

**ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD****MINUTES OF WORK SESSION****February 4, 1999**

---

**FACILITATOR:** Reed Hodgin, AlphaTRAC

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

**BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:** Carol Barker, Susan Barron, Ray Betts, Shawn Burke, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Gerald DePoorter, Derek Dye, Tom Gallegos, Mary Harlow, Victor Holm, Bob Kanick, Jim Kinsinger, LeRoy Moore, Bryan Taylor / Steve Gunderson, Jeremy Karpatkin, Joe Legare, Tim Rehder**BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT:** Alan Aluisi, Tom Marshall, Mary Mattson, David Navarro, Linda Sikkema**PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT:** Kenneth Werth (citizen); Doug Young (Mark Udall's Office); Mark Sautman (DNFSB); Roman Kohler (citizen); Greg Murray (citizen); John Corsi (K-H); Terje Langeland (Colorado Daily); Mark Wickers (citizen); Anna Martinez (DOE); Mariane Anderson (DOE); Dave Shelton (Kaiser-Hill); Alan Trenary (citizen); Will Neff (RFLII); Frank Blaha (citizen); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Erin Rogers (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff); Brady Wilson (CAB staff)**REGULATOR UPDATE (DNFSB):** Mark Sautman with the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board gave an update on issues being tracked by the Board:

- DOE has submitted a revised Implementation Plan for DNFSB Recommendation 94-1, with new milestones and completion dates for work to be done on solutions, metals and oxides with greater than 50% plutonium, and residues with less than 50% plutonium.
- The Defense Board issued a Reporting Requirement to DOE about Y2K issues about safety-related systems. Rocky Flats is doing well in this area, but DNFSB would like the site to further identify issues that would affect any safety-related systems.
- The Defense Board issued a report on external regulation, available on its web site ([www.dnfsb.gov](http://www.dnfsb.gov)).
- DNFSB has begun to look at worker safety issues specifically related to worker protection during deactivation activities such as glovebox size reduction and pipe removal, and to monitor specific issues as adequate ventilation, hard vs. soft-sided containment, air monitoring, accidental disconnections of breathing air hoses, and making sure shift managers are on duty during work activities.
- The Defense Board is reviewing radiological controls for removing highly contaminated piping.
- DNFSB is reviewing the RFFO Facility Representative Program to make sure the individuals who are required to be at and in facilities to oversee radiological practices are there and available during work activities.
- The Defense Board is reviewing the draft standard for the long-term storage of

**ADMIN RECORD**

SW-A-005342

material with less than 50% plutonium.

- DNFSB is looking at the impacts of shipping container delays, because of container certification problems, on the Actinide Processing and Storage Facility at the Savannah River Site.

**PRESENTATION / DISCUSSION ON BUILDING RUBBLE:** John Rampe gave a presentation on the site's plans for building rubble. At the beginning of the Rocky Flats Closure Project, the site had over 700 facilities and structures, 14.2 tons of plutonium, and 7.4 tons of uranium. The proposed endstate for the site is open space, with a potential for industrial use on the south side of the industrial area, all buildings will be demolished, and waste and plutonium will be shipped offsite. During D&D activities at the site, about 111,000 cubic meters of "clean" concrete is expected to be generated. What the site is looking at now is what to do with that concrete, and evaluating onsite vs. offsite disposal options. "Clean" rubble meets sanitary landfill criteria, meets free release criteria, is not low level or transuranic waste, and can be sent to places such as the Erie Landfill. The site is considering three different approaches:

1. One option would be to completely remove all the rubble and building foundations and dispose the waste at the Nevada Test Site. This would include full surface decontamination, disposing of the "clean" rubble at Erie, or by using smart characterization and decontamination by decontaminating only "unclean" surfaces.
2. Another option is to leave the building foundations in place for two buildings that will be demolished — 371 and 771 — then obtain large quantities of clean fill purchased from offsite sources, and filling the basement areas of those foundations with that clean fill. Either full surface decontamination or smart characterization and decontamination would also be performed in this scenario.
3. A third option, the one primarily under consideration by the site, is to use those same two building foundations, but fill them with the "clean" rubble generated at the site rather than to purchase offsite fill material. The site prefers this option, in conjunction with using smart characterization and decontamination. Evaluation criteria used by Kaiser-Hill — such as safety, technical feasibility, schedule performance, waste minimization, and costs — showed that this is the preferred option.

Extensive soil characterization and environmental restoration is a key element of this process. Areas below the buildings will be characterized, as will underground process lines. All plans and data will be shared with regulators and stakeholders during the process, and any contamination detected below the buildings will be addressed before decisions are made regarding building rubble.

The site will continue to work with the D&D Working Group to develop criteria for making the decision on building rubble. A policy document is being prepared; CAB was asked now to provide comments and input for early participation prior to the draft of that document. The document is expected to be completed this spring, with the usual formal public comment period.

CAB posed some questions and concerns, which focused primarily on characterization, the free release standard and its applicability to this issue, why these specific buildings (771 and 371) were selected and the criteria used for their selection, and concerns about the stockpile of building rubble and potential for release of dust and contaminants.

In addition, there were many information requests that the Board would like to have

addressed at its next meeting, to aid in continuing discussions on the issue of building rubble disposition. CAB would like information on: the free release standard and its use in this scenario; independent verification of the total background alpha radiation; sampling plans for characterization of contamination under and around the foundations; plans to record and maintain information about the location of the rubble for future generations; and public participation plans.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:**

**Comment:** Alan Trenary: I am interested in the Leyden gas repository that has natural gas stored in it, and is adjacent to the site. What is the relationship to the plume coming off the Pad and is it coming in the direction of the area where the natural gas is stored? There may be contamination under the basements, and they are not sure what is there. As the characterization is done, we will get an idea of what is going on the soil under the Industrial Area. I would like to see more work done to show where the contamination in the soil is going related to the gas repository. I'd like to see the Public Utilities Commission send a representative out to discuss this with us, because it is pertinent to Rocky Flats due to the fact that it is so close. The issue is to find out the relationship between the transport of groundwater plumes, particularly VOCs, and the location of the lignite mine that is storing natural gas under Rocky Flats.

**Response:** Tim Rehder: We can't say definitively where all the groundwater is at the site right now, but we have enough wells surrounding the Industrial Area so we have a good idea where the trends are. I would be happy to share those maps with you.

**Comment:** Mark Wickers: Is there a place on the DNFSB web site where we can get more information on what kinds of safety issues you see related to Y2K, to help us find out what you discovered.

**Response:** Mark Sautman: On our web site, under documents and reports, pull up Rocky Flats and 1999, you will find the letter the Board wrote to the Secretary of Energy, and the reports detailing the findings, as well as reports covering other reviews. We anticipate having the remedies in place for the safety systems by March, and during March through June we will perform an independent verification to make sure it was done correctly.

**RESCHEDULE WIPP TOUR:** CAB's tour of the WIPP site, originally scheduled for February 12, was canceled. The Board was given new dates to reschedule, the first being March 12-13, and other potential dates in May. CAB suggested having Erin Rogers work on rescheduling the tour sometime in May. Erin will work with DOE officials to come up with an alternative date and finalize the tour details.

#### **FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION ON THE EAST TRENCHES AND SOLAR PONDS**

**PLUME PAMs:** At the last meeting, the site gave a presentation and took comments and questions from the Board about these two Proposed Action Memorandum Documents. Several information requests were made to the site based on that presentation and discussion. At this meeting, a map was distributed showing the extent and direction of the two plumes in question, as well as a spreadsheet highlighting specific analytical results of the Mound Plume Treatment System, which is the type of system proposed to be used at both the East Trenches and Solar Ponds plume areas. This data helped to clarify how the samples were collected and the controls used. A few information requests have yet to be

answered by the site; that information will follow when the next follow-up to this topic is held at the Board's March 4 meeting. In addition, at this meeting there were more information requests from the Board, such as:

- A question was raised about the underground caverns that make up the Leyden gas storage facility and any impact from VOCs.
- Questions about the field sampling protocols used for water samples, and specific details about how samples are prepared and analyzed.
- Where are the laboratories doing the sampling, and what is the turnaround time?
- Concerns about lab handling procedures and how long samples are kept.
- Show the standards used on the Mound water analysis data so that it can be used for comparison.

**APPROVE THE ACTINIDE MIGRATION STUDIES TRG REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS:** The Actinide Migration Studies Technical Review Group prepared a Request for Proposals to hire a Technical Review Contractor to assist the group in its review and analysis of Actinide Migration Studies being performed at the site. The contractor would be responsible for the following tasks, as well as other duties as described in more detail in the RFP:

- Attend meetings of the AMS TRG as well as quarterly AMS meetings, prepare meeting summaries;
- Review documents and procedures as requested by the TRG, and prepare summaries;
- Assist the TRG in identifying goals for the AMS work plans, provide technical analysis and summaries.

Since the funds for the contractor will be part of CAB's annual grant with DOE, the Board was asked to approve this RFP, as well as the contractor ultimately selected by the group. CAB approved the RFP, to will be released on Monday, February 8. Proposals must be received from potential bidders by March 8, and an Evaluation Committee will review those, select finalists, and recommend a contractor for approval by the Board. The contract should be in place and ready to go forward by April 20.

***Decision:** Approve the Request for Proposals for a technical review contractor to the Actinide Migration Studies TRG. APPROVED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.*

**FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CAB SLIDE SHOW:** Based on comments received at the last Board meeting, Erin Rogers made some changes to the text of the CAB slide show. CAB approved this final copy. Board members were asked to sign up to be part of CAB's speaker's bureau, and to make suggestions on which groups might be interested in this presentation.

**DISCUSSION OF "ROCK THE FLATS" PROJECT:** At a meeting in October, Board members discussed a possible project, a 24-hour music festival highlighting the accomplishments at the site. Chris Shields had brought the idea to the Board, and several members were interested in finding out more about the project. Since the idea for the event was discussed in Executive Session, details about what the Board decided are unclear. In late December, Mr. Shields produced and distributed a brochure describing the event, listing CAB as one beneficiary of any proceeds from the event. Several Board members were concerned that this was done without their prior approval. Jeremy Karpatkin with DOE also

stated that there may be legal issues that would prevent CAB from being eligible to receive proceeds from this concert. The Board will request a legal opinion of DOE on this matter. Since there was limited time on the agenda to discuss this issue, it was deferred until the next meeting.

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

Membership Committee. Based on a recommendation from the committee, CAB agreed to add the following two new members:

- **Joe Downey**. Joe is a geohydrologist with Downey & Gutentag, and previously worked for nearly 30 years with the U.S. Geological Survey. He has a BSG from the University of Arizona, with specialized studies in lunar geology, limnology and computer science, among others. Joe has published more than 100 books, papers and professional journal articles in the fields of geology, groundwater, paleontology and hydrology. He is a resident of Arvada.
- **Bill Kossack**. Bill is a statistical and data mining consultant with Qwest Communication, as well as serving as co-chair of the local Sierra Club chapter. He has a BS in Zoology, an MS in statistics, and has experience working in and supervising prairie management projects in Texas. A wildlife photographer, Bill lives in Westminster.

#### **NEXT MEETING:**

**Date:** February 16, 1999, 6:30 - 9:30 p.m. (study session)

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

**Agenda:** Continue discussion of building rubble; conversation with new District 2 Congressional representative Mark Udall; briefing on Rocky Flats FY 2000 budget; "Rock the Flats" project

#### **ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:**

1. Forward questions, concerns, comments and information requests on building rubble issues to DOE-RFFO for response at a future meeting - Staff
2. Continue planning WIPP tour for sometime in May - Erin Rogers
3. Forward additional questions and concerns regarding East Trenches and Solar Ponds Plume PAMs to site for response at a future meeting - Staff
4. Request legal opinion on "Rock the Flats" project from DOE-RFFO - Staff

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:20 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](#)