

**PROPOSED PLAN
ANNOTATED OUTLINE
CONTENTS**

ACRONYMS..... 6-2

INTRODUCTION 6-3

SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION..... 6-4

SITE BACKGROUND..... 6-4

 Overview of the Site..... 6-4

 Site History and Status 6-4

 Site Characteristics 6-4

SUMMARY OF SITE RISKS 6-4

REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 6-4

SUMMARY OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES..... 6-4

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES 6-4

SUMMARY OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE 6-5

 Description of the Preferred Alternative..... 6-5

 Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative..... 6-5

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGES..... 6-5

COMMITMENT TO STEWARDSHIP..... 6-6

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION 6-6

REFERENCES 6-6

GLOSSARY..... 6-6

APPENDIX..... 6-6

ACRONYMS

ARAR	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
EM	Environmental Management
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FS	Feasibility Study
LUC	Land Use Control
LUCAP	Land Use Control Assurance Plan
LUCIP	Land Use Control Implementation Plan
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
ORR	Oak Ridge Reservation
PP	Proposed Plan
RAO	remedial action objective
RI	Remedial Investigation
ROD	Record of Decision
TDEC	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation



This proposed plan describes:

- site contamination,
- current and future risks to human health and the environment,
- remedial action alternatives considered,
- the preferred alternatives for the site,
- how to participate in the selection or modification of the preferred alternatives, and
- where to get more information.

YOUR OPINION IS INVITED

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) invites you to express your opinion of the presented remedial alternatives and the preferred alternatives for the site. You are encouraged to read the Remedial Investigation report and Feasibility Study for additional background and more detailed technical information. A comment form is attached to this fact sheet, but you are not restricted to the form. Decision makers will consider any comments received before the end of the public comment period.

Community involvement is critical to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) process. DOE will establish a 30-day public comment period, during which time local residents and interested parties can express their views and concerns on all alternatives considered and on the rationale presented for the preferences among them. DOE will schedule a public meeting to discuss cleanup alternatives and to address questions and concerns that the public may

Include clearance statement when cleared:

United States Department of Energy
Environmental Management
Program

DOE/OR/01-
0000&D1

**Proposed Plan for [Site],
Oak Ridge, Tennessee**

DO NOT include a preface or title page in a Proposed Plan (PP). The PP document is a unique format for public communication, using two-column, dual-sided pages. This annotated outline was developed as a guide for preparing PPs for the Oak Ridge Operations Environmental Management (EM) program. All PPs are to be prepared in compliance with the requirements of CERCLA, with technical content referencing applicable U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidance and DOE orders.

This outline has not been approved by EPA and the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) and may be modified to meet their needs.

INTRODUCTION

Identify the site by name and location, and identify the lead and support agencies. State the PP's purpose, which is to:

- fulfill the requirements of CERCLA Section 117(a);
- describe the alternatives analyzed;
- identify the preferred alternative and explain the rationale for the preference;
- provide a summary of any formal comments received from the support agency;
- provide a summary explanation of any proposed applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement (ARAR) waiver; and
- solicit public involvement in remedy selection and refer the public to the Remedial Investigation (RI)/Feasibility Study (FS) and Administrative Record file for more information.

The importance of public input on all alternatives should be emphasized.

SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION

Describe the site area, including the specific units, areas, facilities, operable unit, and/or media being addressed in this PP.

Describe the general scope of the alternatives considered (e.g., source control), whether this is an interim or final action, and any land use restrictions that apply. State the scope of the problem that the action will address, including an explanation of how the action addresses the principal threat(s). Summarize how this scope fits into the watershed in which the site resides and describe how the action being considered in the PP fits into that overall ORR remediation strategy.

SITE BACKGROUND

Discuss the nature and extent of contaminants without judgment of the need for corrective action.

Overview of the Site

Include a two-paragraph discussion about the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR).

Site History and Status

Include a discussion about historical operations at the site and the regulatory history as well as a site map. Discuss the following:

- contaminated media,
- history of waste generation or disposal,
- history of site investigations, and
- description of previous remedial actions and removal actions.

Site Characteristics

Provide an overview of:

- physical characteristics of the site,
- the nature and extent of contamination,
- site map,
- materials constituting principal threat wastes, and

- contaminant fate and transport.

SUMMARY OF SITE RISKS

Provide an overview of the baseline risk assessment by

- identifying the contaminants of concern in each medium;
- describing the baseline exposure scenarios (e.g., current and future land-use scenarios, potentially-exposed populations, exposure pathways);
- identifying current and potential site risks (including both carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic threats); and
- discussing ecological risk(s) as appropriate.

This section should reference the RI and FS reports, which contain the supporting risk data for the PP. Provide a concluding statement that supports the need for either taking action or “no action.”

REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES

Describe the proposed remedial action objectives (RAOs) and how they address site risks. Describe the basis for preliminary cleanup goals (protection goals).

SUMMARY OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

Describe the alternatives evaluated in the detailed analysis included in the FS report. Specify the treatment technologies, engineering controls, institutional controls, monitoring requirements, quantities of waste handled, implementation requirements, estimated construction and operation and maintenance costs, and estimated implementation schedule associated with each remedy.

Identify the major ARARs associated with each option. If an ARAR must be waived, the FS report, which contains the justification for the waiver, should be referenced for this information and summarized here.

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

The purpose of this section is to evaluate the alternatives, introduce the nine evaluation criteria listed below (along with major points to be addressed

for each criterion), and discuss how they are applied. The format of this section is similar to the comparative analysis of alternatives presented in the FS.

The nine criteria are categorized into three groups: threshold criteria, primary balancing criteria, and modifying criteria. The threshold criteria must be satisfied in order for an alternative to be considered for selection. The primary balancing criteria are used to weigh major tradeoffs among alternatives. The modifying criteria are taken into account after public comment is received on the PP. A comprehensive analysis of each alternative in relation to each of the nine criteria is not required in this section. The FS report, which includes the detailed comparative analysis, should be referenced. However, each criterion should be discussed. Discuss National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) considerations clearly.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. *Overall protection of human health and the environment*
2. *Compliance with ARARs, unless a waiver condition is met*

Primary Balancing Criteria

3. *Long-term effectiveness and permanence*
4. *Short-term effectiveness*
5. *Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment*
6. *Implementability*
7. *Cost*

Modifying Criteria

8. *State acceptance*

SUMMARY OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

In this section discuss the initial rationale for the preferred alternative.

Description of the Preferred Alternative

- Identify the preferred alternative and state that the preferred alternative can change in response to public comment or new information.
- Describe the alternative, including land use controls. Include the purpose, duration, implementation, and affected area of the controls.
- Provide a brief statement that describes the most decisive considerations that affected the selection of the preferred alternative.
- Describe how risks identified in the Baseline Risk Assessment will be addressed.
- Describe any uncertainties or contingency measures.
- Provide, as an appendix, a summary of remedial actions for the preferred alternative by unit.

Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative

If an ARAR is waived for the preferred alternative, this should be stated. Discuss the preferred alternative's ability to satisfy statutory requirements, including the preference for treatment as a principal element.

Summarize the evaluation of the nine CERCLA criteria and the NEPA values.

When EPA and TDEC concur with the preferred alternative, include their concurrence that the alternative meets the statutory requirements.

Provide a concluding statement that DOE believes the preferred alternative provides the best balance of trade-offs.

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGES

Include the following if applicable:

Hazardous substances above health-based levels will remain on site if these remedies are implemented. Because hazardous substances will remain, it is recognized by DOE, TDEC, and EPA that Natural Resource Damage claims, in accordance with CERCLA, may be applicable. This document does not address restoration or rehabilitation of any natural resource injuries that may have occurred, or whether any such injuries have occurred. DOE has agreed to fund a pilot study of the Operable Unit that will examine natural resource issues and may prove a model for addressing such issues elsewhere. In the

interim, neither DOE nor TDEC waives any rights or defenses they may have under CERCLA, Sect. 107(1)4(c).

COMMITMENT TO STEWARDSHIP

Include the following or similar language if applicable:

Areas within (insert appropriate operable unit name) cannot support unrestricted use due to hazardous substances remaining in place after implementation of the selected remedy. Land use restrictions are required as part of this CERCLA action and will be achieved through imposition of LUC's [sic, land use controls] that limit the use and/or exposure to those areas of the property, including water resources, that are contaminated. DOE is committed to implementing and maintaining LUC's, including institutional controls, to ensure that the selected remedy remains protective of human health and the environment.(From Boyd 5/24/02 letter to SSAB)

This proposed remedy will result in leaving hazardous materials on-site that will remain hazardous for hundreds of years. Existing use restrictions in [name of watershed] will be maintained and surveillance and maintenance activities continued.

DOE, EPA, and TDEC have agreed upon a Land Use Control Assurance Plan (LUCAP) for ORR to help ensure the ongoing effectiveness of Land Use Controls (LUCs) imposed in remedial actions to protect human health and the environment from remaining contamination. The LUCAP establishes regular inspection and reporting procedures designed to ensure that each required LUC is properly implemented and maintained for as long as it is needed, and that it continues to provide the expected level of protection. Any LUCs relied upon as part of the Record of Decision (ROD) for [name of site] remedial action will be implemented in accordance with a Land Use Control Implementation Plan (LUCIP) developed specifically for them as part of the remedial design process, and once implemented, they will be regularly checked for effectiveness in accordance with the ORR LUCAP agreement.(Per negotiation with EPA legal)

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

This section should discuss the schedule for the public comment period, the public meeting and the availability of information pertaining to the proposed remedial action.

DOE, EPA, and TDEC encourage the public to review this document and other relevant documents in the Administrative Record to gain an understanding of [name of site] and the proposed cleanup actions. A copy of this proposed plan, as well as the entire Administrative Record, is located in the Information Resource Center. The telephone number is (865) 241-4582. Hours are Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

DOE will schedule a public meeting to discuss cleanup alternatives and to address questions and concerns the public may have about all alternatives. DOE will establish a 30-day public comment period, which allows the public time to review the documents and submit comments on the preferred and other alternatives. Extensions to the comment period will be granted if requested in writing. DOE will document, evaluate, and respond to comments as part of the subsequent ROD. Comments may be addressed to the FFA Project Manager, Oak Ridge Remediation Management, DOE Oak Ridge Operations, 55 Jefferson Circle, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830.

REFERENCES

Include a list of references using the following standard format for such citations.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1999. *A Guide to Preparing Superfund Proposed Plans, Records of Decisions, and Other Remedy Selection Decision Documents*, Publication 9200.1-23P, Washington, D.C.

GLOSSARY

Provide a glossary of terms used in the PP for public comprehension.

APPENDIX

Provide appropriate appendices for detailed tables, maps, or figures, and ARARs.