

Rocky Flats Stewardship Council

Monday, August 4, 2008

8:30 AM – 12:10 PM

Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport Terminal Building

11755 Airport Way, Broomfield, Colorado

Board members in attendance: Lorraine Anderson (Director, Arvada), Clark Johnson (Alternate, Arvada), Lisa Morzel (Director, Boulder), Matt Jones (Alternate, Boulder), Ben Pearlman (Director, Boulder County), Michelle Krezek (Alternate, Boulder County), Lori Cox (Director, Broomfield), Mike Bartleson (Alternate, Broomfield), Bill Fisher (Director, Golden), Jim Congrove (Director, Jefferson County), Kate Newman (Alternate, Jefferson County), David Allen (Alternate, Northglenn), Andrew Muckle (Director, Superior), Matt Magley (Alternate, Superior), Bob Briggs (Director, Westminster), Ron Hellbusch (Alternate, Westminster), Jeannette Hillery (Director, League of Women Voters), Sue Vaughan (Alternate, League of Women Voters), Ann Lockhart (Alternate, Rocky Flats Cold War Museum), Roman Kohler (Director, Rocky Flats Homesteaders), Kathy Bacheller (Alternate, Rocky Flats Homesteaders).

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.), Erin Rogers (consultant).

Attendees: Bob Darr (Stoller), John Dalton (EPA), Vera Moritz (EPA), Carl Spreng (CDPHE), Maggie Pierce (CDPHE), Jeanette Alberg (U.S. Senator Allard), Zane Kessler (U.S. Senator Salazar), John Boylan (Stoller), George Squibb (Stoller), Linda Kaiser (Stoller), Shirley Garcia (Broomfield), Alan King (Broomfield), Scott Surovchak (DOE-LM), Dale Eberharter (Mineral owner)

Convene/Agenda Review

Vice Chair Jeannette Hillery convened the meeting at 8:35 a.m. There were no changes to the agenda.

Business Items

Roman Kohler moved to approve the February and April meeting minutes as well as the checks. The motion was seconded by Bob Briggs. The motion passed 11-0 (Karen Imbierowicz was not present).

Executive Director's Report

David began by welcoming a few new members to the Stewardship Council. Bill Fisher, a City Council member from Golden, will serve as the city's new Director on the Board. Jacob Smith will now serve as Golden's alternate. Michelle Krezek is now an Alternate for Boulder County. Finally, Kathy Bacheller is the new Alternate for the Rocky Flats Homesteaders.

Next, David spoke about a response letter that the Stewardship Council received from DOE-LM Director Mike Owen in June regarding the requested preservation of documents previously stored at the DOE Public Reading Room. The letter stated that DOE planned to maintain these boxes based on public wishes and ongoing litigation. David said that he did not know what ongoing litigation the letter was referring to, but that he had submitted two requests for more information to DOE. So far, DOE has not been responsive to David's information requests. David said he wondered why the Administrative Record was not sufficient to support any litigation needs, and whether the litigation referenced may have been regarding worker benefits, the Cook litigation, or perhaps something else. He noted that the lawyers driving this issue are not from DOE-LM, and that the head attorney is the former Rocky Flats attorney.

David noted that he has communicated with Board members via email regarding the recent release of the Request for Proposals for the use of Rocky Flats' Natural Resource Damage funds. A public meeting to kick off the process is scheduled for August 12, 8:30 a.m. until noon. A public dialogue will follow. Sketch proposals are due on August 29. A multi-stage process will continue throughout the fall. David observed that the Stewardship Council will need to discuss at which point and in what way the organization would like to be involved in this process. The Stewardship Council will not be submitting a proposal, but the NRD parties are interested in the group's opinions on the process and proposals.

The Rocky Mountain News recently ran a series of articles detailing how the government has been letting down former nuclear workers in terms of health benefits. The Stewardship Council has already weighed in on this issue, as did the Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments before it. David noted that it is clear that federal budget concerns are part of the problem. Colorado's Congressional delegation has consistently presented a unified front in support of the workers. Lorraine Anderson has asked what else the Stewardship Council can do as a Board to push this issue further. David noted that he did not feel it was very likely that additional legislation would help the situation. He said it was important for the Stewardship Council to consistently maintain its position and publicize this message, such as sending another letter to the Colorado delegation noting that the Board is continuing to pay attention to issue. Another option, when the new administration takes over next year, is to look at creating some sort of unofficial public forum to air grievances about specific impediments people are facing from a procedural standpoint. David believes this would be heavily covered by the press, and may lead to a review of the program, an oversight hearing, or other progress on the issue.

The Stewardship Council's quarterly financial report has been distributed to the Board. The organization is currently, and intentionally, below budget for the year. If there are any questions, contact David.

Bill Fisher asked whether there are other groups working on the worker benefits issue. David said that the Energy Communities Alliance is the principal forum for these issues. Lorraine Anderson is the Chair of this group. Lorraine said she would entertain a motion to send a letter thanking the delegation for their help, and requesting that staff put together ideas for a public forum. Lisa Morzel moved to direct staff to draft a letter to the Colorado Congressional delegation expressing the Stewardship Council's support for their efforts to implement the

EEOICPA, and suggesting that they begin planning a public forum to discuss implementation problems in late November or early December. The motion was seconded by Jeannette Hillery. David Allen asked if it would be helpful to try to increase the scope of forum by including workers from other sites. David Abelson suggested that multiple forums could be held simultaneously in areas around country. Lisa Morzel asked if the ECA annual meeting could be another forum for these discussions. Jeanette Alberg from Senator Allard's office said that a public forum is a great idea. She also noted that an upcoming GAO report is going to identify specific problems, and that the forum timing should take this into account. The Alliance for Nuclear Workers and Advocacy is a national group that is trying to organize a 5-state DOE protest. The motion passed 11-0 (Karen Imbierowicz was not present).

Public Comment

There was none.

NRD Fund RFP and Proposed Legislation to Expand the Stewardship Council's Scope to include the Beyond the Fences Proposal

David Abelson prefaced this discussion by noting that it will not be easy to reach agreement on whether to use the Stewardship Council as the forum for 'Beyond the Fences' issues. The Stewardship Council needs to discuss ideas regarding what the forum should be and next steps. The conversation will focus on two related items. The Natural Resource Trustees will provide an overview of the NRD Fund RFP that was discussed in concept at the May meeting. The Trustees will host a separate half-day public workshop which will focus on natural resource damages and the RFP. The Board will then discuss the role of the Stewardship Council in Senator Salazar and Representative Perlmutter's 'Beyond the Fences' proposal.

Natural Resource Damage Fund

Jamie Holmes from Stratus Consulting provided an update on the RFP process. He began by noting that the Federal Trustees for Rocky Flats are the Department of Energy and the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service, and the State Trustees are the Attorney General, the Executive Director of CDPHE, and the Colorado DNR's Director of Reclamation, Mining and Safety. He also reviewed that the FY06 Defense Reauthorization Act provided \$10 million to settle Rocky Flats NRD claims through purchasing essential mineral rights, paying the Trustees, or a combination of both. \$5.5 million was spent on the purchase of three parcels of mineral rights, so \$4.5 million remains to be spent by the Trustees. CERCLA mandates that the remaining funds be used to 'restore, replace, or acquire the equivalent of' the injured natural resources. The Trustees must work jointly to determine the use of the funds and are in the process of seeking proposals for this restoration.

The injured natural resources at Rocky Flats include groundwater, surface water, biota (prairie habitat, riparian habitat, wetland habitat). Restoration refers to actions taken, over and above remedial actions, which return the injured resource to its pre-release (baseline) condition. It can also mean substituting a new resource that provides the same, or substantially similar, services.

Projects that restore injured natural resources could include things such as acquiring open space or mineral rights to protect threatened habitat, or creating or improving wetlands or prairie habitat to enhance existing habitat. Projects that do not restore injured natural resources include such things as trails/paths, playgrounds, sports fields, campgrounds and visitor centers.

The RFP process includes three stages. First is development of a sketch proposal, which will consist of a 1-2 page overview that demonstrates how the proposal meets the screening criteria. This will be followed by a draft proposal with detailed project information. Final Proposals will incorporate suggested changes to the earlier drafts. The Trustees will provide feedback after sketch and draft proposals, which will allow bidders to refine their proposals. The successful bidder(s) will contract with CDPHE.

The Sketch Plans are due on August 29, following an August 12 public meeting. Draft proposals are due October 17 and Final Proposals are due December 12. A final decision by the Trustees is planned for the spring of 2009. This will allow for any work to commence during a favorable time of the year.

The Trustees will use a set of screening criteria to evaluate the proposals. These criteria include restoration of injured resources; inclusion of at least 25% matching funds; avoidance of the need for planning or operations and maintenance funds; consistency with the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge CCP; and compliance with the RFP requirements.

Once projects have been screened, the Trustees will rank the proposals using the following criteria:

- Benefit and proximity to injured natural resources (35%)
- Project feasibility and technical expertise/experience of bidder (25%)
- Project cost-effectiveness and relative cost/benefit (25%)
- Project sustainability (15%)

Public comments on the proposals are due January 16, 2009. The Trustees have the flexibility to fund one or more proposals, or even reject all of the proposals. They may also determine how much of the available funding will be spent.

Andrew Muckle asked about the difference between the sketch plan and the draft proposal. Jamie explained that the sketch plans are only expected to be 1-2 pages, while the draft proposals will need to include several required sections, such as engineering and cost matching. Andrew also pointed out that, in terms of securing matching funds, it may be difficult to coordinate with the GOCO grant application cycle. Jamie said that the proposals need only include an outline of the bidders' plans to request matching funds. The Trustees may choose a proposal subject to the availability of grant funding, but can also reverse this decision if the outside grant funds are not awarded.

David Allen noted that the RFP schedule seems rather aggressive, and asked whether there was any flexibility. Jamie said he did not think there was. He added that the initial proposals will not need to be at a blueprint level of engineering. They will only be required to explain how the bidder intends to do the work. Lisa Morzel asked to what extent matching funds can be used for

development of open space, such as trails or a recreation center. Jamie said that the proposal needs to explain what the overall plans are for management and use. David Abelson pointed out that the RFP Proposal Submission section states that the Trustees may request review of the proposals by outside parties. He asked if this could be a role for the Stewardship Council, or if this would present an inherent conflict since member governments are likely to submit proposals. Jamie said that he was not able to comment on this since he is not a Trustee. Scott Surovchak said that the Trustees will have to see what is proposed first and then decide. However, they are interested in hearing about what has support from the Stewardship Council. David Abelson said that the Stewardship Council can be a forum to discuss and debate proposals, but not to submit proposals.

Matt Jones asked if there was a more complete schedule in the RFP. Jamie said there was. Matt reiterated that it is a pretty ambitious schedule and that identifying projects that everyone supports would be a great thing. He said that he heard a consensus around Section 16, and that he was worried that if the Board did not agree on areas at this meeting that there will not be time to address the proposals as a group prior to the RFP deadlines. Andrew Muckle asked if bidders will we need actual grant approval by the October 17 deadline. Jamie said that they do not, and added that the Trustees will need an explanation about what funding sources are going to be pursued and what the associated process is.

Barb Vander Wall asked what is scheduled to happen between the time the draft and final proposals are due. Jamie said there will be a public presentation of the proposals to allow for feedback on what needs to be done to make improvements to them. Lisa Morzel pointed out that the local governments will need to take any proposal through their own trustees and council, which is a somewhat complicated process. Jamie said to just make this clear in their proposal to the Trustees. Lisa added that she would like to start talking about proposals and come up with framework for moving forward at this meeting. David Allen asked if the 25% matching funds could be used for those projects not supporting restoration of injured resources, such as trails. Jamie said that the Trustees will need to know the intent of the matching funds and the effect on habitat restoration. Regarding the apparent consensus on Section 16, David said his concern would be the possibility of putting all of the Stewardship Council's efforts into one project and not have that be chosen for funding. Jamie noted that proposals may be revised drastically even after the October deadline if it makes sense to do so.

Lorraine Anderson asked if an inventory of areas that need restoration has been created for Rocky Flats site, and if the Board can get a copy. Scott Surovchak said that the site has been inventoried, and most of the needs fall under the operational jurisdiction of DOE or USFWS. Lori Cox reiterated Broomfield's position of support for the acquisition of Section 16 in lieu of pursuing separate projects. If this were to be supported by the full Stewardship Council, she asked who would submit the proposal to the Trustees. David Abelson said that someone would need to take the lead, and added that Jefferson County was the first to initiate this idea. David added that the Stewardship Council may want to have a secondary proposal identified in case the Section 16 project is not able to get done. He said it looks like there is plenty of time after the final proposals will be submitted for the Board to continue to debate and refine positions. Lori asked how the Stewardship Council should communicate its preferences to the Trustees. David said that are times scheduled into the RFP process for incorporating comments.

Beyond the Fences

Lisa Morzel said that there was nothing to prevent the group from collaborating either as the Stewardship Council or as a separate coalition. Lorraine Anderson added that the 'Beyond the Fences' discussion may be a way to look at proposals that are not awarded NRD funds. Lori Cox stated that Broomfield does not support changing the scope of the Stewardship Council to address 'Beyond the Fences' discussions, but that they do support the idea that this collaboration needs to take place within a different organization. She mentioned that Congressman Udall previously proposed a Colorado Mountain Backdrop Protection study, and that Broomfield encourages the Colorado delegation to communicate with each other about moving forward with this process. She said that Broomfield is willing to work with them to host meetings, and start the ball rolling on this issue.

Lisa Morzel asked whether the group should take a vote on whether to go forward as the Stewardship Council or a new coalition to address the 'Beyond the Fences' vision. Lori asked whether it was up to this group to form a new organization or if it should be led by Senator Salazar and Representative Perlmutter, who initiated the 'Beyond the Fences' discussion. Lorraine Anderson said that the City of Arvada sent a letter to the delegation listing organizations that are already in place and could possibly serve as a forum for 'Beyond the Fences'. She noted that it would be up to local governments to form coalitions. She said she would also caution Salazar and Perlmutter that there are nuclear communities around the country that are not yet cleaned up, and Rocky Flats should not take money for open space when there are so many other cleanup needs and other sites are storing our waste. Lisa Morzel said that it would be helpful to know the status of other sites. Lorraine said that this information is available online. Lisa added that she thinks it is great to have this opportunity that can be the first time everyone works together on such a vision.

Jeannette Hillery said she likes the concept of 'Beyond the Fences', believing that the Rocky Flats community can build on the current level of collaboration and momentum, yet still not jeopardize funding at other sites. David Abelson said that it is more likely that funding for 'Beyond the Fences' would come out of separate accounts, and that there would be no competition for funds with cleanup. He added that the current President's budget for DOE is \$1.1B under the minimum regulatory requirements. Andrew Muckle said he thinks that there is a logical nexus between 'Beyond the Fences' and the Stewardship Council. He said he is not sure how another group could address the issues as well and he does not want to squander this opportunity. Lorraine suggested that the Stewardship Council could take a look at proposals left after the NRD funds are awarded and make recommendations from there. Zane Kessler from Senator Salazar's office offered that they appreciate the dialogue, and will take whatever help they can get.

Lori Cox said that she wonders if the existing organizations, such as those mentioned by the City of Arvada, would be amenable to working on these issues and possibly taking on new members from the Stewardship Council. She was also interested in finding out who these organizations were. David Abelson cautioned the group to be careful about integrating into another

community organization, which may serve to divest the Stewardship Council of its power, as opposed to being the convener of the forum. He said there are a lot of different models out there, and the group can look at the current situation as having bought some time. He added that the Stewardship Council does need to address the draft legislation expanding the scope of this organization. Ben Pearlman noted that the discussion was leading him to think that the group is not analyzing the question correctly. He said that the Stewardship Council will be addressing the 'Beyond the Fences' land use questions one way or another, whether there is another organization or not. As two organizations may create additional complexity, the Stewardship Council should consider serving this role. He asked if those opposing this could take another look. Lorraine Anderson said that the group will not make a decision today. Lori Cox questioned whether waiting until a later date to take a position on this issue may serve to put Senator Salazar in a bad position. Zane Kessler said that the timing of the Defense Authorization Act is an issue.

David Abelson pointed out that there are two parts of the proposed legislation. First, under current legislation, when using federal funds, the Stewardship Council can work only on any issues that are directly related to the DOE Rocky Flats mission. The proposal is to amend the legislation to widen the Stewardship Council purview to include everything related to Rocky Flats. David asked if this was acceptable to the members. Northglenn and Broomfield stated that they are opposed to this change. David Allen said that Northglenn does not support this because, everyone has a different vision in terms of open space uses, and Northglenn may not want to participate in every aspect of that. He said that he anticipates future controversy, which will ultimately take the focus away from the original mission of the Stewardship Council. David Abelson clarified that he was not talking about 'Beyond the Fences' at this point, only issued that are unrelated to DOE cleanup. He said that a different piece of the proposed legislation addresses the issue of regional open space coordination.

Jeanette Alberg noted how difficult it was to originally secure the funding for this group, and that she was not sure how easy it would be to get this changed. Zane Kessler said that Senator Salazar did not see this as a problem. Lori Cox said that Broomfield is opposed to both of the two changes David mentioned as part of this proposed legislation. Broomfield thinks this legislation will change the issues upon which the Stewardship Council will focus. David pointed out that the Stewardship Council's IGA and work plan have the same broader scope, even though most of the issues addressed so far have been DOE-related. In response to a clarification request from Barb Vander Wall, Lori stated that the Stewardship Council already has access to enough funding to do the things Broomfield thinks it should be doing. Bill Fischer asked how much input the Stewardship Council can provide regarding the NRD proposals. He said that unless the group makes a decision that it is not interested in any of this, we will end up in position to create a new group in the future. David Allen said that if the scope for the Stewardship Council's DOE grant is broadened, there may also be a risk that funding will not be forthcoming in future. Lisa Morzel referred back to the Rocky Flats Local Impacts Initiative, and said that the original discussion was about the future of Rocky Flats, and that she believes that the site is the site, regardless of jurisdiction. She sees the proposed changes as a move toward efficiency, not losing focus. She thinks it is part of original vision of transforming Rocky Flats into something that all of the surrounding communities can embrace. Zane Kessler said that Senator Salazar's top

priority is public health and safety, and these plans will not change that. Lorraine Anderson closed the discussion.

DOE Briefing on Plans to Notch Dams

George Squibb briefed the Stewardship Council on DOE's plans to notch dams A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, B-3, and B-4. The purpose of the notching is to reduce the active management and maintenance needs. This decision follows the *Pond and Land Reconfiguration Environmental Assessment Comment Response and Finding of No Significant Impact* that DOE completed October 2004 during closure activities. They will be implementing this project in three phases over 8-10 years. The first phase involves the six smallest interior dams, and is a continuation of a project approved during cleanup in 2004. Just prior to closure, DOE decided to leave these dams in place to evaluate the hydrological impacts of closure. Dams are not part of the remedy. DOE currently manages 12 dams within the COU. Currently, runoff is routed around the higher ponds via bypass pipeline. Once water is put into these ponds, however, the equipment to release water at the outlet does not work. The whole intent of this project is to notch the structures so they can divert low levels of water through the ponds. Bypasses will still be used in high precipitation events. Notches are designed to last 100-200 years. The plan is to have everything done by March, 2009.

Second phase construction is slated to begin in 2012, and final phase construction is planned for 2018. DOE will design the final phase at the same time as the second phase. A technical planning discussion is scheduled for next week. Mike Bartleson asked if there will be a public process to discuss first phase plans. George said that there is no hazard involved. During the second and third phases the site will follow the NEPA process that includes an opportunity for public comment. Jeannette Hillery observed that, because the site was planning to create more natural conditions, and will be able to use the data in subsequent steps, this seems like a good process. David Abelson said that the next Rocky Flats Five-Year Review will take place in 2012, and will provide for another look at site status. The following review will take place in 2017, which dovetails with the schedule for a holistic view in terms of the dams. Ron Hellbusch asked if there will be additional sampling done as they breach the ponds. George said that the required monitoring will not change, but DOE may choose to do additional monitoring.

Host DOE Annual Meeting

Representatives from Stoller at Rocky Flats were present to brief the Stewardship Council on site activities for the first quarter of 2008 (January – April). DOE has posted the report on their website.

Surface Water

George Squibb provided an update on Surface Water Monitoring and Operations for the first quarter of 2008. There were no pond discharges. Current pond levels are very low. Pond B5 is the only one with much in it, and it is only at 23%. The site saw only 0.8 inches of total precipitation during the quarter, which was 59% of 1993-2007 average. It has continued to be very dry since the first quarter as well, which results in low or absent flow rates. Levels of

plutonium, americium, and uranium were well below applicable standards. Total uranium activity was a bit lower after hovering around the standard for a couple months. Water quality at all Points of Monitoring, except GS10, was below applicable standards. Reportable values for total uranium at GS10 continue to be observed, and are likely caused by groundwater contributions of naturally-occurring uranium to South Walnut Creek.

At the Original Landfill, surface water quality results indicated that the remedy was functioning properly. At the Present Landfill, surface water quality results triggered monthly sampling for dissolved silver. Dissolved silver was not detected in the first monthly sample, so monthly sampling was discontinued.

Colorado Water Quality Control Commission

Linda Kaiser provided an update on the status of Colorado Water Quality Control Commission rulemaking. Three segments are underway at the present time. The first is a petition to adopt the statewide basic uranium standard at Rocky Flats. Natural uranium in groundwater now higher proportion of surface water, based on samples completed in 2007 (2008 samples have been collected). This move would eliminate Rocky Flats' site-specific standards. The WQCC Hearing Notice is to be published 10/10/08.

The second item is an annual review of Rocky Flats' expiring temporary modifications. The Rocky Flats temporary modifications are set to expire on December 31, 2009. A WQCC Hearing Notice is to be published September 10, 2008, with a hearing to follow in December. The site believes that Solar Ponds Treatment Systems upgrades should reduce nitrate loading.

The final water quality item is the Triennial Review of the South Platte River Basin. An Issues Scoping hearing was held in October, 2007. Potential Rocky Flats issues include expiring Rocky Flats temporary modifications; a new statewide basic standard for arsenic below the site-specific standard; possible CDPHE adoption of new EPA methodology for copper and other metals; and the uranium petition already scheduled for rulemaking. An Issues Formulation hearing is scheduled for November 10, 2008, and a Rulemaking Hearing will take place in June, 2009.

Lorraine Anderson asked how site conditions for arsenic match up with the new standard. Linda said that, most often, it would not be an issue. Lisa Morzel asked what triggered the site's decision to petition to change the uranium standard. Linda said that since closure groundwater become a greater proportion of the surface water and bringing natural uranium with it. The standard does not distinguish between natural and man-made. Lisa asked if this was anticipated. Scott Surovchak said that it was anticipated at GS10. Jeannette pointed out that things are always evolving with EPA changes. Lisa Morzel said that many in the community are concerned about why this is happening at this point in time. Scott pointed out that many different entities are currently dealing with this issue related to natural uranium. Mike Bartleson said there was concern about continuing to monitor isotopic levels. Scott said that the site will continue to monitor and, if the standard were to be exceeded, additional analysis would occur. Lori Cox expressed a concern that this additional analysis will not be triggered until a higher standard has been exceeded than is currently in place. Scott said this was true, but that the statewide standard is a drinking water standard.

Carl Spreng clarified that the reason for the proposed change of standard at Rocky Flats is that EPA changed their standard, so CDPHE changed their regulations to be consistent with EPA standard. As a result, DOE and CDPHE are now they are looking to align the Rocky Flats standard with the new state standard. Lisa Morzel asked the agencies to understand that the communities are a little nervous about the purpose of doing this. Carl responded that this is a public process and if anyone has suggestions about how agencies can better inform the public, they are very interesting in hearing it. David Abelson said that DOE and the regulators can adopt a provision that defines trigger points for additional analysis, as a means of analyzing trending. He observed that the concern is really how quickly the site will react to upward trends. Linda said that the site will be looking at doing something well before any standards are met.

Groundwater

John Boylan presented information about Groundwater Monitoring at the site for the 1st Quarter of 2008. There are six RCRA wells at the Present Landfill and four at the Original landfill. All were sampled successfully. The results were generally consistent with previous results and will be evaluated in the 2008 Annual Report.

John moved on to an update on the Solar Ponds Treatment System. Interceptor Trench System (ITS) remnants are present upgradient and downgradient of SPPTS groundwater intercept trench. Untreated groundwater at the Discharge Gallery is from ITS remnants, as confirmed through potholing investigation in spring 2007. In terms of a path forward, improvements will be performed in phases. Phase I will begin in August and will involve the installation of a collection sump. It will be located where ITS lines converge (near the former Interceptor Trench Pump House). This sump will collect water that is transferred (via pre-existing line) to SPPTS for treatment and discharge treated water via pre-existing, un-perforated line to the discharge gallery. Data collected following Phase I will define and inform any additional phases. John said that the site is fairly confident these changes will lead to decreased nitrate concentrations. Lorraine Anderson asked if there will be any sludge produced as a result of this treatment. John said no.

Site Operations

John provided an update of 1st Quarter Site Operations activities. At the Original Landfill, inspections were performed monthly, and a vegetation inspection was performed in February. Seep #7 was dry for first quarter. Seeps #4 and #8 showed active groundwater seepage throughout 1st quarter (~ 1-3 gpm). The slumping areas of the OLF continued to be monitored and no significant changes were identified.

OLF settlement monuments were surveyed during the quarter and data were within the expected range, based on the OLF Monitoring and Maintenance Plan. Consolidation monitors were surveyed monthly, and no significant movement was identified.

A geotechnical investigation was also completed at the OLF in order to determine subsurface conditions and the possible causes of observed localized slumping and settling of the OLF cover.

Nine test pits were excavated in February. Seven boreholes were drilled beginning in late March and extending into second quarter 2008. The report was issued in June 2008. Lisa Morzel asked how many holes were dug. John said there were nine test pits, and seven boreholes. Lisa mentioned a paper that was just published which describes landslides in this area and will give copies to the site.

At the Present Landfill, there was a quarterly inspection, a vegetation inspection, and settlement monument survey.

Linda Kaiser provided additional information about the OLF Geotechnical Investigation and the path forward. There were eight test pits (20' long and 11-13' deep). A ninth pit, just 3 feet deep was dug to buttress drain depth. The seven boreholes were 28-39' deep (into bedrock) and were continuous core samples. Inclometers were installed to accurately measure movement. A clay layer with organic materials appears to be a weak interface area, Modeling predicts small-scale instability. The buttress was performing as modeled. No large-scale OLF instability was found. The analysis showed migration of surface water from upslope areas, as preferential pathways and porous zones intersect the ground surface. Slope failures appear to shift pathways somewhat. Seep volume and occurrence change over time. Seep #8 is likely a result of water collected by the buttress drain. Collected water is not adequately percolating through subsurface as intended. Directing seep water that surfaces on cover to the perimeter channels/buttress drain will improve weak layer stability.

High and low spots in the channel allow minor ponding in low-flow condition. Heights below two feet are due to minor settlement and localized slumping. High-flow (24 hour/100 year and 1,000 year event model) condition would overtop the berms.

A path forward has been developed:

- Repair localized slumping/differential settlement by filling or grading (area below Berm #1 repaired last summer with good results).
- Fill/regrade perimeter channel to reduce slope and improve stability at berm ends, as needed.
- Two-foot berm height difficult, so height will be adjusted along length based on sub-basin model.
- Conduct routine maintenance for observed ponding in berm channels – regrade high and low spots.
- Install extension to Seep #7 drain to direct water to buttress drain.

Lisa Morzel requested a copy of the presentation and was told it will be posted on the Rocky Flats website. She also asked if any unanticipated materials were collected during this project. Linda said there was not. Lisa asked what materials were placed into the landfill during the time of its use. Linda said it was primarily construction debris. Lisa asked how thick the landfill is. There was no answer given. She said she would like to have a better idea of what is in there. Scott Surovchak said that there is a report that has geotechnical logs. The site did not encounter anything they could identify as waste. The bedrock depth in this area is 15-30 ft. Lisa asked if they did analyses of the core samples. Linda said they did not do isotopic analysis, just geotechnical.

Public comment

There was none.

Updates/Big Picture Review

October 6, 2008 (special meeting, needed for budget process)

Potential Business Items

- Initial review of 2009 budget
- Stewardship Council Triennial IGA Review (desire to continue, changes in scope)

Potential Briefing Items

- Continue discussing use of NRD funds
- Annual review of Stewardship Council activities
- Begin discussing 2009 work plan
- Begin discussing interpretive signage for Rocky Flats.

November 3, 2008

Potential Business Items

- Budget Hearings for 2009 budget/adoption
- Approve 2009 work plan
- Stewardship Council Triennial IGA Review (needs to be approved by councils and commissions by Feb. 1)

Potential Briefing Items

- Host DOE-LM quarterly public meeting
- Continue discussing use of NRD funds
- Continue discussing interpretive signage for Rocky Flats

David and Lorraine will be in Idaho in October giving a presentation at an ECA Peer Exchange on public involvement and the Rocky Flats models.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.