

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION

January 2, 1997

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Tom Marshall called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Alan Aluisi, Jan Burda, Tom Clark, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Tom Gallegos, Paul Grogger, Mary Harlow, Victor Holm, Sasa Jovic, Jim Kinsinger, Beverly Lyne, Tom Marshall, David Navarro, Gary Thompson / Jeremy Karpatkin, Steve Tarlton

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Susan Johnson, Linda Murakami, Todd Saliman / Frazer Lockhart, Tim Rehder

PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT: Kenneth Werth (citizen); Larry Helmerick (DOE); Kim Seebaum (citizen); Jim Stone (RFCC); John Schneider (DOE); Russell McCallister (DOE); Bob Kanick (citizen); James Horan (citizen); Jack Hoopes (K-H); Rick Warner (citizen); Robert Ukeiley (citizen); Robert Scheck (citizen); Gretchen Williams (citizen); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Erin Rogers (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: No comments were received.

BRIEFING ON CAB PARTICIPATION IN DOE FY 99 BUDGET AND PLANNING (John Schneider, DOE-RFFO): John gave an overview of DOE's plans for participation in the FY 99 budget process. A focus group will be convened as a subcommittee of the Site Wide Issues Committee, and will include any interested CAB members and other stakeholders, to ensure there is participation in the process of developing a budget for the Rocky Flats site. During prior budget development, the budget had been developed, then released for public comment and review prior to submission to DOE-HQ. DOE now has a more iterative process for next year's budget, which will be more simplified and involve complete life cycle planning, i.e., develop a budget and scope based on what funding will be required for specific projects from now until the job is completed. A comprehensive list of documentation has been prepared, which will aid those participating in evaluating budgetary needs. This documentation includes a work breakdown structure, assumptions, prioritization methodology, a site priority list, and life

cycle work descriptions such as draft Ten Year Plans, project baseline summaries and work planning documents. Following are some of the key schedule deadlines: documents for review will be developed January 15 through February 28; FY 99 budget formulation guidance issued March 31; 45-day public comment period for EM and site Ten Year Plans March 31 through May 15; national stakeholder meeting on FY 99 budget will be held May 30; FY 99 budget request delivered to DOE-HQ on June 16; and finally the FY 99 budget will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget on September 1.

Q&A Session:

Question: Jim Stone: Where was the mortgage factored into this budget?

Answer: John Schneider: The work planning documents encompass the entire work at the site, including all base activities and projects. All the detail for base work is in those documents.

Question: Jim Stone: That accounts for around \$6 billion over the course of the Ten Year Plan. What happened to the difference between that and the \$22 billion that was allocated, then reduced further to \$10 billion?

Answer: John Schneider: Rethinking some of the methods for how we do our jobs and meet our objectives, acceleration of projects. When you reduce the amount of time it takes to complete projects, you can reduce the costs. Staffing levels may also be reduced.

Question: Jim Stone: What figure will the contractor's fee be based on?

Answer: John Schneider: The fee is based on a negotiated contract value for the year, at a percentage of that. That is broken into pieces, the performance portion and the base element.

Question: Tom Marshall: In your schedule, it indicates the Ten Year Plan will be driven by budget figures that Headquarters has given. Was the previous iteration of the Ten Year Plan driven by a budget figure?

Answer: John Schneider: ASAP was not driven by a budget figure. For the July 30 version of ASAP, we assumed a dollar cap of \$600 million. The scenarios we're discussing would essentially change the dollar cap.

Question: Tom Marshall: So you will be assuming flat funding of either \$523 million or \$568 million for some period of time?

Answer: John Schneider: Yes, until we don't need that any more.

Question: Tom Marshall: You're in the process right now of developing the Ten Year Plan; it hasn't been approved. Do you see any problems because of that in the coming year, with developing the FY 99 budget?

Answer: John Schneider: It's not that we don't have a Ten Year Plan; many portions of the plan released last summer will not change substantially. We continue to build on the data base, keeping parts that work and improving cost estimates. The same model will be used. If any assumptions need to be changed, we will make adjustments.

Comment: Steve Tarlton: The flat funding in the Ten Year Plan was \$650 million per year, and that was also the number that was validated as the amount that would allow the site to accomplish RFCA.

Question: Kenneth Werth: I keep hearing this Ten Year Plan of assumptions. Assumptions don't mean a thing to me. How can you base the Ten Year Plan on assumptions when there are no facts to back it up? I get monthly reports from WIPP, and they're having a hard time convincing citizens that it's going to be a good place to dump nuclear waste. We're going to have to keep the waste here.

Answer: John Schneider: There are two things in the assumption list. Part are things we know, such as that we will ship low-level waste to the Nevada Test Site. It's a fact, we do that now. Other assumptions, such as shipping to WIPP, have to be in place for planning purposes. The assumption list attempts to discover how long things will take, how much it will cost, and how difficult it will be. Also, we have developed action plans, or issue papers, that address how we arrived at some of the assumptions.

Question: Victor Holm: If one or more of the assumptions aren't borne out, and there is a significant savings or cost overrun, what would drive it? Would the Ten Year Plan and the budget ultimately increase, or would the \$600 million still drive it?

Answer: John Schneider: It depends on the issue. As part of the planning process, we're trying to document those assumptions and make sure there's a clear understanding on future assumptions. The first reaction probably would be, can it still remain within our dollar ceiling? If we can't, we would go back to Headquarters. As assumptions change, we will have to re-evaluate the impact.

Comment: Jeremy Karpatkin: There's a scarce amount of money each year that the sites compete for. In the event there were an unexpected windfall, how the site would or would not keep that money would depend in part on how vocal this community and its elected officials are in making the case.

Comment: David Navarro: I would recommend to think about a new verbiage for the Ten Year Plan, because regardless of the amount of funding, after ten years you'd fold up and pull out. You want to be cautious and make sure it's not perceived that way.

Response: John Schneider: Your comment is well taken, that gets talked about a lot.

Question: Jim Stone: What is the time frame for freezing all considerations for alternatives? It looks like March or April.

Answer: John Schneider: I don't believe if an alternative comes in that's better, it will be frozen out. In this documentation there is a time frame, probably mid-summer, when the statement of what our strategy is will be captured. But future alternatives that are better will certainly be considered.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT (Beverly Lyne): The Board discussed last spring's Community Needs Assessment (CNA), conducted by the University of Colorado School of Nursing and Jefferson County Department of Health and Environment. Specifically, Board members were asked to consider which findings of the CNA should be brought to CAB as recommendations, whether any of the findings merit further study, and how to use the process in other areas of study.

Decision: *Health Committee to review findings of Community Needs Assessment and develop any recommendations for the Board's review and approval at a future meeting.*
APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

PRESENTATION ON CAB INTERNSHIP WORK (Linda Campbell): Linda gave a presentation on her work with the Health Committee on developing a literature review and summary of documents. Linda served as an intern for the committee, which asked her to review around 80 publications regarding the health effects of ionizing radiation. The summary she prepared addressed the phenomena of radioactivity and ionizing radiation, health effects of low-dose ionizing radiation, and methodological considerations for future research. There were three primary findings: 1) despite thousands of studies, there has been failure to achieve consensus on the health implications of low-dose ionizing radiation; 2) past research methodologies have had significant limitations; and 3) there is a lack of research on human dimension questions associated with the phenomenon of ionizing radiation. Several recommendations came out of the literature review, including: a workshop to develop criteria for a community-based risk study, followed by a pilot test of such a study; additional epidemiological research; and community participation in planning, research, implementation and evaluation.

Q&A Session:

Question: Steve Tarlton: Regarding consensus, you're saying there is not a consensus in the scientific community?

Answer: Linda Campbell: Based on all articles reviewed, there are certain segments within the scientific community where consensus has been achieved, but there is another segment who completely disagree.

Question: David Navarro: You did research some of the worker studies?

Answer: Linda Campbell: One limitation with worker studies is that they are primarily retrospective. There is a five-year prospective study going on now at the site.

Question: David Navarro: Was the parameter for this research just ionizing radiation, and not looking at the synergistic effects of both radiation and the chemical hazards at the site?

Answer: Linda Campbell: Yes, that would require composite studies, and that was not part of the scope of my work.

Question: David Navarro: Are you aware of any composite studies done by others in the past?

Answer: Linda Campbell: No.

Question: Bob Kanick: Is the more detailed summary available for review?

Answer: Linda Campbell: Yes, it's at the CAB office.

Comment: Tom Marshall: The recommendations are good, but citizens worked for a long time to get DOE out of the business of doing health studies; it would be wise to put distance between DOE and these studies for the sake of credibility.

Question: Tom Marshall: On recommendation number three, talking about a community-based risk study, could you describe your thinking?

Answer: Beverly Lyne: The idea is to find another way to look at risk without using risk assessment numbers.

Question: Eugene DeMayo: Did you find any studies that looked at health effects on generations after the exposure?

Answer: Linda Campbell: Yes, that's in the atomic bomb section, where they looked at

kids in Nagasaki, at intrauterine growth retardation for mothers who were exposed in-utero, and followed the kids into their school age years. They were scored to see how they were doing, and there were some significant findings for poor school performance.

Comment: Victor Holm: I'd like to commend you because I found the study very useful. I hope we can make some arrangement with CAB to continue this work. Someone should go through and computerize the annotation sheets in a data base so they can be cross-referenced. I've had trouble finding a lot of these publications in the Denver area, and to have them copied and in one place is helpful.

Response: Linda Campbell: The government has done a tremendous job of computerizing data, there is a catalog of some 200,000 documents.

Question: Jeremy Karpatkin: In looking over the key findings, the conclusion I draw is that a lot of work has to be done on a national and international basis to get us closer to the truth. The recommendations four through seven, if considered on a national basis for the government, seem to logically flow from that. Recommendations one through three do not seem to logically address the conclusion you drew about the flaws of the existing research.

Answer: Linda Campbell: One thing was that the work I did was also to help support or detract from the Community Needs Assessment. Those first three were more directly related to the Community Needs Assessment.

Comment: Steve Tarlton: The documents from HAP are in the CDPHE reading room. That reading room is catalogued on the CARL system, which is available through the internet. Also, the item on research of human dimension questions, we can't yet tell whether or not low-level radiation has a measurable health impact. That's what we have to figure out before we can deal with the issue of whether or not people are too worried about it.

Comment: David Navarro: As a worker at the plant for 26 years, I've seen my dose records change, going up and down from contractor to contractor, by process or the way that the contractors or DOE viewed the methodology. I'm not comfortable with knowing that I've got a true historical perspective of what I've been exposed to.

Response: Linda Campbell: It's less about your personal health effect than your perception. That's the human dimension questions that were studied.

Comment: Mary Harlow: There's a bigger issue, with our Soil Action Levels, because no one knows exactly what a safe dose exposure is. Maybe it would be appropriate for the School of Nursing and/or CAB to write a letter to the National Academy of Sciences with

a copy of our findings, and ask for some national information available to citizens to help determine what is safe and what is not.

Comment: Beverly Lyne: One of the key problems is that the basic data is scrambled. That's been the foundation of my questioning how we do risk analysis.

Comment: Alan Aluisi: You need to look at a national, high visibility study like the NCI study, which was a 30-year, 10 million population study. That study showed in geographic plotting that incident peaks of radiogenic diseases occurred in the agricultural belt, because of pesticides, and incident deficits occurred in the highest naturally occurring radiation areas. I hope we will not assume that radiogenic cannot be caused by other sources.

Comment: Steve Tarlton: Right now, two of the best places we have to get continuing data on incidences is the birth defects registry and the cancer registry. Those aren't funded very well, and the legislature this spring will once again take up whether to provide funding for the birth defects registry. Last year it was turned down. If you're interested, you might want to look a little closer to home and see if Colorado is willing to fund studies, not just DOE.

HEALTH COMMITTEE PROPOSAL TO APPLY FOR CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL GRANT (Beverly Lyne): CAB's Health Committee is considering developing a grant proposal to the Centers for Disease Control. About \$300,000 is available to develop community education and training to address environmental health research near DOE nuclear weapons facilities. The committee suggests submitting a grant application, which would propose developing and pilot testing a training package methodology on how to conduct a community health needs assessment at DOE nuclear weapons facility sites. Since the grant application is due January 13, the committee will prepare and submit the grant proposal by the deadline, subject to approval by the Executive Committee.

Decision: *Approve the Health Committee's development of a grant proposal. The proposal must be reviewed by the Executive Committee prior to submission, and the committee must return at next month's Board meeting with the final grant proposal for the Board to review. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.*

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Comment: Kenneth Werth: On the grant, you might want to work with Colorado State University, Dr. Whicker. Some of his students could do a needs assessment on what it's going to entail for Rocky Flats.

Response: Beverly Lyne: But he's not in needs assessment, more monitoring. Community health nurses do needs assessment. His students may be able to help with monitoring issues, and he has the opportunity to submit for CAB's RFP to do the monitoring review along with the others.

Comment: Rick Warner: Regarding the needs assessment, I have to agree that trusted information is an asset. The more trust you can have in the information, the better off public involvement will be. I was particularly supportive of recommendation five. Recommendation four regarding the buffer zone, I like that part except for the ending. You need to be specific on the time element. The information on the way you relate consensus information to health, I don't know if this is real information or not. I don't know if it specifically relates to people who would have been exposed, or continue to be exposed. It's a numbers game.

Comment: Mary Harlow: I just want to tell Kenneth Werth, the City of Westminster has quite a bit of information on the monitoring that's going on at Standley Lake. I would be glad to give you any information you need.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

- Future Board Meeting Agenda Topics. Recommended topics: WIPP and transportation issues; Ten Year Plan and budget; pilot project on D&D for Building 779; plutonium vulnerabilities; environmental monitoring RFP results. Other ideas: Alice Stewart will be in the country in March, suggest that she speak to CAB or co-sponsor a meeting with HAP (Ken will follow up); technology development.
- CAB Budget Issues. DOE has informally told CAB that its FY 97 budget will include \$255,000 in new money plus any carryover. This amount, roughly \$358,000 between new money and carryover, will not support CAB's current budget proposal. Members decided to postpone all new contract research projects until later years.
- Ex-Officio Participation. The Board discussed its ex-officio participation. DOE will have one ex-officio representative, Frazer Lockhart, plus Jeremy Karpatkin who serves as the Designated Federal Official under FACA.
- Personnel Committee Report and Staff Compensation Recommendations. Salary increases were approved for Erin Rogers and Deb Thompson, along with a one-time retroactive pay increase back to July 1, 1996.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: February 6, 1997, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

Location: Westminster City Hall, lower-level Multi-Purpose Room, 4800 West 92nd Avenue, Westminster

Agenda: *Presentation on decontamination and decommissioning plans and activities at Rocky Flats; recommendation on Community Needs Assessment findings; committee updates*

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY / ASSIGNED TO:

1. Review findings of Community Needs Assessment; return to Board with any recommendations - Health Committee
2. Develop CDC grant proposal; have reviewed by Executive Committee; return with copy for Board's final review and approval at February meeting - Health Committee
3. Follow up on possibility of having Alice Stewart speak at CAB meeting - Ken Korkia

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:10 P.M. *

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

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

David Navarro, Secretary

Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board

The Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board is a community advisory group that reviews and provides recommendations on cleanup plans for Rocky Flats, a former nuclear weapons plant outside of Denver, Colorado.

[Top of Page](#) | [Index of Meeting Minutes](#) | [Home](#)

[Citizens Advisory Board Info](#) | [Rocky Flats Info](#) | [Links](#) | [Feedback & Questions](#)