

RECORD OF DECISION ANNOTATED OUTLINE CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	7-2
PART 1. DECLARATION.....	7-3
SITE NAME AND LOCATION.....	7-3
STATEMENT OF BASIS AND PURPOSE.....	7-3
ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE.....	7-4
DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED REMEDY	7-4
STATUTORY DETERMINATIONS.....	7-5
DATA CERTIFICATION CHECKLIST.....	7-5
APPROVALS.....	7-6
PART 2. DECISION SUMMARY.....	7-8
SITE NAME, LOCATION, AND DESCRIPTION.....	7-8
SITE HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.....	7-8
HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.....	7-9
SCOPE AND ROLE OF THE REMEDIAL ACTION	7-9
SUMMARY OF SITE CHARACTERISTICS.....	7-9
CURRENT AND POTENTIAL FUTURE SITE AND RESOURCE USES.....	7-11
SUMMARY OF SITE RISKS.....	7-10
Human Health Risks.....	7-10
Environmental Risks	7-10
REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVE.....	7-11
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES	7-11
SUMMARY OF COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	7-11
PRINCIPAL THREAT WASTES	7-12
SELECTED REMEDY.....	7-12
STATUTORY DETERMINATIONS.....	7-15
DOCUMENTATION OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES	7-16
REFERENCES	7-16
PART 3. RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY.....	7-16
APPENDIX A.....	7-18

ACRONYMS

ARAR	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement
AWQC	ambient water quality criteria
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act
COC	contaminant of concern
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FFA	Federal Facilities Agreement
FY	fiscal year
LUC	land use control
LUCAP	Land Use Control Assurance Plan
LUCIP	Land Use Control Implementation Plan
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCP	National Contingency Plan
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NPL	National Priorities List
OU	Operable Unit
ORR	Oak Ridge Reservation
ORO	Oak Ridge Operations
P&A	plugging and abandonment
RAO	remedial action objective
ROD	Record of Decision
SWSA	solid waste storage area
TDEC	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation

This annotated outline is to be used as a guide for preparation of Record of Decision (ROD) documents under the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Oak Ridge Operations Environmental Management Program. This document addresses preparation of a ROD for a particular project, study area, operable unit, watershed, Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) area, or release site, hereinafter referred to as the "site." This outline has not been approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) and may be modified to meet their needs.

A ROD contains the following elements: cover; title page; Part 1. Declaration; Part 2. Decision Summary; and Part 3. Responsiveness Summary. No executive summary is to be written for a ROD. Flysheets are used as tabs for clearly separating Parts 1, 2, and 3. The flysheets are page 1 of each part, but the page number does not appear.

PART 1. DECLARATION

The declaration includes the following unnumbered sections.

SITE NAME AND LOCATION

Use the proper site name, as shown on the National Priorities List, and location. For example:

Y-12 Plating Shop Container Areas [name of site addressed by ROD]
Oak Ridge Reservation [NPL site name]
Oak Ridge, Tennessee
CERCLA Information System ID

STATEMENT OF BASIS AND PURPOSE

Present the following statement of basis and purpose.

This decision document presents the selected remedial action for the [site name] in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, chosen in accordance with CERCLA (as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986) and to the extent practicable, the National Contingency Plan. This decision is based on the Administrative Record for the site.

This document is issued by DOE, as the lead agency. The EPA and TDEC are support agencies as parties of the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) for this response action. DOE and EPA have jointly selected the remedy for the site. TDEC concurs with the selected remedy.

Include a commitment statement, subject to legal review, acknowledging DOE's responsibility for the long-term effectiveness of the selected remedy. Example text follows: *The selected remedy leaves hazardous substances in place that pose a future potential risk and that would require land use*

restrictions for hundreds of years or longer. The interim LUCs selected in this ROD will continue in effect and remain enforceable as part of the selected CERCLA remedy until such time as they may be changed by a future CERCLA decision. DOE has developed a LUCAP for the ORR to help ensure that land use restrictions are maintained and periodically verified. DOE will develop a specific LUCIP that will further detail the specific measures required for land use restrictions as part of this action. DOE is committed to implementing and maintaining LUCs, including institutional controls, to ensure that the selected remedy remains protective of human health and the environment. The implementation and funding of these activities will take place in accordance with the ORR FFA. The public will be informed and involved in a timely manner in the CERCLA decision-making processes consistent with requirements of CERCLA, the NCP, the ORR FFA, and the DOE ORO CERCLA public involvement plan. Documents pertaining to the implementation and performance of the remedial actions, including five-year reviews, will be placed in a post-ROD file, which will be available to the public.

OR

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)

ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE

Present the following assessment:

Actual or threatened releases of hazardous substances from this site, if not addressed by implementing the response action selected in this ROD, may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health, welfare, or the environment.

For a no-action ROD, indicate that the site does not present an endangerment to public health, welfare, or the environment.

DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED REMEDY

Identify the selected remedy and describe it briefly in bullet form. Specify the treatment technologies and/or engineering controls that will be used, as well as any institutional controls, such as deed or access restrictions. Include the following elements:

- A brief explanation of how this response action fits into the remediation strategy within the watershed in which the areas addressed by this ROD reside and the overall Oak Ridge Reservation cleanup strategy, and
- A statement as to how the selected action does or does not address the principal threat(s) posed by the site.

Provide in an appendix, a summary of the remedial actions for the selected remedy by unit, in tabular format, as shown in the example in Appendix A.

STATUTORY DETERMINATIONS

Structure this section as follows. Insert the first and fourth paragraphs (if contamination remains), and choose either the second or third paragraphs. All of these paragraphs may be modified to fit site conditions through negotiations with FFA parties, or through public input.

(1) *The selected remedy is protective of human health and the environment, complies with federal and state requirements that are applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) to the remedial action, is cost effective, and uses permanent solutions and alternative treatment (or resource recovery) technologies to the maximum extent practicable.*

(2) *This remedy also satisfies the statutory preference for treatment.*

or

(3) *However, because treatment of the principal threats of the site was not found to be practical, this remedy does not satisfy the statutory preference for treatment. The size of the site and the fact that there are no concentrated sources of contamination preclude a remedy in which contaminants could be treated effectively.*

(4) *As required by CERCLA, a review will be conducted within 5 years after initiation of remedial action to ensure that the remedy continues to provide adequate protection of human health and the environment.*

For a no-action ROD, explain that EPA does not have authority under CERCLA Sect. 104 to address the site. Indicate that the “no action” decision does not constitute a finding by the agency that adequate protection has been achieved at the site, and identify who actually or potentially has the statutory or regulatory authority over the site. If the site has been referred to other authorities, give an explanation of this referral.

(5) *Hazardous substances above health-based levels will [will not] remain at the site watershed after implementation of this remedy. Because hazardous substances are to remain, DOE, TDEC, and EPA recognize that National 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 such injuries have occurred. DOE has agreed to fund a pilot study of the Watts Bar Operable Unit (OU) that will examine natural resource issues and may provide a model for addressing such issues for the [site]; however, this study has not been completed. In the interim, neither DOE nor TDEC waives any rights or defenses each may have under CERCLA, Sect. 107(a)4(c).*

DATA CERTIFICATION CHECKLIST

State that the following information is included in Part 2. “Decision Summary,” of this ROD:

- contaminants of concern (COCs) and their respective concentrations;
- baseline risk represented by the COCs;
- remediation levels established for COCs and the basis for the levels;
- current and future land and groundwater use assumptions used in the baseline risk assessment and ROD;
- decisive factor(s) that led to selecting the remedy;
- land and groundwater use that will be available at the site as a result of the selected remedy; and
- estimated capital, operation and maintenance, and total present worth costs; discount rate; and the number of years over which the remedy cost estimates are projected; non-discounted constant dollar alternative comparison if appropriate, and
- key factors that led to selecting the remedy.

State also that additional information regarding the site can be found in the Administrative Record for this site.

APPROVALS
Record of Decision for [Site]
[Document Number]
[Document Date]

Assistant Manager
Oak Ridge Operations
U.S. Department of Energy

Date

Director, DOE Oversight Division
State of Tennessee
Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation

Date

Director
Waste Management Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4

Date

PART 2. DECISION SUMMARY

The decision summary includes the following unnumbered sections.

SITE NAME, LOCATION, AND DESCRIPTION

Include a brief description of basic information about the site location and the actual or potential threat from the area. Use a paragraph format with supporting tables, figures, and references. Specify which resources, locations, or media are included within the scope of the ROD and which are not. For those areas not included, specify, if known, how the excluded areas will be addressed by the selected remedy (the scope of the ROD, and hence what the remedy does and does not address, should be precisely described in this section).

- Include the location where the remedial action is occurring, including the town or county, the state in which the site is located, and the distance from significant locations such as an intersection or geographical boundary.
- Include a general overview of the site, summarizing geographical and topographical information such as natural resource use, adjacent land use, distance to nearby populations, location in a floodplain, general surface water and groundwater resources, and surface and subsurface features (e.g., number and volume of tanks, lagoons, structures, and drums at the site.)

SITE HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

In paragraph format, provide background information on the history of the site and enforcement actions taken to date. Include the following factors:

- history of site activities that led to the current situation, such as manufacturing activities or disposal of hazardous substances; and
- history of site investigations or remedial actions conducted to date under CERCLA, as well as under other environmental authorities, such as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, or state authorities.

Present the following statement of DOE's policy of land use control. This section may be modified through future negotiations with the FFA parties.

The terms and conditions of the Land Use Control Action Plan (LUCAP) or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) are not specifically incorporated or made enforceable herein by reference. However, DOE, EPA, and TDEC understand and agree that the contemplated permanence of the remedy reflected herein is dependent in part on DOE's substantial good-faith compliance with the specific LUC maintenance commitments reflected therein. Should such compliance not occur or should the MOU be terminated, it is understood that the protectiveness of the remedy may be reconsidered; consequently, additional measures may need to be taken to ensure adequate and necessary future protection of human health and the environment.

Add this paragraph as the closing statement in this section: In accordance with DOE policy, to the extent practicable, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) values have been incorporated throughout the CERCLA process culminating in this ROD. Specifically, DOE has considered [insert factors DOE has considered]. Separate NEPA documentation will not be issued.

HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

In paragraph format, briefly note how the public participation requirements in CERCLA Section 113(k)(2)(B)(i-v) were met. Indicate that comments from the public have been summarized and responses provided in Part 3. "Responsiveness Summary."

SCOPE AND ROLE OF THE REMEDIAL ACTION

Discuss how the response action for the site addressed by the ROD fits into the overall remediation strategy. Detail how the response action fits into the overall Oak Ridge Reservation strategy for addressing the principal threat or threats posed by conditions at the site. Describe:

- which site units are being addressed in this decision,
- the planned sequence of activities,
- the scope of problems the action will address, and
- the authorities under which the action will be implemented.

SUMMARY OF SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Provide a brief, yet comprehensive overview of the site and the actual and potential exposure routes posed by the site conditions. Describe the assessments made during the remedial investigation that characterized the site, its environment, and the extent of contamination. Characteristics should include general information about contaminants at the site, potential routes of contaminant migration and exposure, population and environmental areas that could be affected by contaminants, and any factors specific to the site (e.g., fractured bedrock) which may affect the remedial actions. Use maps to illustrate the location of contaminant sources and tables to list the types of contaminants and concentrations in various media. Highlight the following factors:

- Site description, including physical characteristics of site and environmental setting;
- Known or suspected sources of contamination;
- Types of contamination and affected media, including a description of the quantity, types, and concentration of hazardous substances present; their mobility, carcinogenicity, and volume; and the lateral and vertical extent of contamination and potential surface and subsurface pathways of migration;

- Known and potential routes of human and environmental exposure, including contaminant fate and transport; and
- Conceptual site model.

CURRENT AND POTENTIAL FUTURE LAND AND RESOURCE USES

Discuss the current and reasonably anticipated future land, surface water, and groundwater uses at the site, and discuss the basis for future use assumptions.

SUMMARY OF SITE RISKS

Provide information to support the decision to take remedial action when there is an actual or potential threat of release. If no action will be taken, support that decision with data and narrative.

In the baseline risk assessment, describe the exposure pathways and risks, so that the ROD clearly specifies how risk reductions resulting from the remedial alternatives are directly related to the exposure pathways and baseline risks. Provide information on human health risks and environmental risks as follows.

HUMAN HEALTH RISKS

Present a summary of the information developed in the risk assessment. State this information in a manner that allows individuals who are unfamiliar with the site to understand the remedial action that is being undertaken. Structure the discussion in the ROD so that it parallels the major areas discussed in the baseline risk assessment sections: contaminant identification, exposure assessment, toxicity assessment, and risk characterization. Focus primarily on exposure pathways and contaminants that pose actual or potential threats to human health and the environment.

ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS

Address risks to the environment that were considered in the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study. Because assessment procedures for environmental risks are not as standardized as those for human health risks, the level of detail describing the environmental evaluation in the ROD can be less standardized. Structure this discussion in the ROD so that it parallels the major areas discussed in the ecological risk assessment sections—contaminant identification, exposure assessment, and risk characterization. As a rule of thumb, include only the evaluation information necessary to help the decision maker address environmental concerns at the site. Discuss, at least, the following points:

- Any critical habitats affected by site contamination; and
- Any endangered species or habitats of endangered species affected by site contamination.

For all RODs, except those selecting no action, conclude this section with the following statement (which is also included in the Part 1 section, Assessing the Site):

Actual or threatened releases of hazardous substances from this site, if not addressed by implementing the response action selected in this ROD, may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health, welfare, or the environment.

REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVE

Present the remedial action objectives (RAOs) for the site, the rationale for these RAOs, and how they address the site risks.

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

Provide a concise description of how each alternative would address the contamination at the site from the beginning of the remedy to the completion of activities. Explain the treatment and/or engineering components of each alternative as they logically occur in the proposed remediation process. Provide engineering details that support the remedial design phase. Outline the performance parameters of each alternative, such as the concentration levels of contaminants to remain on-site without management, the type of long-term management controls to be used, and the maximum concentration levels or other levels to be attained in remediated groundwater.

Identify the source materials constituting principal threats at the site and discuss how the alternatives will address them.

These comprehensive descriptions allow the focus in the next section to be on highlighting the differences or similarities among alternatives.

SUMMARY OF COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

The major objective of this section of the ROD is to evaluate the performance of the alternatives relative to the following criteria so that advantages and disadvantages associated with each cleanup option are clearly understood. Discuss each alternative under each criterion, presenting the best performing alternative first. Include a separate discussion on NEPA considerations.

Threshold Criteria

1. Overall protection of human health and the environment
2. Compliance with ARARs

Primary Balancing Criteria

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

7. Cost

Modifying Criteria

8. State/support agency acceptance
9. Community acceptance

NEPA Considerations

Discuss those NEPA values that are different between alternatives. A table may help this discussion.

PRINCIPAL THREAT WASTES

The National Contingency Plan (NCP) establishes an expectation that treatment will be used to address the principal threats posed by a site wherever practicable [40 *CFR* 300.430(a)(1)(iii)(A)]. Identifying principal threat wastes combines concepts of both hazard and risk. In general, principal threat wastes are those source materials considered to be highly toxic or highly mobile that generally cannot be contained in a reliable manner or would present a significant risk to human health or the environment should exposure occur.

SELECTED REMEDY

Provide a concise discussion of the key factors for remedy selection and the rationale for the selected remedy. Expand on the discussion of the selected remedy, describing how the remedy provides the “best balance” of trade-offs with respect to the evaluation criteria given in the previous section.

Identify and summarize (see attached table) the major treatment components of the selected remedy, including any engineering controls or institutional controls (including monitoring requirements) that will be a part of the remedy. Also, briefly discuss the following:

- RAOs with remediation goals and corresponding risk levels to be attained at the conclusion of the response action, the performance standards, and the points of compliance for the media being addressed, and
- DOE’s basis for the remediation goals (ARARs, risk calculation) as discussed in the feasibility study.

Summarize in tabular format the roles of each major treatment component in fulfilling the RAO and the required performance of these components. Excerpts from a performance measures table from the Melton Valley ROD is provided as an example.

Insert the following or similar text:

The DOE and its contractors will systematically integrate safety into management and work practices at all levels so that the implementation of the selected remedy is accomplished while protecting the public, the worker, and the environment. This will be accomplished through effective

integration of safety management into all facets of work planning and execution. Responsibilities will be clearly defined in documents appropriate to the activity.

Identify the land use controls (LUCs) and describe their purpose, duration, implementation, and affected areas using the attached summary tables (will add Tables 2.32 and 2.33 from BV ROD as examples) as appropriate

Table ____. Performance measures for major actions in the [Watershed Name], [Site Name]

Unit type/ Unit names Project scope	Performance objectives	Selected remedy actions	Performance measure
Buried Waste sites SWSA 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWSA 4 • Liquid Seepage Pit 1 & Secondary Media • Inactive Waste Transfer Lines @ Lagoon Rd • Pilot Pits Area Shallow Well P&A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain disposed & contaminated materials • Meet RAO for the waste management use area (Table ____) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct a cap to cover buried wastes in SWSA 4, Seepage Pit 1, the Pilot pits area, and associated contaminated areas including inactive waste transfer pipelines along Lagoon Rd. • Construct barriers to surface water run-on, upslope stormflow intrusion into the site, and downgradient contaminated groundwater seepage • Treat all intercepted contaminated water to meet discharge requirements • Stabilize abandoned pipelines and trench backfill at cap boundaries • Design and construct all necessary water handling features to prevent erosional impacts to adjacent land and stream channel areas • Plug and abandon all unneeded shallow wells within the project area • Design and implement a monitoring system(s) for surface water and groundwater to demonstrate the performance of the remedial action components 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent releases from SWSA 4 from causing AWQC exceedances in waters of the state within 2 years after SWSA 4 construction is complete. • Reduce SWSA 4 contaminant releases to surface water by approximately 80% to meet computed 1×10^{-4} total residential risk at the confluence of White Oak Creek with Clinch River in ~10 years after all ROD actions are complete • Reduce groundwater throughflow in buried waste units by >75% as measured by >75% decrease in water level fluctuations in selected monitoring locations inside the contained area
Surface water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet TDEC numeric AWQC and narrative (risk-based) water quality criteria in all waters of the state for specified uses • Meet risk levels for hypothetical recreational water use (contact and consumption under the recreational exposure scenario) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydraulic isolation of most contaminant source units with selected waste removal or in situ treatment. Collection and treatment of contaminated groundwater at boundaries of waste containment areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve numeric AWQC and narrative (risk-based) water quality criteria in waters of the state within 2 years after completion of all actions that are part of the selected remedy. Meet recreation use criteria for water contact and consumption (excluding fish consumption) • Reduce contaminant releases to meet water quality conditions that would allow hypothetical residential use (risk level of 1×10^{-4} for water only – no fish consumption or sediment contact scenarios) at confluence with the Clinch River in ~10 years after completion of all ROD actions. Reductions in ^{90}Sr (residential scenario = 185 pCi/L)

AWQC = ambient water quality criteria
 P&A = plugging and abandonment
 RAO = remedial action objective

ROD = Record of Decision
 SWSA = solid waste storage area
 TDEC = Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation

Describe in detail the estimated costs of the remedial action. Identify capital costs of each major treatment and the containment component of the selected remedy, including an indication of the volume of material that each component will address and the estimated unit costs. List contingencies. State operation and maintenance cost in terms of annual costs, and present the total net present value. Include periodic costs (5-year reviews, replacement). Present worth should be calculated for the length of time O&M is required. If the time required exceeds 30 years, present a non-discounted cost scenario. In this section, mention that some changes may be made to the remedy as a result of the remedial design and construction processes. Include a clear statement that such changes, in general, reflect modifications resulting from the engineering design process.

Summarize the estimated outcomes of the selected remedy, including:

- Land use, groundwater use;
- Final cleanup levels achieved and risk at those levels;
- Time frame to achieve remedial goals and land use;
- NEPA values, socioeconomic and environmental justice concerns; and
- Anticipated environmental or ecological benefits.

Present the currently anticipated fiscal year dates for completion of major projects. Also include the following or similar paragraph, subject to appropriate legal review, to clarify the intent of the completion dates.

Pursuant to Section XXXVIII of the FFA, DOE shall take all necessary steps to obtain sufficient funding for activities required by this ROD. This is to be accomplished, as set forth in that section of the FFA, through consultation with EPA and TDEC and the submission of timely budget requests. As depicted in Fig. __, all remedial actions included in this ROD currently are projected to be completed by fiscal year (FY) __. However, schedules for completion of projects are planning date s only and are not considered to be enforceable elements of the selected remedy. The enforceable milestones and nonenforceable FY +3 milestones for performance of remedial actions for sites included in this ROD are set forth in Appendix E and Appendix J of the FFA, respectively. Any additional milestones, timetables, or deadlines for sites included in this ROD will be identified and established independent of this ROD, in accordance with the existing FFA protocols.

STATUTORY DETERMINATIONS

Describe how the selected remedy satisfies each of the following statutory requirements of CERCLA Section 121, which states that the remedy selected by DOE, in consultation with the support agency, must:

- be protective of human health and the environment;
- comply with ARARs (or justify a waiver);
- be cost effective;
- utilize permanent solutions and alternative treatment technologies or resource recovery technologies to the maximum extent practical; and

- satisfy the preference for treatment that reduces toxicity, mobility, or volume as a principal element or provide an explanation as to why this preference is not satisfied.

For a no-action ROD, refer to the explanation provided in the Part 1 Declaration Statement. Repeat the same information developed for the Declaration Statement in this section.

Explain 5-year review requirements for the selected remedy.

DOCUMENTATION OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

Identify the preferred alternative from the Proposed Plan, and indicate whether any significant changes were made. If significant changes were made, explain the reasons for those changes. If a significant change was made that required the issuance of a revised Proposed Plan and the announcement of a new public comment period, summarize the activities performed in compliance with these requirements as well.

REFERENCES

Include a list of references used to develop the ROD in the format shown here. The following are general references for inclusion in a ROD.

40 *CFR* Pt. 300, National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP).

42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq., Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 1999. *A Guide to Preparing Superfund Proposed Plans, Records of Decision, and Other Remedy Selection Decision Documents*, Publication 9200.01-23P, Washington, D.C.

PART 3. RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

The Responsiveness Summary achieves two of the major objectives of the CERCLA process: it documents community concerns about both the site and the preferred remedy, and it demonstrates how public comments are integrated into the decision-making process. The Responsiveness Summary also provides DOE with the opportunity to formally respond to public comments as an element of the decision-making process.

The content of an individual Responsiveness Summary will necessarily vary in detail and complexity according to the scope of each individual project; however, the following elements should be included in each preparation:

- A summary that identifies the date of issuance and the public comment period for the Proposed Plan, the dates and list of publications in which notice was placed, and the date of the public meeting (if required);
- A list of references used in the preparation of the Responsiveness Summary, either included here or presented in the reference section of the ROD;
- Transcripts of written comments or meetings notes, identifying the commenting party and providing a brief written response to each comment or groups of comments; and
- A brief summary of DOE's responses and any changes made to the selected remedy based on the public comment process.

APPENDIX A

Provide a summary of the remedial actions for the selected remedy by unit, as listed/titled in the FFA Appendix C, in tabular format if the remedy addresses multiple units. List all units addressed in this ROD on this table individually. The following excerpt from the Melton Valley ROD is provided as an example.

Table A.__. List of remedial actions for the selected remedy, [Site Name]

Unit name/location (see Fig. __)	FFA Appendix C unit title	Selected remedy	Comments
White Oak Creek Embayment	White Oak Lake and Embayment (7846)	Institutional controls	Institutional controls, pending a future final decision; in the absence of additional actions, acceptable risks would be achieved after allowing <170 years for radioactive decay
Middle White Oak Creek	White Oak Creek and Tributaries (0853)	Remove contaminated surface soils >2500 μ R/hour	Reduces worker exposure; institutional controls, pending a future final decision; in the absence of additional actions, acceptable risks would be achieved after allowing <170 years for radioactive decay; modified from Alternative 5 (500 μ R/hour to 2500 μ R/hour)
Building 7852	OHF Site Surface Facilities (7852)	Demolish to slab; coincidentally capped	No future use; reduce future S&M costs

Note: List all units addressed in this Record of Decision on this table individually.

OHF = Old Hydrofracture Facility
S&M = surveillance and maintenance