

ROCKY FLATS STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL

Monday, April 4, 2011, 8:30 – 11:30 AM

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

Board members in attendance: Marc Williams (Director, Arvada), Lisa Morzel (Director, City of Boulder), David Allen (Alternate, Broomfield), Dan Hartman (Alternate, Golden), Faye Griffin (Director, Jefferson County), Kate Newman (Alternate, Jefferson County), Sheri Paiz (Director, Northglenn), Shelley Stanley (Alternate, Northglenn), Joe Cirelli (Director, Superior), Chris Hanson (Alternate, Superior), Bob Briggs (Director, Westminster), Mary Fabisiak (Alternate, Westminster), Jeannette Hillery (Director, League of Women Voters), Sue Vaughan (Alternate, League of Women Voters), Shirley Garcia (Director, Rocky Flats Cold War Museum), Ann Lockhart (Alternate, Rocky Flats Cold War Museum), 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), Bob Darr (Stoller), Steve Berendzen (USFWS), Cathy Shugarts (Westminster), Emily Hunt (City of Thornton), Debra Williams (Town of Superior Trustee), Mary Harlow (citizen), Hildegard Hix (citizen), Anne Fenerty (citizen).

Convene/Agenda Review

Chair Bob Briggs convened the meeting at 8:37 a.m. The first item was introductions of attendees. He then asked if there were any suggested changes to the agenda, and there were not.

Consent Agenda

David Allen noted a minor correction on p.10 of the February Board minutes. In the first paragraph, last sentence, there should be a 'not' before the words 'regulatory driven'.

Sheri Paiz moved to approve the February Board meeting minutes and checks. The motion was seconded by Jeannette Hillery. The motion to accept the minutes as amended, and checks passed 11-0.

Bob Briggs updated the group that there had been a February 25 Executive Committee meeting. There were no questions.

Executive Director's Report

David Abelson noted that he had emailed a letter to Board members about a request from the City of Thornton to join the Stewardship Council. He commented that the timing is good for this

request, as it would be a fairly simple step to add a member as part of the Board's triennial review. The Board will be starting this conversation in June. Bob Briggs will communicate with city officials and explain the Board's process. He will invite them to meet with the Board at the next meeting in order to start a dialogue and to find out more about why they would like to join this organization.

David also reported about his meetings with DOE regarding the LSO review process. He met first with Scott Surovchak, and then Dave Geiser. In short, David reported that the exact process has not been mapped out. The primary task will be to look at what the Stewardship Council has been doing, and how this relates to the original 2005 guidance on LSO's. If there had been any divergence from the guidance, David said the Board would have heard about it from Scott by now.

David noted that the Rocky Flats Cold War Museum had recently signed a lease for a museum space, and asked Shirley Garcia and Ann Lockhart for an update. Ann said that they have distributed a press release announcing they have signed lease in Arvada. The idea for a Rocky Flats museum had its beginnings as far back as 2000 from the City of Arvada. For years, a committee has been looking at a facility either near the west entrance to Rocky Flats or locating it in Arvada. This announcement is the culmination of many years of hard work and dedication. David offered his congratulations.

David reported to the Board that State Rep. McKinley did not introduce a bill related to Rocky Flats signage this year, and he does not expect anything further this session. Finally, he noted that all but one of the annual government contributions to the Stewardship Council had been received (and that one is on the way) and thanked the Board members for making it an easy process.

Public Comment

Ann Fenerty introduced herself by saying that she had been involved in the cleanup process at Rocky Flats, and served on the Citizens Advisory Board. She said that at the last meeting it was brought up that some Board members are new. She said she would like to recommend the book, "*Making a Real Killing*", by University of Colorado journalism professor Len Ackland. She said it is a very well-referenced book, and is available from Amazon. She also mentioned a Los Alamos Study Group publication. She was also involved in an independent verification effort, and referred to an article from *Physics Today*. She said McKinley's bill was killed by the Stewardship Council and CDPHE in spite of the fact that a number of scientists involved in Rocky Flats supported the bill. She handed out a letter that was sent to Congress last year related to this issue. Finally, she noted that an FBI agent involved in the raid on Rocky Flats, Jon Lipsky, would be speaking in Boulder on April 17 about Rocky Flats and his role in the investigation.

Mickey Harlow said she had read DOE-LM's goals and objectives for 2011. She said they include protecting human health and the environment, reducing health risks, and long-term surveillance and maintenance. She said she would like DOE to explain how they can do this, while they are planning to remove dams and move Points of Compliance. She said that the

Stewardship Council should be made aware of what was left beneath the soil, and that many new members do not have this information. She wants staff to include maps delineating what was left behind after cleanup. She is concerned about the spray fields, and believes they are larger than what DOE has said. She said industrial and hazardous waste were sent to the sewage treatment plant and that Rockwell pleaded guilty in front of the Grand Jury to discharging these materials. She said they could not use the treatment plant because DOE messed it up, so they sprayed these materials in the buffer zone. She said she knows these materials will still move, and she is concerned that taking out ponds will not protect the public even though it will reduce costs. She also referred to classified 'shapes' buried underground. She complimented Rik Getty on his report about dust sampling, and added the need to provide information about an independent sampling expert hired by Broomfield. She said she does not think that DOE found all of the plutonium in the environment, referring to a Kaiser Hill helicopter flyover mapping effort. She said she has spent years studying these issues and that removing the ponds will put the community at risk.

Emily Hunt is the Water Resources Manager for the City of Thornton. She noted that Thornton's primary concern related to Rocky Flats was Standley Lake. She thanked the Board for their responsiveness to her City's request for membership.

Steve Berendzen spoke about Interior Secretary Salazar promoting the Great America Outdoors Initiative. He said Secretary Salazar would be presenting Colorado projects at the opening of the new Rocky Mountain Arsenal visitor center in late-May. As part of this, he will announce plans for a trail between the Arsenal and Rocky Flats. He said they will use existing trails for the main route, and will need to tie in with connector trails. There will be some funding for trail enhancement where needed. Bob Briggs asked Steve to keep the Board informed. David Abelson noted that this idea had been discussed years ago when Secretary Salazar was a U.S. Senator from Colorado.

Briefing on History of Rocky Flats Stewardship Council

With the changes to the Board composition since the group's inception in 2006, the members decided it would be a good idea to take a step back and discuss the reasons for the Stewardship Council's existence – including the legislative roots, mission, and focus since 2006.

David noted that Len Ackland's book, mentioned by Anne Fenerty, is a tremendous resource that everyone should read. It covers the history of the site, and this area. It also does a good job of putting Rocky Flats issues and questions in historical perspective, and delves deeply into the issues.

David began by noting that the meeting packet contained briefing materials about the history of the Stewardship Council. He said that a look back at questions that were being discussed in 1998 showed a concern for how to keep people engaged in Rocky Flats issues once closure had been completed. At the time, those involved were wondering if anybody would care or show up to discuss issues.

David Abelson noted that Dan Miller, who is with the Colorado Attorney General's office, had noted potential problems with institutional controls when there were too few people paying attention to use restrictions, and mistakes had been made at other sites. He said the best example of this is Love Canal. Back in 1998, a predecessor organization (Rocky Flats Local Impacts Initiative) began an ongoing dialogue about long term stewardship and the importance of thinking about these future responsibilities while cleanup decisions were being made. David said that is fundamentally why this Board is here – to engage agencies on the post-closure management of the site. Since the Stewardship Council is an institution, this group is boosting the 'institutional' side of long-term protection at the site. He also noted that as this group goes through the LSO review process, it will be an opportunity to update the work scope in the context of the congressional mandate.

David Allen referred to page three regarding the Board's mission. He said he thought it captured very well the role and purpose of this group.

Mickey Harlow asked what kind of power the Stewardship Council has, since it only provides comments, but does not make recommendations. David Abelson said this was an important question. He said that when Congress approved the law in 2004, many may not have fully understood the Stewardship Council's role. He said it is to solicit and encourage public participation, disseminate information, and transmit questions and concerns. The key role is really to provide a conduit between the community and the agencies. Based on a strict reading of the legislation strict reading, a citizen could ask the Stewardship Council to pass along their concerns to DOE. In reality, this step is not necessary. The Stewardship Council is not a FACA group, and because of this, DOE cannot directly ask the group for a recommendation, which would invoke FACA status. However, FACA does not prohibit this organization from telling DOE what it thinks. Over the years, the Stewardship Council has only written a handful of letters to DOE. Individual governments have also communicated directly with DOE, such as letters from Broomfield engaging on the EA for dam breaching and moving points of compliance.

Chris Hanson said he has been coming to these meetings for about a year, and has heard a lot of discussion about water sampling, and there has not been a lot of contamination. He noted that what he had not heard much about is soil and dust contamination. He said he was curious why this group would not be more vocal on this because of buried contamination. David Abelson said this was an extremely important point. To explain, he noted that DOE retains ownership of approximately 1,000 acres and that most of the buried contamination is associated with process waste lines and building foundations. While some of these contaminated structures were remediated, much was grouted in place. As result of this subsurface contamination, there are use restrictions at Rocky Flats, including a prohibition on excavation. These areas are still on CERCLA's National Priorities List, meaning Rocky Flats is still a Superfund site. All of the buried contamination is located within the DOE-owned lands. David also explained that the reason the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge bill was approved was as a means to ensure that the site would not be developed in the future. Back in 1995, The Future Site Use Working Group (comprised of local governments, former workers and others) developed ideas for how the site should be used in the future. David noted that Superior wanted some of northeast corner to be used development, and there were discussions about the Jefferson Parkway cutting through

the northwest corner. He said that the Jefferson County commissioners had a desire to develop some of this land to increase their tax base. David said that, although the non-DOE lands were clean enough to be approved for residential development, it became clear that there was a desire to protect these areas from both residential and industrial development. In 2006, when the Stewardship Council began, most of the members had been present during these discussions, and understood the concepts behind the risk assessments that showed how the site would be safe in the future under different scenarios. David said that the current concern about sampling is primarily related to a change in personnel, meaning that there are fewer people who were present for the very comprehensive discussions and studies that took place during cleanup. In terms of clarification, David noted that in the DOE-owned lands, the contamination on the surface is below regulatory levels; however, depending on how deep you go, the levels can be much higher. Chris asked about contamination levels in the water. David said that surface water standards are being met, and that while contamination is not at zero, it is at very low levels.

Anne Fenerty commented that cleanup only went down to a six foot depth. David said that was not true, because in many areas they went deeper with the cleanup. He noted also that the standards are higher the farther down you go. With the buildings, the walls were cleaned before they were backfilled. David Allen stated that it was important to understand the difference between the DOE lands, known as the Central Operable Unit (COU), and the Refuge lands, which were delisted from CERCLA. While these lands could have been developed, the Refuge designation was an added level of protection. He clarified that Broomfield's concerns have always been related to the COU. He added that the Refuge bill contains a provision that these lands cannot be acquired by local governments and will remain in federal ownership in perpetuity. Sheri Paiz said she looks at the buffer zone (Refuge) as a safety net.

Arthur Widdowfield asked about how the Parkway Authority would be able acquire land based on the provision of federal ownership. David Abelson noted that there were two caveats in the Refuge bill – one for a potential future museum and one for the parkway. He said that, in order to get all seven governments to agree to support the bill, it included a 300-foot right of way for a regional transportation corridor. Bob Briggs asked if there was anything in the bill about cleanup standards or additional testing. David noted that Arvada wanted cleanup standards to be a part of bill. They wanted to ensure that the fact that this area was to become a Wildlife Refuge did not lead to a 'lessening' of the cleanup standards. This effort was not accepted by Congress. David said that, in the end, the entire site was cleaned to an industrial standard, which was more stringent, as Arvada had wished. To be more specific, the standard was based upon the assumption of a person being located directly on top of the 903 pad area and in the drainages. Sue Vaughan asked if there were requirements for any environmental testing or studies prior to construction of the Parkway. David Abelson said that when DOE transferred jurisdiction to USFWS, there had to be assurance of cleanup. This was done through closure documents (i.e. CAD/ROD), as well as EPA certification. When this land is transferred out of federal ownership, CDPHE will assume regulatory authority which will dictate environmental conditions that the Parkway Authority will have to meet. Steve Berendzen noted that the Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Refuge also addressed the transfer of the right-of-way, and NEPA requirements were covered in that document. He said that after the Parkway Authority takes ownership of the land, they may have to do their own NEPA review. An

audience member asked what level of NEPA analysis was done as part of the CCP. David Abelson said an EIS was done in 2007 and covered all refuge land, or roughly 4,000 acres.

Mickey Harlow said that, according to Steve Tarlton with CDPHE, the former buffer zone areas have VOC contamination that would prohibit residential development. David Abelson noted that Mr. Tarlton was no longer fully engaged in Rocky Flats issues and that the lands in question were now part of the DOE lands, not part of the Refuge. Sheri Paiz said she was concerned about the lack of definitive information about the environmental requirements regarding the Parkway, and said there was a need to re-engage regarding safety precautions. David Abelson said that these discussions will be between the Parkway Authority and CDPHE. Sheri said this group should track the process and look for issues that come up. David said staff will flag issues, but will also stay out of the politics. Sheri suggested having a briefing at least once a year. Sue Vaughan echoed the need to keep the Stewardship Council role separate because the Parkway issues are not directly part of the Board's mission.

Bob Briggs said that this would be a good transition into the next discussion. Marc Williams said that there was no reason to re-open these issues. He said that predecessors of these Board members had addressed the issue and agreed that site has been cleaned up residential standards, and that it would be a political motive at this point to use safety concerns to delay the Parkway. He added that the Parkway Authority will fully comply with all requirements from CDPHE, and admitted some frustration with political opposition creeping into this group.

Meagan Davis said that, although she had no doubt that the Parkway Authority would comply with relevant requirements, it would still be fair to know and discuss what the issues are. Chris Hanson said that he truly wanted to understand if there are any concerns related to dust that would affect people walking around the site. Shirley Garcia added that it might be helpful for Steve to address key aspects of the CCP. She said to also remember this Board did support the Refuge law.

Board Discussion of Soil Sampling in the Eastern Part of the Rocky Flats Buffer Zone

In conversations about moving the water quality points of compliance from Indiana Street to the eastern part of DOE's management boundary, one question that emerged was about contamination levels between the terminal ponds and Indiana Street. Questions about contamination levels have also arisen regarding the proposed Jefferson Parkway and the Parkway's acquisition from the USFWS of a 300 foot right-of-way along Indiana Street. This conversation was set up to focus on any issues, questions and concerns that Board members have. The June meeting will then focus on addressing those issues, etc, and will likely include briefings by CDPHE, EPA and DOE. Importantly, the conversation and subsequent briefing(s) will not concern the wisdom or feasibility of building the Parkway, but will provide information board members can use in the appropriate forum(s).

Mickey Harlow referred to an article in the *New York Times* that explained how animals can pick up and move around contamination. Lisa Morzel also noted how freezing and thawing can bring things to the surface as well.

Bob Briggs noted to Carl Spreng that before he arrived there were some questions about environmental requirements that will apply to construction of the Jefferson Parkway. Carl said that the existing construction standard in the radiation control regulations dates back to 1972. He said it is based on assumptions and parameters quite different from what is used today. For example, the standard is 2 dpm (disintegrations per minute), which is equivalent to 1.9 pCi/g. In contrast, the action level used to clean up Rocky Flats was 50 pCi/g. The Radiation Control Division has said that they consider this standard antiquated and will need to review it. This standard would come into effect if and when the land is turned over to the Parkway Authority. The Radiation Control Division issued a memo to David Allen that stated they would require available data or additional sampling. The requirements will probably be nothing different than what is found at a typical construction site. Lisa Morzel asked why the standard needed to be revised. Carl said it is because of how that number was derived, and that certain parameters were not available that long ago. He added that in the area where the Parkway will be built, there was no buried contamination, so anything that was there was windblown. Because of this, it is likely that new sampling would show lower levels, as clean dust has settled on top of what was there before.

Bob asked if there were any other questions about sampling that could be addressed at the next meeting. Lisa Morzel asked if she could get a copy of the independent sampling report from Broomfield that was mentioned. Shirley Garcia said this had been shared with the Board, and that she would email it again. She noted that it was an 'independent review of DOE's independent review'. Mickey Harlow said that she would also like copy via the Board's email list.

Lisa Morzel requested that a list of acronyms be attached to future meeting packets.

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

As discussed at the February meeting, DOE, EPA and CDPHE have been hosting public meetings to discuss the development of an Adaptive Management Plan (AMP) for Rocky Flats. The AMP will be focused solely on the dam breach EA. Stewardship Council members have actively participated in this process. Based on the many concerns a broad range of members have expressed with DOE's plans to breach the terminal dams, today's conversation was scheduled to serve as an update for members who have not been involved in the AMP process, and to identify common issues members share.

Broomfield, Northglenn and Westminster have been most actively engaged in this issue. David Allen reported that, beginning in December, DOE has hosted several AMP working group meetings. These meetings are now complete and the participants are in a holding pattern, waiting for DOE to release the draft AMP for review and comment. David said there will be one more meeting, after which the communities will submit written comments, and then the final AMP will be released. He said the local governments have provided very specific requests for additional data gathering (copies are in the Board packet), which he does not think is above and beyond what is going on currently. There was one request for an additional groundwater monitoring well, which would involve minimal cost. David referred to a March 2 document that

Broomfield prepared (p. 113 in Board packet). One of the requests was that DOE clearly identify goals and objectives to both begin and end flow-through operations. DOE has agreed to develop criteria to be used to breach dams. The document also included several specific performance criteria that Broomfield felt comfortable supporting related to dam breaching. They also noted that if contamination levels increase, they will need time to study. Broomfield said they are supportive of the moving the POCs, however their disagreement with DOE relates to the timing and location of the new points. Broomfield would prefer that they be located just outside of the Parkway right-of-way, but DOE is proposing that they be located further inside the Federal boundary.

Shelley Stanley said that the Woman Creek Reservoir Authority was providing additional suggestions for turbidity sampling and criteria for closing flow-through operations. She referred to a recent plutonium hit at SW027, and noted they would like to see vegetation more established in these areas. She added that WCRA was working with DOE to get their operations agreement updated with regard to POCs. David Abelson said that the draft AMP is anticipated to be available in April, and the Board will hear a presentation and discuss at its June meeting.

Sheri Paiz commented that although the Board has had numerous presentations, public comments, and government updates, it has stayed quiet about these issues. She said there was a good discussion at the end of the last meeting, and that she would like to see the Stewardship Council take things a step further. She said that Northglenn did not feel comfortable with what was being proposed, and they had heard from Board members and the public that others share this concern. She said that this Board does have the capacity to weigh in on these issues. Jeannette Hillery said that the League of Women Voters was also uncomfortable with some of the plans and processes, but felt it was really more up to the local government representatives to take the lead. Sheri said their primary concern was that it was just too soon to make these changes. Lisa Morzel said she had been thinking the Board needed a briefing from DOE on the full scope of changes they are considering making rather than hearing about them in piecemeal fashion. She asked Sheri if she had a process suggestion. Sheri said she did not have a specific process idea, although she would like Board to come out and say it was not comfortable with the timeframe and these changes happening so soon, and that DOE should not make changes at this point. Lisa said she agreed with this suggestion. Sue asked if there was a record of the Board's discussion to let local governments address these issues independently. She said that maybe it was time to think about sending a letter.

David Abelson said that regarding POCs and dam breach, it was always unclear just what the Board's role would be. In June of last year, the Board set a special meeting in August to develop comments that would be approved in September before the RFMLA POC comment period ended. At the August meeting, there were several suggestions that Board take a position that it did not support the changes, but would not oppose. After this, the Stewardship Council was used more as a forum for dialogue. He said he was hearing Sheri refer to the dam breach EA, and was hearing Lisa refer to that issue plus more. David said that, depending on which topics they were approaching, there would be different timelines. He said that at the August meeting, the Board did not want to create a situation in which the local governments could not make independent decisions. Also last year, Broomfield asked the Stewardship Council to provide letters of

support. Since then, there has been some movement on specific positions by the downstream communities.

Sheri Paiz said that Northglenn is becoming more uncomfortable the more they hear from DOE. She said they would be happy to see the status quo at the site remain, and would like to see the Board agree on a position before these documents are signed. Bob Briggs asked if it would be any different than the Board's previous position. Sheri said it might just be a re-affirmation. David Abelson said that the previous statement contained as many questions as positions. The letters were partly based on a lack of information, some of which no longer applies.

Sheri stated she would like to see the Board say something simple, such as that it would like to see no change. David Allen said that since the Board's initial letter, they have since seen draft information on moving monitoring points and frequency of sampling. However, there are still some outstanding questions about the final document, and there could be a compromise that would meet everyone's needs. Shirley Garcia said that there were also regulatory issues related to institutional controls, water lease agreements, and other things that need to be addressed before moving forward. Joe Cirelli noted that it seemed clear that the Board's goal was to support downstream communities. He said he was unsure what to do about POCs, because there was a good chance they would have to be moved regardless of any opposition. He said he would agree with learning more about the big picture, what is on horizon, and that there was a need to slow down. Barb Vander Wall spoke of the need to steer clear from an advisory committee role. She noted that these comments would be reflective of the common concerns of the communities. Sheri suggested that Board make a motion today and approve a follow-up letter at the next meeting. Meagan Davis said that she wondered whether some of the requested items, such as what Broomfield has laid out, might provide further assurances down the road. Bob Briggs asked David Allen if he thought the Board should pursue a motion on this issue. David said that regarding the dam breach, he would be supportive of the Board reaffirming its previous statement. With regard to the POCs, he said he would be a little uneasy because existing language clearly lays out parameters for movement of POCs related to the Parkway. Accordingly, there is a need to discuss where to relocate them, but not whether to relocate them. Barb Vander Wall noted that the Board's previously-stated preference on the dam breach was for no action.

At this point, the Board took a 10 minute break so that members could talk about their next steps.

When the meeting reconvened, Sheri Paiz made the following motion: "In consideration of the concerns of the constituencies of the respective governments and entities of the Stewardship Council, we would like to: 1) Re-affirm the Board's position of no breaching of dams, 2) Based on current ongoing discussions regarding POC's; if moved, take the position that the same standards and methodologies should apply to the new POC's as existing POC's. The motion was seconded by Jeannette Hillery. Mary Fabisiak asked about new methodology discussions at the AMP meetings. Sheri said that the intent was to capture current ongoing discussions. Shelly Stanley said that the new monitoring was not related to POC's. Scott Surovchak said they are looking at different nitrate collection, and ratio of water flows. He added that all of their analyses were driven by regulatory requirements.

David Allen raised a point that the motion should refer specifically to the current standards at Indiana Street. He said that the second part of motion could be read to say that the Board supports moving the POC's to wherever DOE proposes. Sheri said she did not want to get too specific. David Allen said to remember that there were currently five POC's for surface water, and the two at Indiana have different monitoring and reporting requirements than the other three. He suggested revising the motion to say that any relocated POCs should carry the same reporting requirements that currently apply at Indiana Street. Jeannette said she would support the original motion, because the second part allows for additional input in future. David Allen said they were still working through the issue of 30-day rolling average. Lisa Morzel asked if they were talking about the eastern boundary of refuge lands, after the 300 foot right-of-way for the Parkway was removed. Marc Williams said he agreed with this approach. David Abelson noted that the motion lacked a discussion of continued monitoring at the eastern edge of the Federal boundary, even though the Board has supported retaining these 'data points' even if they are no longer POCs. Jeannette said that if this letter did not mention Indiana, it would not mean the Board cannot address it in the future. David said that these issues were being addressed in the AMP, so there was a time factor at play. Jeannette said that the letter could be approved and then submitted at the June meeting. David said he wondered why there was not a #3 that called for DOE to continue to collect water quality data at the eastern edge of the federal boundary. Lisa Morzel suggested adding a friendly amendment to clarify this point. The motion passed unanimously; Shirley Garcia abstained. Because DOE would be issuing its decisions prior to the Stewardship Council's June 6th meeting, the Board decided not to send a letter.

Lisa Morzel again raised the issue about asking DOE to provide a report about their long-term plans for site maintenance and remedy changes (i.e. next 30 years). David Abelson said this should be able to fit in as part of their quarterly briefing.

Public comment

There was none

Updates/Big Picture Review

Sheri Paiz requested getting more information about potential changes to the environmental covenant, which was mentioned at an AMP meeting. Carl Spreng noted that, under current discussions, the substance would remain the same, but here would be just a slight change in the enforcement mechanism. Dan Miller may be the person needed to provide an update. Scott Surovchak noted that this had to do with county vs. state enforcement authority and that these changes were happening in other states as well.

June 6, 2011

Potential Business Items

- Receive Stewardship Council audit
- Initial discussion of Stewardship Council IGA triennial review, including the question of Thornton joining the Stewardship Council

Potential Briefing Items

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

September 12, 2011

Potential Business Items

- Continue triennial review conversation, including the question of Thornton joining the Stewardship Council
- Initial review of 2012 budget
- Initial review of 2012 work plan

Potential Briefing Items

- Continue discussion with DOE about Stewardship Council's role as LSO
- DOE update on start of CERCLA 5-year review
- DOE quarterly briefing

Issues to watch:

Original landfill performance, including special sampling program results

Solar Ponds performance

Data for CERCLA review

Potential McKinley legislation

The meeting was adjourned at 11:34 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.