

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

April 19, 1999

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Jim Kinsinger called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Carol Barker, Susan Barron, Ray Betts, Shawn Burke, Gerald DePoorter, Joe Downey, Tom Gallegos, Mary Harlow, Victor Holm, Jim Kinsinger, Bill Kossack, Mary Mattson, LeRoy Moore, Lesley Taufer, Bryan Taylor / Mariane Anderson, Steve Gunderson, Joe Legare

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Alan Aluisi, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Derek Dye, Tom Marshall, David Navarro, Linda Sikkema / Tim Rehder

PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT: Tom Stewart (CDPHE); Anna Martinez (DOE); Jack Hoopes (Kaiser-Hill); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff); Brady Wilson (CAB staff)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: No comments were received.

APPROVAL OF ACTINIDE MIGRATION STUDIES TECHNICAL REVIEW

GROUP CONTRACTOR AND FINAL CONTRACT: The Evaluation Committee of the Actinide Migration Studies Technical Review Group (TRG) met in late March to interview finalists for the technical review and advisory services contractor, recently advertised on a Request for Proposals. Eleven proposals were received, and the TRG interviewed three finalists – Advanced Technologies and Laboratories International (ATL), QuantiSci, and Water Science and Engineering. The Evaluation Committee agreed to enter into contract negotiations with ATL. This is a woman-owned technical consulting services company headquartered in Maryland. The company provides occupational health and safety, worker protection, public outreach and information management technical support services. ATL has assigned a team of experts, who have experience in actinide migration at Rocky Flats, to work on this project. Those persons are Drs. Ward Whicker and Tom Hakonson of Colorado State University, Dr. Kathryn Higley from Oregon State University, and Bill Ulicny. At this meeting, Board members approved: 1) ATL's selection as contractor, and 2) the final contract with ATL.

BUILDING RUBBLE DISPOSITION LETTER TO JESSIE ROBERSON: At its last meeting, CAB discussed options for submitting either a recommendation or letter to DOE detailing concerns that Board members had about the three options for disposition of "clean" building rubble. Board members agreed to send a revised letter to DOE, which is a compilation of individual members' concerns rather than a formal recommendation. Final approval of the contents of the letter was given at this meeting. Concerns and comments contained in the letter are outlined below:

- The site must ensure that under-building contamination is adequately remediated, and that adequate sampling protocols are used and documented.
- Sampling of floors, drains, walls, and process lines need to be adequate to achieve a high confidence level. Using the Shonka – which allows a greater percentage of sampling coverage – for surficial contamination and redundant sampling in drains and process lines will increase the confidence level of sampling.
- For rubble awaiting final disposition, the site must ensure fugitive dusts are kept below Clean Air Act standards so there is no negative impact on downwind communities. Also, the site must ensure that rubble runoff does not negatively affect surface water quality.
- Monitoring of the disposition site must continue – either directly or indirectly – for at least 10 years, with a focus on monitoring heavy metals and radiological plumes.
- The site must ensure that rubble remains retrievable should a problem arise, which includes making sure that the location of the disposal site is not lost in the future. The location should be included with stewardship information materials for retention.
- Provide the Board with an analysis for using a Corrective Action Management Unit (CAMU) for long-term monitored retrievable storage of building rubble, and to consider this as an option.

DISCUSSION OF LOW LEVEL WASTE ISSUES FOR INCLUSION IN CAB

VISION: This was a follow-up discussion from the Board's first presentation on low level and low level mixed waste disposition issues at its March 4 Board meeting. At that meeting, DOE gave a presentation on categories of waste, characterization, and possible disposition options. Board members identified topics and issues for which they required clarification, such as criteria, regulations, transportation concerns, site disposal options, and stewardship issues. DOE distributed a summary sheet answering those questions. Based on those responses, the Board posed a few more clarifying questions then began a round-robin and open discussion about possible options for disposition of waste – particularly low level mixed waste with concentrations greater than 10 nCi/g and less than 100 nCi/g.

Joe Legare, DOE ex-officio representative to CAB, reviewed for the Board some of the obstacles for disposition of this waste. The Deer Trail facility, located on the eastern

plains of Colorado, is currently a landfill and disposal site with a RCRA permit, which allows it to receive hazardous waste. However, in order to accept Rocky Flats waste between 10-100 nCi/g, the facility will need to gain a radiological permit from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, and to modify its existing permit. The current operator of that site, SafetyKleen, has not formally applied for that permit. Through 2006, the anticipated closure date for RFETS, the site expects to generate 15,000 cubic meters of this type of waste (10-100 nCi/g), mostly from contaminated soils and asphalt from the 903 Pad. An additional 35,000 cubic meters of mixed waste with less than 10 nCi/g, but not free release, will be generated through 2006. That waste will be treated and disposed at the Envirocare facility in Utah. The WIPP facility can only accept waste greater than 100 nCi/g, and the Nevada Test Site currently can only accept mixed waste generated in-state.

Board members then began to outline issues, comments and concerns related to the ultimate disposition of low level mixed waste. Some of those comments follow:

- Explore remediation possibilities for soil and concrete as alternatives to disposal
- Concerns about equity issues
- The timeframe for gaining a permit for accepting these wastes at Deer Trail may hamper the ability of RFETS to keep to its 2006 timeline
- Issues about the difference between storage and disposal; would prefer to see the waste in a monitored, retrievable storage facility rather than disposed of permanently; need to allow the possibility that future generations may find better options for treating and handling waste problems
- Fewer disposal sites would be better than multiple sites
- Look into technical solutions for treating the waste before disposal
- Nevada Test Site is a good option as it is already so contaminated; however there will be political problems with disposition at NTS
- Disposal equals a loss of control over the materials; they should be stored in facilities onsite to reduce transportation risks
- What are the reactions of neighbors near the Deer Trail facility?
- Colorado should take care of its own waste

Next, CAB identified information needs in order to continue with the discussion. Board members agreed they needed more information on the following:

- A definition from the state of the difference between "storage" and "disposal"
- Treatment options
- Transportation issues – what types of containers will be used?
- A comparison of disposal sites, options and alternatives to disposal, and the costs of those alternatives
- Regulatory hurdles, and more in-depth information on the process for permitting the Deer Trail facility

- Definition of "monitored, retrievable storage"
- A presentation on the Deer Trail facility itself

A worksheet will be sent to Board members to have them give more detail about the specifics of their information requests, and to ask them to identify in greater detail what they need to know about the regulatory process, transportation, the Deer Trail facility, and equity issues. One Board member was asked to provide a description of his understanding of and vision for "monitored, retrievable storage." Next, at its May 6 Board meeting, CAB members will discuss their positions and options on the difference between storage and disposal.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: May 6, 6 - 9:30 p.m. (work session)

Location: College Hill Library, Front Range Community College, 3705 West 112th Avenue, Westminster

Agenda: Review and approve Request for Proposals for the Community Radiation Monitoring (COMRAD) Program; presentation on sampling protocols/laboratory studies and QA audit for that program; presentation on Trench T1 project budget; discussion continues on low level waste issues – storage versus disposal

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:

1. Finalize Actinide Migration Studies Technical Review Group contract with ATL - Staff
2. Revise building rubble disposition letter incorporating additional Board member comments; forward to DOE - Staff
3. Prepare worksheet for Board member comment on additional information needs; forward to CAB - Staff

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:20 P.M. *

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

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Mary Harlow, 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](#)