

**Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments Board Meeting Minutes**  
**Monday, July 9, 2001**  
**8:00 – 11:00 a.m.**  
**Mt. Evans Room in the Terminal Building**  
**Jefferson County Airport, Broomfield**

**Board members in attendance:** Michelle Lawrence (Director, Jefferson County), Nanette Neelan (Alternate, Jefferson County), Hank Stovall (Alternate, Broomfield), Mike Bartleson (Alternate, Broomfield), Sam Dixion\* (Director, Westminster), Mary Harlow (Alternate, Westminster), Lorraine Anderson (Director, Arvada), Carol Lyons (Alternate, Arvada), Amy Mueller (Alternate, City of Boulder), Paul Danish (Director, Boulder County), Matt Magley (Alternate, Superior).

\*Arrived at time indicated.

**Coalition staff members and consultants in attendance:** David Abelson (Executive Director), John Marler (outgoing Technical Advisor), Melissa Anderson (incoming Technical Program Manager), Kimberly Chleboun (Program Manager), and Barbara Vander Wall (Seter & Vander Wall, P.C.).

**Members of the Public:** John Corsi (Kaiser-Hill), Jeff Stevens (Kaiser-Hill), Dyan Foss (Kaiser-Hill), Bob Nininger (Kaiser-Hill), Patrick Haines (Radian), Anna Martinez (DOE), Patrick Etchart (DOE), Fred Gerdeman (DOE), Jeremy Karpatkin (DOE), Steve Gunderson (CDPHE), David Kruchek (CDPHE), Tim Rehder (EPA), Rob Henneke (EPA), Ken Korkia (RFCAB), Ron Hellbusch (City of Westminster), John Swartout (Governor Owens), Pete Jacobson (Senator Allard), Doug Young (Congressman Udall), Nancy Hunter (Congressman Schaffer), Tom Norton (CDOT), Will Toor (City of Boulder), Doris DePenning (Friends of the Foothills), Hildegard Hix (Sierra Club), Dan Chesshir (RFSOIU Local #1), Filiberto Cruz (RFSOIU Local #1), John Whitney (RFSOIU Local #1), Beth Wohlberg (The Daily Camera), Berny Morson (Rocky Mountain News).

### **Convene/Agenda Review**

Paul Danish called the meeting to order at 8:18 a.m. David Abelson proposed moving the discussion with Tom Norton to the beginning of the agenda, prior to the Board discussion of letters regarding a transportation corridor alignment. Lorraine Anderson motioned to approve the change in the agenda. Hank Stovall seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

### **Meet with Tom Norton**

Tom Norton, director of Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), began his discussion of the proposed transportation alignment study by explaining the State needs to survey for a

location to connect the Northwest Parkway and C-470, including potential routes around and through Rocky Flats. The study will look for the most economical and reasonable route, and they must also perform an Environmental Analysis to determine the environmental effects of these routes. Tom confirmed he had already discussed this plan with counties and cities to be impacted by the potential route and acknowledged studies done by Jefferson County and Arvada, but emphasized these two studies did not look at the statewide picture of coordinating traffic and transit units. He stated the western communities developed transportation routes to support local businesses, without the ability to move from region to region. Now he is pushing for analysis of half a dozen different routes, realizing the corridor must be compatible with the proposed wildlife refuge. Tom said he doesn't believe they have all the necessary facts about a preferred route and it is important not to predetermine unacceptable routes.

Amy Mueller asked if this study would duplicate work done by Arvada. Tom said he had no reason to believe they would not use information from the Arvada study, as well as the Jefferson County study. However, the state study needs to be broader. Mary Harlow asked why it was necessary to use state taxpayer's money for another study when so many studies of the route had already been done. Tom said he did not know of any regional or statewide studies or of any agreement or decision in determining the route. Hank Stovall agreed the Northwest Parkway connection to E-470 was successful because the route was determined and acquired with agreement throughout the community. He said in order to avoid controversy on this corridor the State should adhere to the preferred Indiana route. Hank also stated if the Site becomes a refuge a road would segment it. Tom said, according to discussions he has had with Rocky Flats personnel, a route through the Site may be no more contaminated than the Indiana route. Without a study they don't know all of the engineering and environmental facts, or if it could be constructed in a manner compatible with habitat and refuge utilization. Michelle Lawrence said Jefferson County believes the study is very important, and has contributed \$250,000 to get it started. She said the study would not be complete until all possible routes were reviewed to determine the most logical route. Tom added that data showing the unfeasibility of a location is equally valuable as data showing feasibility, and if you leave anything out you will still have controversy. He is requesting support for a decision to give it finality. Paul Danish asked if he really believed revisiting the question of running a road through Rocky Flats, and creating refuge fragmentation, would bring finality. Tom replied data indicate there are still people who agree and disagree on that issue, but they would need both sides to agree to achieve finality.

Lorraine Anderson said Arvada's study was sensitive to a number of opinions, and emphasized they tried to work with communities, and didn't want to go through Rocky Flats if they didn't have to. She also said the road is not meant to generate growth and development, and it goes through areas they will be unable to develop. Lorraine stated the study determined the preferred route, although it did not include an Environmental Assessment. Tom said CDOT is looking to move regional traffic in order to maintain existing economies, and has no desire for development. Existing development is sufficient to warrant the roadway. Sam Dixon said Westminster agrees with the preferred alignment from Arvada's study. Tom said he had already discussed this with the Westminster city manager and understands their concerns about water quality, and the study will look at a route from the environmental perspective. Boulder mayor,

Will Toor, said there are areas where it is highly unlikely there would ever be political consensus in allowing a road, and any route through Rocky Flats would be extremely unlikely to ever move forward. He stated the opposition would be so high it would not be worth the time or funding to study these routes. Tom responded he understands the political issues around these locations, but when you eliminate alternatives you are not doing a real study of all the facts. He added the federal government would not accept it as a valid analysis under NEPA unless all alternatives were considered. Paul Danish said the route location has already received enormous amounts of attention, and the Coalition already has consensus on where they want it to go, including environmental and political considerations. He stated revisiting this question would fracture consensus, jeopardize the refuge bill, and delay a solution for years while parties argue over the right-of-way. Tom disagreed and said his proposal will move forward, assist with the bill and provide scientific answers. He asked the Coalition how they wanted to participate and move forward. Lorraine and Michelle both emphasized the urgency in moving forward with haste. Hank added there are already studies with data available to work toward an expeditious resolution.

\*Sam Dixon arrived at 8:36 a.m.

### **Business Items**

- 1) **Motion to Approve Consent Agenda** – Mary Harlow requested the minutes reflect her thanks to DOE regarding their efforts on behalf of worker safety and a study well done. Hank Stovall motioned to approve the consent agenda with Mary Harlow's suggested changes to the minutes. Lorraine Anderson seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.
- 2) **Approve Letters to Allard and Udall** - David Abelson directed the Board's attention to the letters drafted as a follow-up to the Board's January 2001 resolution regarding the refuge bill. The Arvada study has since closed the loop on the question of which corridor to reserve for future transportation needs. Lorraine said she is satisfied with the letters, but asked if they could also include a request to hasten the environmental studies proposed by Tom Norton in order to reach a conclusion quickly. After discussion, the Board agreed the letters should be sent as drafted, and the subject of the CDOT study could be considered in a separate letter. Lorraine Anderson motioned to approve the letters. Michelle Lawrence seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.
- 3) **Executive Director's Report** – David Abelson thanked John Marler for doing a great job during his time with the Coalition, and introduced his successor, Melissa Anderson. Second, David said the Plutonium Stabilization and Packaging System is finally up and running, and will be assessed in six months to determine its performance. Third, David discussed his meetings in Washington D.C., which focused on Coalition funding, cleanup schedule, and the Allard-Udall bill. On behalf of funding, he met with the new director of the Office of Worker and Community Transition, Mike Owen, who hopes Rocky Flats will follow the example set by the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. He also met with people in DOE's Office of Long-Term Stewardship, which is still without a permanent director, and learned it still remains unclear whether the Coalition will receive the grant requested. David met with key House and Senate staff to discuss the Coalition's position on the Allard-Udall bill and the

prospects of scheduling a hearing. It is possible the hearing may be scheduled in the House for September. He reported they are all very supportive of the bill and cleanup, but there is an increasing cry within DOE and Congress questioning why Rocky Flats is getting full funding when other site's budgets are slated for cuts. Additionally, David met with Dan Ashe, Director of the National Wildlife Refuge System, who voiced concerns about funding and questioned why USFWS should take the property. Dan believes the state or locals should take the property. David also met with Rep. Udall to discuss cleanup progress, and also spoke briefly with Bob Card. Fourth, David referred to the draft Environmental Remediation RSOP and explained unless substantial changes are made in the next draft, he and staff will develop a set of recommendations to submit to the Site. Fifth, he discussed the Asphalt and Soil Management RSOP and pointed out comments provided by Westminster and Broomfield, in which a number of important issues were raised. Sixth, David said Lisa Morzel requested that work on convening an independent panel to review controlled burn issues be postponed until she returns in late August or early September. Seventh, David announced the Coalition website is now up and running. Last, he again asked for Board input on the proposed health effects workshop. The Board still does not agree on the agenda and what should be the level of discussion, either an overview of the health effects of low-level radiation, or a detailed conversation as to the technical aspects of ICRP values. David suggested organizing a meeting at the Coalition office to work it out. The workshop will require a considerable amount of money and he wants to make sure it will meet all the Board's needs.

Lorraine Anderson referred to David's meeting with USFWS and said it is important that those around Rocky Flats be engaged in what happens, since we don't want to end up with a neglected refuge or as part of the Arsenal. She said funding should not be dismissed. David agreed everyone is concerned about funding. Paul Danish said if national defense considerations change, funding priorities could change, and it is very important DOE provide adequate money for stewardship after closure. Hank Stovall insisted the health effects workshop needs to be technical in order for the Board to understand the uncertainties and base decisions on science, not politics. He said the Board should support their staff in giving clear direction. Mary Harlow said she supports the workshop and the staff should try to capture everyone's concerns. Sam Dixon said she has no objections to either format, but if it is technical it will be necessary to have an introduction to the concepts first. Mary also voiced concerns over Coalition funding from the OCWT and suggested sending Mike Owen a formal letter of introduction. David said he already gave him a full informational packet on the Coalition. Mary said the Coalition should send a letter when he is officially the department director. Sam asked what delay was involved with Mr. Owen's appointment, and David explained it is not a political appointment and it is only the normal FBI background checks and procedures causing the delay. David then circulated the quarterly finance report.

### **Public Comment**

Doris DePenning stated she disagreed with Tom Norton's approach to studying a transportation corridor, and the Coalition is doing the right thing in adhering to what they have already agreed

upon. She agreed with Mayor Toor that public perception and the realities of the hazards would make this study a difficult process.

**D&D Briefing**

John Marler reviewed what had been discussed in the previous three sessions of the four-part series of D&D presentations, reviewing the issues captured from last month’s discussion, and describing the issue of demolition and monitoring which would be covered in the current session. He then introduced Jeff Stevens, Kaiser-Hill.

Jeff Stevens began the presentation on demolition by reminding the Board the facility must meet free release criteria. The health and safety issues related to demolition are industrial hazards and the airborne hazards, nuisance dust and silica. Again, Jeff said radionuclides and beryllium are not an issue because the facility meets the unrestricted release criteria. Sam Dixion and Mary Harlow questioned if beryllium and plutonium might be a problem, even with free release. Jeff explained free release does not mean zero but they would still be within environmental and health limits. Jeff then described each demolition technique and the related safety concerns, as captured in the table below:

Demolition Method	Industrial Health & Safety Concerns	Airborne Concerns
Wrecking ball	Personnel in vicinity of large, moving equipment; falling concrete; operator hazards; not controlled process.	Personnel on ground using water hose; high and long duration of dust that is difficult to control. Fogging technique.
Cabling	Personnel not in vicinity; cable failure hazard; operator hazards; not controlled process.	Personnel on ground using water hose; high and short duration of dust.
Diamond wire cutting	Personnel in vicinity; significant amounts of rigging; hazards from the wire; controlled process.	Wet cutting method minimized dust.
Excavator with attachments	Personnel in the vicinity; falling concrete; operator hazards; controlled process.	Personnel on ground using water hose; high and long duration of dust that is difficult to control.
Non-explosive cracking agent	Personnel not in the vicinity; flowout; caustic; controlled process.	Dust control is not required.
Explosives	Personnel not in the vicinity; inadvertent detonation; controlled process.	Automated water suppression; high and short duration of dust.

Sam asked what they would do in the case of high wind. Jeff responded wind would be an issue in any type of demolition because it is difficult to control everything. Once winds reach 15-20 miles per hour work would be shut down. Mary asked if they would remove interior walls prior to using explosives. Jeff said that would be a possible option, and offered all of the cities a personal on-site briefing to walk through the details, noting Arvada has already accepted this offer. Paul Danish noted when you solve a dust problem with water you then have a water problem. Jeff explained a fogging technique would consist of small water particles and would not generate much water. However, if puddles were to be generated they would require sampling, as is the case currently. Paul asked what happens when the water dries and wind picks up, and Jeff said they have suppression techniques in place until all of the work is done. Hank Stovall said an array of dust suppression techniques would be more reliable than one person using a hose. Jeff acknowledged this is reviewed, especially for explosives. For a one-time shot they are able to have the whole area covered, but it is hard to adjust for constant use.

Jeff then described environmental and health and safety monitoring. The Site Health and Safety Program incorporates OSHA requirements and are based on potential hazards. Since the buildings will meet the unrestricted release criteria, the health and safety concerns are limited to silica and nuisance dust. The OSHA standard for dust is a time weighted average of 5.0 milligrams per square meter. The Integrated Monitoring Plan incorporates environmental monitoring, which is required by the Clean Air Act, and is also based on the potential hazardous air pollutants. Jeff explained facilities that meet unrestricted release criteria would not be monitored in a commercial environment, but additional monitoring, without regulatory basis, may be conducted to address identified concerns. Personnel monitoring will consist of lapel air monitors as well as general area air samplers. Jeff explained the individual air samplers would sample the air in the worker's breathing zone. Small portable monitors will be placed downwind of the prevailing winds at the edge of the project area and provide a weighted average of particulates over the duration, and will record the highest reading for the day. Both will be used to determine the effectiveness of dust control activities. Mary asked if they have video footage available from the dust suppression methods used when demolishing Building 779. Jeff knew of photos, but would check to see if they have video. Hank asked how often OSHA inspects the site. Fred Gerdeman, DOE, said onsite personnel verify compliance. Hank also asked about the time period the weighted average is taken from. Jeff responded it would depend on the workday as it is based on the number of hours of worker contact. The lapels would be put on people in the area, the operators, and the hose operator. Mary asked if they monitor for plutonium and beryllium dust on workers. Jeff said when they send the lapel monitor filter offsite for analysis it must be assured to be free of radionuclides, so they are screened. Dyan Foss, Kaiser-Hill, stated they would eventually have the ability to perform real-time monitoring for beryllium. Jeff then introduced Bob Nininger, Kaiser-Hill, who provided a presentation on environmental air monitoring for D&D/ER projects.

Bob displayed an aerial photo pinpointing the air monitoring stations. There are fourteen stations around the perimeter, and seventeen more onsite in the Buffer Zone and Industrial Area. These provide a routine monthly isotopic analysis, unless there is a known or suspected release.

There are also three samplers in nearby eastern neighborhoods, which run continuously. Bob reviewed historic ambient sampling results, which revealed higher numbers in the northeast and southwest corners. He explained they believe these were due to natural uranium released from a quarry operation, and a road intersection. Bob emphasized emissions of concern are at a very low concentration. He described the monitoring difficulties that are encountered since air emissions are not limited to a certain pathway, and there are physical limitations with the turnaround time of samples. Before they can send filters for analysis the radon must first decay, which causes a 72-hour delay. Mary asked if results from project specific monitoring of Building 779 were available. Bob said they would have been in the quarterly report, and he also could provide them. Patrick Haines, Radian, said they should also be on EDDIE, the Site's online environmental database. Next, Bob explained monitoring is used to demonstrate compliance with environmental regulatory requirements, and to evaluate uncharacterized impacts on the environment. Monitoring can also be used to verify assumptions regarding project activities and the efficacy of control measures. All monitoring is documented through the Integrated Monitoring Plan, and is designed around Data Quality Objectives. Mary asked why they would have to worry about a known or suspected release if the buildings met free release criteria. Bob explained a known release could occur in the event of a fire or accident.

Bob then reiterated that 37 samplers operate continuously, analyzing for plutonium, americium, and uranium isotopes, on both PM<sub>10</sub> and coarse particulate samples. Melissa Anderson asked if they would check PM<sub>2.5</sub> and Bob explained studies have shown radionuclides to attach to larger particles. He noted enhanced monitoring for D&D would involve 10 samplers around the IA, sampled weekly, including a 3-day alpha-beta analysis. There would not be daily sampling because they would not want to report constant non-detects, and the radon prevents them from seeing anything for 72 hours. Additionally, six samplers would operate continuously during demolition of several beryllium buildings, with weekly samples and a 2-day analysis turnaround time. Paul expressed concern this is only confirmatory sampling. Jeff explained that is why the key issue is dust suppression and keeping anything from becoming airborne. He said airborne monitoring doesn't protect anyone, it just confirms if there is a problem. Mary asked if there would be soil sampling around the building. Bob said it would not be part of the environmental monitoring program, but soil sampling is covered under the IASAP. Jeff explained soil sampling occurs as they remediate and remove building slabs. Building 779 sampling occurred prior to the IASAP so the best data would be taken from the concrete storage area. Bob concluded by explaining monitoring is not done just to see what they get, but they need to develop a standard against which they can measure performance. Filiberto Cruz, the security guard's safety representative, questioned Jeff about several issues the guards have raised including work stopping when winds reach 35 miles per hour, not 15-20. He also raised the issue of the guard's ignored requests for: street sweepers to remove dust; lapel monitors; surveys of guard posts; daily monitoring; and results of the Building 779 monitoring. He also stated workers said they saw lavender paint, used as a fixing agent for radionuclide contamination, by the rubble pile but it was gone the next day. Sam asked Kaiser-Hill look into lapel monitors for the security guards. Mary asked what the detection limit is on the lapels and Jeff said it is the normal instrumentation for these screenings. Bob added the lapel monitors of workers closest to the action are screened for radionuclides daily.

### **Round Robin**

**Arvada** – Lorraine Anderson said Arvada had a very active citizens committee, which had endorsed their transportation study. Carol Lyons said the Cold War Museum had elected a Board of Directors and officers, approved bylaws, and submitted the necessary applications to qualify as a nonprofit agency. She said it should take six weeks for the State and IRS to process the applications.

**Westminster** – Mary Harlow said she hoped DOE would involve the community in drafting the Site's long-term stewardship plan. She also suggested keeping track of the National Renewable Energy Lab's environmental assessment to determine if it will impact the Rock Creek Reserve. David said the scoping document had been provided to the Board in the meeting packet.

### **Public Comment**

The public offered no further comment.

### **Big Picture**

David Abelson reviewed the big picture. At the August 6<sup>th</sup> meeting the Board will begin reviewing the environmental remediation portion of D&D, and receive an update from the regulators.

The meeting was adjourned by Paul Danish at 10:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kimberly Chleboun, Program Manager