

Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, July 12, 2004
8:30 – 11:00 a.m.
Mt. Evans Room in the Terminal Building
Jefferson County Airport, Broomfield

Board members in attendance: Lori Cox (Alternate, Broomfield), Lorraine Anderson (Director, Arvada), Clark Johnson (Alternate, Arvada), Paul Danish (Director, Boulder County), Jane Uitti (Alternate, Boulder County), Sam Dixion (Director, Westminster), Jo Ann Price (Alternate, Westminster), Michelle Lawrence (Director, Jefferson County), Nanette Neelan (Alternate, Jefferson County), Devin Granbery (Alternate, Superior), Shaun McGrath (Director, City of Boulder), Amy Mueller (Alternate, City of Boulder), Hank Stovall (*ex-officio*).

Coalition staff members and consultants in attendance: David Abelson (Executive Director), Kimberly Lohr (Assistant Director), Rik Getty (Technical Program Manager), Barb Vander Wall (Seter & Vander Wall, P.C.).

Members of the Public: Dave Shelton (Kaiser-Hill), John Corsi (Kaiser-Hill), David Del Vecchio (Kaiser-Hill), Bob Kurz (Kaiser-Hill), Vic Pizzuto (Kaiser-Hill), Dyan Foss (Kaiser-Hill), Gary Schuetz (DOE), Laurie Shannon (USFWS), Mark Sattleberg (USFWS), Mark Aguilar (EPA), Rob Henneke (EPA), Edgar Ethington (CDPHE), Edd Kray (CDPHE), Tammy Ottmer (CDPHE), Marion Galant (CDPHE), Steve Gunderson (CDPHE), Shirley Garcia (Broomfield), Al Nelson (Westminster), Patricia Rice (RFCAB), Victor Holm (RFCAB), Bob Nelson (Golden), Doug Young (Rep. Udall), Kimberly Cadena (Rep. Beauprez), Dan Chesshir (RFSOIU #1), Phil Cruz (RFSOIU #1), Chuck Miller (USWA Local 8031), Ron DiGiorgio (USWA Local 8031), Alisha Jeter (Broomfield Enterprise), Richard Valenty (Colorado Daily), Todd Neff (Daily Camera), Anne Imse (Rocky Mountain News), Anne Fenerty (citizen).

Convene/Agenda Review

Vice Chairman Shaun McGrath convened the meeting at 8:36a.m. Shaun McGrath asked David Abelson to move approval of the Coalition letter regarding the pond and land configuration environmental assessment from the consent agenda so that he could further explain its purpose.

Business Items

1) Motion to Approve Consent Agenda – Michelle Lawrence motioned to approve the consent agenda. Amy Mueller seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

2) Approve Coalition Letter - David stated that the Board had been briefed on the pond and land configuration twice and the issues raised were communicated by Coalition staff directly to the Site. Subsequently Broomfield and Westminster asked the Coalition to send a letter

requesting that the pond remediation be examined holistically, in essence stating that if the A- and B-series ponds are being examined then the C-series ponds should also be included. Rik ran the draft letter through local government staff and it is ready for Board approval. Sam Dixon said she still wants language that states the current integrated monitoring program (IMP) process should remain post-closure. She also said the State should maintain authority to regulate pond management. David said the intention of the letter is different than her comments and that monitoring is not in the scope of the draft document. Lorraine Anderson suggested drafting a separate letter to address Sam's issues. David stated that IMP is being discussed in stewardship conversations and if the Coalition wants to address monitoring then it should take a step back and not limit it to IMP. Likewise, if addressing DOE unilateral authority it should be addressed more broadly than just pond management. Shaun asked if the Board had any opposition to the substance of the letter as it is currently drafted. Sam said it should also mention Building 371 drainage issues. David responded that Sam's issues may have been included in Westminster's letter but Westminster staff did not request that it be included in the Coalition letter. Sam asked if Coalition staff reads the Westminster letters that are sent to them, and David said Westminster and Broomfield get into a level of detail that the Coalition letters do not. He explained that the Coalition and city letters bear a relationship to each other, but he tries to strike a balance with the Coalition being more general and discussing issues at a higher level. Shaun McGrath asked if the Board would entertain a motion to approve the Coalition letter as currently drafted with the condition that Coalition staff draft a second letter to address Sam Dixon's concerns. Michelle Lawrence agreed to put forth this motion. Lorraine Anderson seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

3) Executive Director's Report - David Abelson reported on the following items.

- There has been a second surface water quality exceedance, this time at SW-93, a point of evaluation which is upstream from pond A-1. The results were 0.2-0.36 pCi/L while the standard is 0.15 pCi/L. The source is believed to be a result of soil remediation activities surrounding Building 779. Kaiser-Hill is investigating the results further and is implementing a beefed-up erosion control program.
- The Senate has added an amendment to the FY05 Defense Authorization bill which addresses problems with the Energy Employee Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act. The Senate is proposing moving the portion of the program under DOE to DOL, while the House has proposed implementing minor changes proposed by the Administration.
- Jessie Roberson has resigned, her last day being July 15, 2004. Before leaving she sent a letter to Senator Allard and Rep. Udall confirming her commitment that the Site will not be closed until all orphan waste is removed. Paul Golan will be acting Assistant Secretary.
- Rocky Flats orphan waste will begin shipping to Hanford in a matter of days now that Hanford has a signed Record of Decision. Shipping should be complete by October unless it is hindered by a Washington state citizen initiative.
- Legacy Management is working on the report to Congress regarding the Rocky Flats Cold War Museum, as required by the refuge bill. Coalition and local government staff are working together with Legacy Management to provide input.

- Kimberly Chleboun has changed her last name to Lohr.

David then discussed independent verification and validation (IVV). He asked the Board to review the document drafted by Gary Brosz and Broomfield staff which considers potential objectives and scope, and the strawman document drafted by Hank Stovall which outlines a potential process. David noted one of the objectives listed by Gary is “achieving community buy-in”, but they still need to define what community acceptance might look like.

Hank said his document outlines a process by which an IVV could be outsourced or implemented and is fashioned on the approach used for the Radionuclide Soil Action Level Oversight Panel. He suggested that at the August Board meeting they begin by creating a small core group that would set up the scope and do the legwork which would then require approval by the Coalition Board. The subcommittee would also propose a full committee to include experts and a broad diversity of other organizations. He also suggested the Coalition determine DOE funding capabilities before getting too far into the process.

Clark Johnson asked if Coalition staff could draft a memo including specific timelines and information before the August meeting, and Lorraine Anderson asked that the memo also include information on cost and funding sources. David said the funds would have to come from the federal government and could be \$500,000 and up, depending on the scope. He also said it would be difficult to define cost without a clear goal and scope of work. Lorraine voiced concern about spending money to change the public’s mind about Rocky Flats and about the funds coming out of cleanup money. Paul Danish agreed. Hank said the objective, in one form or another, is to confirm that cleanup and health risk standards are being met. He added that \$500,000-900,000 invested in building community confidence in an \$8 billion project should be possible for DOE and Congress. Shaun asked him if he believed that achieving community buy-in is the same as the objective he just defined. Hank stated that using the best science available to prove that standards have been met should be considered achieving community buy-in.

Jane Uitti said the scope should also include how to deal with the follow-up if methods and results are found to be inaccurate. Hank agreed the scope should identify problem areas. Paul said he agrees it would be worthwhile to find out where problems might be but it should not be characterized as getting public buy-in as that objective is pre-judging the outcome. The Board also discussed issues involved in obtaining Requests for Proposals.

Public Comment

Victor Holm (RFCAB) said he has been attending the Comprehensive Risk Assessment (CRA) meetings for the past six weeks and was surprised to find that since the CRA is being conducted by three independent consultants it could potentially be a very independent analysis process. He said that since he is only there as an observer there is no opportunity to change the CRA scope or methodology. Thus he suggested the local governments may be interested in looking further into the process and how to make public recommendations while decisions are being made.

Anne Fenerty (citizen) asked if the Coalition was interested in why the Memorandum of Understanding between DOE and DOI had not yet been signed when it was due June 2003. She read language from the refuge bill describing the MOU scope and said the public has a right to know why it has not been signed. Second, she asked what corrective actions would be taken by USFWS in response to the letter from EPA commenting on the refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. David said the Coalition has been actively concerned about the MOU and continues to track progress with DOE, USFWS, and Congressional offices. He said it has been known for years that the issue of mineral rights is the primary issue the agencies are grappling with. Laurie Shannon (USFWS) said the response to the EPA letter will be included in their response to comments in the final document to be issued in November.

Building 776/777 Decontamination and Demolition

Victor Pizzuto (Kaiser-Hill) provided the Board with an update on the decontamination and demolition (D&D) of Building 776/777. The project encompasses 224,000 square feet plus ten additional support facilities, 270 gloveboxes, 244 tanks, 57 miles of process piping, 5,111 feet of ducting, and extensive contamination due to the 1969 fire.

Victor began by describing their D&D efforts in the context of the Decommissioning Operations Plan (DOP). Due to the building history, decontaminating the structures to unrestricted release standards is not possible. Thus, the DOP committed to a process called ALARA-based decontamination (As Low As Reasonable Achievable). This process balances the worker risk during decontamination efforts and environmental risk during demolition. The DOP also committed to a project contribution to Site air emissions of less than 1% of the regulatory standard. The Site plans to take the facility to three feet below grade and remove all portions of the building that do not meet unrestricted release.

Victor next addressed decontamination and described the final survey process. Building 776/777 has been divided into areas and survey units, with eight areas (one area being the second floor) and 42 survey units within those areas. A process has been developed with the State and DOE for preparing each survey unit for final survey and encapsulation. Victor presented that process in a flow-chart, which captured the following steps:

- conduct in-process surveys to determine the nature and extent of contamination;
- provide survey to DOE/CDPHE, then determine path forward for survey unit: additional survey, component removal, and/or decontamination;
- conduct component removal and decontamination;
- perform in process and/or final surveys;
- provide surveys to DOE/CDPHE, then determine path forward for survey unit: additional surveys, component removal, decontamination and/or encapsulation; and then,
- prepare RFCA contact record and encapsulate the survey unit.

Victor also explained that the survey reporting has been broken into in-process (before decontamination) and final (after decontamination) surveys. Weekly meetings are held with CDPHE and DOE to discuss progress and exchange information on the surveys. Contact records are used to document when all parties agree that the ALARA-based decontamination has been achieved. Lorraine Anderson asked about the levels of contamination left after achieving ALARA. Victor responded that it varies from area to area since the standard “as low as reasonably achievable” will vary and there are tens of thousands of data points.

Victor then showed numerous pictures of the building before decontamination, illustrating the challenges posed by extensive overhead pipes and ducts, gloveboxes and internal structures up to 46-feet high, contaminated walls and floors, and an exterior which includes transite (a material containing asbestos). He presented the following table which showed benchmarks and areas of comparison between similar plutonium buildings (also open air D&D) at Mound and Hanford.

Areas for Comparison	Mound PP Building Pu ²³⁸	Hanford 233S Building Pu ²³⁹	Rocky Flats 776/777 Building Pu ²³⁹ /Am ²⁴¹
Isotopes of Concern	Pu ²³⁸ , Am ²⁴¹ , Pu239	Pu ²³⁹ , Am ²⁴¹	Pu ²³⁹ , Am ²⁴¹
Type of Decommissioning	Contaminated/Open Air	Contaminated/Open Air	Contaminated/Open Air
Inventory	9,210 µCi/m ² in 44,000 ft. ² Building (total 32.6 Ci)	2,827 µCi/m ² in 3,500 ft. ² Building (total 0.9 Ci)	105 µCi/m ² in 500,000 ft. ² Building (includes walls) (total 4.9 Ci)
Decon Techniques	Minimum decon	Minimum decon	decon/wall removal/floor shaving/hydrolazing/stabilization
Survey Points	35 media samples/cursory surveys	urem surveys	media samples, fixed surveys, removable surveys
Fixatives	latex paint in select areas	PBS-Latex	latex paint throughout/fire damage in ASRF
Demolition Equipment	excavators w/shears, buckets, loaders, hammerhead	same, concrete saw	excavators w/ shears, buckets, loaders, hammerhead
Engineering Controls	fog cannon/spray nozzles	wire saw/fog cannons (2)/spray nozzles/sequenced approach	fog cannons (2)/spray nozzles/sequenced approach
Air Sampling	perimeter/work area	work area	work area/perimeter/lapels
Regulatory Requirements	0.1mrem/yr, “no visible emissions”	10 mrem/yr	0.1 mrem/yr by project, 10 mrem/yr
Personal Protective Equipment	Anti-Cs/ no respirators	Anti-Cs/PAPRs/rain gear	Anti-Cs/respirators
Waste Pile Management	soil cement/timely removal	soil cement/timely removal	soil cement/timely removal (every Friday before weekend off)
Waste Characterization	LSA	LSA	LSA/SCO
Waste Disposal	NTS, no residual water	ERDA onsite, no residual water	NTS/Envirocare, no residual water
Personnel Exposures	Minimal	TBD	TBD

Victor moved on to describe what is involved in preparing the building for demolition, including floor shaving and scraping, hydrolazing, block wall removal, crack remediation, encapsulation, and removal of the false roof. Closure activities will involve: exterior asbestos panel removal and replacement; radiological surveys; asbestos abatement (completed); beryllium area closure (building now free of beryllium); PCB, chemical removal; RCRA area closure; and, an independent validation by Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education. The validation looked at instrumentation, calibration, field work, and data. The verbal outbriefing advised of no problems, and they are awaiting the final written report. Victor then showed “after” photos which illustrated their great progress in gutting and decontaminating the building.

Victor reviewed the following demolition controls and showed photos of the controls in action:

- air sampling
- deposition pans
- fog cannons
- point source water spray
- waste pile management
- water management
- wind evaluation
- special wall handling, including soaker hoses and orange paint to differentiate hot structural walls that cannot be removed
- erosion controls
- worker protecting, including personal protective equipment, lapel air samplers, and respiratory protection

He stated that the entire building is being shipped offsite as waste. Surface water management during demolition will include controls to ensure that water upgradient of the site is directed around the project area. Water application will be specific to the hazard to ensure that excess or unnecessary water is not used. All dust control water that becomes run-off will be controlled and captured prior to leaving the contamination area; run-off will be directed into an impoundment, then sampled and dispositioned according to the sample results. Additionally, applicable erosion control measures will be used based on the Site Erosion Control Handbook, which is being developed to address recent surface water issues. A construction fence will encircle the area. Victor also presented a diagram of the area which maps out the locations of close-in air monitors and water controls.

In closing Victor reviewed the current working schedule. Areas I and II are completed and Area III is partially done. They expect to begin demolition in December and be done by next April, although right now they are one month behind. He noted that they will continue in Area III until they are satisfied, and Area V will also be difficult, but they will work as long as it takes.

Paul Danish asked if he is comfortable doing demolition during the windiest part of the year. Victor confirmed that he feels assured after learning lessons from onsite demolition and work at Mound. They plan to take down the building moving from southeast to northwest which will result in a shadowing effect, keeping contamination on the pad which will be removed last.

Hank Stovall referred to the total inventory of 4.9 curies and asked if that is before or after D&D. Victor responded that that is the “before” number with everything in place except gloveboxes. Hank asked how much of that contamination would be released in the rubble, and Victor figured that an ending inventory would be approximately 3 curies with 90% of it in the rubble. Hank then asked if the Site’s foggers would be as large as the one shown in the photo, and Victor responded in the affirmative adding that two foggers would be mounted on trailers and they would be getting the third fogger shown in the photo. Hank asked about their basis for releasing water from the impoundment. Dyan Foss (Kaiser-Hill) said water would have to meet surface water standards or be treated before release.

Paul asked if the inventory would then represent a pound of plutonium since a curie equals 100 grams. Bob Kurz (Kaiser-Hill) clarified that 95% of the contamination is in the floor, with the majority of that to be removed by shaving, thus the inventory would be an order of magnitude lower. Paul asked how the inventory number was arrived at. Victor explained the safeguard security measurement was based on a wide-angle, wall-to-wall survey of the entire building, with a 95% confidence rate. The total number of 4.9 Ci is actual measured inventory.

Shaun asked about the regulatory requirements and Victor stated the regulatory limit is 1 mrem per year, but Kaiser-Hill’s commitment in the DOP is 0.1 mrem to assure the public of safety. Shaun asked how they know they are beryllium free. Victor said they sampled every work set. Bob added that all areas were resurveyed and each survey unit is randomly surveyed, but there is no sampling during the actual demolition with heavy equipment. Sam asked if the fence would remain as an access control, and Victor responded it is in place as a construction boundary for safety and would be removed once demolition is complete. Hank commended Victor on the quality of his presentation and the level of detail provided. Lorraine, Paul, and others agreed.

Agenda for Coalition Retreat

Shaun McGrath reviewed the retreat agenda items proposed by the Executive Committee:

- Review the history of how and why the current Coalition processes were put into place and how they work. Processes may include:
 - strategic planning;
 - tracking issues;
 - communication between Coalition staff, local government staff and elected officials;
 - the way in which Board meeting agendas are decided upon;
 - the way in which Board meetings are run; and,
 - the process for approving Coalition letters.
- Identify opportunities for improvement.
- Review Coalition’s Strategic Plan.
- Review timeline and work plans to meet closure.
- Consider post-closure opportunities for Coalition.

Shaun emphasized the need to review the process for approving Coalition letters and policies. He added that the Executive Committee has also suggested using a facilitator so that David

Abelson has a better opportunity to participate. Mike Hughes with Resolve has agreed to facilitate if the Board so wishes. The Board agreed to a facilitator.

Lori Cox asked if the retreat had been prompted due to concerns raised by the Board or if it is a routine process. David said the Coalition has not had a retreat for the past couple years, but there also had been no change to the Board for some time. The Board did originally hold retreats annually in order to gel, and now that new directors are on the Board it is a good idea to do so again. He stated that the new Board members have been participating long enough to see how processes currently work, thus it is a good time to benefit from new ideas. Lorraine Anderson said she believes all the suggested agenda items are good. Shaun asked David how much time he thought would be needed and David responded however much time the Board wants. He suggested starting around 10:30 a.m. after the Board meeting and running until possibly 1:00 p.m. with a catered lunch.

Jane Uitti asked that they also discuss a resolution process for those times when the Board has a divergence of opinion. Shaun asked if the Board would approve allowing the Executive Committee to prioritize agenda items, and the Board agreed.

Round Robin

Boulder County - Paul Danish asked for more information on the hotspot found in the north buffer zone. David Abelson said he had briefly informed the Board last month of a hotspot found during sampling south of Highway 128. Rik Getty explained that it was one of the buffer zone composite samples which includes samples from five areas within a 30-acre grid. The initial value was 7 pCi/g, and when they reanalyzed from that same sample they got 2.5 pCi/g. Background is 0.07 pCi/g so this sample is 100 times higher and in an area where they did not expect to find contamination. Rik said he has been tracking the issue with Kaiser-Hill and they are investigating further with plans to perform discreet sampling in August. EPA will also do their own investigation as they analyze the top grid cells in each exposure unit.

Paul said Boulder County has the Colton trail which, if extended, would go right through that area. He voiced concern that it has been his worry all along, especially about public access, that there will be unknown contamination left onsite. Lorraine said the discovery of this hotspot shows that the process is working in that they are able to identify problem areas and work to remediate. She said it is not anyone's intention to have a refuge trail go over a hotspot. Paul said the process is working but when something like this is found it also raises many flags and questions. He said as the Site continues their investigation process he wants to know more about what is contributing to the radiation found and whether it is only plutonium. He also said the decision to allow public access should be revisited.

David said another question is how the contamination got there. The Board discussed the size of the sample and Sam Dixon asked if an aerial gamma survey would have found it. Rik said he has looked at past aerial surveys and he is not confident about using it to detect lower levels like

this. The Board then discussed possible ways the contamination could have been deposited and the impacts of above-ground nuclear testing in relation to background levels.

Jane Uitti raised the issue of sampling on Boulder County and City of Boulder lands in the grid south of the Colton trail. David said the ROD for OU3, which includes all offsite lands, was already approved as No Further Action in the mid-1990s. Hank added that the Operable Unit included Westminster and Broomfield lands with surface soil contamination up to 8 pCi/g. Rik said that the cost for testing should be somewhat reasonable considering that the Site's recent testing of the entire buffer zone was approximately \$250,000. The Board discussed working with DOE to determine the specifics. The Board agreed to follow the results of the Site's investigative process and possibly have them present their findings at the September Board meeting.

Westminster - Sam Dixon raised concern about the 903 Pad Lip Area hillside not being remediated to 50 pCi/g. David said the Site is remediating all surface soils (top three feet) to 50 pCi/g or less. Rik added remediation of the area is over 50% complete and is expected to be finished by October. He gets daily updates and he stated that when confirmation samples come back higher than 50 pCi/g the Site goes back and digs up more until they are below the standard.

City of Boulder - Amy Mueller said this will be her last Coalition meeting as she has accepted a job with the City and County of Denver.

Coalition Staff/Consultants - Barb Vander Wall said she will be out for the next couple of months due to the forthcoming arrival of her baby, but Joan Fritsche will cover for her until she comes back.

Public Comment

There was no further public comment.

Big Picture

The Board reviewed items for discussion for future meetings. At the August meeting the Board will continue discussing independent verification and validation. The Board will then have its retreat immediately following the Board meeting.

The meeting was adjourned by Shaun McGrath at 10:56 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kimberly Lohr, Assistant Director