



Stantec Consulting Services Inc.
9200 Shelbyville Road, Suite 800, Louisville KY 40222-5136

November 18, 2022

Tennessee Valley Authority
1101 Market Street
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402

**Reference: Statistical Methods Certification CCR Rule and Groundwater Quality Monitoring Program
Stilling Pond (Including Retention Pond) CCR Unit
TVA Cumberland Fossil Plant
Cumberland City, Stewart County, Tennessee**

Stantec Consulting Services Inc. (Stantec) has reviewed the *Statistical Methods Certification for Compliance with the Final Coal Combustion Residuals Rule (40 CFR § 257.93)* prepared by Dr. Kirk Cameron, MacStat Consulting Ltd., for application at the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) Cumberland Fossil Plant (CUF) Stilling Pond (Including Retention Pond) Coal Combustion Residuals (CCR) Unit.

I, Stephen Bickel, being a Professional Engineer in good standing in the State of Tennessee, do hereby certify, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief:

1. that the information contained in this certification is prepared in accordance with the accepted practice of engineering;
2. that the information contained herein is accurate as of the date of my signature below; and
3. that selected statistical methods are appropriate for evaluating the groundwater monitoring data for the CUF Stilling Pond (Including Retention Pond) CCR Unit and that the referenced methods meet the requirements described in 40 CFR § 257.93.

11/18/2022

Stephen H. Bickel PE
Tennessee Professional Engineer License No. 113134

Stantec Consulting Services Inc.
9200 Shelbyville Road Suite 800
Louisville KY 40222-5136
Phone: 502 212 5075



Attachments: Statistical Methods Certification for Compliance with the Final Coal Combustion Residuals Rule (40 CFR § 257.93)

Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)

Cumberland Fossil Plant (CUF) – Stilling Pond (Including Retention Pond) CCR Unit

40 CFR § 257.93(f)(6) Statistical Method Certification

REVISION LOG

Revision	Description	Date
0	Issued for Operating Record posting	October 16, 2017
1	Statistical Method Certification revised to clarify approach to statistical analysis of groundwater monitoring data per the USEPA Unified Guidance for Statistical Analysis of Groundwater Monitoring Data at RCRA Facilities (EPA 530/R-09-007, March 2009).	November 18, 2022

Statistical Methods Certification for Compliance with the Final Coal Combustion Residuals Rule (40 CFR § 257.93)

Cumberland Fossil Plant CCR Groundwater Monitoring Network: Stilling Pond (Including Retention Pond) CCR Unit Update from 2017 Certification

1. Introduction

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA's) final Coal Combustion Residuals (CCR) Rule establishes a comprehensive set of requirements for the management and disposal of coal ash in landfills and surface impoundments by electric utilities. The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) Cumberland Fossil Plant (CUF), located in Cumberland City, Stewart County, Tennessee has a CCR surface impoundment (the Stilling Pond [Including Retention Pond]) that is subject to the CCR Rule.

This report includes a summary of the statistical methodology selected for evaluating groundwater monitoring data at the above mentioned CCR unit and supports compliance with requirements outlined in Sections 257.93(f) and 257.93(g) of the CCR Rule. To develop the most appropriate methods to validate assumptions, evaluate groundwater data, and develop background concentrations, the statistical methodology is based on USEPA's *Unified Guidance* (2009). This Statistical Methods Certification updates the prior version dated October 16, 2017, prepared by HDR (HDR, 2017).

Groundwater monitoring activities commenced in November 2016, and, at the time of this report, TVA contractors obtained more than the minimally prescribed number of samples (i.e., "eight independent samples for each background and downgradient well") to comply with the initial baseline requirements included in §257.90(b) of the CCR Rule. Detection monitoring was initiated in October 2017 and the Stilling Pond (Including Retention Pond) CCR Unit transitioned to assessment monitoring in July 2018.

Regardless of the current status of the monitoring program for the Stilling Pond (Including Retention Pond), this Statistical Methods Certification describes statistical methods applicable to detection monitoring, assessment monitoring, and corrective action. The statistical method for evaluating groundwater data in detection monitoring described in **Section 3** of this document – prediction limits – is consistent with method/paragraph (3) of Section 257.93(f), which includes a prediction interval procedure. In assessment monitoring or corrective action, the method described in **Section 4** of this document — confidence intervals (and its variant confidence bands) — is consistent with Unified Guidance recommendations and is also justified under method/paragraph (5) of Section 257.93(f), namely "Another statistical method that meets the performance standards of paragraph (g) of this section."

2. Development of Background

2.1 Interwell vs. Intrawell

When data from multiple upgradient, background wells are available, a determination will be made as to whether the upgradient data appear to come from the same population or whether there is evidence of statistically significant spatial variation at the facility. Data for each constituent will be plotted using box plots to assist in this determination, allowing concentrations within and across wells to be visualized. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) will be utilized to statistically evaluate whether or not spatial variation is statistically significant.

Conventionally, interwell statistical tests are used to evaluate whether compliance wells are consistent with, and in the expected range of, background. These tests are generally appropriate when there is no significant spatial variation at the site, and the natural groundwater gradient flows from the upgradient, background wells to the compliance locations. In the event of significant spatial variation among the background wells, it may be reasonable to assume similar variation among the compliance wells, independent of any groundwater contamination. Under such conditions, it may be difficult to make valid interwell comparisons between compliance wells and upgradient, background locations, since apparent differences may reflect natural spatial variability rather than evidence of groundwater contamination.

As an alternative, USEPA's *Unified Guidance* recommends switching from interwell methods to *intrawell* methods when it can be reasonably demonstrated that no pre-existing contamination from current practices or waste management at the regulated facility is present. More generally, intrawell methods may also be needed when there is insufficient data from upgradient background wells or when interwell methods will not adequately address the question of a change in groundwater quality at compliance locations. The latter can occur, for instance, when the uppermost aquifer underlying a site is discontinuous, or when compliance wells are screened in different hydrostratigraphic units.

Intrawell tests compare the most recent sample(s) from a given well to historical measurements at the same well, rapidly detecting changes over time at a given location. When appropriate, intrawell methods remove the confounding factors of spatial variation in well-to-well concentration levels. In these cases, EPA recommends intrawell methods, such as intrawell prediction limits with retesting, as an acceptable alternative to interwell testing.

The overarching goals in selecting either interwell or intrawell testing will be to:

- ❖ Ensure that statistical comparisons will be adequately sensitive to detecting a facility release;
- ❖ Ensure that data used in testing reflect current background conditions; and
- ❖ Avoid confusing an impact caused by a release from the facility with a difference between wells caused by heterogeneous subsurface conditions.

The statistical analysis for the Stilling Pond (Including Retention Pond) CCR Unit groundwater data will use interwell comparisons between compliance wells and upgradient, background locations.

2.2 Background Screening

Credible and adequate background data is the most important aspect to developing accurate and sensitive statistical limits. Standard parametric prediction and control chart limits for groundwater assume that the background data (1) are representative of current background conditions; (2) are statistically stable over time (i.e., not trending); (3) do not include (extreme) outliers; (4) include a sufficient number of samples to accurately estimate the variability in the underlying groundwater population, and thus be sensitive to a persistent change in groundwater concentrations; and (5) can be normalized, possibly via transformation. Non-parametric prediction limits — including rank-based and bootstrap methods — also rely on assumptions 1-4, but do not require that the data can be normalized (assumption 5).

To test these assumptions, any proposed background data will be screened prior to constructing statistical limits. Time series plots and formal trend tests will be used to check stability. The statistical pattern of the data along with the history and hydrogeology of the site will be used to gauge how well the data mimic current background conditions.

To handle potential outliers, one of two basic approaches will be utilized: (1) the **standard** method involves box plots and formal parametric outlier tests to identify, check for, and exclude any confirmed outliers, while (2) the **robust** method involves down-weighting of any potential outliers and the use of weighted, robust versions of standard statistical estimates (e.g., robust prediction limits) to curtail the influence of outlying values even when not formally excluded from the analysis. Robust methods have the advantage of bypassing sometimes uncertain judgments about whether specific observations are indeed outliers and can be adapted to cases where formal outlier testing is difficult, for instance, when the detection rate is low.

If average background concentration levels are changing over time (i.e., trending), the prospective background data may need to be truncated, removing older data to ensure that the resulting limits continue to represent current natural conditions. Confirmed outliers will either be flagged and de-selected from prospective background data prior to establishing statistical limits or will be downweighted using alternate techniques robust to the presence of possible outliers, as discussed above. Any values flagged as outliers will be summarized in periodic reporting.

Probability plots and normality tests, adjusted for the presence of non-detects (Cameron, 2017), if any, will be used to identify and test best-fitting distributional models for the background data. If the data can be closely fit to a normal distribution (i.e., 'normalized') — possibly via mathematical transformation — then a parametric prediction limit or control chart will be constructed. If the data cannot be normalized, a nonparametric rank-based or bootstrap prediction limit will be constructed instead. Non-parametric methods will also be considered when the skewness and pattern of the background data result in unrealistic and likely inaccurate parametric estimates.

The size of the background dataset impacts both the accuracy (false positive rate) and sensitivity (statistical power) associated with a prediction limit or control chart comparison. The CCR rule requires at least 8 baseline samples prior to the start of statistical analysis and evaluations, but often more background data is needed to meet EPA performance requirements for groundwater tests, especially at larger well networks. These requirements are discussed below (**Section 3.1**).

2.3 Periodic Updating of Background

Background data will be updated for interwell statistical limits by consolidating more recent sampling observations with historical background data at least every five years. Any new outliers in the combined background data will be either (1) flagged and removed, or (2) downweighted prior to construction of statistical limits. This updating process will not only increase the background sample size but will also reduce the incidence of false positives when using nonparametric prediction limits and increase the statistical power of parametric prediction or control chart limits.

For intrawell statistical limits, a similar consolidation of the site-specific intrawell background data will be done after every four new sampling events, with a similar inspection for new outliers. Since subtle trends or changes in the intrawell background observations can additionally impact the accuracy and potential bias of the updated statistical limits, two-sample tests and trend tests of the current background vs. the new candidate background observations will be run to ensure the older and newer data are comparable and can be combined prior to any statistical update. If the enlarged background data pool shows a significant trend or a significant difference in the newer measurements, the intrawell background will be re-examined and reconfigured as necessary to ensure it reflects current, but uncontaminated, conditions at the well.

3. Detection Monitoring Tests

Prediction limits are recommended by USEPA as a primary technique for detection monitoring. The detection monitoring methods described herein are in accordance with 40 CFR § 257.93(f)(3). Prediction limits are statistical thresholds estimated from background. If any new compliance observation exceeds the upper prediction limit, a potential statistical exceedance will be flagged. Retesting will then be conducted by collecting one or more independent resamples of the same well-constituent pair to confirm or disconfirm the initial exceedance. Any confirmed exceedance will be recorded as a statistically significant increase (SSI).

To conduct retesting, the pass one-of-m method, as described in the *Unified Guidance* (Chapter 19), allows for an efficient plan to confirm or disconfirm a potential SSI over background identified during detection monitoring. Depending on the background sample size, the target site-wide false positive rate, and the available time period in which to collect independent resamples, either a 1-of-2 or 1-of-3 method will be used when retesting is needed.

Under the CCR rule, prediction limit tests will initially be implemented for all detected Appendix III parameters. Note that one parameter, pH, will require both upper and lower prediction limits. In that case, a potential SSI will be flagged whenever new compliance measurements are either less than the lower statistical limit or higher than the upper statistical limit.

Parameters with all non-detects in background do not require formal testing but will be evaluated using USEPA's Double Quantification Rule (DQR). The DQR assumes that a significant change in groundwater quality has occurred whenever two consecutive detections of a parameter are observed after no previous detections. It is similar in nature to a nonparametric prediction limit with a single retest (1-of-2).

3.1 Statistical Performance Requirements

The Unified Guidance recommends two general criteria when designing a statistical detection monitoring program in order to meet Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (and, by reference, the CCR Rule) statistical performance requirements: (1) an annual site-wide false positive rate (SWFPR) of no more than 10%, and (2) statistical power of a site's 'weakest' test greater than or equal to the minimum benchmark power represented by the EPA reference power curves.

The first criterion informs the accuracy of statistical testing, limiting the occurrence of spurious (false) SSIs. The second criterion guides the sensitivity of testing, ensuring an adequate chance of identifying real changes in groundwater quality. In practical terms, the annual SWFPR is distributed evenly among the total number of well-constituent pairs and among the total number of statistical evaluations per year. Statistical limits will be constructed with sufficient background size and retesting in order not to exceed the per-pair portion of the overall false positive risk. Similarly, site-specific power curves associated with each distinct type of test will be constructed and compared to the EPA reference power curves to ensure adequate statistical power.

The CCR Rule indicates that if an SSI over background is confirmed for one or more Appendix III constituents during detection monitoring (that is, after all necessary retesting has been conducted), then the owner or operator of the CCR unit must, within 90 days: 1) establish an assessment monitoring program, 2) demonstrate that a source other than the CCR unit caused the SSI over background, or 3) demonstrate that the SSI over background resulted from error in sampling, analysis, statistical evaluation,

Statistical Methods Certification for Compliance with 40 CFR § 257.93

or natural variation in groundwater quality. Written documentation must also be completed and certified by a qualified professional engineer within the 90-day timeframe.

4. Assessment Monitoring and Corrective Action

The methods described herein for assessment monitoring or corrective action — confidence intervals (and its variant confidence bands) — are consistent with Unified Guidance recommendations and are also justified under method/paragraph (5) of Section 257.93(f), namely “Another statistical method that meets the performance standards of paragraph (g) of this section.”

To implement assessment monitoring, the CCR rule requires that all Appendix IV constituents be sampled, with any detected parameters added to the list of parameters sampled semiannually. To statistically evaluate these parameters for the CCR Unit, concentration data will be compared to Groundwater Protection Standards (GWPS) through the use of confidence intervals or their variant, confidence bands. A confidence interval is recommended and appropriate when the monitoring data do not exhibit a statistically significant trend. A confidence band is more appropriate when a trend is present. The GWPS for each constituent will be established as either the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) or as a statistical limit based on background if either no MCLs are available, or background concentrations are higher in concentration than the established MCL. On an annual basis, all Appendix IV parameters must be sampled, and newly detected parameters added to the list of parameters sampled semiannually.

4.1 Confidence Intervals

For each well-constituent pair, a trend test will be run to determine whether there is evidence of a significant trend. If not, a parametric confidence interval around the population mean may be constructed at the 99% confidence level when the compliance data follow a normal distribution. Alternatively, a confidence band approach, as described in Section 4.2, below, may be applied.

If using a confidence interval approach, non-parametric bootstrap confidence intervals may be constructed if the data do not pass a normality test, due to skewness or other reasons. The accuracy of non-parametric intervals, including the bootstrap, depends in part on the number of observations used to construct the interval. When a well-constituent pair does not have sufficient sample size to ensure high statistical accuracy, a confidence interval with potentially less accuracy will be constructed but updated after each new sampling event until the desired accuracy is reached. The pair will also continue to be reported and tracked using time series plots and/or trend tests until enough data are available.

In assessment monitoring, a well is determined to be out of compliance, and has a statistically significant level (SSL), when the lower confidence limit (LCL), and thus the entire interval, exceeds the GWPS, as discussed in USEPA’s *Unified Guidance*. Assessment of corrective measures is initiated within 90 days, with remediation efforts evaluated through the continuing use of confidence intervals and confidence bands to determine remedial effectiveness.

4.2 Confidence Bands

If the compliance data at a given well-constituent pair show evidence of a significant trend, a linear regression line will be fit to the data and a confidence band with 99% confidence will be constructed around the trend line. Confidence bands will only be constructed on pairs with at least four independent samples. This approach may also be applied in the absence of a significant trend.

To evaluate compliance with regulatory standards, the lower edge of the confidence band at the most recent sampling event will be compared to the GWPS. If the lower edge exceeds the GWPS at that point in time (thus guaranteeing the entire vertical cross-section of the band also exceeds the GWPS at that point), an SSL will be recorded. If the lower edge of the band does not exceed the GWPS, no SSL will have occurred. As new sampling events are collected, the trend estimate will be updated along with the confidence band.

4.3 Corrective Action

If and when the assessment of corrective measures is initiated, this information will be placed in the operating record and, if possible, an alternate source demonstration (ASD) will be made. If there is evidence of an SSL above GWPS or if an ASD is not made regarding any SSL above GWPS, efforts will be made to characterize the nature and extent of the release.

Once remediation activities begin, semiannual sampling will continue and confidence intervals and/or confidence bands will monitor the progress of remediation efforts. Confidence intervals and bands are compared to GWPS or other risk-based criteria to determine when clean-up levels are achieved.

Although in corrective action the same statistical techniques are used, the manner of the comparison is different from that in assessment monitoring. In corrective action a well-constituent pair is declared 'clean' when the entire confidence interval or cross-section of the confidence band at the most recent sampling event falls *below* a specified clean-up limit or GWPS (i.e., the upper confidence limit [UCL] or upper confidence band [UCB] falls below the regulatory limit). Alternatively, compliance is achieved when the lower confidence limit (LCL) or lower confidence band (LCB) for every Appendix IV parameter does not exceed the GWPS for a period of three consecutive years.

5. Bibliography

Cameron, K (2017) 'On-the-fly 'goodness of fit and outlier testing for left-censored data. In JSM Proceedings, Section on Statistics and the Environment, Alexandria, VA, American Statistical Association, 3445-53.

HDR (2017) Statistical Methods Certification for Compliance with the Final Coal Combustion Residuals Rule (40 CFR § 257.93). October 16, 2017.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2009) Statistical Analysis of Groundwater Monitoring Data at RCRA Facilities: Unified Guidance. USEPA Office of Solid Waste, EPA 530-R-09-007.