

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION

August 1, 1996

FACILITATOR: Winfried Danke, National Civic League

Tom Marshall called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. After introductions, Tom welcomed three visiting representatives from the Sandia/TRI Citizens Advisory Board: Patrick Baca (chair), Jamie Welles (secretary), and Yolanda Apodaca (administrator).

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Alan Aluisi, Jan Burda, Tom Clark, Eugene DeMayo, Tom Gallegos, Mary Harlow, Susan Johnson, Beverly Lyne, Tom Marshall, Linda Murakami, David Navarro, Gary Thompson / Mark Aguilar, Frazer Lockhart, Steve Tarlton

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Ralph Coleman, Tom Davidson, Paul Grogger, Kathryn Johnson, Sasa Jovic, Jack Kraushaar / Jeremy Karpatkin, Shirley Olinger, Tim Rehder

PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT: Kenneth Werth (citizen); Ron Morris (RF retiree); Dave Shelton (KH); Larry Helmerick (DOE/CED); Frank Smith (citizen); Jamie Welles (Sandia CAB); Patrick Baca (Sandia CAB); Yolanda Apodaca (Sandia CAB); Carol Barker (RF retiree); David and Rhonda Kidd (RF employees); J. Anderson (citizen); Bill McFarland (citizen); Victor Holm (citizen); John Corsi (KH/ECA); P. McClellan (Evergreen Analytical); Joe Legare (DOE); Bob April (DOE); Ravi Batra (DOE); James Horan (citizen); J. McLaughlin (KH); A. Schubert (KH); Stan Beitscher (RF retiree); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Erin Rogers (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff)

CONSENT AGENDA: Tom Marshall explained this new process that will be used, which the Executive Committee would like to try to help expedite meetings. The consent agenda will contain administrative and non-controversial matters on a consent agenda for approval, such as approval of meeting minutes. These items will go out in the Board packet and noted that they are a part of the consent agenda. If any Board member has questions or concerns about any item on the consent agenda, they need to contact the office prior to the meeting and that item will be placed on the agenda for discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Comment: Carol Barker: I would like to thank the Board from our group. I think you have helped us all that you can, helped us get some attention to our problem about health care benefits, we appreciate that very much. We thank you, and we will not be bothering you in the future, because I think you've done what you can do.

Comment: Stan Beitscher: I'm a retiree from Rocky Flats. We've been working very hard to get the attention of the Department of Energy on the question of the continuation of our health benefits as they were when we retired. For those of you who are not aware of the

ADMIN RECORD

problem, there's a very strong feeling that our health insurance is about to be downgraded without our approval. All of us feel that we're entitled to maintain our health benefits the way they were when we retired. Perhaps the meeting of all meetings is going to be held August 7. It's our third meeting with the Department of Energy, the first meeting was a warm-up, the second meeting was to get acquainted with Jessie Roberson and to let her know exactly what we wanted and she promised that at our third meeting something substantial would come of it. The third meeting will be held August 7, and we certainly appreciate the support of CAB and we request a couple of members from the Board and those people who might be interested in the issue attend and help support our position. We ask one more favor from you. That meeting is from 10 to 11 a.m., Building 131, conference room A/B/C. Attendance is by invitation, but as co-chair of the Disabled and Retired Workers Committee, I'm inviting you if you need that.

Response: Tom Marshall: You had asked DOE and Kaiser-Hill to notify us of all such meetings -- Erin, has the office been notified about this meeting? Erin Rogers: No.

Comment: Stan Beitscher: I've had to keep calling them to find out about it, and I'm the primary person that they would have contacted.

PRESENTATION ON THE TEN YEAR PLAN FOR ROCKY FLATS (Frazer Lockhart, DOE): In June, Al Alm outlined ideas for what he would like to see the weapons complex accomplish within the next ten years. He directed all sites to develop draft ten year plans describing how each site would achieve this vision of complete cleanup. Once developed, the plan will serve as the unifying direction to drive budget decisions, project sequence, and program objectives. The seven major principles of this vision are: to eliminate the most urgent risks; reduce facility mortgage and support costs to free up funds for further risk reduction; protect worker health and safety; reduce the generation of waste; create a collaborative relationship between DOE and its regulators and stakeholders; focus technology development on cost and risk reduction; and integrate waste treatment and disposal across sites. The plan strives to stimulate creativity at sites across the complex, to have a data source and focal point available for cross-cutting issues between sites that serves as a means to implement the vision. There is a potential for cooperation and collaboration between sites that has not yet happened. Rocky Flats already has the equivalent of this plan in place in such vehicles as the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement, Vision, and ASAP. The Ten Year Plan will be used to implement RFCA, and also unifies ASAP and the SWEIS. The assumptions between those documents are compatible, and in fact the Ten Year Plan beats RFCA's target milestones and planning schedule. At the end of ten years, following is what the site is proposed to look like:

- 6.6 metric tons of plutonium metal and 3.2 metric tons of plutonium oxides will be stabilized and packaged, awaiting offsite shipment
- 3.1 metric tons of plutonium in 106,000 kilograms of residues material will be stabilized and packaged, and shipped to WIPP
- 7,300 cubic meters of transuranic waste will be packaged and shipped to WIPP
- 6,700 kilograms of uranium will be packaged and shipped offsite
- Low-level and low-level mixed waste (soil, process, demolition, legacy) will be

shipped offsite, if feasible, and/or stored in onsite buildings

- Hazardous/sanitary waste will be shipped offsite
- More than 500 facilities will be deactivated and demolished
- Facilities remaining: plutonium vault; low-level waste building; and some administrative and utility facilities
- Clean D&D debris that comes out of the buildings will be used onsite as fill
- About 6,100 acres will support open space use
- About 100 acres cleaned to industrial use standards

This vision is based on the following assumptions: 1) At least \$657 million per year (in 1997 dollars) budgeted for site activities at Rocky Flats; 2) that the WIPP facility opens and pays the cost of shipping/disposal; 3) that low-level waste will be shipped offsite, or placed in containers and stored in buildings; 4) radioactively-contaminated soils would be cleaned up to achieve an 85 mrem/year or less exposure limit; and 5) the availability of low-level mixed waste shipment.

Q&A Session:

Question: Mary Harlow: When we started the cleanup two years ago, we were talking about 40 tons of plutonium, and now the figure is down to roughly 10 tons. What happened to the other 30 tons?

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: I don't recognize the 40 ton number at all. These are the numbers we have been tracking for many years. If you've got numbers that say 40 tons, I'd like to see those because perhaps it's an error in the documents or an error in presentations.

Question: Mary Harlow: On the ASAP III, we've gone through ASAP I, II, and now it's ASAP IIIc, is that document out for the public?

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: ASAP IIIc has not been put out per se, it is not a document in and of itself. ASAP was done in two phases. The first phase was a concept document, and was released last September. The second phase was to look at various alternatives. ASAP IIIc is one of those alternatives. The document itself was released to support the public comment period for the Vision and RFCA. Portions of what ASAP IIIc says can be made available to you. This was one particular alternative of that analysis of eight or nine different alternatives.

Question: Tom Marshall: Under the validation case, you have at a 15 mrem cleanup standard the ability to store low-level waste in containers, and yet in the responsiveness summary of RFCA, there's an indication that can't happen. Are you aware of that?

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: This was an analysis of a number of different factors. This did show containers. It also showed that the time period to achieve these kinds of things like demolishing buildings and moving materials offsite was in a range of 15-20 years to

basically achieve the same scope being talked about here. Additionally, not much is moving offsite. The transuranic waste we would move offsite, but the low-level waste stores would be in containers but they would all be onsite. We spend almost no money shipping material offsite. Bob April: The responsiveness summary to RFCA said we don't have enough information to make a decision about containers. What the validation case did was to make certain assumptions including containers. Frazer Lockhart: They weren't decisions, it was just an assumption to make the analysis. RFCA basically leaves those questions open.

Question: Tom Marshall: You mentioned that the site was going to be receiving plans from all the other sites. What is the integrating process? As I understand it, all of these plans are supposed to be integrated into a master plan. How is the site involved in that, is it a formal process?

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: We're still learning what the process is. Headquarters is taking the lead on that activity. They have organized teams that are focused at each site, and I'll be going back next week to brief this same material to our team. They additionally have cross-cutting teams set up, to cross-cut sites and particular programmatic issues. A lot of the teams are looking at the same issues complex-wide. The exact timing and process is not yet clear. We will have some involvement with our Rocky Flats team and later in August when they come out here.

Question: Tom Marshall: Will you keep us updated on that?

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: We would expect to, absolutely.

Question: Tom Marshall: I assume you got draft guidance for this plan. Can we get a copy of that?

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: Yes. We actually went beyond what was requested by the guidance.

Question: Alan Aluisi: I was talking to a DOE representative last week and he mentioned something about a recent budget cut being made for FY97 year. Has anything like this happened in the last two-three months. I heard a figure of about \$480 million as a plateau.

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: We're looking for FY97, \$597 million to the site. That's combined EM and DP dollars. FY97 is a little over \$50 million less than FY98 and the level profile that Headquarters gave us. FY97 is still in Congressional committee. We have our targets and have been told what we'll be given. All of that assumes that Congress is going to pass a particular budget. All of our FY97 planning is a bit in flux until that time. We're pretty sure certain activities, like plutonium stabilization, are going to go forward no matter how much money we get. But the totality of the budget and the plan and its timing is at the mercy of Congress. I'm not aware of any cut we've been told of lately for FY97.

Question: I have a question about the quantity of plutonium. It doesn't seem to match what was publicly listed originally. I think it was 14.2 tons.

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: The question asked was about 40 tons. Also, on the question earlier, it is 6,700 kgs, so 6.7 thousand kilograms.

Response: The quantity in the vulnerability study was 14 regular tons, not metric tons. So that's one thing you've got to reconcile. And this includes metals and oxides and residues, you still have other categories that need to be included, the TRU waste. I think if you look at the vulnerability study, you'll see that this is fairly consistent.

Question: Kenneth Werth: How can Rocky Flats, Kaiser-Hill, put out a ten year plan like this based on assumptions and not fact? In this plan, most of the waste is going to be shipped offsite. Who knows what they're trying to do with this waste? I keep harping on this disposal. People better start getting realistic that disposal will never happen in the future industrial site.

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: The plan recognizes that there are certain decisions, some of them at a national policy level and some local, that haven't been made. But we have to plan based on something. We have put together a package that anticipates shipping most of the waste offsite. There are commercial disposal facilities that are currently operating and have been for many of these low-level waste forms. We've shipped material to them and so have other DOE sites. WIPP has been designed and constructed specifically to accept transuranic waste, it's a matter of national policy. So there may still be some decisions associated with that, but we don't believe we're out of bounds.

Question: LeRoy Moore: I wanted to comment on the plutonium totals. Your chart is a bit confusing, but you actually do have the total amount of 12.9 metric tons. Because you have 6.6 and 3.2 on the first line, for a total of 9.8. I didn't spot that at first, and I was wondering where the other three tons were. If you have to do this presentation again, you might redesign that line.

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: Thank you. He's referring to the 6.6 of metal and 3.2 of oxides, which are also fairly rich material. That's our blind spot because we lump them the same as we think about treating them.

Question: Stan Beitscher: When you consider the budget for the ten year plan, what provisions are in the budget for the benefits for retired people, and have those been considered or is that something that slipped through?

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: They are not that specific in detail on this plan yet. There is a dollar area for the general and support costs. This entire plan over the ten years is in the range of about \$5.5 billion dollars. About \$2 billion is support costs of various kinds, which includes benefits to currently-employed and retired people. As for amounts, this plan is not to that level of detail.

Question: Stan Beitscher: Does that level stay constant then, or increase?

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: The general support level is essentially in line with the overall curve. As the overall activities decline, that support level is included in the baseline. But that's everything, the baseline for maintaining buildings and site safety as well as administrative things. It's just not to that level of detail yet. We'll be working on that over the next six months or so.

Question: There is a quantity of low-level waste, I was wondering if the plan includes any technology or continuation of technology development that would make that waste LDR

compliant and therefore disposal?

Answer: Frazer Lockhart: I think it does in some form. Essentially the plan suggests that technologies exist for most of the waste forms. There is some technology that can deal with most of it. There are some special waste forms that will continue to require some development. We are also looking at having some of our treatment offsite. There is an expectation we'll have to treat our mixed waste to some extent to comply with the law. We also expect that even some of the transuranic waste is going to need some treatment or at least repackaging to allow it to go to WIPP.

DISCUSSION ON DEVELOPING A CAB REVIEW PROCESS FOR THE "ACTION LEVELS FOR RADIONUCLIDES IN SOILS FOR THE ROCKY FLATS CLEANUP AGREEMENT" (Tom Marshall): The first major decision portion of the Ten Year Plan is to review and comment on the "Action Levels for Radionuclides in Soils for the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement" document. Both the Environmental/Waste Management and Site Wide Issues committees have developed a schedule for having their committees address this issue. Board members agreed this document is a top priority and expressed support for setting aside other agendas in favor of reviewing and participating in the comment process. However, some Board members expressed concern that inadequate time was allowed for review and comment on this document. A letter will be sent to DOE/EPA/CDPHE expressing the Board's displeasure with the short timeline and asking for an extension to the comment deadline. Susan Johnson agreed to draft the letter; it will be circulated to Board members for their review and comment prior to sending the letter. In the meantime, the following schedule was approved for the review process:

8/5/96: Site Wide Issues Committee CDPHE presentation on soil action levels

8/15/96: E/WM Committee Education Workshop #1 - "Snapshot of Soil Contamination Issues at RFETS" & identification of possible recommendation issues

8/20/96: Pu&SNM Committee Education Workshop #2 - "Risk/Dose Models, Radiation, and Background" & identification of possible recommendation issues

9/9/96: Site Wide Issues Committee Education Workshop #3 - "Action Levels Document/ RESRAD" & identification of possible recommendation issues, plus presentation of findings by outside reviewer

9/17/96: Pu&SNM Committee Optional date for further education if needed; discuss recommendations

9/19/96: E/WM Committee Draft recommendations (revisions of recommendations occur 9/20 through 9/27)

9/27/96: Board packet mailed with draft recommendations

10/3/96: Board meeting Final recommendation approved

10/4/96: Comment period closes

Decision: Send letter to DOE/EPA/CDPHE expressing the Board's displeasure with the

short timeline for review of the Action Levels document and asking for an extension to the comment deadline; but continue to work on review of the document per the schedule developed. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

RECOMMENDATION FROM CAB CO-CHAIRS TO AUTHORIZE EXPENDITURE OF UP TO \$5,000 TO HIRE AN INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT TO REVIEW ACTION LEVELS (Tom Marshall): CAB co-chairs brought a recommendation to the Board to approve spending up to \$5,000 to hire one or more independent consultants to review the Action Levels document and present their findings to the Board. The co-chairs will establish a process and deliverables for this document review.

Decision: Approve spending up to \$5,000 for independent consultant(s) to review Action Levels. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

ENVIRONMENTAL/WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - CLEANUP PRINCIPLES AND CRITICAL REPORTING ELEMENTS (Tom Gallegos): CAB members continued their work on this recommendation. A couple of issues came up that need clarification, such as whether or not to include language regarding worker retention in this recommendation; and how to address language on cleanup to background levels. The Environmental/ Waste Management Committee will review the draft of the language to date, and discuss these issues among committee members and with a few key Board members. The document will be finalized at the September Board meeting.

PLANNING FOR THE BOARD'S SEPTEMBER 8 RETREAT (Linda Murakami): The Board's next retreat will be held on Sunday, September 8, at the Brown Palace Hotel. CAB members agreed on a tentative agenda to include:

1) review and evaluation of the past three years [accomplishments, recommendations, goals, review past work plans, operations]; 2) where do we go from here? [budget prioritization, 1997 work plan, responding to items outside work plan framework]; and 3) issues regarding ex-officio participation in Board meetings. If Board members have specific suggestions for items they would like to have placed on the retreat agenda, or require specific information to be included in the retreat packet, let staff know. Also, if Board members are interested in planning a social event for the Saturday evening prior to the retreat, get those suggestions to staff as well.

Comment: Steve Tarlton: In terms of preparing for the retreat and the work plan process, I'd like to mention that the plant is putting out an integrated site wide baseline and it should be available to you in the next day or two. That will actually allow you to go through and pick out what's going to happen this year that you might want to be involved in.

Response: Linda Murakami: We got a specific commitment from Jessie Roberson and Jeremy Karpatkin that DOE was going to provide to us prior to that what they were going to make decisions on and that they were seeking input directly from the CAB.

Comment: Frazer Lockhart: CAB's taken on some big policy issues and have a few more in front of them. As those are firmed up, we are going to be moving more into the realm of the details of approach and design and execution as compared with policy. It might be worthwhile to consider the direction you're going in terms of that as well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

- Formation of a Personnel Committee: The Board approved forming a Personnel Committee to handle staff issues.
- Program Specialist hiring: The Board approved advertising for the full-time Program Specialist position, stating clearly the amount of time involved and the salary. The decision on hiring a specific individual will come back to the Board through the new Personnel Committee in October.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: September 5, 1996, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

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

Agenda: * *Presentation by panel reviewing past studies of movement of plutonium in the soils around Rocky Flats; Kaiser-Hill's Fiscal Year 1997 Performance Measures; finalize Cleanup Standards and Critical Reporting Elements; discussion of options for privatizing work at Rocky Flats*

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:

- 1) Draft letter to DOE/EPA/CDPHE re: short timeline to comment on "Action Levels" document, then to Board members for review - Susan Johnson
- 2) Establish a process and deliverables for consultant(s) hired to review "Action Levels" document - Co-chairs
- 3) Review Cleanup Principles language drafted to date; discuss with committee and some key Board members - E/WM Committee
- 4) Contact office with any specific agenda/information requests in preparation for September 8 retreat - Board members

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:00 P.M. *

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

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

David Navarro, 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](#)