

## **ROCKY FLATS STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL**

**Monday, November 8, 2010, 8:30 AM – 11:45 AM**

**Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport, Terminal Building, Mount Evans Room  
11755 Airport Way, Broomfield, Colorado**

**Board members in attendance:** Marc Williams (Director, Arvada), Maria VanderKolk (Alternate, Arvada), Lisa Morzel (Director, City of Boulder), Carl Castillo (Alternate, City of Boulder), Meagan Davis (Alternate, Boulder County), Lori Cox (Director, Broomfield), David Allen (Alternate, Broomfield), Greg Stokes (Alternate, Broomfield), Bill Fisher (Director, Golden), Kate Newman (Alternate, Jefferson County), Shelley Stanley (Alternate, Northglenn), Chris Hanson (Alternate, Superior), Jeannette Hillery (Director, League of Women Voters), Shirley Garcia (Director, Rocky Flats Cold War Museum), Ann Lockhart (Alternate, Rocky Flats Cold War Museum), Sue Vaughan (Alternate, League of Women Voters), Roman Kohler (Director, Rocky Flats Homesteaders), Arthur Widdowfield (citizen).

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

**Attendees:** Vera Moritz (EPA), Carl Spreng (CDPHE), Scott Surovchak (DOE-LM), Joe Legare (Stoller), Bob Darr (Stoller), Rick DiSalvo (Stoller), Jeremiah McLaughlin (Stoller), George Squibb (Stoller), John Boylan (Stoller), Jody Nelson (Stoller), Linda Kaiser (Stoller), Lynn Bowdidge (Stoller), Tom Pauling (DOE-LM), Jane Powell (DOE-LM), Ray Reling (Northglenn), Cathy Shugarts (Westminster), Doug Young (Sen. Udall).

### **Convene/Agenda Review**

Chair Lori Cox convened the meeting at 8:36 a.m. The first item was the consent agenda. In reviewing the minutes, two small changes were suggested. Shelley Stanley should be listed as an Alternate, and Jennifer Bohn should be moved to the staff category. Roman Kohler moved to approve the September Board meeting minutes as corrected. The motion was seconded by Bill Fisher. The motion to accept the minutes passed 11-0. Marc Williams moved to approve the checks. The motion was seconded Jeannette Hillery. The motion passed 11-0.

### **Executive Director's Report**

David Abelson provided several updates to the Board. First, he spoke about a letter that the Colorado Congressional delegation sent to the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding the status of Rocky Flats worker compensation. In this letter, which David had emailed to the Board, the delegation requested a reconsideration of the Department's denial of Special Cohort Status for Rocky Flats workers as part of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program. David noted that Special Cohort status had been granted to limited groups of workers at Rocky Flats and most other major nuclear weapons complex sites, but additional classes of workers, the Congressman noted, have been improperly denied. This status allows workers to bypass the requirement to document their exposure which is a huge challenge

because of data gaps and misinformation in existing historical records. This situation has led to widespread frustration throughout the complex, as the previous administration denied claim in order to save costs. David will keep the Board updated on any future developments.

David next spoke about the first DOE-LM Stakeholder conference that was scheduled for the following week in Grand Junction. David is participating on a panel called 'Stakeholder Perspectives'. His message will touch on several points, such as the fact that commenting on official documents is the bare minimum necessary for substantive stakeholder involvement. He will advise that groups wanting to really participate in decisions must move beyond this regulatory minimum and engage in true dialogue. David next reported that met with Leroy Moore with the Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center to discuss the Peace Center's attempts to convince government entities that the Stewardship Council should be considered a FACA group. David they had agreed to share information about what each group was doing. David said he explained that the fundamental role of this group was to provide substantive engagement of community members, and provide a forum for dialogue. David said that Leroy had a different idea about the activities of the Stewardship Council. They also spoke about the Stewardship Council's positions regarding the McKinley bill, which Leroy supports. Rather than working against the bill, David explained that the Board had not taken a position over the last couple of years. Also, individual members of the Stewardship Council had testified both for and against the bill. David said he was hopeful that this meeting had made some progress and opened a forum for dialogue.

David said there had been some progress regarding projects funded through the Rocky Flats Natural Resource Damage (NRD) fund. He provided an update on a package of work that has been developed. These projects include the Spicer mineral acquisition by the Trust for Public Lands, and seed collection by Boulder and Boulder County. Also, Westminster is in the process of taking steps to secure a 26-acre parcel east of Indiana Street, and has grant request in to GOCO. Regarding the parcel at Section 16, there has been ongoing dialogue and negotiation, as well as a proposal to acquire additional mineral rights. David concluded his updates by noting that he had recently distributed the Board's quarterly finance report.

Scott Surovchak, DOE-LM, added some information regarding the purchase of mineral rights onsite. The owner, Charlie McKay, is open to negotiations regarding two remaining parcels for the first time, so DOE is putting together a letter of intent to purchase these mineral rights. This will need to be signed by the NRD trustees. These negotiations also include the lessee (Lafarge), so that the agreement may ensure that minerals are not mined after the purchase. If successful, this will leave two non-DOE owned parcels that are being actively mined. The parties are negotiating new access routes for these parcels. Carl Spreng noted that Charlie McKay had previously given a deadline for his participation. Scott said this is not an issue at present and that McKay has remained interested as long as the negotiations are serious. Lisa Morzel noted that in the past these parcels were priced higher than their appraised value, and asked Scott if DOE will be getting a new appraisal. Scott said they will do appraisal once a deal is reached, but DOE's determination of value will also consider the value to the Refuge. This process is also working within the existing NRD timeline.

Roman Kohler addressed the issue regarding the renewed request for Rocky Flats special cohort status and noted that part of the problem is that the Charlie Wolf Act has not been enacted. The letter sent by the delegation is another way to accomplish same thing. Jeannette Hillery asked David if Leroy Moore indicated whether Rep. McKinley was planning to introduce another Rocky Flats bill this year. David said he did not ask. He added that since the State House will be controlled by the Republicans, the bill would probably have a lesser chance of proceeding and probably would not get out of committee. David also noted that former Stewardship Council member Matt Jones was elected as a State Representative, and would be able to provide his knowledge to any future discussions in the legislature.

### **Public Comment**

Doug Young with Senator Udall's office offered an update on Rocky Flats worker health issues. He emphasized that the delegation is still trying to push the Charlie Wolf Act. However, the challenge is that this bill needs a 'score' because of budget needs. They have received some preliminary information from the Congressional Budget Office that the cost will probably be in the multiple billions of dollars. Because of this, they are looking at other options. They have asked for an administrative rulemaking change. Also, the entire Colorado delegation (except Rep. Lamborn) sent the letter David Abelson spoke about regarding the Rocky Flats special exposure cohort petition. Doug noted that the new administration has been granting these petitions throughout the country, so he will keep the Board posted.

### **DOE Quarterly Meeting**

DOE briefed on Rocky Flats activities for the second quarter of 2010 (April – June). DOE has posted the full report on its website. Activities for the quarter included surface water monitoring, groundwater monitoring, ecological monitoring, and site operations (inspections, maintenance, etc.).

#### *Surface Water Monitoring – George Squibb*

There was some non-RFLMA work during the quarter. Many of these activities have only been taking place since spring, so they will know a great deal more in terms of results in coming quarters. Pond operations included terminal pond discharges of A-4 and B-5 in May, and transfers from A-3 to A-4 intermittently during the quarter. As of June 1, ponds A-3, A-4, B-5, and C-2 and the Landfill Pond were holding approximately 19.8% of capacity.

There was 6.65 inches of total precipitation during the quarter, which is 120% of the average. Flow rates ranged from a low of 11% at SW027 to 116-183% at GS01, GS03, GS10 and SW093. SW027 is the South Interceptor Ditch. Previous, higher flows in this drainage originated in the 400 area. Performance Monitoring during the second quarter showed surface water quality results below standards at both the Original and Present Landfills. George showed a map of the monitoring locations. Next, he ran through a number of slides showing Point of Compliance (POC) monitoring results at the five locations. All were well below standards. He pointed out the timeframes on the graphs showing when the ponds were discharged, and results were still well below the standards. He explained that results showing a big drop in uranium was correlated with some water from Broomfield coming through site. David Allen noted this water

came from Coal Creek. He also asked about a tiny jump in plutonium and americium results at GS01. George said some of that could be analytical error because the results were within the error bar for the testing, and some could be related to extra runoff events. The change was from 2% of the standard to 6% of the standard. David Allen also asked about GS08 and an increase in uranium, in a different timeframe than the increases at GS01. George explained that was from a batch sample, and was based on only two releases in the last year (12-month rolling average). David Allen commented that he was realizing that this system of plotting can show a 'false' stability. George said one can also look at the 30-day rolling average and additional analyses in the annual report. He added that, depending on the scenario, the 12-month rolling average can be more sensitive than the 30-day. David Allen asked about the previous discharge at Pond C-2, and said he was looking at little blip at GS31.

Point of Evaluation (POE) monitoring during the second quarter showed water quality data at POE SW027 (through April 26) indicated the standard for Pu-239,-240 (0.15 pCi/L) would be exceeded when complete data are available through April 30. A formal notification and proposed actions were included in a Contact Record and a subsequent Status Report. Water quality at all other POEs was below applicable standards during the quarter.

George next spoke about non-RFLMA enhanced sampling. The site is looking to better understand fate and transport, specifically between POE's. They are looking for any increases or decreases in concentration as water moves downstream. They saw higher concentrations of uranium at SPOUT (at the SPPTS), and then noticed an increase at Pond A-1. David Abelson asked if they knew whether the uranium was natural or anthropogenic. George said they had done one round of LANL sampling to look at this, and are talking about how to use more analyses in looking at these locations as water moves through drainage. David Allen asked if the sampling at Pond A-3 was flow-through. George said it was, and that there was a storage component factoring in which he said we should not see as they move forward with continuous flow-paced sampling. They are also looking at 'synoptic storm event sampling', which is designed to evaluate the spatial variation of water quality during storm events – and is specifically targeted at the previously-breached dams A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2 and B-3. They currently see no change in plutonium or americium, which George said was a good thing. Shelley Stanley asked why different storm events were listed in the report for various sampling locations. George said it was based on how the samplers were triggered and samples were grabbed.

He said that the LANL sampling was designed to evaluate the spatial variation of uranium isotopic signatures – anthropogenic (site-related) vs. naturally occurring. The latest samples were collected in March, with an additional round of samples coming soon. The only area showing more anthropogenic uranium was the Solar Ponds. This shows that the treatment system is collecting more anthropogenic uranium, which is what it was designed to do. David Allen pointed to a graph showing results at SW027, and noted that it shows how quickly things can change at a sampling location and highlights the importance of monitoring to catch these events

### *Water Quality Control Commission Rulemaking – Rick DiSalvo*

As previously discussed, the triennial review of site-wide basic standards for surface water took place in June. It resulted in no change to the uranium standard. Shirley Garcia asked about a WQCC request that Rocky Flats conduct a study and consider an ambient standard. Scott Surovchak said this is part of what George is working on regarding uranium and nitrates. Although it will take a while to complete, they are starting to get good data. This also feeds into the EA work regarding dam breaching. George noted that the mechanisms associated with migration of plutonium and americium are very well understood. However, uranium was not seen in the samples prior to closure because it was so diluted, which is why they are doing more studies now.

### *Groundwater Monitoring – John Boylan*

During the quarter, the site performed both RFLMA and non-RFLMA monitoring. Solar Ponds Plume Treatment System (SPPTS) activities included:

- Temporarily increased overall system flow to manage spring moisture (which led to decrease in overall treatment effectiveness)
- Continued to collect samples at least weekly
  - Locations support evaluation of Phase II, III, and entire system
  - Most analyzed by ESL; not validated
  - Splits collected periodically for contract lab analysis
- Optimization of Phases II, III
  - Phase II unable to remove significant uranium under increased flow rates
  - Adjusted Cell A dosing (carbon, phosphorus), flow rates, and recirculation
  - Cell B performance improved with warming temps (very low flows)
- Attempted to improve flow conditions in original cells
  - Biocide application (diluted bleach) did not improve flows

These changes increased overall flow rates through the system. Flows decreased in the third quarter, but water built up in the collection trench. The effects of higher flows are consistent with previous flow increases with reduced treatment. Higher flow rate means shorter residence time in the treatment media. Flow rates decreased when water levels in trench reached desired depth.

At the Phase II SPPTS cell, uranium removal essentially ceased in July under higher-flow setting. The media was replaced in August and treatment effectiveness was restored. Lab studies were not fully confirmed by the full-scale application. Studies showed removing uranium before nitrate would be successful and long-lasting. However, they found uranium treatment may be most effective and efficient (i.e., media will last longer) after nitrate is removed. They are continuing to evaluate this system.

The Phase III pilot studies were completed. Cell A (inert media, carbon dosing) was selected for Phase IV alternative development. They are recommending that the original structure be converted to a small building that will house the nitrate treatment cells. This is more active than was desired, but affords the best treatment and easiest access to components for maintenance. It

requires upgrading the carbon storage tank to permit direct fill via tanker truck and also allows change if needed to allow uranium treatment after nitrate treatment.

Ongoing activities include designing Phase IV (full-scale nitrate treatment), operating Phase III to support nitrate treatment, and continuing to evaluate Phase II performance.

At the Mound System Plume Treatment System (MSPTS), activities include designing an effluent polishing component. This will be installed as part of the previously planned media replacement activity, with construction in early CY2011. Shirley Garcia asked which VOC's were being seen at the Mound treatment system. Scott Surovchak said that they are seeing daughter products, and breakdown of constituents.

#### *Site Operations -- Jeremiah McLaughlin*

Monthly inspections at the Original Landfill (OLF) were completed on April 29, May 27, and June 30. At the OLF, several seeps are being monitored. Seep 1 was dry throughout the second quarter. The Seep 2 and 3 areas were saturated and showed some surface expression but no surface flow. The Seep 4 and 5 areas were saturated and showed surface expression, but drained via Berm 3 as designed.

The Seep 6 area had three new locations that showed surface expression and supported wetland vegetation. Seep 7 flowed 2-5 gallons per minute (gpm) in the second quarter. Water from Seep 7 flowed down the Berm 7 channel and the top of the buttress. Seep 8 flowed at approximately 5 gpm throughout the quarter. Samples were taken in two places at Seep 7 in April and were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, metals, and uranium. Only a few analytes were detected above the detection limits. All detected analytes were well below RFLMA surface water standards. Shirley Garcia asked which analytes were detected at Seep 7. Jeremiah listed several, and noted that the full results could be found in Appendix B of the Quarterly Report.

Also at the OLF, settlement monuments were surveyed in June and data were within the expected range per the Original Landfill Monitoring and Maintenance Plan, which is between 1.34 and 2.86 feet depending on the location. Inclinometers were measured in May and June. Inclinometers 2, 3, and 4 were also measured in April after high precipitation and noted deflection in March. There was very little deflection on the April 19 measurement. All inclinometers were measured May 5 due to snow on the OLF surface at the end of April. Inclinometer 2 showed approximately 3 inches of movement on the May 5 measurement. Inclinometer 3 showed little movement during this period. Inclinometer 4 could not be measured below 13-feet. Previous measurements were to a 29-foot depth. This indicated that the tube has broken at 13 feet. They were able to measure approximately 1 inch of movement after May 5.

Inclinometers 5, 6, and 7 measured approximately 0.25 to 0.5 inch of deflection, and Inclinometer 1 showed little deflection. Per the M&M Plan, a qualified geotechnical engineer was consulted. This was consistent with the findings of the 2008 geotechnical investigation. An organic layer near the bedrock surface is a weak zone, especially if it becomes lubricated by subsurface moisture. Seeps 4 and 7 also showed significant moisture and had surface expressions during this period

David Allen asked when the inclinometers were installed and if there was reason to be concerned that one was already lost. Jeremiah said they were installed about two years ago and that losing one was really not unexpected. The path forward is to continue to monitor. Rick DiSalvo said that the results are confirming previous observations, and are providing additional data. They will read the inclinometers for as long as they last, but there is no recommendation to install additional ones.

Jeremiah also reported on the status of OLF Slumps. A significant crack in Berm 1 was noted on April 26 following a precipitation event of approximately 3 inches. The crack was 100 feet long, 6 to 8 inches deep, had 2 to 4 inches of vertical displacement, and followed the same contour as previously reported cracks in the area. It appears consistent with the observed inclinometer deflection. Per the M&M Plan, the crack was filled and compacted with Rocky Flats Alluvium to the extent possible on the same day. Larger-scale repairs were completed with heavy equipment on June 7.

A slump at the end of Berm 7 was observed on March 30 and inspected in April. A design drawing outlining proposed modifications to Berm 7 was submitted to CDPHE and verbally approved in May. The design included removing soil mass that extended into the East Perimeter Channel, backfilling area with soil and rock, and re-contouring the area to match the surrounding grade. Repairs were completed on June 3.

At the Present Landfill (PLF), the quarterly inspection was completed on May 27. No areas of concern were observed. No vegetation inspection was completed because the cover was meeting vegetation success criteria.

Rick DiSalvo completed the presentation with a review of the OLF Soil Sampling project. This project is a preliminary evaluation of residual contamination levels in relation to CDPHE's August 2008 policy, End of Post-Closure Care. Pre-closure residual soil contamination data are between 15 and 19 years old. This study will provide data for comparison to risk-based levels, but does not necessarily mean that post-closure controls for the OLF would end. Some M&M requirements possibly may be reduced. The area also remains subject to land-use restrictions under the Environmental Covenant. Rick said they will provide more detail in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter presentation. He said the area where they are seeing most movement is a historical slide area and was primarily a fill area when the landfill was constructed.

CDPHE approved the OLF SAP on June 9, 2010. The goal is to drill twelve 25-foot boreholes, below 2-foot cover soil and sample at 5-foot core intervals. There are six OLF IM/IRA targeted locations (three from the surface soil data set, and 3 from subsurface soil data set), as well as six additional locations to provide subsurface data from the east and west side. They will analyze for VOCs, SVOCs, pesticides and PCBs, metals, and plutonium, americium, and uranium. Sampling took place June 29 to July 8. 228 samples were collected, and data evaluation and summary reporting will be completed in the third and fourth quarters. They are seeing nothing unexpected, with much lower levels of naturally-degrading materials, and no VOC's to speak of. Levels are decreasing, and are well below risk-based levels. Rick noted that the primary contaminants of concern at the OLF are related to cars, tar and roads. Uranium and depleted

uranium hotspots on the surface were removed during remediation, and none have been seen in the landfill.

### **Approve Fiscal Year 2011 Work Plan**

David Abelson opened discussion of the 2011 work plan by noting that the Board reviewed a draft at the September meeting and no changes were offered. Marc Williams moved to approve the 2011 Stewardship Council Work Plan. The motion was seconded by Roman Kohler. Prior to voting, the Board began a discussion. David Allen commented that Bill Fisher had brought up the issue of outreach at the last meeting. He handed out a May 2010 memo from DOE General Counsel to DOE-LM's David Geiser. He then said he would almost recommend having the Board's attorney go through the work plan to make sure there is nothing in it that would put the organization in jeopardy. He said he was particularly referring to the section about developing and circulating information.

David Abelson said it would have been helpful with regard to planning for this discussion if he had been given a heads-up about this concern before meeting. He said that as the aforementioned DOE memo clearly provides, the Stewardship Council is not a FACA group and is no way even coming close to FACA issues. DOE does not ask for a collective opinion of this group, which comes together to discuss and debate issues. David noted that the Board has issued only two recommendations since 2007. Further, he said he has had multiple discussions with Barb Vander Wall about this FACA issue. David Abelson said this group is supposed to have dialogue and disseminate information.

David Allen said he does not want the organization to be jeopardized, and wants to make sure the work plan is consistent with the Stewardship Council's enacting legislation. David Abelson pointed out that the first three bullets in the work plan were taken directly from the legislation. He said that with rare exception, this Board serves as the only public outreach for DOE, in its role as LSO. He added that nothing has come from any agency that says that the Board is moving beyond its scope, and that DOE just gave the organization a grant extension. He said if there was something we were coming up against, staff would be flagging it as their job to monitor this.

Lori Cox asked David Allen to point to something specific in the work plan that causes him concern. David brought up Item 5 in section regarding 'DOE Management Responsibilities' which calls for the Stewardship Council to provide information about Rocky Flats long-term stewardship to the community. Jeannette responded to David by noting that he had been on the Board for quite a while and had witnessed how this group offers balance and has standards in addressing scientific issues. She said that the Board has always discussed ways of doing public outreach and has deferred to the Rocky Flats Cold War Museum to do much of the public education. She added that most of the content of the work plan is unchanged from year to year and that she was surprised that this was being brought up now. Barb Vander Wall referred to the letter from General Counsel and cautioned the group not to take items flagged in the memo out of context. David Allen said he was not implying that this is a FACA group, and was just bringing these issues forward as a concern. Bill Fisher said that it was important to discuss these issues. He added that, in reviewing the work plan and the Board's enacting legislation, he

believed that the Board's outreach is exactly what it is supposed to be. Joe Cirelli said that did not hear David Allen challenge what the Board is doing, only that a legal review of the language in the work plan would be beneficial. He added that he was satisfied that staff has reviewed it appropriately. Lisa Morzel said she also did not see these remarks as an attack on what the group is doing. She stated that it was imperative that the public sees the Stewardship Council as an independent group, which warrants some vigilance about sticking to the mission of the group, and she was glad this issue was raised. She said it was too bad members of the public or press do not regularly attend these meetings.

Sue Vaughan noted that when she uses the talking points that were developed by this group, she always prefaces her talk by stating that they came from the Stewardship Council. Scott Surovchak stated that Barb was right about that memo. He said it was primarily a conversation between attorneys. Several factors led up to the creation of the memo. It was principally designed to be an informational memo to newer people within the administration and bring them up to speed on the role of the Stewardship Council, because their initial take was completely inconsistent with how this group really functions. David Abelson added that, in response to discussions about how this Board disseminates information, staff will be attaching public statements to minutes and setting up a new area on the website for posting this type of content. He went on to point out that the language for Item 5 in the work plan that David Allen referred to earlier came directly out of the LSO Organization Plan that DOE approved. That Organization Plan, David noted, was included in the Board packet for this meeting. He reiterated that DOE is not treating this Board as a FACA group, and is not asking for consensus advice from a collective body. However, this does not mean that this group cannot provide comments. Chair Lori Cox referred back to the motion and second that were on the table. The motion passed 11-0.

### **Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Hearings**

The Board reviewed the draft budget at the September meeting and no changes were offered. Prior to finalizing the budget, the Board must hold budget hearings and allow time for public comment. Chair Lori Cox officially opening the budget hearing. There were no comments from the audience or the Board. Lori then closed the budget hearing.

Bill Fisher moved to approve the Fiscal Year 2011 budget. The motion was seconded by Lisa Morzel. The motion passed 11-0.

### **Update on Changes to RFLMA Points of Compliance and Dam Breach EA**

Broomfield, Westminster and Northglenn have been meeting with DOE and CDPHE to try to resolve the impasse on DOE's proposals to move the existing surface water and groundwater points of compliance stationed along Indiana Street to the eastern edge of the COU, and to manage ponds A-4, B-5 and C-2 in a flow-through configuration and later breach them.

David Allen updated the group on these issues. He said that since the last meeting, there had been a couple of meetings with DOE, on both management and staff levels. These meetings included a fairly thorough walk-through of difference between 12-month and 30-day rolling averages. Public comments were due on October 19, and those submitted by Broomfield,

Westminster, Northglenn and the Woman Creek Reservoir Authority were included in the Board's packet. He said that the path forward is up in air. DOE has requested a technical group be formed to discuss the adapted management plan. He added that Broomfield is still working to prepare a model for a working group as discussed previously. The EA and RFLMA are just some of the issues this group can address. There are additional issues related to groundwater treatment, landfills and other systems. Shelley Stanley said Northglenn had nothing different to report, and that they are looking forward to participating in the technical working group.

David Abelson asked whether Northglenn and Broomfield were on same page with the development of this technical working group. He said it was his understanding that the letter from DOE requesting a working group was specific to issues related to the EA. Scott Surovchak noted that the first meeting of DOE's technical discussion was going to be in late November. The meeting would be a public working group and would not be limited to downstream, communities. Lori Cox said she was concerned about moving forward with DOE's suggestion. She said Martha Rudolph (CDPHE executive director) had committed two or three months earlier to put a group together. Lori noted this new plan should be fine as long as CDPHE and DOE are working together on composition, goals, and scope for the group. Carl Spreng said that he was fairly certain that Martha Rudolph's intent was to move things forward and that she would be happy to consolidate meetings. Lori asked if there was to be an actual structure proposed by Martha. Carl said that the primary intent was to identify issues and move forward, and that he thought they could meet these objectives without requiring separate 'Martha Rudolph' meetings. He will confirm this with her and report back to the Stewardship Council.

### **Briefing on History of Rocky Flats Stewardship Council**

David Abelson noted that the request for a report on the history of the Stewardship Council was made by Shari Paiz, and since she was not in attendance and the meeting was running long, asked if the Board would like to move forward with this agenda item. Lori Cox asked for a sense of the Board, and the item was tabled for a future meeting.

### **Public comment**

There was none.

### **Updates/Big Picture Review**

Next Meeting: February 7, 2011 (remainder of 2011 schedule to be determined at February 7th meeting)

### **February 7, 2011**

#### *Potential Business Items*

- Elect 2011 Officers
- Adopt resolution regarding 2011 meeting dates

*Potential Briefing Items*

- Host LM quarterly public meeting
- Approve Washington, D.C. talking points
- Continue discussing water issues (focus on changes to RFLMA)
- Continue discussing interpretive signs for Rocky Flats

**April 4, 2011 (?)**

*Potential Briefing Items*

- Initial discussion with DOE about Stewardship Council's role as LSO
- Update on Original Landfill
- Continue discussing water issues (focus on dam breach EA)

David Abelson said that he would like to see the Board start a discussion in April regarding the Stewardship Council's role as LSO and the Triennial Review. He also noted that he started including a list of 'Issues to Watch' on the big picture schedule. Barb Vander Wall announced that the paperwork for re-appointment of members will be sent to each local government, and will be distributed to various contacts within each entity. David Allen requested that the election of Board officers be scheduled at the beginning of the February meeting, as last year there was an issue with maintaining a quorum.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

At 11:54 a.m. Joe Cirelli made a motion to move into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel issues, and to receive legal advice on such issues, as authorized under Sections 24-6-402(4)(b) and (f), C.R.S. Maria VanderKolk seconded the motion. The motion passed 11-0.

The Board reconvened from Executive Session at 12:10 a.m. and affirmed that no actions had been taken during Executive Session.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:11 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.*