

**Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
June 5, 2003
6 to 9:30 p.m.**

Jefferson County Airport Terminal Building, 11755 Airport Way, Broomfield

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Victor Holm, the Board's chair, called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Dave Davia, Joe Downey, Maureen Eldredge, Jim Fabian, Anne Fenerty, Shirley Garcia, Victor Holm, Jim Kinsinger, Bill Kossack, Mary Mattson, Andrew Ross / Rick DiSalvo (DOE), John Rampe (DOE), Steve Gunderson (CDPHE), Dean Rundle (USFWS), Tim Rehder (EPA).

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Tom Gallegos, Earl Gunia, Tom Marshall, Alliyah Mirza

PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT: Gary Schuetz (DOE); Bill McNeill (Lafayette); John Corsi (KH); Alan Trenary (citizen - Westminster); Vanessa Safonovs (student); Hank Stovall (City and County of Broomfield); Pat Etchart (DOE); Rob Henneke (EPA), Bob Davis (Kaiser-Hill), Leland Rucker (Environmental News Service); Conrad Stoldt (CU-Boulder); Liz Wilson (DOE); Rock Werner (Broomfield citizen); James Horan; Jim Jenkins; Ralph Stephens; Jerry Henderson (RFCAB staff); Ken Korkia (RFCAB staff); Patricia Rice (RFCAB staff)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD / NEW BUSINESS: none

PRESENTATION ON ROCKY FLATS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVES: Refuge Manager Dean Rundle gave the presentation. He stated that FWS received about 1,800 comments from the public during scoping. Scoping comments were used to develop the four alternatives. Dean said about one-third of the comments were about public access – with some people supporting and others opposing public access. The comment period on the alternatives ends June 20. In late January or February the draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan/Environmental Impact Statement will be released for public comment. The alternatives encompass a range of options, with some allowing more conservation and other alternatives supporting more public access. Planning maps for each of the alternatives show "Potential Riparian and Native Grass Restoration Area" in the area to be retained by the Department of Energy. Dean said they do not have specific plans for this area because it will not be part of the refuge.

Alternative A, the so-called "no-action" alternative, would follow recommendations outlined in the Rock Creek Reserve Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for the 1,700 acres in a swatch of land that covers the northern portion of the site. Dean said the rest of the site would be placed in "caretaker" status. Tours would be arranged by appointment only. Alternative B, the draft proposed action, would combine habitat restoration with more public access than in A. Meadows in the southeast corner of the site would be restored, some roads would be restored, and there would be a moderate 14-mile trail system for hikers and bicyclists. Alternative C would focus more on ecological restoration than in B. Public access

would be limited to one trail from Highway 93 to an overlook of the Lindsay Ranch. The ranch structures themselves would be torn down. Alternative D would allow more public use than other alternatives, but would still allow for some restoration. Alternative D would allow the most public access, with 17 miles of trails for hikers, bicyclists and horses. Environmental education efforts would increase with programs for kindergarten through college students. A visitor center would be considered.

Perimeter fencing would be included under all the options. Under option A, there would be a security-type, chain-link fence. Options B, C, and D call for a barbed wire stock fence. (In a phone conversation, Dean said Colorado is a "fence-out" state requiring landowners to erect fences to keep out livestock. Since there is active ranching on the boundary of Rocky Flats, it will be necessary to maintain at least the current DOE fence.) At this time, it is not anticipated there will be a fence around the area retained by DOE, however, there may be fences constructed around individual remedies, such as portions of a groundwater treatment system. No dogs or other pets would be allowed under any scenario. Management of the refuge would be centralized at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal National Wildlife Refuge. Limited hunting for a few weekends a year for disabled and youth would be allowed under alternatives B and D.

A board member commented that hunting would be hazardous to other refuge users, but Dean said the refuge would be closed to most uses when the hunting program was in progress. Another member was concerned the public would not be aware of contamination that will be left at the site. Dean said the refuge cannot come into existence until the Environmental Protection Agency certifies it is clean. Another board member asked about restoration of land at the future refuge. Dean said it would not look as it did in the 1800s but they can remove many of the marks made upon the land. In answer to a question about horses, Dean said weeds can be carried in horse manure and can then sprout and spread.

The following are comments made to the Fish and Wildlife Service on the Alternatives Analysis. The comments were captured on flip-chart paper and given to Dean after the segment.

- The groundwater at the site is contaminated.
- Before the refuge opens, an independent evaluation of the site needs to be done to determine if it is safe for the public to enter.
- The site should be closed to the public.
- If the Fish and Wildlife Service allows access, the public should be given specific information about residual contamination so they can make their own decisions about entering and not rely on the government.
- Hunting is a bad idea for two reasons: (1) the site would be closed for a relatively few number of users, and (2) there are questions about the radioactive content of the deer.
- The FWS should rely on the regulators to certify the site is clean. The risk to the public can be captured in the educational program.
- Control public access to protect wildlife.

PRESENTATION ON BUILDING 771/774 DEMOLITION PLAN: Next the Board had a presentation on a recently proposed modification to the Building 771/774 Decommissioning Operation Plan (DOP). Rick DiSalvo (DOE) gave brief introductory remarks on the proposal. A DOP is a RFCA decision document that governs the decommissioning and demolition activities that will be conducted in a given building. The site is looking for input on how to deal with contamination in parts of the structure, particularly the concrete slab that will be left deep underground. They hope to have the document out for public comment soon

and a decision from the regulators in the next several months.

Chris Gilbreath (Kaiser-Hill) then spoke to the technical details of the proposal. In previous versions of this decision document, it was assumed that these deep structures would be cleaned to meet the unrestricted release criteria. This was primarily based on the idea that any rubble or debris generated by breaking up the concrete slabs would then be used as backfill elsewhere on site. The current proposed change comes about for several reasons:

- Now that the site has a known end state, the wildlife refuge, risks from residual contamination can be evaluated based on that alternative.
- In the last couple of years, extensive characterization has been done in B771 and B774.
- With the RFCA modifications about to be finalized, site managers have subsurface soil cleanup criteria to work with.
- Experience gained in D&D of Building 779 shows that meeting the unrestricted release criteria would require multiple passes of hydrolasing and 30% of the building cannot meet those criteria with hydrolasing alone.
- The rigors of meeting those criteria would be a hazard to the workforce and generate a great deal of waste.
- What the site has learned from the Actinide Migration Study suggests plutonium and americium are relatively immobile in the subsurface.

All of the above lead site managers to propose applying the framework for remediation of subsurface soil to subsurface concrete contaminated with plutonium and americium. In other words, if Pu and Am are not migrating in the subsurface, there is no reason to believe they will migrate any quicker from a contaminated slab.

The proposal says that the parts of the concrete slab within 6 feet of final grade must be decontaminated to meet the unrestricted release criteria of 100 disintegrations per minute (dpm) for fixed contamination and 20 dpm for removable contamination. Deeper than 6 feet below final grade, the concrete would have to meet the same cleanup criteria that is used for subsurface soil, namely 7 nanocuries (nCi) per gram. What does not change per the proposal is that any portion of the slab within three feet of final grade will have to be removed, regardless of whether it is contaminated. Nor does the proposal affect the way certain highly contaminated areas of the building will be handled. For example, the infinity room will still be removed under the new proposal. In all, it is anticipated that 5% of the slab will volumetrically have contaminant levels that are too high to meet the 7 nCi/gram criterion. That estimate is based on in-situ gamma surveys and drill cores biased toward two inches taken thus far at areas with historically high contamination.

Bob Davis (Kaiser-Hill) discussed the relationship between environmental restoration and the B771/774 D&D. Samples cored through the slab to detect under-building contamination (UBC) reveal not much contamination beneath the B771 slab. Similar characterization in B774 has shown a few high areas for americium, but none above the subsurface soil cleanup criteria. These samples were biased toward areas of high contaminant potential, such as cracks in the slabs or areas where leaks could have occurred. Infinity room cores have shown that plutonium doesn't penetrate very deep into concrete, even when the source was plutonium dissolved in nitric acid.

A protective layer of gravel will be placed over the slab to be left behind. Then flowable fill will be placed into the deep basement. When D&D work is done and ER takes over the project, they will grade the hillside to an estimated 12% grade. The D&D project will proceed in a way that is coordinated with ER on the carbon tetrachloride groundwater plume, though the groundwater remedy is a separate decision document.

Following the presentations, the Board had a Q&A session with the presenters. Below is a sample of the questions that were asked:

- Is the south wall being left in place to serve as a barrier to the carbon tetrachloride plume and how will it be monitored? Yes, it will be a barrier. The monitoring regime will be informed by results from the hydrologic model, which should be available by end of summer.
- What is the rationale for leaving part of the second floor slab in place and could that create a seep? The second floor slab may contribute to the stability of the south wall. The erosion model will address the possibility of the seep and actions will be taken accordingly to mitigate that possibility.
- What is the lifetime of fixative in soils? The site is not trying to take credit for fixative over the long term. In the short term while the building is being demolished, however, the fixatives will serve an important function in preventing the spread of contamination.

The Board then gave feedback to the Closure Projects Committee, which will address this issue on Monday evening at 6 pm at the CAB Office. Key issues identified by the Board were as follows:

- Can cost savings from this approach be applied toward risk reduction elsewhere at the site?
- Consistency of the D&D with the erosion modeling and final grading plan
- The implications of Pu and Am migration in subsurface soil
- The groundwater modeling, particularly in regard to changing hydrologic conditions post closure
- The implications of applying the subsurface soil approach to subsurface concrete site wide

APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATION ON BUILDING 776/777 DEMOLITION PLAN: The Board then discussed a draft recommendation on the Building 776/777 demolition plan, which is out for public comment until June 11th. The draft recommendation contained a set of nine comments. Three additions to the recommendation were made before the Board approved it. The additions were:

- Waste pile management: The volume of waste being stored must be kept to a level where secondary containment is adequate to control precipitation overflow.
- Characterization of contamination within a non-load-bearing wall: Areas of contamination that cannot be free released within a non-load-bearing wall should have additional characterization to ensure that the air modeling is adequate.
- The use of explosives: Where explosives are being contemplated to fracture thick concrete, the site should explore alternatives such as compressed gases that may be useful for this purpose.

DISCUSSION ON THE WILDLIFE REFUGE TECHNICAL REVIEW GROUP: During the past several months, some Board members have raised concerns over the operation of the Wildlife Refuge Technical

Review Group (TRG). Under a charter approved by the Board when they group first formed last year, the TRG has more autonomy than regular Board committees in that it can transmit recommendations directly to DOE, although the Board reserves the right to endorse, refute, or otherwise comment on those recommendations. The Board discussed whether the group should maintain this autonomy since it deals more in policy issues rather than technical issues. Discussion also occurred on how committees in general take direction from the Board and how much they can determine their own work scope. Members generally agreed that committees need some leeway in operating, but the Board still needs to approve an overall work scope. The Board voted on whether to change the charter of the TRG back to being more of a regular CAB committee. The change was approved.

CAB FUTURE DISCUSSION: Earlier this year DOE informed the Board that it would be providing it with significantly less funding beginning in 2004, and has asked the Board to prepare a transition plan outlining its activities and operations from now until site closure. To address these issues, the Board has formed a CAB Future Committee. At this meeting, the Board reviewed budget scenarios for both 2003 and 2004. Board Chair Victor Holm led the discussion, with Board/Staff Coordinator Ken Korkia providing backup information. Ken had prepared a spreadsheet outlining various budget scenarios.

The Board first considered cuts to its 2003 budget. Last October, the Board submitted a budget to DOE for 2003 at just over \$400,000. DOE will only provide \$275,000 in new funding for this year, which when combined with the Board's carryover from previous years, provides a total funding base for this year at \$355,000. The Board discussed cuts and other adjustments it might make to its budget to address the reduced funding. While a large portion of the Board's budget is for fixed operating costs such as personnel and office and equipment leases, the Board discussed ways to possibly cut meeting expenses. They also agreed they would like to continue with outreach activities, but maybe reducing the number of newsletters produced each year and eliminating advertising. They also would like to keep money reserved for hiring outside consultants. Concerns were also expressed that the Board needs to maintain some funds for staff training. They also discussed the need to keep some money in reserve to begin the next fiscal year, in case there are any delays in getting funding from DOE.

Rather than make specific adjustments to the budget at this time, the Board decided it would monitor the budget and decide on funding projects or activities beyond the fixed operating costs on a case-by-case basis as they go through the coming months.

The Board next examined its 2004 situation. DOE has indicated it will provide only \$175,000 for 2004, but may adjust that amount slightly if the Board can provide good justification. Given its fixed operating costs, the Board would not be able to maintain both an office and staff at that amount. DOE has also indicated it could provide office space to the Board. The Board discussed this option and agreed it would be acceptable, but there are complications in that the Board has signed lease obligations for its office space and equipment that run through 2006. The Board will also need to find out exactly how well DOE can accommodate its office needs. The members decided to pursue discussions in that direction. They will need to consult with the attorney, the landlord and DOE before a decision is made.

The Board will continue discussion of its future budget and the work activities for its transition plan at the next monthly meeting in July.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

The Board received an update from its Grievance Committee investigating staff concerns and other matters. The Committee has met several times over the past month and has conducted interviews. They will continue their work this month and report to the Board in Executive Session in July.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: July 10, 6 to 9:30 p.m.

Location: Jefferson County Airport Terminal Building, Mount Evans Room, 11755 Airport Way, Broomfield

Agenda: Presentation on RFCA Modifications, Presentation on Remedy Strategies for the Present and Original Landfills, Recommendations on Building 771/774 Demolition, CAB Future Discussion

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:35 p.m. *

(* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in the RFCAB office.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Joe Downey, Secretary
Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board

The Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board is a community advisory group that reviews and provides recommendations on cleanup plans for Rocky Flats, a former nuclear weapons plant outside of Denver, Colorado.

[Home](#) | [About RFCAB](#) | [Board Members](#) | [About Rocky Flats](#) | [RFCAB Documents](#) | [Related Links](#) | [Public Involvement](#) | [Board Vacancies](#) | [Special Projects](#) | [Contact](#)