



U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Legacy Management

**ANNUAL SITE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT
CALENDAR YEAR 2005**

for the

LABORATORY FOR ENERGY-RELATED HEALTH RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

Submitted to:

SM Stoller Corporation
2597 B $\frac{3}{4}$ Road
Grand Junction, Colorado 81503

Prepared by:

Weiss Associates
5801 Christie Avenue, Suite 600
Emeryville, California 94608-1827

September 28, 2006
Rev. 0

ANNUAL SITE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT
CALENDAR YEAR 2005

for the

LABORATORY FOR ENERGY-RELATED HEALTH RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

Submitted to:

SM Stoller Corporation
2597 B ³/₄ Road
Grand Junction, Colorado 81503

Prepared by:

Weiss Associates
5801 Christie Avenue, Suite 600
Emeryville, California 94608-1827

September 28, 2006
Rev. 0

Issued To: _____ Date: _____

Copy No.: _____ Controlled Uncontrolled

Approvals Page

ANNUAL SITE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT
CALENDAR YEAR 2005

for the
LABORATORY FOR ENERGY-RELATED HEALTH RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

Submitted to:


SM Stoller Corporation
2597 B ³/₄ Road
Grand Junction, Colorado 81503

Prepared by:

Weiss Associates
5801 Christie Avenue, Suite 600
Emeryville, California 94608-1827

September 28, 2006
Rev. 0

Approved by:



Robert O. Devany, R.G., C.E.G., C.H.G.
Project Manager
Weiss Associates

Date:

9/28/06



**Department of Energy
Office of Legacy Management**

DISTRIBUTION

Dear Sir or Madam,

The 2005 Laboratory for Energy Related Health Research (LEHR) Annual Site Environmental Report (ASER) has been prepared and is available to the public. The ASER summarizes the environmental management performance at LEHR for calendar year 2005. ASER's are prepared annually for all DOE sites conducting significant environmental activities and are distributed to relevant regulatory agencies and other interested parties.

To the best of my knowledge, the 2005 LEHR ASER accurately summarizes results for the 2005 Monitoring Program and Restorations Program at LEHR. This assurance is based upon a thorough review of the data collected at LEHR.

The ASER has limited hard copy distribution and will be available electronically at <http://www.lm.doe.gov/land/sites/ca/lehr/lehr.htm>. Please provide your comments or suggestions for future versions of the report using the enclosed reader survey form. Additionally, your questions or comments on this report may be made directly to me at (304) 285-4579.


Sincerely,

Vijendra Kothari
LEHR Project Manager

CERTIFICATION OF ACCURACY FOR:

**ANNUAL SITE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT, CALENDAR YEAR 2005,
LABORATORY FOR ENERGY-RELATED HEALTH RESEARCH**

I certify that the information submitted herein is true, accurate, and complete, based on my familiarity with the information and my inquiry of those individuals immediately responsible for obtaining the information.

Signature:  Date: 9/28/06
Robert O. Devany, Senior Project Manager

ANNUAL SITE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT READER SURVEY

To Our Readers:

Each Annual Site Environmental Report publishes the results of environmental monitoring at the former Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research (LEHR) and documents our compliance with environmental regulations. In providing this information, our goal is to give our readership—whether they are regulators, scientists or the public—a clear accounting of the range of environmental activities we undertake, the methods we employ and the degree of accuracy of our results.

It is important that the information we provide is easily understood, is of interest, and communicates the Department of Energy's effort to protect human health and the environment. We would like to know from you, our readers, whether we are successful in these goals. Your comments are welcome.

- | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Is the technical level | <input type="checkbox"/> too high? | <input type="checkbox"/> too low? | <input type="checkbox"/> uneven? | <input type="checkbox"/> just right? |
| 2. Is the writing | <input type="checkbox"/> too concise? | <input type="checkbox"/> too verbose? | <input type="checkbox"/> uneven? | <input type="checkbox"/> just right? |
| | | | Yes | No |
| 3. Do the illustrations help you understand the text better? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Are there enough illustrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Is the background information sufficient? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| 4. Are the methodologies being described understandable? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Interesting? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| 5. Are the data tables of interest? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Do they provide sufficient information? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

Other comments:

A business reply envelope has been attached for returning these surveys to Vijendra Kothari, DOE, 610 Collins Ferry Road, Morgantown, WV 26507.

OPTIONAL

Name: _____ Occupation _____

Address: _____

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
1. INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 Site History	1-1
1.2 Site Management	1-2
1.3 Environmental Restoration	1-2
1.4 Site Description	1-3
1.5 Population Data	1-3
1.5.1 Site Population	1-3
1.5.2 Local Population	1-4
1.6 Environmental Setting	1-4
1.6.1 Land Use	1-4
1.6.2 Hydrogeology	1-4
1.6.3 Ground Water Supply and Quality	1-6
1.6.4 Sanitary Sewer Systems	1-6
1.6.5 Storm Drainage System	1-6
1.6.6 Biological Resources	1-6
2. COMPLIANCE SUMMARY	2-1
2.1 Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	2-1
2.1.1 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act as Amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act	2-1
2.1.2 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act	2-2
2.1.3 Federal Facilities Compliance Act	2-2
2.1.4 National Environmental Policy Act	2-2
2.1.5 Toxic Substances Control Act	2-2
2.1.6 Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act	2-3
2.2 Radiation Protection	2-3

2.2.1	Occupational Radiation Protection, (10 CFR Part 835)	2-3
2.2.2	DOE Order 5400.5, Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment	2-3
2.2.3	DOE Order 450.1, Environmental Protection Program	2-4
2.2.4	DOE Order 435.1, Radioactive Waste Management	2-4
2.3	Air Quality and Protection	2-4
2.3.1	Clean Air Act	2-4
2.3.2	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants	2-5
2.4	Water Quality and Protection	2-5
2.4.1	Clean Water Act	2-5
2.4.2	Drinking Water Requirements	2-6
2.5	Other Environmental Statutes	2-6
2.5.1	Endangered Species Act	2-6
2.5.2	National Historic Preservation Act	2-7
2.5.3	Migratory Bird Treaty	2-7
2.6	Executive Orders	2-7
2.6.1	Executive Order 13148, "Greening the Government through Leadership in Environmental Management"	2-7
2.6.2	Executive Order 11988, "Floodplain Management"	2-8
2.6.3	Executive Order 11990, "Protection of Wetlands"	2-8
2.7	Other Major Environmental Issues and Actions	2-8
2.8	Continuous Release Reporting	2-9
2.9	Unplanned Releases	2-9
2.10	Summary of Permits	2-9
3.	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	3-1
3.1	Environmental Management Policy and System Elements	3-1
3.2	Pollution Prevention and Waste Minimization	3-2
3.2.1	Recycling	3-3
3.3	Environmental Monitoring and Surveillance	3-3
3.3.1	Pre-Operational Monitoring	3-3
3.3.2	Surface and Storm Water Monitoring	3-4
3.3.3	Ground Water Monitoring	3-5
3.3.4	Air Monitoring	3-5
3.3.5	Environmental Dosimetry	3-6

3.4	Protection of Biota	3-6
3.5	Training	3-7
4.	ENVIRONMENTAL RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION PROGRAM INFORMATION	4-1
4.1	Radiological Discharges and Doses	4-1
4.1.1	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Dose Estimation Calculations	4-1
4.2	Radiological Soil Measurements	4-2
4.3	Release of Property Containing Residual Radioactive Material	4-2
4.4	Radiological Surface and Storm Water Monitoring	4-3
4.4.1	Surface Water Monitoring	4-3
4.4.2	Storm Water Monitoring	4-3
4.5	Ambient Radiation Monitoring Program	4-3
5.	ENVIRONMENTAL NON-RADIOLOGICAL PROGRAM INFORMATION	5-1
5.1	Non-Radiological Air Monitoring	5-1
5.2	Non-Radiological Soil Monitoring	5-1
5.3	Non-Radiological Surface and Storm Water Monitoring	5-1
5.3.1	Surface Water Monitoring	5-1
5.3.2	Storm Water Monitoring	5-2
5.3.3	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Data	5-2
6.	WATER MONITORING AND PUBLIC DRINKING WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM	6-1
6.1	Uses of Ground Water in the LEHR Vicinity	6-1
6.2	Potential Sources of Ground Water Pollution	6-1
6.3	Ground Water Monitoring	6-1
6.4	Off-Site Supply Well Sampling	6-2
7.	QUALITY ASSURANCE	7-1
7.1	Field Quality Assurance	7-1
7.2	Laboratory Quality Assurance	7-2

7.3	Summary of Quality Control Data Validation	7-2
8.	DEFINITIONS	8-1
9.	REFERENCES	9-1
10.	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	10-1

TABLES

Table 2-1.	Status of Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act Reporting
Table 4-1.	LEHR Radiological Dose Reporting Table for Calendar Year 2005
Table 4-2.	On-Site Effective Dose Equivalent to Maximally Exposed Individual Resulting from Radionuclide Emissions from Each Potential Fugitive Dust Emission Non-Point Source
Table 4-3.	Summary of Estimated Collective Population Dose Resulting from Radionuclide Emissions from Each Fugitive Dust Emission Non-Point Source
Table 7-1.	Components of the LEHR Quality Control Program in Support of Data Quality Objectives

FIGURES

Figure 1-1.	Location of the LEHR Site, UC Davis, California
Figure 1-2.	Site Features and Areas of Potentially Known Contamination Source Areas
Figure 3-1.	Ground Water, Storm Water and Surface Water Monitoring Locations

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

µg/L	micrograms per liter
BEI	Bechtel Environmental, Inc.
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
D&M	Dames & Moore
DOE	United States Department of Energy
DOG	State of California Division of Oil and Gas
DWR	State of California Department of Water Resources
E	east
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act
HSU	hydrostratigraphic unit
IT Corp.	IT Corporation
km	kilometer
LEHR	Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research
m	meter(s)
mg/L	milligram(s) per liter
mrem	millirem(s)
mrem/yr	millirem(s) per year
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheet
mSv	milliSievert(s)
N	north
N/A	not applicable
NNE	north by northeast
NNW	north by northwest
No.	number
NW	northwest
NWT	New World Technology

PCD	Putah Creek, Downstream
PCU	Putah Creek, Upstream
person-rem/yr	person-Roentgen equivalent man per year
rem	Roentgen equivalent man
S	south
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
STPO	sewage treatment plant outfall
Sv	Sievert
UC Davis	University of California, Davis
USCB	United States Census Bureau
US EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
W	west
Weiss	Weiss Associates

DISTRIBUTION

California Department of Energy

Barbara J. Byron
Executive Office
1516 Ninth Street/MS-36
Sacramento, CA 95814

California Environmental Protection Agency

Steven Ross
Department of Toxic Substances Control
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826-3200

California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Susan Timm
Central Valley Region
11020 Sun Center Drive #200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6114

California State Water Resources Control Board

Darrin Polhemus
Division of Water Quality
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

California Department of Health Services

Stephen Pay
Radiologic Health Branch
1500 Capitol Ave., MS 7610
Sacramento, CA 95814-5006

Davis South Campus Superfund Oversight Committee

Julie Roth
Route 2, Box 2879
Davis, CA 95616

Davis South Campus Superfund Oversight Committee

Mary Rust
950 W. Chiles Road
Davis, CA 95616

Davis South Campus Superfund Oversight Committee

G. Fred Lee
G. Fred Lee & Associates
27298 E. El Macero Drive
El Macero, CA 95618-1005

Center for Health and the Environment

Kent Pinkerton, Director
University of California
Old Davis Road
One Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616-8615

Solano County Environmental Health Department

Ricardo M. Serrano
675 Texas Street, Suite 5500
Fairfield, CA 94533

University of California, Davis EH&S

Susan Fields
One Shields Drive
Davis, CA 95616

U.S. Department of Energy

Office of Scientific and Technical Information
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Ray Hardwick

Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of
Corporate Safety and Assurance
EH-2/ Forrestal Bldg.
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Ross Natoli

Environmental Protection Specialist
EH-412/Forrestal Bldg.
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Patrice Bubar

Office of Nuclear Safety Research
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Corporate
Performance Assessment, EH-3
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Glenn S. Podonsky

Director, Office of Independent Oversight &
Performance, OA-1
U.S. Department of Energy, SP-1
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Assistant Administrator for Air & Radiation
(ANR-443)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, MC 6101A
Washington, D.C. 20460

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Michele Dineyazhe
Superfund Division SDF 8-1
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

**Yolo County Environmental Health
Department**

Bruce Sarazin
20 Cottonwood Street
Woodland, CA 95695

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Annual Site Environmental Report for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research (LEHR) or (the Site) at the University of California, Davis (UC Davis), summarizes the United States Department of Energy's (DOE's) environmental performance at the Site in 2005, including environmental compliance; environmental monitoring data for air, soil, ground water, surface water, storm water and ambient radiation; and environmental management programs. DOE operation of LEHR as a research facility ceased in 1989 after three decades of research on the health effects of low-level radiation exposure using primarily beagles as research subjects. Contamination from prior site use, including research activities, resulted in the addition of the Site to the National Priorities List in 1994. In 1997, DOE and UC Davis reached an agreement on the responsibilities for site clean up. During Calendar Year 2005, DOE continued activities at the Site in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) requirements.

Progress of Site Environmental Restoration

DOE site restoration activities are conducted in accordance with a 1999 Federal Facility Agreement entered into by DOE and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), California Department of Toxic Substances Control, California Department of Health Services and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Under the Federal Facility Agreement, DOE is responsible for remediation of site facilities, including the Radium-226/Strontium-90 Treatment Systems, the DOE Disposal Box, on-site domestic septic systems, DOE disposal trenches and the former Dog Pens (Figure 1-2). Under an Administrative Order on Consent with the US EPA, UC Davis is responsible for remediation of three landfills, disposal trenches located south and east of Landfill Number 2, a disposal trench located south of the Western Dog Pens, an old waste water treatment plant and impacted ground water (Figure 1-2) (US EPA, 2000).

DOE activities at the Site in 2005 included only routine storm water sampling and periodic inspections. Having completed all planned removal actions, DOE is in the process of determining a final remedy for the Site that is protective of human health and the environment. The following documents were prepared in 2005:

- **Facilities Transfer:** DOE transferred control and ownership of all LEHR buildings and utilities to UC Davis.
- **Site-Wide Risk Assessment Volume I: Human Health Risk Assessment (Part B – Risk Characterization for DOE Areas):** Preparation of this draft document began in late 2004. The final risk characterization document was issued and approved in 2005 and served as a basis for the CERCLA feasibility study for the DOE areas.

- **Feasibility Study:** A draft feasibility study report, which evaluates remedial alternatives for the DOE areas, was developed in 2005, and completed and issued for review to the regulatory agencies in February 2006.
- **Site-Wide Risk Assessment Volume II: Ecological Risk Assessment:** The draft site-wide ecological risk assessment developed in 2004 was revised in 2005 and finalized in August 2006. It concludes that residual contamination at the Site is not a concern for ecological receptors.

Overview of 2005 Water and Air Environmental Monitoring Results

Per the Memorandum of Agreement with DOE (DOE, 1997), UC Davis is responsible for conducting ground water monitoring at LEHR. A report developed by Brown & Caldwell for UC Davis (Brown & Caldwell, 2006) provides a complete description of the ground water monitoring program and analytical results for 2005. Based on the findings presented by UC Davis, the 2005 ground water monitoring results were consistent with results from previous years.

UC Davis also reported that storm water and surface water samples collected and analyzed in 2005 were consistent with results from previous years, and no new trends or concerns were identified.

Radiological Impact Assessment of the LEHR Environmental Restoration Project

No ground disturbing or other activities that might release radiological material to the environment were conducted by DOE in 2005. The National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants evaluation indicated that ambient radionuclide activities were near or below natural background levels, and do not pose a risk the general public.

1. INTRODUCTION

This Annual Site Environmental Report describes Calendar Year 2005 United States Department of Energy's (DOE's), environmental restoration and waste management activities at the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research (LEHR) (the Site) at the University of California, Davis (UC Davis) (Figure 1-1). This report was prepared according to the requirements of DOE Order 231.1A, Environmental Safety and Health Reporting. The purpose of this report is to summarize environmental data, confirm compliance with environmental standards and requirements, and highlight significant programs and efforts. This report describes activities conducted by DOE during 2005 in support of the Site environmental restoration efforts, and provides information about the impact of these activities on the public and the environment. A ground, surface and storm water monitoring program performed by UC Davis includes information important to the overall environmental restoration of the Site and is briefly summarized herein.

1.1 Site History

The Atomic Energy Commission first sponsored radiological studies on laboratory animals at UC Davis in the early 1950s. Initially situated on the main campus, LEHR was relocated to its present location in 1958 (Figure 1-1). Research at LEHR through the late 1980s focused on health effects from chronic exposure to radionuclides, primarily strontium-90 and radium-226, using beagles as research subjects. Other related research was conducted at the Site concurrent with these long-term studies. In the early 1970s, a cobalt-60 irradiator facility was constructed at the Site to study the effects of chronic exposure to gamma radiation on humans, again using beagles.

A campus landfill with two waste burial units that were used from the 1940s until the mid-1960s is located at the Site (Figure 1-2). Several low-level radioactive waste burial areas were also present at the Site, and campus and LEHR research waste was buried in these areas until 1974 in accordance with regulations in effect at the time. The principle environmental threats posed by these radioactive burial areas have been mitigated during several removal actions conducted at the Site since 1996.

In 1988, pursuant to the Memorandum of Agreement between DOE and the University of California, DOE's Office of Energy Research initiated activities to close out the research program at LEHR. In 1997, a second Memorandum of Agreement divided the responsibility for environmental remediation between DOE and UC Davis (DOE, 1997).

Under the Federal Facility Agreement effective in December 1999, DOE is responsible for remediation of the Radium/Strontium Treatment Systems, a waste burial area known as the DOE Disposal Box, on-site domestic septic tanks and associated leach fields and dry wells, DOE disposal

trenches and the former Dog Pens (Figure 1-2). UC Davis is responsible for remediation of three landfills, disposal trenches located south and east of Landfill Number (No.) 2, 49 waste holes, an old waste water treatment plant, ground water impacted by the Site, and surface and storm water runoff impacted by UC Davis.

DOE activities at the Site in 2005 were limited to Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) document development. DOE field activities in 2005 were limited to environmental monitoring. No site remediation activities were conducted by DOE or its contractors in 2005

1.2 Site Management

Restoration of the Site began in October 1989 and through February 1990, it was managed under an interim contract with UC Davis. From 1990 to 1996, Battelle Environmental Management Operations managed the LEHR remediation project. In 1996, the project was transferred to Weiss Associates of Emeryville, California, who managed all aspects of the project. From late 2003 to 2005, site activities were managed by New World Technology. In 2005, management of the environmental restoration of the DOE-impacted areas at the Site was transferred from the DOE Oakland Operations Office to the DOE Office of Legacy Management. The Office of Legacy Management contracted S. M. Stoller Corporation to oversee management of the Site, and S. M. Stoller Corporation subcontracted Weiss Associates to perform environmental engineering and tasks for the Site.

1.3 Environmental Restoration

In May 1994, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) added the Site to the National Priorities List. A site remedial investigation and feasibility study work plan was developed to ensure that investigation and remediation were conducted in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. Remedial Project Manager meetings are held every four to six weeks to evaluate the progress of remediation and identify actions needed to facilitate the process.

Primary DOE restoration/remediation activities that have been performed at the Site include: soil and ground water characterization; building assessment; decontamination and decommissioning of above-ground structures; removal of contaminated underground tanks, trench structures and contaminated soil; chemical and radiological risk assessment; preparation of CERCLA documents; and waste management. In 2002, DOE completed all removal actions planned for the Site and, in 2004, shipped the remaining waste generated during these removal actions for disposal.

In 2005, UC Davis issued a revised draft human health risk assessment, which DOE used to develop a risk characterization report for the DOE areas that evaluated the risks of various remedial alternatives proposed for the DOE areas. The risk characterization was approved by the regulatory agencies and served as the basis for the draft feasibility study for the DOE areas. The feasibility

study report was developed in 2005 and a draft was issued for review by the regulatory agencies in February 2006. DOE is in the process of revising the feasibility study in response to comments from regulatory agencies and will issue a final document in 2006.

In 2005, the DOE submitted to the University California Office of the President the necessary documents to transfer ownership of all DOE's LEHR buildings and associated utilities to UC Davis. Title to the buildings and utilities was transferred to UC Davis by a Quitclaim Deed effective July 1, 2005.

1.4 Site Description

The Site is a 15-acre parcel owned by the Regents of the University of California. It is 1.5 miles south of the main UC Davis campus in a rural agricultural area (Figure 1-1), and is presently occupied by the UC Davis Center for Health and the Environment. Research at the Center for Health and the Environment includes toxicology, epidemiology, radiation biology and radiochemistry.

Site facilities currently consist of 15 buildings, including a main administration and office building, two former animal hospitals, a laboratory and support buildings (Figure 1-2). Former facilities include radioactive waste water treatment systems, an indoor/outdoor cobalt-60 irradiator, a radioactive waste burial area and outdoor dog pens. Inactive campus landfill units and numerous inactive campus disposal sites (i.e., trenches and holes) were used to dispose low-level radioactive and chemical waste, and are being evaluated and/or remediated by UC Davis. Figure 1-2 shows areas that have potentially impacted the environment at the Site and those areas where DOE removal actions have been completed.

1.5 Population Data

1.5.1 Site Population

The UC Davis Center for Health and the Environment conducts ongoing research in toxicology, epidemiology, radiation biology and radiochemistry with a staff of approximately 200 researchers and support personnel. Center for Health and the Environment staff have varying schedules and are not all present at the Site at the same time.

In 2005, the LEHR remediation project had no full-time workers at the Site. LEHR personnel conducted periodic site inspections and collected storm water at LEHR facilities. During these scheduled site activities, DOE contractors may have deployed up two workers to conduct and oversee site work.

1.5.2 Local Population

The Site is located in a rural area in northeastern Solano County on the UC Davis South Campus (Figure 1-1). The UC Davis campus has a student population of 30,065 and employs approximately 27,816 faculty and staff (UC Davis, 2005).

The estimated population of the city of Davis is 60,308 and the estimated total population of Yolo County is 180,856. The more densely populated and metropolitan Sacramento area is approximately 12 miles east of the Site. The current population of Sacramento County is about 1,305,082, and approximately 407,018 people live in the city of Sacramento (USCB, 2000).

1.6 Environmental Setting

The Site is located on a relatively flat plain bordered on the south by Putah Creek. The Site is mostly open, slopes gently to the east, and has a few trees and bushes. The Site lies outside the Putah Creek 100-year floodplain.

1.6.1 Land Use

The land within a one-mile radius of the Site is owned both privately and by UC Davis. It is used for animal research, agriculture and recreation (i.e., fishing and swimming). Privately-owned lands south and east of the Site are used to produce wheat, tomatoes, corn, barley and oats, and include permanent residences. The South Fork of Putah Creek separates private property to the south of the Site, and private property to the east is adjacent to non-LEHR, UC Davis-owned research facilities. The property immediately west, north and south of the Site (Putah Creek Reserve) is owned by UC Davis and is currently used for various types of animal, agricultural and health research.

1.6.2 Hydrogeology

Unconsolidated Pliocene and Pleistocene sedimentary deposits are the major ground water sources for public and private water supplies in the Sacramento Valley (DWR, 1978), in which the Site is located. Both unconfined and confined fresh water aquifers are present in the uppermost 3,000 feet of the valley subsurface. Ground water generally flows from the valley sides toward the valley axis. In the site vicinity, regional ground water generally flows east from the Coast Ranges toward the Sacramento River (D&M, 1993).

At various depths beneath the valley floor, saline water is present as a result of entrapment during the deposition of sediments in a marine environment. The depth to the base of fresh water in the Sacramento Valley varies from 400 feet to over 3,000 feet, and is 2,600 feet to 3,100 feet below ground surface in the Davis area (DOG, 1982).

Previous investigations identified five hydrostratigraphic units (HSUs) beneath the Site (D&M, 1999). These include the vadose (unsaturated) zone and HSUs 1 through 4. The vadose zone extends from the ground surface to the top of ground water, which has historically ranged from 15 feet to 55 feet below ground surface. The vadose zone consists primarily of unsaturated clay and silt with lesser amounts of interbedded sand and gravel. HSU-1 extends from the bottom of the vadose zone to depths of approximately 76 feet to 88 feet below ground surface. This unit is lithologically similar to the vadose zone and consists primarily of silt and clay, with lesser amounts of sand and gravel. HSU-2 extends from the bottom of HSU-1 to depths of approximately 114 feet to 130 feet below ground surface. This unit is composed primarily of sand in the upper portion of the unit and gravel in the middle to lower portions. HSU-3, investigated in off-site areas, extends from the bottom of HSU-2 to a depth of about 250 feet below ground surface and is approximately 120 feet thick. The unit consists primarily of relatively fine-grained sediments varying from very fine-grained sandy silt to clayey silt and silty clay. HSU-4, also investigated in off-site areas, extends from the bottom of HSU-3 to a depth of about 280 feet below ground surface and is approximately 32 feet thick. This unit consists of coarse sand and gravel. Beneath HSU-4, a sharp contact with a bluish, dark gray silt was encountered 282 feet below ground surface in wells UCD4-41 and UCD4-43 (Figure 3-1). The bottom of this unit has not been penetrated in any of the site borings (D&M, 1999).

The uppermost distinct aquifer beneath the Site consists of two HSUs (HSU-1 and HSU-2), based on the stratigraphy of the sediments at the Site and the associated ground water flow and contaminant migration characteristics. Well drillers' logs indicate that a 90-foot-thick clay unit separates HSU-2 from a second aquifer below (D&M, 1994).

Irrigation water, rainfall and Putah Creek recharge ground water in the site vicinity (D&M, 1997). The main component of ground water recharge, however, has been identified as irrigation water infiltration (Weiss, 1998b). Ground water pumping associated with agriculture is responsible for the great majority of ground water withdrawal. Locally, UC Davis extracts ground water from HSU-2 and re-injects treated ground water near the southwest corner of the Site as part of its interim remedial action.

Generally, there is a 20- to 30-foot seasonal fluctuation in the water table beneath the Site caused predominantly by the lack of surface recharge and nearby agricultural pumping in the summer. Vertical gradients vary both temporally and spatially. The magnitude of the vertical gradient is greatest when ground water elevations are rising or falling sharply. Short-term activities, such as local agricultural pumping, can produce downward vertical gradients during periods of an otherwise rising water table.

The HSU-1 lateral gradient across the Site typically ranges from 0.01 feet/foot to 0.04 feet/foot, and the direction of ground water flow is predominantly northeastern. Representative values of HSU-1 horizontal hydraulic conductivity are between 1×10^{-4} and 1×10^{-7} centimeters per second (D&M, 1999). The lateral gradient across the Site within HSU-2 typically ranges from 0.005 feet/foot to 0.015 feet/foot. The direction of flow appears to be predominantly to the northeast, although it can occasionally be to the east-southeast. Based on pumping tests, hydraulic conductivity in HSU-2 ranges from 0.26 centimeters per second to 0.43 centimeters per second (D&M, 1997).

Ground water in HSU-1, HSU-2 and HSU-4 has been impacted by site activities. Based on investigations to date (Weiss, 1997c and Weiss, 1999a), significant ground water impacts appear to be associated only with the UC Davis disposal areas.

1.6.3 Ground Water Supply and Quality

Ground water at depths between approximately 100 and 500 feet in the site vicinity is used for agricultural and domestic supply. Shallow ground water quality, at depths above 100 feet, has been impacted by nitrates, probably from agricultural sources, and has insufficient yield that precludes its extraction for domestic or agricultural use.

1.6.4 Sanitary Sewer Systems

The Site discharges its sanitary waste water to the UC Davis Campus Waste Water Treatment Plant. UC Davis operates the plant under the conditions specified in its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, granted by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board under agreement with the US EPA.

1.6.5 Storm Drainage System

Storm water runoff from the DOE areas at the Site is mainly collected in an underground drainage system. Storm water from the paved area in the western part of the Site and around the southern buildings in the western area is collected in a storm water drainage system. This system drains to the site storm water lift station (LS-1 shown on Figure 3-1) and then to an outfall along the west side of Old Davis Road. Storm water in the northwestern area of the Site drains into a ditch along Old Davis Road. Storm water in the eastern and non-paved southern portions of the Site percolates into the ground, except for a section of the former Cobalt-60 Field where dog pens were once located and where drainage is connected to the sanitary sewer. Water ponds in some areas of the Site during and after heavy rains.

1.6.6 Biological Resources

A number of sensitive biological resources were identified in an Ecological Scoping Assessment (Weiss, 1997b) as potentially occurring in the vicinity of the Site. These species include the Giant Garter Snake, the Northern Harrier, the Coopers Hawk, the California Horned Lark, the Great Egret, the Burrowing Owl and the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle, which lives in elderberry bushes. Although elderberry bushes are present at the Site, a focused biosurvey (IT Corp., 1998) found no sensitive species actually present on site and concluded that the on-site elderberry bushes are not currently hosting the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle.

A draft ecological risk assessment evaluating the impact of residual site contamination on ecological resources was issued in 2004 and revised in 2005. A final assessment was issued by UC Davis and approved by regulatory agencies in August 2006. It concludes that residual contamination at the Site is not a concern for ecological receptors.




Figure 1-1. Location of the LEHR Site, UC Davis, California

Weiss Associates



Figure 1-2. Site Features and Areas of Potentially Known Contamination Source Areas

Weiss Associates

2. COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

This section summarizes LEHR's environmental regulatory compliance status during the environmental restoration and waste management activities conducted in Calendar Year 2005. No violations, fines or penalties were issued for the Site in 2005.

2.1 Environmental Restoration and Waste Management

Environmental restoration and waste management activities at LEHR were conducted in compliance with CERCLA and the National Contingency Plan, and include compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements and DOE Orders, as described below.

2.1.1 *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act as Amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act*

In 1995, a streamlined remediation process was initiated at the Site using the CERCLA non-time critical removal action approach. This approach enables expedited response to contamination problems without requiring the time-consuming investigations and preparation of lengthy documents required otherwise. By 2003, DOE had finished all removal actions planned for the LEHR site.

In 2004, UC Davis developed draft site-wide human health and ecological risk assessments (each comprised of a risk estimate and a risk characterization component). The human health risk estimate was finalized in 2005 and served as a basis for DOE's human health risk characterization of the DOE areas. Also in 2005, separate human health and ecological risk assessments were conducted by DOE to evaluate the potential risks associated with reuse in the Western Dog Pens of soil that had been removed from the Southwest Trenches area. In 2005, DOE issued a risk characterization for the DOE areas based on the site-wide human health risk characterization. The human health risk estimate and characterization for the DOE areas and the human health and ecological risk assessments for the Western Dog Pens formed the basis for selection of contaminants of concern to be evaluated in a feasibility study report, with the understanding that the final site-wide ecological risk assessment would be issued and approved after the draft feasibility study for the DOE areas was completed. The draft feasibility study for the DOE areas was developed in 2005 and issued for review by regulatory agencies in February 2006. For most DOE areas alternatives including no further action, long term ground water monitoring, excavation, bioremediation and land-use restrictions were evaluated.

The site-wide ecological risk assessment was revised by UC Davis in 2005 and 2006 and finalized in August 2006. The assessment concludes that residual contamination at the Site is not a concern for ecological receptors. The results of the site-wide ecological risk assessment will be incorporated into the revised feasibility study expected to be finalized and approved in early 2007.

2.1.2 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

No hazardous waste requiring compliance with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act was generated, managed, shipped or disposed in 2005. DOE plans to present the preferred remedial alternatives to the public in 2007.

2.1.3 Federal Facilities Compliance Act

The Federal Facilities Compliance Act amends the Solid Waste Disposal Act and states that all federal agencies are subject to all substantive and procedural requirements of federal, state, and local solid and hazardous waste laws in the same manner as any private party. The act requires that a site treatment plan be prepared for each DOE site that generates or stores mixed radioactive waste. A final site treatment plan for LEHR was approved and issued in October 1995. No revisions have been made to this plan. The Site continues to be in compliance with the Federal Facilities Compliance Act.

2.1.4 National Environmental Policy Act

Consistent with DOE policy and guidance, environmental considerations of proposed actions are evaluated concurrent with CERCLA studies, such as feasibility studies. The integration of National Environmental Policy Act requirements with the CERCLA process eliminates the need for a separate National Environmental Policy Act analysis and streamlines the cleanup process. The draft feasibility study for the DOE areas developed in 2005 and issued for review in February 2006 included an environmental assessment in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

2.1.5 Toxic Substances Control Act

Concern over the toxicity and persistence in the environment of polychlorinated biphenyls led Congress in 1976 to enact Section 6(e) of the Toxic Substances Control Act that included, among other things, prohibitions on the manufacture, processing, and distribution in commerce of polychlorinated biphenyls. The Toxic Substances Control Act legislates management of polychlorinated biphenyls from manufacture to disposal. No polychlorinated biphenyl-containing material or waste was generated, managed or disposed in 2005.

2.1.6 *Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act*

The US EPA, under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, regulates the sales, distribution, and use of pesticides by requiring their registration. Registration includes approval by the US EPA of the pesticide's label, which must give detailed instructions for its safe use. The US EPA must classify each pesticide as either "general use," "restricted use," or both. Only registered general use herbicides are applied at the Site by the UC Davis Agricultural Services Department to control weeds. The herbicides are used in accordance with the safe use instructions and in compliance with UC Davis campus requirements, and local, state and federal laws.

2.2 **Radiation Protection**

Under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, DOE has the responsibility of controlling the activities of its contractors and operations in a manner that protects the public and the environment from radiation hazards associated with its operations. Title 10 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 835, Occupational Radiation Protection provides implementing regulations applicable to DOE.

In 2005, all activities at the Site were conducted in compliance with Title 10 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 835, Occupational Radiation Protection, and applicable DOE Orders, as discussed below.

2.2.1 *Occupational Radiation Protection, (10 CFR Part 835)*

All work at LEHR is performed in compliance with the *Final Radiological Protection Program* (Weiss, 1999b) and the *Final As-Low-As-Reasonably-Achievable Plan* (Weiss, 2001a), which comply with Title 10 CFR Part 835. The Radiological Protection Program and the As-Low-As-Reasonably-Achievable Plan require that all work performed at LEHR be conducted in a manner that protects the public and the environment from radiological hazards.

In addition to the Radiological Protection Program and the As-Low-As-Reasonably-Achievable Plan, the LEHR Quality Assurance Project Plan (Weiss, 2000b) requires that environmental monitoring aspects of all operations and activities at LEHR be addressed in the work plans developed for specific activities. All activities at LEHR complied with the Radiological Protection Program, the As-Low-As-Reasonably-Achievable Plan and the LEHR Quality Assurance Project Plan in 2005.

2.2.2 *DOE Order 5400.5, Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment*

The *Final Report on the Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment* (Weiss, 2001h) was developed in 2001. The purpose of this report was to evaluate LEHR operations

and document their compliance with DOE Order 5400.5, Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment. LEHR operations continued to be in compliance with DOE Order 5400.5 in 2005.

2.2.3 DOE Order 450.1, Environmental Protection Program

In 2001, the *Final Environmental Protection Program* (Weiss, 2001e) was developed, which defines environmental protection activities and monitoring conducted at LEHR, including radiological controls and monitoring requirements. This program complies with DOE Order 5400.1, which was subsequently replaced by DOE Order 450.1, Environmental Protection Program. Activities conducted at LEHR in 2005 were in compliance with the Environmental Protection Program.

2.2.4 DOE Order 435.1, Radioactive Waste Management

The comprehensive Radioactive Waste Management Basis (Weiss, 2001g) and Radioactive Waste Management Plan (Weiss, 2001d) were developed and approved in 2001, and at that time existing standard operating procedures for waste management were updated to meet the requirements of DOE Order 435.1. By 2005, all legacy radioactive waste had been removed from the Site, so no waste management activities were carried out in 2005. If future activities generate radioactive waste, the waste will be managed in compliance with the Radioactive Waste Management Basis (Weiss, 2001g) and Radioactive Waste Management Plan (Weiss, 2001d), and will be conducted in a manner that protects the public, the workers and the environment from radiological hazards.

2.3 Air Quality and Protection

2.3.1 Clean Air Act

Under the Clean Air Act, the US EPA defined six criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, lead, ozone, particulate matter and sulfur dioxide, and set National Ambient Air Quality Standards for these pollutants. Of these, the only air pollutant emitted at the Site is particulate matter with aerodynamic size less than or equal to 10 micrometers from uncovered soils in the Eastern and Western Dog Pens. The Site is not a major source of air emissions.

In 2005, the Site was in compliance with all Clean Air Act requirements administered by the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District. Ambient air monitoring was routinely conducted between 1995 and 2001 by DOE. This prior data and current post-removal action site conditions indicate that surface soil contamination does not impact air quality at the Site.

2.3.2 *National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants*

Subpart H of Title 40 CFR Part 61 protects the public and the environment from the hazards of radionuclide emissions, other than radon, from DOE facilities. It sets a limit on the emission of radionuclides that ensures that no member of the public in any year receives an effective dose equivalent of more than 10 millirems per year (mrem/yr).

The National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants requirements primarily target point-source/stack emissions. There are currently no point sources of radionuclide emissions at the Site. However, the Memorandum of Understanding between DOE and the US EPA (DOE, 1995) applies the point-source criteria to potential diffuse area sources at the Site.

The 2005 estimated dose to the public from the Site's diffuse area sources was calculated using available surface soil concentrations and assuming that wind-blown fugitive dust from the Western and Eastern Dog Pens, including re-entrainment and dispersion of surface soil dust, was the only potential sources of emissions. The analysis of potential diffuse airborne radiological effluent sources at the Site is included in the 2005 Calendar Year Radionuclide Air Emission Annual Report (Weiss, 2006). Emissions modeling indicated that the maximum annual credible dose equivalent to a member of the public from residual site contamination was 1.63×10^{-7} mrem/yr for an off-site exposure, and 5.9×10^{-4} mrem/yr for an on-site exposure, far below the 10 mrem/yr effective dose equivalent limit. This analysis is discussed in more detail in Section 4 of this report.

2.4 **Water Quality and Protection**

2.4.1 *Clean Water Act*

As authorized by the Clean Water Act, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit program controls water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants into waters of the United States. The Site discharges its sanitary waste to the UC Davis Waste Water Treatment Plant, which is subject to the conditions in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit CA0077895, issued to UC Davis, and Waste Discharge Requirement Order No. 92-040, granted by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. No waste water, other than sanitary waste, was discharged from LEHR to the waste water treatment plant in 2005.

Under the Clean Water Act, the US EPA also controls polluted storm water runoff. In California, this function is delegated to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, under state-wide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permits for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial and Construction Activities. A storm water sampling program described in the Revised Field Sampling Plan (D&M, 1998) is implemented at the Site and meets the state General Permit requirements. Best management practices are also used at the Site to mitigate any potential contamination in storm water runoff.

Under the Revised Field Sampling Plan (D&M, 1998), storm water samples are usually collected twice a year, once near the beginning of the rainy season, after the first significant storm of the season, and once near the end of the rainy season. Surface water samples are also collected and analyzed in accordance with the Revised Field Sampling Plan (D&M, 1998). Details of the sampling and analyses are provided in the *Draft 2005 Comprehensive Annual Water Monitoring Report* (Brown & Caldwell, 2006) and are summarized herein in Section 3.

2.4.2 *Drinking Water Requirements*

Under the Safe Drinking Water Act, the US EPA sets standards to protect drinking water quality and drinking water sources, including rivers, lakes, reservoirs, springs and ground water wells. The California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act authorizes the State Water Quality Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards to coordinate and control water quality in the state. The regional boards establish and enforce water quality standards for both surface and ground water by issuing permits for discharges of waste water into state water bodies. The Safe Drinking Water and Toxics Enforcement Act prohibits discharge or release of chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity into water, or onto or into land where such chemicals pass, or probably will pass, into any source of drinking water.

Historically, contaminated liquid waste was discharged from DOE research activities to the Imhoff Treatment Facility, the Domestic Septic Systems and the Radium/Strontium Treatment Systems and associated leach fields, which resulted in hazardous releases to site soils. These structures and associated contaminated soils have been removed and shipped off site for disposal, with the final shipment of pipe joints shipped in 2003. Current DOE activities at LEHR do not discharge contaminants to any drinking water sources.

According to the Memorandum of Agreement between UC Davis and DOE (DOE, 1997), potential impacts to ground water from past site activities are to be addressed by UC Davis. UC Davis is conducting a ground water interim remedial action. Quarterly ground water and surface water monitoring has been conducted since November 1990. Monitoring activities conducted in 2005 are summarized in Section 4.

2.5 **Other Environmental Statutes**

2.5.1 *Endangered Species Act*

In 1997, an ecological scoping assessment (Weiss, 1997b) was conducted to support the Draft Final Determination of Risk-Based Action Standards for DOE Areas (Weiss, 1997a). The ecological scoping assessment identified special status species that have a high potential to exist in or near Putah Creek, including two plant species, five invertebrates, nineteen birds, two reptiles, one amphibian and four mammals. Habitat for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle, a threatened

species under the Endangered Species Act, was identified in the Western Dog Pens, Eastern Dog Pens and the former Cobalt-60 Field. No habitat modifications or adverse effects on the species resulted from the 2005 site activities.

As discussed in Section 2.1.1, a draft ecological risk assessment was developed by UC Davis in 2004, revised in 2005, and a final assessment was issued by UC Davis and approved by regulatory agencies in August 2006. It concludes that residual contamination at the Site is not a concern for ecological receptors.

2.5.2 *National Historic Preservation Act*

An archeological evaluation was conducted during the Phase II Soil and Ground Water Characterization of the Site (DOE, 1992a). No evidence of cultural resources, historical or archeologically sensitive areas was encountered in 2005.

2.5.3 *Migratory Bird Treaty*

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act governs the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts and nests. No activities resulting in taking of any migratory birds, their eggs, parts or nests occurred at the Site in 2005.

2.6 **Executive Orders**

2.6.1 *Executive Order 13148, "Greening the Government through Leadership in Environmental Management"*

Executive Order 13148 requires compliance with the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA), also known as the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act (SARA) Title III. SARA Title III requires facilities to provide information on the presence of hazardous chemicals and on the releases, both accidental and routine, of such chemicals into the environment. This information is used by state and local emergency agencies, hospitals, police and fire departments and emergency response teams in responding to chemical emergencies, and is also available to the public to inform them of chemical hazards present in their neighborhood. The toxic release inventory requirements of SARA apply to facilities that use large amounts of certain chemicals.

The amounts of chemicals stored and used at LEHR in 2005 were minimal and included such items as gasoline and propane fuels, paints and thinners. The storage, use, handling and emergency response activities associated with these chemicals were covered by the following LEHR program documents, which meet the EPCRA requirements:

- Project Health and Safety Plan (Weiss, 2001f), which contains a hazard communication program, including requirements for maintaining a chemical inventory and Material Safety Data Sheets;
- Contingency Plan and General Emergency Response Procedures (Weiss, 2001i), which cover planning, notification requirements and release notification procedures; and
- Occurrence Reporting Plan (Weiss, 2000a), which addresses the release notification process.

Since only small amounts of chemicals are used at the Site, LEHR is not required to submit a toxic release inventory under EPCRA Section 313, Toxic Release Inventory Reporting. In 2005, the Site was in compliance with EPCRA reporting requirements, summarized in Table 2-1. All of the hazardous materials were transferred to UC Davis's control on April 14, 2005.

Table 2-1. Status of Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act Reporting

EPCRA Section	Description of Reporting	Status
302-303	Planning Notification	Compliant
304	Extremely Hazardous Substance Release Notification	Compliant
311-312	MSDS/Chemical Inventory	Compliant
313	Toxic Release Inventory Reporting	Not Applicable

Abbreviations

EPCRA Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act
MSDS Material Safety Data Sheet

2.6.2 Executive Order 11988, "Floodplain Management"

The Site is not on a 100-year floodplain, as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

2.6.3 Executive Order 11990, "Protection of Wetlands"

No portion of the Site is designated as a wetland.

2.7 Other Major Environmental Issues and Actions

No violations, compliance orders or negative audit findings were issued to LEHR in 2005.

No new environmental programs and procedures were developed, approved or implemented in 2005.

2.8 Continuous Release Reporting

In accordance with CERCLA, non-permitted hazardous substance releases in quantities exceeding the CERCLA reportable quantity must be reported to the National Response Center. No such releases occurred at the Site in 2005.

2.9 Unplanned Releases

No unplanned releases occurred at the Site in 2005. No reports of unusual or off-normal occurrences under DOE Order 232.1A, the governing DOE Order for occurrence reporting under S. M. Stoller Corporation's contract with DOE, were made in 2005.

2.10 Summary of Permits

DOE is not required to obtain any environmental permits for remediation and waste management activities conducted under CERCLA at LEHR.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

According to the objectives of DOE Order 450.1, DOE sites should implement sound stewardship practices protective of the air, water, land and other natural and cultural resources potentially impacted by their operations. Executive Order 13148 and DOE Order 450.1 required DOE sites to have an environmental management system in place by December 31, 2005. The DOE Order is not applicable to the DOE Office of Legacy Management; therefore, a formalized environmental management system was not adopted for the Site. However, environmental management at the Site is conducted in accordance with a formal program that ensures protection of air, water, land and other natural and cultural resources potentially impacted by site operations. Each year, DOE monitors the air, water and soil conditions at the Site by collecting environmental samples and for evaluating relevant sample data obtained from UC Davis. This section describes the LEHR environmental monitoring program and summarizes the environmental monitoring activities conducted in 2005. The analytical results generated by this monitoring program are discussed in Sections 4, 5 and 6.

3.1 Environmental Management Policy and System Elements

The LEHR Quality Assurance Project Plan (Weiss, 2000b) defines the management and program approach and explicitly incorporates the protection of the environment into site activities. In 2005, environmental management was integrated into the overall management framework for site environmental restoration by integrating the evaluation of applicable environmental requirements and objectives into the CERCLA process and ongoing environmental compliance monitoring activities.

3.1.1.1 Environmental Management System Elements

Although compliance with the requirements of DOE Order 450.1 is not required for the Office of Legacy Management, many of the components of an environmental management system are covered by existing programs implemented at the Site.

All legal and regulatory requirements are evaluated for all proposed actions undertaken at the Site as part of the applicable, relevant and appropriate requirements development process. Environmental objectives and targets for remediation of the Site are set in CERCLA documents such as risk assessments, feasibility studies and others. Waste minimization and source reduction are included in waste management activities, as discussed in Section 3.2. The Quality Assurance Program Plan defines roles, responsibilities, authorities and resources of site staff, operational controls, training requirements (Section 3.5), document control and retention, compliance evaluation, nonconformity, preventive and corrective actions, and internal surveillance and management audit requirements. The Contingency Plan and General Emergency Response Plan provide emergency

preparedness and response procedures. The Environmental Protection Program defines the monitoring and measurement activities for the Site (Weiss, 2001e). The monitoring results are discussed in Section 3.3. Other programs with requirements related to the Site's environmental activities and performance include:

- Report on Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment (Weiss, 2001h);
- Radiation Protection Program (Weiss, 1999b);
- As-Low-As-Reasonably-Achievable Program (Weiss, 2001a);
- Radioactive Waste Management Program and Standard Operating Procedures (Weiss, 2001d);
- Hazard Category Evaluation (safety basis documentation) (Weiss, 2001c);
- Standard Operating Procedure 42.1, Environment, Safety and Health Reporting (Weiss, 2001j);
- Occurrence Reporting Plan (Weiss, 2001a);
- National Environmental Policy Act Environmental Assessments (Weiss, 1998a and Weiss, 2001b); and
- Revised Field Sampling Plan (Dames & Moore, 1998) implemented by UC Davis for ground water, surface water, soil, sediment, air and biota monitoring.

With the decrease in scope of site activities and the transition of site management to a small business, the scope of environmental and other compliance programs implemented at the Site has been scaled back proportionately.

3.2 Pollution Prevention and Waste Minimization

The LEHR waste management program is committed to minimizing waste volumes by giving preference to source reduction, material substitution, decontamination and recycling. Applicable pollution prevention and waste minimization activities include:

- Avoiding the use of porous materials that cannot be decontaminated;
- Minimizing personal protective equipment waste through effective planning;
- Using real-time analyses to delineate the extent of contamination;
- Optimizing waste container utilization and recycling;
- Removing surface contamination from subsurface structures and pipes; and
- Reusing uncontaminated soil and materials on site.

Waste minimization was considered in the development of remedial alternatives in the feasibility study for the DOE areas.

3.2.1 Recycling

A recycling program instituted in 2001 continued at LEHR in 2005 to the extent that personnel were present at the Site. To the extent practicable, all paper, plastic and cardboard waste generated by the project were recycled.

3.3 Environmental Monitoring and Surveillance

In accordance with Section 7 of the *Final Environmental Protection Program* (Weiss, 2001e¹), environmental monitoring was performed by S.M. Stoller Corporation, Weiss and/or their subcontractors, with the exception of ground and surface water monitoring, which was performed by UC Davis.

Environmental monitoring at LEHR is composed of two activities: effluent monitoring and environmental surveillance. Effluent monitoring involves the collection and analysis of liquid and gaseous effluent samples to characterize and quantify contaminants released to the environment. These data are used to assess the exposure of and risk to the public, and to demonstrate compliance with applicable regulations. Environmental surveillance involves the collection and analysis of air, water, soil, terrestrial foodstuffs, biota and other media on or near DOE sites, and the measurement of external radiation. These data are used to assess potential exposure to the public, evaluate impacts on the environment and demonstrate compliance with applicable regulations. Because activities at the Site are conducted under Superfund requirements, water, soil and biota monitoring is integrated into the Superfund process, as discussed in the following sections.

3.3.1 Pre-Operational Monitoring

In accordance with the LEHR Environmental Protection Program (Weiss, 2001e), an environmental study must be conducted prior to start of any new process, which has the potential for significant adverse environmental impact. The study should be not less than one year, and preferably two years, before the start of any new process to evaluate seasonal changes and be consistent with National Environmental Policy Act requirements. The study shall:

- Characterize existing physical, chemical and biological conditions that could be affected;
- Establish background levels of radioactive and chemical components;

¹ A program developed under DOE Order 5400.1.

- Characterize pertinent environmental and ecological parameters;
- Identify potential pathways for human exposure or environmental impact; and
- Provide a basis for developing routine operational and emergency effluent monitoring and environmental surveillance programs.

No activities with potential for significant adverse environmental impacts were conducted at the Site in 2005. Proposed remedial activities were evaluated in the feasibility study in compliance with National Environmental Policy Act requirements.

3.3.2 *Surface and Storm Water Monitoring*

There are currently no active process-based effluent discharges from LEHR facilities to the environment that would require effluent stream monitoring. Surface and storm water runoff are the only potential liquid effluent sources of contamination.

Certain storm drains at LEHR are directed into the UC Davis combined storm and sanitary sewer system and subsequently treated by the UC Davis Waste Water Treatment Plant. The plant operates under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CA0077895, which contains the waste water discharge requirements for the facility. Environmental monitoring and surveillance of the UC Davis Waste Water Treatment Plant is conducted by UC Davis, and is discussed in Sections 4.4 and 5.3 of this report.

Surface water monitoring is conducted by UC Davis in accordance with a Revised Field Sampling Plan (D&M, 1998) developed to comply with US EPA and DOE requirements for chemical and radiological analyses, respectively. Samples are collected at three locations along the South Fork of Putah Creek (Figure 3-1). The Putah Creek Upstream (PCU) monitoring point is located upstream of the Site. The Putah Creek Downstream (PCD) monitoring point is located downstream of the Site and UC Davis property. The waste water treatment plant outfall (STPO) monitoring station is located at the outfall of the UC Davis Waste Water Treatment Plant, which discharges into the South Fork of Putah Creek between PCU and PCD (Figure 3-1).

Surface water runoff samples are collected quarterly and are analyzed for radioactive and hazardous materials. The types of analyses are based upon those contaminants historically present at the LEHR site and are monitored as part of ongoing LEHR activities.

In accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement between DOE and UC Davis (DOE, 1997), DOE collects storm water samples from a lift station located on the western border of the Site (LS-1 on Figure 3-1), and UC Davis collects samples from the UC Davis areas of the Site (LF-1 and LF-3 on Figure 3-1). The LS-1 collection point is a lift station located on the western side of the Site, which pumps runoff to a ditch along the west side of Old Davis Road. All of the storm water monitoring data collected by UC Davis and DOE are included in an annual report prepared by UC Davis. In accordance with the Revised Field Sampling Plan (D&M, 1998), sampling is conducted for two separate rainfall events: (1) the first significant storm event of the rainy season to

sample runoff that may carry material that accumulated on the ground surface during the summer months; and (2) a large storm event late in the rainy season. Storm water samples are analyzed for the following possible contaminants: selected radionuclides (tritium, carbon-14, strontium-90, radium-226), metals, chromium, nitrate, acute aquatic toxicity, alkalinity, other cations and anions, volatile organic compounds, chloroform, semi-volatile organic compounds, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls, total oil and grease, suspended and dissolved solids, and total organic carbon.

In 2005, UC Davis performed all surface water monitoring and monitored storm water runoff from the UC Davis areas of the Site. DOE monitored storm water runoff from the DOE areas only. The surface water monitoring results are discussed in detail in Sections 4.4 and 5.3.

3.3.2.1 Surface Water Protection

Surface water protection in 2005 was achieved through prevention measures, such as covering stockpiles to minimizing the dispersion of dust.

3.3.3 Ground Water Monitoring

DOE and UC Davis signed a Memorandum of Agreement (DOE, 1997) to divide responsibility for site areas of contamination according to historical site use and operation. UC Davis has assumed responsibility for ground water monitoring and remediation activities. The locations of ground water monitoring wells are shown on Figure 3-1.

In 2005, UC Davis performed all site ground water monitoring. The ground water monitoring results are discussed in Section 6.

3.3.4 Air Monitoring

There are currently no point sources of radionuclide or chemical emissions at LEHR. The only potential sources of air emissions in 2005 were areas with exposed soil, such as the Eastern and Western Dog Pens, and soil/gravel stockpiles in the Western Dog Pens and the Southwest Trenches. Under realistic conditions, airborne effluent from these sources does not require sampling for hazardous materials, because there are no appreciable quantities of uncontained hazardous materials in the surface soil (D&M, 1992; BEI, 1991).

Radioactive and non-radioactive materials in air had been monitored at a number of locations at and near the Site since August 1995 through 2002, during site remediation activities. The majority of radionuclide analytical results for samples collected during this period were close to or below the minimum detectable activity for the laboratory analysis methods. Due to the completion of remediation activities, DOE discontinued air monitoring at the Site at the end of 2002.

Airborne emissions of radioactive and hazardous materials from DOE-controlled facilities are subject to US EPA regulations. The primary regulatory driver for air monitoring programs at DOE facilities is Title 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart H, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Emissions of Radionuclides from DOE Facilities. Subpart H of the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants requirements primarily target point-source/stack emissions. However, a Memorandum of Understanding between the DOE and the US EPA (DOE, 1995) applies the same criteria to potential diffuse area sources that are required of point sources. The National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants regulations require that radionuclide emissions not exceed levels that would result in an effective dose equivalent of 10 mrem/yr. Measurement of emission rates is required for all release points with the potential to release radionuclides into the air that would cause an effective dose equivalent in excess of one percent of the standard (i.e., an effective dose equivalent greater than 0.1 mrem/yr) and all radionuclides which could contribute to greater than 10 percent of the potential effective dose equivalent for a release point. A discussion of compliance with Subpart H of the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants is provided in Section 4.1.1.

3.3.5 *Environmental Dosimetry*

The thermoluminescent dosimetry program used to quantify the exposure of on- and off-site personnel to penetrating gamma radiation was discontinued at the end of 2004 after completion of site removal actions.

3.4 **Protection of Biota**

DOE Order 450.1 (2003) requires that as part of integrating Environmental Management Systems (EMSs) into site Integrated Safety Management Systems (ISMSs), DOE consider protection of biota and conduct aquatic and terrestrial evaluations. This Order does not apply to the Office of Legacy Management. Order 5400.5 (1991) requires that populations of aquatic organisms be protected to a dose limit of 1 rad/day. Recommended dose limits of 1 rad/day for terrestrial plants and 0.1 rad/day for terrestrial animals are to be applied in the evaluation of terrestrial systems. The DOE Technical Standard, A Graded Approach for Evaluating Radiation Doses to Aquatic and Terrestrial Biota, (DOE-STD-1153- 2002) is available for use in the evaluation and reporting of compliance with both aquatic and terrestrial biota dose limits.

As discussed in Section 2.1.1, a draft ecological risk assessment evaluating the impact of residual site contamination on ecological resources, including aquatic and terrestrials species, was issued in 2004 and revised in 2005. The final ecological risk assessment was issued by UC Davis and approved by regulatory agencies in August 2006. It concludes that residual contamination at the Site is not a concern for ecological receptors.

3.5 Training

Due to completion of site removal action and waste management activities, site training has been reduced to the minimum required for conducting site inspections and collection of samples.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION PROGRAM INFORMATION

This section summarizes significant results and trends in radiological air, soil and water monitoring data for 2005. The majority of radionuclide sample results for samples collected at the Site in 2005 were close to or below the minimum detectable activity for the laboratory analysis methods. Table 4-1 provides a summary of public radiological dose exposure from DOE activities at the Site.

4.1 Radiological Discharges and Doses

Inhalation of site air emissions constitutes the only major exposure pathway for radiological dose at LEHR. There is no exposure to drinking water at the Site and occupational exposures to contaminated soil are managed in accordance with the CERCLA process and DOE orders discussed in Section 2.

Radioactive and non-radioactive materials in air have been monitored at a number of locations at and around the Site between August 1995 through 2002 during remediation activities. This monitoring indicated that all of the maximum concentrations of air contaminants of concern were well below their respective derived concentration guide values and did not pose any health risks to site workers or laboratory personnel at LEHR. The concentrations only marginally exceeded the concentrations at the background monitoring station. Since the completion of removal actions in 2002, air monitoring at the Site was discontinued.

4.1.1 *National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Dose Estimation Calculations*

Calculations were performed to determine the estimated radiation dose from site sources to the public. During 2005, the Western and Eastern Dog Pens were identified as the only remaining potential sources of non-point, diffuse radionuclide emissions. Radionuclide air emissions could potentially be generated by wind-blown, fugitive dust-containing residual radioactivity above the site background concentrations.

Compliance with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants requirements for diffuse, non-point source emissions was assessed using the US EPA atmospheric dispersion/radiation dose calculation computer code, CAP88-PC Version 1.0. This code was used to calculate the effective dose equivalent to individual receptors at various distances from the Western

and Eastern Dog Pens. "Individual receptor" CAP88-PC runs were executed for each non-point source area to model the fugitive dust emission sources. For each of the potential radionuclide emission non-point sources, a human receptor was identified in each of the north, south, east and west quadrants relative to the source.

The CAP88-PC computer code was then used to calculate the effective dose equivalent to individual receptors at various distances and from each of the potential LEHR facility radionuclide emission sources. The reported effective dose equivalent to a maximally exposed individual at the LEHR facility includes contributions from the two potential radionuclide emission non-point sources. Based on the combined non-point source exposures, the maximally-exposed individual at the LEHR facility is located in the Specimen Storage Building (Building H-216) (Figure 1-2). The results of the assessment are shown in Table 4-2.

Conservative radionuclide emission rates in fugitive dust were estimated using maximum soil radionuclide activities above the Western and Eastern Dog Pens backgrounds and were used to calculate the total estimated contribution to the effective dose equivalent. The total contribution to the effective dose equivalent for an on-site, maximally-exposed individual resulting from non-point source emissions was estimated to be 5.9×10^{-4} mrem/yr (5.9×10^{-6} milliSieverts per year), far below the 10 mrem/yr standard. The results are presented in Table 4-2.

The CAP88-PC computer code was also used to calculate the collective population dose as required by DOE Order 5400.5. The collective population dose to receptors within an 80-kilometer radius was 1.8×10^{-5} person-rem per year and the effective dose equivalent for the off-site, maximally-exposed individual was 3.1×10^{-7} mrem/yr, as estimated by CAP88-PC. The calculated effective dose equivalent for the off-site, maximally-exposed individual is several orders of magnitude below the 10 mrem/yr standard, as required by Title 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart H.

4.2 Radiological Soil Measurements

No soil sampling for radiological analyses was performed in 2005.

4.3 Release of Property Containing Residual Radioactive Material

In 2005, DOE removed all DOE property from Buildings H-292 and H-219 (Room 202 and sample counting area) and the cobalt-60 Field except items accepted by UC Davis. DOE also removed all temporary fencing and signs from the cobalt-60 Field. As of 2005, DOE no longer has a contractor tasked to perform landlord duties at the Site, since all removal actions have been completed, and all property and waste has been disposed.

4.4 Radiological Surface and Storm Water Monitoring

Quarterly surface water sampling has been conducted at the Site since 1990 for an extensive list of analytes. In 1997, in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement (DOE, 1997), responsibility for surface water sampling was transferred to UC Davis. DOE retained responsibility for storm water runoff sampling in the DOE areas of the Site. Trends and conclusions drawn from the surface and storm water monitoring results are briefly discussed below. A detailed discussion of results, including tables summarizing the analytic data, can be found in the Draft 2005 Comprehensive Annual Water Monitoring Report (Brown & Caldwell, 2006).

4.4.1 Surface Water Monitoring

The 2005 UC Davis surface water monitoring program was designed to monitor from three surface water monitoring locations (PCD, STPO, and PCU). During 2005, surface water was sampled on January 12 and December 28.

The collected samples were analyzed for carbon-14, radium-226, strontium-90 and tritium. None of these radionuclides were detected above the contract-required detection limits.

4.4.2 Storm Water Monitoring

Storm water samples were collected from two locations at the Site: LF-1 and LS-1 (Figure 3-1). UC Davis collected samples at location LF-1 on January 11 and December 28, 2005. The samples were analyzed for carbon-14, radium-226, strontium-90 and tritium. All of the sample results were below the contract-required detection limits.

DOE collected samples at location LS-1 on March 22 and December 1, 2005. These samples were analyzed for carbon-14, radium-226, strontium-90 and tritium. Radium-226 was detected slightly above the historical ranges at 1.88 picocuries per liter in December 2005; however, it was not detected in the field duplicate sample. All other radionuclides, including tritium and carbon-14, were below the contract-required detection limits.

4.5 Ambient Radiation Monitoring Program

An ambient radiation monitoring program using passive thermoluminescent dosimeters to monitor gamma radiation was maintained at the Site through the end of 2004. The total dose measurements from all locations monitored were always well below the DOE limit of 100 mrem/yr for public exposure. The program was discontinued in 2005 due to completion of all site activities.

Table 4-1. LEHR Radiological Dose Reporting Table for Calendar Year 2005

Pathway	Dose to Maximally Exposed Individual ¹		% of DOE 100-mrem/yr Limit	Collective Population Dose ²		Estimated Population within 80 km
	(mrem)	(mSv)	%	(person-rem)	(person-Sv)	
Air	5.9E-04	5.9E-06	0.0006	1.8E-05	1.8E-07	3,554,000
Water ³	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Pathways ⁴	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All Pathways	5.9E-04	5.9E-06	0.0006	1.8E-05	1.8E-07	3,554,000

Notes

¹ The maximum total dose is the sum of effective dose equivalents modeled for each maximally-exposed individual receptor from potential radionuclide fugitive dust emission non-point sources. The location of the receptor modeled is 132 meters west of the Eastern and Western Dog Pens, which is the approximate location of UC Davis research facilities. Additional information may be found in the 2005 National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Report (Weiss, 2006).

² The collective population dose is for a population within 80 km of the Site.

³ The water pathway dose was not estimated, but is assumed to be negligible.

⁴ There are no other exposure pathways contributing to a radiological dose at LEHR.

Abbreviations

DOE	Department of Energy
km	kilometer
LEHR	Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research
mrem	millirem
mSv	milliSievert
N/A	not applicable
rem	Roentgen equivalent man
Sv	Sievert
UC Davis	University of California, Davis
yr	year

Table 4-2. On-Site Effective Dose Equivalent to Maximally Exposed Individual Resulting from Radionuclide Emissions from Each Potential Fugitive Dust Emission Non-Point Source

Receptor Location	Western Dog Pens Area		Eastern Dog Pens Area		Maximum Total Dose (mrem/yr) ³
	(mrem/yr) ¹	Location ²	(mrem/yr) ¹	Location ²	
Specimen Storage Building (Building H-216)	5.1E-04	48 m W	7.9E-05	132 m W	5.9E-04
UC Davis Building E of LEHR Site	2.8E-05	300 m E	1.2E-05	180 m E	4.0E-05
Off-Site Receptor S of Putah Creek	2.5E-05	1,200 m S	1.2E-06	1,000 m S	2.6E-05
Off-Site Receptor W of LEHR Site	3.2E-05	400 m W	5.9E-05	500 m W	9.1E-05
Animal Hospital Building No. 1 (Building H-219)	3.0E-04	65 m W	5.1E-05	165 m W	3.5E-04
Inter-Regional Project No. 4 Building (Building H-217)	4.4E-04	52 m W	6.8E-05	143 m W	5.1E-04
Animal Hospital Building No. 2 (Building H-218)	3.0E-04	65 m W	5.1E-05	165 m W	3.5E-04
Cellular Biology Laboratory (Building H-294)	3.8E-04	65 m N	9.3E-05	150 m NNE	4.7E-04
Clinical Pathology (H-215)	1.4E-04	99 m W	6.2E-05	150 m W	2.0E-04
Main Office (H-213)	3.8E-04	65 m NW	5.3E-05	187 m NW	4.3E-04

Notes

¹The effective dose equivalent to the maximally exposed individual is taken as the maximum modeled dose within a 45° sector in the direction and at the distance indicated in the “Location” column. For example, the dose 65 m north of the Western Dog Pens area would be the maximum modeled dose within the sector bounded by 65 m NNE and 65 m NNW.

²The distance from an area source to a receptor is defined by CAP88-PC as the distance from the centroid of the area source to the receptor (US EPA, 1992). For the LEHR facility CAP88-PC modeling, the distance from an area diffuse source to a receptor is measured as the approximate distance from the centroid of the diffuse source to the centroid of the building assumed to house the receptor.

³The maximum total dose is the sum of the effective dose equivalents modeled for each maximally exposed individual receptor from the two potential radionuclide fugitive-dust-emission diffuse sources. Value in **bold face** is the maximum total dose for the Site.

Abbreviations

E	east
LEHR	Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Services
m	meters
mrem/yr	millirem(s) per year
N	north
NNE	north by northeast
NNW	north by northwest
No.	number
NW	northwest
S	south
UC Davis	University of California, Davis
US EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
W	west

Table 4-3. Summary of Estimated Collective Population Dose Resulting from Radionuclide Emissions from Each Fugitive Dust Emission Non-Point Source

Potential Emission Source	Off-Site Maximally Exposed Individual		Collective Population Dose ¹ (person-rem/yr)
	(mrem/yr)	Location	
Western Dog Pens Area	1.48E-07	5 km north	1.03E-05
Eastern Dog Pens Area	1.63E-07	5 km north	8.02E-06
Total LEHR Site	3.1E-07		1.8E-05

Notes

Source of data: CAP88-PC Version 1.0 modeling output files.

¹The collective population dose is for receptors within an 80-km radius.

Abbreviations

km kilometer(s)
 LEHR Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Services
 mrem/yr millirems(s) per year
 person-rem/yr person-Roentgen equivalent man per year

5. ENVIRONMENTAL NON-RADIOLOGICAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

This section summarizes significant results and trends in 2005 non-radiological LEHR air, soil and water monitoring.

5.1 Non-Radiological Air Monitoring

No air monitoring for non-radiological constituents was performed during 2005.

5.2 Non-Radiological Soil Monitoring

No soil monitoring for non-radiological constituents was performed in 2005.

5.3 Non-Radiological Surface and Storm Water Monitoring

In 2005, surface water sampling was conducted and reported by UC Davis. Trends and conclusions drawn from the surface and storm water monitoring results are discussed briefly below. A detailed discussion of results and tables summarizing the analytical data can be found in the *Draft 2005 Comprehensive Annual Water Monitoring Report* (Brown & Caldwell, 2006).

5.3.1 Surface Water Monitoring

In 2005, UC Davis collected surface water samples from three locations: PCU, STPO and PCD (Figure 3-1). Samples were collected during two rainfall events on January 12 and December 28, 2005. The collected samples were analyzed for metals, nitrate, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls, total dissolved solids and volatile organic compounds. Metals, nitrate, and total dissolved solids were detected above the contract-required detection limits. Nitrate was detected in concentrations ranging from 0.457 milligrams per liter (mg/L) at PCU to 9.34 mg/L at STPO. Total dissolved solids were detected in concentrations ranging from 191 mg/L at PCD to 710 mg/L at STPO. These concentrations are similar to concentrations detected in 2004. No pesticides were detected above the contract-required detection limit. The metals detected above the contract-required detection limit were arsenic, barium, boron, chromium (total), copper, iron, lead, manganese, molybdenum, nickel, vanadium and zinc. There are no significant differences between the PCU and PCD metal concentrations.

5.3.2 Storm Water Monitoring

All storm water samples were collected at three monitoring locations: LF-1, LF-3 and LS-1 (Figure 3-1) during or following numerous storms throughout the rainy season in 2005. Monitoring location LF-1 was sampled on January 11 and December 28 by UC Davis; LF-3 was sampled on December 28; and monitoring location LS-1 was sampled by DOE on March 22, April 8 and December 1, 2005. The April 8 samples were analyzed for aquatic toxicity only. DOE began collecting duplicate samples in 2005.

The samples collected from LF-1 were analyzed for field parameters, aquatic toxicity, metals, nitrate, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls, radionuclides (discussed in Section 4), total dissolved solids, total organic carbon, total suspended solids and volatile organic compounds. The following constituents were detected at concentrations above the contract-required detection limits: acetone, metals, nitrate, total organic carbon and total dissolved solids. All of the compounds were within the historical ranges. The LF-3 sample was analyzed for volatile organic compounds. None were present in concentrations exceeding the contract-required detection limit.

On March 22, 2005, a primary sample and a field duplicate were collected from LS-1 and analyzed for aquatic toxicity, metals, nitrate, oil and grease, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls, radionuclides (discussed in Section 4), total dissolved solids, total organic carbon, total suspended solids and volatile organic compounds. Analytical results were similar to previous years except the aquatic toxicity result indicated 65 percent survival for the primary sample and 35 percent survival for the field duplicate. Low dissolved oxygen concentrations (4.4 mg/L) were measured in the samples during the first day of the aquatic toxicity test. Weiss reported the aquatic toxicity results to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Regional Water Quality Control Board agreed that the aquatic toxicity samples should be recollected. On April 8, 2005, the primary and field duplicate samples were recollected for aquatic toxicity. The results were 95 percent survival for the primary sample and 100 percent survival for the duplicate. These results did not indicate significant aquatic toxicity.

On December 1, 2005, a primary sample and field duplicate were collected from LS-1 and analyzed for aquatic toxicity, metals, nitrate, oil and grease, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls, radionuclides (discussed in Section 4), total dissolved solids, total organic carbon, total suspended solids and volatile organic compounds. Analytical results were similar to previous years. The aquatic toxicity results indicated 85 percent survival in the primary sample and 100 percent survival in the field duplicate. These results did not indicate significant aquatic toxicity.

5.3.3 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Data

The Site discharges its sanitary waste to the UC Davis Waste Water Treatment Plant according to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements. Current DOE activities do not contribute to hazardous discharges.

6. WATER MONITORING AND PUBLIC DRINKING WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

Ground water monitoring has been conducted at the Site since November 1990 and has been the responsibility of UC Davis since 1997. UC Davis submits quarterly and annual reports on ground water monitoring to DOE for review and comment.

6.1 Uses of Ground Water in the LEHR Vicinity

As discussed in Section 1.6.3, local ground water is utilized for both domestic supply and agricultural purposes. The major ground water sources for both public and private water supplies in the Sacramento Valley are unconsolidated deposits of Pliocene and Pleistocene age, and older alluvium (DOE, 1992b). Water from the first HSU is not used for drinking or irrigating purposes due to inadequate yield. A number of domestic and irrigation wells in the site vicinity produce water from HSU-2.

6.2 Potential Sources of Ground Water Pollution

Sources contributing to ground water pollution at the Site include the UC Davis Landfill No. 2 (apparent source of volatile organic compounds) and the UC Davis Waste Burial Holes (Figure 1-2) (apparent source of tritium and carbon-14 contamination). UC Davis landfills and the former animal handling facilities at LEHR may be potential sources of nitrate contamination in the site ground water.

6.3 Ground Water Monitoring

UC Davis continued to monitor ground water at the Site. Of 46 wells used in the program, 22 are within HSU-1, 19 are within HSU-2 and five are within HSU-4. The following sampling activities implemented in 2004 continued in 2005:

- Sampling for volatile organic compounds in monitoring well UCD2-29 was conducted on a quarterly basis to determine the reduction of chloroform in HSU-2;
- Monitoring wells UCD1-1, UCD1-4, UCD1-10, UCD1-12, UCD1-13, UCD1-18, UCD1-19, UCD1-20, UCD1-22, UCD1-23, UCD1-24 and UCD1-25

were included in the semi-annual water monitoring program for volatile organic compounds, total chromium, nitrate, total dissolved solids, tritium and carbon-14 to establish present water quality conditions and seasonal variations in HSU-1. (Brown & Caldwell, 2006).

- Well UCD1-054, installed by DOE in 2004, was not incorporated into the 2005 ground water monitoring program conducted by UC Davis. DOE has requested that it be included in the 2006 sampling plan.

The ground water monitoring program and the 2005 sampling results are discussed in detail in the *Draft 2005 Comprehensive Annual Water Monitoring Report* (Brown & Caldwell, 2006). UC Davis reported no significant changes in the ground water contaminant concentrations in monitoring samples collected from DOE areas in 2005. Increased nitrate concentrations were noted in the area of the UC Davis Eastern Trenches. Notable ground water monitoring results associated with UC Davis areas include:

- Chloroform was detected above the contract-required detection limit in 23 of 45 wells monitored at concentrations ranging from 0.553 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) to 1,630 $\mu\text{g/L}$.
- In addition to chloroform, 12 other volatile organic compounds were reported at low concentrations in the chloroform source area.

6.4 Off-Site Supply Well Sampling

Private wells south, north and east of the Site have been sampled since 1989. Monitoring of radiological constituents in private wells ceased in 1996 after adequate monitoring wells and hydrologic information had been established to ensure that no radioactive materials were migrating off site in ground water. UC Davis continues to monitor off-site wells for non-radiological constituents, including chloroform and nitrates, among others contaminants. Results of this monitoring are reported annually by UC Davis to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This information is considered confidential, based on the agreements between UC Davis and the private well owners.

7. QUALITY ASSURANCE

Quality assurance is a key element of the environmental protection program for the Site. A Quality Assurance Project Plan (Weiss, 2000b) describes the requirements for all quality-related work on the LEHR project and is fully implemented. The Quality Assurance Project Plan and other quality-assuring documents, such as standard quality procedures, standard operating procedures and task-specific work plans, govern all phases of the LEHR program, including site characterization, investigation, risk assessments, decontamination and decommissioning, waste management and site restoration. The purpose of the Quality Assurance Project Plan and the other documents are to identify the specifications and methods employed to establish technical accuracy, precision and validity of measurements and statistics; and to provide a sound basis for management decisions based on environmental information collected from the Site. The LEHR Quality Assurance Project Plan, which was last revised in June 2000, was prepared in accordance with US EPA quality assurance specifications. It also conforms to DOE Order 414.1a; the Nuclear Safety Management Quality Assurance Requirements in Title 10 CFR, Part 830; and incorporates requirements of DOE Order 5400.1, General Environmental Protection, to ensure that DOE quality and environmental goals are met.

Environmental samples collected by DOE that are discussed in this report were collected, analyzed, reviewed and validated according to the Quality Assurance Project Plan and other relevant standard operating procedures and/or task-specific work plans. To assure quality, quality control is integrated into all aspects of environmental sampling. Included in the Quality Assurance Project Plan and related documents are sections identifying quality control for sample collection requirements and specific quality assurance objectives for the measurement data. Quality control samples are run with each sample batch at the analytical laboratory to validate the method of analysis and the proficiency of the analyst. Because holding times are important to sample quality, they are carefully controlled. To ensure comparability of analytical data, all samples are analyzed by US EPA-approved methods, when available. When analytical results are received, they are reviewed according to the appropriate data quality objectives and data review procedures. All of the 2005 site air, soil and water monitoring data have been presented in other reports. The specific review and validation process for each data set are presented in these reports, and are not discussed in detail herein.

7.1 Field Quality Assurance

Quality assurance for field sampling is accomplished by collecting field duplicates, decontamination rinseates, trip blanks and field blanks, as appropriate. For each round of sampling, duplicate samples are collected from a selected sample point at the same location as the original sample to check for consistency in the sampling process. The duplicate sample serves as a check on

the precision of the sampling and analytical procedures. Decontamination rinseates are analyzed whenever the potential exists for cross-contamination from sampling equipment. Trip blanks are sent with each shipment of water samples requiring analysis for volatile organic compounds. Field blanks are collected to check for contamination during the water sampling process. Calibration records for each field instrument are maintained in the project files.

7.2 Laboratory Quality Assurance

Contracted laboratories providing analytical services for the LEHR project were evaluated by Weiss, S. M. Stoller Corporation or UC Davis to ensure compliance with the quality assurance program requirements. Laboratory quality assurance is analyzed externally by submitting split samples, spiked samples and blanks to the laboratories analyzing environmental samples. Laboratories must submit their analytical procedure for review if it differs from standard procedures. Each contract laboratory is required to maintain participation, as applicable, in DOE, State of California and/or US EPA-approved inter-laboratory quality assurance programs such as DOE's Environmental Measurement Laboratory Inter-Laboratory Comparison Program or US EPA's Water Pollution/Water Supply Program.

7.3 Summary of Quality Control Data Validation

The overall LEHR quality assurance objective is to collect and analyze environmental samples from the Site in a manner that ensures technical data are accurate and representative, are able to withstand scientific and legal scrutiny, and are useful for evaluating site conditions and remedial actions. The criteria used to specify quality assurance goals are precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness and comparability for evaluation of quality control data. These parameters are evaluated through data validation. Table 7-1 summarizes the components used to monitor and evaluate the quality of LEHR environmental data.

Table 7-1. Components of the LEHR Quality Control Program in Support of Data Quality Objectives

Data Quality Objective	Quality Control Component	Evaluation Criteria
Precision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field duplicate • Matrix spike • Matrix spike duplicate 	Relative percent difference
Accuracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matrix spike • Matrix spike duplicate • Surrogate spikes 	Percent recovery
Representativeness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trip blanks • Field duplicate • Method blanks 	Qualitative degree of confidence
Completeness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holding time • Valid data points 	Percent valid data
Comparability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analytical methods • Field duplicates 	Qualitative degree of confidence

8. DEFINITIONS

The following definitions are adapted from DOE Order 5400.5 and the US EPA.

Term	Definition
absorbed dose	The energy imparted to matter by ionizing radiation per unit mass of irradiated material at the place of interest in that material. The absorbed dose is expressed in units of rad (or gray) (1 rad = 0.01 gray).
as-low-as-reasonably-achievable (ALARA)	A phrase (acronym) used to describe an approach to radiation protection to control or manage exposures (both individual and collective to the work force and the general public) and releases of radioactive material to the environment as low as social, technical, economic, practical, and public policy considerations permit. As used in United DOE Order 5400.5, ALARA is not a dose limit, but rather it is a process that has as its objective the attainment of dose levels as far below the applicable limits of the DOE Order as practicable.
collective dose equivalent and collective effective dose equivalent	The sums of the dose equivalents or effective dose equivalents of all individuals in an exposed population within an 80- km radius, for the purposes of DOE Order 5400.5, expressed in units of person-Roentgen equivalent, man (rem), (or person-Sievert). When the collective dose equivalent of interest is for a specific organ, the units would be organ-rem (or organ-Sievert). For purposes of DOE Order 5400.5, the 80-km distance shall be measured from a point located centrally with respect to major facilities or DOE program activities.
committed dose equivalent	The predicted total dose equivalent to a tissue or organ over a 50-year period after a known intake of a radionuclide into the body. It does not include contributions from external dose. Committed dose equivalent is expressed in units of rem (or Sievert).

Term	Definition
committed effective dose equivalent	The sum of the committed dose equivalents to various tissues in the body, each multiplied by the appropriate weighting factor. Committed effective dose equivalent is expressed in units of rem (or Sievert).
confirmation samples	Analysis for metals, nitrate, pesticides/polychlorinated biphenyls, semi-volatile organic compounds, volatile organic compounds and hexavalent chromium.
Curie (Ci)	A unit of radioactivity equal to 3.7×10^{10} disintegrations per second.
derived concentration guide	The concentration of a radionuclide in air or water that, under conditions of continuous exposure for one year by one exposure mode (i.e., ingestion of water, submersion in air, or inhalation), would result in an effective dose equivalent of 100 millirem (1 milliSievert). Derived concentration guides do not consider decay products when the parent radionuclide is the cause of the exposure (derived concentration guide values are presented in Chapter III of DOE Order 5400.5).
designated level	Cleanup levels for specific constituents of a waste that provide a site-specific indication of the water quality impairment potential of the waste. Designated levels are calculated by first determining the bodies of water that may be affected by a waste and the present and probable future beneficial uses of these waters. Next, site-specific "water quality goals" are selected, based on background water quality or accepted criteria and standards, to protect those beneficial uses. Finally, these water quality goals are multiplied by factors that account for environmental attenuation and leachability. The result is a set of Soluble and total designated levels that are applicable to a particular waste and disposal site and which, if not exceeded, should protect the beneficial uses of waters of the State. Wastes having constituent concentrations in excess of these designated levels are assumed to pose a threat to water quality and are, therefore, classified as 'designated wastes' and directed to waste management units that isolate these wastes from the environment.
DOE Orders	DOE directives intended to direct, guide, inform and instruct DOE employees in the performance of their jobs, and enable them to work effectively within the DOE and with agencies, contractors, and the public.

Term	Definition
dose equivalent	The product of absorbed dose in rad (or gray) in tissue and a quality factor. Dose equivalent is expressed in units of rem (or Sievert).
effective dose equivalent	The summation of the products of the dose equivalent received by specified tissues of the body and a tissue-specific weighting factor. This sum is a risk-equivalent value and can be used to estimate the health-effects risk of the exposed individual. The tissue-specific weighting factor represents the fraction of the total health risk resulting from uniform whole-body irradiation that would be contributed by that particular tissue. The effective dose equivalent includes the committed effective dose equivalent from internal deposition of radionuclides and the effective dose equivalent due to penetrating radiation from sources external to the body. Effective dose equivalent is expressed in units of rem (or Sievert).
effluent monitoring	The collection and analysis of samples or measurements of liquid and gaseous effluents for purposes of characterizing and quantifying contaminants, assessing radiation exposures of members of the public and demonstrating compliance with applicable standards.
environmental surveillance	The collection and analysis of samples of air, water, soil, foodstuffs, biota, and other media from DOE sites and their environs, and the measurement of external radiation for purposes of demonstrating compliance with applicable standards, assessing radiation exposures of members of the public, and assessing effects, if any, on the local environment.
hazard index	The health impact of the non-carcinogenic compounds is quantified through the hazard index, which is the ratio of the expected concentration of a compound to the acceptable concentration of the compound. When more than one toxic compound is emitted, the hazard indices of the compounds are summed to give the total hazard index. A total hazard index of 1.0 or less is considered to be not significant and the resulting impact on public health is deemed acceptable.
maximally exposed individual	The maximally exposed individual is the representative member of the public who receives the highest estimated effective dose equivalent based on the sum of the individual pathway doses.

Term	Definition
members of the public	Persons who are not occupationally associated with a DOE facility or operations (i.e., persons whose assigned occupational duties do not require them to enter the DOE site). Also see: public dose.
picoCurie (pCi)	A unit of radioactivity equal to 1×10^{-12} Curies or 2.2 disintegrations per minute.
preliminary remediation goal	Initial cleanup goals that (1) are protective of human health and the environment and (2) comply with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements. Preliminary remediation goals are developed early in the remedy selection process based on readily available information and are modified to reflect results of the baseline risk assessment. They also are used during analysis of remedial alternatives in the remedial investigation/feasibility study.
public dose	The dose received by member(s) of the public from exposure to radiation and to radioactive material released by a DOE facility or operation, whether the exposure is within a DOE site boundary or off site. It does not include dose received from occupational exposures, doses received from naturally occurring "background" radiation, doses received as a patient from medical practices or doses received from consumer products.
quality factor	The principal modifying factor used to regulate the dose equivalent from the absorbed dose. For the purposes of DOE Order 5400.5, quality factors taken from DOE Order 5480.11 are to be used.
rad	Historical unit of measurement of the radiation energy absorption (dose) in matter. The rad is defined as the amount of radiation required for absorption of 100 ergs ($1 \text{ erg} = 10^{-7} \text{ joule}$) per gram of irradiated material.
radioactivity	Property or characteristic of radioactive material to spontaneously "disintegrate" with the emission of energy in the form of radiation. The unit of radioactivity is the Curie (or Becquerel).

Term	Definition
reference man	A hypothetical aggregation of human (male and female) physical and physiological characteristics arrived at by international consensus (International Council for Radiation Protection Publication 23). These characteristics may be used by researchers and public health workers to standardize results of experiments and to relate biological effects from ionizing radiation to a common base. The "reference man" is assumed to inhale 8,400 cubic meters of air in a year and to ingest 730 liters of water in a year.
remedial action	Those actions consistent with permanent remedy taken instead of, or in addition to, removal action in the event of a release or threatened release of a hazardous substance into the environment, to prevent or minimize the release of hazardous substances so that they do not migrate to cause substantial danger to present or future public health or welfare or the environment.
residual radioactive material	Any radioactive material which is in or on soil, air, equipment, or structures as a consequence of past operations or activities.
RESRAD	<u>Residual Radioactivity</u> model. Argonne National Laboratory computer model for evaluating radioactively contaminated sites. (Argonne National Laboratory)
risk-based action standard	Site-specific, soil contaminant-specific concentrations above which an unacceptable risk to human health is predicted to exist. An unacceptable risk to human health is defined as exceeding a one-in-one million excess cancer risk over a 60-year exposure period.
Roentgen	A unit of radiation exposure equal to the quantity of ionizing radiation that will produce one electrostatic unit of electricity in one cubic centimeter of dry air at zero degrees Celsius and standard atmospheric pressure.
Roentgen equivalent man (rem)	The dosage of ionizing radiation that will cause the same biological effect as one roentgen of x-ray or one gamma-ray dosage.

9. REFERENCES

- Bechtel Environmental, Inc. (BEI), 1991, *Characterization Report for Animal Hospital Buildings (AH 1 and AH 2)*.
- Brown & Caldwell, 2006, *Draft 2005 Comprehensive Annual Water Monitoring Report, LEHR/SCDS Environmental Restoration*, May 5.
- Dames & Moore (D&M), 1992, *Phase II Site Characterization Report, LEHR Environmental Restoration*.
- D&M, 1993, *Phase II Site Characterization Report, LEHR Environmental Restoration*.
- D&M, 1994, *Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment (RI/FS-EA) Work Plan, LEHR Environmental Restoration, University of California, Davis*.
- D&M, 1997, *Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis, Ground Water Interim Remedial Action, LEHR Environmental Restoration*.
- D&M, 1998, *Final Revised Field Sampling Plan, LEHR Environmental Restoration*.
- D&M, 1999, *Groundwater Source Investigation, SCDS/LEHR Environmental Restoration, Davis, California*.
- IT Corporation (IT Corp), 1998, *Focused Biosurvey, Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research (LEHR), UC Davis*.
- New World Technology (NWT), 2004a, *Final Status Survey Report, Southern Portion of Building H-292*, September 8.
- NWT, 2004b, *Final Status Survey Report, Building H-219, Room 202, and Sample Counting Area, Room 200C*, November 12.
- NWT, 2005, *Cobalt-60 Field Final Status Survey Report*, March 18.
- State of California Department of Water Resources (DWR), 1978, *Evaluation Of Ground Water Resources: Sacramento Valley*, Bulletin 118-6, 136 pp.
- State of California Division of Oil and Gas (DOG), 1982, *California Oil and Gas Fields, Northern California*.
- United States Census Bureau (USCB), 2000, *State and County Quick Facts*. Data derived from Population Estimates, 2000 Census of Population and Housing, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, County Business Patterns, 1997 Economic Census, Minority- and Women-Owned Business, Building Permits, Consolidated Federal Funds Report, 1997 Census of Governments, Last Revised: Wednesday, 26-May-2004 13:23:14 EDT.

- United States Department of Energy (DOE), 1992a, *Environmental Assessment for the Decommissioning and Decontamination of Contaminated Facilities at the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis.*
- University of California, Davis (UC Davis), 2005a, UC Davis News Service, Facts and Figures: 2003-2004, <http://facts.ucdavis.edu>.
- University of California at Davis (UC Davis), 2005b, UC Davis Student and Employee Headcount, http://facts.ucdavis.edu/employee_headcount_fall.lasso, Last updated Dec. 1.
- DOE, 1992b, *Environmental Monitoring and Surveillance Plan for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research Environmental Restoration Project.*
- DOE, 1995, *Memorandum of Understanding with the United States Environmental Protection Agency Concerning the Radionuclide National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants*, U.S. Department of Energy Memorandum, April 5.
- DOE, 1997, *Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States Department of Energy and the Regents of the University of California Regarding the Investigation and Remediation of the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research at the University of California, Davis.*
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), 1992, *User's Guide for CAP88-PC Version 1*, (402-3-92-001), March.
- US EPA, 2000, *Addendum to the Statement of Work for Removal Actions and Mitigation Repair, Administrative Order on Consent No. 99-16*, July.
- Weiss Associates (Weiss), 1997a, *Draft Final Determination of Risk-Based Action Standards for DOE Areas, Volume I, for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California at Davis*, Rev. C, August 4.
- Weiss, 1997b, *Draft Final Ecological Scoping Assessment for DOE Areas for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California at Davis*, Rev. C, August 4.
- Weiss, 1997c, *Final Work Plan for Western Dog Pens, Background, and Off-Site Investigations, LEHR, University of California at Davis*, October.
- Weiss, 1998a, *Draft Final Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for the Southwest Trenches, Radium-226/Strontium-90 Treatment Systems, and Domestic Septic System Areas for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research*, January.
- Weiss, 1998b, *Technical Memorandum, Results of Data Gaps Investigation for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research*, January.
- Weiss, 1999a, *Technical Memorandum: Investigation Results of the Former Eastern Dog Pens for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research*, September.
- Weiss, 1999b, *Final Radiological Protection Program for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis*, Rev. 3, November.
- Weiss, 2000a, *Draft Final Occurrence Reporting Plan for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis*, Rev. C, March.

- Weiss, 2000b, *Final Quality Assurance Project Plan for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research at University of California at Davis*, Rev.3, June.
- Weiss, 2001a, *Final As-Low-As-Reasonably-Achievable Plan for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis*, Rev. 4, February.
- Weiss, 2001b, *Final Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for the Western and Eastern Dog Pens*, Rev. 0, February 23.
- Weiss, 2001c, *Hazard Category Evaluation for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis*, Rev. 0, April.
- Weiss, 2001d, *Radioactive Waste Management Plan and Standard Operating Procedures for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research*, Rev. 0, June.
- Weiss, 2001e, *Final Environmental Protection Program for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis*, Rev. 0, September.
- Weiss, 2001f, *Final Project Health and Safety Plan for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis*, Rev. 5, September.
- Weiss, 2001g, *Final Radioactive Waste Management Basis for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis*, Rev. 0, September.
- Weiss, 2001h, *Final Report on the Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis*, Rev. 0, September.
- Weiss, 2001i, *Final Contingency Plan and General Emergency Response Procedures for the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis*, Rev. 4, October.
- Weiss, 2001j, *Final Standard Operating Procedures*, November 14.
- Weiss, 2006, *Final Radionuclide Air Emission Annual Report (Subpart H of 40 CFR 61) Calendar Year 2005 for the Energy-Related Health Research, University of California, Davis*, Rev. 0, June.

10. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following LEHR Project personnel worked on the 2005 Annual Site Environmental Report:

Name and Position	Responsibility
Robert Devany LEHR Project Manager, Weiss Associates	Project management, technical guidance and review
Agata Sulczynski, LEHR Regulatory Compliance Manager, Weiss Associates	Report preparation
Michael Gaud Project Scientist, Weiss Associates	Air quality data interpretation
Craig Adams Graphics, Weiss Associates	Graphics
Elizabeth Nicolas Project Administrator, Weiss Associates	Word processing and report coordination
Ted Trammel Production Personnel, Weiss Associates	Graphics and report production