

Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments Board Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 3, 1999
8:00 AM – 11:00 AM
Broomfield City Hall

Board members in attendance: Mary Harlow (Alternate, Westminster), Tom Brunner (Director, Broomfield), Hank Stovall (Alternate, Broomfield), Nanette Neelan (Alternate, Jefferson County), Michelle Lawrence (Director, Jefferson County), Ken Fellman (Alternate, Arvada), Andrew Muckle (Director, Superior), Lisa Morzel (Director, City of Boulder), Carolyn Dulchinos (Alternate, Boulder County).

Coalition staff members in attendance: David Abelson (Executive Director), Will Neff (Technical Advisor), and Katie Ewig (Program Assistant).

Other people present: Amy Mueller (City of Boulder), Bruce Dahm (City of Broomfield), Kathy Schnoor (City of Broomfield), Helen Kilcoyne (Town of Superior), Gary Baker (Parallax), Clark Johnson (City of Arvada), Chris Rorick (Congressman Tancredo), Jeremy Karpatkin (DOE-RFFO), John Swartout (Gov. Owens), Ann Bormolini (Kaiser-Hill), Ken Korkia (RFCAB), Rob Henneke (EPA), Tim Rehder (EPA), Steve Gunderson (CDPHE), Angela Hutton-Howard (CDPHE), John Corsi (Kaiser-Hill), Dave Shelton (Kaiser-Hill), Joe Legare (DOE), Janice Sinden (Senator Allard), Scott Anderson (Kaiser-Hill), Rick DiSalvo (DOE-RFFO).

Round Robin

Broomfield: Hank Stovall stated that Broomfield had recently sent a letter to DOE signed by the mayor requesting a 45-day review period on all DOE documents, specifically the EA on Interim Storage of TRU Waste. Hank Stovall also said that Broomfield City Council had passed a resolution supporting the transport of TRU waste to WIPP.

Westminster: Mary Harlow announced that Westminster had also recently passed a resolution in support of WIPP and had also sent a letter to DOE requesting a 45-day review period. Mary Harlow expressed concern about the solar ponds and the equipment release program, two issues she would like to comment on in the review period.

Superior: Andrew Muckle thanked Broomfield for hosting the Board meeting.

Arvada: Clark Johnson voiced Lorraine Anderson's concern that the Coalition needs to get involved in stewardship dialogue as soon as possible.

Business Items

- 1) Executive Director Report-** David Abelson started off his report by announcing the hiring of Will Neff as Technical Advisor and Katie Ewig as Program Assistant. David Abelson gave a brief overview of his trip to Chicago for the Worker and Community Transition

Conference on May 26-27, 1999 and his meetings with Bob DeGrasse. He stated that the Coalition still needs the official letter from DOE that designates the Coalition as a CRO. He also said that he had spent a lot of time sending letters to the Colorado delegation to secure funding for 3161.

Concerning the TRU waste Environmental Assessment, David expressed concern about the lack of detailed information in the preliminary drafts and the shortened comment period that DOE had originally proposed. David also renewed his goal of meeting individually with every local government in the upcoming weeks.

- 2) **Motion to Approve May 6 Minutes-** Nanette Neelan noted a mistake in the Jefferson County Round Robin section of the minutes: “habitat conservation plan” should be changed to “4D plan”. Mary Harlow motioned to approve the May 6 minutes as amended. Lisa Morzel seconded. The motion passed 7-0.
- 3) **Discuss Draft Strategic Plan-** Carolyn Dulchinos questioned the expansiveness of the Coalition’s definition of stewardship. David Abelson replied that the stewardship definition is meant to be a general statement of how the Coalition will move forward, not a specific outline of activities. Ken Fellman pointed out a redundancy in wording under the Goals and Objectives section on page 1, and he also requested that something be added on page 3 (under the Stewardship section) that indicates the entity controlling the property is responsible for doing a benefit- cost analysis on all proposed uses of the property. David replied that he would add that under the Five Year Plan heading. David also suggested that the November Board meeting be completely dedicated to a thorough discussion of the Coalition’s vision for the year 2000. Andrew Muckle motioned to approve the draft strategic plan with the aforementioned additions and corrections. Lisa Morzel seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.
- 4) **Discuss Draft 1999 Budget-** David gave a brief overview of the budget issues and changes and suggested that the Board approve the draft budget today and hold public hearings at a later date. Ken Fellman suggested that it may be beneficial to increase the professional development (training) funds for the Technical Advisor. David explained that there is money set aside in case the Coalition decides to publish a newsletter (under section H: Other). Hank Stovall proposed using local papers for outreach and meeting notices, and Ken Fellman suggested using web sites and public access television as well. Ken Fellman motioned to approve the draft 1999 budget. Mary Harlow seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.
- 5) **Discuss Use of Local Government Funds-** David asked for guidance on how to spend the \$40,000 that the local governments contributed to the Coalition. Andrew Muckle suggested keeping it open for lobbying in general. Hank Stovall stated that the ECA may fulfill the lobbying requirements but that there probably is not enough money to successfully lobby more than one issue. Carolyn Dulchinos suggested that we should assess what to do with the money down the road since the Coalition is still a fledgling organization and is still feeling out various issues. Ken Fellman agreed with Carolyn Dulchinos that the Coalition should hold onto the money for a while and see if it is needed for lobbying or some other kind of advocacy. Lisa Morzel also agreed with Carolyn Dulchinos and brought up the question of the Coalition being able to come to a consensus on what issues to lobby. Michele Lawrence stated that the contribution made by each of the local governments was a one-time contribution that would serve as a start-up fund for Coalition advocacy issues.

Site Closure: 2006 vs. 2010

David Abelson referred the Board to his memo on 2006 vs. 2010. He stated that the basic idea he is trying to convey in his press statement is that the Coalition will not compromise cleanup. If the site is not clean by 2006 then the Coalition will support extending the cleanup to 2010 or beyond. David then raised the question of what the Coalition defines as safe and clean. Andrew Muckle stated he would like it cleaned to the highest degree possible. Mary Harlow said that safety cannot be compromised in order to meet the 2006 deadline, and that if the cleanup should extend beyond 2006 then the Coalition will need to make sure there is still adequate funding. Ken Fellman expressed his concern that the Coalition statement proposed by David leaves the door open too much. Ken suggested the statement include that the Coalition's preference is that the cleanup be completed by 2006, but if that cannot be accomplished then the Coalition supports a 2010 cleanup deadline. Hank Stovall stated that after reading the GAO report on the closure of Rocky Flats he is certain that a 2006 cleanup that adheres to the safety requirements of the local governments is not attainable. Lisa Morzel agreed with Hank and suggested that the language in the Coalition statement be stronger, something to the effect of "the Coalition expects cleanup will occur as expeditiously as possible". Michele Lawrence stated that if the Coalition stops pressuring for a 2006 cleanup then it will not happen. Michele also suggested that David wordsmith a few different versions of the statement and then allow the Board to decide which one is best. Mary Harlow said that the Coalition must define cleanup and closure before issuing a statement to the press.

Interim TRU Waste Storage Briefing

Joe Legare from DOE gave a presentation outlining the current interim storage options being considered for the TRU waste at Rocky Flats. The four basic options are 1) No Action 2) Refurbish Existing Buildings 3) Construct New Storage Buildings 4) Additional Storage in Tents. Joe distributed a handout showing the attributes, costs, schedule, flexibility and risks of each option. Hank Stovall expressed concern about the "termination of safeguards" that was listed as a key storage issue in Legare's handout. Joe replied that this was necessary in order to implement storage outside of the protected safeguard area. Lisa Morzel asked that the Project Schedule and NEPA Schedule shown in the handout be updated to reflect the 45-day public comment period. Andrew Muckle inquired if any of the new cast concrete facilities would be built on contaminated soil. Joe Legare replied that they would not. Lisa Morzel requested information on the current level of contamination in the existing buildings that may be renovated for use as storage facilities.

Rubble Disposition Mid-Project Briefing

Will Neff introduced Gary Baker from Parallax and briefly outlined the work that Gary had been doing on the Rubble Disposition project. Gary Baker presented his work to the Board and explained the various documents (RSOP/MARSSIM) he had reviewed thus far. He mentioned the piles of contaminated particulate matter that can collect in the run-off of a demolished building and how safeguards will need to be in place to catch them. Mary Harlow asked if storms or wind could potentially disturb the file piles. Hank Stovall stated that he would like to know more about the sensitive parameters in RESRAD. Andrew Muckle asked if a trial demolition and

rubble backfill could be done first to see how the particulate matter disperses. Mary Harlow asked if the oxides could get airborne, and Gary assured her that issue would be part of the lines of inquiry.

Rock Creek Reserve Briefing

Rick DiSalvo gave an overview to the Board as to why the Rock Creek Reserve site was chosen by the DOE and what the key issues are regarding the current and future management of the land (ie public access, the Preble's meadow jumping mouse, etc.). Rick DiSalvo explained that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had been contracted to help manage the land through 2006. He explained that right now they are in the process of evaluating what resources exist there and creating an integrated Natural Resource Conservation plan. Lisa Morzel asked if the DOE had characterized the Rock Creek Reserve site with respect to radioactive material. Rick DiSalvo replied that the site had extremely low levels of plutonium similar to the rest of the buffer zone and that in the near future it may be de-listed from the Superfund cleanup area. When asked by Lisa Morzel if DOE had plans to further clean the Rock Creek Reserve area, DiSalvo replied that he did not know. Mary Harlow expressed her wish that the DOE involve local governments more in future land use decisions. Mary referred to the principles signed by ex-Secretary of Energy Pena that stated all decision processes relating to the cleanup of Rocky Flats would solicit local government input. Ken Fellman, Hank Stovall, Michele Lawrence, and Nanette Neelan all expressed their disappointment regarding DOE's failure to get local government input into the decision that designated the Rock Creek Reserve.

Public Comment

John Swartout from Governor Owen's office urged the Coalition to move to a consensus on future use, stewardship, and buffer zone issues so that the Coalition can have the greatest impact on the decision-making process.