

Rocky Flats Stewardship Council Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, October 2, 2006
8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Jefferson County Airport, Broomfield

Board members: Lorraine Anderson (Director, Arvada), Clark Johnson (Alternate, Arvada), Matt Jones (Alternate, Boulder), Jane Uitti (Alternate, Boulder County), Lori Cox (Director, Broomfield), Mike Bartleson (Alternate, Broomfield), Chuck Baroch (Director, Golden), Bob Nelson (Alternate, Golden), Jim Congrove (Director, Jefferson County), Kate Newman (Alternate, Jefferson County), Shari Paiz (Director, Northglenn), Shelley Stanley (Alternate, Northglenn), Karen Imbierowicz (Director, Superior), Jo Ann Price (Director, Westminster), Ron Hellbusch (Alternate, Westminster), Ken Foelske (Director), Jeannette Hillery (Director, League of Women Voters).

Stewardship Council staff members and consultants: David Abelson (Executive Director), Rik Getty (Technical Program Manager), Barb Vander Wall (Seter & Vander Wall, P.C.), Erin Rogers (consultant).

Attendees: Carl Spreng (CDPHE), Mark Aguilar (EPA), Mark Sattleberg (USFWS), Frazer Lockhart (DOE), Jennifer Bohn (RFCLOG accountant), Scott Surovchak (DOE), Cathy Shugarts (City of Westminster), Bob Darr (DOE/Stoller), Larry Kimmel (EPA), Linda Kaiser (Stoller), John Rampe (DOE-RF), Doug Hansen (Stoller), Jeanette Alberg (Senator Allard), Joe Legare (Stoller), John Boylan (Stoller), Shirley Garcia (Broomfield and Westminster), George Squibb (Stoller), Jane Greenfield (City of Westminster), Joshua Baile (City of Thornton), Sam Garcia (EPA), David Krucek (CDPHE), Tim Purdue (Town of Superior), Laura Hubbard (City and County of Broomfield), Jeannine Waterman (CDPHE), Bob Nininger (consultant), Cindy Pritekel (Stoller, PE Group), Amy Thornburg (USFWS), Erin Minks (Senator Salazar), Darrell Cornell (COMRAD).

Convene/Agenda Review

Chair Lorraine Anderson convened the meeting at 8:35 a.m. and asked if there were any proposed changes to the agenda. There were none.

Business Items

1) Consent Agenda –Karen Imbierowicz moved to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Kate Newman. The motion passed unanimously.

2) Executive Director's Report - David Abelson reported on the following items:

- The CAD/ROD for Rocky Flats has been signed, which marks the end of the cleanup process at the site. The next step will be approval of the post-closure regulatory agreement, the Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement. David noted that the way in which the agencies are engaging the Stewardship Council and the public in general is starting to change. The CAD/ROD was signed only 16 days after the comment period

ended, which David believes was unnecessary and unfortunate. He said that EPA-Headquarters pushed the CAD/ROD along to meet quotas for the year. This process was in stark contrast to the way decisions were made during cleanup. The public had been waiting quite a long time for the CAD/ROD, which is a very important document ending the cleanup process. There has been a fundamental change in how business is being done at Rocky Flats now. The public got a first look at the draft post-closure agreement back in December 2003 when Dan Miller shared a copy with the Stewardship Working Group before DOE and EPA had even seen it. However, now that the agreement is close to being released for public comment, the public has not yet seen Attachment 3, which contains most of the important parts of the agreement. David finds this trend troubling in terms of what it means for public involvement and partnership as we move into post-closure.

- The Rocky Flats Coalition had a presence in Washington D.C. about four times per year. David believes that while a DC presence remains important, twice each year will be ample for the Stewardship Council. He also believes it will be valuable for the Stewardship Council to continue as a member of the Energy Communities Alliance.
- David next addressed the issue of Rocky Flats mineral rights acquisition. Senators Allard and Salazar sponsored legislation which became law to provide the means by which willing sellers could sell their mineral rights to DOE. The legislation also encompassed Natural Resource Damage claims through the State of Colorado. Congress appropriated \$10 million for this project, and included a one year timeline for the rights acquisitions. DOE tells David negotiations are going well.
- Finally, David reported that he and Jennifer Bohn were not happy with the company that recently completed the final Coalition audit. Therefore, the Stewardship Council will be soliciting new bids for the next audit. This budget item was increased for 2007 in case additional costs arise.

Ken Foelske asked how many acres would be involved in a mineral acquisition. David noted based on what DOE tells him that willing sellers own approximately 500 acres.

Public Comment

There were no comments.

FY07 Stewardship Council Budget – Initial Review

Lorraine asked the Board's attorney, Barb Vander Wall, to explain the legal requirements for the budget process. Barb explained that the Stewardship Council, as an entity of local government, is required to submit a draft budget and make it available to the public by October 15th. The group must then hold a budget hearing before December 31st. Prior to the budget hearing, the Stewardship Council will publish notice in the *Denver Post* and allow the public to comment on the draft prior to adoption. Finally, the Board will approve the budget and appropriate the money. Copies of the draft budget were available at this meeting for review.

David Abelson noted that the Stewardship Council's FY06 budget was only for 9 months. In terms of funding, the FY07 budget is actually smaller than FY06 if it had been extended to 12 months. This draft presumes that any staff will be consultants and there will be no office space rental. David also pointed out that the 'revenue' figure is somewhat misleading because the number provided does not reflect how much funding is actually available; rather the amount shown is the grant dollars that are budgeted for 2007. While the Board will have to make decisions regarding staff for next year, the monthly amount in the draft budget is one that David was comfortable putting in not knowing what personnel will be. He added that there may be some cushion in this budget. There were no questions or comments.

Briefing/Discussion on CAD/ROD and Post-Closure Regulatory Agreement

John Rampe from DOE-Rocky Flats gave this presentation. DOE and the regulators signed the CAD/ROD on September 29th. The CAD/ROD documents the remedial action that was selected for Rocky Flats and includes a responsiveness summary which addresses public comments. John explained that there were two selected decisions. For the Central Operable Unit, Alternative 2 was chosen. This alternative includes monitoring and maintenance with physical and institutional controls. For the Peripheral Operable Unit, the selected remedy is no action. All areas other than what DOE will manage will be transferred to the USFWS.

Features of the selected remedy include continued maintenance of landfill covers and groundwater treatment systems; environmental monitoring; institutional controls to prevent unacceptable exposure and protect the remedy; physical controls, including signs and protection of engineered components; and an enforceable agreement (Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement) and state environmental covenant.

Jo Ann Price asked about two monitoring stations that might fall outside of DOE's perimeter. John said he thinks there are three monitoring stations outside of this area, but he will get to the answer a little later.

John reported that there are no significant differences between the Proposed Plan and the CAD/ROD, but additional details were added in some areas. The document is posted on the Rocky Flats website. Some of the additional details include objectives, rationale and implementation of institutional controls. Also, DOE received many comments on signs. The CAD/ROD calls for two kinds of signs. The first type is boundary signs, which will state that there is no trespassing allowed. A second type of sign, added to the CAD/ROD, will be posted at access points, and include a notification of restrictions and contact number. Also, about 100 acres were added to the central OU, in order to avoid the boundary going through wetlands, which are difficult to mark. This change also brought one of the monitoring stations back into the OU. Additionally, there is a lot more detail regarding the scope and role of the Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement (RFLMA).

Substantial comments were received on the issue of the boundary fence, boundary wells and monitoring points. Neither a boundary fence nor wells are required by the CAD/ROD, but DOE does intend to build a fence and the RFCA parties are working toward making boundary wells a

requirement in the draft RFLMA. Although conditions on the ground do not require boundary wells, the parties know there is an interest. The RFLMA will be easier to modify than the CAD/ROD if the agencies and the public decide the wells are no longer needed in the future. Monitoring points are required by the CAD/ROD and DOE will protect these points to ensure their continued functioning even though they are outside the Central OU.

Next steps for the site will include completing a boundary survey of the Central OU, modifying the environmental covenant to incorporate the entire Central OU, and completing the draft RFLMA, which includes soliciting comments and getting it signed.

David Abelson asked if the boundary fence will be included in the RFLMA. John said it will not be in that agreement because the fence is going to be treated as a 'best management practice', not a requirement. David pointed out that the boundary wells are not a requirement, but will be included in the RFLMA. John said they do not see the fence in the same category. David also asked how the agencies can justify signing off on the regulatory agreement when they are not sure about the effectiveness of the Solar Ponds Treatment System and its ability to operate as designed. He noted this issue, which was raised in the Stewardship Council's comments on the Proposed Plan, was not addressed in responsiveness summary. John responded that the treatment system had long history of functioning properly, and now that it is repaired, the site expects full well that it will return to functionality. The remedy has been installed and will continue to operate. He said that the work that was done was maintenance. Also, if it does not function properly, DOE will have to fix it again. Therefore, it was not a compelling reason to hold off on signing the CAD/ROD. David concluded by saying that the Stewardship Council's letter asked for an answer regarding this issue and they did not receive one until now.

Ron Hellbusch asked for a clarification of John's statement regarding 'continued functioning' of the POCs. John explained that DOE needs to continue to monitor, maintain, and protect the points of compliance. They have long history of being functioning well, but if anyone was to cause any damage, DOE would have to increase security in some way. DOE's responsibility to maintain these stations serves the same purpose as Institutional Controls. This will be documented in the RFLMA and it is also in the CAD/ROD.

Jane Uitti asked what kind of environmental monitoring will be done and where. John replied that the environmental monitoring is primarily within the Central OU for surface and ground water. They will continue monitoring at the POCs that currently exist. They are also required to continue monitoring POEs upstream of the ponds and at known areas of contamination. There will likely be some minor modifications to the series of groundwater wells that are monitored, but that network will remain in place. These are all within the Central OU.

Shelley Stanley asked about the request that terminal ponds be sampled annually. John said this request was not incorporated. She then asked whether the selenium map will be corrected or an errata will be printed. John said that selenium was not identified as a contaminant of concern or analyte of interest, and he thinks that it is at background levels. Shelley replied that it still would be helpful to have the data.

Mike Bartleson noted that Part 10 of the CAD/ROD states that only significant changes will go out for public comment and asked how the agencies will determine what is significant. John said that DOE will advise the public on any change, and added that they will consider revising the document to reflect this.

Ken Foelske asked if there will be any air monitoring. John said that previous results have been very low, never more than 3% of allowable limit, most of which was background. Therefore, the agencies saw no need to continue.

Ron Hellbusch noted that Westminster felt strongly that the annual testing of the ponds was a workable alternative their original request for more frequent pond releases. John said that the agencies just did not think it was technically necessary.

Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement

John noted that much of this has previously been shared with stakeholders, as it has been under negotiation for more than two years. The objectives of the RFLMA are similar to RFCA, and include coordinating all DOE's obligations into one agreement; specifying how remedy objectives will be met; specifying requirements for monitoring, operation and maintenance; specifying review and termination processes; and providing for public involvement.

Jo Ann Price said she did not see how downstream communities will be consulted. John said this will be in the public involvement plan. Jo Ann said she would rather the document be more specific. John said this plan will be put out for public comment.

The RFLMA will supersede RFCA when it is signed by DOE-LM, CDPHE and EPA, and will similarly be a CERCLA/RCRA/CHWA agreement. Next steps include complete the drafting of Attachment 3. This attachment will contain the meat of the requirements, including monitoring and maintenance, and reporting requirements. Currently, the document is being edited for internal consistency. John said he does not think there will be many surprises in the monitoring program they will be proposing in Attachment 3.

A preliminary draft will be released in mid to late-October, with a formal comment period beginning in late October or early November, most likely lasting 30 days. The agencies plan to sign the agreement in December. Jo Ann Price said she would like the comment period to last 60 days. John said one of the reasons for the shorter comment period is that there is not a great deal of difference between the RFLMA and the existing IMP. Therefore, it is really a continuation of current processes rather than a new plan. Shelley Stanley asked if the IMP is being updated as well. John said it is not, because they want to include all DOE responsibilities in the RFLMA.

Karen Imbierowicz said she would like the Stewardship Council to ask DOE to put a requirement for a boundary fence in the RFLMA, and also to clarify the involvement of downstream communities. She noted that it will be important to think about these issues for next month's meeting.

David noted that the Stewardship Council may want to add a meeting in December in order to be able to comment on the RFLMA. He thought perhaps it could be scheduled for December 4, but Lorraine pointed out that there is a National League of Cities conference on that day. The Stewardship Council will discuss this further during the Big Picture agenda item.

Ron Hellbusch asked if Attachment 3 is available now. John said that they are hoping to get it done in the next 2-3 weeks so that it is available prior to the comment period.

Mark Aguilar spoke to the shift in public involvement that David mentioned during his update. He pointed out that one thing that happened recently is that Rocky Flats has moved out of RFCA and into CERCLA, which explains why communication has diminished somewhat. Public communication is outside of that process. He added that he is looking forward to shifting back to more involvement as part of the RFLMA, and that the public has always helped, so he is looking forward to working with everyone again. He also pointed out that part of the reason the CAD/ROD was signed so fast was because most of comments agreed with the chosen alternative.

Legacy Management Quarterly Meeting

John Boylan - 2nd Quarter Ground Water Monitoring Results

John noted that the main activities of the groundwater monitoring program are, 1) routine 'IMP' groundwater monitoring, 2) special ('non-IMP') monitoring, and 3) treatment system maintenance.

All well classes except water level were sampled as part of the IMP monitoring, which included AOC, boundary, sentinel, evaluation, RCRA and decision document locations. Other locations included treatment systems and surface water support (1 of 2 locations). Results from this quarter represent the first comprehensive post-closure data set. Although not all evaluation wells were due for sampling, they did sample them all in order to put them all on the same schedule and to collect the comprehensive, post-closure dataset. Analytical data from this sampling are included as Appendix A in the report.

One hundred and fourteen locations were scheduled for sampling, but one was cancelled. This led to 240 of 248 scheduled samples being taken. Dry locations included one treatment system performance monitoring location, two sentinel wells and three decision document wells.

All seven AOC wells were sampled and none of the applicable standards or thresholds was exceeded. Both boundary wells were sampled. The well on Walnut Creek at Indiana came back very high for nitrate, but after re-sampling, the results were normal.

Thirty of 32 Sentinel wells were successfully sampled. Plutonium and americium activities from wells downgradient of B771 and B371 remain very low. There were VOCs in samples from a well at Pond B-3. PCE showed a significant decrease, TCE showed an insignificant decrease, while Cis-1,2-DCE (a typical breakdown product of TCE and PCE) showed a significant increase. TCE was also found to have a statistically insignificant increase at a well at Pond B-2.

John also noted statistically insignificant increases and decreases of VOCs and uranium around the site, including near the 903 pad, B991 and the East Landfill Pond.

Lorraine Anderson asked what an 'insignificant' increase or decrease was. John explained that these were not statistically significant. Shelley Stanley asked if they used the entire period of record to make their determinations. John said they did.

John went on to report that all 40 evaluation wells and all 10 RCRA wells were successfully sampled. Also, six of nine decision document wells were successfully sampled, and in OU1, the results were consistent with previous data. Nine of ten treatment system locations were successfully sampled as well.

In the sampling that took place prior to treatment system repairs at the Solar Ponds, GS13 was dry. Influent sampling showed nitrate increasing significantly and uranium increasing insignificantly. At the discharge gallery, both nitrate and uranium were increasing significantly. Effluent was not analyzed for trend, as the 85th percentile concentrations were well below the applicable threshold.

At the Mound treatment system, VOC detections in effluent and at GS10 led to the decision to replace the treatment media. At the East Trenches, the results were consistent with previous data. For surface water support, no VOCs were detected downgradient of IHSS 118.1 and POM3 sampling was cancelled because the State did not require it.

The site also conducted some non-IMP sampling. At the Mound treatment system, they collected extra samples of influent and effluent in order to assess the need for media replacement. At the Solar Ponds, there were field screening samples of influent, effluent, locations within the cells, the discharge gallery and GS13. Also, 'no-purge' data collection continued in order to compare the effectiveness of two different sampling protocols. These results will be evaluated in the Annual Report.

Shelley Stanley asked for confirmation that the temporary modification is 100 mg/l. John said that is correct.

John added that uranium is being treated, and nitrate has been cut in half or less. The effluent levels have been cut by a factor of 10 or more. So, currently, the effectiveness of the repairs is looking good.

Other events during the quarter included replacing the effluent line at the East Trenches; replacing the effluent line and planning media replacement at the Mound; and repairs, inspection and testing at the Solar Ponds. The site is also monitoring a slump at well 45605, which they will resurvey in the future.

Shelley Stanley asked if they were able to sample this well. John said the last time they sampled it was in July, but they will try again soon because it looks like they will not be able to collect samples for much longer. At that time, they will re-evaluate this area with the regulators.

Jo Ann Price wanted to know when the technical staff should ask their questions. David Abelson said that since this was a new process for meetings to go ahead and ask any questions now if they would like, as it may be good for everyone to hear.

Laura Hubbard asked John to explain true vs. traditional samples. John explained that a pump had been installed which provided the true samples, and the traditional samples were those taken without the use of the pump. He was also asked if there was a plausible explanation for the anomalous nitrate results. John said there could have been a mix-up with the bottles used to collect samples, as some used nitrate preservatives, or with the lab. He was asked how much time elapsed between samples and he responded that it was about 4-6 weeks. Shirley Garcia asked about POM3 where the State did not schedule sampling. She said their docs and the IMP say different things. John was also asked about actions taken at the discharge gallery. He said that the downgradient water originally flowed east, but it started to shortcut northward, so the site is re-routing it to flow east.

Lorraine Anderson asked how the site ensures the quality of the labs it uses. John responded that the labs meet strict quality control standards, and they also do periodic audits. He was also asked if they are careful about how they create and seal wells. He said they are very careful, and also keep up on any new studies. Frazer Lockhart noted that during closure the site abandoned about 1,000 wells and that there was a very formal process for doing that.

George Squibb – RFETS 2nd Quarter Surface Water Monitoring and Operations

George is a project engineer for surface water, who has been at the site since 1992. He began by noting that the surface water program includes routine pond operations and routine surface water monitoring in accordance with the Rocky Flats Integrated Monitoring Plan (IMP).

Pond operations during the 2nd quarter did not include any terminal pond discharges or transfers. Maintenance included instrumentation upgrades, inclinometer readings and monument surveys. George also reported on current ponds levels which ranged from 3.4% - 20.2 % on 6/19/06. On October 2, 2006, they were even lower, ranging from 2%-19.9%.

Although the 2nd quarter of the year is usually the wettest quarter, this was a very dry spring, with only 1.71” of total precipitation. This was 29% of the average from 1993-2005. Flow rates were also very low, with either no flow or 1.4%-3.1% of flow averages.

IMP surface water objectives for this 2nd quarter report included point of compliance, point of evaluation, Present and Original Landfill performance, investigative, and nitrate sampling in Walnut Creek.

Point of compliance monitoring demonstrated compliance at Indiana Street through comparison of 30-day averages with RFCA standards; compliance at the terminal ponds was measured through comparison of 12-month rolling averages with RFCA standards. All water quality data at the RFCA POCs remain well below the applicable standards using all available data.

With regard to the low flows, Lorraine Anderson asked George whether this would be more correctly attributed to weather conditions or the removal of the impervious surfaces onsite.

George responded that in Woman Creek, he would think it was mostly climate, but for Walnut Creek, it was probably the result of both.

Point of evaluation monitoring demonstrated radionuclide compliance through a comparison of 12-month rolling averages with RFCA action levels. Metals compliance was demonstrated through a comparison of 85th percentile of 30-day averages for the calendar with RFCA action levels. Reportable 12-month rolling averages for uranium were observed for April through June 2006, and a source evaluation summary is presented in the report. This is predominantly natural uranium due to hydrological changes from the removal of impervious surfaces. The site will continue to watch and see what any long-term issues might be. All other water quality data at the RFCA POEs remain well below the applicable action levels using available data.

The site also conducts performance monitoring on the Present Landfill. On February 23, 2006, they sampled the North GWIS influent, seep influent to treatment system, effluent from treatment system and South GWIS influent (which was dry). Treatment system effluent data is compared to RFCA standards. Any concentration above the standard triggers monthly sampling for three consecutive months. Continued concentrations above the standard will trigger landfill pond sampling and consultation.

Several analytes had triggered monthly sampling at the Present Landfill. Monthly concentrations for antimony, phenanthrene, selenium, silver and thallium were below applicable standards. Therefore, monthly sampling for these analytes was discontinued and they reverted to a quarterly schedule. Monthly concentrations for manganese were above the standard for three consecutive months, triggering landfill pond sampling. The pond sample was below the applicable standard, so monthly sampling was discontinued. Monthly sampling for boron and arsenic also triggered landfill pond sampling. These results were above applicable standards, and the site is now consulting with the RFCA parties. Shirley Garcia stated that these samples should have been expedited. George and Scott Surovchak noted that there have not been any releases from the landfill pond since May.

Performance monitoring was also conducted at the Original Landfill at upstream and downstream locations, using flow-paced composites for metals and uranium.

Monthly sampling had been triggered for arsenic and thallium at the Original Landfill. The monthly concentrations were below applicable standards, so monthly sampling was discontinued and a quarterly schedule was re-instituted.

Investigative monitoring provides data to aid in source evaluation should reportable water quality be observed at downstream POEs or POCs. Continuous flow-paced composites were taken at five locations.

Finally, Walnut Creek is sampled for nitrates during pond discharges. There were no terminal pond discharges during the 1st quarter of CY06.

Bob Nininger – Air Quality

Bob reviewed air monitoring results for the 2nd quarter. Currently, there are only three air monitors in place at Rocky Flats, two along the east boundary on Indiana Street, and one on the west boundary on Highway 93. The eastern monitors primarily pick up dust blowing across the site and from the nearby road. The western monitor picks up gravel dust from nearby mining operations and also dust from the highway.

These monitors conduct continuous sampling for respirable particulate matter less than about 10 microns aerodynamic diameter (AED), and coarse particulate matter between 10 and about 25 microns AED. Samples are analyzed monthly for Pu-230, Am-241, U-234, -235 and -238. Bob also noted that the presentation results have been corrected for a recently discovered spreadsheet error (he had been reporting 4.8x higher than correct values).

Bob showed graphs depicting the results from the three-station network. There were no detects for plutonium or americium. In February and March, there was a laboratory error which resulted in lower results than normal. The lab has since taken corrective actions.

Annual averages for each of the three monitors compared to the standard show results of less than 1% of the standard. Since closure, these percentages are even lower.

The results suggest that air concentrations are comparable to typical previously observed levels.

Darryl Cornell – COMRAD Program Summary

This presentation was a summary of the COMRAD program's history, as it was discontinued at the end of September.

As part of the COMRAD program, air monitoring stations were placed in the downwind communities. Stations were located at Standley Lake Library in Arvada, Emerald Park in Broomfield, Countryside Recreation Center in Westminster, and Northglenn Recreation Center. Early in the program, there was also a station at Arvada West High School.

COMRAD had an educational mission and it was also used to validate the sampling at Rocky Flats. The samplers were similar to those at Rocky Flats, and were run continuously. Stations also included educational information and meteorological data. The stations ceased operations a little over one year ago. All stations are no longer operational. The air monitors never picked up any significant results and all were extremely low.

Many outreach activities were conducted during the history of COMRAD, including a website, media contacts, presentations/educational courses, booths, and literature distribution. Overall, the program reached an estimated 39,276 people.

Cindy Pritekel - Ecological Monitoring

Ecological data management and reporting activities during the 2nd quarter included data entry, QA and analysis of 2005 ecology data; data presented in the annual LM Report for Rocky Flats; semi-annual progress report for a dam-notching permit; and submittal of a draft wildfire consultation document to the USFWS in response to the April 2006 wildfire, with regard to Preble's mouse habitat.

Wildlife monitoring included an annual boreal frog vocalization survey on May 2nd. Dry conditions resulted in limited water available for mating pools. As a result, only 11 of the 20 monitoring locations had frogs present. This was the lowest recorded number of stations since the current survey route was begun in 1999. Further analysis of the data will be conducted and the results will be presented in the annual report.

The site is also responsible for monitoring four species of rare plants. These species are monitored under the Colorado Natural Heritage program.

Noxious weed control is an ongoing concern at Rocky Flats. Approximately 260 acres of native grassland and revegetation areas have been sprayed in 2006 to control noxious weeds. Weeds treated include diffuse knapweed, Canada thistle, Scotch thistle, common mullein, kochia, Dame's rocket, whitetop, and musk thistle. Additional locations may be treated this fall. A number of other locations were mowed. Treatment location maps and additional information will be included in the annual report. Shelley Stanley asked which herbicides were used. Cindy said the list was in the annual report. Shelley also asked if surrounding local governments had been notified. Cindy said this would have been in the monthly report.

The site also conducted weed mapping for diffuse knapweed and Dalmatian toadflax. Monitoring of Dalmatian toadflax densities was conducted at locations where different herbicide applications have been conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the methods. The results will be presented in the annual report.

Erosion control surveys were continued for evaluation in Preble's mouse mitigation areas and other revegetation areas. A subcontract was put in place for larger scale erosion control repairs. Erosion matting was replaced at some locations in South Walnut Creek. Smaller scale repairs were conducted as needed.

Willow stakes were planted in several locations. New ditches were cut to help re-route water and increase the amount of wetland at functional channel 1. Also, the wetland mitigation monitoring and management plan for Rocky Flats was finalized in June.

The site also monitored the results and regrowth after the April 2, 2006 wildfire that took place off Highway 128 and burned 852 acres, including 85 acres of Preble's habitat. The areas are growing back quite well.

Shirley Garcia noted that she would like to see the herbicide information in the quarterly reports.

Doug Hansen - Site Surveillance and Maintenance, Site Operations

The site performed an inspection at the Present Landfill on June 29th. This inspection followed the prescribed checklist in the monitoring and maintenance plan, and looked at subsidence/consolidation, slope stability, stormwater management structures, soil cover, and vegetation. No significant concerns were identified.

The Original Landfill was also inspected on June 29th. This inspection followed the same checklist as the Present Landfill. They are monitoring a small slump in the perimeter ditch. Seep #7 is not on the cover itself. The 'burrito drain' in this location was investigated and the collection system is functioning as designed.

Routine site inspections are required annually or after a 'significant event', such as a large precipitation event, seismic event, or deliberate human activity (vandalism). In these events, the site will document with photos and use applicable expertise, such as a geotech engineer, geologist, or ecologist.

Routine site inspections cover groundwater monitoring, stormwater management structures (functional channels and natural drainages), soil cover/erosion control, vegetation, fences and postings, site markers and monuments, monitoring locations, landfills, ponds and surface water features, groundwater treatment systems, and revegetation areas.

Site operations also include access and security, which includes the west access gate, east property boundary (Indiana Avenue) and a surveillance subcontract which began in April.

Outreach Plan

The agenda was revised by postponing discussion on the Stewardship Council's public outreach plan. Members were asked to send ideas on this topic to David.

Public Comment

There were no comments.

Updates/Big Picture

Lorraine Anderson invited Chuck Baroch, Director from Golden, to sit at table with the rest of the Stewardship Council.

David noted that there was some frustration over the quick turnaround with the CAD/ROD, and some comments were not addressed. He advised that the members think about whether the Board should follow-up with another letter.

David's advice is to hold another meeting before end of year. The draft RFLMA should be issued by early November. Karen Imbierowicz asked if this would give enough time to create comments at the December meeting. David said that the Stewardship Council should be able to work this out with DOE to stretch the comment period just a bit. The Stewardship Council just needs to be able to understand Attachment 3. Jeanette Hillery asked if the Stewardship Council will be able to review Attachment 3 before the November meeting. David said that the agencies are saying it will be out prior to this meeting.

The Stewardship Council agreed to schedule a meeting for December 11th.

Mike Bartleson provided an update to the Stewardship Council that DOE and Broomfield have entered into an IGA for water issues.

David noted that he needs information whenever items are added to the agenda, so that timing issues can be addressed. Lorraine noted that she appreciated all of the presentations during the LM Quarterly Meeting.

At 11:45 a.m. Lorraine Anderson motioned to move into Executive Session for the purposes of discussing personnel issues, and to receive legal advice on such issues, as authorized under Sections 24-6-402(4)(a), (b), (e) and (f), C.R.S. Chuck Baroch seconded the motion. The motion passed 11-0.

The Board reconvened from Executive Session at 12:00 p.m. and affirmed that no actions had been taken during Executive Session.

The Board determined not to do an RFP for Executive Director services for 2007, and to proceed with a new contract with David Abelson and his company, Crescent Strategies, subject to approval of a new agreement to be drafted by legal counsel.

Rik Getty announced that the airport board meeting room would be available for a special meeting scheduled for December 11, 2006.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.