

**Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
October 2, 2003
6 to 9:30 p.m.**

Jefferson County Airport Terminal Building, 11755 Airport Way, Broomfield

Victor Holm, the Board's chair, called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Dave Davia, Joe Downey, Jim Fabian, Anne Fenerty, Shirley Garcia, Earl Gunia, Victor Holm, Mary Mattson, Andrew Ross / John Rampe (DOE), Rich Schassburger (DOE) Steve Gunderson (CDPHE), Mark Sattelberg (USFWS), Gary Kleeman (EPA).

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Bill Kossack

PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT: Conrad Stoldt (Boulder), Bill McNeill (Lafayette), Erin Hamby (Boulder), Sean Rea (Boulder), Ralph Stephens (Denver), Alan Trenary (Westminster), Vanessa Safonovs (Fort Collins), John Corsi (Kaiser-Hill), Terry Vaughn (Kaiser-Hill), Carl Spreng (CDPHE), Bob Davis (Kaiser-Hill), Jerry Henderson (RFCAB staff), Ken Korkia (RFCAB staff), Patricia Rice (RFCAB staff)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD / NEW BUSINESS:

Public Comment:

There was no public comment

New Business:

- John Rampe introduced Rich Schassburger with DOE who will fill-in as the third available DOE representative for Board meetings. Rich will replace Rick DiSalvo.
- Gary Kleeman announced that he will fill in for Tim Rehder as EPA's ex-officio representative while Tim is on detail.
- Shirley Garcia distributed a list showing member committee assignments and asked them to make sure it was correct. She also announced that the Closure Projects Committee would meet on Monday, October 6 at the Broomfield Municipal Center.
- Ken Korkia announced that the office relocation was complete and provided the new contact information. He also announced that the location for monthly Board meetings and the committee night would be moved to the College Hill Library through the end of the year. He finally reminded members that Board officer elections would take place in November.

- Victor Holm provided a report on the EMSSAB Chairs meeting that was held at the end of September in Paducah, Kentucky. He was the only representative from the Rocky Flats site. One of the major lessons he brought home from the meeting was that there appears to be a disconnect between DOE field offices and DOE Headquarters regarding funding for the SSABs. Also, DOE is asking the boards that use site contractors to provide administrative support to find another method. At first, DOE suggested the other boards use the Rocky Flats board as a model, whereby they would incorporate and hire their own support staff. After meeting resistance to this idea, DOE is now looking at an option whereby it would contract directly with another firm besides its site contractor to support the board. Ultimately, DOE would like to use its own personnel to support the boards.

Victor next reported that the next Chairs meeting would be held in Washington, D.C. sometime next spring. The Chairs asked for this location because they want to be closer to the decision-makers in Washington. They felt they were at a disadvantage at this meeting because the DOE Headquarters representatives present were not authorized decision-makers. Victor also reported that the Rocky Flats and Fernald representatives volunteered to draft a letter to DOE outlining concerns about transition of public participation at sites that are approaching the end of cleanup and moving towards long-term stewardship. Because this is ultimately a complex-wide concern, the letter once approved will be sent out under joint signature of all the boards. Victor also reported that he met privately with Dave Geiser who works with the new Office of Legacy Management. Mr. Geiser reported that there has been little discussion so far within his agency concerning public participation.

In response to Victor's concerns about long-term stewardship, John Rampe reported that Ray Plieness with DOE's Grand Junction Project Office would meet with site officials and other DOE representatives who are involved with future long-term stewardship planning at Rocky Flats within the coming week. John also reported that Ray would be available to meet with groups such as RFCAB in the near future.

UPDATE ON WORKER EXPOSURE INCIDENT IN BUILDING 707: Terry Vaughn with Kaiser-Hill provided information to the Board on a worker exposure incident that occurred in Building 707 on September 9. On that date, a D&D crew was removing ventilation ductwork in module E, when a worker from a different crew working on the second floor of the building removed a cover on the ventilation system. This caused a change in airflow that allowed plutonium contamination to flow into the room. The workers in the room were wearing protective clothing, but air did travel outside the room. Forty-three workers outside the room were potentially exposed, so they all received nasal and mouth smears. Twelve of these workers had results just above background and received follow-up bioassays. Results from only one of the bioassays had been received so far, with that individual reporting a 7 mrem exposure. The cause of the incident was the worker on the second floor exceeding the scope of work he was to address. There had been a plan of the day and briefings, but the worker did more work that he should have, resulting in his removing the cover on the ventilation system that was being removed on the floor below.

PRESENTATION ON THE ORIGINAL LANDFILL: Bob Davis of Kaiser-Hill gave a presentation on the Original Landfill. The 20-acre landfill is located on the south side of the site on a hillside just north of Woman Creek. It has been inactive for 35 years. Bob's talk focused on characterization, landfill stability, remedial action plan, protection of water quality, and post-action monitoring.

Bob summarized the sampling of the landfill, as follows:

Surface Soil:	7,568 analyses at 70 locations.
Subsurface Soils:	24,964 analyses at 175 locations within the landfill.
Groundwater:	31,171 analyses at 50 wells.
Surface Water:	25,384 analyses at 15 locations.

Results of sampling show four uranium hot spots on the surface, which will be removed. In the subsurface, two of 129 samples contained polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) above action levels. In groundwater, Bob said there were a few contaminants slightly above background. Surface water sampling shows no impact from the landfill. Although the ecological evaluation has not been completed, the conclusion is landfill wastes are not significantly affecting the environment.

Bob said the landfill wastes were dumped in a fashion to create a hummocky appearance. The hummocks were not a result of settlement or sliding. Geotechnical investigations indicate the potential for landfill sliding but there has been no physical evidence of sliding. Additional investigations are needed to develop a monitoring plan to measure slope stability.

The Interim Measure/Interim Remedial Action (IM/IRA) covers four alternatives: no action, two alternatives that involve limited grading and a landfill cover, and removal with off-site disposal. The limited grading and cover alternative would cost about \$5 million; complete removal would cost about \$400 to \$500 million dollars. The preferred alternative is limited grading and cover.

While the landfill remediation would be regulated under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Liability, and Compensation Act (CERCLA or Superfund), Bob said a cover would meet the substantive requirements under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle D. The preferred alternative calls for a cover that would be at least two-feet thick and a slope no greater than 18 percent. The area would be revegetated with native plants and erosion controls would be installed. During design, the site would investigate whether to install retaining walls and a groundwater barrier system and develop a plan to monitor stability. Bob said there is no indication the landfill wastes are sliding toward Woman Creek. The proposed action would cover the landfill waste and increase structural stability.

Stewardship at the landfill would include quarterly inspections of the cover and drainage ditches. A surface water and groundwater monitoring plan will be developed. Institutional controls would prohibit digging or drilling, construction of roads and trails, and disturbance of monitoring points. In addition, restrictive signs

would be erected.

In answer to a question, Bob said the monitoring would measure movement to determine if there is sliding. They would also look for trees that might grow and cause damage to the integrity of the cover. In answer to another question, Bob said the geotechnical investigations would include an examination of the bedrock. However, the geotechnical plan is not yet final.

The public comment draft of the IM/IRA will be released in November or December.

PRESENT LANDFILL PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION: The next agenda item was the Present Landfill. At the September meeting, the Board heard a briefing on the early draft of the Present Landfill Interim Measure / Interim Remedial Action. Since then, the document has been revised and issued for a 45-day formal public comment period. This evening's purpose was to highlight any changes made to the document in the public comment version and give the Board another chance to have Q&A with project manager, Bob Davis.

Actually, there were few changes to discuss. The most significant one related to the seep strategy. Leachate discharges to the surface at a seep on the east face of the landfill and is treated to remove volatile organics (vinyl chloride and benzene) by means of a passive aeration system (a series of flagstones). The site will now seek a wastewater treatment unit exclusion. In order to meet the requirements, the leachate collection system must include a tank. Not only that, but the treatment process itself must occur inside the tank. Contrary to what was reported at the September meeting, the site discovered there are in fact two tanks in the current leachate system, one of which accumulates the leachate and the other just has a hose running through it. In order to meet the state's requirements, the passive aeration will be incorporated into a tank going forward. That way the system will be considered a treatment unit in the legal sense, which allows the site to avoid the administrative requirements of an NPDES permit for the seep. The technical requirements of a permit (e.g. surface water standards) will have to be met in any case.

A question of interest to the Board was why the proposal includes no monitoring of the cover itself, beyond that of physical inspection. This type of cover has been extensively used and researched, and is considered a presumptive remedy for a solid waste landfill. Therefore, the site feels there is no need to use lysimeters or other instrumentation to measure flow through the cover. It was further asked that, if no monitoring takes place, how we will know if the cover is performing as intended. From the site's perspective, a reduction of seep flow would be the prime indicator of cover performance. CDPHE also made the point that if the site were using an experimental cover, such as an evapotranspiration (ET) cover, instrumented monitoring would be appropriate. In this case, lysimeters actually punch a hole in the cover, thereby creating a conduit for water to infiltrate the landfill.

Some of the other changes to the document are:

Ø Burrowing animals have been added to the cover inspection criteria.

Ø The addition of quarterly inspections of the passive wastewater treatment system.

In terms of seep sampling, the site will begin collecting influent data; that is, the seep will be sampled prior to treatment as well downstream of the treatment unit. Old data on untreated seep water does exist and it has historically fallen within the same order of magnitude as the effluent (i.e. several parts per billion). With the new sampling regime, the site will reintroduce sampling of the influent to the seep treatment system. The site hopes this data will support the eventual delisting of the seep. Once the cover is installed, delisting sampling will commence upstream of the treatment system. It was asked why the site would wish to delist the seep? Though not a regulatory requirement, delisting would allow the site at some point in the future to stop treating the leachate if it were below surface water standards even without treatment.

The public comment period on the Present Landfill IM/IRA runs through November 6. Design work begins next Tuesday, and the plan is to start construction of the cover in the March / April time frame and finish by September 2004.

Following Bob's Q&A, there was Board discussion of a list of Present Landfill issues drafted by the Closure Projects Committee in September. The main topics identified by the committee were long-term stewardship and cover design. The purpose of the Board discussion was to elicit input these issues and others from the full Board so that the committee can begin putting together recommendation language at its next meeting on Monday, October 6th, to be held from 6 to 8 p.m. in the Lobby Conference Room at Broomfield City Hall. Feedback from the Board was as follows:

Ø The draft list of issues included using lysimeters on the cover. Some felt the use of lysimeters to monitor the cover may be counterproductive and that the monitoring of seep flow will provide an indicator of cover performance. Others felt that monitoring, if feasible, might provide useful information, and that the issue needs further investigating.

Ø Are there other types of instrumentation that would accomplish the same goal without compromising the cover? Is cover monitoring routinely done? These are questions the committee members will look into.

Ø There was an interest in finding out how widely this type of landfill cover has been used across the United States.

Ø Steve Gunderson invited members of the CAB to contact Larry Bruskin, one of the State's landfill engineers, with any detailed questions.

Before the break, Board chair Victor Holm asked about the development of the future

Record of Decision (ROD) for the site, specifically when will work begin and who will be responsible. The site representatives reported that Environmental Management will take on this responsibility, with assistance from Legacy Management. There are likely to be other important closure documents or activities for which Legacy Management may have lead responsibility, including the petition for delisting from CERCLA and certification of cleanup that will be submitted to EPA. The state reported that the RFCA principals have formed a committee to start working on the post-closure documents, and that they intend to have a draft of the post-RFCA document by next spring. One of the issues still being discussed is the application of the State's environmental covenants.

RFCAB TRANSITION PLAN AND 2004 BUDGET: Board member Dave Davia was joined by DOE representative Dotti Whitt to present and discuss the final draft of the Board's Transition Plan. The plan outlines the Board's activities between now and site closure. Members provided a few editorial comments, after which the plan was approved. Next, Dave presented the draft budget for 2004. In discussion, members provided some comments that focused on areas such as the lack of dollars for public outreach, advertising and library resource materials. The Board then approved the budget, although the Executive Committee will consider some minor changes such as whether dollars can be added for advertising and library materials. Depending on a few minor modifications, the budget is anticipated to fall just under \$270,000, with an anticipated carryover from 2003 of \$35,000, resulting in a request for new funding in 2004 from DOE at around \$235,000. The Executive Committee will set up a meeting with Gene Schmitt (or his designate) in the near-term to go over the 2004 budget request.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: November 6, 6 to 9:00 p.m.

Location: College Hill Library, Room L211, Front Range Community College, 3705 W. 112th Avenue, Westminster

Agenda: Approval of Recommendation on the Present Landfill IM/IRA document

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:00 p.m. *

(* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in the RFCAB office.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Joe Downey, 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.

[Home](#) | [About RFCAB](#) | [Board Members](#) | [About Rocky Flats](#) | [RFCAB Documents](#) | [Related Links](#) | [Public Involvement](#) | [Board Vacancies](#) | [Special Projects](#) | [Contact](#)