

**ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES OF WORK SESSION
December 1, 1994**

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Linda Murakami called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.

Board/Ex-Officio members present: Alan Aluisi, Gale Biggs, Jim Burch, Jan Burda, Lloyd Casey, Chuck Clark, Eugene DeMayo, Gislinde Engelmann, Tom Gallegos, Kathryn Johnson, Jack Kraushaar, Albert Lambert, LeRoy Moore, Linda Murakami, David Navarro, Gary Thompson, Beverly Lyne Wilber, Mark Silverman, Leanne Smith, Steve Tarlton

Board/Ex-Officio members absent: Lorraine Anderson, Stuart Asay, Ralph Coleman, Tom Davidson, Richard Seebass, Reginald Thomas, Martin Hestmark

Public/observers present: Leah Dever (DOE-NTS); Kenneth Werth (citizen); Eileen Simmons (ICF Kaiser); Tom DuPont (citizen); Jim Navratil (Rust); Bob Pressey (Total Remediation Inc.); Peter Hixson (CH2M Hill); Joelle Klein (DOE); Elizabeth Baracani (Suerdrup Environmental); Bob Wallace (citizen); Nancy M. Daugherty (Woodward-Clyde); Ron Holey (Parsons); Jim Broughton (Parsons); Marty Fabrick (Parsons); Mike Freeman (E/WM Committee); Dan Miller (S.M. Stoller); Sujit Gupta (E/WM Committee); James Voorhies (EG&G); Kelly Coleman (Colorado School of Mines); Charles Nuckols (citizen); Steve Slaten (DOE); D.A. Parker (EG&G); Edd Kray (CDPHE); R. Moraski (citizen); Gregg Nishimoto (DOE); Allen Schubert (EG&G); Becca DePenning (EG&G); Beth Brainard (DOE); George Martelon (DOE); Sandy Wagner (LANL/RFETS); Toby Lovato (LANL/RFETS); John Hunter (Parsons); David Moody (LANL/RFETS); Jack Hoopes (Jacobs Engineering); Mary Margaret Golten (CDR Associates); Ann Moss (Shapiro Associates); LizBeth Cone (ASG)

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

1) Executive Committee

- The co-chairs of CAB committees will meet on Monday, December 12, 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. at the CAB office, to discuss roles and responsibilities based on the workplan.
- On February 14-15, 1995, there will be a national SSAB conference in Washington, D.C. Five members from each SSAB are invited to attend (the chair plus four members), to discuss substantive issues regarding each site. Linda asked for volunteers from the Board to attend this meeting (Jim Burch, Gislinde Engelmann, Tom Gallegos and David Navarro volunteered). If others are interested in attending, please notify the office.
- The ad-hoc FACA Committee will meet Friday, December 16 at 6 p.m. at the CAB offices. The committee will review options and bring a recommendation to the Board at its January meeting.
- The Rocky Flats Summit was approved at the November Board meeting. The budget for the summit is approximately \$40,000. Some Board members have expressed concerns regarding the cost for a one-day meeting, staff time for involvement with the organizing committee, and goals and outcomes from the meeting are ambiguous. Board members can be a part of the organizing committee if they are interested. Staff will provide a monthly update to the Board.
- **Recommendation:** Approve CAB workplan.
Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.
- Volunteers to serve on the Membership Committee include: Jan Burda, Linda Murakami, Jim Burch, David Navarro, Kathryn Johnson and Tom Gallegos. There was an election between

Kathryn and David to determine who would represent Rocky Flats Labor - David Navarro was elected.

2) Community Outreach Committee

- **Recommendation:** Approve CAB Public Outreach and Communications Plan. Suggestion: build in a mechanism to allow for more public input. (Also discussed was the development of an internship program; Jim Burch agreed to assist.)
Action: Motion to accept as amended. APPROVED.
- **Recommendation:** Endorse community project (send letter of support to Andy McKean of Complete the Cycle Center).
Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.
- **Recommendation:** Approve sample newsletter format and title of newsletter.
Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.
 - Suggestion: add a monthly calendar to the newsletter (this will accompany the weekly fax produced by staff).
 - Suggestion: add story about the Tracking Project.
- The timeline for implementation of the Outreach Plan was reviewed. It will be submitted for final Board approval in January; if Board members have comments, please submit them before then.
- Draft outline for CAB newsletter: It was decided that the committee will discuss suggestions and come back to the Board with its ideas for newsletter.
 - Suggestion: have committee review and approve stories; give Board members the opportunity to review before publication; notify Board as to what stories will be included in each issue.
 - Suggestion: allow for op-ed pieces; guest commentaries by public, DOE workers, etc.; letters to the editor.
 - Set up an editorial committee for the newsletter.

3) Plutonium Committee

- **Recommendation:** Approve the official name of the committee: Plutonium and SNM Committee. It was suggested that acronyms not be used, and to spell out the name: Plutonium and Special Nuclear Materials Committee.
Action: Motion to accept as amended. APPROVED.
- **Recommendation:** Approve co-chairs of committee: LeRoy Moore and Gary Thompson.
Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.
- **Recommendation:** Approve Tom Marshall to serve as co-chair during LeRoy Moore's absence from the Board.
Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.
- Regular meeting time for the committee will be the second Tuesday of each month, 6:30 p.m., at the Westminster City Hall Multi-Purpose Room. Next meeting will be held December 13.

4) Environmental/Waste Management Committee

- A formal process for communication was discussed at its last meeting, so that members will identify when they are speaking individually or on behalf of the committee.
- The committee is continuing its review of solar ponds and liquid stabilization.

OTHER ISSUES:

- Suggestions for educational presentations:
 - one hour for radiation issues
 - 1/2 hour for health physics

- criticalities (will have presentation done for Plutonium Committee)
- update on Future Site Use Working Group (February or March)
- program baseline (FY 96)
- health studies (HAP, dose reconstruction, epidemiological studies on workers, and historical health studies for perspective), and allow different sides of the issues to give presentations
- have presentation, possibly from Alice Stewart, on dangers of low-level radiation
- a perspective on the oversight of Rocky Flats
- Site Wide Issues Committee scheduled for Monday, December 5, has been postponed until January 9, 1995, from 7 to 9 p.m. at the Westminster City Hall Multi-Purpose Room.

PRESENTATION/PANEL DISCUSSION: Waste Disposal Options

- Allen Schubert, Program Manager of Waste Compliance Programs at EG&G - Rocky Flats, Rocky Flats Perspective: Allen gave a breakdown of the various types of waste at Rocky Flats, their current volume and amount generated annually, the shipments of waste scheduled for FY95 and respective disposal sites. Sanitary waste is disposed at an on-site landfill; hazardous waste is shipped to various commercial disposal sites; low-level waste will go to NTS and Hanford; low-level mixed waste to Envirocare; medical waste is disposed of commercially; and the following wastes are scheduled to be disposed at WIPP pending its opening: transuranic, transuranic-mixed, residues, and mixed residues. There are also radioactive PCBs stored on-site, for which there are currently no treatment facilities. A compliance agreement between DOE and EPA is being negotiated to address the problem.
- Bob Wise, Manager of System Waste Disposal at DOE-WIPP, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Perspective: There was a video presentation, an overview of the WIPP facility entitled "WIPP ... Freedom and Responsibility." WIPP was established as a research and development facility for safe disposal of nuclear waste. Since its inception, the regulatory environment changed, and the WIPP site was behind in regulatory compliance. Then in 1991, a number of lawsuits were filed and the land withdrawal for the facility was determined to be illegal. A decision plan was created which notes key activities that must happen before WIPP can open: a permitting package; a performance assessment to demonstrate compliance; working with waste generators to prepare for the plant's opening; transportation issues; and a supplemental EIS.
- Leah Dever, Deputy Assistant Manager of DOE-NTS, Nevada Test Site Perspective: NTS handles primarily low-level waste, and also stores some transuranic waste at the site. They are not currently available as a storage site for other transuranic waste. There are plans to store mixed wastes from other sites in the future. Total low-level radioactive waste shipped to NTS in FY94 was approximately 750,000 cubic feet. There are transportation issues, because low-level waste follow routes some consider unsafe, and travel through areas that concern local citizens and politicians. Waste is disposed of in two separate areas at NTS, using two different techniques of shallow land burial. NTS has a Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program in place to make sure that waste accepted at the site meets compliance criteria, and that waste generators follow specific requirements.
- Leonard Slosky, President of Slosky & Associates, Independent Perspective: The focus of this discussion should be on waste management. There needs to be a systematic approach, which DOE is beginning to take, on waste minimization and treatment, and changing waste generation practices. The early stages of remediation involved shipping wastes to other sites, but in the future less waste will be leaving its place of origin. WIPP will be a good site, and should make it through the regulatory process. But it does have some technical problems involving how the site is expected to perform over thousands of years. WIPP may not be approved and ready to receive wastes by 1998 because of many regulatory and technical hurdles. One challenge is to find a way to deal with the risks involved with cleanup, and placing waste in more safe conditions.

- Judith Mohling of Boulder, affiliated with the Nuclear Guardianship Program, Alternative Perspective: Conducted a visualization exercise to demonstrate how much time the nuclear wastes will exist into the future. Nuclear guardianship is an expression of values to guide decisions on management of radioactive materials. The goal must be to isolate these materials from the environment for their entire hazardous life. Deep burial of nuclear waste will preclude precise monitoring of the wastes. Transportation of wastes from one site to another is too dangerous. The generations of the future deserve technology that will make these wastes harmless. Production of radioactive materials must cease, and safe removal and non-violent resolution to conflict are essential. This will require a steady and loyal scrutiny of the issues.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: January 5, 1995, 6:30 - 9:30 p.m.
 Location: Westminster City Hall, Multi-Purpose Room
 Agenda: • *Seven Liability Reduction Activities, and ER 2000 (Accelerated Cleanup)*

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY:

ASSIGNED TO:

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1) Volunteers for February SSAB meeting in Washington, D.C. | Board members |
| 2) Provide monthly update on Summit to Board | Staff |
| 3) Revise CAB Community Outreach Plan | Staff |
| 4) Assist with development of internship program | Jim Burch |
| 5) Add monthly calendar of events to weekly fax | Staff |

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:35 P.M.

* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

- Question:** Has the Board been in contact with the potential contractors for RFETS?
Answer: There was a contractor forum on Tuesday night, with eight Board members in attendance, to meet with the contracting teams. It was productive and there was an interactive dialogue. It might be a good idea to have a public meeting with the potential contractors so that the public could also interact and ask questions of the contractors.
- Comment:** Perhaps you could rename the Plutonium Committee the Radioactive Materials Committee.
- Question:** Is the intent of the committee to deal with all the radioactive materials at the site?
Answer: To deal with radioactive materials used with respect to weapons at Rocky Flats. Some of the plutonium issues will be dealt with by the Environmental/Waste Management Committee. There is some overlap, because some materials are already declared as waste.
- Question:** What is the target date for the new contractor?
Answer: A decision by the end of April, and a new team in place by mid-summer.
- Question:** Regarding their decision not to store waste at Rocky Flats, why was Rocky Flats designated as a technology site, when you don't look at innovative ideas that come up?
Answer: It's for technologies that help remove waste materials from Rocky Flats, rather than storage.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD TO BRIEFING ON WASTE DISPOSAL OPTIONS:

Question: What is NTS's definition of difference between disposal and long-term storage?

Answer: Long-term storage is considered to be disposable but retrievable.

Question: At WIPP, has consideration been given to how to retrieve waste when it does begin to contaminate water or soil in the future?

Answer: Right now, there is no long-term plan for retrieval after closure. Post-closure, plans for monitoring possibly will be considered, but nothing currently exists.

Question: Is there an end-point to the monitoring at the site?

Answer: No, there will always be some monitoring that will go on, but not in the repository itself.

Question: For Judith, when you discussed the bombs dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima, would you rather have seen 250,000 young men killed instead of dropping those two bombs?

Answer: I don't want to see anybody killed, and wish that we weren't such a technological society but more of a sociological society, so that it would never have happened.

Question: Aren't there severe ground problems surrounding the WIPP site, including a reservoir below where the waste will be stored? And that the capacity of WIPP regarding TRU waste is also an issue?

Answer: Right now, TRU waste is only 30% of capacity. And there have been ground monitoring tests going on for years. The quantity that will get through is very small. Many of the issues are still being debated with EPA.

Comment: Regulations are not necessarily created to protect the public.

Question: Isn't it the case that the formation of the caverns that have been built are not very stable, and that there was a situation where a roof caved in at one of the rooms?

Answer: That is an experimental rock mechanics area, and the intent was to monitor the natural process of the closing of the rooms. It was a data gathering activity.

Question: In the past, we have tried to recover plutonium from residues, but it is now called waste. When you talk of the 30% capacity, is that the old viewpoint of TRU waste versus residues, and can you handle that sort of material? Do you think there is any chance the people will accept WIPP becoming an SNM repository?

Answer: To serve as an SNM repository, if ever, would be the distant future. Residues are another issue; the sheer volumes have caused us to consider internal shielding.

Question: Regarding PCBs, will they go to WIPP?

Answer: There is a plan to ship organic contaminated transuranic waste to WIPP. WIPP is looking at whether there will be a limit on such materials. The PCBs must be treated by incineration. They are burned at a number of commercial facilities, but there are no radioactive PCB sites in the country other than at Oak Ridge. They are not destined for WIPP.

Question: A lot of Rocky Flats waste is scheduled to go to WIPP. What if it doesn't open in time, or at all?

Answer: Rocky Flats may be a long-term storage facility for some of these materials. Right now, there is no discussion about looking at an interim storage facility.

Question: Where you are burying the wastes in the cavities caused by the bomb tests, how can you be sure that it doesn't get to the groundwater?

Answer: We are putting in wells below the area, and going in at an angle to do sampling. We believe it is not a pathway.

Question: Have any provisions been made for the tons of spent nuclear fuel rods?

Answer: Not for WIPP. There are two EISs being written to look at that issue. Oak Ridge is one possible site, Idaho and maybe Savannah River. NTS is being looked at, but it was described in the EIS as not being a good first choice for a site.

Question: What about seismic problems at NTS?

Answer: RCRA covers that, you can't be close to an active area.

Question: Is NTS studying the aquifer in the area that is creeping to the west?

Answer: Yes, that is a part of the environmental restoration program, underground test areas and remedial investigation. We are drilling deep monitoring wells to determine how much movement there is in the groundwater. It is a high priority in the restoration program.

Question: What underground nuclear tests are being conducted now?

Answer: None. There was a moratorium put in place under President Bush, and it was extended in 1992.