

**Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
January 6, 2005
6 to 9 p.m.
College Hill Library, Room L-211
Westminster, Colorado**

Board Chair Jerry DePoorter called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Suzanne Allen, Jerry DePoorter, Joe Downey, Earl Gunia, Erin Hamby, Victor Holm, Bill Kossack, Mary Mattson, Bill McNeill, Andrew Ross, Phil Tomlinson / John Rampe (DOE-RFPO), Steve Gunderson (CDPHE), Mark Sattelberg (USFWS)

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Mike Maus / Mark Aguilar (EPA), Scott Surovchak (DOE-LM)

PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT: Alan Trenary (Westminster resident), Roman Kohler (RF Homesteaders), Rob Henneke (EPA) / Ken Korkia (RFCAB staff), Patricia Rice (RFCAB staff)

PUBLIC COMMENT / NEW BUSINESS:

Public Comment: none

New Business:

John Rampe: John expressed concern from the Department of Energy regarding the recent news articles and press conferences about the inadequacy of Rocky Flats cleanup that is being brought forward by individuals connected with the former Rocky Flats grand jury and others. DOE is worried that the current press coverage will cast doubt on the progress the site has made toward cleanup since the FBI raid in 1989. John stated that DOE is actively challenging these assertions. He asked the Board to consider writing an editorial describing its efforts in watching over the cleanup.

In discussion about John's request, the Board decided it would be appropriate to write such an editorial that would describe the Board's work and encourage those who have concerns about the cleanup to get involved with the Board's activities. The Board asked Executive Director Ken Korkia to draft an editorial that will be shared with the Board for comment via email. The Board established a goal of having a final editorial completed a week following the meeting.

Chair Jerry DePoorter encouraged members as individuals to also consider sending in letters to the local papers.

Jerry DePoorter: Jerry asked Ken Korkia to provide an overview of the recent meeting with the Coalition of Local Governments concerning the formation of the future Local Stakeholder Organization (LSO). Ken reported that members of the Coalition and the CAB appear to agree on most aspects of the future LSO

including its work scope and mission. The Coalition members also appear to agree that non-elected representatives should be involved in the LSO, but the level of that involvement has not been clarified. Ken stated that David Abelson has drafted a joint CAB-Coalition communiqué that would be sent to Mike Owen, the DOE Director for the Office of Legacy Management. David has shared this communiqué with both Ken and Jerry DePoorter to get their comments before sending it out for comment by the membership of both organizations. Jerry DePoorter noted that while there are many areas of agreement between the CAB and Coalition, the communiqué stops short of expressing the CAB's desire that future membership on the LSO include an equal role for both elected officials and non-elected representatives. In asking the Board how to proceed, the members advised that they were uncomfortable in joining in a communiqué at this time until there is agreement on the equal membership issue. This is not a minor issue for the Board and cannot be overlooked.

Ken also noted that Mike Owen sent letters to the individual local governments asking for their assistance in establishing an LSO. He reported that the Coalition views Mr. Owens letter as an attempt to by-pass the Coalition as an organization. Ken also noted that the Coalition has expressed concern about forming the future LSO as a Federal Advisory Committee. When asked for their views on the use of the Federal Advisory Committee, CAB members noted that it has worked successfully for them and would welcome its application to the LSO as long as DOE maintained the same limited role it has demonstrated with the CAB.

In discussing its next steps, the Board decided to devote a substantial portion of its February 3 meeting to discuss the membership issue for the LSO. The CAB will invite others in the community, including representatives from the Coalition, the Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center, the Rocky Flats Homesteaders and others, to join in the February 3 discussion. The Board also will send a letter to Mike Owen inviting him or representatives from the Office of Legacy Management to participate.

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF THE RECOMMENDATION ON THE ORIGINAL LANDFILL INTERIM MEASURE / INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTION DOCUMENT:

At its December 16 Committee Night meeting, the Board heard a presentation on and discussed the Original Landfill Interim Measure/Interim Remedial Action document. CAB staff prepared a set of draft comments and recommendations on the document based on the December 16 discussion. These comments were shared with the Board via email in advance of this meeting. The Original Landfill is a former dump that overlooks the Women Creek drainage and is located on the south side of Rocky Flats. Dumping at the Original Landfill stopped in the late 1960s when the site opened the Present Landfill. DOE's current plan is to regrade the landfill and install a two-foot soil cover.

The Board discussed minor modifications to the draft recommendation and then approved it by consensus. A summary of the recommendation is as follows:

- The Board agrees with the general proposal to regrade the site and install the soil cover. Because of its concern that the Landfill is located in an area prone to landslides, the Board asked DOE to consider modifying its proposal to include a soil buttress at the toe of the landfill to improve stability. The Board also asked DOE to include a drainage system to divert groundwater around the buttress and to provide access for monitoring the diverted groundwater.
- The Board noted that the document did not include details on the future monitoring of the ground and surface water in the area around the landfill. The Board also noted that the document does not

indicate that monitoring will be needed past the first five years after remediation of the landfill is complete. Thus, the Board recommended that the document be modified to include a detailed description of both the surface and ground water monitoring network and that the members be allowed to comment on the monitoring proposal before the document is finalized. The Board also asked that the document be changed to recognize that monitoring may continue to be necessary after five years.

- The Board expressed concern that the document did not include details as to how workers would be protected during the remediation project and asked that a description of the worker health and safety measures be added to the document.
- The Board is concerned that the landfill area needs to be protected against human intrusion and asked that the same protocols for fencing and signs that will be used at the Present Landfill also be used at the Original Landfill.
- The Board did not find any details about how the borrow areas at the site from which cover materials will be collected will be restored and revegetated. The recommendation asks that this information be included in the document.

DISCUSSION OF THE GROUNDWATER INTERIM MEASURE / INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTION DOCUMENT:

The Board discussed the Groundwater Interim Measure/Interim Remedial Action (IM/IRA).

A Board member remarked that the document originally identified 15 groundwater contaminant plumes but chose only seven groundwater plumes to remediate. Patricia Rice answered that the goal of groundwater remediation was to protect surface water. The document examined all 15 plumes but only seven of them were seen as having the potential to impair surface water standards. John Rampe with DOE said he hoped that the decision process in choosing which plumes to remediate was clear in the document.

Board Member Bill McNeill commented that the document was quite good, although he said he was concerned with phytoremediation of the East Trenches plume. He said Trichlorethene (TCE) in the plume was at significant levels – as high as 400 milligrams per liter – in the water and might impair surface water. He said the plants or trees used in phytoremediation would be dormant for about half the year. Bill said that the phytoremediation outlined in the document for the Carbon Tetrachloride plume between Building 771 and Building 776 is a good idea because that remediation project also relies on source removal and biodegradation to treat the contaminant plume. But at the East Trenches downgradient plume, phytoremediation is the only remedial method that will be employed. Bill said his concern with phytoremediation of the downgradient East Trenches plume is that because the plants will be winter-time dormant for about six months of the year, applicable relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) would not be met because the TCE, which is migrating into Pond B-2, could exceed standards. Bill said that should be addressed in the document.

Bill said he was also concerned that the post-accelerated action monitoring system was not described in the document.

Bill said the maps in Section 7, shown as Figures 7-1 through 7-5 and purporting to show the remedial strategy, were difficult to follow. He said it was not clear what the maps were trying to show.

With regard to the East Trenches, a treatment system has been installed upgradient of the area where phytoremediation would take place, just south of the B Series ponds. John Rampe commented that the volatile organic compounds (VOCs) they were trying to capture with phytoremediation consist of VOCs that had migrated out of the reach of the treatment system. John said this was not an indication that the treatment system was not capturing all the contamination but that these VOCs were beyond the reach of the treatment system when it was built.

Bill also asked whether the site had good examples of successful phytoremediation in this climate. Steve Gunderson of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) replied that there had been success with phytoremediation of nitrates. A Board member expressed doubt that phytoremediation would be as successful with VOCs as with nitrates.

Another Board Member said he believes it will be difficult to grow the plants. Another suggested the site have a "Plan B" in place in the event phytoremediation did not work. Mark Sattelberg of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service said, however, that he thinks the phytoremediation is a last-ditch effort by the site to catch the VOCs. He said it is his opinion that there is not a lot that can be done beyond phytoremediation to remediate the VOCs in that area. Mark said he believes the Site is trying to do something rather than just leaving it behind.

A Board Member suggested, however, that it appeared there was no real purpose to the IM/IRA because it did not address the issue about backup plans. John Rampe disagreed. He said the IM/IRA separates the wheat from the chaff in presenting practical remediation alternatives and identifying those plumes that need to be dealt with.

In answer to a question about the VOC plume at the 903 Pad/Ryan's Pit area, John said remediation in the 903 Pad/Ryan's Pit area requires further investigation.

A Board Member asked how decisions would be made about trends in contamination. Steve Gunderson answered that the post-closure monitoring regime would encompass three types of monitoring wells. He said Sentinel Wells would be posted at the edges of the plumes. In those wells, he said, groundwater contamination that is detected above the surface water standard triggers an action to find out what is going on. Evaluation wells in the area of the plume would then be used to corroborate what is happening in the Sentinel Wells. Groundwater Level Wells could also be used to find out how plumes are migrating. A Board Member said, however, that the document does not give the frequency and duration of monitoring.

Steve Gunderson said there would be an attachment to the post-closure regulatory agreement that would specify how often groundwater wells would be monitored and for which contaminants. The monitoring regime is also set forth in the Groundwater Integrated Monitoring Plan (IMP). Steve suggested that the Groundwater IMP and other groundwater documents be referenced in the IM/IRA.

Bill McNeill said the IM/IRA does not address groundwater at the Present or Original Landfills. Bill said he was particularly concerned with the Present Landfill, because there are materials, such as beryllium, uranium, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and radioactive materials in the landfill. Bill said he thinks the Present Landfill is a ticking time bomb and asked what would happen if a drum corroded. He said a large quantity of leachate is coming out of the landfill.

With respect to the Groundwater IM/IRA, Patricia said there appeared to be a lack of review built into the document. That is, there did not seem to be any backup plans if a remediation effort failed. A Board Member asked what will happen if remediation is not effective.

Patricia also mentioned that the IM/IRA does not address the potential for concentrations of contaminants to accumulate in the plants, and asked whether the site had plans to dispose of the plants if contaminant levels became high enough. She also said the document appears to lack detail in many places.

Bill McNeill and Patricia Rice will draft a set of comments on the IM/IRA to be considered at the next Committee Night. The draft comments will be forwarded to members via email in advance of the meeting.

UPDATE ON THE BOARD'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE INDEPENDENT VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION OF ROCKY FLATS CLEANUP:

Jerry DePoorter asked John Rampe to update the Board on the site's activities related to the upcoming Independent Validation and Verification (IVV) of Rocky Flats cleanup. John began by explaining that there has been some difficulty in applying the same methodology the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education (ORISE) has used for verifying building cleanup to soil cleanup. Some of the difficulties lie in the fact that the MARSSIM methodology used in verifying building cleanup relies on sampling protocols and methods that are different from those used in the open environment. Examples of such differences include classification of different levels of contamination (e.g., MARSSIM has different classes of contamination based on the absolute levels of contamination that are more readily identified in a building but are more difficult to isolate in the soil environment. Also, contamination sampling in buildings relies heavily on scanning methods, but these methods are not as widely used in soil applications.) Site contractor Kaiser-Hill is working on ways to overcome these difficulties before ORISE begins its work and plans to provide an update to DOE and ORISE within a couple of weeks.

Jerry DePoorter next asked when DOE thought the first public meeting with ORISE could be held. John thought it would be sometime during the first part of February. Member Earl Gunia asked who would be responsible for organizing this meeting. Ken Korkia stated that based on DOE's response to the proposal the Board sent to DOE regarding public participation in the IVV, it would be his responsibility to start organizing the meeting and will seek DOE's assistance in logistics and advertising. Ken also will start organizing materials about the IVV and the public process for the Board's website.

Member Phil Tomlinson next reported to the Board on his review of IVV related documents and preparation for his and Jerry DePoorter's trip to Oak Ridge to visit with the ORISE personnel. Phil has reviewed several documents and provided written comments to ORISE. ORISE has responded to these comments in a conference call with Phil and Jerry. Phil and Jerry will be meeting in the next week to further plan for their visit to Oak Ridge scheduled for February 1 and 2. Some of the activities and procedures they will be examining in Oak Ridge include sampling and lab procedures. Phil also wants to start reviewing some of the reports and the backup documents ORISE has done produced related to building cleanup.

Phil and Jerry will provide a preliminary update to the Board on their visit to Oak Ridge at the February Board meeting.

PLANNING FOR UPCOMING MEETINGS:

At its January 20 Committee Night meeting, the Board will continue its discussion of the Groundwater Interim Measure/Interim Remedial Action document. There will be a presentation on the proposed post-closure ground and surface water monitoring network for the site.

At the February 3 Board meeting, the main agenda topic will be the open community discussion on membership in the future Local Stakeholder Organization. Other business items will include discussion and approval of a recommendation on the Groundwater Interim Measure/Interim Remedial Action document. The Board also will hear a presentation on and discuss the recently completed Rocky Flats Site Wide Integrated Public Involvement Plan.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: February 3, 2005 6 to 9:00 p.m.

Location: College Hill Library, Room L-211

Agenda:

- *Community Discussion on the Future Local Stakeholder Organization*
- *Presentation and Discussion on the Rocky Flats Site-Wide Integrated Public Involvement Plan*
- *Approval of Recommendation on the Groundwater Interim Measure/Interim Remedial Action Document*

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:00 p.m. *

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

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Bill Kossack, 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](#)