



Via email to [ighotline@hq.doe.gov](mailto:ighotline@hq.doe.gov)

February 10, 2023

Phil Rutherford Consulting  
8655 Delmonico Ave.  
West Hills, CA 91304

US Department of Energy  
Office of Inspector General  
Attn: IG Hotline  
Mail Stop 5D-031  
1000 Independence Ave., SW  
Washington, DC 20585

Subject: Shipments of Waste from the former Energy Technology Engineering Center

Dear Inspector General Donaldson:

I wish to bring to the attention of the Office of Inspector General my concerns over irregularities in shipments of waste from the Department of Energy's (DOE) former Energy Technology Engineering Center (ETEC) in Southern California to EnergySolutions in Clive, Utah during 2020-2022. These irregularities have abused ethical standards, falsified NRC waste manifests, and wasted DOE-EM and taxpayer dollars.

A [2020 Amendment to Order on Consent](#) signed by California's Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and Todd Shrader, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for DOE-EM, committed to send both decommissioned material (released for unrestricted use) and non-radiologically impacted demolition debris from buildings with no history of radiological use, to either authorized or licensed LLRW disposal facilities. In the end, all building demolition waste was sent to the licensed LLRW disposal facility at EnergySolutions, in Clive, Utah. This unique and potentially precedent-setting agreement was the result of political pressure from California activists.

Following completion of the demolition program, I sent a [FOIA request](#) to DOE, seeking shipping papers for the subject waste that would explain how DOE could manifest non-radiologically impacted waste as LLRW.

After almost a year, [DOE responded](#) by providing a data package including, [EnergySolutions Radioactive Waste Profile Records](#) for five waste streams and [NRC 540/541 Uniform Low-Level Radioactive Waste Manifests](#) for four hundred and eight shipments. Close inspection of these regulatory required documents demonstrates misuse and misapplication of limited survey data, failure to identify building names, and highlights numerous inconsistent and illogical data in shipment manifests.

- DOE uses the same limited survey data (one upper-bound surface scan data point and three wipe tests) from a contaminated, non-decommissioned facility to characterize demolition debris from different facilities,
  - 1) the same contaminated facility, and
  - 2) three decommissioned buildings that had been released for unrestricted use, and



- 3) four buildings that had no history of radiological use and had been surveyed as being indistinguishable from background.
- DOE provides no building identification names/numbers, that would facilitate distinguishing waste from (1) acknowledged contaminated non-decommissioned buildings, (2) decommissioned buildings, and (3) buildings with no history of radiological use. This is clearly an effort to obfuscate and cloak distinctions between real LLRW and fake LLRW.
  - Instead of using the waste stream profile weighted average concentrations to derive the container activities by multiplying by the waste weight, the manifests appear to do the reverse by dividing the container activities (whose source is unexplained) by the waste weight to derive the container weighted average concentrations, which are then inconsistent with the waste stream profile weighted average concentrations.
  - NRC 540/541 manifests for multiple separate containers have identical individual and total radionuclide activities (to the 5<sup>th</sup> significant place), yet significantly different net waste weights.
  - NRC 540/541 manifests for multiple separate containers have identical individual and total radionuclide activities, and identical net weights (to the 7<sup>th</sup> significant place).
  - Some individual manifests have identical gross and net waste weights implying the container has zero weight.

Clearly there has been a systemic lack of quality control by DOE's contractor that completed the shipping paperwork, by DOE itself, and by *EnergySolutions* that is responsible to ensure the waste it receives is properly documented and complies with its NRC and Utah State licenses.

This concern was communicated in detail to the DOE, North Wind, *EnergySolutions* and DTSC, a month ago, but as of today, has failed to elicit any response. See [online letter to DOE](#) for background, additional details and specific examples of the general errors/inconsistencies outlined above.

I would suggest your office investigate the following questions.

- Why ETEC did not dispose of decommissioned material at a California Class I or II waste disposal site in compliance with California Executive Order D-62-02 and non-radiological impacted material at California Class II or III disposal sites?
- Why ETEC did not dispose of the fake LLRW at the DOE-authorized NNSS (a cheaper option) that would have complied with the 2020 Amendment to Order on Consent?
- Did NNSS refuse to accept the fake LLRW?
- What was the added cost to the taxpayer for sending all decommissioned material and all non-radiologically impacted waste to the licensed LLRW disposal site at *EnergySolutions*?

Please inform me of any consequential actions that your office will undertake, and the results of those actions.

If you need any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.



Sincerely,

Phil Rutherford

+1 (818) 912-1501

[email@philrutherford.com](mailto:email@philrutherford.com)

[www.philrutherford.com](http://www.philrutherford.com)