ROCKY FLATS STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL
Monday, October 27, 2014, 8:30 – 12:00 PM
Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport, Terminal Building, Mount Evans Room
11755 Airport Way, Broomfield, Colorado

Board members in attendance: Sandra McDonald (Alternate, Arvada), Lisa Morzel (Director, City of Boulder), Tim Plass (Alternate, City of Boulder), Megan Davis (Alternate, Boulder County), Mike Shelton (Director, Broomfield), Sharon Tessier (Alternate, Broomfield), David Allen (Alternate, Broomfield), Laura Weinberg (Director, Golden), Faye Griffin (Director, Jefferson County), Joyce Downing (Director, Northglenn), Joe Cirelli (Director, Superior), Emily Hunt (Alternate, Thornton), Bob Briggs (Director, Westminster), Mary Fabisiak (Alternate, Westminster), Jeannette Hillery (League of Women Voters), Sue Vaughan (League of Women Voters), Roman Kohler (Rocky Flats Homesteaders), Arthur Widdowfield (Director, Rocky Flats Institute & Museum), Ann Lockhart (Alternate, Rocky Flats Institute & Museum), Nancy Newell (citizen).

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

Attendees: Vera Moritz (EPA), Carl Spreng (CDPHE), Scott Surovchak (DOE-LM), Linda Kaiser (Stoller), Bob Darr (Stoller), John Boylan (Stoller), Jody Nelson (Stoller), Jeremiah McLaughlin (Stoller), David Ward (Stoller), Kurt Franzen (Stoller), Anya Palmieri (Stoller), Heather Brown (Stoller), Art Burmeister (citizen), Mike DiPardo (citizen), Anne Fenerty (citizen).

Convene/Agenda Review

Chair Joyce Downing convened the meeting at 8:39 a.m. The Chair also noted that an Executive Committee meeting was held on September 29, 2014. Meeting attendees included the Executive Committee, Bob Briggs and David Abelson. The purpose was to develop an agenda for this meeting. These meetings are open to public.

Bob Briggs moved to approve the September 2014 Board minutes and the checks. The motion was seconded by Lisa Morzel. The motion to accept the minutes and checks passed 14-0.

Executive Director's Report

David Abelson began by discussing a class about Rocky Flats issues that Sue Vaughan had recently coordinated at the University of Denver. This four week continuing education class incorporated a site tour, as well as presentations by David Abelson and Rik Getty, the Rocky Flats Museum and Institute, CDPHE, and DOE. David said that the discussion was excellent and many good questions were asked. David noted that in the general public today, Kristen Iversen's book still has a huge influence on public perception. Some of the students had read her book, as well as Len Ackland's book about Rocky Flats. Sue added that her main goal was to get more

information out to citizens. There were 25 students in the class. She said she received excellent feedback, and learned a lot herself through the presentation of complicated science at a level people that could understand. She noted that even skeptics walked out of the class with better information. She said there was great interest in doing the class again, maybe in another way. David noted that the group size helped to make it successful, as it was not too large to be unwieldy. He said it also helped that people were there to learn, as opposed to using the forum to press an agenda.

David next addressed sampling conducted in soil of the Woman Creek Reservoir. Located in Westminster, this reservoir opened in 1996 and severed the hydrological connection between Rocky Flats and Standley Lake. Because of excavation during construction, the bottom of the reservoir was made into blank slate in terms of radioactive contamination. It lacks any effects from past fires at Rocky Flats, atmospheric nuclear testing, or other activities that may have deposited particles of materials on the surface. David said that Tim Plass had asked at a meeting following the September 2013 floods how much contamination had moved offsite during the flood. David noted that in addition to water quality monitoring, soil sampling in the Reservoir soils helps provide another important data point. The Woman Creek Reservoir Authority has conducted soil sampling, finding extremely low levels of contamination that were far below any risk level . Carl Spreng commented that it was an extremely important piece of information that these results came back near background levels. Contamination levels at the Reservoir, because of its history, would reflect any contamination traveling off-site since 1996. This time period includes nearly all cleanup activities, including excavation at the 903 Pad. Mary Fabisiak reported that work had begun on berm repairs at the reservoir. Carl added that the reservoir sampling numbers were used to develop a risk assessment, which came back well below any levels of concern. This risk assessment used an ultra-conservative approach. Sue Vaughan asked if it would be worth the Stewardship Council creating a white paper on this issue. David said it would and that it could be folded into the broader discussion of offsite contamination. Additional information about the reservoir can be found on the City of Westminster website.

David concluded by mentioning that the Board's quarterly financial report was recently completed and distributed to Board members. He said to contact him if there were any questions.

USFWS' Plan to Conduct a Prescribed Fire at the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge

David explained that the Board started discussing this topic at the last meeting in the context of its 2015 workplan. The Executive Committee continued discussing this plan at its October meeting. USFWS has indicated it plans to burn approximately 700 acres in the southern part of the Refuge. The goal is to restore native habitat, remove non-native species and reduce fuel load. David noted that there are several questions among Board members regarding this plan. Board members have expressed an interest in learning about various options to address prairie management, and about any plans that are in place for the agencies to address community concerns prior to embarking upon this strategy. Concerns include the risks from fire. There is also concern about the protection of homes in the Candelas development. David noted that DOE,

CDPHE and EPA should help address these concerns prior to USFWS moving forward with its burn.

David noted that, as background, in 2000, DOE conducted a test fire in the buffer zone. Results from that test showed that the greatest risk during a fire was to the people fighting the fire. David also discussed that local elected officials bore the brunt of public concern during this fire, which is a big reason that the Board needs to have a very good understanding of all of the factors going into this decision. David directed the Board to the draft motion in the Board packet that was developed prior to the meeting. He described it as narrowly-tailored, not touching on the question of risk, but focusing on anticipated public concerns. He said there would be an opportunity to further discuss these issues at a later date, advising the Board think of this motion as one point in time, with much more discussions to take place starting at the first Board meeting of 2015.

Megan Davis noted that although Commissioner Gardner could not be at this meeting, she had shared her concerns at the Executive Committee meeting. Megan said that adequate engagement and a tremendous amount of public information need to be provided well in advance of the fire. The public will see fire and smoke, and turn to local governments to address numerous questions. Lisa Morzel noted that during the test fire in 2000, there was a lot of public concern in Boulder. She said the City received more phone calls than ever before and had many members of the public attended Council meetings to discuss their concerns. She added that some people were not satisfied with the conclusions from the tests, and that a negative perception exists about fire safety at Rocky Flats, whether true or not. Lisa said that the motion being discussed was developed in order to get everyone up to speed and to encourage additional dialogue with the agencies. She said that the City of Boulder approved the motion to oppose the proposed burn. Lisa also noted that the test fire took place prior to the publication of Kristen Iverson's book, and that there may be more fear in the community now.

Joyce Downing said that the Northglenn City Council was extremely concerned, but has not taken a position. She said that they would support alternative method for prairie management. Bob Briggs said that Westminster has the same concerns about public perception. Joe Cirelli said that Superior echoed these concerns, and that certain Board members were very concerned about risk. Mike Shelton said that Broomfield Councilman Greg Stokes presented some questions about the fire that had been answered. Mike said that there is a role for prescribed burns; however, with Rocky Flats, they would worry about erosion control. He added that it seems that there are plenty of other ways to accomplish the same prairie management goals. Sandra McDonald said that Arvada realizes that public perceptions are important. One question they had was whether another burn would be required down they road. They would like to see a more long term plan created upfront. She also asked if there would be enough time to address all of the issues prior to a burn is implemented.

David said that the refuge manager David Lucas partially addressed this issue by saying that they are planning the burn for after the snow melts; however, that makes exact timeframe still very uncertain. Ann Lockhart asked who would fight a lightning strike fire at Rocky Flats. Scott Surovchak said that local fire departments would respond as there is a cooperative agreement

with local fire departments. Scott also noted that Boulder County had used prescribed burns for their own land. Megan said that for them, fire was the best option, as it was in more of a forest environment. She clarified that the County is not opposed to fires as tools; they just want to make sure it is safe and the best option in this case. Ann asked how many fires had there been onsite in recent years. Jody Nelson estimated that there had been about 10-11 unplanned fires since 1994.

Lisa Morzel moved to approve the following motion:

"The Rocky Flats Stewardship Council opposes USFWS's plan to conduct a prescribed burn at the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge. Our opposition rests primarily on two factors: (1) A burn will cause widespread community concern that will not be sufficiently alleviated through any public education process; (2) given that concern, there are other management options USFWS can employ, thereby obviating the need to burn at this time."

The motion was seconded by Joe Cirelli. The motion passed 14-0.

The motion and supporting documentation is found at: http://rockyflatssc.org/USFWS%202015%20burn%20motion%20approved%2010%2027%202014.pdf

Public Comment

There were no comments. Art Burmeister provided a handout from LeRoy Moore to the Board, which will be posted on the website. (LeRoy Moore's comment can be found at: http://rockyflatssc.org/public_comment.html) He also clarified that a recent fire at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal encompassed 280 acres.

DOE Quarterly Update

DOE's activities during the second quarter of 2014 included surface water monitoring, groundwater monitoring, ecological monitoring, and site operations (inspections, maintenance, etc.). All reports are available on the Rocky Flats website.

As background, DOE's focus is detailed in the Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement (RFLMA) and was designed to document that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) remedy continues to be protective. The primary goal is protection of surface water. Response actions were developed under the final remedy in order to meet this goal. The response actions include the following requirements:

- Maintain two landfill covers
- Maintain four groundwater treatment systems
- Surface water and groundwater monitoring
- Physical controls
    - Signage
    - Restricted access

- Institutional controls
    - No building construction or occupation
    - Restrictions on excavation and soil disturbance
    - No consumption or agricultural use of surface water
    - No groundwater wells except for monitoring
- Protection of landfill covers and engineered remedy components

Surface Water – George Squibb
George first showed a map of the monitoring locations onsite. He then summarized quarterly performance monitoring at the Original Landfill (OLF) and Present Landfill (PLF). All sampling results met water quality standards during the quarter.

George next spoke about Point of Compliance (POC) and Point of Evaluation (POE) monitoring. Reportable 12-month rolling average values for americium and plutonium at GS10 were observed during the quarter. All plutonium and americium results since August 2013 have been below the 0.15 pCi/L standard. Additional sampling continues to be conducted downstream of GS10. As of June 30, 2014, uranium was no longer reportable.

At WALPOC, reportable 30-day average values for uranium were first observed during December 2013. As of May 18, 2014, the 30-day average for uranium was no longer reportable. The 12-month rolling average remains below the 16.8 μg/L standard. Additional sampling is being conducted upstream of WALPOC. George noted that it is projected that the 12-month rolling average will approach the standard. It is currently at 6-7 μg/L. October looks like it will be about 17 μg/L. He said RFLMA parties are evaluating this condition.

Groundwater Monitoring -- John Boylan
John began by noting that the second quarter is a heavy quarter in terms of sampling requirements, especially in even numbered years. Sampling during the quarter included all RFLMA groundwater monitoring locations:

- 10 RCRA wells (quarterly)
- 9 AOC wells (semiannually, 2nd and 4th quarters)
- 28 Sentinel wells (semiannually, 2nd and 4th quarters)
- 42 Evaluation wells (biennially, 2nd quarter; by convention, all in even-numbered years)
- Treatment system locations (semiannually, 2nd and 4th quarters)
- 1 Surface Water Support location (semiannually, 2nd and 4th quarters)

He said that one Sentinel well was dry, which was expected for that location.

At the Mound Site Plume Treatment System (MSPTS), TCE (a VOC) was detected at GS10 above the RFLMA level:

- Reported at 2.8 ug/L; RFLMA level is 2.5 ug/L)
- After re-sampling, concentrations were back below RFLMA levels
- Caused by 2013 flood-related groundwater recharge

- More groundwater means higher flow rates
- Higher flow rate means shorter residence time in treatment system
- Shorter residence time limits treatment

Statistical evaluations and discussion of 2nd quarter results will be included in the 2014 annual report.

Non-RFLMA monitoring was also conducted at the treatment systems:

- MSPTS: air stripper, including data to evaluate adjacent French drain
- East Trenches Plume Treatment System (ETPTS): air stripper
- Solar Ponds Plume Treatment System (SPPTS): microcell and lagoon testing

General activities at the treatment systems during the quarter included:

MSPTS Air stripper
- Cleaned pump, nozzles, plumbing
- Maintained ventilation fans
- Sampled

ETPTS Air stripper
- Cleaned & Sampled

SPPTS
- Continued microcell tests
- Continued pilot-scale lagoon tests
- Sampled

John also updated the group on the ETPTS Reconfiguration Project. Bids were solicited and a Notice of Award was issued June 18. This project will convert the system from a treatment using ZVI to one using a commercial air stripper. It will treat water in batches (not run continuously) and will use the existing solar/battery power, with minor additions and revisions. The air stripper will be housed in a small enclosure next to tanks (former treatment cells). It is scheduled to be completed in late CY 2014.

Site Operations -- Jeremiah McLaughlin
Quarterly sign inspections are required as a physical control under RFLMA. All signs were found to be in good condition. At the OLF, three monthly inspections were performed, as well as weekly inspections of areas where recent slumping or cracking had been noted. Eight settlement monuments and seven inclinometers were monitored. No significant cracking was noted within the landfill boundaries during the second quarter. Cracking and slumping were noted on the east side of the East Perimeter Channel, outside of the landfill boundary, and the cracks were filled as required by the M&M Plan. There was also one quarterly inspection of the PLF. Lisa Morzel asked if there has ever been a fire on top of the OLF. Jeremiah said he was not aware of any fires in this location.

Ecology -- Jody Nelson
Second quarter ecology activities included:

- Weed Mapping
- Prairie Dog Surveys (still no prairie dogs on COU)
- Wetland Water-level Surveys
- Wetland Weed Surveys
- Herbicide Applications (~58 acres treated)
- Planted 130 trees/shrubs for habitat enhancement (Rocky Mountain Juniper [30], 4-Wing Saltbush [50], and Skunkbush [50])
- Set up irrigation system for plantings and watered weekly.
- Preparations made for revegetation, Preble's mouse, and wetland monitoring that will occur in the 3rd quarter.

Jody said that herbicides were used for diffuse knapweed and thistles. Mary Fabisiak noted that an area that burned in 2006 in the northeast corner of the site was some of the best grassland onsite and asked what it was like now. Jody said that because that was part of the refuge, he had not been out there in a long time.

Briefing/Discussion on Groundwater at Rocky Flats – Treatment Systems

As part of the Board's ongoing study of groundwater issues at Rocky Flats, John Boylan discussed the four groundwater treatment systems. He began with a quick summary of the two previous Board presentations related to groundwater. Part One covered the geology and science of groundwater at Rocky Flats. It explained why groundwater is monitored in order to watch for threats to surface water. Part Two reviewed the development and design of the site groundwater monitoring network, and began a discussion of groundwater treatment systems.

For this briefing, John went into more detail about the four groundwater treatment systems that were installed at Rocky Flats as long term stewardship remedies. Treatment systems in the Corrective Action Decision/Record of Decision for Rocky Flats (CAD/ROD) were originally designed to reduce contaminant load reaching surface water. RFLMA has more stringent requirements (effluent compared with Table 1 standards). These requirements and the CERCLA 5-year review process drive continuing efforts to improve the treatment systems.

Treatment system locations were dictated by the detection of contaminated groundwater at or near surface water and fed by a source area. Analytical data and modeling showed systems would be appropriate at four locations:

Present Landfill Treatment System (PLFTS)

- Designed to treat very low levels of VOCs by cascade aeration

Mound Site Plume Treatment System (MSPTS)

- Former Seep SW059

- Designed to treat VOCs by passing water through ZVI

East Trenches Plume Treatment System (ETPTS)

- Designed to treat VOCs by passing water through ZVI

Solar Ponds Plume Treatment System (SPPTS)

- Designed to treat nitrate and uranium by passing water through sawdust and ZVI

Each system includes a groundwater intercept component. Except for PLFTS, all systems have received upgrades since closure. Each system treats very low flows of water (0.75 – 1.5 gpm). In comparison, a garden hose on 'full blast' is approximately 10 gpm and the recommended minimum flow rate for a household-supply spring or well is typically at least 5 to 6 gpm. All four treatment systems combined contribute less than 5% of the average flow measured at WALPOC.

The Present Landfill (PLF) occupies the 'headwaters' of No Name Gulch. A seep developed on the east face of PLF. The Groundwater Intercept System (GWIS) intercepts groundwater flowing toward PLF. Water from the GWIS and seep enters the Present Landfill Treatment System (PLFTS). This system was designed to treat very low levels of VOCs via cascade aeration (concrete steps). It is a very simple, gravity-driven, minimal maintenance system.

The Mound, East Trenches and Solar Ponds treatment systems (MSPTS, ETPTS, and SPPTS) are similar to one another. In these systems, groundwater intercept trenches feed collected water to treatment cells, where the treated effluent is discharged to the subsurface. John recapped the history, performance and series of upgrades to each of these three systems.

At the MSPTS, after numerous wells were installed to define groundwater contamination, the treatment system was installed in 1998. The system is comprised of a 220-foot-long groundwater intercept trench and two ZVI-filled treatment cells. In 2005, groundwater flow from Oil Burn Pit #2 was routed to MSPTS, which increased flows and contaminant loads. As a result, residence times and treatment effectiveness decreased. The ZVI media has been replaced twice since closure (2006, 2011) and air stripping was added to 'polish' the effluent water quality. Air stripping was tested in 2010–2011, a prototype was installed in 2011, and a larger-scale unit was installed in 2013. The result was a significant reduction in recalcitrant VOCs in the system effluent.

At the East Trenches, contaminated groundwater was produced in wells along South Walnut Creek drainage, and VOCs were detected in surface water during the pre-closure period**.** Numerous wells were installed to define groundwater contamination. In 1999, the ETPTS was installed to intercept and treat the East Trenches Plume as it migrates towards the creek**.** This system includes a 1,200-foot-long groundwater intercept trench and two ZVI-filled treatment cells**.** The ZVI media has been changed several times (approximately every three to four years)**.** In 2013, air stripping (based on the MSPTS prototype) was added to reduce influent contaminant concentrations. Currently, the site is reconfiguring the ETPTS to treat water more effectively using a commercial air stripper.

The Solar Ponds plume required a more complex system, and is a much more complex story. During the pre-closure period, seeps and wells on the hillside and in the North Walnut Creek drainage produced contaminated groundwater. Nitrate from the former Solar Evaporation Ponds (SEPs) was detected in surface water. Six intercept trenches were installed in the early 1970s to collect seepage and shallow groundwater. An Interceptor Trench System (ITS) was completed in 1981. This system encompassed approximately 2 miles of French drains to intercept and collect shallow groundwater. Collected water was drained to a sump and then routed for disposition. Numerous wells were installed to define groundwater contamination. Nitrate contamination was reaching the valley bottom. Uranium was more localized in the area of the SEPs. VOCs were present on the western side of SEPs.

The SPPTS was installed in 1999 to intercept and treat the Solar Ponds Plume as groundwater migrates toward the creek. This system included an 1,100-foot-long groundwater intercept trench that intercepted the ITS. Collected water was routed through two cells. The first cell contained sawdust with 10% ZVI and the second contained ZVI with gravel. Treated effluent was routed back into the downgradient portion of ITS, ultimately to the subsurface Discharge Gallery. The original design required water to build up in the trench. The result was episodic flow, including long periods of no flow. In 2002, a collection well was installed and equipped with solar-powered pump.

Treatment system flows increased after the pump was installed and effluent data confirmed satisfactory treatment. Water from the vicinity of the Discharge Gallery contained higher concentrations of contaminants than untreated influent. Through the CAD/ROD there was regulatory acceptance for conditions as they existed. Cell 2 clogged in early 2005 (pre-closure) and the media (ZVI with pea gravel) was replaced. Site closure was in late 2005. Rocky Flats had a Temporary Modification through 2009 for the nitrate standard in North Walnut Creek (100 mg/L).

In 2006, after costly repairs, the site began investigating design improvements for the SPPTS. Treatability studies were conducted in 2006 and 2007. In 2008, the site began laboratory and bench-scale tests of different treatment components and approaches.

Phased upgrades were conceived in 2008.

Phase I: Collect, treat more of the contaminated groundwater

- Water quality at Discharge Gallery showed a portion of the plume was not being intercepted

Phase II: Install new uranium treatment cell

- Easily accessible
- First in treatment train, so nitrate treatment media would not be potentially contaminated

Phase III: Install pilot-scale treatment cells and operate pilot studies to identify more efficient method of nitrate treatment

Phase IV: Install full-scale nitrate treatment component based on previous testing and results

Throughout these phases, the site continued to try new approaches to come up with better treatment results.

John reviewed the potential path forward for uranium and nitrate treatment at SPPTS:

Microcells for uranium treatment

- Continue testing to determine optimal treatment media for raw influent
- Testing microcells using lagoon effluent
    - May require effluent polishing (settling, filtration, sterilization) to reduce clogging
    - May require different media design
- Results drive design of uranium treatment component
    - How many microcells, what size, what media, effective lifetime….

Lagoons for nitrate treatment

- Continue testing to determine response to cold weather, suitable controls
- Provide effluent to test with downstream uranium-treating microcells
- Results drive design of nitrate treatment component

The anticipated timing of installed full-scale components is 2016.

In conclusion, John noted several overall concepts related to groundwater treatment at Rocky Flats.

- The CERCLA process requires consideration of new technologies
- RFLMA requires that effluent meet Table 1 levels
- Adjustments to systems are the result of several factors, such as:
    - RFLMA requirements more stringent than original treatment objectives
    - CERCLA 5-year review process
    - Need for environmentally-sensitive, cost-effective, efficient systems
    - Requirements for maintenance and spent media disposition
- PLFTS is very simple, influent has very little load
- MSPTS and ETPTS are more complex
    - Greater influent contaminant loads than PLFTS
    - Both now incorporate air stripping
    - ETPTS undergoing additional reconfiguration right now
- SPPTS is complex
    - Partly due to history, setting
    - Undergoing lengthy testing to support ultimate reconfiguration
- Adjustments can be expected to continue, episodically
- Updates will be provided in quarterly and annual reports, and in presentations to RFSC

Tim Plass asked about the lifespan of VOCs. John said they naturally degrade through minerals and bacteria in the ground. The rate at which they degrade depends on many factors and is location-specific. Tim also asked about the cost and lifespan of the ETPTS air stripper. Linda Kaiser said that it cost about $600K. In terms of expected lifespan, they have lasted multiple decades at other sites.

Mary Fabisiak asked about the life expectancy of the liner in the intercept trenches. Scott said the manufacturer says they will last 30 years; however, that is based on the material being exposed to elements. Because it is underground, he said it should last longer in the trenches. She asked if they are able to inspect these materials. Scott said they could not, but they can tell based on flow rates and water levels whether the barrier has been breached. Sandra asked if there were cleanouts. Scott said there are.

Tim asked John for his current assessment of the treatment system technology. John said that they were using mature technologies, but the overall success will depend on data once everything is installed. They will know much more in a year or two. Scott noted that plans for ZVI treating solvents at ETPTS and MSPTS were based on tests using lab groundwater, not Rocky Flats groundwater. They saw right away that these systems were not going to be what they were hoping for in terms of being low maintenance. The technology for these two systems is now on point. At the SPPTS, they are dealing with two competing contaminants, nitrate and uranium. Nitrate interferes with uranium treatment. He said that they still have a little while to go in terms of optimizing this treatment, but it is looking a lot more promising than it was a few years ago. Scott said that the bottom line is that water quality is still good. Mary asked if there were any opportunities to inject oxidants into source areas. John said that while they looked at this option, the areas were not readily accessible and thousands of holes would be needed, making it not practical.

Board Approval of 2015 Work Plan

The Board reviewed the 2015 Work Plan at its September meeting. A few small changes were noted in the version provided in the Board packet. There were no questions or comments.

Jeannette Hillery moved to approve the 2015 work plan. The motion was seconded by Roman Kohler. The motion passed 14-0.

Board Approval of 2015 Budget

The Board also reviewed the draft budget at its September meeting. No changes were offered. David pointed out a new column in the budget based on a Board request to highlight 'over-budgeted' items.

The Board's attorney Barb Vander Wall explained the required budget review process. Because the Board was created as a political subdivision and is a unit of local government, it must adhere to state budget statutes. Prior to finalizing the budget, the Board must provide public notice, hold

a budget hearing and allow time for public comment. Following the public hearing, the Board must approve the budget resolution. This must occur before the end of each year. She also noted that after the budget is approved, it is filed with the State by the end of the year

Chair Joyce Downing officially opened the budget hearing at 10:55 a.m. There were no comments from the audience. The Chair then closed the budget hearing at 10:56 a.m. There were no comments from Board members.

Joyce Downing moved to approve the 2015 budget. The motion was seconded by Lisa Morzel. The motion passed 14-0.

Public Comment

Anne Fenerty stated that she would like to thank the Stewardship Council for not automatically endorsing the plans for a prescribed burn at Rocky Flats. She said she was speaking for her friend Jon Lipsky, who could not be at the meeting. He asked her to refute some comments from last Stewardship Council meeting. She said he disagreed with David Abelson's assessment of the event in June commemorating the raid on Rocky Flats. She handed out copies of his detailed remarks, and asked that his comments be posted on the website. (Jon Lispky's comment can be found at http://rockyflatssc.org/public_comment.html)

Updates/Big Picture Review

February 2, 2015

Potential Business Items

- Elect 2015 officers
- Adopt resolution re: 2015 meeting dates

Potential Briefing Items

- DOE quarterly update
- Proposed prescribed fire at Rocky Flats
- Begin identifying goals for Rocky Flats visitor's center

April 6, 2015

Potential Business Items

- TBD

Potential Briefing Items

- Continue discussing proposed prescribed fire at Rocky Flats
- Finalize goals for Rocky Flats visitor's center

David Abelson noted that Scott Surovchak developed a pictorial history of Rocky Flats a few years ago, and suggested that this may be a good time for the Board to revisit this information.

Member Updates

Joe Cirelli said he would report on any changes resulting from the upcoming election. Laura Weinberg said that Golden passed a resolution to continue as a member of Stewardship Council. Faye Griffin reminded everyone to get their ballots in. Murph Widdowfield reported that representatives from the Rocky Flats Institute and Museum gave presentations for several groups, including the Colorado School of Mines, University of Denver and Regis University. He also mentioned the upcoming Colorado Gives Day on Dec. 9. Donations could be accepted via the Museum website or Colorado Gives website, and matching funds would be provided through sponsors. He also mentioned an upcoming four-day bus tour, which included a visit to the Trinity site, which is only open once per year. He said that the Museum has many good presenters if anyone would like them to speak to a group. Lisa Morzel suggested re-introducing the Stewardship Council to the new and returning crop of U.S. Senators and Representatives. She also noted that Boulder was recently funded to do a study in Yellowstone, pertaining mercury and other toxic metals in fish.

At 11:15 a.m. Joyce made a motion to move into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel issues, and to receive legal advice on such issues, as authorized under Sections 24-6-402(4)(b) and (f), C.R.S. Joe Cirelli seconded the motion. The motion passed 14-0.

The Board reconvened from Executive Session at 11:33 a.m. and affirmed that no actions had been taken during Executive Session.

Bob Briggs noted that the Board had not recently discussed the usefulness of the Executive Committee meetings and process. Joyce said she thought it was working well. Lisa Morzel said the process has helped the Board work better, and that she would love to see more people attend. Jeannette Hillery said that the Executive Committee gets a lot accomplished. David Abelson clarified that serving on the Executive Committee is not a big time commitment.

Issues to watch:

- Americium, plutonium and uranium levels upstream of pond B-3 and U levels at WALPOC
- AMP sampling
- Original landfill

The meeting was adjourned at 11:48 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.