



**DRAFT AGENDA
ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Stoller-Navarro, 7710 W. Cheyenne, Conference Room 130
July 12, 2006 - 5:00 – 8:00 p.m.**

- I. Public Comment Period
- Chair's Opening Remarks (10 minutes) Kathleen Peterson
- Agenda Approval
 - Ground Rules - Review Carla Sanda
- II. Committee Updates (30 minutes)
- EMPIRE Jan Spinato
 - Transportation/Waste Committee Dave Hermann
 - UGTA Committee Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen
- B R E A K**
- III. Other CAB Business
- Approval of June 3, 2006, Orientation/Retreat Draft Minutes All
 - Approve CAB Member Reappointment Letter All
 - Sept. 2006 Work Plan Development/Election of Officers Facilitator
 - When
 - Where
 - Response to DOE Headquarters Appointment Letters Facilitator
 - CAB Standard Operating Procedures Discussion Kelly Snyder
 - Site-Specific Advisory Board National Meeting Facilitator
 - DOE News Kelly Snyder
- IV. July State of Nevada Notification : Facilitator
Closed in Place Corrective Actions
- CAU 116 - Area 25 Test Cell C Facility (SAFER Plan) - 7/14/06
 - CAU 118 - Area 27 Super Kukla Facility (SAFER Plan) - 8/24/06
- V. Meeting Wrap-Up / Assessment



DRAFT

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PUBLIC INFORMATION REVIEW EFFORT (EMPIRE) AD HOC COMMITTEE

FY 2006 Work Plan – Developed at June 3, 2006, CAB Retreat

Committee Members

Jan Spinato, Chair
Walt Wegst, Vice Chair

CAB Committee Members: Bob Gatliff, Vernell McNeal, Robert Johnson,
Marian Lawrence, and David Rosin *Stacy Standley*

The overall goal of the committee is to review and comment on the EM outreach material and confirm that it is understandable for someone unfamiliar with the program.

Sub-goals of the committee include ensuring that the information is understandable on an eighth-grade level and has visual appeal.

1. Review DOE fact sheets, brochures, videos, and website (including EM Update).
 - Obtain public information goals from DOE.
2. Perform a reality check to see what works, what is irrelevant, what may be causing confusion, identify if it provides clear answers/information, and note whether or not something is missing.
3. Determine potential audiences to receive the information.
4. Determine where to put the information (fact sheets and videos).
5. Evaluate language options.



DRAFT

TRANSPORTATION / WASTE COMMITTEE

FY 2006 Work Plan – Revised at June 3, 2006 CAB Retreat

Committee Members

David Hermann, Chair

Ted Oom, Vice-Chair

Committee Members: Bill Aldrich, Robert Johnson, Marian Lawrence, Helen
Neil, Jack Ramsey, David Rosin, David Swanson, and Hal Sullivan

Warren Pawliuk

The following initiatives were developed at the CAB's June 3, 2006, Work Plan Retreat.

1. Review and comment on the National Low-Level and Mixed Low-Level Waste Disposition Plan when released.
2. Work with David Shafer in developing a presentation for public outreach on the DRI Transportation Study. Tentative release the next public rural meeting, in a town located on or near a waste shipment route
3. Review the DOE Industrial Sites CAU Process documentation and assessment of the adequacy of the available documents to the public in the reading rooms.
4. TRU
 - TRU in the Trenches – An update of the presentation by Dr. Bruce Crowe on the Performance Assessment
 - TRU Letter to Joni Norton – With CAB T-W Committee's assessment of TRU program wrap-up.
5. Recruit new members for the T/W Committee
6. Review the 5 options considered by the T/W Committee for the Clean Slate Soils Remediation.

CAB Monthly Update
July 2006

Industrial Sites:

Accomplishments (June)

- Began corrective action fieldwork at Corrective Action Unit (CAU) 214: Bunkers and Storage Areas.
- Began radiological and geophysical surveys at CAU 484: Surface Debris, Waste Sites, and Burn Area (Tonopah Test Range).
- Began UXO surveys at CAU 408: Bomblet Target Area (Tonopah Test Range).
- Began radiological surveys at CAU 116: Area 25 Test Cell C Facility.
- Begin characterization fieldwork at CAU 139: Waste Disposal Holes.
- Completed characterization fieldwork at CAU 538: Spill Sites.
- Completed corrective action fieldwork at CAU 528: Polychlorinated Biphenyls Contamination.
- Completed corrective action field work at CAU 168: Area 25 and 26 Contaminated Materials and Waste Dumps, CASs 25-16-01 and 25-16-03.
- Received Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) approval of the Closure Report (CR) for CAU 489: WWII UXO Sites (Tonopah Test Range).
- Received NDEP approval of the Corrective Action Investigation Plan (CAIP) for CAU 166: Storage Yards and Contaminated Materials, and CAU 542: Disposal Holes.
- Received NDEP approval of the Corrective Action Decision Document for CAU 151: Septic System and Discharge Area.
- Received NDEP approval of the Streamlined Approach For Environmental Restoration (SAFER) Plan for CAU 177: Mudpits and Cellars.

Expectations (July)

- Continue radiological and geophysical surveys at CAU 484: Surface Debris, Waste Sites, and Burn Area (Tonopah Test Range).
- Continue corrective action fieldwork at CAU 168: Area 25 and 26 Contaminated Materials and Waste Dumps.
- Begin corrective action fieldwork at CAU 516: Septic Systems and Discharge Points, and CAU 177: Mudpits and Cellars
- Complete low-level waste disposal for CAU 115: Area 25 Test Cell A Facility.
- Begin characterization fieldwork at CAUs 542: Disposal Holes, and CAS 166: Storage Yards and Contaminated Materials.
- Complete characterization fieldwork at CAU 139: Waste Disposal Holes.
- Complete corrective action fieldwork at CAU 214: Bunkers and Storage Areas.
- Complete the corrective action fieldwork to allow for the completion of a CADD/CR for CAU 274: Septic Systems.
- Submit to NDEP final Closure Report for CAUs 530 – 535: Mudpits.
- Submit to NDEP final Corrective Action Plan for CAU 224: Decon Pan and Septic Systems, and CAU 300: Surface Release Areas.
- Submit to NDEP final Post-Closure Inspection and Monitoring Reports for CAU 90: Area 2 Bitcutter Containment, CAU 110: Area 3 WMD U-3ax/bl Crater, CAU 333: U-3auS Disposal Site, and CAU 342: Area 23 Mercury Fire Training Pit.
- Submit to NDEP final SAFER Plan for Corrective Action Unit 116: Area 25 Test Cell C Facility.

CAB Monthly Update
July 2006

- Began establishing subcontract for fence installation at CSII and CSIII.
- Completed training of subcontract UXO personnel.
- Modify the cost estimates in Rev. 7 of the Baseline to better reflect expected remediation costs for CAU 413 (Clean Slate II) and CAU 414 (Clean Slate III). Revised costs will include required Documented Safety Analysis and UXO work.
- Continued Real Estate Operations Permits for the Soils Sites. This included developing strategies to define the boundaries of the Soils Sites, investigating the extent of existing fencing and posting of contamination area around the Soils Sites, and beginning ground truth surveys of the areas of Fencing and posting.

Expectations for July:

- Begin UXO surveys at CSI, CSII, and CSIII.
- Begin radiological surveys at CSII.
- Continue establishing subcontract for fence installation at CSII and CSIII.
- Conduct comment resolution meeting with the Air Force concerning alternatives available for addressing the CS II site.
- Begin Preliminary Assessments of selected Soils Project Sites on the NTS.

MONITOR

WEAPONS COMPLEX

Waste Management ♦ Clean Up

Volume 17 No. 27

June 27, 2006

— INSIDE HIGHLIGHTS —

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water is set to take up its version of the FY 2007 Energy and Water Appropriations bill on June 27.	2	The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board is calling on the Department of Energy to involve facility representatives in the design and construction of new nuclear facilities. ...	8
The Senate last week voted 96-0 to approve its version of the FY 2007 Defense Authorization bill, which would authorize \$5.43 billion in funding for the Department of Energy's cleanup program.	3	The Department of Energy has been unable to provide full oversight of USEC's uranium decontamination activities because of the company's delays in providing information, according to a Government Accountability Office report released June 16.	9
The Department of Energy formally released last week an executive summary of Bechtel National's latest estimate at completion for the troubled Hanford Waste Treatment Plant.	3	On WIPP	10
The Dept. of Energy has once again delayed the award of the contract for information technology services at Oak Ridge, this time until at least mid-July.	4	At the DOE Operations Offices/Facilities	10
The Department of Energy's controversial plan to dissolve its Office of Environment, Safety and Health is facing mounting opposition, as three former heads of the office have joined many Capitol Hill lawmakers in warning that the move would lead to a perceived downgrading of safety issues.	4	At River Protection	
In the face of heavy opposition, the Department of Energy has decided to postpone its controversial plan to shift new contractor employees to market-based pension and medical benefit policies as a cost-cutting measure.	6	Expert Panel Reviewing Bulk Vit Project	10
Provisions that allow the federal government to award no-bid contracts to companies owned by Alaska natives came under fire at a House hearing last week.	7	At Richland	
		Off-Site Worker Suffers Exposure after Fluor Miscue	10
		At Idaho	
		Mixed Waste Shipments to NTS Suspended	11
		At Oak Ridge	
		Building Transferred to Private Ownership	11
		K-25 Water Tower Demolished	11
		OPS Office Goes to Paperless Invoice System	12
		At West Valley	
		EPA Floats Proposal to Remove HLW Tanks	12
		Wrap Up	13
		Calendar	13

John Abraham, a toxicologist formerly with the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, has been hired by Fluor to develop the protocol for testing the sampling and provide other advice. The Environmental Protection Agency is recommending that the family of the exposed worker also be given medical checks and that samples be

taken from the cars of the other workers to see if they spread contamination outside the recycling yard. The contaminated soil has been dug up from the recycling yard. The Department of Energy's Richland Operations Office has formed a team to conduct a formal assessment of the incident and oversee Fluor's response. Fluor also is conducting an assessment to determine why the transformer was not emptied.

AT IDAHO MIXED WASTE SHIPMENTS TO NTS SUSPENDED

Idaho National Laboratory cleanup contractor CH2M-WG Idaho (CWI) has suspended some shipments of mixed low-level waste from Pacific Ecosolutions, where the Idaho waste is being treated, to the Nevada Test Site for disposal due to contamination concerns. Shipments were suspended following a June 14 incident when material from Pacific Ecosolutions arrived at NTS with contamination on the outside of the container, according to DOE Nevada Site Office spokeswoman Kelly Snyder. There was no evidence of a breach of the container, and NTS workers conducted a "wipedown" to remove the contamination from the vessel, which was disposed of at the site, Snyder said. "This was at a level we could remove with a cloth," she noted. CWI spokeswoman Amy Lientz said that shipments of the particular waste stream from Pacific Ecosolutions would be suspended until the source of contamination was identified and corrective actions put in place. "There have been numerous cases like this throughout the complex," she noted. "Consideration should be given to either using

dedicated trailers or performing 100 percent surveys of equipment prior to use for shipment to DOE facilities."

INL was the first Energy Dept. site to begin shipping mixed low-level waste to NTS for disposal, beginning in April (*WC Monitor*, Vol. 17 No. 18). Late last year, the state of Nevada issued DOE a permit to allow for the disposal of material that might otherwise have become orphaned since a dispute with the state of Washington has result in the Energy Dept. being unable to send the material to Hanford. Under the terms of the permit, DOE can dispose of mixed low-level waste at NTS for up to five years or to a maximum amount of 20,000 cubic meters of material. To date, less than 100 cubic meters have been received, according to Snyder. The Energy Dept. has begun increasing shipments to NTS, though, with two other generators having begun transporting material this month—Savannah River and Perma-Fix, she said. In total, seven generators have expressed interest in shipping mixed low-level waste to NTS, according to Snyder, with the others including Lawrence Livermore, Sandia, West Valley and Foster Wheeler.

AT OAK RIDGE BUILDING TRANSFERRED TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

After a lengthy cleanup, the Dept. of Energy's Oak Ridge office transferred ownership June 20 of a World War II-era building once used as a hospital to the Methodist Medical Center. The building and its 3.79 acres will be used for the medical center's expansion plans. "We take great pleasure from these types of land transfers. Providing additional property to the Methodist Medical Center will allow the hospital to enhance the services they provide to this community. We are glad to be a partner in this effort," DOE site manager Gerald Boyd said in a statement.

The building was a hospital during the Manhattan Project and later hosted clinical radiation trials conducted by the Oak Ridge Institute for Nuclear Studies, a predecessor of the Oak Ridge Associated Universities. The ORINS Cancer Research Hospital operated from 1950 until 1974. The facility later hosted other ORAU programs, including training and work in cytogenetics supporting the Department of Energy. DOE's Oak Ridge office said there had been 12 parcels of federal property transferred to non-government entities during the past several years, mostly in support of local economic development projects.

AT OAK RIDGE K-25 WATER TOWER DEMOLISHED

More and more things are coming down at the East Tennessee Technology Park—a closure site that once was the K-25 uranium-enrichment plant in Oak Ridge. Workers used explosives charges on June 17 to demolish a 175-foot

water tower at the site. "Strategically placed explosive charges at two of the four legs holding the water tank aloft were detonated simultaneously, bringing the tank crashing down in a cloud of smoke and dust," the Dept. of Energy

**May 25, 2006 DRAFT AGENDA
EM SSAB CHAIRS MEETING
Santa Fe, New Mexico
September 6th – 8th, 2006**

DRAFT

Wednesday, September 6th, 2006

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 8:00 – 9:00 am | Assemble in Bus and Travel to Los Alamos |
| 9:00 – Noon | Tour of LANL Sites <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Material Disposal Area G - LLW Disposition Facility• “260 Outfall & Building” – Explosives machining facility & explosives discharge to canyon• Trinity device assembly area – house on National Historic Register |
| Noon – 2:30 pm | Lunch
AND
Technical Workshop Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling Methodology in LANL Conference Room <p>Presentations and discussions to be held by LANL staff. Workshop Proceedings will be published by NNM CAB.</p> |
| 2:30 – 3:30 pm | Continue Tour of LANL Sites <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Archeological Sites around LANL |
| 3:30 – 4:30 pm | Return to Santa Fe Hotel La Fonda |
| 6:00 pm | Reception at Hotel La Fonda |

DRAFT

Thursday, September 7th, 2006

8:15 – 8:45 a.m.

Welcome and Overview

Welcome: J. D. Campbell, NNM CAB Chair
Ed Wilmot, DOE, Los Alamos Site Manager
Doug Frost, DFO

Review of meeting objectives, agenda and ground rules. Facilitator

8:45 – 9:30 a.m.

Update on Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling Technology by DOE-HQ Staff

9:30 – 10:30 a.m.

Round Robin: Groundwater Issues at Sites

10:30 – 10:45 a.m.

Break

10:45 – Noon

Update on Waste Disposition, DOE-HQ

Noon – 12:15 p.m.

Public Comment Period

12:15 – 1:15 p.m.

Lunch on your own in Santa Fe Plaza

1:15 – 2:15 p.m.

Presentation by James Rispoli, Assistant Secretary for EM

2:15 – 2:30 p.m.

Break

2:30 – 3:45 p.m.

Round Robin: Top Three Site Issues

2:30 – 3:15: Each Board has five minutes to present top three site issues.

3:15 – 3:45: Questions and discussion of issues

3:45 – 4:00 p.m.

Break

4:00 – 4:45 p.m.

Discussion of Any Proposed Product from the Chairs.

This time will be used for the Chairs to decide on any products to be provided to DOE.

4:45 – 5:00 p.m.

Review of Day's Discussion and Friday's Agenda

DRAFT

Friday, September 8th, 2006

8:15 – 8:30 a.m.

Opening

Welcome and summary of Thursday's work

8:30 – 9:15 a.m.

Briefings by Doug Frost and Melissa Nielson

9:15 – 10:45 a.m.

**Work on Product to Send to DOE or Follow-up
on Any Issues Raised on Thursday**

10:45 – 11:00 a.m.

Break

11:00 – 11:30 a.m.

SSAB Organizational Issues

Discussion regarding the Spring Chairs Meeting in Las Vegas and if the SSABs will pursue holding a Workshop.

11:30 – 11:45 a.m.

Public Comment Period

11:45 – Noon

**Meeting Wrap-up and Closing Remarks
(Facilitator)**

**Notification for
Closed in Place Corrective Actions
July 12, 2006
Las Vegas, Nevada**

During the next 30 days, the Department of Energy (DOE) will be submitting two Streamlined Approach for Environmental Restoration Plans (SAFER Plans) to the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) for the following Corrective Action Unit (CAU). These documents will recommend that engineering and/or administrative controls be used to close the sites although contamination remains.

When submitting these documents to NDEP, copies will be supplied to the Community Advisory Board and the Las Vegas and Carson City Public Reading Rooms for review. Submit comments regarding these decision documents to Tim Murphy (NDEP) within 30 days of the document's release.

CAU Number	CAU Description	Approximate Submittal Date
116	Area 25 Test Cell C Facility (SAFER Plan)	July 14, 2006
118	Area 27 Super Kukla Facility (SAFER Plan)	August 24, 2006



UNDERGROUND TEST AREA (UGTA) COMMITTEE

FY 2006 Work Plan – Developed at June 3, 2006, CAB Retreat

Committee Members

Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen, Chair
Genne Nelson, Vice Chair

CAB Committee Members: David Ek, Bob Gatliff, Steve Hopkins, Ted Oom,
Kathleen Peterson, Charley Phillips, Jan Spinato, Jim Weeks, and Walt Wegst,

UNLV Technical Support Team Members: Dr. Helen Neill

The following initiatives were developed at the CAB's Work Plan Retreat:

1. Complete comprehensive report.
2. Review new data for additional well recommendation.
3. Review any new UGTA reports.



Community Advisory Board for Nevada Test Site Programs

February 9, 2005

Charles Phillips, CAB Chair
Marian Lawrence, CAB Vice-Chair

Kaye Allisen-Medlin, Chair
Budget Committee

Pauline Esteves
Robert Gatliff

David Hermann
Terry Hixson
Steve Hopkins

Bill King
Genne Nelson
Richard Nocilla
John Pawlak, Chair

Transportation/Waste Committee

Kathleen Peterson, Chair
UGTA Committee

Jackson Ramsey
Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen

Ex Officio Members

Stephen A. Mellington
U.S. Department of Energy,
Nevada Site Office

Tiffany Lantow
Defense Threat Reduction Agency

Tim Murphy, Chief
Bureau of Federal Facilities,
State of Nevada Division of
Environmental Protection

Frank Tussing
Nevada Alliance for Defense,
Energy, and Business

Susan Moore
Nye County

Administrative Support Staff

Kay Planamento

Mr. Stephen A. Mellington
Acting Assistant Manager for Environmental Management
U.S. Department of Energy – Nevada Site Office
PO Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Subject: Community Advisory Board (CAB) for Nevada Test Site Programs Recommendations for Immediate Action: Locating Monitoring Wells for the Early Warning System for the Underground Test Area (UGTA)

Dear Mr. Mellington:

As you are aware, the CAB's Underground Test Area Committee (UGTA) has been carefully tracking the UGTA project over the past several years. The CAB's initial recommendations to the U.S. Department of Energy's Nevada Site Office (DOE/NSO) Environmental Management (EM) Program for a peer review of the UGTA strategy were adopted. As a result of our comments and feedback to the DOE on the peer review, Carl Gertz, former Assistant Manager for Environmental Management, requested that the CAB further review the project and provide recommendations for siting a future monitoring well at the Nevada Test Site (NTS). The CAB's UGTA Committee accepted that task, which has involved extensive review of DOE/NSO technical reports and maps, numerous meetings with DOE/NSO staff, and members of the UGTA Technical Working Group. To ensure that potentially affected stakeholders were aware of this effort, the CAB has conducted formal public information meetings in both Las Vegas and rural communities, participated in several meetings with Nye County representatives, sponsored informational groundwater workshops, and prepared and presented informational briefings to the town boards in the rural communities that would be most likely impacted if radionuclides were ever detected in groundwater outside the NTS boundaries.

As a result of our study and the stakeholder feedback received, we are recommending a series of three wells. We believe this network is vital to characterize the groundwater flow path toward the community we perceive as at highest risk.

The CAB has focused on the groundwater flowing west/southwest from the NTS, and its potential to carry contaminants from the 828 underground

nuclear detonations that have occurred over the past 40 years. The tests of primary concern occurred in Western Pahute Mesa, closest to the NTS boundary, and in closest proximity to offsite Nye county residents.

The CAB has reviewed the various facets of the UGTA program to better understand the interrelationships that affect the prioritization of the UGTA project, including laws and regulations that govern the UGTA program, aimed at finding improvements or refinements which might better respond to stakeholder concerns while aiding DOE/NSO in their program goals.

As the UGTA committee sees it, the crux of the problem is this: the 828 nuclear detonations released approximately 132 million Curies of radioactivity (DOE/NSO 2001) during the 40 years of testing at the NTS, of which 60,860,000 Curies were released under Area 20 of the NTS. Many of these tests were conducted within the groundwater. The radioactive isotopes introduced into the groundwater include cesium-137, strontium 90, plutonium 239, americium 241, tritium 3 H, and technecium-99. With this level of data, it is important that a process be in place to detect contamination, define its boundaries, and monitor its movement.

We believe there is a shortage of monitoring wells down gradient of this most important area of contamination beneath Area 20. After several years of study, there have been no maps produced to accurately depict the groundwater flow paths from that area. As a result, the UGTA Committee was compelled to focus their attention to this area.

Because the DOE/NSO is bound by the Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFACO) of 1996 (and subsequent agreements) negotiated between the NTS and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), DOE has the responsibility for the understanding, management and monitoring of groundwater contamination from nuclear testing. Within the FFACO, a generic process is defined as the "UGTA Strategy" which contains the following parameters:

- Evaluate the extent of contamination to the groundwater due to nuclear testing;
- Develop five Corrective Action Units (CAUs) specific computer models; and
- Design a groundwater monitoring network.

The goals of the FFACO include the following:

- Provide protection of the public, workers, and the environment;
- Establish a long term groundwater monitoring network; and
- Develop groundwater flow models, which can be used to evaluate the effects of future changes in the system as a result of contaminant migration.

The FFACO mentions "protection of the public," but specifically lacks the protocol contained in the Federal Superfund Amendments and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), which sets forth a process of requiring a risk-based assessment of contamination, transmission pathways, and prioritization of activities in assessing the risk to potential receptors of the contamination. Environmental media transmission pathway analysis is critical in this risk-based approach in CERCLA's

Remedial Investigation and Feasibility processes. Therefore, the CAB feels that the FFACO and DOE/NSO should include these most important tenets in prioritizing and funding their activities.

As a part of the CAB's careful review and assessment of the DOE/NSO progress in addressing groundwater issues, it also identified perceived deficiencies in the FFACO. Deficiencies seemed to range from a lack of a risk-based approach to a guidance in focus on a region with large data gaps. Therefore, in 2000 the CAB requested an external peer review of the UGTA program strategy.

Indeed, the external peer review panel provided the following feedback either in formalized written recommendations in the peer review report, or in dialogue at the public meeting convened to discuss the panel's findings:

- Improve the capability to detect changes in groundwater early enough for corrective action
- Groundwater flow paths must be understood in order to predict contaminant migration
- Predictions must be validated with field data
- Collect more data from Northwest Pahute Mesa
- Support the concept of "transition zone" monitoring in areas where water from a site merges with the larger flow paths (high probability of detection of contaminant)
- It is critical to identify water velocities

In a letter dated April 19, 2002, the CAB responded to the Peer Review report with the following recommendations:

- The DOE/NSO must demonstrate an early commitment to groundwater monitoring in this location
- More data is needed to reduce the uncertainties in Northwest Pahute Mesa
- It is imperative to understand groundwater flow paths in this area, and areas down gradient of Pahute Mesa
- DOE/NSO should consider siting sentinel wells in the transition zone flow paths
- Predictions must be validated by field data

From the Peer Review report, the CAB recognized that the most important area in the UGTA Program is the area down gradient of Pahute Mesa, where very few wells exist that could provide important data as well as to serve as an early warning system to protect the public. Currently there are seven offsite wells in this area (ER-EC-1, ER-EC-6, ER-EC-4, ER-EC-8, ER-EC-2A, ER-EC-5, and ER-EC-7). DOE obviously understands the importance of this area because it has placed half of all the UGTA wells drilled to date in the Pahute Mesa/Oasis Valley region. However, due to the large size of the area involved, their spatial locations still leave data gaps where no wells exist for detecting radionuclides. This critical area is the western part of upper Pahute Mesa.

It is this area, down gradient and southwest of Pahute Mesa, that is of immediate concern because it is directly up gradient of the residents of Oasis Valley, Beatty, and Amargosa. The CAB feels this area requires immediate investigation, collecting data that can only be obtained by drilling a series of wells that will likely intersect some part of a contaminant plume. From this well, water samples can be taken to

characterize groundwater geochemistry and to analyze for specific radionuclides. A single well pump test would provide valuable information about transmissivities and water level determination would give clues to groundwater flow direction. There is a compelling need for information on the groundwater in this area, where data can be obtained to help enhance the groundwater models, to decrease the large degree of uncertainties in this area, and serve as part of the early warning system.

The UGTA Committee also selected this area because it has the steepest groundwater gradient and closest proximity of underground testing to offsite receptors. One of the shots with the largest yield was the Benham test shot, which is within a couple of miles of the Test Site boundary. Fortunately, some groundwater tests have already been conducted in this area and these tests reveal that contamination clearly originating from the Benham test has migrated more than 4,000 feet to monitoring well ER-20-5#1. Therefore, another well sited down gradient of this well using the trend of structural fractures could provide valuable information on how much further this contamination has migrated.

The "system" of wells being recommended by the CAB is briefly described here. The CAB feels strongly that the DOE/NSO should advance a system of three wells down gradient of Pahute Mesa designed to collect highly important data including geology, water levels, geochemistry, and groundwater ages. The system should include one well that is sited to have a high probability of intercepting some contamination. These wells are described as follows:

Well 1:

Using existing data in conjunction with mapped structures (including surface crack maps), install the first well down gradient of the Tybo-Benham area south of ER-20-5#1. The exact distance from the Benham shot still needs to be determined, but the well should be close enough to intersect the contaminant plume. Properly designed, this well should produce data that would aid in determining contaminant progression. The wells should be deep enough to intersect the most important saturated aquifers. The proposed depth and more specific location of the well will be coordinated with DOE/NSO staff members, who are more knowledgeable of this area.

Well 2:

Install a second well down gradient of the first well, in the transition area between the Silent Canyon caldera and the potential barrier, the Timber Mountain bench area that was identified by geophysics and confirmed by UGTA drilling in 1999. Data gathered from this well could confirm direction of groundwater flow from the difference in the water levels as well as provide possible clues to the hydrologic character of the bench structure; i.e., groundwater barrier or conduit.

Well 3:

Install the third well at the junction of the potential barrier structure (the "bench") and a major fault identified by geophysics as a possible fast path into Oasis Valley. This well would complete a system to enhance our understanding of the groundwater flow direction. These three wells could show us how much further radionuclides have been transported beyond ER-20-5#1, the general direction of groundwater flow in that area and may also add to our understanding of the hydrologic characteristics of the bench; i.e., whether it is a barrier or conduit to groundwater flow. In our opinion, it is most important to understand the nature of

Mr. Stephen Mellington

Page 5

February 9, 2005

groundwater movement in this area. Typically, longer flow path routes result in a greater degree of potential attenuation of contaminants by adsorption, radioactive decay and dilution.

The resulting data would also strengthen the UGTA project's models, decrease the degree of uncertainty in one of the most important areas in the UGTA project, and satisfy a need to include the elements of risk and monitoring in the UGTA strategy. This is a compelling argument that is at the heart of our stakeholders' concerns, and would hopefully accelerate the potential for additional funding for the UGTA project well in advance of 2009.

The CAB's approach is further supported by the position of NDEP and the Peer Review. In the July 30, 2001, letter from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection to the Department of Energy, it is stated that, "If CAU investigations consistently place monitoring wells where no contamination is found, additional wells may be required." In the CAB's recommendation letter to Mr. Gertz dated April 21, 2003, the CAB expressed its support for the Peer Review's stance that, "the need for near-field characterization ... should not be understated or postponed until all the modeling is complete." The CAB also stated, in concert with the NDEP letter, "Without contaminant data in the downstream flow direction, the CAB does not see how modeling the location of the contaminant boundary will be valid in 2007." The Peer Review panel also acknowledged that identifying the direction of flow and velocity of movement of groundwater was crucial because sites with higher velocities need sentinel well emplacement early in the game.

A report detailing the background and process used to arrive at our conclusions will be forthcoming. We appreciate the opportunity to delve into the details of the UGTA characterization process. It has been a tremendous learning experience for the CAB and we recognize the superior support provided by DOE/NSO for this effort.

Sincerely,



Charles A. Phillips, Chair
Community Advisory Board
for Nevada Test Site Programs

cc: U.S. Senator John Ensign
U.S. Senator Harry Reid
U.S. Congresswoman Shelly Berkley
U.S. Congressman Jim Gibbons
U.S. Congressman Jon Porter
S. L. Waisely, DOE/HQ, (EM-30) FORS
R. Betteridge, ERD, NNSA/NSO, Las Vegas, NV
R. Bangerter, ERD, NNSA/NSO, Las Vegas, NV
K. Snyder, ERD, NNSA/NSO, Las Vegas, NV
C. Sanda, Stoller-Navarro JV
CAB Members



Department of Energy
National Nuclear Security Administration
Nevada Site Office
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

July 6, 2006

Community Advisory Board Members

**UNDERGROUND TEST AREA (UGTA) TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)
COMMENTS TO COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD (CAB) RECOMMENDATION FOR
FUTURE NEVADA TEST SITE WELL LOCATIONS**

Enclosed are the comments that I have received and reviewed from members of the TWG subcommittee tasked with reviewing the CAB Recommendation for Future Nevada Test Site Well Locations (memo to Steve Mellington, dtd February 10, 2006). Review comments were received from Sig Drellack, Gayle Pawloski, Rick Waddell, and Dave Finnegan. Each of the reviewers has brought their own unique perspectives to bear on the well proposals. Bullet summaries were prepared of what I believe to be the main points raised by each reviewer.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (702) 295-3188.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill Wilborn".

Bill Wilborn
UGTA Federal Sub-Project Director
Environmental Restoration Project

ERP:2167.BW

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/encl:
Tim Murphy, NDEP, Las Vegas, NV

TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP
COMMENTS ON CAB WELL SITE RECOMMENDATIONS

CAB Site #1 Summary Comments

The stated objective for this well is to “intersect a contaminant plume which can be tied to the source test”.

- CAB#1 is likely to fulfill the CAB’s stated objective to intersect a contaminant plume. However, this location is too close to the ER-20-5 well cluster to provide much, if any, new hydrogeologic information. “Plume chasing” in fractured aquifers can be problematic (SLD).
- Plume chasing is a difficult, high-risk task; it is almost impossible to predict with confidence that a plume will be encountered. A drill hole this close to existing drill holes brings no new geologic, hydrologic, and chemical understanding to UGTA (GAP).
- A well drilled at the proposed location of CAB#1 may encounter radionuclides migrating solely from BENHAM, or it may encounter a mixture from TYBO and BENHAM. In the first case, the additional information gained is likely to be little more than a confirmation of the results from the ER-20-5 wells. In the second case, it may not be possible to interpret the results without considerable uncertainty (RW).
- Trying to track a plume can be extremely difficult. Just drawing a straight line from Benham through ER-20-5#1 to the proposed site looks good on paper but can lead to great disappointment in the field. That being said, I do like the idea of intercepting a contaminant plume, but the risks of not hitting the plume must be taken into account (DLF).

CAB Site #2 Summary Comments

The stated objective for this well is to “sample geochemistry, measure elevation of the water, and test for potential contamination”.

- The CAB#2 location is not in an uncharacterized portion of the model. Consequently, the amount of new hydrogeologic data as desired by the CAB will not be that useful to the UGTA Project. This proximal down-gradient site would be a good “sentinel well” to monitor for contaminant movement from Pahute Mesa tests (SLD).
- A drill hole this close to existing drill holes brings little new [data] to UGTA. Locating the drill hole in the transition zone [caldera margin] cannot be a top technical reason for siting this hole where it is. The CAB must be willing to state clearly the low confidence and risk associated with this location, and strengthen the argument that the site is valuable even if it isn’t optimally located in the transition zone. The idea of using the well as a monitoring site is attractive, but we won’t know if this is an optimal monitoring location until we get to that stage of the program (GAP).
- It is recommended that CAB#2 (and CAB#1) sites would be more optimally located between the BENHAM and TYBO underground test locations because of the information already available from the ER-20-5 wells, an increased likelihood of obtaining info on a greater number of radionuclides at concentrations representing a greater health risk, and the avoidance of issues related to mixing of TYBO and BENHAM waters (RW).

- If a plume was intercepted, this would be a wonderful well, but the likelihood of intersecting the plume decreases with distance. One would need to look at the value of the well if the plume was not detected (DLF).

CAB Site #3 Summary Comments

The stated objective for this well is to “improve the understanding of the effect of the structure known as the Thirsty Canyon Lineament on groundwater flow”.

- The CAB#3 site needs refinement, and the CAB acknowledges that additional work is necessary to precisely site this well. A focused study that reevaluates all the geophysical data specifically to help site a drill hole should be considered. However, pushing the geophysical data further may not be fruitful. The CAB#3 general location is in a geologically challenging and important down-gradient structural block. A borehole in this vicinity would provide useful information to the UGTA Project and better constrain subsequent modeling. Constructing an access road to this area is going to be challenging and costly (SLD).
- Many would agree that the Thirsty Canyon Lineament has a poorly understood effect on groundwater flow. However, a single drill hole probably will not supply sufficient information to understand the issue. Multiple drill holes and aquifer tests are not part of DOE’s promise to drill a location for the CAB, and frankly, this issue is an important scientific question that should not be left to the CAB if it is to be investigated (GAP).
- A well in this general location will have utility from a long-term monitoring perspective. A single well will probably not be able to answer the geologic question concerning the “origin” of the Thirsty Canyon lineament. Thus, I would recommend that the well be sited to answer questions related to its hydrologic significance, through collection of water-level and geochemical data. I suggest additional discussions about the siting of this hole be considered prior to extensive planning (RW).
- This well would be an excellent location if there was a suitable place to drill it. This would be a sensible hole from the geology/geochemistry standpoint, but doesn’t do much for [improving our understanding of] source term (DLF).

General Comments:

- Although justifications for the new drill-hole locations are fairly well defined by the CAB, details about drill-hole design, completion, and post completion objectives are not well developed (SLD).
- Locating a hole is only part of the issue, and may only be the tip of the iceberg. No comments are provided by the CAB for well completions, types of analyses to be performed, or post-completion sampling schedule (are the wells to be sampled regularly?) Are these holes automatically part of the monitoring network, even if not optimally located for monitoring?

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM INDIVIDUAL TWG SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS

To: T. P. Rose
From: S. L. Drellack, Jr.
Subject: Comments on *Community Advisory Board for Nevada Test Site Programs (CAB) Recommendation for Future Nevada Test Site Well Locations, February 10, 2006*
Date: March 14, 2006

I have prepared the following comments in response to your request to assess the technical merit of the three drill sites recommended by the Community Advisory Board for NTS Programs (CAB) in their February 10, 2006 letter to Mr. Stephen Mellington. This review was conducted with two perspectives in mind: 1) From the CAB's perspective -- would these three proposed drill sites satisfy their stated objectives? and 2) From the UGTA Project perspective -- would these proposed locations, if drilled, yield important or significant new information useful to the UGTA Project?

My discussion starts with four general comments, followed by site-specific comments for each proposed well location.

General Comments

1. The top-priority objective of the CAB is to intersect a contaminant plume that can be tied to a particular source test. Understandably, they are particularly interested in western Pahute Mesa, which is immediately down-gradient of underground nuclear tests and up-gradient of stakeholders in Oasis and Amargosa Valleys. UGTA Well Cluster ER-20-5, drilled in 1995, did that. Encountering this contaminant plume at a location only slightly further down-gradient would not add significant new information. Also, "plume chasing" in fractured aquifers such as those at Pahute Mesa can be problematic.
2. Another top objective of the CAB is to collect important hydrogeologic data in "the critical focus area" (of western Pahute Mesa). Proposed sites CAB#1 and #2 are not far removed from existing drill holes that do provide substantial subsurface information. Though we can obtain some new information from virtually any new drill hole, this immediate area already has several good drill holes and is fairly consistent geologically. Hydrogeologic uncertainties as they relate to the PM-OV CAU framework model will not be reduced much by CAB#2 and not at all by CAB#1. CAB#3 (or a location nearby), on the other hand, does have the potential to provide information that would better constrain and enhance the model. Information that might affect transport uncertainty could be obtained from CAB#2 and #3 but not from CAB#1, particularly if CAB#1 encounters plume conditions similar to those at nearby Well Cluster ER-20-5.

3. The third objective of the CAB is to improve understanding of the Thirsty Canyon lineament (TCL), especially as to its affect on groundwater flow. Targeting buried, geophysically-inferred structures is also problematic, especially with only a single drill hole. The TCL is not well defined with hard data (e.g. drill holes). Though, we do have a half dozen or so holes (three pairs of boreholes) that help define it. Of course, this is a strong argument for making an effort to investigate it further. It was first recognized in 1999 by Grauch et al. as a geophysical anomaly. Its precise location varies with the geophysical method (e.g., aeromagnetic data vs. gravity). More discussion on this issue is presented in the site-specific section.
4. Justifications for the new drill-hole locations are fairly well defined by the CAB, however, details about drill-hole design, completion, and post completion objectives are not well developed. Two contaminated aquifers (two different contaminant plumes from perhaps two different tests) were encountered at Well Cluster ER-20-5. Groundwater samples from the Tonopah Spring aquifer (TSA) and a lava-flow aquifer (LFA) within the Calico Hills zeolitic composite unit (CHZCM) both have high tritium values. Does the CAB wish to investigate both with two separate completion zones? If no tritium plume is encountered, should the well be pumped in an attempt to draw in a nearby plume, or simply monitor for natural transport?

Site-Specific Comments

CAB#1

The proposed CAB#1 site is located about 270 m (885 ft) south-southeast of UGTA Well ER-20-5#1. This is about 480 m (1575 ft) southwest of the TYBO test conducted at U20y and about 5,000 ft south-southwest of the BENHAM test at U20c (the infamous source of radionuclides found at Well Cluster ER-20-5). The stated objective is to intersect a contaminant plume. Additionally, it would be desirable to detect "...radionuclides other than tritium so that contaminants maybe linked to a specific historical test." According to the CAB, focusing on a site behind the leading edge of the known ER-20-5 plume best fulfills these criteria. However, as stated in General Comment #1 above, Well Cluster ER-20-5 already did this. The 800-ft separation may not be enough to provide significant new information. It was possible to trace radionuclides from the BENHAM test, but are other possible source tests unique enough to "fingerprint?" This site, with its stated objective, may not be a cost-effective endeavor.

Access to this proposed site is excellent due to its proximity to an existing, recently drilled location. The terrain is accommodating for pad construction. Both of these attributes would be economic pluses. The CAB has also suggested the possibility for gaining further efficiencies by reusing the existing sumps at Well Cluster ER-20-5. This should be pursued. The proposed site would be very close to the southern group of sumps, #3 through #7. These lined sumps also would be useful to dispose potentially contaminated water from well development, pump tests, well purging, etc.

Targeting the TSA at 2,160- to 2,590-ft depth and the CHZCM lava-flow aquifer at 3,201- to 3,620-ft depth would necessitate two separate completion zones. I agree with the CAB that the

hole should TD within the tuff confining unit immediately underlying the target LFA. TD would therefore be at about 4,000 ft.

CAB#2

The suggested location for CAB#2 is about 3,600 ft south of Well ER-20-5#1 and in line with CAB#1. As the CAB points out, this is generally down-gradient of the TYBO and BENHAM tests. The potential to acquire new hydrogeologic information at this location also is not great, except perhaps near the bottom of the borehole. However, the potential for new transport data is better. Additionally, if no plume is encountered, this would be a favorable sentinel well, as intended by the CAB. The statement that "...contamination could be in this area by 2020" is intriguing. Where does this date come from, and what are the associated uncertainties?

As mentioned in General Comment #4, what are the completion and monitoring plans? Are two isolated completions desired? Monitoring and pumping objectives would be important aspects to achieving the overall scientific objectives for this well.

Access to the site is good and there are no topographical impediments to building a location at this site. For planning purposes hole construction and TD should be similar to CAB#1.

CAB#3

The location for the CAB#3 well is not yet firm. The primary objective is to improve understanding of the effect of the TCL on groundwater flow. As mentioned in General Comment #3, this feature is not well understood, and any effort to gather information in the vicinity of the TCL would contribute to the overall goals of the CAB and the UGTA Project. The UGTA base model (BN, 2002) depicts this feature not as a separate feature unto itself, but rather as the western edge of the two caldera complexes, though an alternative model depicts the TCL as a distinct and continuous structural feature. Mankinen, et al. 1999 describes the TCL as a 2- to 5-km wide fault zone. A compilation of traces representing this feature by various investigators using several geophysical tools is presented as Plate 2 in BN, 2002. Based on these traces, the CAB#3 location could be 600 to 900 m (2,000 to 3,000 ft) east-southeast of the TCL (Figure 1). The CAB's suggestion to conduct some additional geophysical survey(s) in order to refine this well location may not be as helpful as one would hope. This feature is defined by geophysical methods (specifically aeromagnetic, gravity and resistivity). The list of authors and coauthors who have studied this feature include: Grauch, Sawyer, Fridrich, and Hudson (1999); and Mankinen, Hildenbrand, Dixon, and McKee (1999); in addition to the UGTA modeling team (BN, 2002). A reevaluation of the existing geophysical data might help refine the prospective location. Ultimately the TCL will need to be drilled, and a core hole (ideally, two holes) would provide the maximum amount of geologic data to help characterize this feature.

As discussed above, we are not ready to precisely pick this site. However, a drill site in the vicinity of CAB#3 would definitely enhance the model, as the Timber Mountain Bench structural block has not been drilled. This block is directly down-gradient of tests conducted on Pahute Mesa and could play an important roll in controlling groundwater flow from Areas 19 and 20. A segment of the TCL forms the western edge of this block, providing additional incentives for drilling a CAB#3 location.

The proposed coordinates for the CAB#3 location given in the CAB letter would be very difficult and costly to access with regards to road construction.

Summary

CAB#1 is likely to fulfill the CAB's stated objective to intersect a contaminant plume. However, this location is too close to Well Cluster ER-20-5 to provide much, if any, new hydrogeologic information to the UGTA Project.

The CAB#2 location is not in an uncharacterized portion of the model. Consequently, the amount of new hydrogeologic data as desired by the CAB, will not be that useful to the UGTA Project. This proximal down-gradient site would be a good "sentinel well" to monitor for contaminant movement from Pahute Mesa tests.

Flow and transport modeling specific to this study might be used to help site another location that would address most of the objectives of both CAB#1 and #2 with only one well (i.e., somewhere between the two proposed locations).

The CAB#3 site needs refinement, and the CAB acknowledges that additional work (they suggest geophysical surveys) is necessary to precisely site this well. A focused study that reevaluates all the geophysical data specifically to help site a drill hole should be considered. However, pushing the geophysical data further (including additional surveys) may not be fruitful. The CAB#3 general location is in a geologically challenging and important down-gradient structural block. A borehole in this vicinity would provide useful information to the UGTA Project and better constrain subsequent modeling. Constructing an access road to this area is going to be challenging and costly.

If you need additional details, please feel free to call or e-mail me.

CAB Well Recommendations
Dave Finnegan
April 7, 2006

General comments

I think that the well sites proposed by the CAB are well thought out and planned and in general are reasonable. I think that the only problem with their sites is their lack of familiarity with the NTS and not understanding the difficulty in tracking contaminant plumes.

CAB Well #1

As we on the TWG are all aware, trying to track a plume can be extremely difficult. Just drawing a straight line from Benham through ER20-5#1 to their proposed site looks good on paper but can lead to great disappointment in the field. There is no guarantee that the radioactive plume will be intercepted since the water does not necessarily move in a straight line. That being said, I do like the idea of intercepting a contaminate plume, but the risks of not hitting the plume must be taken into account. As Sig said, we have plenty of geological data in this area, so a well that does intercept the plume would not be very useful.

CAB Well #2

I do like their idea of following a plume down gradient for more than a kilometer, but again, the likelihood of intersecting the plume decreases with distance. If the plume was intercepted this would be a wonderful well, however, one would need to look at the value of the well if the plume was not detected. According to Sig, this well (#2) would be more useful geologically so it may be a better choice than #1.

CAB Well #3

This well would be an excellent location if there was a suitable place to drill it. From the maps, there does not appear to be a relatively flat area close to their suggested location. If a reasonable area could be found, this would be a sensible hole from the geology/geochemistry standpoint. It doesn't do much for the source term folks (i.e. me.) I would prefer to be risky and drill either #1 or #2.



ORIENTATION AND RETREAT

Date: June 3, 2006

CAB Members Present: Kathleen Peterson, Chair; Marian Lawrence, Vice Chair; Bill Aldrich, Robert Gatliff, Dave Hermann, Robert Johnson, Vernell McNeal, Genne Nelson, Ted Oom, Charles Phillips, Jackson Ramsey, David Rosin, M.D.; Jan Spinato, Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen, Harold Sullivan, James Weeks, and Walter Wegst, Ph.D.

Liaison Members Present: Steve Mellington, NNSA; Tim Murphy, NDEP; David Ek, National Park Service; and David Swanson, Nye Co. Nuclear Waste Repository Office

CAB Members Not Present: Paul Adras, Kaye Allisen-Medlin, Steve Hopkins, Warren Pawliuk, and Stacy Standley

Liaison Members Not Present: Tiffany Lantow, DTRA

Department of Energy: Frank DiSanza, Kelly Snyder, John Jones, Sabine Curtis, Bill Wilborn, and Joni Norton

Facilitator: Carla Sanda

Support Staff: Dr. Helen Neill, UNLV; Elizabeth Thomson, UNLV; Kay Planamento, and Carla Sanda

DRAFT

Agenda - Orientation

Meeting Objectives:

- Provide project updates/overviews
- Provide "lay of the land" – CAB "Big Picture"
- Who does what

Briefings

- Environmental Management Overview
- Soils Project
- Industrial Sites
- Underground Test Area (UGTA)
- Transuranic/Mixed Transuranic Waste
- Low-Level Waste
- Mixed Low-Level Waste
- EM Public Involvement
 - SSAB History
 - Travel Reimbursement Procedures

Agenda - Retreat

- Nevada Division of Environmental Protection and Department of Energy Perspective on CAB Work Plan Development

- Work Plan Development Break-Out
- Committee Work Plan Approvals
- Mid-Year Self Assessment
- Other Business

DRAFT

New Ad Hoc Committee - Environmental Management Public Information Review Effort (EMPIRE)

Walt Wegst moved, seconded by David Rosin to approve new ad hoc committee to review Nevada Site Office EM outreach material. Motion passed unanimously. Jan Spinato, newly elected Chair, presented the proposed work plan. Dave Hermann moved, seconded by Hal Sullivan, to approve work plan as presented by the EMPIRE Committee. Motion passed unanimously.

UGTA Committee

Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen presented the proposed work plan. Ted Oom moved, seconded by Walt Wegst, to approve the work plan as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

Transportation/Waste Committee

Dave Hermann presented the committee's proposed work plan. Jack Ramsey moved, seconded by Ted Oom, to approve the work plan as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

CAB Work Plan Approval

Kelly Snyder, Designated Deputy Federal Officer, approved all work plans for the remainder of FY 2006.

Mid-Year Evaluation

The 2006 Mid-year CAB Self-Evaluation was distributed for all to review.

SSAB Letters

Kathleen Peterson explained the following two letters developed by the nine Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) at the recent SSAB Semi-Annual Chairs meeting held in Knoxville, TN.

1. Letter to James A. Rispoli regarding, "Recommendation for EM SSAB Input to Future Site Environmental Budget Requests,"
2. Letter to Mr. Rispoli regarding, "Incorporation of Lessons Learned in Future Site Closures."

After discussion, Dr. Walter Wegst moved, seconded by Charles Phillips, to approve both letters. Motion was unanimously passed.

Other Business

- Reminder of the Administrative Committee meeting scheduled for July 12, 2006.
- Status report on submittal of the CAB membership package to DOE Headquarters for approval.
- Discussion of March 2007 SSAB Meeting to be held in Las Vegas
- Helen Neill, UNLV, distributed a CD containing the latest version of the EM 101 handbook.