

APPENDIX I  
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (FUSRAP)  
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Paragraph	Page
Applicability .....	I-1.1 .....	I-1-1
Multi-year Program .....	I-1.2 .....	I-1-1
Prioritization .....	I-1.3 .....	I-1-1
Program Description and Procedures .....	I-1.4 .....	I-1-2
Program Considerations .....	I-1.5 .....	I-1-2
Submission Requirements .....	I-1.6 .....	I-1-3

**ILLUSTRATIONS**

	Illustration	Page
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program, <u>Justification</u> .....	I-1.1 .....	I-1-4
Program Ceilings.....	I-1.2 .....	I-1-5



APPENDIX I  
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (FUSRAP)

I-1.1. **Applicability.** This appendix provides program guidance and procedures for all activities in the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) appropriation.

I-1.2. **Multi-year Program.**

a. **Overview and objectives.** The major objectives of the FUSRAP program are to evaluate and remediate sites identified by the Department of Energy (DOE) as suitable for remediation under FUSRAP. Each FUSRAP division's multi-year program should be developed and conducted in such a manner that projects are completed as soon as possible and at the lowest cost consistent with cleanup criteria that is fully protective of human health and the environment, responsive to regulatory and community interests, and in accordance with land use requirements.

b. **Program Ceilings.** Illustration I-1.2 provides a listing of ceilings for FY 02-11. These ceilings reflect the decisions reached during the program development meeting in July 1999, FY 00 reprogramming actions, cost and schedule changes as of April 2000 recommended by FUSRAP divisions/districts, and adjustments for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) ceiling increases, starting in FY 03. These are the same ceilings provided in January 1999, which were based on each division's share of the remaining program. HQUSACE is in the process of drafting a mechanism for prioritizing work within the program, which can be utilized to develop new ceilings based on guidance from the Office of Management and Budget contained in the passback to the FY 00 program, and other relevant considerations. Coordination of this draft with district and division FUSRAP program managers will be done in the near future. It is critical that the Corps finalize an outyear program based on the new ceiling of \$150 million and defensible in terms of the OMB's criteria prior to defending the FY 02 to OMB in September 2000.

c. **Baseline Level.** (PRISM LVL: C) Each FUSRAP division will submit a multi-year program consisting of continuing FUSRAP sites or new sites which have already been designated as eligible for cleanup under FUSRAP by the Department of Energy. This multiyear program should be consistent with the program developed in July 1999 which was modified to reflect cost and schedule changes as of April 2000 recommended by FUSRAP divisions/districts, allocation of FY 00 funds, the project completion dates provided for the record to Congress in conjunction with the defense of the FY 01 program, permit completion of all sites by the end of Fiscal Year 2011 and which reflects the application of the priorities in I-1.3, assuming constrained funding of \$150 million per year, consistent with the expenditure and the program ceilings for FY 02 in Illustration I-1.2.

d. **Capability Level.** Each FUSRAP Division will submit a multi-year program consisting of continuing FUSRAP sites which will complete all sites as soon as possible, considering only the division's capacity to accomplish the work.

I-1.3. **Prioritization.** Your baseline multiyear program should be developed in accordance with the following priorities:

- demonstrable threat to health, safety, or the environment;
- potential threat to health, safety or the environment;
- Federal Facility Agreements (FFA) or other legal/contractual/regulatory requirements;
- completion of current stage (RI/S, EE/CA, &c);
- completion of the project;

- efficient design/construction schedule;
- local support; and
- potentially responsible party issues.

#### I-1.4. **Program Phases.**

##### a. **Pre-Construction/Implementation.**

(1) **Preliminary Assessment (PA).** A PA is a limited-scope investigation to collect readily available information about a site and its surrounding area. The PA is designed to distinguish, based on limited data, between sites that pose little or no threat to human health and the environment and sites that may pose a threat and require further investigation. The PA also identifies sites requiring assessment for possible emergency response actions.

(2) **Site Investigation (SI).** SI is an on-site inspection to determine whether there is a release or potential release and the nature of the associated threats. The purpose is to augment the data collected in the preliminary assessment and to generate, if necessary, sampling and other field data to determine if further action or investigation is appropriate.

(3) **Remedial Investigation (RI).** RI is the process undertaken to determine the nature and extent of the problem presented by a release which emphasizes data collection and site characterization. The remedial investigation is generally performed concurrently and in an interdependent fashion with the feasibility study.

(4) **Feasibility Study (FS).** FS is a study undertaken to develop and evaluate alternatives for remedial action.

(5) **Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA).** This document is prepared in the case of a non-time critical removal action. The document takes the place of the RI/FS that is prepared for a full remedial action. The EE/CA is an analysis of removal alternatives and must satisfy environmental review and administrative record requirements, and provide a framework for evaluating and selecting alternative solutions.

(6) **Record of Decision (ROD).** The ROD is a document prepared in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 1505.2 that provides a concise public record of the agency's decision on a proposed action, identifies alternatives considered in reaching the decision, the environmentally preferable alternative(s), factors balanced by the agency in making the decision, and mitigation measures and monitoring to minimize harm.

(7) **Remedial Design (RD).** RD is an engineering phase that follows the Record of Decision when technical drawings and specifications are developed for subsequent remedial action.

b. **Remedial Action (RA).** RA is the actual construction and implementation of a remedial design that results in long-term site cleanup.

#### I-1.5. **Program Considerations.**

a. Program amounts should be based on the PY-1 program when applicable, as shown on Illustration I-1.2. No assumptions should be made regarding additional PY-2 work allowances which might be provided to

individual projects, beyond the amounts shown on Illustration I-1.2. Cost estimates and schedules should to the greatest extent possible be consistent with cost estimates for a baseline remediation in the 90-day report to Congress, but in every instant must be consistent with the cost estimate prepared in accordance with CECW-B/CEMP-R memorandum dated 4 Feb 98, subject: Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) Project Baseline Cost Verification.

b. Costs estimates and schedules presented to Congress should be considered an upper limit and where possible the remediation should be concluded sooner and at lower cost.

c. Cost estimates should not include an allowance for inflation.

#### I-1.6. **Submission Requirements.**

a. **Justifications.** Supporting data for each site in the FUSRAP Division' s program will consist of a Justification Sheet, see Illustration I-1.1. The Justification Sheets must be typed on standard size paper, 8 inches by 11 inches, should be right and left justified Word 6.0/95, or less, or WordPerfect 6.0, or less, documents at 6 lines per inch using landscape 12 pitch font; Prestige Elite is the preferred typeface. The typed material must be confined to 6 inches vertically and 10 inches horizontally, leaving one half inch margins on the left and right sides and 1 inch margins on the top and bottom. The appropriation title and division must be shown as the first line in the body of the first page. Do not underline any headings. The district must be identified under the site name. Justifications are to be submitted electronically as Word 6.0/95, or less, or WordPerfect 6.0, or less, documents to HQUSACE CECW-BA.

b. **ADP.** PRISM has been modified to accommodate FUSRAP data program entry.

ILLUSTRATION I-1.1  
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM  
JUSTIFICATION

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program, Fiscal Year 2002

Division \_\_\_\_\_

Site	Total Estimated Federal Cost	Allocation Prior to FY 2000	Allocation FY 2000	Requested Allocation FY 2001	Additional to Complete After FY 2001
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Site name EFG District	100,000	0	0	100,000	100,000

Furnish a brief description of the site, including location, size, ownership, and nature of contamination. Cite any matters known to be of concern to Congress. Describe briefly the general the general scope and key areas of concern that were or are being addressed, probable solutions, and the work to be performed in the budget year. Provide any pertinent information concerning coordination with Federal and state agencies, and local communities. Identify Potentially Responsible Parties (PRP), if any, and status of PRP actions.

Describe what FY 2001 funds will be used for, and what work is scheduled with requested FY 2002 funds.

State month and year when the project is scheduled for completion.

ILLUSTRATION I-1.2

**PROGRAM CEILINGS**  
(\$K)

MSC	Fiscal Year											
	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11
<b>LRD</b>	40,000	40,661	43,000	49,000	44,000	47,000	48,000	54,000	118,000	127,000	111,000	4,000
<b>MVD</b>	45,000	55,004	54,000	51,000	56,000	57,000	60,000	58,000	39,000	2,000	1,000	
<b>NAD</b>	65,000	44,335	53,000	52,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	14,000	3,000	2,000	1,000