

**Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments Board Meeting Minutes**  
**Monday, August 6, 2001**  
**8:00 – 10:45 a.m.**  
**Mt. Evans Room in the Terminal Building**  
**Jefferson County Airport, Broomfield**

**Board members in attendance:** Nanette Neelan (Alternate, Jefferson County), Tom Brunner (Director, Broomfield), Mike Bartleson (Alternate, Broomfield), Sam Dixon\* (Director, Westminster), Mary Harlow (Alternate, Westminster), Lorraine Anderson (Director, Arvada), Carol Lyons (Alternate, Arvada), Paul Danish\* (Director, Boulder County), Karen Imbierowicz (Director, Superior).

Note: There were only six voting Board members in attendance.

\*Arrived at time indicated.

**Coalition staff members and consultants in attendance:** David Abelson (Executive Director), Melissa Anderson (Technical Program Manager), Kimberly Chleboun (Program Manager), and Barbara Vander Wall (Setzer & Vander Wall, P.C.).

**Members of the Public:** John Corsi (Kaiser-Hill), Jeff Stevens (Kaiser-Hill), Dyan Foss (Kaiser-Hill), Bob Nininger (Kaiser-Hill), Dave Shelton (Kaiser-Hill), John Rampe (DOE), Norma Castaneda (DOE), Denise Onyskiw (CDPHE), David Kruchek (CDPHE), Rob Henneke (EPA), Ken Korkia (RFCAB), Shirley Garcia (City of Broomfield), Theresa Sauer (Governor Owens), Doug Young (Congressman Udall), Doris DePenning (Friends of the Foothills), Hildegard Hix (Sierra Club), Gail Bange (Wackenhut), Dan Chesshir (RFSOIU Local #1), Filiberto Cruz (RFSOIU Local #1), Katy Human (The Daily Camera), Berny Morson (Rocky Mountain News), Stacie Oulton (Denver Post), Bob Nelson (citizen), Richard Huggins (citizen).

**Convene/Agenda Review**

Chairman Danish was not yet in attendance, so Lorraine Anderson called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m.

**Business Items**

- 1) Approve Mileage Reimbursement Rate Resolution** - David Abelson presented a resolution to adjust the Coalition's mileage reimbursement rate to match the current federal rate. There was Board discussion regarding the IRS rate, the DOE rate and the federal rate set by the General Services Administration. The purpose of the resolution is to change the Coalition rate from a fixed number, to a number that can track the federal rate. Tom Brunner motioned

to approve the mileage reimbursement rate resolution. Nanette Neelan seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

\*Sam Dixion arrived at 8:17 a.m.

- 2) **Approve Letter to Gale Norton** - David Abelson explained the letter to Gale Norton was drafted in order to inform the Secretary of the Coalition's support of the refuge bill and urge her to join the Colorado congressional delegation and DOE in supporting it. David confirmed he had discussed the letter with local government staff, and Allard and Udall staff. Lorraine Anderson said she does not have a problem with telling the Secretary the Coalition supports the bill, but she is uncomfortable urging the Secretary to support it when there are other issues that will require consideration on her part, especially funding for USFWS. Lorraine asked to remove the sentence urging Norton to support the bill. Sam Dixion and Paul Danish said the purpose of the letter is to ask the Secretary to support the bill. Sam Dixion motioned to approve the letter, without any changes, to Gale Norton. Tom Brunner seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

\*Paul Danish arrived at 8:20 a.m.

- 3) **Motion to Approve Consent Agenda** –Lorraine Anderson motioned to approve the consent agenda. Karen Imbierowicz seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

**Executive Director's Report** – David Abelson informed the Board Jessie Roberson had been sworn in as Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management. Second, David distributed an excerpt from the House Energy and Water FY02 appropriations report. He explained it is notable because it shows the House recognizes the challenges of meeting a 2006 closure, including the dependency on other sites and funding. The House committee also threatens to remove the Ohio sites from the closure account, and thus reduce funding, for failure to maintain the 2006 schedule. David explained this is important language because it gives a sense of what happens if a site doesn't meet the 2006 schedule. In the case of Rocky Flats, the Board must keep this in mind while discussing endstate issues, and consider how work above and beyond the scope of the contract could affect the schedule and funding. Third, David informed the Board Rocky Flats was not selected as a long-term stewardship pilot project, and thus the Coalition will not be receiving funding under this program. However, the Coalition will be receiving a \$120,000 grant in October to cover Coalition stewardship activities. Fourth, David discussed the Health Effects Workshop. He met last week with Ken Fellman, Mary Harlow, Nanette Neelan, Matt Magley, and Shirley Garcia to chart a path forward. The group proposes holding the workshop at the October Board meeting with four to five hours devoted to a special session on the health effects of low-level radiation, since the target audience will be the elected officials and local government staff. Presentations will focus on radiation, relative risks, sound science, and uncertainties with the goal of educating the Board on the technical background so that they may address policy issues. David will work with the Board to bring in outside experts. He explained the workshop will not cover ICRP dose conversion factors since this will be an RSAL issue prior to October, and because only two Board members, Hank and Paul, had expressed interest. Karen Imbierowicz subsequently voiced an interest at that point. There was further Board discussion regarding the technical level of presentations, avoiding misinformation, and the workshop agenda. Mary Harlow asked if they could add an afternoon session to cover the

ICRP information Hank Stovall was interested in. The Board gave David approval to continue planning the workshop as discussed, including a session on ICRP values.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment at this time.

### **D&D/ER Briefing**

David Abelson reviewed what had been discussed in the previous four-part series of D&D presentations, and explained the next two sessions would cover the interface between D&D and environmental remediation, ER. He then introduced Lane Butler, Kaiser-Hill.

Lane began the presentation by describing the bigger picture and how all the work fits together. The entire ER scope of work includes 367 potential sites, with 100 sites expected to require remediation. This includes six miles of original process waste lines (OPWL) and under building contamination (UBC). Lane also presented charts which illustrated timelines of these remedial actions. He then described the ER process and drivers: CERCLA and RCRA drive the RFCA, which in turn incorporates requirements for information access, environmental monitoring, accelerated remedial actions, and the final administrative actions. The accelerated remedial actions, the focus of the current presentation, start with the gathering of environmental data through historical assessment and additional characterization. Sampling locations will be selected based on the requirements in the Industrial Area Sampling Analysis Plan. Lane said the Industrial Area data set will consist of 1 million pieces of filtered data. This data forms the basis for remedial decisions and planning (i.e. – RSOP, PAM, etc.), which results in remediation and restoration, in-process sampling and data analysis, and waste disposal. Once completed they perform confirmation sampling and evaluation, and repeat the cycle until no further remediation is required. The process is completed with a closeout report and a Historical Release Report update. Lane explained in-process sampling occurs in the field with field instruments, but confirmation samples are sent to labs and processed under characterization plans to support remediation and risk assessment. The ER work is all coordinated through the Site's Remedial Action Decision Management System, which creates the remediation target map they work from.

Lane then described the interface between D&D and ER. The ER characterization and remediation schedule is integrated with the D&D schedules. The D&D projects will remove the facilities to three feet below grade, unless there is concrete three feet below grade that does not meet the unrestricted release criteria. In that case, the concrete will be decontaminated or removed by the D&D projects. Lane and Jeff Stevens, Kaiser-Hill, clarified “unrestricted release criteria” can be used interchangeably with “free release criteria”. If it doesn't meet this criteria it will be removed and disposed of as waste. In referring to the ER RSOP, Mary Harlow questioned if remedial actions will generally consist of source removal. Lane explained if something other than source removal for plutonium contamination is required, the Site must create an additional decision document for that action. The level of source removal will be a policy issue. He also said on occasion VOC contamination may be treated by thermal desorbition. Lane continued his presentation and said if ER encounters additional UBC after

D&D removes contaminated structures below three feet of the proposed grade, ER will remove the additional structure as necessary to complete the remediation. He stated remedial actions are taken based on action levels, stewardship impacts, and as-low-as-reasonably-achievable (ALARA) considerations. Once the area has been remediated it will be re-graded and stabilized, and waste created as a result will be placed in waste containers and dispositioned offsite. In conclusion, Lane described four technical issues they still face: 1) characterization of the OPWL; 2) in-process sampling for beryllium; 3) lab turnaround time for confirmatory sampling; and 4) waste shipment from point of generation.

Paul Danish asked if the sampling analysis plans were not capable of tracking OPWL leaks, and how many leaks they knew of. Lane explained it is a matter of confidence in statistical methods. They can detect plumes, but they may not be able to find discreet source areas that aren't moving with their standard methods. Although they have looked at other technology, they have not found anything else acceptable. John Rampe, DOE, added that if they sample every 50 feet they may not see something smaller in diameter. Sam Dixon asked what percentage of the lines contained plutonium, and Lane estimated it may be approximately 40%. He said he would get this data for the Board. Tom Brunner asked the Site to provide information on the number of identified leaks, where they are, how deep, the diameter of the lines, and exactly what contaminants are involved. Mary asked what would be the impacts to groundwater, and how they intend to shut off pathways and migration through the sandy gravel the lines sit in. She also asked for information on how removing foundations and sumps will impact groundwater. Karen Imbierowicz asked when they expect to have the capability for in-process beryllium testing. Lane and Jeff stated a couple sites are claiming to have a process that works, and it may be tested at Rocky Flats in three to four months. Lane added it is more a process for surface soils, which would work for D&D but not ER since they work more in the subsurface. They won't be doing any work in beryllium buildings for at least one year. Until then, they will continue to use their current methodology. Doug Young asked about orphan wastes and if ER will create waste that has no known receiver sites. Lane said they have to deal with that situation as it arises, and their waste management team is working to identify new sites and help these sites with the necessary permitting for mixed wastes. Mary asked for future information on the onsite waste issue, including how much waste is being stored onsite, how fast it is moving, and if they need additional storage. Sam asked if they are on schedule for the 2006 closure date, and Lane replied their performance project numbers show they are behind. In closing David asked John Rampe to provide the requested information at the next ER presentation at the September Board meeting.

### **Guard Towers Demolition**

Jeff Stevens, Kaiser-Hill, began by explaining why the Site is considering using explosives to demolish select onsite structures. He said worker safety is the key driver, and noted the use of explosives is a standard demolition technique across the country, including other DOE sites. Jeff also said it is the only safe and effective means for demolition of some of the fortified structures. He stressed explosives will only be used when the facility meets the unrestricted release criteria, the soils under or around the facility are clean, and there is a structural or safety reason to use this method. Kaiser-Hill believes using explosives on the guard towers would provide the Site

and the community with a good example of the explosives process and methods. The guard towers are 12 feet by 12 feet, 35 to 45 feet high, and continue to 5 feet below surface. They are made of cinder block with rebar placed in the holes of the cinder block, and concrete poured around the rebar. Jeff described the demolition method evaluation that was done for the guard towers as a communications tool for Kaiser-Hill and stakeholders. The evaluation is a qualitative assessment based on subject matter opinion, but it is not an environmental assessment or a feasibility study. Jeff said the evaluation objective was to determine which demolition method would be effective and most suitable for the three towers. He then described the techniques and timeline for each method, including explosives (two days), a mechanical excavator with attachments (six weeks), and mechanical cabling demolition (four and half weeks). The evaluation results were based on analysis of four criteria: health and safety, environmental, structural, and economic. Jeff noted the economic analysis did not include the cost for dust control since they normally would not use this type of system for a Type 1 building. Material size reduction and waste disposition also were not included since they would be the same regardless of the demolition method used. Sam Dixon raised the issue of real-time monitoring for Type 3 buildings, in case of a hot-spot. Jeff said they have monitors around the entire area, and Paul Danish and Tom Brunner said project specific, portable, temporary monitors would be a confidence building measure. Jeff responded he believed they had that type of monitoring covered. He then reviewed the matrices which compared each method, and stated that in each of the four categories explosives was the best alternative.

In reviewing health and safety factors, Melissa Anderson asked why the possibility of an inadvertent detonation wouldn't make explosives a higher safety risk, and Jeff explained the possibility is 1 in 10 million. Paul asked if there would also be a danger of explosives not going off, and Jeff said they must confirm all explosives detonated. Tom asked if there would be additional work required to cut through rebar, and Jeff said the explosives would rupture all the rebar. Melissa asked if there would be a difference between methods in the amount of clearance required around the structure. Jeff responded a 1000-foot radius would be required for explosives, in which case they would perform the work on a weekend, and a 100-foot radius for the other two methods. In reviewing environmental factors, Paul asked if explosives could rupture a PWL, and Jeff said they did review this and the likelihood is extremely low, especially since the high frequency would not travel very far. Karen Imbierowicz asked if the letters and concerns from Broomfield and Westminster regarding the guard tower demolition method evaluation had been addressed yet. Jeff stated they had met with Broomfield and would also be meeting with Westminster, and most of the issues had been resolved. Lorraine Anderson said she would like to see documentation of the Site's response. The Board raised no issues while reviewing the structural criteria, but had several questions about the economic analysis. Specifically, the numbers don't add up. Ken Korkia pointed out that, under explosives, \$31,400 for the first tower and \$18,300 for each additional tower do not add up to a total demolition cost of \$49,700. Jeff said the contractor gave him the total bid as \$49,700.

The Board again raised the issue of using explosives on Type 3 facilities. Mary asked if Rocky Flats would be the first to use explosives on former plutonium buildings. Jeff asked if they believed the unrestricted release criteria would be protective, and Sam said no. John Corsi asked

her what she was basing her decision on, and Mary responded there will be nooks and crannies in the building containing contaminated dust, and they must have monitors to detect it. Jeff said they are raising two issues: project specific monitoring and the protectiveness of unrestricted release criteria. David asked if it would be helpful to the Board to have a white paper and maps explaining monitoring plans. Paul said no, because he does not have trust in this process due to levels of uncertainty, unknown contamination, and the amount of dust he believes will be generated. He acknowledged the Board does not have the authority to tell the Site what to do, but he believes it would be profoundly dumb to use explosives. Tom stated he is not willing to disregard this technique since it would make sense to use explosives in certain circumstances, including the economic and health and safety aspects. He added all techniques produce dust, and the prospect of one day as opposed to fifteen is favorable. Karen said reviewing monitoring results after the fact would not be protective, and they must determine how to stop the dust before it moves. Jeff emphasized dust suppression would be a bigger issue with the other two techniques, since they spray the entire project with water during explosives demolition and it is short term with less shifting wind. He added they would have real-time dust monitors, just like they did for Building 779. Lorraine agreed with Tom and added the immediate danger is to the workers and she would like information on the effectiveness of dust suppression. Jeff said they had hoped to provide this information using the example of the guard towers. Steve Tarlton, CDPHE, clarified that studies by the Health Advisory Panel concluded there had been no risk to offsite residents from contamination leaving the Site from the fires in 1957 and 1969, or from the 903 Pad. He said the State's real concern is with worker exposure. Sam disagreed and stated no epidemiologist had been involved in the Health Advisory Panel study, and there is evidence there was a strong effect on people's health, including stillbirths. Lorraine asked Sam if she had documentation of these effects, and Sam responded it had been hearsay but she could provide names of people she had talked to. Tom said they would need EPA and State confidence in demolition and monitoring techniques. Mary said if the Site is going to use explosives they will need a public relations program, and also suggested video taping the work. Jeff said they will do that as well as invite some stakeholders to observe. Tom asked when they expect to take down the towers, and Jeff said they would like to do it at the end of September. Melissa asked if the economic analysis would be similar for other buildings, and Jeff said it could vary widely since each structure is dramatically different. He added in those cases the use of explosives may be driven more by health and safety concerns than by economics. In closing, Jeff stated using explosives for demolition is a viable technique, and if they were to be used on a Type 3 facility the evaluation would be significantly different, and much more comprehensive.

### **Round Robin**

**Arvada** – Lorraine Anderson said Arvada was in Washington, D.C. last week and distributed copies of their transportation study, outlining the preferred transportation alignment. She also noted the theme they heard repeatedly was Rocky Flats' stable funding, and added how important it is to make sure receiver sites are also funded.

**Westminster** – Sam Dixon agreed with Lorraine. She also recommended sending a letter of congratulations to Jessie Roberson on her confirmation.

**Broomfield** - Tom Brunner also agreed with Lorraine regarding funding. He added it is important the Coalition keep apprised of the status of the Site's budget, and any major setbacks, since their reputations are on the line when they lobby in Washington, D.C.

### **Public Comment**

Bob Nelson asked the status of the controlled burn discussion. David Abelson explained it is on hold until Lisa Morzel returns in September. Bob also asked if the Site could look into leaving the water tower intact for fire suppression. The Board agreed this may be something to consider, and David said that is something that would be discussed in the context of endstate and long-term stewardship. John Rampe said it probably would not be slated for demolition until the year 2005 or 2006.

### **Big Picture**

David Abelson reviewed the big picture. At the September 10<sup>th</sup> meeting the Board will continue reviewing the environmental remediation portion of D&D, and meet with Representative Mark Udall. The Board agreed to hold the November meeting on the first Monday of the month as planned. Mary Harlow reminded the Board the Site should provide their quarterly budget status at the November or December meeting.

The meeting was adjourned by Paul Danish at 10:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kimberly Chleboun, Program Manager