



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

May 22-23, 2006

Savannah, Ga.

Monday, May 22, 2006, Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Meryl Alalof
Donna Antonucci
Manuel Bettencourt
Leon Chavous
David Dawson
Gerald Devitt
Mary Drye
Judy Greene-McLeod
Kuppuswamy Jayaraman

Stakeholders

Gary Zimmerman
Jack Roberts

Mel Galin

Wendell Lyon
Jimmy Mackey
Robert Meisenheimer
Joe Ortaldo
Karen Patterson
Barbara Paul
Wade Waters
Alex Williams

Regulators

Kim Newell, SCDHEC

Carolyn Haugabook, EPA

Eddie Wright, EPA

Ex-Officio Members

Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC
Al Frazier, GADNR
Robert Pope, EPA

DOE/Contractors

Gerri Flemming, DOE
Becky Craft, DOE
Kevin Smith, DOE
Helen Belencan, DOE
Wade Whitaker, DOE
John Dickenson, WSRC

Mary Flora, WSRC

Teresa Haas, WSRC
Chris Bergren, WSRC
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
Jim Moore, WSRC
Dawn Haygood, WSRC

Nuclear Materials Committee

Manuel Bettencourt presented a draft motion regarding the Nuclear Materials Disposition Consolidation & Coordination Committee (see attachment). In 2005, DOE established the Nuclear Materials Disposition and Consolidation Coordinating Committee (NMDCCC), which is chartered to identify opportunities for materials disposition and consolidation. The NMDCCC is charged with considering all aspects of material consolidation to include impacts on operations, transportation assets and realistic schedules. Following a recent update by Charlie Anderson, DOE Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, in March 2006 the draft motion recommends that DOE provide timely updates on the NMDCCC activities whenever committee deliberations/decisions may affect SRS. It also asked for notification before shipments of nuclear materials destined for disposition involving SRS are made and/or any time a decision by NMDCCC implicates or impacts SRS or ongoing remediation activities at SRS. The

motion further recommended that DOE send no additional plutonium or plutonium-laden materials to SRS until a materials disposition path has been determined. Following much discussion regarding wording to clarify plutonium shipments, the draft recommendation was ready for modifications and presentation to the full CAB for approval.

Waste Management Committee (WMC)

Bob Meisenheimer, Chair, commented that the WMC had one draft recommendation to present. He informed the CAB that the WMC has not received a response from Jim Rispoli on the recent WMC letter regarding salt processing. However, an initial response to the corresponding Salt Waste Process Facility (SWPF)/High Level Waste (HLW) disposition recommendation has been received. That response addressed each issue in the recommendation and reported substantial progress/adjustments which should favorably impact this effort. A copy of that response was provided to all Board members in the pre-meeting package. Mr. Meisenheimer commented that the recommendation to be discussed ties together the points the WMC has been discussing in the last few months related to new programs being developed.

Holistic Management Approach Draft Recommendation

Joe Ortaldo, Vice Chair and Motion Manager, explained that the WMC wanted to keep the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) continually operating. In order to do that, it was important that the tank farms don't become water logged. Therefore, it is important to empty the salt tanks in order to get feed for DWPF and service the DWPF byproducts. The Interim Salt Process has low volumes of throughput and will start up with the Deliquification, Dissolution, and Adjustment (DDA) hopefully in July 2006. The Actinide Removal Process (ARP) and the Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction (CSSE) Unit (MCU) will start up next summer, 2007. Then, the major facility, the SWPF, will start up in 2011, explained Mr. Ortaldo.

There are two companies working on these processes, Washington Savannah River Company (WSRC) on the Interim Salt Process and Parsons on the SWPF. There is a lot of development work on SWPF and Parsons gave a good review at the last WMC meeting. This draft recommendation is geared to assure the WMC that the information both companies are developing is interchanged. There is no indication that this is not occurring but the WMC just wants to be sure communication continue. A second recommendation relates to the way process risk analyses are completed for a new facility. While hazard studies are done for the new facility, this recommendation requests that hazard analysis be completed for all the facilities involved, not just the new facility. This is a lessons learned from the SWPF facility.

After discussions on the wording, the draft recommendation (see attachment) was ready for modifications and presentation to the full CAB for approval.

Strategic and Legacy Management Committee

SRS Budget Process Draft Recommendation

Jimmy Mackey, Chair, explained that the Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) held a meeting in April and developed a letter from the SSAB's to Assistant Secretary Rispoli related to the budget process. He noted that Karen Patterson and Donna Antonucci attended the meeting.

Karen Patterson remarked that she planned on reviewing the letter at the full CAB meeting but would give a short review. She explained that at the SSAB meeting, she said that one of the issues for the SRS CAB was the lack of discussion on the budget. The SRS CAB had some years back received periodic updates and was involved in the priority process, but in the last several years, the updates had dried up. Other than Nevada and Hanford, all the other sites said they are having the same problem. Thus the SSAB developed a letter to Rispoli stating that DOE Headquarters develop a consistent and an effective Environmental Management (EM) budget process to assist in the

establishment of priorities and levels of funding for each site. She said that the letter would be discussed at the full Board meeting and she would be asking for approval from the SRS CAB to sign the letter.

Mr. Mackey explained that this recommendation (see attachment) was in support of the SSAB letter to Rispoli. After discussion of the draft recommendation and the wording, the draft recommendation was ready for modifications and presentation to the full CAB for approval.

Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee

P-Area Operable Unit

Helen Belencan stated the purpose of this presentation is to provide a general overview of P-Area its processes, operations, past and present configuration and define the components of the Operable Unit. Ms. Belencan stated that P-Area Reactor is one of five reactors and the second to go operational and went critical on February 20, 1954. The cooling water from the reactor was released to Steel Creek from 1954-1961, and after 1961, the cooling water was released to Pond C (Par Pond). The reactor suspended operations in 1988 and was placed in cold shutdown on 1991. Ms. Belencan noted that this is the first hardened facility closure, which will address the integration of SGP and D&D toward an efficient, timely and cost effective cleanup and closure.

Chris Bergren stated that the P-Area Operable Unit is comprised of 11 subunits:

- Five Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) Operable Units (OU)
 - o Potential release from the P-Area Disassembly Basin
 - o Process Sewer Lines as Abandoned
 - o Cask Car Railroad Tracks as Abandoned
 - o Potential Release from the Cooling Water System
 - o Ash Basin
- One Structure
 - o Reactor Building (105-P) and its ancillary structures (Engine Houses(108-1P and 108-2P))
- Five Potential Source Areas (PSAs)
 - o PSA 1: Emergency Cooling Water Retention Basin
 - o PSA 2: Area around the Cooling Water Effluent Sumps
 - o PSA 3A: Area north of the Reactor Building
 - o PSA 3B: Area west of the Administrative / Maintenance slab

- o PSA 4: Area east of the Reactor Building
- o PSA 5: Two localized areas in the southwestern part of P Area

Mr. Bergren stated that there are five investigative units have been identified for PAOU based on location, grouping, and understanding of the subunits that comprise the Operable Unit; and designed to allow for subunit and overall investigative unit characterizations, as needed. Mr. Bergren noted that most of the subunits are associated with subsurface contamination and designed to address problems warranting action from a contaminant migration and Principal Threat Source Material (PTSM) perspective.

Mr. Bergren noted the schedule as follows:

- Multiple information / scoping meetings from November of 2005 to the present
- Submitted RFI/RI work plan in March of 2006
- Initiated pre-work plan characterization in March 2006
- The Record of Decision (ROD) issuance is planned for October of 2009
- Remedial action will start in January 2010

Mr. Bergren stated that SRS, EPA and SCDHEC are committed to developing a public involvement plan for PAOU; the plan is in the early stages of development and will be shared with the public when it is completed. In conclusion, Mr. Bergren stated that P-Area Operable Unit is well defined in scope and size; the likely constituents of concern are known (tritium, cesium and solvents) and characterization is ongoing. This is the first area completion involving a hardened facility (reactor).

Barbara Morningstar asked about the vadose zone. Mr. Bergren stated the vadose zone is the soil from ground surface down to the groundwater. Jimmy Mackey asked Mary Drye if when talking of end states on this operable unit if the CAB SLM Committee and CAB FD&SR Committee could join and have it as a joint review since his Committee had been following End States for the SRS in general. Ms. Drye encourages joint Committee following of the end state dialog as the site investigates the P-Area Operable Unit. Kuppuswamy Jayaraman asked if the team was looking at other DOE sites and the treatment of hardened facilities end states. Ms. Belencan stated that they had looked at Hanford where they selected entombment as the end state for the Canyons there but that did not necessarily mean that would be the end state at SRS p reactor building remedy.

Mary Drye presented a draft motion regarding the P Area Operable Unit (see attachment). It recommended the three parties involved in the closure continue to brief the SRS CAB on ongoing unit characterization; host a series of public workshops on the P Reactor End State process; consider issuing an Record of Decision in 2010; and ensure that adequate funding is available to complete the end state planning process as well as P Area closure as scheduled in the

SRS Federal Facility Agreement. Following brief discussion, the motion was determined to be ready for presentation to the full CAB for approval.

Tuesday, May 23, 2006, Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Meryl Alalof
Donna Antonucci
Manuel Bettencourt
Leon Chavous
David Dawson
Gerald Devitt
Mary Drye
Judy Greene-McLeod
Kuppuswamy Jayaraman
Ranowul Jzar

Wendell Lyon
Jimmy Mackey
Madeleine Marshall
Robert Meisenheimer
Joe Ortaldo
Karen Patterson
Barbara Paul
Wade Waters
Alex Williams
Gloria Williams Way

Ex-Officio Members

Bill Spader, DOE
Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC
Al Frazier, GADNR
Robert Pope, EPA

DOE/Contractors

Gerri Flemming, DOE
Becky Craft, DOE
Kevin Smith, DOE
Helen Belencan, DOE
Wade Whitaker, DOE
Yvette Collazo, DOE

Stakeholders

Gary Zimmerman
Jack Roberts

Regulators

Kim Newell, SCDHEC

Mel Galin

Carolyn Haugabook, EPA

Terry Spears, DOE

Jean Sulc

Eddie Wright, EPA

Mary Flora, WSRC

Charles Hansen

Teresa Haas, WSRC

Jim Gaver

Jim Moore, WSRC

Palmer Bowen

John Dickenson, WSRC

Bill Vogele

Chris Bergren, WSRC

Paul Sauerborn, WSRC

Dawn Haygood, WSRC

SRS CAB members Tracey Carroll, Art Dombay, Mercredi Giles, Cynthia Gilliard, and Bill Lawless were unable to attend. The meeting opened with Bill Spader, DOE, serving as Designated Federal Official. Mike Schoener served as facilitator and Rick McLeod, Board Technical Advisor was present as well. The meeting was open to the public and posted in the *Federal Register* in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Approval of the Minutes

The meeting minutes of March 27-28, 2006, CAB meeting were approved with no changes.

Agency Update

Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC, announced that David Wilson had accepted a new position as Bureau Chief for Water. He then discussed the Saltstone Facility, noting that SCDHEC is conceptually in agreement with the saltstone strategy, disposal and schedule, but would like to see more

commitment from DOE in funding. He stated that direct disposal into vaults is the first activity. Mr. Gorman also commented that the scheduled had slipped for closure of high level waste Tanks 18 and DOE had sent a letter in March stating the schedule will not be met and requesting a 13-month extension. SCDHEC does not concur with the request and sent back a letter of nonconcurrency, which means the parties enter into dispute resolution. Mr. Gorman noted that delays are largely due to the consultation process by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and while SCDHEC does appreciate the NRC review, it has caused the schedule to slip and there needs to be more innovative approaches considered for the consultation process. Mr. Gorman concluded by stating that SCDHEC's consistent theme has been to push the schedule. They want to see comments resolved and risk reduced.

Al Frazier, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, noted that the Environmental Protection Department continues to evolve into a new organization, from three branches to one. The Watershed

Branch is reorganizing to divide duties by watershed versus a geographic split. GADNR is still working funding sources to try and get radiological monitoring program back up in the next year or so.

Rob Pope, Environmental Protection Agency, commented that Ken Feely is detailing over to the branch to fill in for Dawn Taylor while she is out on maternity leave. Noting the high level waste tank issue, Mr. Pope stated that EPA is there and involved and supports SCDHEC's position and wants to make sure reasons for any delay are good valid reasons. Mr. Pope commented that T Area is quickly coming to closure and the final cap will be in place by September. Closure of M area is moving ahead as well and all deactivation and decommissioning is complete. Mr. Pope also commented on closure plans for P Area and looking ahead at R Area closure.

Bill Spader, DOE, reaffirmed DOE's commitment on salt disposition. He noted SCDHEC issued a construction permit on the modular cesium extraction unit. He also recognized Karen Patterson as a recipient of the Volunteer Service Award on behalf of the SRS Citizens Advisory Board during the SSAB Chairs meeting held the last week of April in Oak Ridge, TN.

Jeff Allison, DOE-SR Manager, introduced Yvette Collazo, the new Assistant Manager for Closure Projects at SRS. She will be a key liaison for the board and CAB administration. Mr. Allison noted the April 24 letter from Assistant Secretary Rispoli regarding CAB administration. He said that when asked about administration he has said let's not try to fix something that's not broken, but DOE-SR has been given direction to come into compliance with the other SSABs by October and it's time to move forward in that direction. He commented this received much spirited discussion a few years ago and SRS was given an extension, however the time is approaching to readdress the issue and come into compliance with the HQ directive. He noted the three options are for the board to be administered federally by DOE, by a 501-C non profit organization or by an 8(a) small business. He asked the CAB to put themselves in DOE shoes and asked for support to implement. Mr. Allison commented that DOE wants to gather CAB support and input and work closely with the Board and move forward with the process.

Board members questioned why the change was needed. Mr. Allison responded that DOE wants to see them operated consistently. Board members also questioned if they would be able to have input in writing the scope of work and how it is administered. They asked for equal access to the entire contract. Mr. Allison stated he was interested in their input. He commented there was a draft scope of work from several years back they could start with. Board members questioned if the small business was specific to an 8(a) and Mr. Allison indicated it was not. Board members stated they needed more information and Mr. Allison stated he envisioned working with the Administrative Committee. One member questioned if the issue was one of 8(a) quotas. Mr. Allison responded that DOE is trying to do more with small business, but the issue is more about what is the best vehicle and there is no mandate to make this venture a small business one. Wade Waters commented that the last effort to find an 8(a) that could manage the CAB in the way they needed failed due to lack of funds. He commented that under 501C, CAB members are liable as officers. Luckily, the State of Colorado had a law that saved the officers at Rocky Flats. Mr. Waters commented that he thought the CAB could work with Jeff Allison and staff, but if they have to go with anything other than the current arrangement, then he'd rather go with DOE. Board members further commented that their main concern is loss of efficiency.

Administrative Committee Chair Meryl Alalof asked for a formal presentation during the June 7 committee meeting. Jimmy Mackey asked Mr. Allison for a commitment to let the CAB help write the contract. Mr. Allison agreed to let the CAB work with Gerri Flemming and staff to provide input.

Public Comments

Bill Vogele, Savannah, Georgia.

Mr. Vogele commented that this meeting was dejavu all over again. He said he doesn't see where there is any progress. He stated they keep talking about the same things and he doesn't understand the inertia.

Chair Update

Karen Patterson provided a trip report of the SSAB Chairs meeting held in Oak Ridge, TN (see attachment). She noted that Rocky Flats thanked Savannah River for helping them to close by taking their plutonium. She also noted that several of the sites were not included early on in the budget process. She commented that Charlie Anderson gave the same presentation he gave to the CAB in March. Ms. Patterson reported that the draft Low Level Waste/Mixed Low Level Waste disposition strategy will be available in draft by the end of May for public comment. Mr. Patterson also discussed a presentation by Assistant Secretary James Rispoli commenting on his five focus areas: safety; risk reduction; project management; human capital; and lessons learned and feedback. She stated his approach was refreshing. Ms. Patterson also noted that Melissa Nielson talked about the limitations of SSABs as a FACA board. She said that DOE does not want a laundry list of things to think about, and advice should be framed as a recommendation and not a request. Ms. Patterson also discussed changes to the SSAB charter. Board members will be allowed to serve a total of six years lifetime. DOE is interested in broad public involvement and the bylaws will have to be brought into compliance with those procedures. Ms.

Patterson said she asked about institutional memory and how DOE proposed to maintain institutional memory. She commented that with no returning members, the board will lose that history and without history they are somewhat handicapped. She commented that DOE had stated that emeritus members were not a good idea (since all meetings are open to the public anyway) and therefore the CAB will have to get its institutional memory another way.

Donna Antonucci presented two letters produced during the SSAB Chairs meeting for board approval for Ms. Patterson's signature. The first letter addressed incorporation of lessons learned in future site closures and the second letter was a recommendation for EM SSAB input to future site budget requests. The Board agreed by a unanimous show of hands that Ms. Patterson should be a signatory to the letter.

Facilitator Update

Mike Schoener provided a recommendation status. There are two recommendations pending, 28 open and 200 closed.

National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA)

Richard Arkin, DOE, provided a Defense Programs Overview. He briefed the board on the following topics: National Security Mission, Federal Organizational Structure, the Nuclear Weapons Complex, Defense Programs missions at SRS, Tritium Extraction Facility Update, Center for Hydrogen Research, and the Ten Year Outlook for Defense Programs at SRS.

National Security is the mission of NNSA- that's the bottom line, said Arkin. Security and nuclear weapons components work is what they do. Mr. Arkin personally approves every guest who walks into a NNSA facility at SRS. Admittance is based on "need to know" and not clearances. The NNSA mission is to enhance US national security through military application of nuclear energy; to maintain and enhance the safety, reliability, and performance of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile, including the ability to design, produce and test, in order to meet national security requirements.

Mr. Arkin presented an organization chart for NNSA and discussed how NNSA and EM work together at SRS. The role of the NNSA site office is to provide operation oversight and contract administration for NNSA Defense Program activities at SRS. The Site Office Manager establishes the operational requirements necessary to carry out NNSA missions assigned to SRS. The Site Officer Manager acts as the NNSA's risk acceptance official. Mr. Arkin showed a diagram of the Nuclear Weapons Complex and NNSA sites. NNSA is only 25 acres of SRS. DP missions primarily involve the Tritium Facility and the Savannah River National Laboratory. The FY06 budget of \$224 million is about 13% of the total site budget. The largest single project is the Tritium Extraction Facility at \$506M.

If SRS fails in its mission, the stockpile goes red and the NNSA mission is to keep it green. There are three missions in Defense Programs- limited life component exchange-recycle of tritium loading; unloading and shipping of gas filled reservoirs; and surveillance – function testing, life storage, and materials testing of reservoirs.

The Tritium Extraction Facility is a \$506 Million project with a project duration from 1996-2007. It will provide capability to extract tritium from targets irradiated in Tennessee Valley Authority reactors.

All operations are remote. Mr. Arkin shared pictures of construction of the Tritium Facility, glovebox containment, the first shipment of irradiated TPBars arrives at SRS, and the Center for Hydrogen Research.

Mr. Arkin discussed SRNL hydrogen programs and discussed the ten year outlook for Defense Programs.

Building 232-H will be deactivated in 2006; tritium reservoir loading workload will decrease as weapons stockpile is reduced; reservoir surveillance workload will remain stable; and the Tritium Extraction Facility will be operational in 2007. Mr. Arkin also discussed Complex 2030, looking at modernized sites, reduced footprints, one integrated network- with contracts consolidated; centralized acquisition; shared facilities; and 3-4 CAT I/II SNM sites.

Mr. Arkin also discussed the Radiological Assistance Program- DOE Region 3 RAP- DOE/NNSA responders from SRS are deployable within two hours of team activation and arriving on scene anywhere in DOE region 3 within 4-6 hours. They provide detection and identification of radioactive materials and radiological monitoring and assessment services to help characterize the event and advise on mitigative actions.

Board members questioned if there was any serious consideration being given to underground testing to test reliability of weapons. Mr. Arkin stated there was not. They also asked if DOE test reservoir operation at SRS. Mr. Arkin responded yes, but in a bell glass jar environment. When asked how many RAP regions there are, Mr. Arkin responded nine. Mr. Arkin also responded to questions regarding what happens to targets once gas has been extracted; how the condition of the stockpile is certified (through extensive analytical work done by laboratories); and how DOE monitors Russia and how they are certain weapons will not fall into the hands of rogue countries.

Waste Management Committee

Joe Ortaldo presented the draft motion regarding an Integrated Management Approach (see attachment). DOE will process salt waste at SRS using a two-phase, three-part process that utilizes several facilities and two different contractors. Each facility, project, and process has its own management team and organization, with its own fiscal responsibility and performance accountability. The SRS CAB is concerned that two different contractors are essentially developing the same process and due to contracting constraints may have limited interactions to share valuable information about the processes. The SRS CAB believes there is a need for an integrated management approach to salt waste processing, especially due to the severe schedule and cost concerns of the project. DOE needs a process that looks at the entire system in addition to each separate facility design. Therefore, the draft motion recommended that DOE-SR provide the Board with the method DOE uses to ensure that all pertinent testing and design information/data (in addition to appropriate lessons learned from operational experience) are

shared between the two contractors and that existing contracting constraints do not interfere with the interactions and dissemination of information between the two contractors. The motion also asked DOE to explain how the hazard analysis process is being used to evaluate the hazards between existing and new facilities within the same general area and how the hazard analysis process can be implemented across a more integrated system wide basis. The SRS CAB wants to know the schedule for implementation and who at DOE-HQ is responsible to ensure that the more integrated management approach is utilized. Wade Waters moved the Board adopt the motion and Wendell Lyon seconded. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote of 18 members in favor.

Nuclear Materials Committee Report

Manuel Bettencourt presented the draft motion regarding the NMDCCC (see attachment). The motion asked that DOE provide timely updates on the NMDCCC activities whenever committee deliberations/decisions may affect SRS. It also asked for notification before shipments of nuclear materials destined for disposition involving SRS are made and/or any time a decision by NMDCCC implicates or impacts SRS or ongoing remediation activities at SRS. The Board further recommended that DOE send no additional plutonium or plutonium-laden materials to SRS until a materials disposition path has been determined and a formal adoption of and commitment to a strategic plan and implementation plan occurs, including a detailed schedule for removal of SRS material. Gerald Devitt moved the Board adopt the motion and Mary Drye seconded. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of 18 members in favor.

Public Comments

Jack Roberts, Aiken, S.C.

Mr. Roberts commented that non-CAB citizens are very appreciative of the board's work. He stated it was his observation that hundreds of hours are put into the effort. He also noted the excellent presentations and exceptional information provided to the Board. He stated he had observed regulators attending CAB meetings and this is very commendable. It is important to all work together, he said. Mr. Roberts also noted the substantial DOE management support of the CAB effort, saying he didn't think he has been to a meeting where the DOE manager responsible was not present.

Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee

Mary Drye presented a draft motion for the P Area Operable Unit (see attachment). SRS is about to embark on closure of the first of five reactors at SRS. P Reactor is scheduled for insitu disposal to support P Area closure in FY2013. In preparation for that project, appropriate end state alternatives that are protective, reasonable, compliant with appropriate regulations, and consistent with the planned future use and end state for its area are being planned. The SRS CAB is very interested in the ultimate end state of P-Reactor as it will likely set the example for other hardened facilities at SRS. Therefore, the motion recommended the three parties involved in the closure (DOE, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control and the Environmental Protection Agency- Region IV) continue to brief the SRS CAB on ongoing unit

characterization; host a series of public workshops on the P Reactor End State process; consider issuing an Record of Decision in 2010; and ensure that adequate funding is available to complete the end state planning process as well as P Area closure as scheduled in the SRS Federal Facility Agreement. Wade Waters moved the Board adopt the motion and Wendell Lyon seconded. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of 18 members in favor.

Soils and Groundwater Project Overview

Mary Flora, WSRC, and Wade Whitaker, DOE, provided an overview of the Soil and Groundwater Project at SRS (see attachment). Soils and Groundwater Project (SGP) is responsible for waste site remediation, including soils, groundwater and surface water required by the Federal Facility Agreement and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Permit. There are 515 waste sites, including seepage basins, rubble pits, rubble piles, and disposal facilities, 13 major groundwater plumes and six integrator operable units. Waste sites located in industrial areas make up 14 completion areas. Program Objectives include work under oversight of EPA and SCDHEC to address SRS waste sites to reduce risk; implementation of an Area Completion Strategy integrating with D&D to complete cleanup in whole areas of SRS; deploy and utilize cost-effective technologies and natural technologies such as bioremediation, phytoremediation, and monitored natural attenuation; monitor completed waste sites to ensure protection of human health and the environment; involve the public in cleanup decisionmaking.

Discussion and questions revolved around how contaminated soils are disposed; budget assumptions in developing the SRS area closure plan, new discovery of disturbed areas, and how the 515 waste sites were identified.

Strategic & Legacy Management Committee

Concerned that participation by the SRS CAB in the budget process has been very limited in recent years, Jimmy Mackey presented a draft motion (see attachment) that asked for DOE-SR to institute a consistent and effective budget participation process that involves stakeholders in the establishment of SRS funding priorities and levels for environmental actions and regulatory compliance. It also recommended that DOE-HQ ensure that a consistent and effective budget participation process is being used across the DOE complex, with early participation by all of DOE's Site Specific Advisory Boards. Meryl Alalof moved the Board adopt the motion and Gerald Devitt seconded. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of 18 members in favor.

Administrative Committee Report

Meryl Alalof announced that an Administrative Committee meeting would be held June 7 at the North Augusta Community Center to discuss CAB administration.

Handouts

SRS CAB May 22-23, 2006 CAB Meeting

Nuclear Materials Disposition Consolidation & Coordination Committee, First Draft, Manuel Bettencourt, CAB

Integrated Management Approach, First Draft, Joe Ortaldo, CAB

P Area Operable Unit, Helen Belencan, DOE

P Area Operable Unit Fact Sheet

P Area Operable Units, First Draft, Mary Drye, CAB

SRS Budget Participation, Working Draft, Jimmy Mackey, CAB

SRS Gold Metrics

SRS CAB Recommendation Summary

Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board Letter to James Rispoli, Donna Antonucci, CAB

SSAB Chairs Meeting Notes, April 26-28, 2006

P Area Operable Units, Final, Mary Drye, CAB

Soil and Groundwater Project Overview, Wade Whitaker, DOE

Nuclear Materials Disposition Consolidation & Coordination Committee, Final Draft, Manuel Bettencourt, CAB

Integrated Management Approach, Final Draft, Joe Ortaldo, CAB

SRS Budget Participation, Final Draft, Jimmy Mackey, CAB

SRS CAB Calendar

NEPA Report