



## Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

September 29, 2014

**MEMORANDUM FOR: ANDREW C. LAWRENCE, DIRECTOR  
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION,  
SUSTAINABILITY SUPPORT AND CORPORATE  
SAFETY ANALYSIS  
OFFICE OF HEALTH, SAFETY AND SECURITY**

**FROM: THOMAS PAULING, DIRECTOR Thomas C. Pauling  
OFFICE OF SITE OPERATIONS  
OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT**

Digitally signed by Thomas C. Pauling  
DN: cn=us, o=us, government, ou=department of energy,  
ou=Energy IT Services, ou=DOE Common Operating  
Environment, ou=People, cn=Thomas C. Pauling  
Date: 2014.09.29 12:42:35 -0400

**SUBJECT: Annual Site Environmental Reporting for Department of Energy  
Legacy Management Sites**

---

The U.S. Department of Energy Office (DOE) of Legacy Management (LM) was established in 2003 to manage the Department's post-closure responsibilities at sites under LM's care and ensure the future protection of human health and the environment at those sites.

LM is submitting the attached *Office of Legacy Management's Summary of Annual Site Environmental Reports* for calendar year 2013 to meet the intent of DOE Order 231.1B with a scaled-down approach as identified in the Annual Site Environmental Report (ASER) preparation guidance. LM is committed to ensuring environmental protection, compliance, sustainability and the LM Site's efforts to ensure the validity and accuracy of the monitoring data.

Please review the summary and attachments and contact Tracy Ribeiro at (303) 410-4817 if you have any comments or questions.

Attachment

cc w/ attachment:

D. Geiser, DOE-LM (e)

R. Natoli, DOE-HSS (e)

T. Ribeiro, DOE-LM (e)

D. Shafer, DOE-LM (e)

S. Osborn, Stoller (e)

File: ADM 115.02 (rc grand junction)

LM20.3\Ribeiro\8-27-14 ASER Strategy Memo (Lawrence)



# *Office of Legacy Management's Summary of Annual Site Environmental Reports*

## **1.0 Reporting Requirement**

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Order 231.1B, *Environment, Safety and Health Reporting*, requires that each DOE site prepare an Annual Site Environmental Report (ASER) documenting the site's environmental conditions and compliance with DOE reporting requirements. The ASER is submitted to DOE Headquarters annually and is available to the public. DOE's *Guidance for the Preparation of 2013 Department of Energy Annual Site Environmental Reports* for calendar year (CY) 2013, dated April 2014, recognizes that each Office of Legacy Management (LM) site has unique characteristics and suggests two alternatives to the preparation of an ASER: (1) prepare a scaled-down or streamlined version of the ASER that reflects the current nature and extent of site operations and monitoring programs, or (2) submit equivalent documentation that provides the results of the relevant environmental monitoring programs. The following summary is submitted to meet the intent of DOE Order 231.1B with a scaled-down approach as identified in the ASER preparation guidance.

## **2.0 Background**

LM was established in 2003 to manage DOE's postclosure responsibilities at sites under DOE's care and ensure the future protection of human health and the environment at those sites. The histories of the legacy sites vary, as do the regulatory regimes under which the sites are managed. Long-term surveillance plans (LTSPs) are prepared for the majority of the sites. These LTSPs, which are available to the public, include site descriptions, information about site history, nature and extent of contamination, closeout condition of the site, present and future monitoring and surveillance programs, and institutional controls. Several examples of the types of sites and their regulatory framework are provided below and in the following link:

[http://www.lm.doe.gov/pro\\_doc/references/framework.htm](http://www.lm.doe.gov/pro_doc/references/framework.htm).

- a. LM currently manages sites where remediation was conducted in accordance with Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) or Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulations. These sites were radiologically or chemically contaminated by federal milling, processing, research, or weapons-manufacturing operations. LM currently manages eight CERCLA/RCRA sites.
- b. Underground nuclear testing was conducted at sites in five states for various purposes, including stimulating natural gas production and cataloging seismic detonation signatures. The Nevada Offsites refers to the sites where underground nuclear tests and experiments were performed outside of the Nevada National Security Site (formerly the Nevada Test Site). LM currently manages nine Nevada Offsites.
- c. The Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act (UMTRCA) of 1978 (Title 42 *United States Code* Section 7901, as amended) provides for the remediation and regulation of uranium mill tailings at uranium mill sites addressed under Title I and Title II of UMTRCA. Title I sites are former uranium mill sites unlicensed and essentially abandoned before UMTRCA was implemented on January 1, 1978. LM currently manages 21 UMTRCA Title I sites. Title I of UMTRCA designated inactive uranium-ore-

processing sites for remediation. Remediation of these sites resulted in the creation of 19 disposal cells that contain encapsulated uranium mill tailings and associated contaminated material. Title II of UMTRCA addresses reclamation of uranium mill sites that were under specific license on or after January 1, 1978. LM currently manages six UMTRCA Title II sites. The number will increase as ongoing site reclamations are completed and the sites are transferred from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to LM for long-term surveillance and monitoring (LTSM).

- d. DOE established the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) in 1974 to remediate sites where radioactive contamination remained from Manhattan Project and early U.S. Atomic Energy Commission operations. DOE assessed more than 600 candidate facilities and determined that 46 would require remediation. DOE remediated 25 sites by 1997; Congress directed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to remediate the remaining 21 designated FUSRAP sites. Remediation of FUSRAP sites follows CERCLA protocols. When the USACE completes remediation of the sites, they are transferred to LM's responsibility. LM currently manages 29 FUSRAP sites.
- e. LM manages five sites in the DOE Defense Decontamination and Decommissioning Program.

## **3.0 Summary of General Environmental Reporting**

### **3.1 Oversight**

All of the legacy sites have an LM site manager assigned to ensure that the regulatory regime for the site is followed, oversee the long-term activities of the site, and address stakeholder concerns. All reports, including environmental monitoring reports, are reviewed by the site manager, team lead, or both for the site type, or their designee. The information is thoroughly reviewed to ensure that accurate data are being reported.

### **3.2 Summary of Site-Specific Activities**

LM currently (as of December 2013) manages the long-term care of 90 sites. LM classifies the sites into one of three categories based on the actual or anticipated LTSM activities associated with that site. The sites and their respective categories are listed in the *LM Site Management Guide*, which is issued annually. Each geographic site location will be counted as one site, including those locations having both a former processing site and a disposal site. Typically, the lower/smaller the category number assigned to the site, the fewer activities and less environmental monitoring occur at the site, resulting in less documentation and reporting. The three tables in Attachment 1 summarize the associated monitoring and reporting performed for each site. Primary stakeholders, including state and federal regulators for the site type, are generally sent copies or notices of electronic availability when annual inspection and monitoring reports are issued. The majority of the information identified in the tables is available on site-specific websites that can be accessed from the main LM website (<http://www.lm.doe.gov/default.aspx?id=120>) or from the site-specific links provided. Any additional information is available upon request.

LM is providing Attachment 1 as a summarized version of the environmental reporting in lieu of individual reports.

The three categories and count of LM sites currently within that category are:

1. Category 1 sites, listed in Table 1, are expected to require records-related activities and stakeholder support.
  - 40 sites.
  - Stakeholders have online access to historical information about these sites.
  - Environmental monitoring data is not collected for these sites.
  - Information on these sites will not be reported annually unless a change occurs in the activity level at these sites.
2. Category 2 sites, listed in Table 2, are expected to require routine inspections and maintenance, records-related activities, and stakeholder support.
  - 41 sites.
  - Annual site inspections are completed.
  - If LTSM is required, monitoring results are available to the public.
3. Category 3 sites, listed in Table 3, are expected to require operation and maintenance of remedial action systems, routine inspections and maintenance, records-related activities, and stakeholder support.
  - 9 sites.
  - Annual site inspections are completed.
  - LTSM is completed.
  - Includes RCRA and CERCLA sites.
  - Includes sites with active treatment systems for ground and surface water.
  - Multiple reports are periodically issued.
  - Routine stakeholder communications.

## **4.0 Summary of Environmental Management System (EMS) & Sustainability Reports**

As required by prior DOE Orders and DOE Order 436.1, *Departmental Sustainability*, LM has a fully implemented EMS. The LM EMS public website [http://www.lm.doe.gov/Office\\_of\\_Site\\_Operations/Environmental\\_Management\\_System.aspx](http://www.lm.doe.gov/Office_of_Site_Operations/Environmental_Management_System.aspx) describes LM's EMS and provides links to many of the documents and reports identified in this section. The LM EMS was implemented in October 2005. Full implementation of the EMS was declared by June 30, 2009. As required by DOE Order 436.1, LM had an audit by a third party, outside the scope and realm of the EMS, in early 2012 and LM verified the full implementation of the EMS on June 7, 2012. The next third-party external audit will be conducted in 2015.

The LM EMS is consistent with the framework of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 14001, *Environmental Management System*, and the Integrated Safety Management System. The EMS serves as the platform for tracking and adhering to environmental requirements for compliance and sustainability. The EMS is a set of processes and practices that enable LM to reduce its environmental impacts and increase its operating efficiency. In addition, the LM EMS implements the LM Site Sustainability Plan (SSP), which assists DOE with meeting its sustainability goals, objectives, and targets established in Executive Orders 13423 and 13514, and in DOE Order 436.1. The following programmatic documents describe LM's EMS and are provided on the LM EMS website on the Guiding Documents and Links page:

- a. LM's *Environment, Safety, and Health Policy* (LM P 450.9)
- b. LM's *Environmental Management System Description*

The LM EMS encompasses all LM sites under cleanup custody, and federal and contractor facilities where work is managed throughout the United States; all reports are programmatic summaries.

Following is a summary of the submissions and postings for the EMS and Sustainability Requirements, most of which are available on the LM EMS website on the Goals/Progress and Plans page:

- a. LM SSP: Describes progress toward sustainability goals and future plans.
- b. Annual Energy Report, also known as the Consolidated Energy Data Report: Gathers information on energy and water usage, waste data, renewable energy generation, greenhouse gas emissions, high-performance sustainable buildings, and sustainability projects.
- c. Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) Section 432 Report: EISA reinforces the energy reduction goals for federal agencies put forth in Executive Order 13423. Section 432 requires federal agencies to identify facilities that constitute at least 75 percent of the agency's facility energy use. Comprehensive energy and water evaluations of 25 percent of facilities are completed each year, so that an evaluation of each facility is completed once every four years. Section 432 reports are submitted annually to provide a status on energy and water evaluations, benchmarking, and project implementation and measures follow up.
- d. Facility EMS Annual Report Data (Executive Order 13423): Collects information on status of EMS.
- e. Pollution Prevention Tracking and Reporting System: Collects sustainable acquisition, pollution prevention, and electronics stewardship data, which is included in LM's annual SSP.
- f. Facility Information Management System (FIMS) updates: FIMS collects real property attributes and use, including a list of assets excluded from the energy intensity reduction goal. The database also stores data on buildings that have been assessed or are scheduled to be assessed against the High Performance Sustainable Building goals.

- g. Federal Acquisition Statistical Tool updates: Collects current and past federal fleet fuel use, vehicle inventory, and vehicle acquisitions for the current year in addition to plans 2 years into the future.
- h. Significant Aspects: The environmental aspect of an activity is the portion of it that creates a possibility for a significant environmental impact if not controlled.

## 5.0 Summary of Environmental Compliance

As described in the Background section, the LM sites are regulated under different regulatory regimes, with the category 3 sites subject to more regulatory requirements than category 1 and 2 sites. The sites that are considered CERCLA/RCRA sites have been remediated under the requirements of those statutes, with the majority under CERCLA. Under CERCLA, the sites were subject to meeting or exceeding the applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) of federal, state, and local laws and statutes, such as Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA); RCRA; the Clean Water Act (CWA); the Clean Air Act (CAA); the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA); UMTRCA; the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA); the National Historic Preservation Act; the Endangered Species Act (ESA); and the associated state regulations. Because DOE is a federal agency, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is also an applicable requirement.

- No Notices of Violation were issued to LM sites during CY 2013.

### 5.1 Major Laws

The following summarizes LM compliance with major laws and related reporting during CY 2013:

- a. **CERCLA:** The CERCLA sites have completed remedial actions with the exception of long-term monitoring and active groundwater remediation at several sites. The sites are now conducting long-term surveillance, groundwater treatment, and maintenance under this regulation. The status of the activities at each site is available on the associated webpages and in the documents as listed. The CERCLA sites (see Table 2 and Table 3) are required to prepare Five-Year Review reports to evaluate whether the remedies at the sites remain protective of human health and the environment. There were no Five-Year Review reports that were required to be issued in CY 2013. The Weldon Spring, Missouri, Site received the EPA Superfund Sitewide Ready for Anticipated Use (SWRAU) designation from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in a letter dated March 20, 2013. The SWRAU performance measure designation is met when sites are documented as ready for reuse by meeting the following construction-completed National Priority List requirements: (1) All cleanup goals in the Records of Decision (RODs) or other remedy-decision documents have been achieved for media that may affect current and reasonably anticipated future land uses of the site so that there are no unacceptable risks; and (2) All institutional or other controls required in the RODs or other remedy-decision documents have been put in place.

- b. **SARA:** Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA) reports under SARA Section 312 are required annually for sites that store chemicals in amounts that exceed threshold planning quantities. The following sites submitted EPCRA reports under SARA 312 for CY 2013:
- Grand Junction, Colorado, Site.
  - Grand Junction, Colorado, Disposal Site.
  - Tuba City, Arizona, Disposal Site.
- c. **UMTRCA Title I and II:** UMTRCA provides for the remediation and regulation of uranium mill tailings at uranium mill sites addressed under Title I and Title II of UMTRCA. As discussed in the Background section, LM manages sites under UMTRCA Title I and II, including inspections, monitoring, and maintenance at each of the sites.
- Requirements and frequencies for inspections, monitoring, and maintenance activities are detailed in site-specific LTSPs and Groundwater Compliance Action Plans, which are reviewed and approved by the NRC.
  - Two Site Inspection and Monitoring Reports describing activities on UMTRCA sites, one for Title I and one for Title II, are submitted annually to NRC at the conclusion of the calendar year.
  - Data Validation Packages are developed for every major sampling event and sent to NRC and placed on the applicable site webpage.
- d. **RCRA:** The majority of the CERCLA/RCRA sites managed hazardous wastes during the active remediation in compliance with RCRA. Each site met the status of Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator during CY 2013. No RCRA wastes were manifested offsite during CY 2013 for any of the sites. RCRA remains an ARAR at many of the sites for disposal cell maintenance and groundwater monitoring, and the sites maintain compliance with these ARARs.
- The Pinellas County, Florida, Site maintains an active RCRA Hazardous and Solid Waste Act corrective action permit issued by the State of Florida, which includes requirements for remedial action at the site under the state Global Risk-Based Corrective Action regulations. Pinellas maintains compliance with this permit, which was renewed as a 10-year permit in January 2012.
- e. **CWA:** Some of the sites maintain National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits issued under the CWA. These NPDES permits include discharge permits, storm water permits, and a Section 404 nationwide permit.
- The Fernald, Ohio, Site maintains an NPDES discharge permit.
  - The Miamisburg, Ohio, Site discharges treated groundwater under a CERCLA authorization demonstrating compliance with the CWA.
  - The Weldon Spring site was issued a NPDES storm water permit in August 2012 for a building demolition project and new wastewater system installation project. This permit was terminated on September 9, 2013. The site also maintained two NPDES discharge permits. One permit is for a pipeline to discharge leachate as a contingency option. Leachate has never been discharged under this permit. The second permit was for a sanitary wastewater treatment plant, which was closed during 2012. This permit was terminated on March 5, 2013.

- The Rocky Flats, Colorado, Site was issued a Section 404 nationwide permit Number 43 related to breaching of earthen dams. The permit will remain in effect until the wetland mitigation success criteria are met.
- f. **SDWA:** The SDWA is an ARAR for many sites in regard to groundwater contamination. This information is detailed in the environmental monitoring reports for each site.
  - g. **CAA:** National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants monitoring has occurred at LM sites in the past. This type of monitoring is presently not required at any of the LM sites.
  - h. **NEPA:** NEPA documentation is typically not required for CERCLA sites that considered NEPA values in their decision documents. Actions at non-CERCLA LM sites are typically evaluated in Categorical Exclusions and documented on Determination Forms, which are available for public review on the DOE and LM NEPA websites. An annual summary of proposed or ongoing environmental assessments, environmental impact statements, and mitigation action plans is provided to the DOE Office of General Counsel (GC-1) and reported on the following website: referencing is <http://energy.gov/lm/services/joint-environmental-management-system-ems/national-environmental-policy-act-nepa>.
  - i. **FIFRA:** Herbicides and pesticides are used at LM sites. Policies, procedures, and manuals are in place to ensure that they are used in compliance with FIFRA.

## 5.2 Requirements or Accomplishments Related to Cultural and Natural Resources

### 5.2.1 Cultural Resources

- LM annually submits a Report on Federal Archaeology Program Activities to the DOE Office of Health, Safety and Security (HS-22; however, future reports will be sent to the reorganized Office of Environment, Health, Safety and Security or EHSS) for submittal with other DOE reports to the National Park Service. The report summarizes annual activities and also reports the cumulative total of acreage surveyed to date, the number of sites on agency-managed lands that were determined to be eligible or ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and costs associated with managing the cultural resources program, among other things.
- In CY 2013, LM initiated a programmatic agreement for the DOE Uranium Leasing Program (ULP) to address Section 106 requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The programmatic agreement addressed the roles and responsibilities of DOE, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Colorado State Historic Preservation Office, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, and cognizant tribes.
- LM also complies with NHPA Section 106 by using subcontracts for cultural resources inventories prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities if the area has not been previously inventoried or if it is in need of an updated inventory. In CY 2013, one cultural resource inventory was undertaken and no sites were identified on the property. Additional consultations with either tribal historic preservation offices or state historic preservation offices were undertaken for proposed site work in areas previously highly disturbed or covered by an existing cultural resource inventory.



### 5.2.2 Natural Resources

- LM submits the Annual Accomplishments Questionnaire for the Council of Migratory Birds to DOE HS-22/EHSS. Departmental annual reports are combined and submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Council for the Conservation of Migratory Birds. This report summarizes conservation activities related to the protection or enhancement of migratory birds or their habitat and also describes coordination efforts between DOE, state, and USFWS regional or field offices.
- LM participated in a revision of the Memorandum of Understanding between DOE and USFWS. The Memorandum of Understanding states responsibilities specific to each agency related to the protection of migratory birds.
- In association with the ULP Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) efforts in CY 2013, LM entered into consultation with the USFWS under the ESA. LM completed a Biological Assessment associated with endangered species on and near the ULP lease tracts. USFWS responded with a Biological Opinion and indicated that consultation was complete.
- LM evaluates the presence or potential presence of listed species or their habitat during the NEPA process. The USFWS website is used to obtain information on species occurrence and habitat. This information is combined with site knowledge, conversations with other federal agency wildlife biologists, records, and, as needed, a site visit to determine if consultation is required under the ESA. The evaluation is documented and attached to the NEPA document prepared for the proposed action. In CY 2013, LM activities did not affect any listed species.
- In some instances, water depletions from river basins may have an adverse effect on listed species inhabiting the river (e.g., fish) or river corridor (e.g., birds). LM continues to track water use related to LM site activities.

## 6.0 Summary of Environmental Radiological Protection Program

LM has a radiological protection program in place that is documented in the *Radiation Protection Program Plan* and *Radiological Control Manual*. LM uses this program to ensure that radiation exposure to workers and the public and releases of radioactivity to the environment are maintained below regulatory limits and to further reduce exposures and releases to levels as low as reasonably achievable. Environmental cleanup at LM sites was completed according to all applicable statutes and regulations, and LM conducts long-term monitoring and surveillance to verify that site conditions have not changed and that established institutional controls remain effective.

## 7.0 Summary of Quality Assurance

The *Quality Assurance Manual* (based on ISO 14001, *Environmental Management System*, requirements) includes processes for monitoring environmental sampling at LM sites and at the subcontracted offsite laboratories. Quality assurance requirements for sampling activities at LM sites are detailed in the *Sampling and Analysis Plan for U.S. Department of Energy Office of Legacy Management Sites* (LMS/PRO/S04351). Compliance with the sampling plan quality requirements provides LM sites with reliable, accurate, and precise monitoring data. The sampling plan furnishes guidance, directives, and quality control procedures to detect and

prevent quality control problems from the time of sample collection through analysis and reporting of data. Key elements in achieving the goals of this program are compliance with the quality assurance program and sampling procedures; the use of quality control samples; complete documentation of field activities and laboratory analyses; sample analysis by subcontracted offsite laboratories that participate in the Consolidated Audit Program and the Mixed Analyte Performance Evaluation Program; and reviews of data documentation for precision, accuracy, and completeness (data validation).

## 8.0 Summary of Unique Occurrences

This section identifies unique environmental activities and reports that LM generated in the reporting year, as requested by the ASER preparation guidance. The following are examples of what may be identified (as applicable): awards, violations, lawsuits, environmental reports related to non-legacy sites under LM's management (e.g., reports on calibration models and pads and ULP sites), and environmental occurrences.

- a. Violations: No Notices of Violation were issued to LM sites during CY 2013.
- b. Occurrence Reports: No occurrence reports related to environmental compliance were issued to LM sites during CY 2013.
- c. Lawsuits: Identified below are lawsuits to which DOE and LM were involved parties during 2013.

1. ULP Lawsuit

*Colorado Environmental Coalition v. Office of Legacy Management*, 819 F. Supp. 2d 1193 (D. Colo. 2011), amended on reconsideration, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24126 (D. Colo. Feb. 27, 2012).

In July 31, 2008, a lawsuit was filed against DOE in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado (*CEC v. DOE*) on behalf of four environmental organizations. The complaint alleged that (1) DOE violated NEPA multiple times over several years by its actions taken in conjunction with the DOE ULP, including the entire programmatic environmental assessment process; and (2) through its actions, DOE is responsible for the resurgence of activity within the domestic uranium industry.

On March 26, 2010, the Plaintiffs in the lawsuit, *CEC v. DOE*, amended their complaint to add alleged violations of the ESA. Additionally, as part of the amended complaint, a fifth environmental organization joined the Plaintiffs.

On October 18, 2011, the Court issued an adverse ruling in the case. The Court invalidated the 2007 Programmatic Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact and enjoined DOE from leasing-related activities.

On December 9, 2011, DOE filed a motion with the Court to reopen and reconsider the previous decision. On February 27, 2012, the District Court granted in part DOE's motion for reconsideration and modified its injunction in order to permit DOE and ULP lessees to conduct only certain specified activities that are absolutely necessary.

On April 30, 2013, DOE and the Plaintiffs signed, and filed with the court, a joint stipulation to settle the Plaintiffs' claim for payment of their attorneys' fees and costs. DOE agreed to settle Plaintiffs' claim by payment in the amount of \$200,000.00. Of that amount, LM paid \$170,000.00 to the Plaintiffs; the remainder was paid by the U.S. Department of Justice's Judgment Fund.

This case is now closed. However, the court injunction on the ULP remained enforced at the end of CY 2013. In compliance with the district court's orders, DOE pursued drafting of the ULP PEIS and consulted with the USFWS under the ESA in CY 2013.

## 2. El Paso Lawsuit

*El Paso Natural Gas Co. v. US*, 632 F.3d 1272 (D.C. Cir. 2011).

The El Paso Natural Gas Co. (EPNG) filed suit in May 2007 against the United States (numerous agencies), claiming, among other things, that DOE failed to designate certain sites as vicinity properties during the UMTRCA cleanup of the Tuba City mill site on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona. EPNG also claimed that if UMTRCA did not apply, then RCRA applied. EPNG asked for a judgment under UMTRCA declaring that DOE is exclusively responsible for the remediation of the groundwater and soil at the sites allegedly contaminated by residually radioactive uranium mill waste materials. Under the alternative RCRA claim, EPNG is seeking a permanent injunction ordering the United States to perform cleanup activities necessary to abate present and imminent threats to human health or the environment caused by United States treatment, storage, disposal, or management of solid, hazardous, or radioactive waste and is seeking further appropriate civil penalties to be paid to the U.S. Department of the Treasury. Because EPNG was a former operator of the mill site, it also asked for the United States to prospectively reimburse it for the cost of all cleanup activities which EPNG may be ordered or required to perform at the specified sites.

The Navajo Nation filed to intervene and became party to the lawsuit in May 2009. In addition to alleging the same violations raised by EPNG's RCRA and UMTRCA claims, the tribe also alleged various other claims under federal and tribal law. Numerous court rulings favoring the United States followed, including a subsequent appeal by the Plaintiffs upholding the dismissal of the UMTRCA claims. The Court of Appeals affirmed, finding the claim was not subject to judicial review, and the canon of statutory interpretation directing courts to construe statutes in favor of Native Americans did not apply to UMTRCA. In March 2012, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia dismissed all remaining claims in this lawsuit. On appeal, the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals agreed that the tribe's federal and tribal law claims were properly dismissed. The court of appeals also upheld the dismissal of Plaintiffs' RCRA claims with respect to the Tuba City Open Dump as being barred by CERCLA but remanded that claim with instructions to enter a dismissal without prejudice. The court of appeals reversed and remanded the dismissal of the Highway 160 Site RCRA claims on the basis that the release language signed by the tribe did not encompass claims for compliance with RCRA's groundwater compliance regulations.

On remand, the district court has stayed further proceedings to allow the parties time to discuss available data and assess groundwater conditions at the Highway 160 Site.

## 9.0 Abbreviations

ARAR	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements
ASER	Annual Site Environmental Report
CAA	Clean Air Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CWA	Clean Water Act
CY	calendar year
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
EHSS	Office of Environment, Health, Safety and Security
EISA	Energy Independence and Security Act
EMS	Environmental Management System
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act
EPNG	El Paso Natural Gas Co.
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FIFRA	Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act
FIMS	Facility Information Management System
FUSRAP	Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
LM	Office of Legacy Management
LTSM	long-term surveillance and monitoring
LTSP	long-term surveillance plan
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
ROD	Record of Decision
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
SSP	Site Sustainability Plan
SWRAU	Superfund Sitewide Ready for Anticipated Use
ULP	Uranium Leasing Program

UMTRCA Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act  
USACE U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
USFWS U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**Attachment 1**

**Legacy Management Sites and Related Reports**

This page intentionally left blank

### Table 1: Category 1 Sites

(Typically involves records-related activities and stakeholder support)

Acid/Pueblo Canyon, NM, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Acid/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Acid/Sites.aspx</a>
Adrian, MI, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Adrian/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Adrian/Sites.aspx</a>
Albany, OR, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Albany/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Albany/Sites.aspx</a>
Albuquerque, NM, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/ITL/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/ITL/Sites.aspx</a>
Aliquippa, PA, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Aliquippa/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Aliquippa/Sites.aspx</a>
Ashtabula, OH, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Ashtabula/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Ashtabula/Sites.aspx</a>
Bayo Canyon, NM, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/bayo/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/bayo/Sites.aspx</a>
Berkeley, CA, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/berkeley/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/berkeley/Sites.aspx</a>
Beverly, MA, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/beverly/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/beverly/Sites.aspx</a>
Buffalo, NY, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/buffalo/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/buffalo/Sites.aspx</a>
Center for Energy and Environmental Research, PR, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/CEER/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/CEER/Sites.aspx</a>
Chicago North, IL, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/chicago_north/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/chicago_north/Sites.aspx</a>
Chicago South, IL, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/chicago_south/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/chicago_south/Sites.aspx</a>
Chupadera Mesa, NM, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/chupadera/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/chupadera/Sites.aspx</a>
Columbia, MO, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/MURR/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/MURR/Sites.aspx</a>
Columbus East, OH, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/columbus_east/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/columbus_east/Sites.aspx</a>
Columbus, OH, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Columbus/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Columbus/Sites.aspx</a>
El Verde, PR, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/El_Verde/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/El_Verde/Sites.aspx</a>
Fairfield, OH, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/fairfield/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/fairfield/Sites.aspx</a>
Granite City, IL, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/granite_city/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/granite_city/Sites.aspx</a>
Hamilton, OH, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/hamilton/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/hamilton/Sites.aspx</a>
Imperial Valley, CA, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/geothermal/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/geothermal/Sites.aspx</a>
Indian Orchard, MA, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/indian_orchard/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/indian_orchard/Sites.aspx</a>
Jersey City, NJ, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/jersey_city/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/jersey_city/Sites.aspx</a>
Madison, IL, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/madison/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/madison/Sites.aspx</a>
Maxey Flats, KY, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/maxey_flats/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/maxey_flats/Sites.aspx</a>
Middlesex North, NJ, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Considered_Sites/Middlesex_North_NJ_Site_-_NJ_05.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Considered_Sites/Middlesex_North_NJ_Site_-_NJ_05.aspx</a>
New York, NY, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/new_york/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/new_york/Sites.aspx</a>
Niagara Falls Storage Site Vicinity Properties, NY, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/niagara/vicinity/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/niagara/vicinity/Sites.aspx</a>
Oak Ridge, TN, Warehouses Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/oakridge/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/oakridge/Sites.aspx</a>
Oxford, OH, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/oxford/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/oxford/Sites.aspx</a>
Oxnard, CA, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/oxnard/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/oxnard/Sites.aspx</a>
San Diego, CA, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/general_atomic/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/general_atomic/Sites.aspx</a>
Seymour, CT, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/seymour/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/seymour/Sites.aspx</a>
Springdale, PA, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/springdale/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/springdale/Sites.aspx</a>
Sunol, CA, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Vallecitos/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Vallecitos/Sites.aspx</a>
Toledo, OH, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/toledo/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/toledo/Sites.aspx</a>
Tonawanda North, NY, Site Unit 1 <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/tonawanda/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/tonawanda/Sites.aspx</a>
Tonawanda North, NY, Site Unit 2 <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/tonawanda/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/tonawanda/Sites.aspx</a>
Wayne, NJ, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/wayne/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/wayne/Sites.aspx</a>



**Table 2: Category 2 Sites**

(Typically involves routine inspection and maintenance, records-related activities, and stakeholder support)

Site Name	Type of Data Collected					Where Data Is Reported				
	Inspection	Groundwater and/or Surface Water Monitoring	Production Water and Gas Monitoring	Air Monitoring	Other Environmental Monitoring (biological, soil, etc.)	Site Inspection Report	CERCLA Five-Year Review Report	Annual Site Inspection and Monitoring Report for UMRCA Title I or Title II Sites	Environmental Monitoring Report *	GEMS**
<b>UMTRCA Sites</b>										
Ambrosia Lake, NM, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Ambrosia/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Ambrosia/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Bluewater, NM, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/bluewater/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/bluewater/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Burrell, PA, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/burrell/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/burrell/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Canonsburg, PA, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/canonsburg/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/canonsburg/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Durango, CO, Processing Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Durango/Processing/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Durango/Processing/Sites.aspx</a>		x							x	x
Durango, CO, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Durango/Disposal/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Durango/Disposal/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Edgemont, SD, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/edgemont/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/edgemont/Sites.aspx</a>	x							x		x
Falls City, TX, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/falls/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/falls/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Green River, UT, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/green_river/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/green_river/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Gunnison, CO, Processing Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Gunnison/Processing/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Gunnison/Processing/Sites.aspx</a>		x							x	x
Gunnison, CO, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Gunnison/Disposal/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Gunnison/Disposal/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Lakeview, OR, Processing Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Lakeview/Processing/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Lakeview/Processing/Sites.aspx</a>		x							x	x
Lakeview, OR, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Lakeview/Disposal/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Lakeview/Disposal/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
L-Bar, NM, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Lbar/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Lbar/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Lowman, ID, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/lowman/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/lowman/Sites.aspx</a>	x							x		x
Maybell, CO, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Maybell/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Maybell/Sites.aspx</a>	x							x		x
Maybell West, CO, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Maybell_West/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Maybell_West/Sites.aspx</a>	x							x		x
Mexican Hat, UT, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Mexican_Hat/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Mexican_Hat/Sites.aspx</a>	x							x		x
Monument Valley, AZ, Processing Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/MonValley/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/MonValley/Sites.aspx</a>		x			x				x	x

**Table 2: Category 2 Sites**

(Typically involves routine inspection and maintenance, records-related activities, and stakeholder support)

Site Name	Type of Data Collected					Where Data Is Reported				
	Inspection	Groundwater and/or Surface Water Monitoring	Production Water and Gas Monitoring	Air Monitoring	Other Environmental Monitoring (biological, soil, etc.)	Site Inspection Report	CERCLA Five-Year Review Report	Annual Site Inspection and Monitoring Report for UMRCA Title I or Title II Sites	Environmental Monitoring Report *	GEMS**
Naturita, CO, Processing Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Naturita/Processing/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Naturita/Processing/Sites.aspx</a>		x							x	x
Naturita, CO, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Naturita/Disposal/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Naturita/Disposal/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Rifle, CO, Processing (Old) Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rifle/Old_Processing/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rifle/Old_Processing/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x							x	x
Rifle, CO, Processing (New) Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rifle/New_Processing/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rifle/New_Processing/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x							x	x
Rifle, CO, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rifle/Disposal/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rifle/Disposal/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Riverton, WY, Processing Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Riverton/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Riverton/Sites.aspx</a>		x							x	x
Salt Lake City, UT, Processing Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Salt_Lake/Processing/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Salt_Lake/Processing/Sites.aspx</a>										x
Salt Lake City, UT, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Salt_Lake/Disposal/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Salt_Lake/Disposal/Sites.aspx</a>	x							x		x
Sherwood, WA, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/sherwood/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/sherwood/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x			x			x	x	x
Shirley Basin South, WY, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Shirley_Basin/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Shirley_Basin/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x						x	x	x
Slick Rock, CO, Processing Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Slick_Rock/Processing/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Slick_Rock/Processing/Sites.aspx</a>		x							x	x
Slick Rock, CO, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Slick_Rock/Disposal/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Slick_Rock/Disposal/Sites.aspx</a>	x							x		x
Spook, WY, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Spook/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Spook/Sites.aspx</a>	x							x		x
<b>Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&amp;D)</b>										
BONUS, PR, Decommissioned Reactor, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/bonus/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/bonus/Sites.aspx</a>	x					x				x
Grand Junction, CO, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Grand_Junction/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Grand_Junction/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x				x			x	x
Hallam, NE, Decommissioned Reactor Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/hallam/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/hallam/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x				x			x	x
Piqua, OH, Decommissioned Reactor Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Piqua/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Piqua/Sites.aspx</a>	x					x				x
Site A/Plot M, IL, Decommissioned Reactor Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/SiteA_PlotM/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/SiteA_PlotM/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x				x			x	x

**Table 2: Category 2 Sites**

(Typically involves routine inspection and maintenance, records-related activities, and stakeholder support)

Site Name	Type of Data Collected					Where Data Is Reported				
	Inspection	Groundwater and/or Surface Water Monitoring	Production Water and Gas Monitoring	Air Monitoring	Other Environmental Monitoring (biological, soil, etc.)	Site Inspection Report	CERCLA Five-Year Review Report	Annual Site Inspection and Monitoring Report for UMRCA Title I or Title II Sites	Environmental Monitoring Report *	GEMS**
<b>Other</b>										
Amchitka, AK, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Amchitka/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Amchitka/Sites.aspx</a>	x				x				x	x
Central Nevada Test Area, NV, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/CNTA/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/CNTA/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x				x			x	x
Chariot, AK, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/chariot/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/chariot/Sites.aspx</a>										
Gasbuggy, NM, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Gasbuggy/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Gasbuggy/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x	x						x	x
Gnome-Coach, NM, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Gnome/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Gnome/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x				x			x	x
Parkersburg, WV, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/parkersburg/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/parkersburg/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x				x			x	x
Rio Blanco, CO, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rio_Blanco/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rio_Blanco/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x	x						x	x
Rulison, CO, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rulison/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rulison/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x	x						x	x
Salmon, MS, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/salmon/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/salmon/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x				x			x	x
Shoal, NV, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Shoal/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Shoal/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x							x	x
<b>FUSRAP Sites</b>										
New Brunswick, NJ, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/New_Brunswick/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/New_Brunswick/Sites.aspx</a>	x								x	
<b>CERCLA/RCRA Sites</b>										
Davis, CA, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/LEHR/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/LEHR/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x					x		x	x

\*Types of Environmental Monitoring Reports include

- Data Validation Packages
- Verification Monitoring Reports
- Groundwater Monitoring Reports
- Post-Closure Inspection and Monitoring Reports
- Hydrologic and Natural Gas Sampling and Analysis Reports
- Protectiveness Certification sent to State of New Jersey based on biennial inspection of New Brunswick site.

\*\* GEMS—Geospatial Environmental Mapping System: Designed to provide dynamic mapping and environmental monitoring data display for sites managed by LM. Site-specific data are available via GEMS on the site webpage.

**Table 3: Category 3 Sites**

(Typically involves operation and maintenance of remedial action system, routine inspection and maintenance, records-related activities, and stakeholder support)

Site Name	Type of Data Collected					Where Data is Reported						
	Inspection	Groundwater and/or Surface Water Monitoring Data	Discharge Monitoring	Other Environmental Monitoring (biological, soil, etc.)	Chemical inventories****	Annual Site Inspection Report	CERCLA Five-Year Report	Annual Title I or Title II Compliance Report	EPCRA Report	NPDES Report	Environmental Monitoring Report*	GEMS**
<b>UMTRCA Sites</b>												
Grand Junction, CO, Processing Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Grand_Junction_DP/Processing/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Grand_Junction_DP/Processing/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x									x	x
Grand Junction, CO, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Grand_Junction_DP/Disposal/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Grand_Junction_DP/Disposal/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x			x			x	x		x	x
Shiprock, NM, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Shiprock/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Shiprock/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x		x				x			x	x
Tuba City, AZ, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Tuba/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Tuba/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x	x		x			x	x		x	x
<b>CERCLA/RCRA Sites</b>												
Fernald, OH, Site*** <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Fernald/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Fernald/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x
Monticello, UT, Processing Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Monticello/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Monticello/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x	x			x	x				x	x
Monticello, UT, Disposal Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Monticello/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Monticello/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x	x			x	x				x	x
Miamisburg, OH, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Mound/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Mound/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x
Pinellas County, FL, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/pinellas/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/pinellas/Sites.aspx</a>		x			x						x	x
Rocky Flats, CO, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rocky_Flats/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Rocky_Flats/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x		x	x	x	x				x	x
Weldon Spring, MO, Site <a href="http://www.lm.doe.gov/Weldon/Sites.aspx">http://www.lm.doe.gov/Weldon/Sites.aspx</a>	x	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x

\*Types of Environmental Monitoring Reports include

- Data Validation Packages
- Verification Monitoring Reports
- Groundwater Monitoring Reports
- Hydrologic and Natural Gas Sampling and Analysis Reports
- Federal Facility Agreement Quarterly Reports

\*\* GEMS – Geospatial Environmental Mapping System: Designed to provide dynamic mapping and environmental monitoring data display for sites managed by the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Legacy Management. Site-specific data is available via GEMS on the respective site webpage.

\*\*\* This site has an Annual Site Environmental Report.

\*\*\*\* Certain sites conduct chemical inventories to ensure compliance with EPCRA.

This page intentionally left blank