

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION

March 5, 1998

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, Eugene DeMayo, Tom Gallegos, Victor Holm, Bob Kanick, Jim Kinsinger, Tom Marshall, David Navarro, Linda Sikkema / Steve Gunderson, Jeremy Karpatkin, Tim Rehder

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Tom Davidson, Mary Harlow, Beverly Lyne / Joe Legare

PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT: Richard Terry (DOE), Kenneth Werth (citizen); John Law (RMRS); Jeff Barroso (SSOC) Norma Castañeda (DOE); Tom Stewart (CDPHE); Angela Hutton-Howard (CDPHE); John Corsi (K-H); Dave Shelton (K-H); Will Neff (RFLII); Rick Wagner (RMRS) Hopi Salomon (Morrison Knudsen); Pat Etchart (DOE); M.J. Strong (DOE); Laura Belsten (Belsten & Assoc.); Tom Greengard (RF); Carl Spreng (CDPHE); Mariane Anderson (DOE); Rob Henneke (EPA); Alan Trenary (citizen); Michael Bemski (RMRS); David Janecky (LANL); Annette Primrose (RMRS); Alan Rodgers (K-H); David Drucker (DOE); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Erin Rogers (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff); Brady Wilson (CAB staff)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Comment: Kenneth Werth: Recently I heard that all the tank draining of the nuclear waste materials have been completed. My question is, where did they put all of the nuclear waste material?

Response: Jeremy Karpatkin: I don't specifically know what the status is now. Draining them was a high priority item. I can get back to the Board with the status of where the solutions are now.

UPDATE BY CDPHE (Steve Gunderson, CDPHE): Steve reviewed some Rocky Flats issues for CDPHE:

- Building 779 Decommissioning Operations Plan: The DOP was approved on February 6.
- NPDES Permit: There is an unresolved issue between DOE, CDPHE and EPA. The regulatory agencies proposed an additional point-of-compliance (POC) at the Sewage Treatment Plant discharge below Pond B-5. DOE did not agree with the addition, and proposed that the discharge be a point-of-evaluation (POE). The difference is that a POE is not enforceable. CDPHE and EPA will meet to determine how to respond.
- Milestone M3: The Senior Executive Committee will meet to address the disputed milestone for removal of 40 gloveboxes from Building 779 by 9/30/98.
- Milestone M9: This milestone involves completion of an information management system for integrated site-wide monitoring and environmental data. Kaiser-Hill asked for clarification, and met with the regulatory agencies. Consensus was reached, and Kaiser-Hill will provide a database of monitoring information that can be accessed through the RFETS home page.
- Decommissioning Program Plan: CDPHE, EPA and DOE are currently discussing the draft DPP.
- RFCA Annual and Biennial Review: RFCA signatories have begun both the annual update and biennial assessment.
- Emergency Planning Zone Phase III Project: Kaiser-Hill expects to complete the final report by March 31. The state will then determine what changes are required in the current EPZ. A meeting was held with CAB's Health Issues Focus Group to provide an overview of the emergency planning and response process for Rocky Flats.
- New Rocky Flats Worker at CDPHE: Steve introduced Angela Hutton-Howard, who will work on DOE's budgetary, policy and performance setting process. She will also participate in the RFCA biennial review.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON THE ROCKY FLATS LOCAL IMPACTS INITIATIVES INFRASTRUCTURE TRANSITION TASK FORCE DRAFT REPORT: In January, Will Neff of RFLII gave an overview presentation of activities of the Infrastructure Transition Task Force. At this meeting, Will discussed

some of the conclusions and recommendations of the Task Force, as written into the study's draft report of February 1998. The Task Force's mission is to look at options for maintaining an employment center or other use at the site that contributes to the economic vitality of the area. So far, eight buildings have been identified for reuse. Two of those buildings were reserved for the National Conversion Pilot Project (NCPP) and the other six buildings will be limited to companies involved in the cleanup process. Kaiser-Hill anticipates those buildings will be available sometime between 2003 and 2009.

The Task Force developed three options, or implementation strategies: A) aggressive and timely reuse [ensuring that buildings and infrastructure are reusable immediately following cleanup]; B) preserving options [allowing for reuse decisions to be delayed until closer to completion of cleanup]; and C) hands-off [staying out of the way until just before or after cleanup is complete in accordance with RFCA]. Several specific scenarios were developed for discussion. Those include: 1) industrial redevelopment; 2) an eco-industrial park focusing on environmental technologies; 3) a university/federal laboratory/research and development center; 4) a single "jewel" or major tenant; 5) a Cold War museum and historical archive; or 6) making the entire area open space.

Recommendations from the Task Force are anticipated to be submitted to DOE by June 1, in order to be incorporated into the '99 work plan. A web site has been developed for feedback from citizens (www.votelink.com/rfr), and an open house will be held the evening of March 25 at the Arvada Center to allow anyone interested to discuss the draft report and issues of concern.

CAB members gave their views on several issues to help the Site Wide Issues / Budget Focus Group develop comments on the draft report:

1. How will the public be involved?
2. How will scenarios influence cleanup to background?
3. Monetary value of scenarios - What is the cost for each?
4. Bias: Starting point - looking for reuse opportunities
5. Contamination could be brought to the surface with any new construction
6. Comprehensive public participation is necessary
7. Long-term stewardship issues need to be incorporated
8. Interview potential tenants - what would it take for them to move to RFETS?

9. Assumption: DOE agreed to be steward?

Then, Board members participated in an exercise to identify their thoughts on the options and scenarios:

Regarding options/implementation strategies

Aggressive and timely reuse: Support = 2; Don't support = 8; Neutral = 1; Need more info = 0

Preserving options: Support = 7; Don't support = 1; Neutral = 1; Need more info = 3

Hands off: Support = 6; Don't support = 3; Neutral = 1; Need more info = 0

Regarding specific scenarios

Industrial redevelopment: Support = 1; Don't support = 9; Neutral = 1; Need more info = 1

Eco-industrial park: Support = 2; Don't support = 3; Neutral = 0; Need more info = 6

University/lab R&D center: Support = 5; Don't support = 1; Neutral = 2; Need more info = 2

Single tenant/"jewel" use: Support = 2; Don't support = 9; Neutral = 0; Need more info = 0

Cold War museum: Support = 1; Don't support = 6; Neutral = 2; Need more info = 2

Open space: Support = 11; Don't support = 2; Neutral = 0; Need more info = 0

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON ROCKY FLATS ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ACTIVITIES FOR 1998: John Law of RMRS and Jennifer Uhland of Kaiser-Hill gave an overview of the site's environmental restoration program for Fiscal Year 1998.

- Source Removal at Trench 1. T-1 is ranked No. 5 of over 200 sites, as it has the largest known volume of radioactive contaminants buried at the site. The trench is just west of the inner east access gate, and contains about 10,000 to 20,000 kilograms of depleted uranium in water based lathe coolant, potentially pyrophoric depleted uranium in 25 drums buried from 1954-1962, ten drums of cemented

cyanide, and other materials. Remediation of the trench is a RFCA milestone with a target date of September 30, 1998. RMRS plans to install a weather shelter; remove waste and buried debris; sample, package, inert and ship depleted uranium to Starmet Corporation in South Carolina for treatment and disposal or recycling; sample, package and either store or dispose of other generated wastes; then disassemble the tent structure. RMRS has spent about 18 months planning this project, and has assembled teams to deal with specific hazards, hazard control, and quality control requirements. Some expected hazards are: airborne release from either a fire or a spill; radiological, chemical, and other unknown, uncharacterized hazards; or industrial hazards. Controls have been put in place to deal with any of those hazards should they occur. Air monitoring will increase during the project, with four perimeter monitors in the vicinity of the trench, and three additional air monitors within the tent structure. Monitoring for worker exposure will increase as well. The tent structure is expected to be in place in April, with completion of the project and disassembly anticipated for December of 1998. The Board learned that the addition of the weather shelter and the fact that the materials will be shipped to South Carolina were recent changes made to the original proposal reviewed earlier by CAB.

- Mound Site Groundwater Plume Remedial Action. The Mound plume resulted from storage of drums containing volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The source was removed in FY97, and the goal now is to protect the surface water by intercepting and treating the groundwater plume. Kaiser-Hill has designed a passive groundwater collection and treatment system, and awaits public comment on the Decision Document. During FY98, the groundwater collection and treatment system should be installed so activities can begin.
- 903 Pad, 903 Lip Area and Americium Zone Investigation. Drums containing radiologically contaminated oils and VOCs were stored in an open field from 1958 to 1967. After it was discovered they were leaking, the drums were removed in 1967, and some radiologically contaminated soil was removed in 1968-1969. In FY98, Kaiser-Hill will estimate the extent of soil contamination. The areal extent of radiologically contaminated surface soils in the Americium Zone will be investigated, and the vertical extent will be determined by drilling shallow boreholes. Additional boreholes will be drilled to determine the presence of VOCs.
- Groundwater Plume Investigations. The Solar Ponds Plume is listed as a RFCA milestone for FY99. Plans include characterization of the plume to evaluate remedial options such as phytoremediation, treatment at Building 995, and to determine whether present or future release to North Walnut Creek would be acceptable. Kaiser-Hill also plans to review and characterize approaches for remediation at the 903 Pad/Ryan's Pit Plume and the East Trenches Plume.

- IHSS 118.1 Accelerated Action. This IHSS resulted from spills associated with an underground carbon tetrachloride storage tank. Source evaluation is almost complete, and shows that natural and man-made controls are containing the source and that surface water quality does not appear to be impacted. Monitoring will continue, and source removal will be evaluated when surrounding buildings and infrastructure are removed.

Q&A / Comment Session:

Question: Bob Kanick: Regarding the trench, what were the considerations regarding airborne contamination?

Answer: John Law: In the original analysis of this job, they did an air modeling, which indicated that a containment structure was not required. When we analyzed the job for what makes the most sense for keeping the job going and keeping the workers protected, we decided the tent would work best.

Question: David Navarro: During the Trench 3 & 4 excavation, when a depleted uranium drum was crushed, one of the things that concerned us is that the excavation, as well as this one, is extremely close to the east access road. During that event, all the traffic entered and exited near there. I understand it's to control weather incidents, but will it contain sufficiently?

Answer: John Law: It has the added benefit of acting like a containment structure. In the event something occurs in the tent and we are concerned about dispersion, we will turn off the ventilation system back outside.

Comment: David Navarro: I would hope there are contingency plans to deal with the high volume of traffic that goes by there.

Question: Tom Gallegos: I was involved in the initial review of the T1 PAM. At that time, the Board made a recommendation. Has anything changed with the T1 PAM since that time? Also, continuing to integrate T3 & T4 lessons learned are important. Did you also integrate our recommendations on the trench, from July of 1997?

Answer: John Law: We've incorporated and responded to your comments from the original PAM. But there has been a change in the PAM to reflect the presence of a weather shelter. Also, originally we planned to treat the waste onsite, but we're now shipping it offsite. The changes were made according to RFCA.

Question: Tom Marshall: I will submit some written questions and hope you will be able to follow up on those. I want to follow up on the use of a containment structure. In the

past I've heard the site say they wouldn't use a containment structure because of concerns about worker safety. But you're planning on having workers go in with supplied air now. What would it take to create a containment structure with HEPA filtration, and why aren't you doing that?

Answer: Wayne Sproles: We did evaluate that. It made a lot of sense to try to encompass all the activities associated with the job. We did look at the cost and schedule. From our perspective, it didn't make sense. Most of the team felt that a structure wasn't required, other than for the weather and soil stockpiling.

Question: David Navarro: It was identified in Trench 3 & 4 that we had two step-off pads, and the safety requirements were different.

Answer: John Law: We've made some radical changes in how we do business at Rocky Flats. We've brought radiological engineering into RMRS. We brought them into planning the job from the start. We've instituted a lot of management changes in RMRS. We've required managers to attend an extensive training program. We're following an extensive list of safety requirements.

Question: Victor Holm: If you encounter either VOCs or radiological contamination in the bottom of the trench, what standard will you use for cleanup? Also, for the put-back material, what standard will you use?

Answer: Wayne Sproles: It's stated in the PAM what the standards are. The standard is cut off at groundwater and 3 feet into bedrock. If it's a source removal job, we will go after the source. We won't continue on to remediate the entire plume associated with it. Those are the bounding conditions established.

Question: Tom Gallegos: When CAB and the committee addressing these issues looked at the approach to remediation, we asked that Kaiser-Hill put together the information on what your plan is for the remedial activity into a simply understandable format, the critical reporting elements. Could I ask you to put the critical reporting element information together for what you are planning for the Mound Plume, 903 Pad, Solar Ponds, Ryan's Pit, and the IHSS 118.1.

Answer: John Law: Based on the description you've given us, we can do a summary on each project.

Comment: David Navarro: The Steelworkers do not buy into the Integrated Safety Management concept as we have it out there right now. We're not opposed to doing the work, we're opposed to the companies selecting those hourly members that are on these ISM teams. It's a huge problem. Somebody needs to get with our leadership and talk about

this.

Response: John Law: We'd be glad to sit down with Jerry Harden and talk with him about it.

Question: Alan Trenary: What will Starmet use the metals for?

Answer: John Law: I believe they use the depleted uranium to create an aggregate-like material, put into a concrete which is used for shielding.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Comment: Kenneth Werth: You're going to ship this material to South Carolina. Do you have any kind of consensus from other states about shipment across states? Also, I hope you won't ship these materials in unmarked tractor trailers. Why ship it that way when all the transuranic wastes will be shipped by huge casks down to WIPP?

Response: John Law: We're going to follow all the laws, rules and regulations of both DOE and the Department of Transportation in shipping this material. The risk of shipping this material is quite a bit different than TRU waste, which is more radioactive and has more activity to it. The containers to Starmet are all approved by DOT, and they have to comply with labeling. When they go to South Carolina, the facilities are licensed to accept the materials. To the best of my knowledge, we aren't confirming with other states that the shipment is okay with them. Steve Gunderson: DOE-HQ has had meetings along the shipping routes about the shipment of material from Rocky Flats. States have been briefed.

Comment: Carol O'Dowd: Regarding the tent structure, one point I would like to see addressed, is making sure you stay on your schedule given the winds out there. This structure is in a shape right for our northwesterly winds. I would also appreciate CAB sharing your concerns because I'm interested in some of the responses to the questions.

Response: Tom Marshall: We can make sure that any responses we get are made public so you get those.

ACCELERATING CLEANUP PLAN (formerly the 2006 Plan) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD (Tom Marshall): The Site Wide Issues / Budget Focus Group recommended that the Board approve sending a letter to DOE asking for an extension to the public comment period, through May 8, in order to allow more time to review the new draft document and prepare comments and recommendations on behalf of the Board.

Decision: *Approve letter requesting extension to public comment period. APPROVED BY*

CONSENSUS.

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO DOE ON CONTRACT REVIEW ISSUES: The Site Wide Issues / Budget Focus Group prepared a letter for Board approval - a follow-up to CAB's recommendation no. 97-2 approved in May of 1997, which asked DOE to conduct a review of the performance-based contract with Kaiser-Hill at Rocky Flats. DOE's responses referred CAB to recent studies that may have addressed the Board's primary concerns. However, several issues were not addressed and the draft letter suggests that a review of the contract is still warranted. Among those issues that still need to be addressed are the contract's effect on:

- the progression of cleanup
- deployment of innovative technologies
- public and worker participation in decision-making
- nuclear safety
- efficient use of the work force; and
- linkage of performance measures to site priorities

***Decision:** Approve follow-up letter of recommendation regarding review of DOE's contract with Kaiser-Hill. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.*

D&D / CLOSURE PLAN FOCUS GROUP:

- Co-Chairs. Tom Gallegos and Victor Holm were approved to serve as a co-chairs for the D&D / Closure Plan Focus Group. The co-chairs for this group will focus on specific tasks. Tom Gallegos will work primarily on natural resource management issues, Victor Holm will deal with waste management issues, and Tom Clark will work on decommissioning plans.
- Update. The group will: review DOE's response to CAB comments on the Building 779 Decommissioning Operations Plan; begin review of the Decommissioning Program Plan; and assist with developing recommendations and comments on the Site Reuse Plan being developed by the RFLII Infrastructure Transition Task Force.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE - UPDATE ON PLANS FOR NEW BOARD MEMBER RECRUITMENT (Linda Sikkema): The Membership Committee held a

conference call in February to discuss plans. Currently there are only two CAB members on the committee, so other members are needed to participate. The committee plans to: 1) send letters to some former members to ask if they are interested in rejoining, or if they have referrals for new members; 2) send postcards to all those on CAB's main mailing list, about 650 persons in the area; 3) ask Board members to help identify potential new Board members; 4) hold an open house to meet with interested citizens and potential new members; 5) set time aside at a future Board meeting for interaction with Board members. DOE offered to send their local stakeholder database to CAB so that persons on that list could receive the recruitment postcard as well.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: April 2, 1998, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

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

Agenda: Presentations on Natural Resources Management Policy and Long-Term Stewardship for Rocky Flats; recommendation on Rocky Flats Transition Task Force Report; discussion of CAB outreach survey and forum ideas; letter concerning future CRESA study; discussion of CAB role as grant administrator for SAL Oversight Panel

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:

1. Send letter recommending extension of public comment period on Accelerated Cleanup Plan - Erin Rogers
2. Send letter of recommendation - follow-up to CAB recommendation on Kaiser-Hill contract review - Erin Rogers

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:05 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](#)