

ROCKY FLATS STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL
Monday, June 1, 2015, 8:30 AM – 11:30 AM
Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport, Terminal Building, Mount Evans Room
11755 Airport Way, Broomfield, Colorado

Board members in attendance: Mark McGoff (Director, Arvada), Sandra McDonald (Alternate, Arvada), Lisa Morzel (Director, City of Boulder), Tim Plass (Alternate, City of Boulder), Megan Davis (Alternate, Boulder County), Mike Shelton (Director, Broomfield), David Allen (Alternate, Broomfield), Laura Weinberg (Director, Golden), Pat O’Connell (Alternate, Jefferson County), Joyce Downing (Director, Northglenn), Shelley Stanley (Alternate, Northglenn), Ray Reling (Alternate, Northglenn), Joe Cirelli (Director, Superior), Emily Hunt (Alternate, Thornton), Bob Briggs (Director, Westminster), Bruce Baker (Alternate, Westminster), Mary Fabisiak (Alternate, Westminster), Jeannette Hillery (Director, League of Women Voters), Sue Vaughan (Alternate, League of Women Voters), Roman Kohler (Rocky Flats Homesteaders), Arthur Widdowfield (Director, Rocky Flats Institute & Museum), Ann Lockhart (Alternate, Rocky Flats Institute & Museum), Ken Freiberg (Alternate, Rocky Flats Institute & Museum).

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

Attendees: Scott Surovchak (DOE-LM), Bob Darr (SN3), Jody Nelson (SN3), Kurt Franzen (SN3), Linda Kaiser (SN3), John Boylan (SN3), George Squibb (SN3), David Ward (SN3), Carl Spreng (CDPHE), Vera Moritz (EPA), Shirley Garcia (City & County Broomfield), Cathy Shugarts (City of Westminster), Judith Mohling (RMPJC), LeRoy Moore (RMPJC), Sam Dixion (citizen), Mickey Harlow (citizen), Donald Sabec (citizen), Judy Padilla (RFNW), Jay Hormel (citizen), Barbara Nabb (former Rocky Flats employee), Erik Sween (citizen), W Gale Biggs (citizen), Anne Fenerty (citizen), Jon Lipsky (citizen), Mike DiPardo (citizen), Ted Ziegler (citizen).

Convene/Agenda Review

Chair Joyce Downing convened the meeting at 8:38 a.m. The first order of business was introductions of Board members and the audience. David Abelson noted that the Executive Committee had reviewed and approved the agenda for this meeting.

Consent Agenda

Prior to approving the April 6 minutes, a one word change was noted pertaining to comments made by Jon Lipsky at that meeting. Chair Downing moved to approve the April 6, 2015 Board minutes (as amended) and the checks. The motion was seconded by Joe Cirelli. The motion to accept the minutes and checks passed 12-0.

Executive Director's Report

David Abelson began his update to the Board by mentioning that he had received 13 emails from Jon Lipsky after the last meeting and that these had been forwarded to the Board. As part of his correspondence, Jon had brought up five legal/regulatory issues pertaining to the Board's activities. David noted that he remains confident that the Stewardship Council is operating correctly. He then reviewed each of the five issues.

Jon suggested that the RFSC adopt procedures related to Colorado Open Records Act requests. David noted that the Board had only received two of these requests throughout its existence. One was from LeRoy Moore and now one from Jon. Under State law, the Stewardship Council is not required to adopt CORA policies unless the Board would like to charge for photocopies of the documents being shared.

Jon said that more should be done to publicize upcoming meetings. David noted that the Board goes beyond what is legally required when posting meeting notices. Notices are filed with each member government (plus Adams County), which meets the requirements for notices. Beyond legal compliance, the Board posts the agendas to the website, includes future meeting dates in monthly updates and all agendas, and emails out meeting packets to everyone who has requested information.

Jon also questioned whether RFSC meeting minutes were in compliance with state laws and regulations. He said that the Open Meeting Law requires minutes to be taken, promptly recorded and publicly available, and that Executive Sessions must be recorded. David noted that the Board must approve the minutes at a public meeting, which is what dictates the schedule for getting the minutes posted. They are posted promptly upon Board approval. David also responded that Executive Sessions are recorded and maintained in accordance with state law.

Finally, Jon suggested that the Board use a microphone and speaker system at meetings for the public and tend to American Disability Act (ADA) needs. David said that while a microphone was used in the past, the Board believes that meeting dialogue is accessible to anyone attending. David said that Board would need to decide if it would like to go beyond required procedures and incur additional expenses to add a sound system.

David opened the discussion up for Board questions. Joe Cirelli asked what suggestions were made to enhance meeting notice distribution. David said it was related to enhancing metatags on the website so the information could be found easier.

Barb Vander Wall noted that at the first meeting of each year, the Board passes a meeting resolution which includes how and where notices will be filed. Bruce Baker asked if the Board was meeting requirements. She said it was. He then asked how much it would cost to go above and beyond the requirements. He added that, if these costs were minimal, the Board would be wise to spend a couple thousand dollars to go over and above the minimum, given the history of Rocky Flats. He said this would provide transparency and would be prudent.

David Abelson said that the Board could enact a CORA policy if it would like. Barb said that up until last year, there was no specific policy mentioned in statutes. Policy guidelines were developed for organizations to be eligible to charge for records. The state allows for a \$30 per hour cap with the first hour free. Barb said she could write up a policy to be approved at the next meeting.

David said that in terms of meeting notices, he was not really sure what else they could do. He noted that running ads in newspapers was extremely expensive. Also, in terms of ADA compliance, he said that a small sound system could be purchased in the \$250-700 range. Sue Vaughan said that the League of Women Voters publish their meeting notices on Your Hub, which is free. Joe Cirelli said that Superior has dealt with the meeting notice issue in their town. He said paper does not really work, and that an e-blast is the best option. David noted that people who have opted in to the Board's email list already receive meeting notices.

Tim Plass said that a sound system could get very cumbersome, given how many people speak during Board discussions. He suggested looking into reconfiguring the room setup as an option. David noted that the current room configuration was designed so that none of the Board Members had their backs to the public. He added that they could try a different setup at the next meeting and see how it works. Mark McGoff said he did not think it would work well to have people sitting behind the Board, and that it would be better to give presenters a microphone and that others do a better job of projecting their voices. Regarding the CORA issue, Megan Davis said that even though the Board would not want to charge for records, it could not hurt to have a policy in place simply in the name of transparency. Chair Downing summarized the Board's discussion on these issues. She said they would look into developing a CORA policy, try reconfiguring the room, and will look at purchasing a sound system. Barb will develop a draft policy for approval. Bruce clarified that it was not his intent to suggest the Board collect fees, since that would be barrier to sharing information. Barb clarified that fees could be assessed based on the discretion of the Board. Most requests would not be very time intensive.

Joyce announced that the Board audit agenda item was being moved up to take place prior to the Public Comment period.

Receive Stewardship Council 2014 Financial Audit

Eric Barnes from Wagner, Barnes and Griggs was on hand to brief the Board on the results of the 2014 financial audit. The Stewardship Council is not required by either state law or the DOE grant to seek an audit. However, it has always believed that an independent audit is an important check that confirms both the board and staff are managing the finances in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

Eric noted that the auditor's job is to review the financial statements and provide an opinion on whether there are any material problems. He went through a quick review of the report. On Page 1, he noted that the 'Opinion' of the auditors of the RFSC financial statements was about as good

as it can get for an independent audit. Eric noted that the most important item for them to review based on the Stewardship Council's finances was to look at the cash it holds, about one year of operating expenses. This setup is needed because the Stewardship Council's grant works on a reimbursable basis. He said page 2 was for compliance only, and does not apply to RFSC.

Eric noted that the Stewardship Council's main revenue source was the grant from DOE, which accounts for about 90% of the budget. The primary expense for the Board is the management contract. Eric said that he had heard some discussion earlier in the meeting regarding transparency, and that he wanted to note that this organization was not subject to a mandatory audit since their revenue is far less than the \$500,000 threshold for required audits. Page 5 shows budget to actual expenses, and reflects that the Stewardship Council was below budget on expenditures. Mark McGoff asked about the 'investments' section on page 10, specifically whether the Board should have policy statement on this. Eric said that this was not legally required. Barb said she agreed. Eric pointed out on Page 12, risk management, that the Board does not have true 'personnel'. Barb clarified that, technically speaking, the Board Members are personnel. Mark asked what 'management' meant on Page 12, note 7. Eric said it was the governing body/executive director. Emily Hunt asked what the carryover from RFCLOG was on Page 5, Statement of Revenue. David Abelson explained that when the Stewardship Council was created, it assumed RFCLOG's assets and liabilities. He said that the way the budget works, this dollar amount needs to be shown as a source of revenue, but that the Board generally does not spend from this category.

Eric concluded by saying that no material problems were found, and that the Stewardship Council was found to be in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. He added that the Board's accountant, Jennifer Bohn, and David Abelson had always done a great job with record keeping and answering his questions. He found them to be very open and accessible.

Lisa Morzel moved to accept the 2014 financial audit. The motion was seconded by Roman Kohler. The motion passed 12-0.

Public Comment

Joyce Downing noted that there would be a three minute limit per comment.

Anne Fenerty said that, regarding the discussion about using audio equipment at meetings, it was difficult to hear all of the discussion at these meetings. Her primary comment had to do with the RFLMA Contact Record 2015 Immediate Response to Recent Precipitation of the OLF cracking and slumping. She was concerned that there would be digging in this area, and said that the present problems could have been avoided had the landfill closure been done as required by RCRA, which was recommended by an independent scientist. She said that had the RCRA rules been followed the public would not now be exposed to the present situation.

(Anne's comment can be found

at: http://rockyflatssc.org/public_comment/Comment%20by%20Anne%20Fenerty%20June%201%202015.pdf)

Mickey Harlow noted that she was the former Rocky Flats coordinator for the City of Westminster. She had prepared a seven page document outlining her concerns related to how plans were being made by DOE (link below). She said the typical DOE decision process was to decide, disseminate and defend. She said she would like to know how public comment came into play with these decisions. She added that she would like to see details from CDPHE and EPA about what they are looking at and how they are making decisions. Regarding the Wright Water Engineers study, she said it was the first report from a consultant she had read that did not contain any recommendations. Mickey said that the Solar Ponds were not remediated during cleanup, and that this should be done. She said stream sediments have not been sampled, and they should be. She said all treatment systems have required modification since closure. She said this was a failure of the remedy and that DOE has moved from passive gravity driven engineered treatment to active, solar powered air stripping. Additional concerns from Ms. Harlow can be found in her submitted document. Mickey submitted the following comment to be posted on the Stewardship Council website (see http://rockyflatscc.org/public_comment/Harlow%20060115.pdf)

Ted Ziegler noted that his handout explained what he wanted to comment on. He said there was quite a difference between cleanup and burial, and that the intent was to clean up Rocky Flats. Instead, he said it was capped and will decay. He said he was concerned about lead paint in imploded buildings, as there were a million pounds of lead in inventory at Rocky Flats. He said this contamination will not change until it is removed. Ted submitted the following comment to be posted on the Stewardship Council website (see http://rockyflatscc.org/public_comment/20150601%20Public%20Comment%20-%20Ted%20Ziegler.pdf)

Jon Lipsky spoke about his emails to David Abelson. He said he would like his comments to be added to minutes of meetings. He clarified that he was not a member of the Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center or the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability, although he was recognized by ANA for his actions. He also said that these groups were not ‘anti-Stewardship Council’. He said that the subject of re-funding the Stewardship Council on a competitive basis was a topic of discussion for after the current contract expires. He said he also wanted to point out that he never said there was a violation of the ADA at these meetings. He suggested putting a note on the website asking attendees to contact the Board if they have a particular need that could be accommodated. Jon submitted the following comment to be posted on the Stewardship Council website (see http://rockyflatscc.org/public_comment/20150601%20RFSC%20-%20Jon%20Lipsky%20Public%20Comment%20060115-%20with%20attachments.pdf)

Host DOE Annual Meeting

DOE was on hand to brief the Board regarding site activities for calendar year 2014. DOE has posted the full report on its website. Activities included surface water monitoring, groundwater monitoring, ecological monitoring, and site operations (inspections, maintenance, etc.). DOE was also asked to include an overview of the recent independent report on uranium transport. Therefore, a summary of the recent report by Wright Water Engineers regarding uranium in surface water at Rocky Flats was presented first.

Uranium Transport – Wright Water Engineers

Ian Paton and Dr. Bob Weiner addressed the distribution, transport mechanisms, sources and composition of uranium, in terms of its natural versus anthropogenic fractions, with a focus on the North and South Walnut Creek drainages. Dr. Weiner is a retired Professor Emeritus of Chemistry at the University of Denver. Ian Paton worked with the actinide migration panel during cleanup. Wright Water was tasked with three main questions:

1. How do concentrations of natural uranium observed globally and throughout Colorado compare with the uranium concentrations observed in the Rocky Flats Walnut Creek drainages?
2. What are the primary mechanisms by which concentrations of uranium in surface water may significantly increase and decrease?
3. Are previously unrecognized anthropogenic uranium sources suggested by the data?

Dr. Weiner explained that the average uranium (U) concentration in the earth's crust is 2-3 parts per million (ppm). This number is quite variable, as well as very site-specific. He added that the same applies for U concentrations in water. He also noted that, in the Ralston Creek drainage basin, approximately 5 miles southwest of Rocky Flats, the Schwartzwalder mine is identified as the largest vein-type uranium deposit in the United States. He noted that the Rocky Flats standard is at the lower end of the statewide stream standard.

Dr. Weiner noted that a key factor concerning uranium is the oxidation state and that there are two main oxidation states – U(IV) & U(VI). He said that oxidizing elements can help mobilize uranium and change it from U(IV), which does not dissolve in water, to U(VI). With oxidizing conditions, uranium can move more and is soluble. Natural or anthropogenic (man-made) uranium will move the same way based on the existing conditions. Dr. Weiner said that a few things changed at Rocky Flats since closure that have affected uranium concentrations. He said that there have been very different patterns of uranium transport since this time. He added that the September 2013 storm provided very useful data for their analysis. He said that the excessive rain meant more oxygen in the soil/groundwater, which mobilized uranium temporarily. He said that the Solar Ponds area comprises only 5-10% of the uranium load in Walnut Creek, so most of it is coming from other places. Part of the Wright Water analysis included looking at uranium isotope ratios (natural vs. anthropogenic). Dr. Weiner said that even at the solar ponds, more than half of the U is natural. He said that data shows that the natural uranium component is dominant despite the concentration, and no new anthropogenic sources of uranium were identified.

Mary Fabisiak asked if other metals move the same way as uranium under oxidizing conditions. Dr. Weiner said that most act in the reverse way. He said that a few others act like uranium, but not common metals such as lead or chromium. With plutonium and americium, their solubility changes somewhat with oxidation potential. However, they are insoluble in almost all conditions. Shelley Stanley asked if the Solar Ponds Treatment System was improved for nitrogen and uranium, could this have measurable effect on load in Walnut Creek. Ian said that even if they did not treat at the Solar Ponds at all, it would account for only 10% of the uranium load in the creek, so it is not a dominant factor. He said nitrate may be more of a factor. George Squibb said

that in the presence of oxygen, this will be the oxidizing factor for uranium, not nitrogen. He said this would make some difference, but not a big difference. Shelley noted that the SPPTS was not collecting all of the water coming off the hillside, and asked if it was expanded to capture more of the water, if it would have a big impact on the stream. George said this was a hard question to answer. Ted Ziegler asked about any findings related to lead. Ian said that they did not look at lead. David Allen observed that the area that had the greatest variability in uranium isotope ratio was near GS10. He emphasized that it was important that the Board not lose sight of this other area in terms of uranium issues. Bruce Baker asked if the site could just add water to solve the exceedance problem. Ian said that this would involve huge quantities of water but would work. David Allen pointed out that this would just mask the performance of the remedy, which was not the goal of downstream communities. Ian clarified that while the concentrations of uranium would be lower, the total load would not. Emily Hunt asked why the uranium load was reduced more at Pond A4 than other areas. Ian said that the residence time was longer, and the form of uranium was a little different. Megan Davis asked if there was a way to measure the quantity of uranium regardless of concentration. Ian said that this was what is meant by the term 'load'. Lisa Morzel commented that she felt the presentation was excellent and thanked the presenters.

Mickey Harlow said that because of possible extreme storm events like the September 2013 rains, DOE to do climate studies so they can plan for worst case scenarios and improve treatment systems to make them more robust. Ian responded that anytime you are managing water, you have to look at balancing how big to scale your systems. Bruce Baker asked which entity was the first domestic user of water from Walnut Creek. There was no clear answer, possibly Fort Morgan or Aurora. Mickey Harlow said there are 15 private wells that people are drinking from. A member of the audience asked if beryllium was becoming airborne at Rocky Flats. Ian said that they did not study beryllium. George Squibb said that the site does monitoring for beryllium, and that it was not found in water. LeRoy Moore asked if uranium from the Schwartzwalder mine was getting to Rocky Flats, and whether this would be regarded as natural or anthropogenic. Dr. Weiner said that this uranium does not affect Rocky Flats, and that he only mentioned it to illustrate that there are high uranium deposits in the foothills. He said this was natural uranium (not depleted or enriched, not modified in reactor). Gale Biggs confirmed that uranium from Schwartzwalder mine does not come to Rocky Flats, as there is no hydrological connection.

Surface Water – George Squibb

George began with a quick review of the map of locations and monitoring sites. George reviewed performance monitoring at the Original Landfill (OLF) and Present Landfill (PLF). At the OLF on Woman Creek, all sampling results met water quality standards during the calendar year. At the PLF, routine quarterly sampling showed that vinyl chloride and arsenic concentrations were above the applicable RFLMA standards, triggering increased sampling frequency (monthly) per RFLMA evaluation protocols. Monthly arsenic samples were below the standard and sampling frequency reverted to quarterly. Vinyl chloride measured above the standard for three consecutive monthly samples, triggering sampling of surface water from the former PLF pond area outfall to No Name Gulch, per RFLMA evaluation protocols. Vinyl chloride was not detected in surface water at the PLF pond area and sampling frequency at the system effluent reverted to quarterly. Megan Davis asked if OLF runoff would trigger increased monitoring in

other areas. George said no because the monitoring requirements were specific to each site or source.

Point of Evaluation (POE) monitoring throughout the year showed that reportable 12-month rolling average activities of Americium (Am) and Plutonium (Pu) at GS10 became no longer reportable as of June 30, 2014. All other RFLMA POE analyte concentrations remained below reporting levels throughout 2014. George said that at GS10, uranium had not been reportable since August 2013.

Rocky Flats Point of Compliance (POC) monitoring included reportable 30-day average uranium concentrations through May 17, 2014, at the Walnut Creek Point of Compliance (WALPOC). The 12-month rolling average subsequently became reportable on October 31. Uranium was no longer reportable at WALPOC as of January 31, 2015. All other RFLMA POC analyte concentrations remained below reporting levels throughout 2014.

Groundwater – John Boylan

John noted that the primary objective of groundwater monitoring was the protection of surface water. During 2014, 89 wells and one surface location were sampled one –to-four times each. Treatment system locations were sampled two-to-several times each. This sampling included non-routine and non-RFLMA sampling and locations.

All RFLMA-required monitoring and evaluation was performed:

- All AOC well data were below RFLMA levels (same applies to data from Surface-Water Support location)
- Results are consistent with previous data

OLF and PLF RCRA wells:

- Statistical evaluations per RFLMA
- Results for 2014 are similar to previous years
 - A few analytes were higher in downgradient groundwater than in upgradient groundwater
 - A few analytes in downgradient groundwater are on an increasing trend but below RFLMA levels
 - Several statistical results may not be valid due to abundance of nondetects, estimated concentrations, and/or changes to detection limits
- Monitoring and evaluation continues per RFLMA

All Sentinel and Evaluation wells sampled:

- Results largely consistent with previous data

Large amount of work conducted at groundwater treatment systems:

- East Trenches Plume Treatment System (ETPTS)
 - Reconfigured to eliminate ZVI, replace with commercial air stripper (completed January 2015)

- Solar Ponds Plume Treatment System (SPPTS)
 - Ongoing lagoon and microcell tests

Some data suggest continuing influences from September 2013 precipitation event:

- Some areas continued to show higher water levels
- Treatment system flows remained elevated
- Contaminant concentrations were within historic ranges in most cases

Removed one broken well from the monitoring network:

- Sentinel well south of former Building 881
- Area adequately monitored by remaining Evaluation well, Sentinel well, and downgradient AOC well
- Contact Record 2014-07

At the Mound Site Plume Treatment System (MSPTS), the total flow volume in 2014 was the highest ever measured (689,000 gallons). This averaged approximately 1.3 gallons per minute, nearly double the average post-closure flow rate. VOC concentrations in influent remain higher than pre-closure. Flow from a second source area was routed to MSPTS as part of site closure. MSPTS treats flows from two source areas, which means it treats higher flows and higher concentrations (greater load).

At the East Trenches Plume Treatment System (ETPTS), the total flow volume in 2014 was more than 2012 and 2013 combined (approximately 1.3 million gallons). 2014 experienced the second highest flow since site closure. VOC concentrations in influent were generally higher in 2014 than previous years. The air stripper installed in 2013 continued to operate and reduced contaminant concentrations by about one order of magnitude. Water from the air stripper was routed through ZVI for further treatment until the ZVI was removed.

The ETPTS Reconfiguration Project evolved from air-stripper testing at MSPTS. Design was completed in December 2013 and construction took place through 2014 (completed in January 2015). Results for this project included:

- All ZVI removed and dispositioned; ZVI eliminated from the system
- Treatment is now based on commercial air stripper
- Exhaust from air stripper is below air-permitting requirements; constituents degrade in sunlight
- Powered by pre-existing solar conex, boosted with four additional photovoltaic (PV) panels
 - Reconfigured to deliver AC power to air stripper
- Air stripper housed in enclosure designed and built for this purpose
- Uses former Treatment Cell 1 as influent tank; Treatment Cell 2 as effluent tank
- Automated, with safeguards
- Operates daily to treat approximately 3,000 to 5,000 gallons per day

John also showed photos of the project as it was being completed.

At the Solar Ponds Plume Treatment System (SPPTS), lagoon testing continued, and they are moving to design a larger-scale lagoon. Bacteria were found to be very effective for treating nitrate. Cold weather conditions also impacted treatment. Microcell testing also continued, using ZVI to treat uranium. This is an effective treatment for a short lifetime. The first “settling” batch test was conducted using lagoon effluent and it was found that abundant bacteria could clog downstream components. Also, allowing water to stagnate lets biomass settle to bottom, clarifying the water. More tests are being conducted in 2015.

John said that planning was also underway to pump water from the MSPTS down to the ETPTS. Shelley Stanley asked how far the distance would be. John said it will have to go up 18 feet, and then rest is downhill (approximately 1,800 feet total). Mike Shelton asked if there were any plans for a second air stripper. John said that was considered, but they determined that the ETPTS one is sufficient, and the flows could be combined. Mike asked if there would be a need for an air stripper anywhere else onsite. John said there was not. Shelley Stanley asked if the second vault of the ETPTS was physically removed. John said it was. Shirley Garcia asked how the water will be transferred to ETPTS. John said it would be via pipe. She asked if they will need any changes to the sampling protocol. He said they would because the MSPTS would not be used anymore. They have started talking to the regulators about this. Shirley asked if there would be public comment. John said it was being discussed. Mickey Harlow asked if this was going from passive to active treatment because everything was failing over and over. She said all of these changes should be out for public comment. John said that the remedy was the same and that part of the CERCLA process was to evaluate better treatment options every five years. Scott Surovchak said that the remedy was treatment, and that it did not matter if the specific system was passive or active. They ran into maintenance issues with the ZVI, so it made sense to improve the system. He added that the cost of solar has dropped substantially in the past 20 years. He said these are improvements in terms of cost as well as in the risk to workers. These things were not envisioned at the time RFLMA was developed.

Site Operations – Linda Kaiser

During quarterly sign inspections, all were found to be in good condition, At the OLF, three monthly inspections performed. Eight settlement monuments and seven inclinometers were monitored. During the fourth quarter, areas within the landfill boundaries did not show significant cracking or slumping. Outside of the waste footprint, 10 small burrowing-animal holes were noted between berms 6 and 7. None showed signs of recent activity. Berms were re-graded where necessary in July 2014. The East Perimeter Channel Reconfiguration construction project was initiated in mid-October and completed mid-January (Linda showed some photos). This was needed to make the grade of the sides of the channel not as steep. Shelley Stanley asked if they maintained the depth of the cap when they regraded. Linda said that they only added some soil and erosion controls, and did not really regrade.

At the PLF, one quarterly inspection was performed. The PLF Monitoring and Maintenance Plan was revised and issued in December 2014. Changes included:

- Updates to reflect the PLF dam breach and removal of the East Landfill Pond
- Updates to discontinue quantitative vegetation monitoring
- Updated sample location East Landfill Pond to its new location, NNG01

Linda next updated the group on the current status at the OLF. She said that last week, some cracking/differential settling was noticed on the west side. These are areas that have cracked previously. On the east side, about mid-March, they started seeing some cracking and slumping around berms 4 and 7 outside the waste footprint, and outside of the buttress-affected area. This area had also been repaired previously. Mike Shelton asked if they have to revegetate in these repaired areas, or if that happened naturally. Linda said it depended on how big of an area they were talking about. He asked if they had to do it with the recent event. She said it had been too wet to really get in there. She said that their biggest concern was keeping water off the landfill. On May 16-17, there was a huge amount of rain, which developed a big crack (12-14 feet) at the top of Berm 4. The first priority was to drain the water off. Lisa Morzel asked if Linda would acknowledge that this area was located on a landslide. Linda explained that they had geotechnical engineering reports that helped them understand the area.

Shelley Stanley asked Linda to point out where the SID used to cut through the OLF. Scott Surovchak explained how the area was well characterized and that the SID had monitoring points. Shelley asked whether the former SID area was a weak point. Scott said he did not think so. He said that the underlying Laramie formation could not accommodate much weight on top (not very 'capable'), and was a geological weak point. He said it was also a very wet hillside historically. Mary Fabisiak asked what the closest POE was downstream from this area. George said it was GS59, a performance monitoring site. Mike Shelton asked what the possible long term solutions were for the east area. Linda said they might divert groundwater seepage, change grading, or extend the buttress. David Allen asked if they had looked at inclinometer data since these occurrences. Linda said they had collected data, but had not reviewed yet. Shelley asked John if wells on or downgradient of the OLF had been tested for VOCs. He said they were tested quarterly. She asked if they had considered sampling this more frequently. John said that they had not seen anything to indicate they should, and pointed out that the surface water was continuously tested. Shelley asked if any buried materials had been exposed with the cracking. Linda said there was a small piece of corrugated metal strapping. Scott said that this was the first sign of waste they had ever seen in this landfill. Megan asked where the water was diverted to and if it was captured by other monitored areas. Linda said it was running down to a flat grassy area and the East Perimeter Channel. From there, it goes into the creek and is monitored. Lisa Morzel asked where the soil was moving to. Scott said they were rotational slumps that produce a kind of a wave pattern. Ray Reling asked if they were seeing flows at SW027. George said they were. Mickey told Scott she believed a classified shape was found previously in that landfill. Scott said that piece was not classified, and that it was stainless steel or aluminum and used for training purposes. Mickey asked if he thought it was time to put a RCRA cap on the landfill. Scott said that would not help these problems.

Ecology – Jody Nelson

As part of the Vegetation Management Program, several actions were taken:

- Herbicide applications
 - Approximately 118 acres treated
 - Spring – 58
 - Fall – 60
- Habitat enhancement project
 - 50 four-wing saltbush
 - 50 skunkbush
 - 30 Rocky Mountain juniper
- Interseeding/revegetation
 - Approximately 2.4 acres
- Forb nurseries Updated vegetation map from 1996. Needed to fill in industrial area.

Ecological Monitoring included:

- Revegetation monitoring
- Preble’s meadow jumping mouse (PMJM) mitigation monitoring
- Wetland mitigation monitoring

Wildlife Monitoring included:

- Prairie dog monitoring
- Nest boxes
 - 13 of 20 boxes used in 2014
 - Mountain bluebirds
 - House wrens
 - Tree swallows

Jody reported that they also updated the site vegetation map from 1996 during the year. They needed to fill in the industrial area with current vegetation conditions.

Briefing/Discussion on cleanup levels at Rocky Flats

This agenda item was moved to September due to time constraints.

Public Comment

LeRoy Moore referred to the April 2015 Board packet and a 2-page memo dated March 25 to the Stewardship Council from David. In this memo, LeRoy noted that David wrote that the Board could begin discussing goals/priorities for the Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center, as well as criteria the agencies should use in putting together their plans. LeRoy said that this memo was the basis for his April 1, 2015, letter to DOE General Counsel. He went on to say that in the minutes from last meeting, David said that LeRoy had accused the Stewardship Council of undertaking illegal activities under the DOE grant and called his letter inaccurate. LeRoy said he did not state that the Stewardship Council was doing anything illegal, but that he simply raised some questions. He said that to be publicly accused of falsehoods was troubling and that if he had made a mistake, he would ask for the Board’s pardon. He said he was asking the Board to realize who

was speaking falsely and who was not. LeRoy's comment to the Stewardship Council can be found

at: http://rockyflatssc.org/public_comment/L%20Moore%20Comment%20to%20RFSC%206-1-15.pdf

(Note: In a letter dated June 1, 2015, DOE responded to LeRoy Moore's April 1, 2015, letter to DOE-General Counsel. DOE rejected all of LeRoy's claims. DOE's response can be found at: http://www.rockyflatssc.org/public_comment/Response%20to%20Steven%20Croley%20Letter%20Dated%20April%201,%202015.pdf)

Updates/Big Picture Review

September 14, 2015

Potential Business Items

- Initial review of 2016 budget
- Initial review of 2016 work plan
- Review community member application and appointment process

Potential Briefing Items

- DOE quarterly update
- *Carl's postponed presentation on cleanup levels
- Anne Fenerty/Jon Lipsky presentation (Note: Executive Committee made this invitation. Megan Davis asked what the topic of this discussion would be. David Abelson said he would find out. Lisa Morzel said that they wanted an opportunity to rebut some of DOE's comments)

October 26, 2015

Potential Business Items

- Approve 2016 budget
- Approve 2016 work plan
- Conduct community member interviews

Potential Briefing Items

- DOE quarterly update
- TBD

Jeannette Hillery suggested inviting the geotechnical engineers to speak to the Board. Lisa said that she would bring a copy of the USGS map. David Abelson said that the only problem may be time allotment, and said he would work with the Executive Committee on the agenda. Chair Downing noted that USFWS had been reluctant to come back to the Board meetings. She said that the Executive Committee was sending a letter to USFWS Regional Director Noreen Walsh requesting to address this issue.

*TBD

- Overview of post-closure management (what DOE does and why)
- Continue discussing Rocky Flats visitor's center

Issues to watch:

- Original landfill
- Uranium exceedances
- AMP sampling

The meeting was adjourned at 11:47 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.