

## ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

### MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

May 17, 1999

---

**FACILITATOR:** Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Jim Kinsinger called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

**BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:** Carol Barker, Shawn Burke, Eugene DeMayo, Gerald DePoorter, Joe Downey, Victor Holm, Jim Kinsinger, Bill Kossack, Tom Marshall, Mary Mattson, Bryan Taylor / Anna Martinez, Steve Gunderson, Joe Legare

**BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT:** Alan Aluisi, Susan Barron, Ray Betts, Tom Davidson, Derek Dye, Tom Gallegos, Mary Harlow, LeRoy Moore, David Navarro, Linda Sikkema, Lesley Taufer / Tim Rehder

**PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT:** Bruce Dahm (Broomfield); Kenneth Werth (Arvada Citizen); Colburn Kennedy (RFETS); John Corsi (Kaiser-Hill); Anne W. Callison (ITRC); David Kenney (EnviroCare); Terje Langeland (Colorado Daily); Ken Korkia (CAB Staff), Erin Rogers (CAB Staff), Brady Wilson (CAB Staff)

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:** Kenneth Werth raised the issue of his proposal to construct a granite pyramid onsite at Rocky Flats for the storage of waste and other materials. Ken stated that he had reviewed the minutes from the last Board work session in which the waste containment criterion had been developed and believes that his pyramid proposal would meet those criteria. He asked the Board to reconsider his proposal at a future meeting.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

1. Rock Creek Reserve. Ken Korkia provided a handout and a verbal update regarding the press event held earlier in the day announcing the creation of Rock Creek Reserve at Rocky Flats. This reserve is an 800 parcel in the northwest corner of the buffer zone that will be managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service through an interagency agreement with DOE. At the press event, DOE Secretary Richardson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Regional Director Ralph Morgenweck, and Colorado Governor Bill Owens signed a letter of intent to join together in

developing a management plan for the new reserve. Under the agreement, DOE will continue to own the property and be responsible for access controls, while Fish and Wildlife will manage the ecological resources.

In statements to DOE, some Board members complained about DOE's unilateral decision-making in reaching this agreement with Fish and Wildlife without consulting CAB and the rest of the community. Members also questioned DOE's assumption that the area is free of contamination and stressed a need for further characterization.

**Action:** Joe Legare will transmit copy of the agreement to CAB.

2. CAB Training Session. Ken Korkia briefed the Board on a proposed Board training event to be held in June. The training session would a half-day event involving personality profile testing and team building exercises. A possible location for the training could be a golf course in Arvada that has a meeting location and can provide food. In the afternoon, Board members who wished to golf could do so at their own expense.

**Action:** The Board agreed to the idea of having a training session in June that would be a half-day in the morning, followed by golf or other recreation at the members' expense in the afternoon. Staff was tasked with conducting a survey of members to determine an acceptable date for the training session.

**LOW LEVEL WASTE DISCUSSION:** At its last meeting, the Board developed a set of draft criteria for low level waste containment. At this meeting, the first question raised was what to do with this list of criteria the Board developed last time. Possibilities raised included looking at specific waste options and applying the containment criteria, or further refining what the Board developed previously into some type of recommendation. Another suggestion was that the Board develop a timeframe or set of timeframes for consideration of the criteria. Questions and discussion points also were raised about the assumptions used by DOE and reflected in the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement that all waste and materials would be removed from Rocky Flats.

Reed Hodgin suggested that the Board list a set of options and then evaluate each of them against the waste containment criteria. The Board began by listing four options: onsite storage or disposal, and offsite storage or disposal. They later determined to return to the containment terminology, using two options, either onsite or offsite. The members also determined that they should apply a timeframe to any option considered. A point also was raised that the risks of transportation must be considered and weighed in any offsite containment option.

After further discussion, it was next offered that the Board might consider some specific options for waste disposition and then weigh these options against the waste containment criteria. To each of these, the Board would need to consider a timeframe. The options included:

- An above ground building offsite from Rocky Flats
- A cargo container that would be placed in a bomb subsidence crater at the Nevada Test Site
- A RCRA licensed landfill offsite
- An onsite CAMU (Corrective Action Management Unit)
- An above ground building onsite

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:** During the second public comment period, Ken Werth requested that the Board formally respond to his proposal to build a granite pyramid to store waste at Rocky Flats. In response, it was mentioned that the Board was unlikely to consider his proposal as a separate possibility, but that it would fall under the category of "onsite building."

**CONTINUED LOW LEVEL WASTE DISCUSSION:** After its break, the Board continued discussion of low level waste disposition. Reed Hodgins outlined the proposals the Board had listed so far (see bulleted items listed above) and suggested that they evaluate each under the four waste containment criteria: isolated (both geographically and through designed containment), monitored, retrievable and secure. For each of the criteria, he advised that the Board members rate each proposal using a scale of very good (++), good (+), poor (-), or very poor (--). For each option, the Board would need to consider a single timeframe or multiple timeframes. Reed further suggested that for any option where there is a problem in meeting a certain criteria, the Board could develop a list of ways of correcting or altering the option to better meet the criteria.

To accomplish Reed's suggestion, the Board attempted to perform the evaluation on the option of burying cargo containers in a bomb crater at the Nevada Test Site. The members first discussed the idea of what timeframe should be used. At first it was suggested that this option was meant as a more permanent one, well beyond tens of thousands of years. Concerns were then raised that it would not be possible to predict the conditions at the site in that long of time period. Thus, the Board cut the timeframe down to something in the 100 to 200 year duration. It was further suggested that a limited timeframe of this duration should be considered as a waste containment principle for use in evaluating all options. Further comments on the concept of a lifespan suggested that there must be reevaluation of the waste disposition options in very short increments of time, perhaps five to ten years.

First, the Board attempted to evaluate the option for isolation capability. Concerns were raised that the cargo container would have a limited lifespan and may not last for 200

years. Given that problem, it was raised that good secondary containment would be necessary so that any failure of the primary containment would not lead to environmental contamination.

Not able to gain any consensus in the evaluation of a specific waste disposition option, Reed Hodgkin next suggested that there were several overarching themes that had emerged from the conversation throughout the evening:

- The concept of containing waste for an extended timeframe such as thousands, ten of thousands or more years does not make sense to the Board. Two hundred years would probably be the maximum for design considerations.
- The primary containment should be designed to last for 200 years.
- There should be something designed that backs up the primary containment in case it fails. Therefore, if the primary containment fails, the secondary containment will be able to hold it, and through monitoring, the failure would be detected and retrieval or other remedy could be put into place.
- The combined risk of transportation and the containment itself must be considered for each option.

The conversation then turned toward next steps. It was suggested that what the Board had completed over the last two meetings was a set of waste principles similar to the cleanup principles developed a few years ago. A follow-up suggestion was that the staff should prepare a preliminary draft of a recommendation outlining the conversation over the past two meetings. This draft would be distributed as soon as possible to members in advance of the next meeting for review and comment.

**Action:** The Board agreed to have staff develop a draft recommendation outlining the waste containment principles. After drafting, the staff will distribute via email to all Board members for review and comment.

**ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS:** Concerns were raised concerning the lack of attendance at this meeting and the fact that the meeting got started late. Members were asked to please come on time. A question was raised that perhaps during the summer, two meetings a month might be too much of a commitment for members.

**NEXT MEETING:**

**Date:** June 3, 1999, 6 — 9:30 p.m. (work session)

**Location:** College Hill Library, Front Range Community College, 3705 West 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Westminster

**Agenda:**

- Report back on the SSAB Waste Transportation Conference
- Presentation by and discussion with John Schneider with DOE regarding long-term stewardship planning and CAB's potential role
- Review and approval of draft Waste Containment Principles.

**ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:**

1. Forward agreement signed between DOE, the State of Colorado and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Joe Legare
2. Draft Waste Containment Principles - Staff

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:25 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](#)