

Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments Board Retreat Notes
Friday, December 1, 2000
8:00 – 12:00 a.m.
Mt. Evans Room in the Terminal Building
Jefferson County Airport, Broomfield

Board members in attendance: Michelle Lawrence (Director, Jefferson County), Nanette Neelan (Alternate, Jefferson County), Tom Brunner (Director, Broomfield), Hank Stovall (Alternate, Broomfield), Mike Bartleson (Alternate, Broomfield), Sam Dixon (Director, Westminster), Mary Harlow (Alternate, Westminster), Ken Fellman (Director, Arvada), Carol Lyons (Alternate, Arvada), Paul Danish (Director, Boulder County), Carolyn Dulchinos (Alternate, Boulder County), Lisa Morzel (Director, City of Boulder), Amy Mueller (Alternate, City of Boulder), Mike Weil (Alternate, City of Boulder), Andrew Muckle (Director, Superior).

*Arrived/Departed at time indicated

Coalition staff members and consultants in attendance: David Abelson (Executive Director), John Marler (Technical Advisor), Kimberly Chleboun (Program Assistant)

Members of the Public: John Corsi (Kaiser-Hill), Dave Shelton (Kaiser-Hill), Jeremy Karpatkin (DOE), Kristi Pollard (Senator Allard), Pete Jacobson (Senator Allard), Doug Young (Congressman Udall), Doris DePenning (Friends of the Foothills), Hildegard Hix (Sierra Club).

Round Robin and Goals for Retreat

Sam Dixon – wants the Coalition to issue more statements and make a public stance on positions, work on water quality protection, long-term stewardship and final cleanup levels. Suggested round robin at end of meeting instead of beginning.

Mary Harlow – wants vision of end-state to guide decisions.

Tom Brunner – wants to be on forefront of issues and work with ECA on policy issues to lobby in Washington DC.

Hank Stovall – wants to set priorities on issues like D&D, cleanup levels, worker safety. Work with Congressional delegation. Urged members to attend RFCA Focus Group meetings.

Paul Danish – wants to pass Allard-Udall bill and maintain integrity of bill, don't let land use creep into it.

Closure and Allard-Udall Bill

Arvada - Ken Fellman:

- Open space with limited public access (ex-trails)
- Small portion close in proximity for transportation corridor, subject to clean property
- No large, overbearing fences that give a bad impression

Superior – Andrew Muckle

- No imposing fences
- Minimal amount of engineered barriers

City of Boulder – Lisa Morzel and Amy Mueller

- Quick passage of Allard-Udall bill with current language

Westminster – Sam Dixon

- Pass Allard-Udall bill in current form
- Protect water quality
- Minimize caps and restricted areas
- Minimize institutional controls and engineered controls (thus reduced monitoring)
- Keep ponds – they work well for settling contaminants
- Use appropriate wildlife fencing with low visibility (ex- split rail or mesh)

Broomfield – Tom Brunner

- Minimize structures left in place, including foundations
- Keep property open for greater good
- Support a transportation corridor as it will be necessary

Hank Stovall

- Protect water quality, including maintaining 0.15 pCi/L, ponds work well
- Minimize engineered barriers
- Support transportation corridor of 150' easement
- Support Allard-Udall bill w/ protection of water rights
- Support unobtrusive perimeter barrier
- Support public access for wildlife viewing – may need interior fencing
- Minimize restricted uses

Boulder County – Paul Danish

- Site truly be closed
- Passage of Allard-Udall bill, continuing wildlife habitat
- No roads to break up refuge
- Public access would be incompatible with the refuge and cleanup uncertainties
- Fence/barrier would be necessary, can be unobtrusive (ex-barbed wire)
- Do not reopen to any government uses

- Prioritize cleanup (ex-water quality, then air quality...remember other hazardous materials)

Jefferson County – Michelle Lawrence

- Protect surface water quality from all contaminants
- Support Allard-Udall bill
- Keep transportation options open (widen Indiana if necessary) and let process (ex-NEPA) work when appropriate
- Support public process for wildlife management
- Urge highest cleanup within reason
- Advocate worker and citizen safety
- Support attractive, but strong, fence
- Advocate public access if practical and feasible

David Abelson went over the following areas of agreement:

- Minimize controls (although there will be some necessary).
 - ie- minimize contamination, and controls so that if the controls fail the risk faced will be less.
- Support Allard-Udall bill
 - Refine water rights
 - Define transportation corridor
- Support best cleanup possible – minimize restricted areas
- Support unobtrusive fences
- Ensure water quality protection
 - How? ie – ponds, engineered barriers

The group agreed the following would need to be addressed:

- Foundations/infrastructure left in place and subsurface contamination
- Mineral rights and other natural resource rights
- Minimal radioactive footprint
- Post-closure contingency planning (as part of long-term stewardship)

Steps forward:

- Address long-term water quality protection and devise a position the Board can promote
- Allard-Udall bill: decide on water rights language (Broomfield) and transportation corridor option (150' vs. 300' and Indiana vs. Section 13)
 - David and staff research and provide Board transportation corridor information
 - Decide on issue at January meeting

Workforce Issues

The Board listed the following suggestions as worker issues that should be addressed:

- Good worker retention

- Worker morale
- Consensus on issues for the lobbying trip
- Health benefits for all workers
- Early retirement packages
- Early retirement language
- Incentives to help/work towards closure
- Worker transition
- Worker safety
- Research Kaiser-Hill performance bonus and workforce restructuring
- Work with DOE, Congress, etc. to bridge benefits appropriately (review feasibility)

Steps forward:

- David and staff research and present worker information at future meeting
- Reign-in issues and narrow focus

Coalition Process Issues

The Board suggested the following process procedures:

- Move Round Robin to the end of the Board meeting
- Directing staff projects:
 - If four groups want to discuss/work on an issue, appropriate to move forward
 - Consensus vs. majority
 - If a minority, a limited amount of time should be spent
- Avoid duplication of staff work
- Add staff/Coalition recommendations to the Board Consent Agenda
- Trust the staff to do their job