

Rocky Flats Stewardship Council Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, September 11, 2006
8:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Jefferson County Airport, Broomfield

Board members in attendance: Shaun McGrath (Director, Boulder), Lori Cox (Director, Broomfield), Jo Ann Price (Director, Westminster), Ron Hellbusch (Alternate, Westminster), Lorraine Anderson (Director, Arvada), Clark Johnson (Alternate, Arvada), Kate Newman (Alternate, Jefferson County), Karen Imbierowicz (Director, Superior), Ben Pearlman (Director, Boulder County), Jane Uitti (Alternate, Boulder County), Bob Nelson (Alternate, Golden), Shari Paiz (Director, Northglenn), Jeannette Hillery (Director, League of Women Voters), David Allen (Alternate, Northglenn) Ken Foelske (Director), Marjory Beal (Alternate, League of Women Voters), Kim Grant (Director, Rocky Flats Cold War Museum), Roman Kohler (Director, 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), Jennifer Bohn (accountant).

Members of the Public: Marion Galant (CDPHE), Carl Spreng (CDPHE), Mark Aguilar (EPA), Mark Sattleberg (USFWS), Frazer Lockhart (DOE), Scott Surovchak (DOE), Ray Russell (Russell/West), Mary Lindsey (City of Westminster), Scott Verstandig (DOE-LM), Susan Vaughan (League of Women Voters), Scott Raynes (Source One/DOE-LM), David Shelton (Shelton Environmental), Bob Darr (DOE/Stoller), Rich Schassburger (DOE-RF), Larry Kimmel (EPA), Shelley Stanley (City of Northglenn), Linda Kaiser (Stoller), Mike Butherus (Stoller), John Rampe (DOE-RF), Doug Hansen (Stoller), Mike Owen (DOE-LM), Jeanette Alberg (Senator Allard), Joe Legare (Stoller), John Boylan (Stoller), Shirley Garcia (Broomfield), George Squibb (Stoller).

Convene/Agenda Review

Chair Lorraine Anderson convened the meeting at 8:35 a.m. She led the group in a moment of silence on the five-year anniversary of the September 11, 2001 attacks. Lorraine then offered a special welcome to Mike Owen, Director, DOE Office of Legacy Management.

Business Items

1) **Consent Agenda** – Bob Nelson moved to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Lori Cox. The motion passed 12-0.

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

- David announced that the next three meetings will be very busy and may be slightly longer than usual. Next, he gave an overview of the topics for the upcoming meetings. Today, the Board will be discussing the Proposed Plan. Rocky Flats modified the standard CERCLA cleanup process by performing interim cleanup actions first, then

preparing the Proposed Plan, and then issuing the Corrective Action Decision (CAD)/Record of Decision (ROD). At most sites, the Proposed Plan and CAD/ROD precede cleanup. The CAD/ROD will be issued in late October or early November, followed by the preparation of a Post-Closure Regulatory Agreement, and a Long Term Surveillance and Maintenance Plan (LTSMP).

At the Stewardship Council's October meeting, topics will include the CAD/ROD and the post-closure regulatory agreement. In November, the group will begin looking at the LTSMP.

There will be a lot of information presented to the Stewardship Council members during these next few months, and staff will continue to use email as needed, and in between meetings work with Board members one-on-one to address issues or concerns.

- The Stewardship Council's grant from DOE was issued August 1st. It was a very laborious process. Certain assurances from DOE turned out not to be correct, and the Stewardship Council almost ran out of funding at one point. However, everything was worked out in the end. The total grant was approximately \$395,000.
- The Stewardship Council agreed to conduct final audit for the Coalition, and money was provided to the Stewardship Council for this purpose. Later in the meeting, there will be a presentation of audit results and the Council will be asked to formalize their acceptance of this audit.
- David is finalizing edits of the Coalition history report. He is still able to incorporate information, so everyone was encouraged to pass along anything they would like included.
- After the Coalition decided not to send members to Washington, D.C this fall, David was tasked to work with the Executive Committee to determine whether it made sense for him to go instead. The committee decided to send him and he leaves tomorrow. The purpose of the visit will simply be to meet with relevant parties to provide an overview of the Stewardship Council's mission, and introduce them to the new group.
- At the May meeting, the Stewardship Council determined that it should focus on developing an outreach plan during late summer or early fall. David sent out an e-mail with some initial ideas, but received no feedback. He would like to find out who is interested in working on outreach, and what kind of time they could devote to it. Also, he would like to find out what kind of existing systems that member organizations may already have in place which could be used by the Stewardship Council to share information with their constituents. David has allotted time at the October meeting for brainstorming on these issues.
- David distributed a quarterly finance report to the Stewardship Council for review. He acknowledged that it was a bit outdated. In the future, David will e-mail these updates if the Stewardship Council meetings are far apart. He also asked for feedback from the

Stewardship Council in the event they would prefer an alternate schedule for these updates.

Public Comment

There were no comments.

Receive Coalition 2005 and 2006 Financial Audits

As part of the transfer of assets from the Rocky Flats Coalition, the Stewardship Council agreed to conduct audits of the Coalition's 2005 and 2006 finances. Auditor Ray Russell reported that he found no indications of lack of internal control, and no conflict of accounting principles that would be considered improper. During the timeframe that he reviewed, the Coalition did switch to a different accounting standard, but no problems were found. Lori Cox moved to accept the audit. The motion was seconded by Jeannette Hillery. The motion passed 12-0.

A review of the groundwater treatment systems was next on the agenda, but the presenter was not yet at the meeting, so the order of the agenda items was changed.

Stewardship Council Discussion with DOE-LM Director Mike Owen

Mike Owen opened his remarks by noting that he had hoped to be able to visit with the Stewardship Council sooner. He said he was glad to be able to work with the Stewardship Council and maintain a close liaison. He noted that most of the group already knew Scott Surovchak, DOE-LM's Rocky Flats manager, but introduced him to those who did not. Mike said his primary mission today was to listen, to hear what is on the mind of the Stewardship Council, and also to see how the Stewardship Council works and who is on it.

DOE-LM is scheduled to receive full jurisdictional control of Rocky Flats from DOE-EM soon. However, this may be delayed by Congressional budget issues. LM is excited about what has been accomplished at Rocky Flats, and where it is today. Mike said he is a firm believer that the correct things were done here, and that, to a large extent, Rocky Flats is a success story. He does not think any major problems will arise, and that the site will only improve and perfect itself, while working some things out. He said LM has not met resistance in Congress over any budget requests, and that his office has received everything it asked for. He mentioned that DOE-LM is also close to completing work at the Fernald and Mound site. In closing, he said that he is very excited to work with local government representatives, as he thinks they are very important in moving forward with plans for the site. He opened the discussion for questions from the Stewardship Council.

Jo Ann Price noted that downstream communities have some important concerns about long-term monitoring, and they hope to continue to work well with Mr. Owen and DOE-LM. She asked if Mr. Owen knew what kind of schedule DOE-LM would be using for public updates. Mr. Owen responded that they are here to serve the taxpayers, and that the flow of information is important. He added that LM sees this group as readily-organized forum, and that they will

continue to maintain as much public communication as possible and be as forthcoming as possible. LM hopes to work through this group as much as possible, but with others as well.

Jeannette Hillery stated that one of the concerns of the League of Women Voters is the insurance of funding for stewardship activities. She asked if Rocky Flats is really going to continue to receive enough funding to conduct ongoing monitoring. Mr. Owen pointed out that one of the reasons the LM office was created was to continue to highlight the need for long-term monitoring of these sites and ensure it did not become buried within another layer of government and go unnoticed. The LM budget goes to Congress on equal footing with EM and is very visible, so it would be hard for these monies to disappear. Even the LM outyear requests have been honored. Having the LM budget stand alone has been real eye opener for Congress to show what the expenses and obligations really are.

Lori Cox noted that she appreciates the ready flow of information. She added that a few communities in this organization are touched uniquely by the impact of Rocky Flats, due to their location downstream. She asked for an LM commitment to continue two information-sharing opportunities: 1) Quarterly data exchange meetings (she noted that the technical aspects of this data are very important) and 2) periodic notifications of anything that may affect water coming downstream, even relatively simple things, so the cities can account for any anomalies in a timely manner. Lori noted that these requests are not new, but she would like commitment to continue them. Mike Owen responded that her requests sounded reasonable and that LM should be able to make available what is useful to the communities.

Ron Hellbusch discussed mentioned the Woman Creek Reservoir Authority (WCRA). He conveyed to Mr. Owen that the WCRA is a related organization that he has heard from and will hear more from, as it intends to be very much involved with both the Stewardship Council and LM. He also echoed the previous comments about downstream concerns and priorities. Mr. Owen confirmed with Ron which entities are represented on the WCRA and which Stewardship Council members are part of the WCRA.

Shaun McGrath asked Mr. Owen to what degree DOE sees the Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments and Stewardship Council as models for stakeholder involvement. He also asked if DOE-LM would be inviting the Stewardship Council's Executive Director to present at other cleanup sites. Mr. Owen responded that David is very visible in Washington and has helped other sites quite a bit, but that different communities are organized differently. Senator Allard introduced concept of the LSO in legislation, and mentioned Rocky Flats, Mound and Fernald. Other sites are going about public involvement in a different way, but Rocky Flats has certainly been an example. Some sites are very small and do not have much going on. He said he would be prepared to allow this to serve as a model for other sites if this is how they would like to go about it. However, he did note that Rocky Flats is a somewhat unique site with regard to its history of involvement. He also mentioned that at Mound the local community wants LM off the site as soon as possible because they want to redevelop.

Clark Johnson asked about LM immediate and long-term challenges at Rocky Flats. Mr. Owen said the immediate challenge was to work through all the details of final regulatory closeout. This step is enormous and the pace will increase this fall. As for the long-term challenges, five

years from now LM anticipates they will continue along their current trajectory. If successful the Stewardship Council will need to meet less frequently, perhaps two times per year. That would be a success to him.

Jo Ann Price said she supports Lori's comments about having data exchange meetings separate from Stewardship Council meetings. She noted this was a commitment from Ray Plieness, DOE-LM. Mr. Owen responded that Ray's commitment is his commitment, and will remind him of that when he sees him in Grand Junction this week.

Kim Grant mentioned that Mr. Owen may be aware of the Rocky Flats Cold War Museum's efforts to preserve the history of Rocky Flats. He added that all weapons complex sites have remarkable stories to tell and he encouraged Mr. Owen to support their efforts. Kim also noted the recent creation of a Museum and Visitor Center Network. Mr. Owen responded that he was aware of the organization, that he received a copy of their recent letter from Frazer Lockhart, and that he will have open ears in order to determine where they have common interests. He noted that some of issues in the letter were encouraging to him versus some of what was being discussed earlier.

Briefing on Maintenance Work on Groundwater Treatment Systems

Lorraine Anderson introduced this topic by pointing out how important groundwater treatment and monitoring are. All monitoring results – both surface water and groundwater – are key indicators in showing the effectiveness (or lack thereof) of the cleanup efforts.

Scott Surovchak provided a brief introduction to the presentation and pointed out that both surface and groundwater are both important in terms of monitoring. He added that the site has been issuing monthly reports and they have been very busy doing maintenance work. Recently, DOE completed road improvements for bad weather conditions, so site personnel now have access to the site in any weather. Also, they did some maintenance on the Mound groundwater treatment system to replace the treatment media, which had lasted eight years. Similarly, they conducted repairs on the Solar Ponds groundwater treatment system, where plumbing problems were found. He said the valving used when the system was installed was probably not the best choice, but as a result of the repairs they have very good flow now, and will probably have some discharge samples this week.

Scott introduced the site's groundwater program manager, John Boylan, to deliver the presentation. John explained that there are four groundwater treatment systems in place at Rocky Flats -- East Trenches, Present Landfill, Mound and Solar Ponds. He said he would briefly discuss some repairs to the Mound treatment system and provide an extensive overview of some significant work on the Solar Ponds system.

The Mound treatment system was the first of its kind installed in the world. It was installed in 1998, and funded in part by EPA. It treats VOCs from the Mound Site Plume. The East Trenches treatment system was installed in 1999 and treats VOCs from the East Trenches Plume. The Present Landfill System also treats VOCs. The Solar Ponds treatment system was installed in 1999 and treats both VOCs and nitrates from the Solar Ponds Plume.

In April/May 2005, a storm drain trench was tied into the Mound treatment system intercept trench, and the flow into the treatment system increased by about ten-fold. In late-2005 and early-2006, the site began to notice signs that the media was becoming plugged and the effluent began to show detections of VOCs. A decision was made to replace the media, which was done in July and August of this year. They also installed an instrumentation vault which enhances the maintenance of the system and measures flow rates and water pressure. John showed several photos of the project.

John then showed photos taken during installation of the Solar Ponds treatment system in 1999. He explained how there are two cells in this treatment system. The first cell contains sawdust and iron filings to treat nitrates. The second cell is filled with pea gravel and iron filings to treat uranium. Just prior to site closure, water backed up in the west cell and interceptor trench. Kaiser Hill reconfigured the valves to bypass the plugged east cell. After these actions, nitrate and uranium concentrations increased. Kaiser Hill replaced the treatment media in the east (uranium-treating) cell in September 2005. Uranium concentrations returned to acceptable levels, but the nitrates remained elevated.

DOE-LM came in and inspected the valve configuration. Only two of the five were accessible, and they were not in the proper configuration. LM corrected the configuration on these two valves. However, despite the corrections, nitrate values remained high, suggesting a possible plumbing problem. LM assembled multi-disciplinary team, including the site hydrogeologist, an LM treatment system expert, and a microbiologist working with nitrate treatment. This group developed a set of recommendations, which included performing a valve test, inspecting media and plumbing, and performing treatability studies to investigate more robust media.

These investigations found broken influent lines, leaking valves, and pipe penetrations that were not adequately sealed. They found that the media was still effective and functional (not plugged). John reviewed a long list of plumbing repairs that were made. Following these numerous repairs, the system is refilling now. Flow should resume this week and then samples will be taken. Results will be available on 24-hour turn-around time, rather than the normal 28-day cycle. They will sample twice weekly until a trend develops. These results will be included in the report for the third calendar quarter. John also showed the group a series of before and after photographs of the work that was done.

Jo Ann Price asked if the site thinks it will be able to meet the water quality standards in 2009 when the temporary standards are set to expire. John Rampe (DOE) explained that the temporary modification is set at 100 mg/l, which is the irrigation standard. The drinking water standard is 10 mg/l. DOE had asked the Water Quality Control Commission to leave temporary standards in place for Rocky Flats until 2009. This request was granted in order to give the site time to see if residual contamination will be washed out by then. At this point, it is too early to tell. John Boylan said that the site discovered they had not been treating all of the water leaving the site, so there is a good chance now that levels will go down. Scott Surovchak said they are still seeing discharge from the gallery, and some concentrations still high, so it will take some time to flush out.

David Abelson pointed out that two separate issues were being mingled in the discussion. The first question is whether the treatment system is working as designed. Secondly, there is a separate issue of the discharge gallery. Because of where the Solar Ponds treatment system was sited (due to Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse habitat concerns), there is a pocket of water that is not treated, which then mixes with treated water. Therefore, there is an issue about whether the site can still meet the standard given this untreated source. Scott pointed out that since the site was closed, the flow in the streams is orders of magnitude lower than it was before, which also makes it more likely to see higher levels.

Lorraine Anderson asked if the standards do become stricter, if the site will look to meeting new standards that might be developed in the future. John Boylan responded that the site will have to meet whatever standards are included in the regulatory agreement. Lorraine also asked how the site will use lessons learned from these treatment system repairs to make sure the same problems are not repeated. John noted that they had put in proper valves this time. They also needed to account for settling, so the replacements are flexible pipe. The addition of a flow meter at influent and effluent locations will help the site better monitor performance. Also, the backfill is also now compacted as much as possible, and the pipes are now lighter because they do not have cast-iron valves.

Karen Imbierowicz thanked John for the helpful presentation. She asked at what point DOE would look for another possible source of contamination. Scott answered that it was not an issue of separate contamination source. The site has always known that this part of plume was not recoverable. They will see what data says and then move forward. Rik Getty pointed out that in looking back over six years of data, the nitrate levels have not yet stabilized, and are still going up slightly. Scott said they will continue to monitor to see if levels go down. They had planted some trees along the area where this water was discharged at the gallery, but they all died because it was too dry. This year, they will also try bare root plantings, as the previous effort had used cuttings. They would like to create a wetland area, which will polish the effluent and further reduce nitrates.

Ron Hellbusch asked if Scott would continue to work with the Water Working Group and water users. He said the issues being discussed become wastewater discharge issues for the downstream communities. Scott asked Ron what standards the cities have to meet. Ron said he did not know the specifics. Scott said they are not seeing nitrates at Points of Compliance.

David Allen said that he echoed Lorraine's concerns about preventing this from happening again. He asked if the site will be able to access the new valves from the surface. John Boylan said they can operate the valves from surface, but they cannot access them physically. David asked if there were groundwater monitoring wells beyond plume to ensure it does not expand. John said that there were a few monitoring wells outside the plume. Scott added that others included Points of Evaluation and Points of Measurement. Finally, David asked what the site would do if they found the plume expanding. John responded that they are required to consult with the regulators if that happens.

Discussion of Proposed Plan and Approval of Board Policy on Plan

David Abelson said that the goal for this agenda item was to approve comments on the Proposed Plan. The comment period closes Wednesday, September 13th. The draft comment letter in the Board packet incorporates comments already received on prior drafts.

The Stewardship Council is trying to walk a thin line with regard to the Solar Ponds groundwater treatment system. The organization needs to at least question whether the regulators can say that the site has met all regulatory requirements at the time of closure if there are still questions about the treatment system effectiveness. With these recommendations, the Stewardship Council is also flagging the question of what happens if the nitrate standards will not be met in 2009. This issue is important as we do yet not know if the repaired system will work properly. There is also the issue of the untreated area of contamination that may factor into whether the site can meet the standards.

David said that all of the other issues were fairly straightforward. One recent change in the comment letter relates to the fact that not all of the treatment systems are on lands that DOE will retain. While this is not a new issue, David added a statement in the letter that the roles and authority of USFWS and DOE need to be clarified in this regard.

David also directed the group to the third paragraph on Page 6. This section addresses a change in the positions of Broomfield and Westminster related to discharging water from the retention ponds. The letter was modified to highlight this position change and add that the Stewardship Council supports this revised position.

Jo Ann Price brought up the issue of fencing around the DOE-retained lands. She pointed out a need to make a clarification between legal requirements and risk management. She said it is very important that the fence always be maintained. David said this issue is addressed on Page 4 of the letter. He provided some history of the discussion of a need for a fence. In the bill designating Rocky Flats as a wildlife refuge, at closure all land will be transferred to USFWS, except for those areas that DOE needs to retain to meet its post-closure responsibilities. Shortly after the passage of the Refuge Bill, DOE started discussing the idea of retaining one vast area of land to manage rather than several individual areas. Accordingly, the purpose of the fence was simply to delineate the border between DOE lands and USFWS lands, not to create a barrier to protect human health and the environment. Now people are asking the question of whether the fence is part of the remedy.

John Rampe explained that in order for an action to be required by the ROD, it must be directly related to something remaining at site. All of the planned institutional controls are directly derived from current conditions. There are no conditions at the site that mandate the need for a fence. DOE knows there is a concern about this issue, and agrees it makes sense to put one up. Therefore, a fence is included in the plan, but it will not be a requirement. If someone were to cross the fence, there is no safety risk. Jo Ann asked who has to maintain the fence. Scott Surovchak said that DOE-LM will.

Lorraine Anderson asked what the risk would be if the fence fell down. Ron Hellbusch said that the sampling stations and monitoring facilities are absolutely critical and need to be protected using a fence among other things. If the fence is damaged, and monitoring facilities are compromised, downstream communities will not have important data they need. He added that some of the monitoring facilities are not even within the proposed fence, and they also need to be protected. Carl Spreng said he agreed with Ron about the need to protect the monitoring equipment, and pointed out that the State has some specific regulations that are used to protect remedies. Carl is not sure what level of security will be necessary, but the State will write requirements as needed. For now, signs will be required, and DOE will still erect a fence. Frazer Lockhart noted that the Proposed Plan includes signs as part of the regulatory requirements, and since the signs need to hang on something, DOE is using this to show a need for fencing. He added that a fence will not protect against many other risks to the remedies, such as fire or small rodents, which instead require an onsite presence. Scott Surovchak said that this daily presence is what will really protect the remedies, and that there will probably be better security for these areas in the future than during site operations. Also, the decreased water flow onsite will mean less risk. Scott believes the biggest benefit of a fence will be to keep out damaging wildlife.

Lorraine asked Ron if the draft recommendations were sufficient to address his concerns. Ron said he appreciated and agreed with the intent of DOE and the regulators, but asked where it will be documented. Carl Spreng said it will be documented in an attachment to the post-closure regulatory agreement. Ron said he was trying to be cooperative and make this work, but would like to include a reference to what Carl said in the comment letter. Carl explained that part of the post-closure agreement is an attachment that lists monitoring and maintenance activities, and one of these is physical controls. Jo Ann Priced moved to incorporate a reference to fencing requirements in the post-closure agreement attachment into the letter. There was no second. David pointed out that page 4 of the letter clearly refers to ‘disturbing remedies’ and also references layered controls. He said he could look for a place in the letter to put this provision, but it would be calling for something that is already legally required. Jo Ann still thinks it needs to be added. David said he would add this statement.

Jeannette Hillery suggested that Jo Ann’s concern could be incorporated on Page 3, in the second to last paragraph. The language could read “...and that DOE must agree to maintain the fence”. John Rampe clarified that the attachment being discussed is part of the post-closure regulatory agreement and not the CAD/ROD. That agreement and the attachment will be put out for public comment period. David then offered a suggestion.

Kim Grant moved that the letter be amended as suggested by David, and that the Stewardship Council approve the letter. The motion was seconded by Lori Cox. The motion passed 12-0.

Public Comment

There were no comments.

Updates/Big Picture

David Abelson noted that the October and November Stewardship Council meeting agendas will be very busy and may go longer than usual. He said he hoped all Directors can attend.

David also said that DOE wants to use this forum to share monitoring data, but that city staffers could meet for more technical discussions at a separate time. Lori Cox asked whether this would make it less likely that LM would be willing to meet separately with the technical staff. David said this depends on who you ask. Mike Owen said earlier in the meeting that LM wants to work with the local governments, so it should not be a problem. Lori added that Broomfield will stand firm on their desire to hold quarterly technical data exchange meetings, and if a public meeting is intended to replace these meetings, Broomfield would not support this format. Lorraine Anderson suggested that the Stewardship Council try the process as DOE is suggesting and then give feedback on the format and any additional needs.

David Allen pointed out that DOE previously said they had no problem having a technical meeting immediately following the public meeting and asked why this format could not be used. Jo Ann stated that these technical meetings are much more than just a few people. Scott Surovchak said he thought this was really not a problematic issue. He said that John Boylan's report consisted of more data than is usually given at the quarterly data exchange meetings. David noted that he was sensing a change in DOE's position based on what he had heard that morning, and that there is a question about the level of detail that would be required at each meeting. Bob Darr said that a data report will be issued several weeks prior to the public meeting, so there will be ample time to address any technical questions prior to the meeting. He added that DOE will be happy to sit down and answer any questions if they come up. Lorraine suggested that the group try having a data overview at the Stewardship Council meeting with the technical staff meeting afterwards, and then the Stewardship Council will provide feedback on the process.

Karen Imbierowicz asked about the issue of whether regulatory closure should be recommended if the solar ponds treatment system is not functional at the time of closure. David said this will be discussed at next couple of meetings.

Kim Grant announced an October 28 event at which the Rocky Flats Cold War Museum will be receiving a donation of the teepee that was used to barricade the site during one of the organized protests. The Museum will also be conducting a fundraising event at the proposed museum site/Building 60 at this event. He noted that the RFCWM is not endorsing this particular movement, but is happy to receive artifact of historic importance and hopefully receive some donations.

David reviewed the Stewardship Council's Big Picture schedule for the upcoming meetings.

October 2 -- Potential Business Items:

- Review draft 2007 Stewardship Council budget
- Discuss Stewardship Council staffing needs (Executive Session)

October 2 -- Potential Briefing Items:

- Host LM quarterly meeting – if board approves
- Briefing on CAD/ROD
- Briefing on post-closure regulatory agreement
- Begin discussing outreach plan

November 6 -- Potential Business Items:

- Hold 2007 budget hearings and approve budget
- Continue staffing discussion

November 6 – Potential Briefing Items:

- Long-Term Surveillance and Maintenance Plan
- Briefing on Rocky Flats Cold War Museum
- Continue discussing outreach plan
- 2007 Work Plan

February 2007 – Potential Briefing Items:

- Annual review of Stewardship Council activities
- Host LM quarterly public meeting
- Briefing on EPA delisting
- USFWS updated on Rocky Flats Refuge

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.