

## **ROCKY FLATS STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL**

**Monday, September 13, 2010, 8:30 AM – 11:45 AM**

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

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

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

**Attendees:** Larry Patton (citizen), Hank Stovall (citizen), Vera Moritz (EPA), Carl Spreng (CDPHE), Marilyn Null (CDPHE), Rick Berendzen (USFWS), Scott Surovchak (DOE-LM), Rick DiSalvo (Stoller), Jeremiah McLaughlin (Stoller), George Squibb (Stoller), John Boylan (Stoller), Linda Kaiser (Stoller), Lynn Bowdidge (Stoller), Martha Derda (City of Broomfield), Cathy Shugarts (City of Westminster), Jennifer Bohn (RFSC accountant).

### **Convene/Agenda Review**

Chair Lori Cox convened the meeting at 8:36 a.m. The first item was the consent agenda. Bob Briggs moved to approve the August Board meeting minutes. The motion was seconded Lisa Morzel. The motion to accept the minutes passed 11-0. Lisa Morzel moved to approve the checks. The motion was seconded Bob Briggs. The motion passed 11-0.

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

David Abelson provided several updates to the Board. First, he updated the Board on his discussions with DOE regarding securing additional funding for the Stewardship Council. Although delayed by personnel changes at DOE-HQ, the Stewardship Council was awarded \$180,000 in mid-August. DOE also extended the Board's grant by one year, so that it now runs through February 28, 2012. David said that this date is key, because now the Board's funding, grant and IGA are all on the same timetable. He said DOE would like to use 2011 to make sure that the Stewardship Council is still fulfilling its congressionally-defined role. Beyond February 2012, any future funding will be contingent upon the Board continuing its role as the Rocky Flats Local Stakeholder Organization (LSO).

David also mentioned that Leroy Moore with the Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center has continued to protest the membership policies of Stewardship Council. Since the last meeting, Mr. Moore has written to federal agencies, including DOE's Office of General Counsel, advocating that this Board become a FACA organization. DOE wrote Mr. Moore telling him the Stewardship Council is not a FACA group. David also noted that Mr. Moore had an issue with a memo that Stewardship Council staff drafted regarding a recent offsite monitoring project. David said he would be meeting with Mr. Moore to talk about his concerns about the Stewardship Council. Lisa Morzel asked what rules exist regarding Board communication and public release of information. David said that because this group is a public entity, it is responsible for providing information upon request. David said staff will add a section to the Board's website that will be used to post various correspondence in order to ensure compliance, as well as to post information from other parties.

David moved on to an update on the planned changes to the Points of Compliance locations. He said that there had been a lot of dialogue going on, and added that, because of the nature of the process, Stewardship Council staff has been consciously not attending meetings that have been taking place between participating cities and DOE. This issue will be discussed in detail later in the meeting.

David Allen asked what part of the year the Stewardship Council reviews will occur in 2011. David Abelson said that they had not figured out a schedule yet, but will look at the process that was used in 2008. He added that, if the Board decides it wants to continue, each city will have to ratify the new IGA. There will also be discussions about a 'big picture' path forward, such as whether to continue working within same format. David Allen said that it would make sense to answer this question before working on the next work plan. David Abelson said this would depend on whether all governments decide to continue their participation in the Stewardship Council and whether there are any significant changes in the Board's mission. David Abelson asked Scott Surovchak (DOE) about whether DOE had developed a plan for how to conduct their evaluation of the Stewardship Council. Scott said this had not been decided. David added that he has not been hearing that any big changes will be needed. For example, the legislation is not changing, and DOE has not made any complaints about the Board's operations. Finally, he requested that if any government is thinking about not continuing, or believes that there is a need for any kind of major changes, they communicate this as early as possible. Lisa Morzel suggested that each member check in with their Council to get a sense for the interest in moving forward. David said that the Board should have a good idea about any changes by the November 2011 meeting, so that they would be reflected in the 2012 work plan.

### **Public Comment**

There was none.

### **Board Review of Stewardship Council Activities for 2010 and Initial Review of 2011 Work Plan**

The 2010 Stewardship Council work plan provides that the Board shall undertake a review of its work each year. The review shall include an assessment of how the organization can improve in

the coming year, focusing on areas of weakness and opportunities for improvement. The review is a first step in the Board approving the 2011 work plan. Board members received a draft 2011 work plan in their meeting packet, which is an update of the 2010 plan. Formal approval of the 2011 work plan will take place at the November 8th meeting.

David Abelson started the discussion by explaining the basic idea of the review is to reflect on the work done in 2010. He said that typically, this has been the shortest discussion annually. Bill Fisher noted that the outreach section of the work plan seems to stay at the same level each year. David Abelson answered by pointing out how individual members have handled outreach within their own organizations or constituencies. For example, Sue Vaughan with the League of Women Voters periodically asks staff for information to share with her group. He said that Board members are available when opportunities present themselves to share information in the community, and that staff is available to help provide information and presentations. David added that he does some of this on a national level. Sue Vaughan pointed out that the 'talking points' on the website are especially helpful in providing perspective on various issues or to 'put out fires'. Lisa Morzel explained how when the City of Boulder was concerned about prescribed burns, they called special study sessions. Also, she said she brings various Rocky Flats updates to her city, which are televised, a couple times a year. She said it is important to keep reminding the community about the importance of Rocky Flats. Lori Cox asked whether Stewardship Council staff receive requests from community groups or organizations. David said they do not receive many requests. Shirley Garcia said that the Rocky Flats Cold War Museum does various presentations throughout year, and that they receive a good number of requests. David Abelson summarized that the Board's outreach activities are a collective effort among various members and their own organizations. He said outreach does happen, but is not necessarily coordinated. Bill Fisher added that he also provides various Rocky Flats updates to the Golden City Council. He also said that this kind of ad hoc system might not be enough to keep awareness high enough in the community over the long-term, and was wondering if the Board had discussed this in the past. Jeannette Hillery was curious about whether anyone was getting requests from schools in the area. Shirley Garcia said that the Museum had presented to various local schools. David Abelson responded to Bill's question by saying that he thinks that the best ways to educate people about Rocky Flats are signage at the Refuge and the planned Museum. He added that both are not quite functional yet because of funding issues, but that is where the largest number of people will be able to be reached.

Lori Cox noted for the group that a paragraph had been added on Page 3 that addressed the continuing evaluation of DOE's proposed changes to dam breaching and points of compliance. David Allen suggested that this paragraph would fit better under #1 in that section. David Abelson said he agreed, however, since this issue has garnered more energy and dialogue since any issue since closure, he felt the Board would be remiss not to flag it as a separate bullet point, as it may leave people wondering if the Board was addressing this specific item. Lisa Morzel asked if there were any other activities that anyone could anticipate coming up that are not on the radar screen at the moment. David Abelson said he had been in touch with agencies to see what was coming up. In fact, this is why the item regarding the Refuge CCP was being removed from the 2011 plan. He said there could possibly be a larger activity related to the Solar Ponds Treatment System. This would fall under item #6, but could be pulled out and flagged as a separate issue. Lisa also asked if staff would be able to create a big picture covering a more

extended amount of time. David said they could definitely do this to flag big ticket items on the horizon. David Allen said that although activities related to the landfill have been slow lately because of dry conditions, this should be on the Board's radar screen because this will change if it starts getting very wet again.

David Abelson pointed out that the Board had included funding for an additional website in last year's budget. The plan was to create a website that was not associated with any particular organization in order to offer 'just the facts' on Rocky Flats issues. He pointed out that, given the issues that are currently being raised related to FACA, such an undertaking could get complicated. If the Board is obligated to post information from non-members on the website, it might result in things being posted that are not technically sound. If the new website is being promoted as having just the facts, it may create confusion. For this reason, the new website is being removed from the work plan and budget. Carl Castillo asked about the reason behind this new website idea. David Abelson said that there had been discussion about having a website serve as a central locale for basic information about Rocky Flats that was separate from any existing organizations' or agencies' websites that are specific to their own operations (minutes, meeting notices, membership, etc). There had also been discussion that management of this website could be passed to the Cold War Museum in the future. David referenced a memo that the Board received from the Office of General Counsel that directed the Stewardship Council to post information from non-members on its website upon request, which was what led him to question the effectiveness of creating this new site. Meagan Davis said that she sees the type of information referred to in the General Counsel memo as 'public comment' that could be separated from any factual content. Shirley Garcia pointed out the need to include a clear caveat that any information posted by outside entities does not reflect the Board's positions. She said it was also important to provide basic fact sheets for each post-closure area. Lisa Morzel asked who would write the fact sheets. David Abelson said that there is a lot of information available, and much of the work would be in re-packaging existing material to get the website started. He said the next level, involving the preparation of new fact sheets, would happen over time. He added that he had not thought about the option of posting 'public comment' on the existing Stewardship Council website, and leaving the 'facts-only' website alone. Carl Castillo asked why there would be a separate website. David said it was to create distance from organizational information. Lisa Morzel asked how much was budgeted. David said it had been \$4,500. She said she would like to get started on the website, and get it going incrementally. David clarified that the funding was primarily for webmaster tasks, and that creating the information would be part of the staff's responsibilities. Sue Vaughan said that the website could be almost like a virtual tour of the site. David Abelson said that a key factor would be figuring out a balance in terms of the level of the information, in order to appeal to the general public level of questions. He said most people in the community are more likely to ask questions such as whether it is safe to buy a house in a neighboring subdivision. He said they also will need to get ahead of the inevitable questions that will arise as the parkway is being built. David Allen said that he liked the idea of having basic fact sheets for each area that would include links to additional information and the original documents. Jeannette Hillery noted the importance of identifying the intended audience prior to creating the information. David Allen said that since most people simply ask if it is safe, going into too much detail about specific areas might be more than they need.

## **FY 11 Budget – Initial Review**

Formal budget hearings will take place at the November 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. As part of this initial review, David Abelson began by noting that the budget is very straightforward. As background for new members, he said that because the Stewardship Council is a public organization, it is required to hold public hearings across two meetings in order to make any changes to the budget. The Board typically over-budgets within each category of expenses. These categories are used as general markers, whereas the Board itself makes decisions on specific expenditures. David reported that expenditures over the past few years have been flat. He added that if the Board makes any changes today, the revised budget will be presented at the next meeting. He said that the actual and projected expenses will also be updated at next meeting as data becomes available. David also pointed out that the categories used in the budget were designed to match with DOE's grant budget categories. There were no questions or changes.

## **Host DOE Quarterly Meeting**

DOE was on hand to brief the Stewardship Council on site activities for the first quarter of 2010 (January - March 2010). The full report is available on DOE's website. Activities include surface water monitoring, groundwater monitoring, ecological monitoring, and site operations (inspections, maintenance, etc.). In order to transition into the next discussion, the surface water presentation was scheduled as the last topic.

### *Groundwater Monitoring and Operations -- John Boylan*

John began by noting that it was a light monitoring quarter. All RCRA wells were monitored (six at PLF, four at OLF). The results were reviewed in accordance with the RFLMA Attachment 2 decision flowcharts and were generally consistent with past results. Results will be evaluated in the 2010 annual report.

At the Solar Ponds Treatment System, the site continues to collect samples at least weekly. Sample locations were chosen to support evaluation of Phase II, III, and the entire system. Split samples were collected periodically for contract lab analysis. At the Phase II cell, uranium removal decreased when flow rates increased to manage spring 2010 moisture. Uranium removal essentially ceased in July 2010. Media was replaced in August 2010 and the treatment effectiveness was restored. As part of the Phase III pilot studies, testing was completed at both Cell A (inert media) and Cell B (organic media). Inert media was selected for Phase IV alternative development.

LANL high-resolution uranium sampling was conducted at the SPPTS in order to determine the amounts of natural vs. anthropogenic uranium. At the sump installed as part of SPPTS Phase I (ITSS), both east and west drains feeding the sump were sampled. The West drain was found to be 50-51% anthropogenic uranium, while the east drain came in at 99% natural uranium. At the SPP discharge gallery during pre-closure, the uranium was predominantly natural. Post-closure, before Phase I, this area was predominantly anthropogenic. The result this spring was predominantly natural. This shows that Phase I is capturing, and the SPPTS is treating, more anthropogenic uranium.

Ongoing activities include conceptualizing and costing Phase IV alternatives (full-scale nitrate treatment) and operating Phase III to support nitrate treatment. The site also installed auxiliary flow distribution piping in the original Cell 1 to address biofouled piping and adding associated plumbing.

At the Mound and East trenches sites, effluent includes constituents above RFLMA values. Treatment effectiveness corresponds to residence time (how long the water is in contact with treatment media), media condition, and specific contaminants. Spring moisture presented high flow rates (less treatment). The Mound Treatment System is due for media replacement (coming fall 2010). It is now treating high concentrations of breakdown products (which take longer residence time to treat). Consultation was initiated and continues with CDPHE and additional sampling was conducted in June, July and August at RFLMA locations and additional locations between effluent and surface water performance locations. More information will be presented in second quarter and annual reports.

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

Monthly inspections at the OLF were completed on January 28, February 25, and March 30, and a vegetation inspection was completed on February 16. Seep 4 had some surface expression, but did not show any surface flow due to the rock drain that was installed in 2009. Seep 8 flowed at a rate of 2 to 5 gallons per minute (gpm) throughout the first quarter. The rock drain located at the base of the West Perimeter Channel was flowing at a rate of 0.5 gpm during the January inspection; flow increased to 2 to 4 gpm during the February and March inspections. Seep 7 showed a surface flow of approximately 0.5 gpm during the January inspection; flow increased to 2 to 4 gpm during the February and March inspections. The increased seep flow rates in February and March were due to the melting of recent snow events.

Settlement monuments were surveyed on March 26 and data are within the expected range per the Original Landfill Monitoring and Maintenance Plan (which is 1.34-2.86 feet depending on the location). Inclometers were measured on January 26, February 24, and March 30, 2010. March readings indicated deflection for inclinometers between Berm 1 and Berm 3. Surface cracking in vicinity of Berm 1 appears consistent with inclinometer indications, and also consistent with the findings of the 2008 geotechnical investigation. A small hairline crack that ran through the top and south face of Berm 1 was noted on March 30; the crack was filled and compacted with Rocky Flats alluvium the same day. The end of Berm 7 was observed as having slumped into the Eastern Perimeter Channel during the March 30 inspection. The area was too wet to perform any immediate repairs, but repairs were completed in June.

At the Present Landfill, the quarterly inspection was completed on February 25. No areas of concern were observed. The vegetation inspection was completed on February 17.

Ron Hellbusch asked about an elevated plutonium result in Pond C2. Rick said that the contact record for this issue was on website. He added that since that April sample, the carboy has not filled up enough to take another sample, due to dry conditions. The site did sample Pond C2, and found very low levels of plutonium. Since it is impacted by the 903 lip area, fate and transport models predicted some movement. Therefore, vegetation is important. The site is

watching this, and has enhanced long-term vegetation and erosion control. David Allen asked if they will be re-seeding these areas in the future and Rick said they were.

Rick was asked if there will be a remedy for the area impacted by the lubricated organic layer. Rick said that the problem does not justify the cost for a slurry wall or caissons, and that the hope is that it will stabilize over time. Shelley Stanley asked if all of the inclinometers were working. Rick said inclinometers 2, 3 and 4 have each moved a couple of inches. This is an area of historic landslides, and lots of fill was brought in during closure. In moist conditions, it is prone to slide. The geotechnical investigation showed no risk of mass failure. This information can be found in the 2009 Annual Site Report. The current monitoring and maintenance plan calls for watching the surface. If cracking, slumping, or differential settling is found, the area is filled and smoothed out. Sometimes they will bring in some soil for contouring to minimize water percolating down through the cover. Lisa Morzel asked if the site is planning to re-install the inclinometers. Rick said that is not the current plan. Lisa asked how they can differentiate between movement of the landslide and the landfill. Rick said that the top inclinometer has not moved at all, so that is how they calculate the differential. Also, since they added channels for drainage, things have improved. For the time being, maintenance and observation are sufficient. However, this may change in the future, depending on cost effectiveness. Lisa asked how thick the cover on landfill was. Rick said vegetation was stripped off, and then a foot of clean soil was brought in to do design contours, and another two feet was added on top of that.

#### *Annual Site (COU) Inspection -- Rick DiSalvo*

The annual inspection of the Central Operating Unit (COU) took place on March 17, 2010. This project includes:

- Inspect and monitor for evidence of significant erosion
  - Conduct visual observation for precursors of significant erosion
  - Evaluate proximity of any significant erosion to subsurface features
- Inspect effectiveness of institutional controls (ICs)
  - Determine effectiveness by any evidence of violation of ICs and determine whether required signs are in place
  - Verify that Environmental Covenant is in Administrative Record and on file with Jefferson County (verified March 19, 2010)
- Inspect for evidence of any adverse biological conditions

To perform this inspection, the COU was divided into five areas - Former 300 and 400 Areas; Former 700 and 991 Areas; Former 800 Area; Former 903 Pad and East Trenches Area; and Former Ash Pits Area. Landfills, treatment systems, and water monitoring stations are inspected during the year on a routine basis and are therefore not included in this walk-through. The teams walked down the surface of each area to observe conditions. No significant erosion was noted – only minor holes and surface debris. Any holes found were filled in, and debris and trash was collected or flagged for pick up. No adverse biological conditions were noted. No evidence of IC violations were found, and all signs were in place. Lisa Morzel asked if they found any traces of people inside the fence. Rick said they did not. In 2009, they found some shotgun shells by the landfill.

### *Surface Water Monitoring -- George Squibb*

There were no terminal pond discharges during the quarter. Water was transferred from A-3 to A-4 intermittently throughout the quarter (total of approximately 12.6 MG). Pond levels during the quarter averaged 32.8 percent of capacity. As of August, these levels were even lower. There was 1.58 inches of total precipitation during the quarter, which is 124% of the 1993–2009 average. Flow rates ranged from 58 (GS03) - 216% (GS01) of average.

At the Original Landfill (OLF), surface water quality results triggered monthly sampling for selenium; selenium was not detected in subsequent samples. At the Present Landfill (PLF), surface water quality results were all below standards for the quarter.

George reviewed several charts showing sampling results (including plutonium, americium, uranium and nitrates) for Points of Compliance and Points of Evaluation. Water quality at all points was below applicable standards during the quarter.

David Allen asked George to show when Pond C2 discharges took place on the slide showing 1997-2010 GS01 plutonium data. Shelly Stanley asked if plutonium and americium were associated with sediment and turbidity. George said this was not an issue any more. George said that, in looking at the data overall, any detection results are almost equal to the uncertainty range. David Allen said he was looking for sampling data associated with discharges. He said he would like to see both upstream and downstream data in presentations. George said that the site looks thoroughly at all of the data because they do not want something to crop up that they should have seen coming. For example, with the recent .16 reportable value, they could have waited for next sample. However, since they realized it would have been high anyway, they reported proactively to the regulators.

### *Plutonium and Americium Loading – George Squibb*

George said that post-closure concentrations remain within historic variability and have decreased significantly. Loading has also decreased significantly. This results in an insignificant contribution to sediment concentrations. Looking at load is not a RFLMA requirement. Based on reduction in loads, this is an insignificant contribution to sediment concentrations. Sediments have not been characterized since 2005, but he said they know from data that it will not have changed much. Lori Cox asked if there was a way to predict loads in future. George said he estimates they will either stay the same or go down. He added that, as vegetation becomes thicker and more established, loads should decrease. Lori asked about variables that can affect water quality. George said these include hail storms and heavier rains. He said that by looking at total suspended solids (TSS), it will provide an indication of how much material is moving based on various events.

George discussed that concentrations have stayed about the same since pre-closure. To illustrate this point, he presented a chart showing large decreases in load during that time period. The load is less because there is a lot less water. Shirley asked about a mid-point sample. George said that since composite samples are based on period of time, this would refer to middle of that time period.

George next talked about the dam breach conceptual design. The dam breach project plans call for making a notch in the dam rather than removing the entire dam structure. They will take the material removed in making the notch and add it to the existing pond pool area to make it more flat, and add wetlands and vegetated areas. Lori Cox asked what the plans are to test the water once sediments are disturbed. George said they will still be monitoring downstream at POCs, and will also be limiting the movement of soil as they do in all actions onsite. He said that no water leaves the COU without being monitored several times. Shelley asked if they would be able to operate in a flow-through condition without breaching the dams. George said that is exactly what they are proposing. She also asked if the site has received approval from CDPHE given the plan to excavate below three feet as part of this project. Rick said they have. David Allen asked how many sample were taken as part of the 2005 sediment characterization. Rick said probably about 12. David asked if any if these were on the dam structure. Rick said he thought a couple of them were. David asked what the action levels were for the removal of sediments in the upstream B-series ponds. Rick said from the surface down to 3 feet, the action levels were 50 pCi/g. Below 3 feet, the action levels depend on number of things. If an action was triggered, there was a sliding scale up to 1000 pCi/g for the subsurface. This applied at only a few places, such as the 903 pad, buried process lines, and the B1-B3 ponds. Shirley Garcia asked about the definition of a storm event. George said it is generally when there is direct runoff. She asked that if the solar ponds are not a major source of uranium, whether the treatment could be missing another source plume. George said that so much of it is naturally occurring. She also wondered about nitrates. George said they are looking into this. Shelley Stanley asked how many of the previously breached dams had sediments removed. George said that the B-series (1-3) did, and four more (including A-series) did not. David Allen said that sampling results, including looking at timing and sequence of events, should come before the next dams are breached. Lori Cox asked when these sampling regimens started. George said most were implemented this past year, although some were in place previously. Shirley Garcia asked if the site does any modeling to see what would happen with loss of vegetation (i.e. fire). George said they do not, although the Site Ecology staff does some of this.

### **Continue Roundtable Discussion on Changes to RFLMA Points of Compliance and Dam Breach EA**

This conversation was designed to build on the Board's conversation from its August 16th meeting. The goal for the meeting was to develop an organizational position. As discussed in prior meetings, DOE is proposing to move the existing surface water and groundwater points of compliance stationed along Indiana Street to the eastern edge of the COU. Because DOE will manage ponds A-4, B-5 and C-2 in a flow-through configuration and later breach them, DOE is also proposing to continue to collect water quality data along Woman and Walnut creeks at the federal boundary along Indiana Street. The conversation was also designed to include the DOE dam breach proposal, as changing the points of compliance, eliminating the batch and release protocols, and breaching the dams are linked activities.

Chair Lori Cox asked first for an update from the downstream communities before the Board discussion. David Allen reported that Broomfield had been meeting with CDPHE, EPA and DOE. There have been several meetings and phone conversations since the last Stewardship Council meeting, with more on the schedule in upcoming days. David said Broomfield still had

not received formal responses to letters they sent to CDPHE and DOE, although it is their understanding that responses are being worked on. Carl Spreng said that he had completed a draft response about a month ago, and that it was just held up in review. He offered to share the draft letter. David Allen said that his community is positive about how things have been going. He said Broomfield may or may not submit another request to extend the comment period, depending on how next couple of meetings go. He said he does not anticipate requesting any formal position from the Stewardship Council. Ron Hellbusch added that Westminster had also been in some of the meetings, had submitted letters, and stated their case and concerns clearly. He said they were encouraged by the agencies' participation in reviving something equivalent to the Water Working Group, and that everyone just needs to continue working together. Lori Cox took a moment to update those in attendance that CDPHE has agreed to form a technical group for dialogue and collaboration. Sue Vaughan asked about the history behind the Water Working Group. Shirley Garcia explained that it had been a subgroup looking at developing the Integrated Monitoring Plan, which was focused on post-closure monitoring for the whole site. David Abelson asked who would be sending out notices for this group and if Rik Getty would be included on the list. Lori Cox said it would be CDPHE. Carl Spreng said he had been charged with scheduling an ad hoc meeting with interested parties, which was to take place the next day. He said they will discuss issues that have been raised over the past year, and seek to resolve as many as possible. He said they will also discuss moving forward, possibly looking other topics. David Allen said that the Broomfield City Manager is requesting a map that depicts the location of remaining contamination. He said the meeting will also be used to come to a clear understanding of what issues need resolution.

Lori Cox noted that the meeting was already past its scheduled end time. The Board indicated that it was fine for discussion to continue at the next meeting.

### **Public comment**

There was none.

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

**November 8, 2010** (second Monday)

#### *Potential Business Items*

- Budget Hearings for 2011 RFSC budget

#### *Potential Briefing Items*

- Host LM quarterly public meeting
- Approve 2011 RFSC Work Plan
- Review history of RFSC
- Continue discussing interpretive signage for RF (note: will probably postpone)

David Abelson noted that DOE will continue to include some of the broader issues as part of their quarterly report, as they did today. Staff will budget more time for this. They will also look to schedule a discussion about the Original Landfill at a future meeting as well.

**February 7, 2011**

*Potential Business Items*

- Elect 2011 Officers
- Adopt resolution regarding 2011 meeting dates

*Potential Briefing Items*

- Host LM quarterly public meeting
- Approve Washington, D.C. talking points
- Continue discussing interpretive signage for Rocky Flats

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

*Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.*