03			7.98E-04
Cs-134	2.79E-08	1.21E-07				
Cs-137	2.11E+03	1.46E+04	1.99E-01	1.32E-01	4.68E-02	5.40E+00
Eu-152	3.73E+02	8.08E+00				
Eu-154	8.49E+01	1.39E+00				
Eu-155	8.87E-02	7.95E-04				
Fe-55		1.28E-05				
H-3	1.30E+02	1.97E+01		2.23E+00		
I-129	4.92E+00	5.18E-01				
K-40	5.53E+00	1.90E+01		2.23E+01		6.33E+00
Mo-100	5.58E-05					
Na-22	1.08E-05	1.45E-07				
Nb-94	2.16E-01					
Ni-59	4.04E+01					
Ni-63	6.02E+02	8.97E+03		1.72E+00		
Np-237	4.59E-01	2.81E+00	4.90E-02	2.15E-01		4.32E-01
Pa-231	3.17E+00					
Pb-210	4.68E+01	2.26E+00				
Pm-146	1.17E-03					
Pm-147	2.83E-03	9.38E-05				
Pu-238	7.37E+02	5.46E+02	1.84E-01		3.95E-01	8.77E-03
Pu-239	2.37E+02	5.76E+02			7.62E-02	5.93E-01
Pu-240	3.51E+02	5.08E+02	6.77E-02	1.80E-01		
Pu-241	6.87E+01	2.83E+03				
Pu-242	1.83E-01	2.27E+00				
Pu-244	4.89E-02					
Ra-226	2.92E+00	3.92E+00		9.97E-01		1.45E+00

Table B.5. Arithmetic average activity concentrations for EMDF waste streams (cont.)

Radioisotope	EMDF waste stream average activity concentration (pCi/g)					
	ORNL D&D	ORNL RA	Y-12 D&D Alpha-4 and Alpha-5	Y-12 D&D Biology	Y-12 D&D Remaining Facilities	Y-12 RA
Ra-228	6.54E-03	1.39E-02			1.71E-01	2.68E-03
Re-187	2.27E-05					
Sb-125	4.02E-07					
Sr-90	2.16E+03	4.15E+02		1.75E+00	1.66E-01	
Tc-99	1.32E+01	3.94E+00	1.08E+00	4.06E+01	7.78E-01	4.61E+00
Th-228	1.16E-06	1.88E-09	5.93E-07	1.27E-05	1.58E-05	
Th-229	1.73E+00	7.96E+01			4.71E-02	
Th-230	1.70E+00	2.11E+01	4.32E-01		7.85E-02	1.37E+00
Th-232	1.19E+00	9.36E+00	3.74E-01	7.96E-01	6.54E-01	1.31E+01
U-232	8.34E-01	1.45E+02				
U-233	2.65E+02	2.92E+02		9.65E+01	1.10E+00	
U-234	1.11E+01	1.51E+02	9.10E+00	8.33E+01	5.23E+03	1.56E+01
U-235	4.20E-01	2.34E+00	7.47E-01	7.18E+00	3.16E+02	1.11E+01
U-236	2.65E-01	1.08E+00	3.80E-01	4.23E+00	7.47E+01	2.26E-01
U-238	6.79E+00	2.92E+01	3.43E+01	3.40E+02	2.91E+03	1.51E+02

D&D = deactivation and decommissioning  
EMDF = Environmental Management Disposal Facility  
ORNL = Oak Ridge National Laboratory

RA = remedial action  
Y-12 = Y-12 National Security Complex

---

<sup>vi</sup> *Focused Feasibility Study for Water Management for the Disposal of CERCLA Waste on the Oak Ridge Reservation, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (DOE/OR/01-2664&D2) APPENDIX E. Mercury Concentration in Environmental Management Disposal Facility Leachate includes:*

*“Untreated soils and debris that pass TCLP will be disposed of in the landfill. Although mercury has naturally high Kds, the amount of mercury-contaminated waste soil and debris expected to be disposed is large enough to result in significant “as-disposed” soil mercury concentrations that may result in measurable mercury concentrations in the leachate (see Fig. E.3). “As-generated” soil/debris mercury concentrations must be adjusted to account for the addition of soil fill, necessary for landfill stability, and the inclusion of other wastes in the landfill resulting in an “as-disposed” mercury concentration. The assumed volume of mercury-contaminated debris and soil to be disposed that will not require treatment to meet LDRs is approximately 300,000 CY. This material will be disposed along with the mercurycontaining debris and soil within the first three cells resulting in a final as-disposed volume of approximately 1.25M CY. Consequently, the as-generated mercury concentrations would be reduced by a factor of about four. Assuming the resulting, as-disposed concentration is in the range of 0.03 to 0.25 mg/kg (equivalent to an as-generated waste mercury concentrations corresponding to 0.1 to ~1 mg/kg), leachate concentrations could exceed the 51 ppt ambient water quality criteria (AWQC) for mercury depending on the Kd exhibited (see Fig. E.3). As noted in the Alpha-5 characterization results, mercury concentrations are highly variable, and 95% of debris samples exhibiting mercury concentrations up to 151 mg/kg may pass TCLP. Taking this as an upper bound of the as-generated mercury concentration and assuming the Kds for contaminated debris would be the same as soil, a leachate mercury concentration in the range of 10,000 (highest Kd) to 90,000 ppt (lowest Kd) might be possible. With the uncertainty in volumes of soil/debris to be disposed, and the variability in as-generated mercury concentrations, predictions are highly uncertain. It is expected that leachate concentrations will vary widely for reasons such as variability in rainfall, sequencing of waste volumes, operations procedures, etc.”*

vii

**Table B.6. Total EMDF waste radionuclide inventory (Ci decayed to 2047)**

Waste mass (g)	ORNL		Y-12 D&D		Y-12 D&D		EMDF Waste Total Inventory (Ci)	EMDF waste average activity concentration (pCi/g)	
	D&D	ORNL RA	Alpha-4 and Alpha-5	Y-12 D&D Biology	Remaining Facilities	Y-12 RA			
	1.94E+11	1.81E+11	1.37E+11	2.81E+10	3.03E+11	5.26E+11	1.37E+12		
<b>Radio-isotope</b>	<b>EMDF activity by waste stream (Ci)</b>								
Ac-227	7.54E-03						7.54E-03	5.50E-03	
Am-241	4.09E+01	1.11E+02	2.20E-03	5.11E-03	1.80E-02	3.61E-01	1.52E+02	1.11E+02	
Am-243	5.30E-01	7.12E+00					7.65E+00	5.59E+00	
Ba-133	Refer to Attachment B.3 for basis of inventory estimate							4.14E+00	3.02E+00
Be-10	Refer to Attachment B.3 for basis of inventory estimate							6.52E-05	4.76E-05
C-14	1.66E+00	4.60E+00		1.17E+00			7.43E+00	5.43E+00	
Ca-41	Refer to Attachment B.3 for basis of inventory estimate							1.09E-01	7.92E-02
Cf-249	2.80E-06						2.80E-06	2.05E-06	
Cf-250	1.91E-05						1.91E-05	1.39E-05	
Cf-251	5.42E-07						5.42E-07	3.96E-07	
Cf-252	3.37E-07						3.37E-07	2.46E-07	
Cm-243	1.01E+00	1.02E-01					1.11E+00	8.10E-01	
Cm-244	3.23E+02	2.53E+00	5.39E-04				3.26E+02	2.38E+02	
Cm-245	9.87E-02						9.87E-02	7.21E-02	
Cm-246	4.10E-01						4.10E-01	2.99E-01	
Cm-247	2.68E-02						2.68E-02	1.96E-02	
Cm-248	1.44E-03						1.44E-03	1.05E-03	
Co-60	4.23E-02	7.90E-03	8.87E-04			4.20E-04	5.15E-02	3.76E-02	
Cs-134	5.41E-09	2.19E-08					2.73E-08	1.99E-08	
Cs-137	4.11E+02	2.63E+03	2.73E-02	3.71E-03	1.42E-02	2.84E+00	3.04E+03	2.22E+03	
Eu-152	7.25E+01	1.46E+00					7.40E+01	5.40E+01	
Eu-154	1.65E+01	2.52E-01					1.67E+01	1.22E+01	
Eu-155	1.72E-02	1.44E-04					1.74E-02	1.27E-02	
Fe-55		2.31E-06					2.31E-06	1.68E-06	
H-3	2.52E+01	3.56E+00		6.25E-02			2.88E+01	2.10E+01	
I-129	9.56E-01	9.35E-02					1.05E+00	7.66E-01	
K-40	1.07E+00	3.43E+00		6.27E-01		3.33E+00	8.46E+00	6.18E+00	
Mo-100	1.08E-05						1.08E-05	7.92E-06	
Mo-93	Refer to Attachment B.3 for basis of inventory estimate							1.00E+00	7.30E-01

**Table B.6. Total EMDF radionuclide inventory (Ci decayed to 2047) (cont.)**

Waste mass (g)	ORNL		Y-12 D&D		Y-12 D&D		EMDF Waste Total Inventory (Ci)	EMDF waste average activity concentration (pCi/g)	
	D&D	ORNL RA	Alpha-4 and Alpha-5	Y-12 D&D Biology	Remaining Facilities	Y-12 RA			
	1.94E+11	1.81E+11	1.37E+11	2.81E+10	3.03E+11	5.26E+11	1.37E+12		
<b>Radio-isotope</b>	<b>EMDF activity by waste stream (Ci)</b>								
Na-22	2.09E-06	2.63E-08					2.12E-06	1.55E-06	
Nb-93m	Refer to Attachment B.3 for basis of inventory estimate							6.01E-01	4.39E-01
Nb-94	4.20E-02						4.20E-02	3.07E-02	
Ni-59	7.84E+00						7.84E+00	5.73E+00	
Ni-63	1.17E+02	1.62E+03		4.84E-02			1.74E+03	1.27E+03	
Np-237	8.92E-02	5.08E-01	6.72E-03	6.04E-03		2.27E-01	8.37E-01	6.12E-01	
Pa-231	6.15E-01						6.15E-01	4.49E-01	
Pb-210	9.09E+00	4.08E-01					9.50E+00	6.93E+00	
Pm-146	2.28E-04						2.28E-04	1.66E-04	
Pm-147	5.49E-04	1.69E-05					5.66E-04	4.13E-04	
Pu-238	1.43E+02	9.86E+01	2.52E-02		1.20E-01	4.62E-03	2.42E+02	1.77E+02	
Pu-239	4.61E+01	1.04E+02			2.31E-02	3.12E-01	1.50E+02	1.10E+02	
Pu-240	6.81E+01	9.18E+01	9.29E-03	5.07E-03			1.60E+02	1.17E+02	
Pu-241	1.33E+01	5.12E+02					5.25E+02	3.83E+02	
Pu-242	3.55E-02	4.10E-01					4.45E-01	3.25E-01	
Pu-244	9.49E-03						9.49E-03	6.93E-03	
Ra-226	5.68E-01	7.08E-01		2.80E-02		7.63E-01	2.07E+00	1.51E+00	
Ra-228	1.27E-03	2.52E-03			5.17E-02	1.41E-03	5.69E-02	4.15E-02	
Re-187	4.40E-06						4.40E-06	3.21E-06	
Sb-125	7.82E-08						7.82E-08	5.71E-08	
Sr-90	4.21E+02	7.50E+01		4.93E-02	5.02E-02		4.96E+02	3.62E+02	
Tc-99	2.57E+00	7.11E-01	1.48E-01	1.14E+00	2.36E-01	2.43E+00	7.23E+00	5.28E+00	
Th-228	2.25E-07	3.40E-10	8.14E-08	3.58E-07	4.78E-06		5.45E-06	3.98E-06	
Th-229	3.36E-01	1.44E+01			1.43E-02		1.47E+01	1.08E+01	
Th-230	3.30E-01	3.81E+00	5.92E-02		2.38E-02	7.20E-01	4.94E+00	3.61E+00	
Th-232	2.32E-01	1.69E+00	5.14E-02	2.24E-02	1.98E-01	6.87E+00	9.07E+00	6.62E+00	
U-232	1.62E-01	2.61E+01					2.63E+01	1.92E+01	
U-233	5.15E+01	5.27E+01		2.71E+00	3.33E-01		1.07E+02	7.83E+01	
U-234	2.15E+00	2.72E+01	1.25E+00	2.34E+00	1.58E+03	8.24E+00	1.62E+03	1.19E+03	
U-235	8.15E-02	4.23E-01	1.02E-01	2.02E-01	9.57E+01	5.84E+00	1.02E+02	7.47E+01	
U-236	5.14E-02	1.95E-01	5.22E-02	1.19E-01	2.26E+01	1.19E-01	2.32E+01	1.69E+01	
U-238	1.32E+00	5.27E+00	4.71E+00	9.56E+00	8.83E+02	7.92E+01	9.83E+02	7.18E+02	

D&D = deactivation and decommissioning  
 EMDF = Environmental Management Disposal Facility  
 ORNL = Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
 RA = remedial action  
 Y-12 = Y-12 National Security Complex

<sup>viii</sup> This is documented in the EPA Office of the Inspector General, May 2007 Semiannual Report to Congress (EPA-350-R-07-002).

<sup>ix</sup> The EMWMF ROD has not been amended to authorize wastewater discharge to surface water, establish enforceable applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) for discharge of radionuclides and Clean Water Act (CWA) pollutants, and establish discharge criteria that are overall protective of human health and the environment. The *Focused Feasibility Study for Water Management for the Disposal of CERCLA Waste on the Oak Ridge Reservation, Oak Ridge, Tennessee* (DOE/OR/01-2664&D1) (DOE/OR/01-2664&D2) and (DOE/OR/01-2664&D3) (Focus Feasibility Study or FFS for Water Management) was to address this failure and provide basis for both an EMWMF ROD amendment and future discharge from a new Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF) landfill. EMDF is a proposed new landfill for disposal of toxic (e.g., PCBs), hazardous (e.g., mercury), and radioactive waste in Bear Creek Valley on the DOE Oak Ridge Reservation. Dispute over this focus feasibility study for water management is the subject of EPA Administrator Wheeler's December 31, 2020, final dispute decision. The D3 version of the FFS for Water Management issued by DOE after the EPA Administrator's dispute decision did not comply with the dispute resolution decision. See EPA letter from Mr. Carl R. Froede Jr. to Mr. Roger B. Petrie dated July 22, 2021, and TDEC letter from Mr. Randy C. Young to Mr. Roger Petrie dated July 23, 2021.

<sup>x</sup> Oak Ridge Environmental Information System (OREIS) data

<sup>xi</sup> Fiscal Year 2021 Phased Construction Completion Report for the Oak Ridge Reservation Environmental Management Waste Management Facility (DOE/OR/01-2880&D2)

<sup>xii</sup> Oak Ridge Environmental Information System (OREIS) data.

<sup>xiii</sup> Joanna Burger & Kym Rouse Campbell (2008) Fishing and consumption patterns of anglers adjacent to the Oak Ridge Reservation, Tennessee: higher income anglers ate more fish and are more at risk, *Journal of Risk Research*, 11:3, 335-350, DOI: 10.1080/13669870701795560

<sup>xiv</sup> Oak Ridge Environmental Information System (OREIS) data.

<sup>xv</sup> See: endnote iv on *Comparison of Maximum Measured Activity Concentration in EMWMF Leachate and Contact Water for the period of October 2015 to June 2021 with the Average Leachate Activity Concentration Projected in EMDF at Closure.*

<sup>xvi</sup> Engineering Feasibility Plan for Groundwater Suppression at the Environmental Management Waste Management Facility, Oak Ridge Tennessee (BJC/OR-1478/R1)

<sup>xvii</sup> 40 CFR 761.75(b)(3) on EMWMF ROD page 2-73

TDEC 1200-2-11-.17(1)(h) EMWMF ROD page 2-74. (TDEC rule 1200-2-11-.17(1)(h) renumbered to TDEC 0400-20-11-.17(1)(h) after the EMWMF ROD was issued.)

<sup>xviii</sup> Addendum to Remedial Design Report for the Disposal of Oak Ridge Reservation Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 Waste, Oak Ridge Tennessee, Volume 3, Appendix A (continued, Appendix B, (DOE/OR/01-1873/V3&D2/A6/R1)

Analysis of the Performance of Cells 1-6, with Underdrain, of the EMWMF, OR, TN


## CONCLUSION

For the approved list of WAC constituents (Revised Table A.1: Analytic WAC Limits, <http://bechteljacobs.org/webindex.html#3>) assumed to be in the EMWMF at the maximum allowable concentrations (and having a finite WAC value) the risks and doses to the receptor will not exceed the current WAC criteria for all the constituents currently with approved WAC, if the EMWMF is configured with 6 cells, as depicted in Figure 1. The risk and dose criteria for all such constituents are satisfied. Several factors cause the risks and doses calculated for Cells 1 through 6 to be lower than those that formed the basis for the approved WAC. These include the fact that the underdrain beneath Cell 3 will collect a significant fraction of the leachate and direct it into Bear Creek via the remnant of NT-4. This will significantly decrease the concentrations of constituents in the well water. The analyses that led to the development of the WAC in the attainment plan (DOE 2001a), in which it was projected that the concentrations in the well water and the creek would be approximately the same, demonstrated that the vast majority of the total risk and dose to the receptor for most of the constituents came from drinking well water. Any major reduction in concentrations in the groundwater at the well, such as those achieved by the presence of the underdrain, greatly reduces projected risks and doses. Therefore, as shown in the calculation package supporting this assessment (JEG 2010b), the expansion of the EMWMF from 4 to 6 cells, will not exceed the current WAC criteria for any of the constituents currently with approved WAC.

<sup>xix</sup> EMWMF discharges landfill wastewater (i.e., contact water) into Bear Creek. Bear Creek and downstream are included on the 303(d) list of impaired and threatened waters for PCBs and other pollutants. Bear Creek is designated for recreational use and promulgated water quality criteria for total PCBs in surface water designated for recreational use is 0.00064 ug/L. PCBs are a bioaccumulative carcinogenic pollutant. PCB-1260 is measured in fish harvested from Bear Creek. EMWMF discharges to Bear Creek surface water during February 2003 utilized a detection limit for PCB-1260 of about 2 times the water quality criteria at 0.00125 ug/L. OREIS data shows that since March 2003 detection limits for PCB-1260 in EMWMF landfill wastewater discharges ranged from 0.0311 to 0.532 ug/L with reporting limits ranging from 0.0317 to 0.61ug/L.

<sup>xx</sup> 2021 Remediation Effectiveness Report for the U.S. Department of Energy Oak Ridge Site Oak Ridge, Tennessee Data and Evaluations (DOE/OR/01-2869&D1) (2021 RER)

BCK 9.9 is located near the Bear Creek Burial Grounds and is the first fish sampling location downstream of EMWMF. (See 2021 RER Figure 4.2 for fish sampling locations.)



<sup>xxi</sup> EPA Administrator Wheeler’s December 31, 2020, final dispute decision (Page 11) specifies Tennessee antidegradation rules remain legally applicable to Clean Water Act pollutants. PCBs are a CWA pollutant. TDEC Rule 0400-40-03-.06(2)(a) specifies “Nor will discharges be authorized in such waters ... that have criteria below current method detection levels.”

<sup>xxii</sup> TDEC Rule 0400-40-03-.06(2)(a)

*In waters with unavailable parameters, new or increased discharges that would cause measurable degradation of the parameter that is unavailable shall not be authorized. Nor will discharges be authorized in such waters if they cause additional loadings of unavailable parameters that are bioaccumulative or that have criteria below current method detection levels.*

<sup>xxiii</sup> OREIS data of mercury in surface water at Bear Creek sampling stations BCK 9.2 and BCK 07.87 with mercury analysis performed by EPA method 1631 or 1631E from 2009 through 2020 were evaluated using ProUCL 5.1. This evaluation yielded a mercury concentration 95% UCL of 5.17 ng/L (ppt) and a median mercury concentration of 3.3 ng/L (ppt).


<sup>xxiv</sup> *Focused Feasibility Study for Water Management for the Disposal of CERCLA Waste on the Oak Ridge Reservation, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (DOE/OR/01-2664&D1) (DOE/OR/01-2664&D2) and (DOE/OR/01-2664&D3)*

<sup>xxv</sup> OREIS data


<sup>xxvi</sup> *Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study for Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Oak Ridge Reservation Waste Disposal Oak Ridge, Tennessee (DOE/OR/01-2535&D4)*

<sup>xxvii</sup> The D1 through D3 versions of the EMDF RI/FS located the EMDF groundwater point of compliance essentially outside groundwater contamination projected to originate at EMDF.






EMDF D3 RI/FS



EMDF D3 RI/FS

In the D4 EMDF RI/FS, the groundwater point of compliance was moved to a location near the projected highest concentration beyond a 100-meter buffer zone surrounding the waste consistent with DOE G 435.1-1.



**Figure H-16. MT3D Model Predicted Plume of Maximum Contaminant Concentration in All Model Layers for EMDF**

EMDF D4 RI/FS

xxviii DOE G 435.1-1 was cancelled January 12, 2021.

xxix The D4 RI/FS, page H-17, states *“For radioisotopes predicted to peak after 2,000-years post-closure, preliminary administrative limits based on modeling exposures at 100 m have been assigned, considering DOE, International Commission on Radiological Protection, and proposed Nuclear Regulatory Commission exposure limit guidelines.”* The EPA National Remedy Review Board’s April 4, 2017 recommendations on EMDF (*EPA National Remedy Review Board Recommendations for the Oak Ridge Reservation Environmental Management Disposal Facility and Waste Management for the Disposal of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act Waste, April 4, 2017 from Amy R. Legare to Franklin E. Hill*) states that a dose limit of 500 mrem/year and a hazard index of 3 post-2000 years would not be considered protective of human health for CERCLA cleanup purposes. D4 RI/FS Table H-13 includes carcinogenic WAC where 28 of the 32 radionuclides were assigned preliminary administrative limit based on risk greater than the CERCLA risk range and inconsistent with relevant and appropriate requirement TDEC Rule 0400-20-11-.16(2) and 10 CFR § 61.41 Protection of the general population from releases of radioactivity. TDEC commented on the preliminary administrative limits in its May 16, 2016, comment letter. DOE’s response to TDEC’s May 16, 2016, comments on the D4 EMDF RI/FS are included in the D5 EMDF RI/FS. DOE’s full response to TDEC Comment 9: *“As noted in the D4 RIFS response to comment reviews and informal dispute resolution meetings, modeling of radionuclide fate and transport will not be presented in the D5 RI/FS. Rather, a placeholder range (low to high) of analytic Waste Acceptance Criteria limits for radionuclides will be presented, along with placeholder (total) inventory limits. The previous radionuclide fate and transport modeling (included in the D4 RI/FS) that was completed for the East Bear Creek Valley site will be removed from the revised document. Modeling to determine CBCV Site radionuclide Analytic WAC that meet Remedial Action Objectives will be performed and results documented in the CERCLA WAC Compliance Plan and the final ROD. Discussion of specific*

elements of this path forward is included in the D5 RIFS Sections 3.2, 6.2.3, and 7.2.2.1 This comment dealing with modeling and/or preliminary WAC will be considered in moving forward with modeling and WAC development through the CERCLA process."

<sup>xxx</sup> Relevant and Appropriate requirement TDEC Rule 0400-20-11-.16(2) and 10 CFR § 61.41

<sup>xxxi</sup> High end of the 10<sup>-4</sup> to 10<sup>-6</sup> CERCLA risk range used by TDEC in the TDEC May 16, 2016, letter to DOE.

<sup>xxxii</sup> Based on the proximity of the EBCV site and EMWFM, it is likely that to protect future groundwater use, EMWFM WAC should be similar to the D4 EMDF WAC adjusted to 10 mrem/year instead of 500 mem/year. WAC values to protect groundwater from Table 1 of TDEC's May 16, 2016, comment letter on the D4 EMDF Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) are shown below. WAC from the D4 RI/FS shown below are adjusted so preliminary administrative limits are based on 10 mrem/year effective dose equivalents (EDE) instead of 500 mrem/year EDE. This conversion was accomplished by dividing the preliminary administrative limit by 50. EPA has determined that 10 mrem/yr EDE is within the CERCLA cancer risk range and is roughly equivalent to dose requirements in relevant and appropriate requirements TDEC Rule 0400-20-11-.16(2) and 10 CFR § 61.41. (See page 7 of EPA Administrator Wheeler's December 31, 2020, final dispute decision. 10 CFR § 61.41 was identified as a relevant and appropriate requirement in Administrator Wheeler's December 31, 2020, final dispute decision and should be ARARs for radionuclides disposed in EMWFM and a future EMDF. TDEC Rule 0400-20-11-.16(2) is the TDEC equivalent to 10 CFR § 61.41.) Source screening concentrations from the EMDF Performance Assessment for the Environmental Management Disposal Facility at the Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (UCOR-5094/R2) (Performance Assessment or PA) are also included. This gives the EMDF Performance Assessment high-end screening level of radionuclides in wastes proposed to be disposed in a future EMDF. Comparing EMWFM WAC with D4 RI/FS WAC adjusted to 10 mrem/year, WAC from Table 1 of TDEC's May 16, 2016, comment letter, and the screening source concentrations indicates the list of radionuclides in the EMWFM WAC is incomplete. This is a problem because radionuclides without WAC may be disposed at unlimited amounts and are not tracked or used in determining whether overall landfill WAC is exceeded. Using a limited list of radionuclides may make a landfill seem protective when it is not. EMWFM WAC levels of certain radionuclides (e.g., I-129, uranium isotopes, and plutonium isotopes) are also significantly greater than WAC based on EMDF D4 RI/FS methodology.

Comparison of EMWFM Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) with EMDF D4 RI/FS WAC <sup>A</sup>						
Isotope	EMWFM Analytic WAC	EMDF D4 RI/FS Analytical WAC	TDEC May 16, 2016, letter to DOE	TDEC May 16, 2016, letter to DOE	EMDF PA Table G.18 Screening Source Concentration <sup>^^</sup> (pCi/g)	Half-life (years)
	D2 Table F-10 Carcinogenic (pCi/g)	Table H-13 Carcinogenic WAC / Preliminary Administrative WAC Limits were divided by 50 to convert 500 mrem/yr. dose to 10 mrem/yr. dose <sup>^^^</sup>	Page 13, Table 1 /Target Risk Level	Page 13, Table 1 / Calculated WAC based on Target Risk Level using D4 RI/FS methodology (pCi/g)	pCi/g (Rounded to whole number if > 1)	ORNL RAIS
Ac-227					48,900	21.772
Am-241	2.00E+21	2.92E+13	1.00E-04	6.92E+13	2,300	432.2
Am-243		95	1.00E-04	225	23	7370
Ba-133					27	10.52
Be-10					716,000	1510000
C-14	165	69	1.00E-04	69	627,000	5700
Ca-41					4,110,000	102000
Cd-113m					111,000	14.1
Cf-249		6.60E+15	1.00E-04	2.25E+16	0.0004	351
Cf-250					0.0170	13.08
Cf-251		1.44E+07	1.00E-04	4.88E+07	0.0001	900

Attachment to 11/4/2021 Letter to EPA Administrator Michael S. Regan

Cl-36		3	1.00E-05	3	1	301000
Cm-243					44	29.1
Cm-244					526,000	18.1
Cm-245		70	1.00E-04	172	98	8500
Cm-246		264	1.00E-04	665	2	4760
Cm-247		12	1.00E-04	29	24	15600000
Cm-248		3	1.00E-04	7	23	3.48E+05
Co-60					1,930,000	5.2713
Cs-135					2,460,000	2300000
Cs-137					382,000,000	30.1671
Eu-152					584,000	13.537
Eu-154					785,000	8.593
H-3	150,000	3.80E+19	1.00E-05	3.80E+19	4,840,000	12.32
I-129	13	2	1.00E-04	2	486,000	15700000
K-40		274	1.00E-04	85	57	1251000000
Mo-93					4,990	4000
Nb-93m					3,000	16.13
Nb-94		22,800	1.00E-04	6,170	190,000	20300
Ni-59		1.47E+10	1.00E-04	4.19E+09	1,550,000	101000
Ni-63					10,300,000	100.1
Np-237	320	21	1.00E-04	46	56	2144000
Pa-231		2,620	1.00E-04	13,400	3	32760
Pb-210					448	22.2
Pd-107					3,340,000	6500000
Pm-146					0.124	5.53
Pu-238					7,150	87.7
Pu-239	720	19	1.00E-04	42	185,000	24110
Pu-240	5,800	97	1.00E-04	222	8,440	6564
Pu-241					283,000	14.35
Pu-242		10	1.00E-04	23	50	375000
Pu-244		10	1.00E-04	20	11	80000000
Ra-226					14	1600
Ra-228					3	5.75
Re-187		172,200	1.00E-04	32,700	0.00194	41200000000
Se-79		35,800	1.00E-04	18,500	2,470,000	295000
Si-32		5.28E+12	1.00E-04	1.02E+12	Not Included	132
Sm-151					5,750,000	90
Sn-121m					64	43.9
Sn-126		1,874	1.00E-04	421	1,890,000	230000
Sr-90					393,000,000	28.79
Tc-99	172	46	1.00E-04	46	1,350,000	211100
Th-229					3,480	7340
Th-230					148	75380
Th-232					2,670,000	14050000000
Th-234					Same as U-238	
U-232					843,000	68.9
U-233	1,700	65	1.00E-04	57	549,000	159200
U-234	1,700	65	1.00E-04	55	1,670	245500
U-235	1,500	61	1.00E-04	51	2,570	704000000
U-236	1,700	61	1.00E-04	53	487	23420000
U-238	1,200	63	1.00E-04	55	2,070,000,000	4468000000
Zr-93		2,640	1.00E-04	3,330	556,000	1530000

^Except for Th-234 which should be in secular equilibrium with U-238, radionuclides with half-lives less than 5 years are not included in the above table.

^^For radionuclide screening in the EMDF Performance Assessment (PA). Per the PA, these are bounding activity concentration estimates (screening source concentrations) that include all maximum and upper confidence limit (UCL) data values as inputs to the screening model without corrections for radioactive decay or adjustments for addition of clean fill.

^^^EMDF D4 RI/FS Preliminary WAC limits divided by 50 are shown in bolded red font

xxxiii Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study for Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Oak Ridge Reservation Waste Disposal Oak Ridge, Tennessee (DOE/OR/01-2535&D5)

xxxiv




Figure 6-31. CERCLA and DOE O 435 Progression and Interaction for On-site Disposal Alternatives

xxxv

Comparison of EMDF D1 ROD WAC based on NRC Class C limits and Inadvertent Intrusion scenario at a 100 mrem/year dose with EMDF D4 RI/FS WAC corrected from a 500 mrem/year dose to a 10 mrem/year dose. The 500 mrem/year dose was converted to a 10 mrem dose consistent with relevant and appropriate requirement 10 CFR § 61.41 by dividing by 50. The EMDF D4 RI/FS used a groundwater point of compliance at a location near the projected highest concentration beyond a 100-meter buffer zone surrounding the waste. The EMDF D1 ROD WAC did not include protection of groundwater as criteria in WAC development. Neither the EMDF D1 ROD nor the EMDF RI/FS included protection of future surface water use in WAC development.

Attachment to 11/4/2021 Letter to EPA Administrator Michael S. Regan

Comparison of EMDF D1 Record of Decision (ROD) Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) with EMDF D4 RI/FS WAC corrected from a 500 mrem/year dose to a 10 mrem/year dose.						
Isotope	EMDF D1 ROD WAC (pCi/g)	EMDF D4 RI/FS EBCV Site WAC at Criteria (pCi/g)	EMDF D4 RI/FS Criteria	WAC to Protect Downstream	EMDF PA Table G.18 Screening Source Concentration (pCi/g)	Half-life (years)
	If value >1, rounded to a whole number	Rounded to a whole number	10 CFR § 61.41 ARAR or ELCR Level identified	Recreational Uses	If value >1, rounded to a whole number	ORNL RAIS
Ac-227	1,300,000	NI		NE	48,900	21.772
Am-241	100,000	2.92E+13	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	2,300	432.2
Am-243	100,000	95	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	23	7370
Ba-133	55,000,000	NI		NE	27	10.52
Be-10	6,000,000	NI		NE	716,000	1510000
C-14	31,000	69	1.00E-04	NE	627,000	5700
Ca-41	2,300,000	NI		NE	4,110,000	102000
Cd-113m	NI	NI		NE	111,000	14.1
Cf-249	79,000	6.60E+15	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	0.0004	351
Cf-250	100,000	NI		NE	0.02	13.08
Cf-251	100,000	1.44E+07	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	0.0001	900
Cl-36	NI	3	1.00E-05	NE	1	301000
Cm-243	100,000	NI		NE	44	29.1
Cm-244	100,000	NI		NE	526,000	18.1
Cm-245	100,000	70	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	98	8500
Cm-246	100,000	264	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	2	4760
Cm-247	68,000	12	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	24	15600000
Cm-248	16,000	3	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	23	3.48E+05
Co-60	4,700,000,000	NI		NE	1,930,000	5.2713
Cs-135	NI	NI		NE	2,460,000	2300000
Cs-137	230,000	NI		NE	382,000,000	30.1671
Eu-152	3,600,000	NI		NE	584,000	13.537
Eu-154	63,000,000	NI		NE	785,000	8.593
H-3	570,000,000	3.80E+19	1.00E-05	NE	4,840,000	12.32
I-129	6,100	2	1.00E-04	NE	486,000	15700000
K-40	18,000	274	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	57	1251000000
Mo-93	55,000	NI		NE	4,990	4000
Nb-93m	16,000,000,000	NI		NE	3,000	16.13
Nb-94	16,000	22,800	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	190,000	20300
Ni-59	76,000,000	1.47E+10	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	1,550,000	101000
Ni-63	64,000,000	NI		NE	10,300,000	100.1
Np-237	100,000	21	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	56	2144000
Pa-231	41,000	2,620	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	3	32760
Pb-210	21,000	NI		NE	448	22.2
Pd-107	NI	NI		NE	3,340,000	6500000
Pm-146	9,600,000,000	NI		NE	0.1240	5.53
Pu-238	100,000	NI		NE	7,150	87.7
Pu-239	100,000	19	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	185,000	24110
Pu-240	100,000	97	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	8,440	6564
Pu-241	3,500,000	NI		NE	283,000	14.35
Pu-242	100,000	10	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	50	375000
Pu-244	63,000	10	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	11	80000000

Attachment to 11/4/2021 Letter to EPA Administrator Michael S. Regan

Ra-226	880	NI		NE	14	1600
Ra-228	720,000,000	NI		NE	3	5.75
Re-187	NI	172,200	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	0.002	4.12E+10
Se-79	NI	35,800	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	2,470,000	295000
Sm-151	NI	NI		NE	5,750,000	90
Sn-121m	NI	NI		NE	64	43.9
Sn-126	NI	1,874	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	1,890,000	230000
Sr-90	350,000	NI		NE	393,000,000	28.79
Tc-99	48,000	46	1.00E-04	NE	1,350,000	211100
Th-229	63,000	NI		NE	3,480	7340
Th-230	2,400	NI		NE	148	75380
Th-232	4,800	NI		NE	2,670,000	1.405E+10
Th-234^				NE		
U-232	12,000	NI		NE	843,000	68.9
U-233	39,000	65	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	549,000	159200
U-234	39,000	65	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	1,670	245500
U-235	35,000	61	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	2,570	704000000
U-236	45,000	61	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	487	23420000
U-238	41,000	63	10 CFR § 61.41	NE	2,070,000,000	4468000000
Zr-93	NI	2,640	10 CFR § 61.41	NE		1530000

NI means not included. Radionuclides labeled NI have an unlimited WAC

NE means not evaluated.

^Th-234 is in secular equilibrium with U-238

<sup>xxxvi</sup> Proposed Plan for the Disposal of Oak Ridge Reservation Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Waste (DOE/OR/01-2695&D2)

<sup>xxxvii</sup> The EMDF D1 ROD bases WAC for radionuclides on the lesser of NCR Class C limits (EMDF Administrative WAC Table 2-4) and Inadvertent Intrusion from the EMDF Performance Assessment at a 100 mrem/year EDE. 100 mrem/year EDE is greater than the CERCLA risk range.

<sup>xxxviii</sup> Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study for Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Oak Ridge Reservation Waste Disposal Oak Ridge, Tennessee (DOE/OR/01-2535&D5), Section 6.4, Hybrid Disposal Alternative.

<sup>xxxix</sup> DOE May 10, 2019 Response to High Level Cost Evaluation Questions: Follow-up to TDEC Request (November 29, 2018) for Backup Information Used in the Development of the Cost Estimates for Comparison of Disposal Alternatives Associated with ORR CERCLA Waste Disposal

<sup>xl</sup> Proposed Plan for the Disposal of Oak Ridge Reservation Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Waste, September 2018 (DOE/OR/01-2695&D2/R1) includes the following State Acceptance:

STATE ACCEPTANCE The State of Tennessee recognizes the importance of selecting a waste disposal option to support environmental cleanup and building demolition on the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR) by the U.S. Department of Energy. The State also supports identification of Central Bear Creek Valley Site 7c as the most promising disposal location on the ORR. A key reason the State supports evaluation of Site 7c is its potential to provide a reasonable disposal capacity without relying on underdrains for collecting and discharging groundwater under the facility. DOE is collecting information at the site to evaluate this assumption.

To be clear, the State would not support a disposal facility that has a drainage feature (underdrain) to suppress the water table. In addition, current information about conditions at the site indicates the proposed landfill would need limits on the types and volumes of waste to protect human health and the environment. Waste exceeding onsite disposal limits would need to be disposed of offsite.

The State did not approve the remedial investigation/feasibility study report that serves as the primary basis for this Proposed Plan. The State documented concerns about protecting human health and the environment

throughout the CERCLA process leading to this Proposed Plan. On May 22, 2017, DOE initiated a formal dispute under the Federal Facility Agreement for the Oak Ridge Reservation to move the CERCLA process forward to this Proposed Plan. The State, EPA and DOE signed a Dispute Resolution Agreement on December 7, 2017. As part of the Dispute Resolution Agreement, the three parties agreed to give their best efforts to work jointly to issue this Proposed Plan identifying Central Bear Creek Valley Site 7c as the preferred location for EMDF. The Dispute Resolution Agreement outlines a general path for meeting CERCLA requirements.

It is the State's opinion that outstanding issues should be resolved before a ROD selects onsite disposal as the preferred alternative. Until then, the State is unable to approve the preferred alternative. To be clear, a preferred alternative is not the same as a preferred location. The preferred alternative presented in this Proposed Plan includes assumptions about the volumes and types of waste, as well as natural conditions at Central Bear Creek Valley Site 7c.

The following discussion summarizes the State's key concerns.

1) Site characterization (detailed description) – During March and April, 2018, DOE collected data on hydrologic conditions underlying the proposed Central Bear Creek Valley Site 7c disposal site during the “wet” season (winter/spring), consistent with the attached Field Sampling Plan. DOE submitted a “Pre-published Technical Memorandum #1” summarizing the data. Preliminary review of Technical Memorandum #1 indicates the conceptual design of the EMDF presented in the draft RI/FS reports and this Proposed Plan may need revision to accommodate the new information on site hydrology.

DOE will collect additional data before the ROD to characterize conditions during the “dry” season (summer/fall). DOE will place the data in the Administrative Record. If this information changes understanding of the site's suitability, the new information would be documented consistent with the NCP at 40 CFR 300.430(f)(3)(ii), including possible issuance of a revised Proposed Plan. Provided the FFA parties determine the EMDF can be built, operated, and closed in a manner that is protective of human health and the environment and complies with ARARs, a ROD for the EMDF would be signed consistent with CERCLA and the NCP.

2) ARAR identification – CERCLA requires the ROD to include a final list of ARARs. It is the State's position that, at a minimum, ARARs will include State and Federal statutes, rules, and regulations identified in RI/FS Appendix G attached to the Dispute Resolution Agreement. As stated in this Proposed Plan, DOE may request CERCLA waivers and/or exemptions under the State radioactive waste disposal rules and waivers under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) for the following requirements, as allowed by the regulations.

- The hydrogeologic unit used for disposal shall not discharge ground water to the surface within the disposal site. [TDEC 0400-20-11-.17(1)(h)]

- The landfill site shall be located in an area of low to moderate relief to minimize erosion and to help prevent landslides or slumping. [TSCA 40 CFR 761.75(b)(5)]

- The bottom of the landfill shall be above the historical high groundwater.... There shall be no hydraulic connection between the site and standing or flowing surface water.... The bottom of the landfill liner system or natural in-place soil barrier shall be at least fifty feet from the historical high water table. [TSCA 40 CFR 761.75(b)(3)]

The State intends to review exemption and waiver requests pursuant to statutory and regulatory requirements and the State's site-specific understanding, including characterization data, projections of waste proposed for disposal (i.e., volumes, types, and characteristics), and the conceptual dimensions for a waste disposal unit at Central Bear Creek Valley Site 7c.

3) Waste acceptance criteria –TDEC wants to make sure that the proposed landfill would be sufficiently protective for Tennessee residents. One way to protect human health over the long term is to limit what may be placed in the landfill. Limits are determined through modeling various scenarios that represent where and how people may be exposed to materials released from the landfill in the future. Even though the landfill would be engineered and constructed to specific standards, it would still be affected by natural processes such as erosion, settling, and root penetration over time. Given that some radionuclides to be placed in the landfill would remain dangerous for



thousands of years and longer, analytical WAC will be developed to limit what can go into the landfill.

The Dispute Resolution Agreement provides for the State's independent verification of DOE modeling. State acceptance of the preferred alternative relies heavily on the State's ability to complete the independent verification based on information provided by DOE. The State will consider site-specific data, assumptions, and exposure scenarios in evaluating whether the WAC support an onsite disposal alternative that meets CERCLA requirements, remedial action objectives in this Proposed Plan, and performance objectives in Tennessee radiological health rule 0400-20-11-.16. The State will evaluate potential toxic effects of uranium in addition to potential cancer risk.

4) DOE assessments – DOE Orders require an assessment of the performance of the proposed disposal facility for radionuclides. This includes the Performance Assessment (PA), Composite Analysis (CA), and Preliminary Disposal Authorization Statement (PDAS). The State contends these DOE documents should be in the Administrative Record because the State will rely on them when evaluating the protectiveness of the preferred alternative during remedy selection under CERCLA

5) Mercury disposal – Mercury contamination at the Y-12 National Security Complex (Y12) is currently the greatest known environmental risk on the ORR (DOE 2017b). DOE plans to demolish parts of Y-12, including the West End Mercury Area (WEMA) buildings. The State is concerned about disposal of mercury-containing waste from that effort because of its potential release into Bear Creek and threat to people who eat fish caught downstream.

Fish in Bear Creek and downstream in East Fork Poplar Creek already contain mercury. Both streams are posted by the State to prevent fish consumption. The State is concerned that disposal of large volumes of mercury-contaminated waste in EMDF could further degrade Bear Creek, East Fork Poplar Creek, Poplar Creek and the Clinch River. Therefore, the State expects that DOE will limit or manage mercury disposal to provide reasonable assurance that the amount of mercury released in the future will not violate the intent of the Tennessee Water Quality Control Act (TWQA) or adversely impact people fishing and eating fish downstream.

6) Use of underdrains – Tennessee operational practice does not allow drainage features to permanently suppress the water table to mitigate springs or streams at proposed landfill sites. This is consistent with Tennessee rules [for example, TDEC Rules 0400-11-01-.04(3), 0400-11-01-.04(4)(a)(2), 0400-20-11-.16(5), and 0400-20-11-.17(1)(h)]. It is the State's position that selecting a disposal alternative that requires an underdrain would require (1) exemptions or waivers from Tennessee Division of Radiological Health and TSCA requirements and (2) a convincing demonstration that use of underdrain(s) would protect human health and the environment.

7) Discharge limits – Consistent with the Dispute Resolution Agreement, it is the State's position that discharge limits for disposal of facility wastewater should be consistent with CERCLA and established in the ROD. The State considers it important for a future onsite disposal facility to protect downstream surface water users who eat fish and comply with the Tennessee Water Quality Control Act and regulations.

CERCLA requires DOE, as the lead agency, to provide an opportunity for local governments and members of the public to offer input to help ensure selection of the most acceptable alternative. CERCLA also requires DOE to incorporate meaningful citizen input into making the decision. After DOE collects additional data, the State may request another public meeting if evaluation of the data changes the State's understanding of conditions at the Central Bear Creek Valley Site 7c.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
KNOXVILLE**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )**

**v. )**

**DURATEK FEDERAL SERVICES )**

**3:06-CR-172 \_\_\_\_\_  
JUDGE SHIRLEY**

**PLEA AGREEMENT**

The United States of America, by and through James R. Dedrick, United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee, and the defendant, DURATEK FEDERAL SERVICES (hereinafter "DFS") through corporate resolution and its counsel, William L. Penny, Esq., enter the following agreement pursuant to Rule 11(C)(1)(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure:

1. Defendant DFS agrees to plead guilty to the attached Information which is incorporated herein by reference, charging a misdemeanor violation of 33 U.S.C. §§ 407 and 411.
2. Defendant DFS understands that upon conviction of the Information, 18 U.S.C. § 3571(c)(3), provides for a maximum fine of one hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000.00) or \$25,000.00 per day violation. DFS also understands that it is subject to a special assessment of one hundred twenty-five dollars (\$125.00) pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3013(a)(1)(B)(iii).
3. Defendant DFS and the United States agree, pursuant to Rule 11(C)(1)(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, that the appropriate sentence to be imposed upon defendant DFS is a fine in the sum of \$10,000.00. Defendant DFS also agrees to pay the additional sum of

\$290,000.00 restitution to be used for remediation, education and protection to improve and enhance the natural environment in Tennessee including Anderson County, Tennessee, where the violation, herein, occurred, to be paid by the time sentencing as follows:

- a. \$240,000 to the Radiation Reclamation Trust Fund/Perpetual Care Trust Fund (TCA § 68-202-405), earmarked for cleanup and expenditures for the ATG Facility on Bear Creek Road in Anderson County, Tennessee.
  - b. \$20,000 to the TVA Police Criminal Investigative Division (CID) to fund specialized training, equipment and support related to area of environmental concern.
  - c. \$20,000 to the Southern Environmental Enforcement Network Inc. (SEEN) for training local, state and federal regulators and law enforcement agents and officers paid to the Southern Environmental Enforcement Training Fund Inc.
  - d. \$5,000 to the Economic Crimes Fund, Seventh Judicial District, Anderson County District Attorney's Office, and
  - e. \$5,000 to the Economic Crimes Fund, Ninth Judicial District, Roane County District Attorney's Office.
4. Defendant DFS will pay a special assessment of one hundred twenty-five dollars (\$125.00) at the time of sentencing.
5. No organizational probation shall be required.
6. A written stipulation of facts which establishes the factual basis supporting this plea and is relevant to all matters pertinent to sentencing is attached. This written stipulation of facts shall form the factual basis offered in support of this plea.
7. By pleading guilty, DFS waives and agrees to waive any and all motions, defenses, objections or requests which have been made or which could have been made in this case, except specific performance of the terms of the plea agreement and except as otherwise provided by the terms of this agreement. The corporation also waives the right to grand jury

presentment and trial by jury (or by a judge if the corporation is tried by a judge alone). At any such trial, the corporation would have the right to assistance of counsel to confront and cross examine the witnesses against the corporation, to present evidence on the corporation's behalf, to compel the attendance of witnesses for the defense, and to have witnesses to testify or refuse to testify on its behalf. The United States would have the burden of proving the case against the corporation beyond a reasonable doubt. The corporation would be presumed innocent and could be convicted only if a jury of twelve people (or a judge if the corporation is tried by a judge) unanimously found the corporation to be guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The corporation would have the right to appeal a guilty verdict. All these rights and protections are hereby waived by the corporation.

8. The United States agrees, in exchange for the pleas of guilty identified in paragraph one (1) of this agreement, not to seek further criminal charges against defendant DFS or any of its officers, agents or employees based on any evidence presently known to the United States, of environmental law violations in the Eastern District of Tennessee, or otherwise arising out of or related to the facts in the Agreed Factual Basis.

9. No other agreement, understanding, promise or condition between the United States Attorney's Office and defendant DFS exists nor will such agreement, understanding, promise or condition exist unless it is committed to writing in an amendment attached to this document and signed by the defendant DFS and its attorneys and an Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

DURATEK FEDERAL SERVICES,  
Defendant  
Authorized Officer

By:

  
Its: President and Chief Executive Officer


12-12-06

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM L. PENNY, Esq.  
STITES & HARBISON, PLLC  
Suite 1800, Fifth Third Bank Center  
Nashville, TN 37219  
[bill.penny@stites.com](mailto:bill.penny@stites.com)


12/4/06

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
AUBREY B. HARWELL, Jr. Esq.  
150 4th Avenue North, Suite 2000  
Nashville, TN 37219  
[aharwell@nealharwell.com](mailto:aharwell@nealharwell.com)

Dec. 14, 2006

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
GUY W. BLACKWELL  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
U.S. Attorney's Office  
220 West Depot Street, Suite 423  
Greeneville, TN 37743

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
KNOXVILLE**

<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b>	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>3:06-CR-<u>172</u></b>
	)	<b>JUDGE _____</b>
<b>DURATEK FEDERAL SERVICES</b>	)	

**AGREED FACTUAL BASIS**

In May 2002, the Department of Energy (DOE) opened the Environmental Management Waste Management Facility (EMWMF), a multi-celled, above grade disposal facility located on the Oak Ridge National Laboratory Reservation (ORNL) near the Y-12 facility in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The facility was authorized under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 as part of an accelerated cleanup program to provide disposal of waste from DOE burial sites at ORNL, Y-12 and K-25 (East Tennessee Technology Park, ETTP). The disposal facility was constructed as a series of waste disposal cells. Stormwater was diverted around the disposal cells but rainwater that fell on the cells was pumped to one of four contact water ponds. The contact water ponds were expected to be tested to assure the level of contaminants met the release levels outlined in protocols and, when full, would be pumped to a sediment basin where it would be held allowing the suspended solids to settle out before being released into Bear Creek. Each contact water pond could hold 350,000-400,000 gallons of water and all were synthetically lined to prevent seepage. This water was to be managed for both radioactive contaminants and chemical constituents for the known waste streams accepted. DOE contracted with Bechtel-Jacobs Company (BJC) who had subcontracted actual landfill operations and management to DURATEK FEDERAL SERVICES (DFS).

Samples of the contact water in the ponds was expected to be collected by DFS and sent to a designated lab for analysis. Prior to water being released from the ponds the water must meet DOE Order 5400.5 and Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) Rule 1200-4-3 Water Quality Criteria. The protocols for determining compliance with the release limits has changed since September 2002; however, the procedure (DFS-OP-009) in place at the time of discharge did not allow the use of annual averaging of the concentration of radiological constituents. Once water is ready for release it was to be pumped into the east/west diversion ditch to a sediment basin that holds up to 1.5 million gallons and then to the north tributary (nt 5) that empties into Bear Creek. If the analysis exceeded release criteria the water in the contact water ponds was supposed to be pumped to a Leachate Tank and shipped to the ORNL Waste Water Treatment Plant, treated and then released at ORNL.

In mid-August 2002, STL Richland Lab, Richland, Washington, received water samples from DFS which were analyzed and found to contain radiological constituents. DFS was notified the results were above release criteria for one of the ponds. The ponds were full due to heavy rains in the area that had occurred in July that year. On September 22 and 23, 2002, heavy rains from the remnants of Hurricane Isadore filled the waste cells and the contact water ponds. The storm caused the cell walls to breach allowing cell one storm water to commingle with cell two. On September 23, 2002, the landfill manager, David Williams, learned from weather reports that another heavy rainfall was imminent. The landfill manager determined that if the water in the cells was not pumped off the cells would breach causing a complete failure of the disposal cells which would destroy the disposal cells, damage downgradient features, and allow the buried waste to be exposed and wash into waters of the United States. The landfill manager determined that the leachate tanks would not contain the amount of water from the cells and

contact ponds. To avert this potential disaster, the landfill manager met with BJC officials on September 24, 2002, to discuss measures that could be employed to address the water in the cells and the ponds. The landfill manager was aware that one of the two ponds exceeded release criteria as set out in the protocols existing at that time. Because there was nowhere for the water in the cells to be pumped, the contact water ponds needed to be emptied to accommodate the anticipated volumes of water from the cells. As such, the landfill manager began pumping the ponds to the sediment pond. During the night of September 24, 2002, the landfill manager became concerned that the water in the contact ponds was not being pumped rapidly enough to beat the impending storm. In order to speed up the process, the landfill manager, without notification to or consultation with any Duratek management, decided on his own to use a portable pump to pump the water in one of the ponds into a drainage ditch which ran directly into Bear Creek, bypassing the sediment basin and the established treatment procedure and protocols. As a result, the landfill manager allowed 350,000-400,000 gallons of contact water containing radionuclides to bypass the sediment basin and the water was discharged directly into Bear Creek. Since that time, DFS and the prime contractor have taken steps to ensure compliance with applicable state and federal regulations. No other similar events have occurred at the EMWMF site in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. Bear Creek is a navigable water of the United States that flows into the East Fork of Poplar Creek into the Clinch River.


ATG Inc. was the prior owner and operator of the ATG facility on Bear Creek Road, Oak Ridge, Tennessee. It was liquidated in a bankruptcy proceeding in California in 2003. The facility is radioactively contaminated, particularly in the interior portions of the building and in certain discrete areas outside the building. The Tennessee Department of Environment and



Conservation (TDEC) has determined that the public health and the environment are at risk if the facility is abandoned or left unsecured to public access. The TDEC has filed an administrative expense claim with the bankruptcy court for approximately \$15,000,000 which is the amount estimated to decontaminate and decommission the facility. Defendant Duratek through its parent corporation will make the payments described in the plea agreement and potentially obtain ownership of the ATG facility to assist in relieving the citizens of Tennessee from the legacy of radioactive contamination at this facility.

DURATEK FEDERAL SERVICES,  
Defendant  
Authorized Officer

By:

  
Its: President and Chief  
Executive Officer


12-12-06

Date

WILLIAM L. PENNY, Esq.  
424 Church Street, Suite 1800  
Nashville, TN 37219  
[bill.penny@stites.com](mailto:bill.penny@stites.com)

12/4/06

Date

  
AUBREY B. HARWELL, JR., Esq.  
150 4th Avenue North, Suite 2000  
Nashville, TN 37219  
[aharwell@nealharwell.com](mailto:aharwell@nealharwell.com)

Dec. 14, 2006

Date

  
GUY W. BLACKWELL

Assistant U.S. Attorney  
U.S. Attorney's Office  
220 West Depot Street, Suite  
423  
Greeneville, TN 37743