

**Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board
Minutes - June 2, 1994**

Facilitator: Ginger Swartz

- Meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.
- Ginger Swartz introduced Rich Aiken from DOE headquarters; and Deb Thompson, new executive assistant for CAB.

Liquid Stabilization Briefing:

- Presented by Carl Sykes, DOE Rocky Flats Office, Liquid Stabilization Program.

Question and Answer Period to Liquid Stabilization Briefing:

Question: Was there some reason for storing in such small containers?

Answer: Concentrations vary widely.

Question: You have 8,000 gallons of liquid and 100 pounds of plutonium, or 100 pounds of contaminants?

Answer: 100 kgs. of plutonium.

Question: What percentage is low-level, and what is high-level?

Answer: 80% low-level, 20% high-level.

Question: You're going to precipitate this out with sodium hydroxide or sodium chloride?

Answer: Only a small percentage.

Question: Is there enough of the low-level to mix and make the split closer to 90/10 or 95/5?

Answer: We're looking at the potential for doing that now.

Question: The cleanup agreement is being negotiated, the goal to agree upon something by September. At roughly \$2 million per day operating costs, is there some way to get through this sooner?

Answer: That figure is for entire site operations, but for the stabilization program it's approximately \$17 million per year. But if we do this operation safely, that's what the money is being spent on.

Comment: Beth Brainard offered to do a presentation for the CAB on the budget at the site.

Question: Why wasn't evaporation mentioned as a viable process?
Answer: We wanted to keep it simple, in a small-scale operation, and there are some questions on evaporation where you get plutonium in very high concentrations.

Question: Why is that different than precipitating it out?
Answer: Precipitating it out would mean doing it in slow batches. But evaporation is one step in the liquid stabilization process.

Question: What form is the plutonium oxide in?
Answer: Granule or powder.

Question: How do you handle a powder form of plutonium?
Answer: It's not like talcum, more like granules. There is a filter on the furnace, and studies show that less than .1% become airborne. Plus the glovebox is equipped with a filter, and beyond that there are four more stages of filtering.

Question: What is the timeline for a NEPA decision for those activities for which the 1980 Sitewide EIS could not be used? And are you looking at a separate EA/EIS or will you roll that into the upcoming sitewide EIS?

Answer: The sitewide EIS is scheduled to be completed in 1996 timeframe, and we hope to be performing this precipitation long before that.

Question: What are the NEPA issues associated with Building 771?
Answer: Under NEPA, all activities must consider environmental effects. This is a slightly different process, and we need to evaluate it and see if there are substantial changes to the environmental impact. This is a safer process for the workers, and the impact should be less than what was analyzed in the 1980 Sitewide EIS. But the intent is different. We wanted to get the public's view to see if an EA is warranted even though it's not technically required.

Question: When will the decision be made, and who will make it?
Answer: DOE is the agency to make that determination, and the decision should be made as soon as possible in the event an EA is warranted.

Comment: The precipitation technology has been in use for 50 years. The issue here is that we would like to know if there will need to be an EA done up front, rather than once the work has been started.

Comment: The technical expertise should exist in-house to decide if an EA is warranted. Then bring it before the CAB. The CAB is not a body to give technical advice.

Comment: It may be technically be okay to go ahead with the process, but DOE needs to know how the public feels before going ahead.

Comment: Suggest a re-evaluation of the 1980 Sitewide EIS to look this issue, and do a shortened version of the EA.

Comment: Suggest a meeting with the Environmental Management Committee to discuss technical portions, but also meet with Sitewide Issues Committee regarding EAVEIS issues. Suggest Environmental Management Committee visit the site for clarification.

- Beth Brainard agreed to help arrange site visit with Environmental Management Committee.

Question: What was discovered during the EA process on thermal stabilization in Building 707?

Answer: There was a Finding of No Significant Impact.

Comment: DOE would rather jump through the hoops than stop the process once it's started.

Question: There was a plantwide EIS in 1980 - has there been anything in addition for 771 only since then?

Answer: No other analysis has been done.

Question: What was the last time the precipitation equipment used, and what kind of condition is it in?

Answer: Environmental Management Committee will be able to see that during site visit.

Question: The reason this issue came up is because, with building 371, it wasn't really covered in the 1980 Sitewide EIS, and the building 771 process has been changed, so doesn't it seem that an EA should be done?

Answer: You can't predict forever what will come up, so under NEPA regulations if you make a change you have to make a judgment as to whether you are significantly changing the impact.

Comment: Suggest the discussion be deferred to Environmental Management Committee for its site visit.

- After the Q&A/Public Comment session, Ginger Swartz introduced Linda Murakami, new chair of the CAB; and introduced Nancy Porter, executive assistant for CCRF attending her last meeting, and formally thanked her for her efforts.

Standley Lake Protection Project:

- Report to the group on action taken, presented by Chuck Clark.
 - Some questions were raised regarding the levels of plutonium in the Standley Lake area, and the cleanup process's possible effect on the wetlands area.

Brainstorm of Values for the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement:

- Values decided on by CAB:
 - Trust
 - Jobs
 - Power sharing
 - Permanent storage
 - Accountability
 - Public solicited regularly
 - Feedback loop simplified and audience specific
 - Utilize knowledge of workers (existing)
 - Information open and accessible
 - People and process are accessible
 - Make money and timeline information available to public
 - Eliminate redundancies - do real cleanup
 - Pu management
 - Local options
 - Start real cleanup
 - Work efficiently and economically
- Chuck Clark requested that the Environmental Management Committee and Sitewide Issues Committee also request their members to prioritize guidelines on issues and values for CAB.

Agenda for next meeting, July 7:

- Pu Storage/Safety - Vulnerability Assessment
- Committee Reports (request that committee chairs get reports in to the office at least one week prior to 7/7 meeting so reports may be distributed with agenda)
- Retreat
- Meet the Staff
- Sitewide Committee to include briefing on draft RFP

PUBLIC PORTION OF MEETING ADJOURNED.

* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.

Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board
Minutes of Executive Session
June 2, 1994

Executive Committee Report:

- Executive Committee suggests that Board accept Operational Procedures as drafted in March (there will be an expansion of the role of the Executive Committee added to the Operational Procedures).

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

- Discussion of absentee policy - will be enforced as stated in bylaws from 6/2/94 meeting forward. Board members may miss no more than three consecutive meetings, or a total of four (within one year).
- Executive Committee suggests that Board offer facilitator contract to Reed Hodgins.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

- Executive Committee noted that after this meeting, it will assume duties of ad-hoc Personnel & Budget Committee.

Budget and Personnel Update:

- Personnel and Budget Committee recommends that Board offer:
 - Project Administrator position to Lisa Hanson;
 - Program Coordinator position to Ken Korkia; and
 - Outreach Coordinator position to Erin Rogers.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Meeting Adjourned.