

RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
November 14, 2001
Meeting Minutes

INTRODUCTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE

A participants list for the November 14, 2001 Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement (RFCA) Stakeholder Focus Group meeting is included in this report as Appendix A.

Reed Hodgins of AlphaTRAC, Inc., meeting facilitator, reviewed the purpose of the RFCA Focus Group (Focus Group) and summarized the meeting rules. Introductions were made.

AGENDA

Reed reviewed the agenda:

- Task 3 Peer Review and Wind Tunnel Technical Review – Update
- October 30, 2001 Meeting With the Principals
 - Feedback From the Principals
 - How the Meeting is Affecting the RSALs Project
 - Feedback from the Focus Group Members
- Path Forward and Schedule for the RSALs Project
- Task 3 Report – Questions and Answers on Draft Report
- Continuing the Policy Discussion – Topics and Schedule

Reed began the meeting with a discussion regarding the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS) website. The RFETS website has been placed out of service for security purposes. AlphaTRAC is working with RFETS on developing solutions, as historical and current material for this Focus Group and the RSAL Working Group are no longer available via web access. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is investigating how to issue information within the security parameters. Other options involve AlphaTRAC hosting the website temporarily or permanently from its server.

Reed agreed to keep the Focus Group informed of any new developments or how the problem has been solved.

ADMIN RECORD

1/26

SW-A-006552

TASK 3 PEER REVIEW AND WIND TUNNEL TECHNICAL REVIEW – UPDATE

Comments resulting from the Wind Tunnel Technical Review are due this week. AlphaTRAC will provide the comments to the agencies and the Focus Group the following week.

The Task 3 Report peer review process is underway, but reviewers have found that more time is necessary. With this in mind, responses will most likely begin to arrive in late December 2001.

A Focus Group member commented that the Task 3 Report would behave much like a “living document” for the next few months. This approach will ensure that any key additions or differences are included in the document, as well as results for Uranium, and the study being conducted on actinide migration.

The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) stated that additional information on naturally-occurring background radiation from Uranium and groundwater needs to be gathered. There exists a need to distinguish between man-made contaminants and naturally-occurring background radiation. Another consideration is that there are Uranium mines near the RFETS with potential to contaminate surface water.

Reed reiterated that the Task 3 Report peer reviewers should have their comments submitted near the end of December 2001, with agency responses for the Focus Group by mid-January, 2002.

OCTOBER 30, 2001 MEETING WITH THE PRINCIPALS

On October 30, 2001, a meeting was held with the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement (RFCA) principals, of which there were both presentations and dialog with key organizations of the community and individuals in the community.

Reed asked for comments in areas that involved descriptions of the principals' responses, what the principals thought of the meeting, what the community said, and

what was learned from the meeting. Reed asked that comments be geared toward impressions and reactions of the October 30th meeting. These comments will provide a framework for establishing an on-going decisionmaking process for the Focus Group.

General comments were summarized as follows:

- Additional comments and questions from the principals were desired;
- The public was not prepared for the high level discussions the Focus Group members conducted;
- A specific process may have been helpful for discussions between the Focus Group members and the principals;
- Follow-along questions were addressed after the meeting regarding the RSALs;
- Important views were communicated to the principals by the Focus Group members, which were unfiltered by project coordinators and staff;
- From the agency standpoint (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]) it was found that the Focus Group members' work was valuable.

PATH FORWARD AND SCHEDULE FOR THE RSALS PROJECT

Reed stated that the peer review process results are scheduled to be completed by the end of December 2001. From this point, the agencies will review the comments and form resolutions within two weeks, if possible. The Focus Group should have a week and one-half to respond to the peer review and various agency comments.

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) described a recent decision involving the final Radionuclide Soil Action Levels (RSALs) report. It is the intention of DOE to resolve any contradictions, align the report with regulatory compliance requirements, use acronyms in a practical manner, and produce the report in such a way that it reads as if one author wrote it.

A Focus Group member expressed concern about whether or not the results from the actinide migration study would be included. The member would like to see the results discussed in the final RSALs report.

Reed clarified the process regarding the actinide migration study. Specific questions about ground water / surface water pathways for Plutonium and Americium have been submitted to the peer reviewers. This process will allow for further consideration and discussion about ground and surface water pathways contamination. As an additional point, Reed stated that Uranium is going to be addressed separately from the Task 3 Report and is considered a subsurface issue, while the Task 3 Report is specifically concerned with surface RSALs.

TASK 3 REPORT – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON DRAFT REPORT

Reed called for a discussion regarding the Task 3 Report. The following topics were discussed (some bulleted points may have additional notes):

- Periods of sufficient rainfall;
- Depleted Uranium;
- Consideration and use of 30 years of historical meteorological data;
- Fire scenario, vegetation and revegetation;
- Mass loading considerations;¹ and
- Major construction is not a part of any of the scenarios developed;²

¹The Focus Group revisited the mass-loading concept once again. A triangular distribution was used when the shape of the distribution was unknown. With a triangular distribution, there exists some sort of central tendency and this central tendency is more likely to be in the middle of the distribution than elsewhere. A triangular distribution tends to be useful when there are not enough data to know what shape the distribution is and there is a vague idea about the maximum and minimum data points. The Focus Group decided that a more thorough discussion of triangular distribution and mass loading could be available via email.

²EPA noted that major construction projects beyond a building, a dwelling, or a structure are not included in any of the scenarios, but the assumptions made about mass loading are sufficiently conservative to incorporate these activities.

The Focus Group discussed topics related to the rural resident scenario. The following comments regarding the approach and certain assumptions were made:

- The assumption that the rural resident will only be outdoors 20% of the time seems unrealistic;
- CDPHE will provide background basis to support the data on the percentage of time a rural resident may spend outside;
- Outdoor activities were considered during scenario development;

- Concerns about how shielding or contamination inside structures are factored in the modeling results; and
- Plant uptake and ingestion.³

³Reed pointed out that quality factors in the actual gamma versus alpha radiation from Plutonium are included in the dose conversion factors and are also used in the risk factors when modeling for plant uptake and ingestion. Reed noted that different pathways are calculated differently for each scenario, depending on how much time is spent outdoor or indoors—shielded, and the degree of shielding one gets from a building, as well as external penetrating radiation. Each of these considerations is a variable in the calculation.

CONTINUING THE POLICY DISCUSSION – TOPICS AND SCHEDULE

Reed introduced the policy discussion by recommending some points of interests for the path forward. Due to the variety of perspectives regarding the cleanup budget, whether the budget has changed or will change, Reed suggested that the budget discussion wait.

Reed identified two points of interest, stated as:

1. End-state discussion through the examination of end-state scenarios, end-state alternatives, and how the Focus Group currently views end-state; and
2. Identify cleanup priorities using an analysis of available options for surface water protection, surface contamination removal, sub-surface contamination, removal, risk reduction, etc.

From this point, it would be beneficial to review the budget to see how these alternatives have impacted the budget. This process can lead to looking at an integrated picture.

One Focus Group member suggested that one-on-one interviews, with facilitator synthesis of the viewpoints, be considered as a valid method of managing the diverse and complex views of this Focus Group.

Another Focus Group member asked to revisit prior policy discussions and proceed from that point.

And another Focus Group member would like to see the Focus Group's conversations streamlined with activities within the community and agency groups.

Other Focus Group members expressed frustration over the repetitive nature of some of the dialog in the group. This repetitive dialog mainly occurs during complex technical discussions, and is intended to be educational, and iterative, so that non-technical people can contribute. Another aspect that causes discomfort for some Focus Group members is the negotiation process that exists between the community and the agencies. It was recognized by EPA that better negotiation skills for all parties would need to surface in order to make progress.

Reed suggested that the Focus Group find common ground based on interests to produce answers that help move the process along. Reed agreed to revisit this topic at the next meeting. He also agreed to develop some options for productive discussions, which may include a discussion on Uranium, policy, and priorities.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
November 14, 2001
Meeting Minutes**

**Appendix A
Participant's List**

11/14/01 RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting

Last part of meeting

MH: I need to look at the fact that ... FG was and it wasn't considered ... write the letter or take was not to make ... I think we have been delayed significantly because of our ... stop talking about ...

RH: I think there's been a lot of benefit to having the RSALs discussion. The question is are you at a point now that you can go back to some of these other broader discussions, more inclusive discussions that you've looked at.

MH: ... the RSALs I am sick of them. I'd like to move on.

SG: This isn't for discussion. This is for me. I bet I'm speaking for a lot of the agency people, maybe a lot of ... are very frustrated. We're going to have to modify the Task 3 report. The numbers may change, but I don't know if they're going to change so much given the broad circle of risk range, where the real risk is going to boil down into some of the other things... Now the RSALs and other end state issues ... priorities. In one of the places I think we get a big disconnect is, there are certain people in the group that seem to recognize that when we get down to making a decision, when the decision makers have to decide this is how we're going to close the site, between now and 2006, ... we have to decide what the resources are likely to be versus what we can do with those resources to use to make the best cleanup possible. We have another vocal group in this group who really focus on this is our position. We want everything. We want an ultimate cleanup to background, surface, sub-surface. You want the standard measure of .15, 30-day average at every single spot, and that's where we end up getting stuck in the ... My own view is, if we can't break through that log jam, that disconnect, I don't think this group has any purpose any more. It should go away. Look at how many public meetings some of us have to deal with. Why do this one. Why cause all the brain damage? We'll work with the CAB and the coalition and we'll meet with some of the key stakeholders and talk about end state, and the RFCA parties will make a decision. We're going to have to make a decision. If we can't get this thing back together, I want to get rid of this group. That's my view.

JL: We're going to make decisions. I'm a little bit more upbeat about ... I think we all know about soil ingestion than anybody else on the planet. Let's move the process ...but we are going to ... We can either engage in the process together and let go of personally held positions ... or we can have the discussion with these folks ... You aren't going to get it. We can get \$50 million more ... and still have to make choices.

You can't hide behind the issue of, you just go ask for more money. We've just moved the discussion from here to here and we still have to make choices. Either we're going to talk about making choices, surface water, surface soil, sub-surface soil, institutional controls, or we're not going to talk about it and we're just going to go make those decisions.

RH: I think one of the things that needs to happen, and it needs to happen somewhere, and it can happen at least in part in this group, is to move from a discussion about positions just for two position demonstrated to a discussion that's based on interest and where we can find common ground to produce answers that help move a process along because they're brought on the table and contribute to that. That's the kind of discussion I think Dave is asking for, for me to have one on one with folks, and I think that would be a good way to look at moving the process forward, for me to evaluate ...

Sgarcia: This group I think is one of the best groups. I know a lot of people are really upset about it because we seem to go in circles a lot of the times, but this is one of the meetings where everybody ... dialog ... talk about. ... No offense to all those other meetings, but people that have not had the technical background ... Whatever the topic is for the day a lot of the times, we change our agenda to meet the ... I think it does have value, it adds to the process but also keeps ... The only thing I don't agree with is for Reed to be ... I think that is not within this focus. ... has a feel for they should be able to say that in this meeting. That's the whole purpose of this meeting. ... I'm not saying we shouldn't have dialog...

JL:: Part of my question is, ... recommendations ... certainly ... folks ... recommendations ... A lot of people ... what's really meant, but to me you just can't do that. But here we're talking about here and here and here, we're saying no, my position is way over here. That's it. No interests, ..., priorities, we're over here we're not even talking about our recommendations. That's our frustration. Some of these folks are ... where the heck did that come from? Haven't we been talking the last couple of years and all of a sudden they're an accusation ... That's a real frustration.

VH: I'd like to get back to the ... The community's on one side of the table, and we're not going to be ... but I want to ... negotiate. That's what I'm ... I do not know what form that's taken, but I had hoped this meeting is going to work. It hasn't been to this point. ... negotiating we start talking about tradeoffs, we're not going to get anywhere. The CAB's recommendation, maybe I don't ... That says we're going to start with an RSALs with a cleanup level of ... 10-6. It may not even be cleaned to 10-4.

... ground rules.

KK: attacking the citizens who work very hard, if you would like to offer them ... involved in ...

JL: ... recommendation ...

KK: Then tell them that.

JL: ...

KK: Tell them. I am not the CAB. I work for the CAB. Tell them as a group ...

RH: That's a good point. From the standpoint of where we go from here, Shirley, your point is well taken. I think I have ...

MH: ... discussion ...

?: suggestion ... also be good to pulse ...

MH: ...

RH: Let me come back to you folks at the next meeting with some options for productive discussions that you can have that will contribute to moving a path forward on this. I'll bring newer perspectives to bear and look at this holistically. I also think that you've proven to be a good group as a place that can have the detailed discussions. I believe there's a place in this group for review of uranium discussion, at the kind of level that you've talked about for RSALs. It's a great place to do that ... your ability to do that. I also think that this is an untapped resource for the larger discussion. Dave's right, we've got to figure out a way to make that happen successfully if we're going to tap into this as a resource. I'm going to try to ... something that does that and also works from the perspective that Ken was talking about that doesn't replace what you're doing at your parent groups, but rather services them from here as well.

?: ... priority ...

RH: I will access that source as well.

Our next meeting is the 28th. My recommendation is that we have a basis for me to bring something back on this discussion as part of the discussion for the 28th, but that we should make our only meeting in December the 12th, and not try to meet any later

and then be ready to come back after the holidays. And continue this discussion at our first meeting in January and then at later meetings in January and in February be back and finish up the RSALs discussion.

I will come back on the 28th with specific options and recommendations for you to consider. I'll talk to the agencies about where they believe ... it's at. Start with pulling that together and presenting to you what I believe the options are.

JG: ... regulators ... We considered 10-5 as ... soil action level, and our frustration is that we ... because we thought that we had done a terrific job, and yet the soil action levels ... and it's not like what the ... did. We tried to take into consideration some ... so that we have as much a right to frustration as they do. At a minimum, this is our third go around now,

?: What I don't ...

RH: Thank you all and see you on the 28th.

RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group

November 14, 2001 Meeting

Policy Discussion

RH: ...directions at least that you might go with this discussion on policy.

First of all, I don't think there's probably a very productive discussion about whether the dollar amount that you have that exists in the cleanup budget is all there is or ... get more. There are people that have one side of that opinion and others that have the other side. I think there are a couple of very productive pathways of discussion for this group. As was mentioned earlier today, one of the original purposes of the group is to look at things holistically and look at integration. It might be very productive to get back and do that. There are two ways that I can think that you might proceed to have that discussion and build into that what you've learned about RSALs, cleanup levels, etc. and what's coming up with such things as water. One is to get back to the end state discussion which you started... examine end state scenarios and end state alternatives and what they mean in light of what you know now. Talk about that as a group and start looking at specific end state options and examining those.. Another is to look at this from a standpoint of cleanup priorities. If you did that, you would examine the priorities that different ones of you have for cleanup what are the priorities that are available? Surface water protection, surface contamination removal, sub-surface contamination removal, risk reduction, those sorts of priorities exist for you. Then start examining, what are the things we know we must do and what is that going to achieve for us? We must cleanup to meet the water standards, so what will that give us in the way of risk reduction, surface removal, etc.? We're going to cleanup the 903 pad in a particular way, we have maybe a couple of options there. What will that give us in the way of surface water protection, risk reduction, surface removal, etc. How do these play against the different priorities that we have.

Then examine perhaps what each of those means in terms of money. If we go and do these things and protect surface water, what's it going to cost to do that out of the bucket of money that's immediately available? To go cleanup 903 pad and this scenario versus this scenario, how much money are we going to spend against where we're going to get against our priorities? I think that's another fruitful way that a group like this with the diversity of perspectives that you have can look at this. Because different

members of this group will be pursuing this from different priorities. Those are two ideas I have. What do you think in the group; what would be a productive use for looking at an integrated picture, looking at the holistic view?

DA: The question you raise is extremely important. ... government say that ... For most of you who have been sitting here for a year and whatever, we try to define time and time and time again ... and at various points to get whose side is to various people or governments or whatever. I'm not convinced that there is a ... this is the place to have that discussion. While alternatively ... that it is something that people are interested in talking about, for lack of a better word, what's the best cleanup you can get for your money. I'm just not convinced...I think it would be a great value as a facilitator, instead of talking to people, ... have a really good sense of what people's interests are and ... and where they're coming from ... We've tried it time and time again ... suddenly get defensive, and you still can't get to mission in other areas ... you were talking about ...in having that integrated discussion ... and I would ask that that is not something to go around the room. I think you really have one on one conversations rather ... not necessary.

RH: Save for ... Okay. I think that's a valid point.

KK: I agree with David. I think the struggle that we face is, I'd like to see these questions we've discussed ... I think that's the hardest ... that we built on different perspectives and different ... that we, when we started this conversation ... same people in all the different groups, so that those conversations within those one groups can be ... can happen. The value of this group is ... together ... intended ... perspectives that you can bring forward then prepare ...other than those ... that this is how... There'd probably be some value. The thinking of these jobs on these discussions you go back to the ... that laid out, then come back to the group to discuss ...

BN: One of the things we're in the process of doing that was figuring ... water quality ... the RSALs too some of the things that normally ... necessary is that we need to make sure we don't... anymore ... so maybe now we have better money. ... material ...

RH: I see the power of this group, the fact that you do bring very different perspectives to the table and different interests and they can together. I think it's important for us to find a way to move away from restating positions over and over again hoping that if you say it one more time everybody will figure it out, to actually finding something we can work on so that the, so our different interests can contribute to a common solution. I believe that pony is there.

?: It raises the question though, does this conversation ... two hour groups in terms of information given then; I mean working for the coalition and working with the CAB ... are there, but within a huge range ... expected ... and this becomes emotionally ... brings to the table this is the focus group that doesn't ... of each other ..., unfortunately impossible... but that's what I'd like to see ...

RH: Was that one of the things you were getting at Ken?

KK: ... because I don't know how, how does the CAB ... how do you ... many people ...

RH: So the idea is to craft a conversation here that fits in with what's going to happen at your home groups as well.

JG: We started to have a discussion like this a year ago. In that year, I have seen no ... data ...

RH: Joe. I think you have lot's of information in front of you. I think you're ripe for this discussion.

JG: Wait a minute.

We still don't know all the contaminated areas. We've never been told what contamination We don't know the What we've been looking at, and I think this the ... is trying to develop a standard that it safe for the future ... That's a big undertaking and we've had a heck of a lot of time on it. In fact, we're not finished yet. I haven't heard the regulators, what they consider is safe ... There's a lot of double talk.

RH: Joe. That breaks the ground rules and I'm going to move on.

MH: I need to look at the fact that ... FG was and it wasn't considered ... write the letter or take was not to make ... I think we have been delayed significantly because of our ... stop talking about ...

RH: So there's been a lot of benefit I think to having the RSALs discussion. The question is are you at a point now that you can go back to some of these other broader discussions, more inclusive discussions that you've looked at.

MH: ... the RSALs I am sick of them. I'd like to move on.

SG: This isn't for discussion. This is for me. I bet I'm speaking for a lot of the agency people, maybe a lot of you too are very frustrated as we go over the same stuff over and over again, ... to death. We're going to have to modify the Task 3 report. The numbers may change, but I don't know if they're going to change so much given the broad circle of risk range, where the real issue is going to boil down into some of the other things... Now the RSALs and other end state issues and priorities. In one of the places I think we get a big disconnect is, there are certain people in the group that seem to recognize that when we get down to making a decision, when the decision makers have to decide this is how we're going to close the site, between now and 2006, ... we have to decide what the resources are likely to be versus what we can do with those resources to use to make the best cleanup possible. We have another group, a very vocal group in this group who really focus on this is our position. We want everything. We want an ultimate cleanup to background, surface, sub-surface. You want the standard measure of .15, 30-day average at every single spot, and that's where we end up getting stuck in the ... My own view is, if we can't break through that log jam, that they disconnect, I don't think this group has any purpose any more. It should go away. Look at how many public meetings some of us have to deal with. Why do this one? Why cause all the brain damage? We'll work with the CAB and the coalition and we'll meet with some of the key stakeholders and talk about end state, and the RFCA parties will make a decision. We're going to have to make a decision. If we can't get this thing back together, I want to get rid of this group. That's my view.

JL: We're going to make decisions. I'm a little bit more upbeat about what we achieve in these meetings from hell. I think we all know about soil ingestion than anybody else on the planet. Let's move the process ...but we are going to ... We can either engage in the process together and let go of personally held positions that have been passed... or we can have the discussion with these folks ... You want insurance. You're not going to get it. We can get \$50 million more ... and still have to make choices. You can't hide behind the issue of, you just go ask for more money... We've just moved the discussion from here to here and we still have to make choices. Either we're going to talk about making choices, surface water, surface soil, sub-surface soil, institutional controls, or we're not going to talk about it and we're just going to go make those decisions.

RH: I think one of the things that needs to happen, and it needs to happen somewhere, and it can happen at least in part in this group, is to move from a discussion about positions just for two positions demonstrated or talked about, to a discussion that's based on interest and where we can find common ground to produce answers that help move the process along because we're brought to the table and contribute to that. That's the kind of discussion I think Dave is asking for, for me to have one on one with

folks, and I think that would be a good way to look at moving the process forward, for me to evaluate ...

Sgarcia: This group I think is one of the best groups. I know a lot of people are really upset about it because we seem to go in circles a lot of the times, but this is one of the meetings where everybody ... dialog ... talk about. ... No offense to all those other meetings, but people that have not had the technical background ... Whatever the topic is for the day a lot of the times, we change our agenda to meet the ... I think this group does have value, it adds to the process but also keeps ... The only thing I don't agree with is for Reed to be talking... I think that is not within this focus. ... has a feel for they should be able to say that in this meeting. That's the whole purpose of this meeting. ... I'm not saying we shouldn't have dialog...and more ... We not going to have that dialog.

JL: Part of my question is, ... recommendations ... certainly ... folks ... recommendations ... A lot of people ... what's really meant, but to me you just can't do that. But here we're talking about here and here and here, we're saying no, my position is way over here. That's it. No interests, ..., priorities, we're over here we're not even talking about our recommendations. That's our frustration. Some of these folks are ... where the heck did that come from? Haven't we been talking the last couple of years and all of a sudden they're an accusation ... That's a real frustration.

VH: I'd like to get back to the ... Part of my frustration ... certainly ... that the folks ... from the RFCAB ... this process. As I read it, you have a lot of people ... what this really meant ... we're talking about here and here and here, we're saying no, .our position's way over here. No interests, not ..., priorities. They're over here, we're not even going to talk about it; our recommendation's here. That's our frustration. Some of these folks ... that. Where the heck did that come from: Haven't we been talking the last couple of years, and all of a sudden there's accusation real question.

VH: The community's on one side of the table, and we're not going to be but I want to ... negotiate. That's what I'm ... I do not know what form that's taken, but I had hoped this meeting is going to work. It hasn't been to this point. ... ready for negotiating we start talking about tradeoffs, if that's what it's going to be, we're not going to get anywhere.

?: That was ...

VH: The CAB's recommendation, maybe I don't ... That says we're going to start with an RSALs with a cleanup level of ... 10-6. It may not even be cleaned to 10-4. That's what ...

KK: That's ground rules...

A lot of jabber from a lot of people.

JL: ...?

KK: Yeah. I think that you're attacking the citizens who work very hard, if you would like to offer them ... involved in ...

JL: That recommendation was ... coalition ... focused ...

KK: Then tell them that. I am not the CAB. I work for the CAB ...

JL: That's a good point.

RH: That's a good point. From the standpoint of where we go from here, Shirley, your point is well taken. I think I have ...

MH: What you should do is ... open discussion ...

DA: suggestion ... also be good to pulse ... process

MH: ...

DA: ... says more than ...

RH: Let me come back to you folks at the next meeting with some options for productive discussions that you can have that will contribute to moving a path forward on this that will bring your perspectives to bear and look at this holistically. I also think that you've proven to be a good group as a place that can have the detailed discussions. I believe there's a place in this group for review of uranium discussion, at the kind of level that you've talked about for RSALs. It's a great place to do that and you've proven your ability to do that. I also think that this is an untapped resource for the larger discussion. Dave's right, we've got to figure out a way to make that happen successfully if we're going to tap into this as a resource. I'm going to try to craft something that does that and also works from the perspective that Ken was talking that

doesn't it replace what you're doing at your parent groups, but rather services them from here as well.

SGarcia: There's one last thing, as far as this ... to discuss. Everyone knows ... priority ...

RH: I will access that source as well.

RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting Agenda

When: November 14, 2001 3:30 - 6:30 p.m.

Where: Broomfield Municipal Hall, Bal Swan and Zang's
Spur Rooms

- 3:30-3:40 Agenda Review, Objectives for this Meeting
- 3:40-4:00 Task 3 Peer Review and Wind Tunnel Technical Review -
update
- 4:00-4:15 October 30, 2001 Meeting With the Principals
- Feedback From the Principals
 - How the Meeting is Affecting the RSALs Project
 - Feedback From the Focus Group members
- 4:15-4:30 Path Forward and Schedule for the RSALs Project
- 4:30-5:00 Task 3 Report – Q&A on Draft Report
- 5:00-5:10 Break
- 5:00-5:45 Task 3 Report – Q&A on Draft Report (Cont.)
- 5:45-6:25 Continuing the Policy Discussion – Topics and Schedule
- 6:25-6:30 Review Meeting
- 6:30 Adjourn

RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting Agenda

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
Attachment B**

Title: Letter from Joe Legare regarding DOE's milestones

Date: October 11, 2001

Phone Number: (303) 966-5918

Email Address: joe.legare@rf.doe.gov

RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group Attachment C

Title: RFCLOG Health Effects Workshop Notes

Date: October, 2001

Author: Melissa Anderson
Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments

Phone Number: (303) 412-1200

Email Address: manderson@rfclog.org

RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group Attachment D

Title: RFCA Stakeholder Questions for the Technical
Review of the Wind Tunnel reports

Date: October 17, 2001

Phone Number: (303) 428-5670

Email Address: cbennett@alphatrac.com

RESRAD 6.0 INPUT PARAMETERS	UNITS	RESRAD		Resident Rancher (ADULT)	Resident Rancher (CHILD)
		6.0 Default	1996 VALUE		
Pathways					
External Gamma		active	active	active	active
Inhalation		active	active	active	active
Plant Ingestion		active	active	active	active
Meat Ingestion		active	Suppressed	active	active
Milk Ingestion		active	Suppressed	active	active
Aquatic Foods		active	Suppressed	Suppressed	Suppressed
Drinking Water		active	Suppressed	active	active
Soil Ingestion		active	active	active	active
Radon		active	Suppressed	Suppressed	Suppressed
Initial Principal Radionuclide					
Activity in Contaminated Zone	pCi/g		Am-241	0.111	0.111
	pCi/g		Pu-238	0.0132	0.0132
	pCi/g		Pu-239	0.843	0.843
	pCi/g		Pu-240	0.157	0.157
	pCi/g		Pu-241	0.798	0.798
	pCi/g		Pu-242	7.62E-06	7.62E-06
Basic Radiation Dose Limit					
Basic Radiation Dose Limit	mrem/y	25	15	15 & 25	15 & 25
Time for Calculations	y	1	0.2	29	29
Time for Calculations	y	3	1	1029	1029
Time for Calculations	y	10	5	not used	not used
Time for Calculations	y	30	not used	not used	not used
Time for Calculations	y	100	not used	not used	not used
Time for Calculations	y	300	not used	not used	not used
Time for Calculations	y	1000	not used	not used	not used
Time for Calculations	y	not used	not used	not used	not used
Time for Calculations	y	not used	not used	not used	not used
Occupancy, Inhalation, and External Gamma					
Inhalation Rate	m ³ /y	8400	7000	10800	8600
Mass Loading for Inhalation	g/m ³	0.0001	0.00026	0.00318(90%) & 0.008920(95%)	0.00318(90%) & 0.008920(95%)
Exposure Duration	y	30	30	30 not used	30 not used
Indoor Dust Filtration Factor		0.4	1	0.7	0.7
External Gamma Shielding Factor		0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7
Indoor Time Fraction		0.5	1	0.6	0.75
Outdoor Time Fraction		0.25	0	0.4	0.25
Shape Factor for external gamma		1	1	1	1
Area of Contaminated Zone					
Area of Contaminated Zone	m ²	10000	40000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Thickness of Contaminated Zone	m	2	0.15	0.2	0.2
Length Parallel to Aquifer Flow	m	100	200	3000	3000
RESRAD 6.0 INPUT PARAMETERS					
RESRAD 6.0 INPUT PARAMETERS	UNITS	RESRAD		Resident Rancher (ADULT)	Resident Rancher (CHILD)
		6.0 Default	1996 VALUE		
Cover and Contaminated Zone Hydrological Data					
Cover Depth	m	0	not used	No Cover	No Cover
Density of Cover Material	g/cm ³	1.5	not used	No Cover	No Cover
Cover Erosion Rate	m/y	0.001	not used	No Cover	No Cover
Density of Contaminated Zone	g/cm ³	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.8
Contaminated Zone Erosion Rate	m/y	0.001	0.000749	0.0000749	0.0000749
Contaminated Zone Total Porosity		0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3
Contaminated Zone Field Capacity		0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Contaminated Zone Hydraulic Conductivity	m/y	10	44.5	44.5	44.5
Contaminated Zone b Parameter		5.3	10.4	10.4	10.4
Humidity in Air	g/m ³	8	not used	not used	not used
Evapotranspiration Coefficient		0.5	0.233	0.92	0.92
Average Annual Wind Speed	m/s	2	2	4.2	4.2
Precipitation	m/y	1	0.381	0.381	0.381
Irrigation	m/y	0.2	1	0	0
Irrigation Mode		overhead	overhead	overhead	overhead
Runoff Coefficient		0.2	0.004	0.2	0.2
Watershed Area	m ²	1000000	8280000	8280000	8280000
Accuracy for Water/Soil Computations		0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Uncontaminated Unsaturated Zone Parameters					
Number of Unsaturated Zone Strata		1	1	1	1
Thickness	m	4	3	3	3
Density	g/cm ³	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.8
Total Porosity		0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3
Effective Porosity		0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Field Capacity		0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Hydraulic Conductivity	m/y	10	44.5	44.5	44.5
b Parameter		5.3	10.4	10.4	10.4
Radionuclide Transport Factors					
Distribution Coefficient Contaminated Zone	cm ³ /g	-	-	Pu = 2000, Am = 20	Pu = 2000, Am = 20
Distribution Coefficient Unsaturated Zone	cm ³ /g	-	-	Pu = 2000, Am = 20	Pu = 2000, Am = 20
Distribution Coefficient Saturated Zone	cm ³ /g	-	-	Pu = 2000, Am = 20	Pu = 2000, Am = 20
Time since placement of materials	year	0	0	0	0
Solubility Limit	mol/l	0	0	0	0
Leach Rate	year ⁻¹	0	0	0	0

RESRAD 6.0 INPUT PARAMETERS	UNITS	RESRAD		Resident Rancher (ADULT)	Resident Rancher (CHILD)
		6.0 Default	1996 VALUE		
Saturated Zone Hydrological Data					
Density of Saturated Zone	g/cm ³	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.8
Saturated Zone Total Porosity		0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3
Saturated Zone Effective Porosity		0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Saturated Zone Field Capacity		0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Saturated Zone Hydraulic Conductivity	m/y	100	44.5	44.5	44.5
Saturated Zone Hydraulic Gradient		0.02	0.15	0.15	0.15
Saturated Zone b Parameter		5.3	not used	5.3	5.3
Water Table Drop Rate		0.001	0	0	0
Well Pump Intake Depth (below water table)	m	10	10	10	10
Model: nondispersion (ND) or Mass-Balance (MB)		ND	ND	ND	ND
Well Pumping Rate	m ³ /y	250	250	250	250
Ingestion Pathway, Dietary Data					
Fruit, Vegetable and Grain Consumption					
Leafy Vegetable Consumption	kg/y	14	2.6	64	42
Milk Consumption	l/y	92	not used	110	200
Meat and Poultry Consumption	kg/y	63	not used	95	60
Fish Consumption	kg/y	5.4	not used	not used	not used
Other Seafood Consumption	kg/y	0.9	not used	not used	not used
Soil Ingestion					
Drinking Water Intake	l/y	510	not used	730	550
Contaminated Fraction, Drinking Water		1	not used	0	0
Contaminated Fraction, Household Water		1	not used	not used	not used
Contaminated Fraction, Livestock Water		1	not used	0	0
Contaminated Fraction, Irrigation Water		1	0	0	0
Contaminated Fraction, Aquatic Food		0.5	not used	not used	not used
Contaminated Fraction, Plant Food		-1	1	1	1
Contaminated Fraction, Meat		-1	not used	1	1
Contaminated Fraction, Milk		-1	not used	1	1
Ingestion Pathway, Nondietary Data					
Livestock Fodder Intake For Meat					
Livestock Fodder Intake For Meat	kg/day	68	not used	68	68
Livestock Fodder Intake For Milk	kg/day	55	not used	55	55
Livestock Water Intake For Meat	l/d	50	not used	0	0
Livestock Water Intake For Milk	l/d	160	not used	0	0
Livestock Intake For Soil	kg/day	0.5	not used	0.5	0.5
Mass Loading for Foliar Deposition					
Depth of Soil Mxing Layer	m	0.15	0.15	0.03	0.03
Depth of Roots	m	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Groundwater Fractional Usage, Drinking Water		1	not used	1	1
Groundwater Fractional Usage, Household Water		1	not used	not used	not used
Groundwater Fractional Usage, Livestock Water		1	not used	1	1
Groundwater Fractional Usage, irrigation Water		1	not used	1	1
Plant Factors					
Wet Weight Crop Yield, Non-Leafy					
Length of Growing Season, Non-Leafy	years	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17
Translocation Factor, Non-Leafy		0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Weathering Removal Constant	1/year	20	20	20	20
Wet Foliar Interception Fraction, Non-Leafy					
Dry Foliar Interception Fraction, Non-Leafy		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Wet Weight Crop Yield, Leafy					
Length of Growing Season, Leafy	years	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Translocation Factor, Leafy		1	1	1	1
Wet Foliar Interception Fraction, Leafy					
Dry Foliar Interception Fraction, Leafy		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Wet Weight Crop Yield, Fodder					
Length of Growing Season, Fodder	years	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
Translocation Factor, Fodder		1	1	1	1
Weathering Removal Constant, Fodder	1/year	20	20	20	20
Wet Foliar Interception Fraction, Fodder					
Dry Foliar Interception Fraction, Fodder		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Storage Times Before Use Data					
Fruits, Non-Leafy Vegetables and Grain					
Leafy Vegetables	days	14	14	14	14
Milk	days	1	1	1	1
Meat	days	20	20	20	20
Fish	days	7	7	not used	not used
Crustacea and Mollusks	days	7	7	not used	not used
Well Water	days	1	1	1	1
Surface Water	days	1	1	1	1
Livestock Fodder	days	45	45	45	45

26/24