

**Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments Board Meeting Minutes**  
**Monday, June 6, 2005**  
**8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**  
**Jefferson County Airport, Broomfield**

**Board members in attendance:** Gary Brosz (Director, Broomfield), Lori Cox (Alternate, Broomfield), Mike Bartleson (Alternate, Broomfield), Sam Dixon (Director, Westminster), Jo Ann Price (Alternate, Westminster), Ron Hellbusch (Alternative, Westminster), Lorraine Anderson (Director, Arvada), Nanette Neelan (Alternate, Jefferson County), Karen Imbierowicz (Director, Superior), Shaun McGrath (Director, City of Boulder), Carl Castillo (Alternate, City of Boulder), Ben Pearlman (Director, Boulder County), Jane Uitti (Alternate, Boulder County).

**Coalition staff members and consultants in attendance:** David Abelson (Executive Director), Rik Getty (Technical Program Manager), Barb Vander Wall (Setter & Vander Wall, P.C.), Erin Rogers (consultant).

**Members of the Public:** Dave Shelton (Kaiser-Hill), Frazer Lockhart (DOE), John Rampe (DOE), Rob Henneke (EPA), Steve Gunderson (CDPHE), Edgar Ethington (CDPHE), Shirley Garcia (Broomfield), Doug Young (Rep. Udall), Ken Korkia (RFCAB), Roman Kohler (Rocky Flats Homesteaders), Ron DiGiorgio (USWA Local 8031), Chuck Miller (USWA Local 8031), Hank Stovall (Broomfield County, RFCAB), Mark Sattelberg (USFWS), Todd Neff (Boulder Daily Camera), Gerald DePoorter (RFCAB), Patricia Rice (RFCAB), Bob Darr (DOE), Marion Galant (CDPHE), Dale Kralicek (WCRA), Phil Thomlinson (RFCAB), Karen Deike (RFCLOG consultant), Erin Hamby (RFCAB, RMPJC), Kim Cadena (Rep. Beauprez), Jeanette Alberg (Sen. Allard), Mark Aguilar (EPA), Lee Johnson (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock/Woman Creek Authority), Jim Holladay (Woman Creek Reservoir Authority), Scott Surovchak (DOE-LM), Fred Johnson (GEI Consultants, Inc.), Steve Dwyer (Dwyer Engineering), Mike Dungen (Muller Engineering).

**Convene/Agenda Review**

Chairman Shaun McGrath convened the meeting at 8:10 a.m.

**Business Items**

**1) Consent Agenda –** Lorraine Anderson motioned to approve the consent agenda. Karen Imbierowicz seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

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

- Last Friday, the Coalition was notified of a water quality violation at the end of the South Interceptor Ditch (SID) upstream of pond C-2. John Rampe clarified that this is classified as an exceedance at the point of evaluation, rather than a violation. Pond C-2 showed elevated plutonium of 0.21 picocuries per liter (pCi/l) during the period 4/17/05-5/11/05. The standard is 0.15 pCi/l. The pond is currently at 16% capacity, and the site will hold the contents and not discharge. Lorraine Anderson asked if the site is planning

to track the source of these elevated levels. John Rampe responded that DOE believes this event is transitory and that compared to last year when there was bare ground in the 903 Pad area, these levels are much lower.

- David noted that the Board had received a letter from the mayor of Golden expressing an interest in participating on the Local Stakeholder Organization (LSO) that will be formed later in the year. Roman Kohler also submitted an application for the LSO on behalf of the Rocky Flats Homesteaders. Staff has also received initial contact from the City of Thornton, but nothing official. These issues will be discussed later in the meeting. Sam Dixon also noted that the City of Northglenn will be sending a letter expressing its interest in participating on the LSO.
- John Rampe's responses to the Independent Review issues matrix have been incorporated and copies were provided. Updates will follow later in the meeting.
- David and Katie have been working on post-closure information management issues and have sent a memo to the local government staffs for feedback on three main issues, 1) appropriate onsite post-closure sign content; 2) information available post-closure to site visitors and other members of the public; and, 3) specific content of the Administrative Record and additional information needs. David recommends that the Coalition be prepared to weigh in on many of these questions as DOE begins to develop post-closure plans.

### **Public Comment**

There were no comments.

### **FY 05 Supplemental Budget**

David Abelson noted that since the Board approved the FY 05 RFCLOG budget in late 2004, it received an additional \$25,000 to fund MACTEC's contract. On recommendation of the Coalition's auditor, the Board will need to supplement the budget to reflect this change. Therefore, a budget hearing is scheduled for the July meeting.

### **Update on Independent Reviews**

Shaun McGrath introduced this agenda item, during which the Board will receive updates from Muller Engineering on the Woman and Walnut Creek drainages, GEI Consultants, Inc. on the groundwater IM/IRA, and Coalition staff. Sam Dixon noted that the consultants have met with DOE and the regulators since the last meeting.

Mike Dungen from Muller Engineering gave a presentation on their review of the Walnut and Woman Creek drainages. First, he noted that a review of the Site Wide Water Balance study showed lower 100-year peak runoff values were used than those calculated by Muller and Wright Water Engineers. Also, Muller does not believe that the current pond configuration could accommodate a 100-year flood. To improve the scenario for accommodating such an event, Muller recommends: 1) allowing the ponds to fill to only 20% of capacity before testing and releasing the contents; 2) testing sediments in the ponds; and 3) viewing the terminal ponds as the last line of defense rather than a part of any remedy.

Regarding Walnut Creek specifically, Muller has been assured by Rocky Flats that the Present Landfill Pond can accommodate a 100-year flood, but Muller has not seen the data. They also recommend testing sediments upstream of the ponds to discover problems before they might affect the ponds. Muller asks that Rocky Flats consider storing routine runoff from both the north and south in Pond A-3. There is also some question about whether or not A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4 will be notched.

For Woman Creek, Muller would like to see test data for Pond C-2 and Woman Creek sediments in order to develop a baseline. They also noted certain limitations of Pond C-2, including that it only picks up runoff from certain areas and that other runoff is bypassed around it. Muller would also like to see the SID and Woman Creek Bypass removed and to have C-2 enlarged. This would allow a much larger area to drain into C-2, but is also one of the most costly recommendations.

In conclusion, Muller stated that they have shown that there are actual risks associated with a potential 100-year flood and that by changing current pond operations, Rocky Flats would be able to accommodate an event even larger than the 100-year scenario. Muller would like to see the ponds kept as empty as possible and more frequent testing occur. In addition, they recommend more sediment characterization and the treatment of pollutants at the source. Muller sees Woman Creek as a high potential risk and identifies the only solution as an expansion of Pond C-2.

John Rampe then provided a DOE response to Muller's recommendations. He noted that some of his responses can be found in the Coalition's independent review matrix. He first stated that DOE believes that the Site Wide Water Balance study was very vigorous and thorough, and that DOE's values are more accurate than what Muller is suggesting. DOE agrees with the fundamental conclusion that the ponds are better operated at a low capacity and they do anticipate that lower capacities will be possible very soon. They are not sure however on the exact percentage of capacity that will be used, whether it be 20% or 25%. He stated that there has been a great deal of sediment characterization done and that he will provide this data to Muller. However, he is not sure if any more characterization will be done. DOE agrees that the ponds are the last line of defense and the site has been operating on this premise. The clearest disagreement with Muller's recommendations has to do with the extension of the SID to the east. This scenario was analyzed in the 903 Pad IM/IRA and modeling showed that environmental conditions do not warrant such an action. If the SID were to be reconfigured to allow more water into Pond C-2, DOE thinks this would create an even larger management issue than currently exists. Finally, DOE agrees with the recommendation to treat pollution at the source, and has been doing this.

Steve Gunderson (CDPHE) added that the State has not yet seen all the data either. They are expecting a decision document in the next few weeks. The Comprehensive Risk Assessment Working Group requested additional sediment sampling. He also noted that international experts conducted a very robust peer review of the Site Wide Water Balance study. Regarding the landfill pond, Steve noted that seep has gone way down since the installation of the synthetic cover and they do not expect to even have much of a pond at this location in the future. Finally,

he noted that Pond C-2 has not needed to be discharged for about a year and the State would take issue with Rocky Flats spending millions of dollars to reconfigure the ponds when there is no data to back up the action.

Mark Aguilar (EPA) noted that EPA agrees with DOE that the ponds are not to be used as part of any remedy.

Gary Brosz asked Steve Gunderson if the State supports running the ponds at 20% capacity. Steve responded yes, and added that with operations on the Site winding down, they expect a lot less water to be coming off the site, especially in Walnut Creek. This means fewer discharges will be necessary.

Gary asked Mike Dungen to explain why Muller's runoff numbers were higher than DOE's. Mike responded that their numbers were more in line with standard flood hydrology numbers, but noted that DOE's numbers were not necessarily wrong. Gary then asked Mike if the discrepancy in runoff values would still have relevance if the ponds are kept to 20% capacity. Mike responded that the SWWB still has many other great uses and benefits. Gary asked Mike if the ponds still serve an important role even though they are not part of a remedy. Mike responded yes, and that it would be nice to have the same level of protection on Woman Creek, with an expanded Pond C-2. Gary asked John Rampe about DOE's plans for sediment testing post-closure. John responded that while no decision has been made, DOE will look at this issue.

Lorraine asked how Woman Creek Reservoir plays into these issues. Mike Dungen responded that the reservoir does protect the Standley Lake drinking water source, but that they are still worried about the potential effects of a large storm event. Lorraine followed up by noting that the remedies apparently functioned successfully during cleanup and wondered if Mike agreed with Steve Gunderson that conditions would be even better now that cleanup is progressing. Mike responded that there is still a risk of actinides bypassing Pond C-2. John Rampe stated that DOE funded the Woman Creek Reservoir to provide a level of defense in case of a large flood, that the majority of sources in the Woman Creek drainage have been removed and that the site has met standards, even throughout the 903 Pad cleanup.

Ron Hellbusch noted that the Woman Creek Reservoir provides a physical disconnect between Woman Creek and Standley Lake and it therefore plays a role in protection, but that there still need to be terminal ponds on Woman Creek. He strongly supports the extension of the SID to the east, noting that not all of the runoff from the south of the Industrial Area can be caught and tested currently. John Rampe responded that DOE disagrees. Their data does not show a need for this action and that this would duplicate the functions of Woman Creek Reservoir.

Karen Imbierowicz noted that she would be more inclined to endorse the numbers developed under the well-reviewed SWWB study than Muller's.

Sam Dixion asked John Rampe why DOE does not think that the exceedances that are still happening are significant. John responded that the most recent exceedance occurred at the end of the SID which drains the 903 Pad area, and that this is still the most significant source in that

drainage. This water then flows into Pond C-2 where it will be held and tested. Areas that do not drain into C-2 consistently test clean at Indiana Street.

Shaun McGrath noted that this had been a very good discussion and that he appreciates the fact that the independent reviews are already generating some changes. He also acknowledges that there are still some areas of disagreement and suggested that the Board continue to fill out the matrix and get responses from DOE. He asked if the Board could review and consider the issues and responses and be prepared to transmit comments at the next meeting. John Rampe noted that he believes DOE has responded to all of the matrix issues.

Next, Fred Johnson of GEI Consultants presented a summary of their technical review of the Groundwater IM/IRA. GEI was retained in January 2005 to review the draft IM/IRA focusing on groundwater issues. In addition to the IM/IRA, GEI reviewed the FY05 Integrated Monitoring Plan, the 9/04 Final Comprehensive Risk Assessment Work Plan and Methodology, and RFCA. GEI issued a draft report in March 2005 and then met with DOE and regulators.

GEI noted that the IM/IRA is consistent with RFCA, is vague on how the ultimate cleanup goals will be accomplished, and is an effective means to an end, although not the end itself. GEI found that the IM/IRA screening process eliminated key constituents of concern, including groundwater VOCs discharging to surface water, americium and plutonium. GEI also found that ecological effects were not considered, and the quality of the lower hydrostatic unit (deep sandstone formation) was not validated. Remedial measures that were chosen are generally effective in reducing risk, although GEI has some concerns about the use of phyto-remediation.

Per direction by Westminster, Broomfield and the WCRA, GEI is basing its review on two main desired outcomes: 1) documented assurances that all areas of concern will be addressed to the objectives required by RFCA, and 2) development of a long-term monitoring program to detect constituents of concerns before they reach critical points of exposure. To meet these outcomes, work after the IM/IRA will need to include, 1) Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (including a sitewide groundwater evaluation and risk assessment), 2) Final Integrated Monitoring Plan (will include all constituents of concern and will measure to final standards), and 3) Final Record of Decision (approved by regulators with input from cities and other stakeholders, with firm commitment and schedule from DOE).

GEI developed a number of recommendations, including: 1) complete the IM/IRA with a firm commitment to meet RFCA cleanup objectives, 2) validate and document conformance through completion of CERCLA/RFCA process, and 3) consistently communicate progress to stakeholders. Next steps for GEI will include reviewing the revised IM/IRA to evaluate the response to comments and meeting with site technical staff and community representatives to resolve any outstanding issues.

John Rampe provided DOE's response to the GEI presentation. DOE agrees that the IM/IRA is not the end of cleanup requirements. It is really a series of polishing steps on top of the groundwater remedies already in place. He noted that there has been a misunderstanding about the seemingly-high surface water standards used in the IM/IRA and that this section will be revised. However, these standards did not play into the actions in any case. Regarding the

elimination of americium and plutonium as constituents of concern, John pointed to the conclusions of the Actinide Migration Panel, which show that there is most likely no pathway for these contaminants to reach receptors. DOE will continue to monitor groundwater in the 371/771 area, as there are some residual contaminants in this location. John pointed out that the analysis of ecological receptors will take place under the Comprehensive Risk Assessment. Regarding the lower hydrostatic unit, John noted that EG&G had completed a study in the 1990's that ruled out water moving into this layer and that DOE will provide this data to GEI. He also noted that the Integrated Monitoring Plan will provide the comprehensive look at groundwater that may be lacking in the IM/IRA.

Steve Gunderson noted that most of the major groundwater issues at the site have already been addressed. He acknowledged that the IM/IRA has been a difficult document to create and that there has been a great deal of regulator comments. Also, the groundwater section of the Remedial Investigation will address the lower hydrostatic unit.

Gary Brosz asked Fred Johnson what his top concerns are regarding the IM/IRA. Fred responded that the site needs to continue developing the administrative record, that there are still residual issues left, and they are not done addressing them. He recommends making sure the Comprehensive Risk Assessment and Remedial Investigation address the issues and that DOE can back this up with data. John Rampe stated that he would like to make sure GEI reviews the Actinide Migration work. Fred noted that he has seen one report and would be interested in reviewing more, but that it would be a tough sell for him to buy into the data if they do not recommend long-term monitoring for Americium and Plutonium. John stated that the IMP includes groundwater wells at the 371/771 area in addition to surface water monitoring for these constituents.

Shaun McGrath asked the Board to get all of their issues on the table regarding these reviews and commended Rik Getty on the work he was about to discuss regarding a summary of remaining subsurface contamination.

Rik noted that while his original plan was to look IHSS by IHSS for remaining contamination, this process was too labor-intensive. He developed a new approach to look at several priority areas, including the 2 landfills, original process waste lines and valve vaults, 903 Pad/Lip area, ash pits, east trenches/mound site contaminated groundwater plume, contaminated foundations in the 371/771 locations, sediments in the B-series ponds and the solar evaporation pond contaminated plume.

As Coalition staff reviews these priority areas, they will be preparing a briefing summary document for each. These briefing summaries will include several standard sections, including IHSS information, Approximate Location, Historical Information, Pre-remediation Characterization Data, Remedial Actions Taken, Post-remediation Remaining Contamination, Potential Exposure Pathways to Remaining Contamination, Long-Term Stewardship Controls, Notes, and References.

Issues may be identified during the course of these reviews that could require a response from the RFCA parties. As these issues are identified, they will be added to the Coalition's

independent review issues matrix. Shaun McGrath thanked Rik for his work in developing the great briefing summary examples for the Board packet. Shaun particularly liked the format and the language used in the summaries, and that Rik included mention of allegations of releases as well as known releases. Steve Gunderson also said that he was very impressed with the summaries. Shaun noted that the LSO will be able to use these papers as a foundation for their future work. David Abelson noted that while they were originally tasked with just looking at subsurface issues, staff had decided to look at any sites that may be outside the scope of other reviews. Karen Imbierowicz agreed that the format of the summaries was good, noting that she particularly like the paragraph format. She asked if Rik will update these summaries as the cleanup proceeds. Rik agreed to do this.

Rik then updated the Board on the ORISE review. Since the last meeting 3 documents have been released: 1) Kaiser-Hill/DOE final survey plan for sitewide characterization; 2) ORISE Project Specific Plan; and 3) MACTEC comments on ORISE plan. There was also a meeting with Bechtel Nevada to discuss plans to conduct the helicopter-based survey of the site. ORISE plans to review Kaiser-Hill's final survey plan, which includes the helicopter survey.

The helicopter survey will include areas just outside the site boundaries, as well as the entire site. Anything found above the minimal detectable activity will be followed-up with a ground-based scan and perhaps soil sampling. The helicopter will fly at about a 50-foot altitude, approximately 70 mph. At this height and speed, the helicopter scan can see about a 730 square meter area (approximately 30 yard circle). The minimal detectable activity for an area this size is about 6-7 picocuries per gram, going down about 1-2 inches into the soil. This survey cannot detect isolated small area hotspots. ORISE will choose about 15 areas (12 in Industrial Area and 3 in Buffer Zone) in which it will sample to confirm the helicopter and ground-based scanning results. This will include the 10 areas most likely to contain contamination. They will also do a 'mini' MARSSIM study in the area surrounding the 903 Pad, as suggested by MACTEC last month. This area was chosen because it is the only remediated area not covered by backfill. This study will allow ORISE to compare the outcomes of the MARSSIM and CERCLA analyses.

Gary Brosz asked if the spots ORISE selects in the buffer zone will be random. No one knew the answer. He also asked about the significance of the 9 picocuries per gram number that had been talked about for the buffer zone. John Rampe said to forget this number.

Jane Uitti asked how we can assure that there are not any hotspots left in the Industrial Area. No answer was provided.

Gary asked if the scan to be used around the 700 and 900 buildings would be a perimeter scan. John Rampe answered yes. Gary also asked if the ORISE verifications of the scanning negate the need for a validation by using a known source. Rik responded that Bechtel Nevada reported that they use a 3-mile heavily-characterized flight line in the desert in order to calibrate/validate their scanning equipment.

Shaun McGrath stated that the Coalition would like to verify the characterization of the top 6 inches of soil and asked if the ORISE samples will look at this depth. John Rampe responded

that this is only a difference in methodology and that if there are any anomalies, they will go through the appropriate RFCA process. Shaun also asked about the use of 7 picocuries per gram (pCi/g) in the buffer zone as a standard. John responded that 7 pCi/g has no regulatory basis and that it is used in the context of institutional controls.

Dr. Steven Dwyer presented an update on his review of the Original Landfill (OLF) Closure Design. Dr. Dwyer first reviewed RCRA and CERCLA requirements for landfill covers, which are generally designed to block downward movement of water through the landfill. Next he summarized a number of comments he presented to DOE in January and the responses he received. Included in Dr. Dwyer's comments was the inability of the landfill cover to contain the waste, the lack of biointrusion controls, the location of a number of hazardous contaminants at or near the landfill site, the detection of contaminants down gradient of the OLF that were not monitored up gradient, the monitoring of contaminants up gradient of the OLF that do not show up down gradient, and the unexplained surface appearance of radionuclides. Dr. Dwyer is also concerned about the increased slope length of the design, the reliance on vegetation for erosion control and the lack of quality requirements for the cover soil.

DOE's responses, echoed by John Rampe at this meeting, showed some clear disagreement on many of the issues identified by Dr. Dwyer. In general, DOE sees a fundamental difference between what landfill designs usually include and the specific conditions and goals for this site. Also, DOE does not agree that the landfill poses any specific environmental threat because, 1) contamination is sporadic, 2) there is no expression in surface water, and 3) there is no pathway to drinking water. Through current studies, the boundaries of the landfill are proving to be approximately where they were expected to be. Dave Shelton briefly explained some recent work that affected some of the conditions observed by Dr. Dwyer.

Jane Uitti asked about one of DOE's responses that referenced no analyte exceeding standards more than 7% of the time and asked if this was acceptable. John Rampe responded that the common measure is to meet the goals 85% of the time. Dr. Dwyer stated that you want to isolate what is there and that this obviously is not happening. He is concerned that even though there has been no reported dumping at this site for 35 years, there is still contamination being seen.

Karen Imbierowicz asked Dr. Dwyer what his recommendations would be. He responded that although the design is good, he would like to see more containment. More soil would help and he would make sure it is good quality soil that will support native vegetation.

Steve Gunderson said that the State will be meeting with Dr. Dwyer later today. He noted that CDPHE has very conservative engineers that have looked at this landfill design and he would take strong exception to the statement that the landfill poses a risk to the environment.

Lorraine Anderson stated that certain piles of soil that Dr. Dwyer mentioned seeing near the landfill site that he thought might contain excessive levels of salts were probably native soils to the area. John Rampe clarified that most of the soils used in the remediation come from other areas of the site and are therefore suitable for native vegetation.

Mark Aguilar mentioned that EPA has tested the soils and they are appropriate for fostering revegetation. Also, the EPA agrees with Dr. Dwyer about the need to lower the water table in the landfill area. He also stated that he has great confidence in the current design.

Sam Dixon commented on a component of the design that involves the use of buttresses, which would lead to a loss of protection for the SID. She asked why there is still contamination coming from this area after 35 years. John Rampe answered that the contamination in this area is intermittent and it is unknown whether it can be attributed to the landfill. Also, this area will be a site of long-term monitoring.

Gary Brosz said he had some questions about the landfill, but will postpone asking them until after Dr. Dwyer has had a chance to meet with the regulators. He asked why the site is not worried about being able to successfully revegetate the landfill area. Dave Shelton explained that some of the surface disturbances witnessed by Dr. Dwyer were the result of recent work involving some heavy equipment for sampling. Dave also noted that Rocky Flats has been successful with revegetating similar areas onsite.

Shaun McGrath asked that those attending the meeting on this topic later in the day update the Board on the outcomes of the discussion.

### **Local Stakeholder Organization (LSO) Discussion**

The Board began a discussion of a draft letter to the Department of Energy addressing the issue of membership on the LSO. The draft letter endorses including all 7 member governments from the Coalition as well as 3-4 other non-elected community members as full voting members on the LSO. The letter also endorses including the City of Golden as a member.

Lorraine Anderson stated that she believes the local governments which are directly adjacent to Rocky Flats have the most interest in serving on the LSO. She recognizes that Northglenn and Thornton have some water interests, but that Westminster has adequately represented these interests. She sees a good balance of power currently on the Board. She would rather see more involvement by the Rocky Flats Homesteaders. Regarding the membership of Golden, Lorraine is worried about having too many local governments represented and opening the door to even more.

Shaun McGrath noted that the Coalition had contacted the cities of Golden, Northglenn and Thornton about their interest in serving on the LSO. To date, only Golden has responded and is interested in participating. Shaun recommended that the Board only consider whether or not to include Golden at this point. Sam Dixon stated that, due to water issues, Northglenn and Thornton have even greater concerns regarding Rocky Flats than Golden. Shaun McGrath noted that these two entities would be able to petition DOE for membership at a later date. Sam Dixon noted that the mayors of Northglenn and Thornton have not yet seen the letter from the Coalition. Gary Brosz stated that, especially in the first few years of the LSO, the members should have a good historical knowledge of Rocky Flats issues. Therefore, he would support Golden's membership because representatives have been attending Coalition meetings. He felt

that the other cities may have a narrower focus, particularly on water issues – and may therefore skew the work of the LSO.

Lorraine Anderson motioned to approve the letter without the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph on page 2. The motion was seconded by Karen Imbierowicz. Gary Brosz asked David Abelson if there would be any problems associated with removing this paragraph. David said there was not a problem, but that the Board should explicitly state a position on the membership of the other cities. He also mentioned that he had been in contact with representatives from Thornton and they have seen the Coalition's letter. Shaun McGrath stated that he had no problem including Golden, but is concerned about adding any more. Shaun motioned to approve the letter as written, stating that the Coalition supports including Golden. The motion was seconded by Gary Brosz.

Lorraine Anderson suggested that Bob Nelson from Golden be included as a stakeholder member, as she did not know if the city as an entity had a great interest in the LSO. Jo Ann Price asked what would happen if Northglenn or Thornton sent a letter of interest at a later date.

The motion to endorse Golden's membership in the letter passed 5-2 with Jefferson County and Arvada opposing.

Shaun McGrath suggested that they add a sentence to the letter endorsing the regulatory agencies as ex-officio members on the LSO. He also suggested removing the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence from the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph in the letter. Lorraine Anderson motioned to approve these changes. Ben Pearlman seconded. The motion passed 6-1 with Westminster opposing.

Jo Ann Price motioned to wait one week to send the letter to allow Northglenn and Thornton this additional time to respond to the Coalition's letter. There was no second motion.

### **Coalition Communications Strategy**

Karen Deike has been hired by the Coalition to develop a communications strategy. She took feedback from the Board at the last meeting regarding the development of a fact sheet about the Coalition. She provided a draft fact sheet at this meeting for review and comment. She asked the Board if all points were covered and if it is specific enough for all audiences. She also asked for input on whether the Coalition should pursue additional communications strategies such as a speaker's bureau, editorial board visits, op-ed pieces, or press releases. These are all options included in the draft communications plan. David Abelson noted that he is having trouble gauging the Board's interest in participating in some of these other activities.

Karen Imbierowicz stated that she had not yet spoken with her Town Board about these issues, but can bring it up at their next meeting. She suggested that they could probably publicize some of the Coalition's messages through their town newsletter, the cable television channel, and their website. She asked if this would be enough. Gary Brosz noted the wide spectrum of possible communications efforts by the local governments and the need for uniform talking points and message. Regarding a speaker's bureau, Gary suggested that Broomfield's level of interest in participating would depend on the event and importance. Karen Deike noted that the Coalition could actively seek out speaking engagements, or could operate more informally, responding to requests for speakers, or in response to certain significant events. Carl Castillo asked for an

outline of desired responsibilities for the cities that could be taken to the various councils for approval.

David Abelson noted that he was getting the sense that a couple versions of a fact sheet and monthly updates would suffice at this time, followed by editorial board visits later in the year. The Coalition should try to meet with and educate the editorial boards prior to any editorials that may address the end of cleanup. Minimal resources by the local governments would be needed for these activities. Shaun McGrath concurred that it is important for the Coalition to be proactive in getting out its message as cleanup is winding down. Gary Brosz asked if Coalition staff could immediately transmit any 'newsworthy' Rocky Flats information directly to the Board members via email along with background/contextual information about the particular issue. David agreed that staff will do this. Karen strongly encouraged the Board to be prepared to distribute a press release about the results of the Independent Reviews in a timely manner.

Karen Imbierowicz suggested that the fact sheet mention that areas of the Buffer Zone will be opened for public use gradually over the next several years. Ben Pearlman referenced the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence on page 2 of the fact sheet, and asked that it be changed to read 'meet residential standards'. He also handed in a few other minor written comments.

### **Public Comment**

Patricia Rice (RFCAB) stated that she wanted to ask a question of the GEI consultant about an apparent inconsistency in his presentation handout, but he was no longer in attendance. The handout noted that the groundwater IM/IRA is consistent with RFCA, but also said it was less stringent than the ultimate objectives required by RFCA. Rik Getty will follow-up on this question.

Hank Stovall noted that the presenters from earlier in the meeting were gone and commented that members of the audience need to be able to ask them questions. He stated concerns that Northglenn and Thornton were not being endorsed by the Coalition for membership in the LSO. Regarding the independent reviews, he has faith in Muller and the models used. He said it is unacceptable that we do not know what is in ponds A-4 and A-5. He noted that if there is a flood in the future, that residual contamination will be spread, even in high areas.

Marion Galant (CDPHE) thanked the Coalition for adding a microphone system at this meeting and noted that it really helped the audience hear the various presentations and discussion.

Shaun McGrath noted that the Coalition's public comment process was consistent with the City of Boulder's procedures and that the meeting went past the scheduled time, even with the limitation on public comment earlier in the meeting.

### **Updates/Big Picture Review**

**Big Picture** - The Board reviewed the Big Picture. Topics for the July 11th Board meeting include: 1) Post-closure monitoring, 2) Independent reviews (bring closure to Board comments/positions), and 3) Local Stakeholder Organization (discuss scope/purpose/goals)

The meeting was adjourned by Shawn McGrath at 12:00 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.*