

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION

October 9, 1997

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Tom Marshall called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Alan Aluisi, Susan Barron, Tom Clark, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Tom Gallegos, Paul Grogger, Mary Harlow, Victor Holm, Susan Johnson, Sasa Jovic, Bob Kanick, Jim Kinsinger, Beverly Lyne, Tom Marshall / Mike Konczal, Frazer Lockhart, Tim Rehder, Steve Tarlton

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Jan Burda, David Navarro, Linda Sikkema

PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT: Kenneth Werth (citizen); Steve Singer (Rocky Flats employee); Robert W. Terry (CDPHE); Richard Fox (CDPHE); John Corsi (K-H); Jack Hoopes (K-H); George Squibb (RMRS); Elizabeth Pottorff (CDPHE); Mariane Anderson (DOE); Rick Roberts (SSOC); Hildegaard Hix (League of Women Voters); Dianne Rahm (Iowa State University); Russell McCallister (RFFO); Doug Mercer (CRESP); Purna Halder (DOE-RFFO); Karen Lowrie (CRESP); John Hill (Kaiser-Hill); Alan Trenary (citizen); Susan Flack (citizen); Jim Stone (RFCC); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Chris Millsaps (CAB staff); Erin Rogers (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff)

PRESENTATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING SYSTEMS REVIEW (Dorothy Hall, George Maier, George Murgel - Parker-Hall Inc.):

Parker-Hall Inc. (PHI) presented the results of its review of the environmental monitoring systems in place at Rocky Flats. PHI's objectives were to describe, assess, and recommend improvements to the Rocky Flats environmental monitoring programs. They reviewed air quality monitoring, soil and sediment monitoring, surface and groundwater monitoring, ecological monitoring, and project-specific monitoring. PHI feels the site should develop and distribute an annual Integrated Monitoring Program to stakeholders; improve communications and monitoring results to stakeholders; and perform environmental monitoring that goes beyond simply meeting regulatory requirements. PHI recommends that all environmental monitoring programs in place could be improved, and believes a comprehensive, cost-effective program can be developed with careful planning. Following

are some of the highlights of their recommendations:

- RFETS should evaluate which analytes are reviewed as part of its groundwater and surface water monitoring programs.
- New monitoring wells should be installed.
- A soil and sediment monitoring program is crucial - an ongoing program needs to be established.
- PHI called for better coordination and integration among/between various monitoring programs for each media at the site.
- Improve the monitoring data reporting systems so that it is more user-friendly and easily understood by stakeholders, including pictures and graphs that explain in detail any findings.
- Augment ecological monitoring programs to collect more quantitative information.
- Look into ways to get a quicker lab turnaround.
- Change the notification processes so cities and local residents can know more quickly about exceedances.

PHI has produced a 250-page draft document detailing its work, critical analysis of the programs and specific recommendations for improvement. CAB prepared a summary of those recommendations available from the CAB office. The draft document will be revised based on comments and input received at the Board meeting, and distributed to CAB members in final form soon. In addition, a *Citizen's Guide to the Environmental Monitoring Systems at Rocky Flats* will be produced as part of PHI's contract. The guide is expected to be completed in November.

Q&A / Comment Session:

Question: Bob Kanick: Would it be possible to grade each of these areas, perhaps in an Executive Summary?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: There will be an Executive Summary and section on conclusions still to be prepared. Everything is important with environmental monitoring, so I wouldn't grade it. I wouldn't rate one thing as more important than the other, but I can give some priorities to some of the issues. But it is dynamic, it changes and is interrelated.

Question: Kenneth Werth: How do the monitoring programs that are in existence now compare to the monitoring that was done when the plant was in production and working with plutonium? Was there more leaching going offsite during production years than there is now?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: Monitoring now is not going to be the same as monitoring when it's in operation, because the focus is different. We did look at the historical information. The site is always looking at the historical data that's available. During production, there were some management disposal practices that did allow contaminants to be released to the environment.

Question: Tom Marshall: Could you comment on how well the contamination in the groundwater is characterized right now, and what the connection there is between groundwater contamination and radionuclides being left in the soil?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: As far as contaminated soils, they did do remedial investigations and did find some subsurface contamination above and below some of the IHSSs. Contaminated soils can feed groundwater contamination. They can also receive contamination from the groundwater. The fact that you see contamination below the groundwater indicates that it is leaching. You will learn more from the Actinide Migration Studies. It's hard to answer about the characterization of groundwater. It's done semi-annually, and there's not a lot of data. I didn't look at it from the perspective of whether it's well-characterized, but rather whether it's being monitored for potential contaminants.

Question: Victor Holm: One of the problems with the surface water monitoring program is the sample turnaround time. Is this an intrinsic characteristic of the lab work? What could the normal turnaround be if it was expedited?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: I have seen faster turnaround at other Superfund and CERCLA sites. Typically, 30-day turnaround does happen, and sometimes two weeks. Sampling for radionuclides at minimum takes two weeks. It is a lot more costly and will add to the budget to get faster turnaround. But there are options. The 45-day turnaround is pretty excessive.

Question: Jim Stone: How well does the monitoring program assist in cleanup? Is it way behind? Is the monitoring program adequate to continue the cleanup program as it is progressing right now?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: I can't answer that. We were evaluating the monitoring programs. Whether they are far behind or ahead on the cleanup, you would have to ask that question of Kaiser-Hill. As remediation, cleanup and source removals increase, you will see an increase in some of the monitoring because of the potential for remobilizing some of the

contaminants. The monitoring program can use improvement, but it will keep up with the cleanup activities. I think we could do a better job of protecting the public though.

Question: Mary Harlow: We have been told that the groundwater plumes will not be moving, and there is little chance of them migrating into the lower aquifers. Do you have any information on that?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: There does not seem to be a good conductivity. I don't think it will be impacted at all or that there is a lot of risk. I think the Laramie/Fox Hills aquifer is safe.

Question: Kenneth Werth: Are you familiar with the Leyden coal mine? A lot of the tunnels run under Rocky Flats and contaminated water is settling in the mine tunnels. Has a monitoring program tapped into the mines to find out if plutonium or other metals are leaching into the tunnels?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: The location you're talking about is upgradient of Rocky Flats. It's unlikely there would be any plutonium contamination from the site. Kaiser-Hill: The Leyden mine is used for storage of natural gas by Public Service, and the locations of the tunnels and the fracture zones are well understood because of characterization for natural gas storage.

Comment: Alan Trenary: The contamination in the soils is a major liability, and I'm concerned that they eliminated testing the soils in 1994.

Question: Susan Barron: When you were going through the historical studies on the soils, I noted Martel's study. Can you give us more information on that, and why the vast differences in what is being reported?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: I asked that same question. When they were doing the studies, they weren't always sampling at the same depth. Some were surface samples, subsurface samples, depth samples, or a combination. I can't give an opinion on which is right or wrong. But there is a lot of historical data and we wanted to give you a perspective.

Question: Tom Marshall: In your presentation on groundwater, do you have concerns about how reporting should happen, or do you have concerns about the reports themselves?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: I do not like the negative results. It doesn't tell you anything unless you're a statistician. I'm not saying their statistics are wrong. It's statistically valid, but they need to tell you what it means. I don't have concerns with their analysis, but with the way they are reporting it.

Question: Mary Harlow: Based on your review, what other hazardous elements should be monitored besides radionuclides?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: The radionuclides are the highest contaminant of concern. But there are hazardous wastes out there, carbon tetrachloride, VOCs, heavy metals, etc. That is called mixed waste, and makes it difficult to treat. I couldn't give you a list without spending some time thinking about it though. With beryllium, the background levels are very high, so that makes it difficult. They are monitoring for beryllium in the groundwater and the air.

Question: Reed Hodgin: One of the recommendations for the community radiation monitoring program is to install beta gages to relieve some of the analysis time. How would you use beta gages to get that information?

Answer: George Maier: The recommendation was to discuss installing a beta gage or a tape sampler. Currently there is monitoring for plutonium in particulate at the COMRAD stations and the Rocky Flats network operated by the state. If the tape sampler and/or the beta gage would be installed, the equipment could store the data until someone retrieved it. If the sampler were downwind, there would be a readout of what the particulate or dust is downwind at the time.

Question: Kenneth Werth: Are you of the opinion that the site can be cleaned up to background levels in the next 15 to 25 years?

Answer: Dorothy Hall: We don't want to answer that. We're not qualified to answer that. That's a question you need to ask DOE or others. It was not in the scope of our project to examine that.

DISCUSSION WITH DOE CONCERNING CAB FUNDING FOR NATIONAL DIALOGUE AND 2006 PLAN (Tom Marshall): CAB spoke with representatives from the Sandia Citizens Advisory Board in late September, and learned from those representatives that money had been forwarded from DOE-Headquarters to the respective sites to assist with funding SSAB participation in both the 2006 Plan and national dialogue activities. Although DOE-Rocky Flats had received this funding in July 1997, CAB was not informed that this money was available. There was a difference of opinion between CAB and DOE representatives about how the money was to be used. DOE did, however, agree to modify CAB's grant contract to make the funds available to offset funding of CAB's 1998 budget.

Decision: *Draft and send letter to Al Alm requesting clarification on intent of the \$75,000 funding. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.*

APPROVAL OF CAB WORK PLAN AND BUDGET (Ken Korkia): CAB approved a 1998 work plan, and budget of approximately \$370,000 to fund those activities. CAB's new work plan reflects the Board's preference for a different way of work by using a combination of standing committees and issue/project-specific focus areas (Site Wide Issues/Budget; Health Issues; Plutonium Issues; Closure Plan; and Deactivation and Decommissioning). Staff will provide tracking of several key issues of interest identified by the Board. A copy of the final work plan is available at the CAB office.

Decision: Approve 1998 CAB work plan and budget. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

LETTER TO DOE CONCERNING RETALIATION TOWARD WORKERS (Tom Marshall): At the August Board meeting, several site workers attended and expressed concerns about how two incidents were handled at the site, which involved activation of the Emergency Operations Center at Rocky Flats. As a follow-up, those workers met with the Site Wide Issues Committee at its September and October meetings. One worker explained that he had been the target of what he felt was management intimidation following comments at the August Board meeting. The committee drafted a letter to Jessie Roberson and Bob Card expressing CAB's concern with this worker's claim. However, several Board members did not agree that this letter should be sent.

Decision: Table this item, and return to Site Wide Issues / Budget Focus Group for review and decision on next course of action. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: November 7, 1997, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

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

Agenda: Presentation on actinide migration studies; presentation on Building 779 Decommissioning Operations Plan

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:

1. Draft and send letter to Al Alm requesting clarification of \$75,000 additional CAB funding - Ken Korkia
2. Prepare and submit 1998 grant application based on approved CAB 1998 work plan and budget - Ken Korkia/Deb Thompson

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:15 P.M. *

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

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Tom Gallegos, 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](#)