

**Monday, September 14, 2009, 8:30 – 11:45 AM**  
**Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport, Terminal Building**  
**11755 Airport Way, Broomfield, Colorado**

**Board members in attendance:** Lorraine Anderson (Director, Arvada), Clark Johnson (Alternate, Arvada), Marc Williams (Alternate, Arvada), Lisa Morzel (Director, City of Boulder), Matt Jones (Alternate, City of Boulder), Meagan Davis (Alternate, Boulder County), David Allen (Alternate, Broomfield), Bill Fisher (Director, Golden), Shelley Stanley (Alternate, Northglenn), Andrew Muckle (Director, Superior), Bob Briggs (Director, Westminster), Jeannette Hillery (Director, League of Women Voters), Shirley Garcia (Director, Rocky Flats Cold War Museum), Karen Imbierowicz (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:** Vera Moritz (EPA), Carl Spreng (CDPHE), Scott Surovchak (DOE-LM), Rick DiSalvo (Stoller), Bob Darr (Stoller), John Boylan (Stoller), Linda Kaiser (Stoller), Steve Berendzen (USFWS), Jennifer Bohn (RFSC accountant).

**Convene/Agenda Review**

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

**Business Items**

The first business item was the consent agenda. David Allen noted a minor change to the June Board minutes. He noted that he was the person who had asked the question on page 2 about stream classification, not David Abelson. Bob Briggs moved to approve the June Board meeting minutes with the minor modification. The motion was seconded David Allen. The motion passed 10-0.

Lorraine Anderson moved to approve the Board's checks. The motion was seconded Karen Imbierowicz. The motion passed 10-0.

**Executive Director's Report**

David Abelson began by noting the Board's decision not to meet in July and August this year. He asked the members to consider whether this worked well or not, and to keep this in mind as the Board develops its meeting schedule for 2010.

Next, David noted that Don Rohlf had stepped down from his position with the Rocky Flats Cold War Museum Board, and therefore the Stewardship Council. His replacement will be Jack Swanzy.

David said that the Stewardship Council's tour of Rocky Flats on June 11 was excellent and that DOE and Rik Getty did great job of pulling it together. He pointed out that the two things that really stood out to him on the tour were the continuing challenges at the Solar Ponds treatment system and at the original landfill.

DOE-LM has not chosen a new Director yet. Dave Geiser, who had been Deputy LM Director and previously worked in EM, is serving as the Acting Director. David noted that the Stewardship Council is the only Legacy Management stakeholder organization at the moment and posited whether the Board should consider writing a letter of support, expressing its belief that Mr. Geiser's background and experience are a good match for the Director position. David will be in D.C. during the first week of October and will try to get better sense of whether someone is being considered for the job. He would like some guidance from Board members on this issue.

Another item David will be exploring on his D.C trip will be additional DOE funding for the Stewardship Council. There is also the question of funding for the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge. On this trip, David will try to get better sense of what Congress might have in mind. He also noted that, as this trip also involves work for another client, the costs for the Stewardship Council will be lower.

As part of its support for the Charlie Wolf Act, the Stewardship Council asked Energy Communities Alliance (ECA) to support behind the bill. So far, there has not been any response from ECA. There is an Intergovernmental board meeting scheduled for mid-October at which David plans to request that ECA express whether it supports the Act. He said he will also pitch why this bill is important, and that the Rocky Flats community is looking for this group's active support. David may have a scheduling conflict that could prevent him from attending this meeting, but will keep the Board posted.

David noted that he may need the Board to make a minor modification to his management contract, due to a change in printing costs. This will be addressed at the November Board meeting. Andrew Muckle asked about electronic distribution of meeting packets. David said that only Board members receive hard copies, while all others are distributed electronically. Staff will check again with Board members to see what their preference is. He added that there is money in the budget to cover the excess costs, but that he may need the Board to approve the additional expenditures related to printing.

Andrew also asked if is there an update on the progress of the Charlie Wolf Act in Congress. David said that the GAO is currently conducting a study, and that they expect to have some initial findings back in December. David's understanding is that nothing will happen with the bill until the GAO reports. It is expected that the GAO report will expose additional problems with the nuclear worker compensation program and supply even more grounds for the changes to the Act.

Andrew next asked for a clarification regarding the funding process for the Refuge. David explained that the USFWS receives a certain budget and then must determine how to allocate the funding at its different sites. He said that what it really comes down to is the direction from HQ

to the Region that the Rocky Flats Refuge is a priority. He added that there is no need to lobby for changes in the authorization bill, but there is a need for USFWS to make Rocky Flats a funding priority.

The next item David discussed was the proposed Jefferson County Parkway. The Jefferson Highway Authority has submitted a request for 300 feet on the eastern boundary of Rocky Flats by easement or sale. David emphasized that the decision about whether to build this highway is not within the scope of the Stewardship Council. He added that, after some very delicate negotiations, the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge Act did include a provision stating that if an appropriate authority moves forward with such a transportation improvement, they will be provided the land they request for this purpose.

David pointed out two questions about this process. The first question has to do with the requirements in the Rocky Flats Refuge Act that call for any action to be in compliance with applicable laws. There are two types of requirements to consider – hazardous/radioactive contamination, as well as general industrial activities that could negatively affect downstream water supplies. Since cleanup has been completed and the site has been delisted from CERCLA, that question regarding hazardous waste has been asked and answered. There is still a question of whether additional NEPA analysis needs to be done. According to Steve Berendzen (USFWS) a decision has been made on this question, but all parties have not been notified yet.

The second question is, if a NEPA analysis is required, whether this Board should engage in that process since it will not be directly related to Rocky Flats issues. David's counsel was that since most of the Stewardship Council members will be looking at these issues outside of this venue, the best course of action may be to not address the issues as a group, but just keep staff in the loop.

David also noted that the 300 foot corridor may be transferred, but the road not built. If so, there might be a reversion clause. In this instance, because it would be related to the boundaries of Rocky Flats, the Board may choose to participate in the discussion. Overall, the Board needs to determine the extent of its desired level of involvement in these issues. This will also be a question when developing the Board's work plan for next year.

Bob Briggs asked if there is an anticipated timeline for any of the highway decisions. David said that we will soon know what the NEPA decision is. There may be an Environmental Assessment performed for the actual transfer of land, rather than construction. He assumes we will have knowledge about this before the next meeting. Also, any transfer of land will pose challenges and take time, including such steps as a DOJ review. Shirley Garcia said that if the Board opposed the highway because of Rocky Flats issues, she is afraid we might be sending mixed messages to the public since the site has been delisted. David clarified that the Board would not weigh in on whether an analysis should be done. Rather, he is asking if the Board feels it should weigh in on any assessment if one is done.

David Allen said that he tended to agree that any Board participation should be limited to specific Rocky Flats issues, such as maintaining points of compliance and the Central Operable Unit (COU). He added that any land transfer would be a decision between the granting parties.

Clark Johnson stated that it would be quite hard for the Board to give any guidance at this point. He said there are too many uncertainties, and that this is going to be a very long process. Therefore, his recommendation would be to just have staff monitor the issues and update the Board as necessary. Lorraine Anderson said she agreed. She said CDOT has given an initial approval to the Jefferson Parkway Authority, and the next step will be to become part of DRCOG's fiscal plan, which take place in January or February. She added that this is a transportation issue, not an environmental issue. Jeannette Hillery interjected that she was hearing that Board members support being kept updated about this issue and do not feel that any other action is necessary at this time.

David Abelson suggested adding a provision to the work plan addressing the Board's desire to track this issue. He added that it might be a good idea to create a white paper in early 2010 that explains the environmental analyses that have already been done as part of cleanup in advance of any public questions on these issues.

David Allen asked David Abelson if he wanted to discuss direction from the Board regarding a potential letter of support for the LM Director position. Scott Surovchak stated that Mr. Geiser does not wish to have the Board convey such a letter. David Abelson said the Board will hold off then. Lorraine Anderson added that, if the Secretary of Energy asks if the Board supports Mr. Geiser as LM Director, it would be appropriate to answer in the affirmative. She said the Secretary did make this inquiry last time a Director was named.

### **Public Comment**

None

### **Host DOE Annual Meeting**

DOE next briefed the Stewardship Council on site activities for the first quarter of 2009 (January – March). Activities included surface water monitoring, groundwater monitoring, ecological monitoring, and site operations. DOE has posted the report on its website.

#### *Surface Water Monitoring and Operations.*

Pond operations saw no discharges, due to lack of precipitation. Pond levels averaged approximately 15% of capacity. The site is in the process of completing a dam breach project in order to reduce long term maintenance and to remove the dams from regulatory requirements. Breaching of Dams A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, B-3, and B-4 was completed in March 2009. The next dams to be breached will be in 2012 and 2018. This will provide time to collect additional water quality data and see how the system is working at Pond A1. Shelley Stanley asked when the site plans to breach pond C-2. John Boylan and Scott Surovchak said that there is no firm plan in place, perhaps in 2012.

Hydrologic data during the quarter showed total precipitation of .45 inches, which was 35% of the average. Flow rates were very low (0-15% of average).

Water quality at all Points of Evaluation, except GS10, was below applicable standards. Reportable values for total uranium at GS10 continue to be observed. Uranium concentrations are impacted by reduced surface runoff and elimination of imported water after closure resulting in higher groundwater contribution to the creek. Upgradient groundwater wells and GS10 water show predominantly naturally occurring uranium.

Surface water quality results at the Original Landfill during first quarter 2009 triggered monthly sampling for silver. Silver was not detected in the first monthly sample collected during first quarter 2009. Therefore, monthly sampling was discontinued. Surface water quality results at the present landfill (PLF) triggered monthly sampling for vinyl chloride, selenium, and silver. These analytes were not detected in the first monthly sample. Therefore, monthly sampling was discontinued.

Lorraine Anderson asked if there is a plan to sample for these contaminants again in the future, since sampling was discontinued. John explained that they do not stop sampling completely, just that they do not have to sample monthly for these contaminants. Shelley Stanley asked if there was any plan to revegetate the mudflats. John said that those areas are wetlands and there has been quite a bit of revegetation already. David Allen asked about water being held in Pond B5 that may be released, and whether all sampling results have been clean. John said they were.

#### *Groundwater Monitoring and Operations.*

All Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) wells were monitored during the quarter. The results will be included and evaluated in the 2009 Annual Report. All groundwater treatment systems continue to remove contaminants from the groundwater.

The next topic was the status of updates to the Solar Ponds Plume Treatment System (SPPTS). Phase I involved collecting additional contaminated groundwater and routing it through treatment cells. Phase II saw the installation of a new uranium treatment cell as first treatment step. These two phases are complete. Phase III involves conducting pilot-scale studies to identify preferred nitrate treatment media. Construction has been completed and the site is currently evaluating inert (plastic) media fed liquid carbon source and corn stover. John Boylan noted that recently a water storage sump developed a leak causing the system to automatically shut down. They removed the sump and revised the Phase II plumbing so the cell acts as the sump. So far, they are observing nitrate removal in both cells.

Phase IV will combine the findings from Phase III (media) and flows measured since the completion of Phase I to design and construct a full-scale nitrate treatment cell. This phase will be initiated following completion of Phase III in early FY 2010.

Vera Moritz asked about the expected lifespan of these media. John said that they calculate that the corn stover will last about 4 years. The black plastic media is never consumed, only the carbon they add to the water. However, they might clog up. Rik Getty pointed out to the Board how flexible and well-designed this system is, as they were able to re-route the plumbing and keep the system going.

David Abelson asked John to discuss some slumping that occurred around July 4. John explained that the water storage sump had subsided. The bottom portion lowered causing it to leak out the seam, which led to erosion and even more subsidence. It dropped total of about 8 inches. The most obvious probable cause was a 72-inch pipe that ran under this area. When it was removed, the trench was backfilled; however, there are no detailed records. John guesses that the backfill was probably not compacted enough. A former stream drainage also flowed close to this work area in the late-1970's. John said that they performed a geotechnical investigation, during which 6 boreholes were drilled. The report is not yet finalized, and there is no defined exact cause. They do know that there is locally poor compaction. They have moved forward to determine they will consider adding better supports during Phase IV. The project is currently back online and operational. Lisa Morzel asked how they found the leak. John responded that they are basically monitoring everything, and water levels triggered the automatic shutdown of system.

#### *Water Quality Control Commission (WQCC) Rulemaking process.*

At a January 2009 hearing, in response to a DOE petition, the WQCC revised the uranium standard and deleted gross alpha/beta standard for Walnut Creek and Woman Creek (Big Dry Creek segments 4a, 4b, and 5), effective March 30, 2009. The previous uranium standards were 10 pCi/L for Walnut Creek and 11 pCi/L for Woman Creek. Based on 0.67 pCi/μg uranium conversion factor, 16.8 μg/L equates to 11.3 pCi/L.

At a June 2009 hearing, part of the Triennial Review of the South Platte River Basin, the WQCC revised the current arsenic standard (50 μg/L) to conform with the new statewide water supply standard, effective January 10, 2010. The new standard will be 0.02 to 10 μg/L (the low being the WQCC risk-based water consumption and the high being EPA's maximum contaminant level [MCL] for drinking water supply). Water below the MCL (based on 85th percentile of data) is considered in attainment with standard. Rocky Flats is in attainment with new standard.

The WQCC also changed the segment 4b recreation use classification from N (no recreation use) to P (potential recreation use) based on the establishment of the Refuge outside of Central Operable Unit (COU), effective January 1, 2010. The E.coli standard will change from 630/100 ml to 205/100 ml. Segment 5 retains N classification. A portion of segment 4b now inside COU (from A-4 and B-5 terminal ponds to COU west boundary) will become segment 5. Also, a portion of segment 5 outside COU (North Walnut Creek west of COU boundary) will become segment 4b.

DOE did not propose any extension/changes to the expiring Temporary Modifications (TMs). Current Rocky Flats TMs (six VOCs, nitrate/nitrite) expire December 31, 2009. Changes will be incorporated in RFLMA Attachment 2, Table 1, Surface Water Standards, as part of the planned Attachment 2 modification.

#### *Annual COU Inspection*

Rick DiSalvo next provided an update on Annual COU inspection, which took place during the first quarter on March 25. This project encompassed an inspection and monitoring for evidence of significant erosion or adverse biological conditions. Site employees performed a visual

observation for precursors of significant erosion and evaluated the proximity of any significant erosion to subsurface features.

Another part of this project was to inspect the effectiveness of institutional controls (ICs). This effort included looking for any evidence of violation of ICs. It also included checking whether required signs were in place and verifying that the Environmental Covenant was in the Administrative Record and on file with Jefferson County. This was verified March 31, 2009.

David Abelson asked what it means to verify the Environmental Covenant. Rick said they look at the online public records. David asked if any county officials or employees know about this requirement. Rick said that the planning department looks at land records as part of their planning process.

In summary, no significant erosion or adverse biological conditions were noted. There was no evidence of IC violations, and signs were in place. Lisa Morzel asked why there were some sinkholes. Rick said these were in areas that were filled and compacted. He clarified that they were just surface subsidences, not technically sinkholes.

#### *Annual Site Operations.*

At the Original Landfill (OLF), monthly inspections were performed throughout the quarter, as well as a vegetation inspection in March. Seeps #4 and #7 were dry throughout the first quarter except for short durations following precipitation events. Seep #8 showed a surface flow of approximately 1 gpm throughout the first quarter. The West Perimeter Channel flowed at a rate of less than 1 gpm throughout the first quarter.

Settlement monuments were surveyed on March 24 and data were within the expected range per the OLF Monitoring and Maintenance Plan. Inclinometers were measured twice in February. No significant displacement was observed. At the Present Landfill (PLF), the quarterly inspection was completed in February, the vegetation inspection was completed in March, and the settlement monument surveys were completed in January.

A special inspection of the site, including the landfills, was completed on March 30 following the melting of a snow event of approximately 16 inches. No problems were encountered at any of the locations inspected.

David Allen asked about the reason for the inclinometers. Rick responded that they can be used to identify differential movement based on parameters that might cause such movement, such as heavy precipitation. One inch of movement is the approximate threshold for concern. He said they did see some movement during the 2nd quarter. David asked if the appendices were posted on the website. Bob Darr said they were.

David Abelson asked Scott Surovchak to say a few words about how he thinks things have been going at the site now compared to what he had expected now that we are a couple years into post-closure. Scott said that they underestimated the effort needed for things such as revegetation, erosion controls, and dam breaching. David also asked Scott about whether DOE continued to have any discussions about managing Rocky Flats out of the Grand Junction office

rather than maintaining an office locally. Scott said there have been no more discussions about moving this office. He believes that as long as there is a DOE-controlled COU, the office will be here.

### **Briefing by CDPHE and EPA on Role of Regulators**

CDPHE and EPA were the state and federal regulators during cleanup and continue regulatory oversight of Rocky Flats. They were asked to brief the Board on their respective roles and offer their perspectives on the effectiveness of the cleanup remedies and ongoing management activities. Carl Spreng began by speaking about the underlying regulatory authority and roles during cleanup and post-closure.

There were two major laws underlying the regulatory framework at Rocky Flats. One was the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), otherwise known as the Superfund Program. This Act created the National Priorities List, to which Rocky Flats was added in 1989. It identifies Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs), and uses risk-based assessments to determine cleanup standards. Lisa Morzel asked where the list of ARARs could be found. Carl said they are posted on the CDPHE Hazardous Materials Division website.

The second major statute applicable to Rocky Flats was the Resource Recovery and Conservation Act (RCRA.) As an ‘authorized state’, Colorado enacted the Colorado Hazardous Waste Act which was required to be at least as stringent as the federal law. The State statutes contain virtually the same wording as the federal law. The State then develops policies and guidance in order to implement the regulations. The State has authority to regulate hazardous and mixed wastes. Other State regulations also applied at Rocky Flats, such as Radiation Control, Solid Waste Disposal, Air Pollution Prevention and Water Quality Control.

There have been several regulatory agreements at Rocky Flats over the years, beginning with the 1986 Compliance Agreement. This was followed by the 1989 Agreement in Principle, and the 1991 Interagency Agreement (IAG). The IAG identified 178 Individual Hazardous Substance Sites (IHSS’s) organized into 16 Operable Units. It contained a rigid schedule with detailed milestones, which Carl believes helped lead to its downfall.

Beginning with the 1996 Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement, the regulators took a more flexible and consultative position by allowing cleanup to be performed under ‘interim actions’ and in-the-field decisions. This was when major cleanup action really started at a rapid pace. For example, in one year, CDPHE provided 208 approvals. This agreement implemented both RCRA and CERCLA simultaneously. The State was the lead agency in the Industrial Area, and the EPA was lead in the Buffer Zone. It also called for rigorous public involvement in cleanup decisions.

There have been numerous community organizations focusing on Rocky Flats issues throughout the years, including local government groups, focus groups, oversight panels and technical working groups.

During the cleanup of the site, regulators provided oversight of building decommissioning and environmental cleanup, and were also involved in emergency preparedness and response planning. Some of these activities included independent monitoring of surface water discharges, setting and revising standards, approving monitoring protocols and sampling methodology, reviewing data, and air monitoring.

The Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement (RFLMA) was put in place in March 2007 as the post-closure agreement. It covers the monitoring and maintenance framework, reporting schedules, and defines the remaining Central Operable Unit. It also identifies contact records to review and approve major actions.

The State and EPA also entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that defines post-closure regulatory roles. Under the MOU, the State is the lead for most regulatory actions, and consults with EPA. Joint approval is necessary for decisions that affect RFLMA.

Some of the roles of the regulators in the post-closure period include reviewing routine reports, sampling and analyzing water from terminal ponds prior to discharge, approving actions and changes proposed in Contact Records, coordinating with other State agencies, and Natural Resource Damage Restoration Projects. EPA is also charged with consultation, providing access to EPA resources and topic experts, conducting 5-Year Reviews, and de-listing.

Vera Moritz (EPA) clarified that RFLMA provides that the State is the lead agency for most actions. She reviewed EPA's responsibilities. She said that the amount of work during the post-closure period is about what she expected from seeing closure at other sites. She added that DOE and its contractor are addressing issues very responsively, and that it has been a good experience with many lessons learned

Carl said he has been surprised at how much effort has been required post-closure. He agreed that all issues have been handled very openly and professionally, and according to the agreement in place. Shirley Garcia offered her thanks to all three agencies for being so diligent and responsive. David Abelson noted that the regulatory agreement is crucial to keeping the process going, along with the ongoing public involvement. He added that part of the reason for this briefing was to make sure that everyone understood the checks and balances that are in place, and the roles and responsibilities of the various parties. Lorraine Anderson stated that the RFLMA agreement and the way Rocky Flats was cleaned up is a model for other sites being cleaned up around the country. She said she was just at Hanford and their contract is very similar to what was used at Rocky Flats. Lisa Morzel added that the cooperative effort of local governments and other members of the community at Rocky Flats was a surprise to many. She said these positive relationships allowed for accelerated cleanup and budget savings.

### **Board Review of Stewardship Council Activities for 2009 and Initial Review of 2010 Work Plan**

The 2009 Stewardship Council Work Plan provides that the Board review its work for the year. This review is to 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 2010 Work Plan. Staff included a draft 2010 Work Plan in the packet distributed for this meeting. Formal approval of the 2010 Work Plan will take place at the November 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

David Abelson said that one of the new activities staff is looking at for 2010 is the development of a new website to be focused solely on the history and current conditions of Rocky Flats. Jeannette suggested ensuring linkages to other relevant organizations. Lisa Morzel suggested putting information YouTube, such as excerpts from the Oral Histories conducted by the Cold War Museum Board.

Shirley Garcia noted that David had called and talked to her about the Stewardship Council developing a new website. She said that the Museum does not have funding available to add to their website at this point. She said that the oral histories are posted on the website. They also publish a quarterly newsletter, which is informational and historical. She added that there is no need to generate new sites, which could lead to redundancy. Jeannette clarified that this was not meant to be an additional burden on the Museum. David Abelson said that that Stewardship Council website currently includes a great deal of historical information, but what is really missing is a one-stop shop for what happened, what is going on, and where are we going. Various sites have various pieces of this. If the Stewardship Council took on this initiative, it would be as a steward of the information only, not an owner. He was thinking about what kinds of names would be good for such as website, and would suggest something basic, such as 'RockyFlatsHistory' or 'RockyFlatsFacts'. Andrew Muckle said that the website could also be used by DOE-LM, which may provide funding for the website if this group is not around in the future. David said that part of problem is that, while DOE's website contains a great deal of information, it is very difficult to navigate and locate the specific information one is seeking. David Allen suggested that, before the Board takes on new venture, it would be important to review costs and sources of funding. David Abelson said that the Board could use the same person who created their website, and that there is \$4,500 in the budget for this type of activity. He said that a large amount of the work will be to simply organize and format existing information. He believes that \$4,000 might cover the website development, and hosting is minimal.

Shirley asked about the possibility of modifying the Museum website with this information instead of creating something new. David said that they could use an existing website, even that of the Stewardship Council. However, he added that this would complicate the task, as both the Stewardship Council and the Museum websites were designed for their own specific purposes. The entire structure of either existing site would have to be changed for this purpose. Also, he would not want to have to navigate political positions on Museum Board in terms of agreeing to what would be posted.

Andrew Muckle said he did not care how it is done, but he thinks it is a good idea. Bill Fisher said he also cared less about structure, and more about what issues such a website would address. The draft work plan had mentioned the idea of addressing 'misconceptions'. Bill said this approach would make it harder to avoid opinion, rather than fact. He said that he could see structuring it around specific purposes or questions that website visitors might have, such as contamination issues, the Refuge, or basic Rocky Flats history. David Abelson said that Bill

described the vision for the website better than he did – a different way of using the already existing information. The Stewardship Council website is about the Stewardship Council. The Museum website is about the museum. The way in which the information is presented is a key aspect of this endeavor.

Jeannette Hillery moved the discussion back to the work plan. Karen Imbierowicz said that Meagan Davis had to leave, but asked her to add that the Board should compile a white paper addressing Rocky Flats issues related to the Jefferson Parkway. Jeannette told Board members to let David know if there are any further comments on the Work Plan. David said he will accept all changes that were presented and then add points from Meagan about the white paper and Bill about misconceptions. Lorraine Anderson advised using positive language in crafting messages. David Allen proposed adding ‘federal’ to the section about monitoring state legislation. He also suggested that the Board develop an Annual Report of its activities and accomplishments. David Abelson addressed the need to reach out to state legislators, and said he sees this as more of a responsibility of elected officials to make this a more proactive part of their work. Clark Johnson added that it is also a responsibility for Stewardship Council staff to arm members with relevant information.

### **FY 10 Budget – Initial Review**

Formal FY10 budget hearings will take place at the November 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. This agenda item was set up as a preliminary review. David Abelson said that the Board has reduced its budget for the fourth year in a row. One item that is going up, as mentioned earlier, is printing and copying. Clark Johnson asked for confirmation that all packets are being sent electronically except to Board members. David said they are. Barb Vander Wall noted that the draft budget needs to be submitted to the Board by October 15, which it was. After the hearing in November, the Board will adopt a resolution approving the budget.

David Allen asked if statutes require that revenue sources be listed in the budget. David Abelson said that revenue is included in the budget. He briefly explained how expenses are allocated according to revenue source. All expenses are charged to the Stewardship Council’s DOE grant except those that are prohibited, such as food, and trips to Washington, DC that could in any way be construed as lobbying. He said each check is assigned to specific account. This also shows up in the annual audit. David Allen went on to state that it would be helpful to have a 2-5 year projection regarding the budget. David Abelson responded that every quarterly report contains current grant/funding balances and noted that part of the nature of working off grants is the uncertainty. He confirmed that there will be ample opportunity and forecasting that will allow for planning ahead if funding is running out in the future. David Allen asked if they would have at least one year notice and was told they would.

### **Public Comment**

There was none.

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

Bob Briggs announced an event commemorating the 150 year history of Jefferson County. It will take place on October 24, 5:30 – 7:30 pm at Copperfields in Wheat Ridge. The event will include the induction of people into Jefferson County's Hall of Fame. The event is free.

## **November 2, 2009**

### *Potential Business Items*

- Budget hearing for 2010 budget

### *Potential Briefing Items*

- Host LM quarterly public meeting
- Approve 2010 work plan
- Update on Cold War Museum
- Continue discussing interpretive signs for Rocky Flats

## **February 1, 2010**

### *Potential Business Items*

- Elect 2010 Officers
- Adopt resolution regarding 2010 meeting dates

### *Potential Briefing Items*

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

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

*Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.*