

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION****December 14, 1998**

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Jim Kinsinger called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Susan Barron, Ray Betts, Shawn Burke, Gerald DePoorter, Tom Gallegos, Mary Harlow, Jim Kinsinger, Tom Marshall / Steve Gunderson, Mariane Anderson, Frazer Lockhart, Tim Rehder**BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT:** Alan Aluisi, Carol Barker, Tom Clark, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Derek Dye, Victor Holm, Bob Kanick, Beverly Lyne, LeRoy Moore, David Navarro, Linda Sikkema, Bryan Taylor**PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT:** Mark Wickers (citizen); Kenneth Werth (citizen); Julie Negri (citizen); Mark Sautman (DNFSB); Ann Marshall (CTAC/CAO); Anna Martinez (DOE); Mary Jo Strong (DOE); John Corsi (K-H); Alan Trenary (citizen); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Erin Rogers (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff); Brady Wilson (CAB staff)**NOTE: A QUORUM WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE DURATION OF THIS BOARD MEETING.****PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:**

Comment: Mark Wickers: Mark is a resident of Rock Creek, and read from a letter he had prepared. I have a few concerns with the proposition of turning Rocky Flats into a permanent monitored retrievable storage facility. First, because of the detection of unacceptable levels of dangerous material at the Indiana Street border of Rocky Flats last spring (which is still unexplainable), I feel that our ability to contain the material at Rocky Flats safely is questionable. Secondly, if WIPP opens, then the people of Denver will be at risk due to the transportation of nuclear reactive material traveling on highway I-25. The material at Rocky Flats will be only 20% of all material traveling through Denver. I would rather add the 20% risk and have the material at Rocky Flats stored in WIPP than go through 80% of the risk for no apparent gain. Finally, keeping the radioactive material at Rocky Flats sounds like an expensive solution. Who is going to pay for the maintenance and upkeep of the storage facility over the next 100, 1,000 years? For these reasons, I recommend that we continue our efforts to move the dangerous material at Rocky Flats to WIPP and concentrate our efforts on: 1) preventing further release of nuclear material while demolishing Rocky Flats; 2) testing the transportation methods to verify that they are safe; 3) developing contingency plans in case there is an accident; 4) helping to ensure that WIPP is a safe storage facility in the future. I have only been attending these meetings for a short time. If my opinions are unsound due to lack of accurate information, I look forward to hearing your input.

ADMIN RECORD

Comment: Kenneth Werth: I have been working on a concept for over five years now, and have written letters to my U.S. representatives and the Secretary of Energy, but all I've heard is that they want to bury high level waste in a repository. I've come up with a pyramid design. I envision it as one structure out at Rocky Flats, and it would be of state-of-the-art construction, with the finest quality of granite. Granite is the most abundant and dense material in the world. I have already contacted a granite repository in Vermont, and they can supply me with over 18,000 granite blocks that would be 10 feet in length, 5 feet in width, and 6 feet in height. This structure could be built on about 4-1/2 acres, by going up instead of at ground level, I can put over 800,000 cubic meters in this structure. I look at the ancient pyramids of Egypt, and also have looked at the Maya and the Aztecs. They all built structures like this. I'm thinking about a structure that people can drive by and say, Colorado's on the right track by putting this storage facility above ground. I have calculated that it will cost around \$513 million to construct the facility — compared to what I've been hearing of \$7 or \$8 billion. That can fit into the budget with no transportation. Put it in a six-year sequence, you would still have money left over for other projects.

FOLLOW-UP ON INFORMATION REQUESTS REGARDING ONSITE TRU WASTE STORAGE CONTINGENCIES: Frazer Lockhart (DOE) was present to review and answer questions and comments from the Board on DOE's follow-up information distributed. At the December 3 Board meeting, members had asked questions about DOE's plans for interim storage of transuranic waste. Following are highlights of DOE responses:

- **Evaluation of Building 460 as a possible storage site.** Not enough cost advantages. Building 460's high bay area only provides enough capacity for approximately one year's production of TRU waste. The office area is not suitable for storage because of floor load limits.
- **Construction of a hardened facility which is more suitable.** This option was not pursued. A hardened facility designed to Risk Category III is estimated to cost around \$150 million.
- **What options to interim storage of TRU waste onsite were considered?** DOE's position is that TRU waste will be disposed at WIPP when the facility is opened. Until then, Rocky Flats will manage its waste safely and efficiently without impacting site closure risk reduction activities.
- **Explain the difference between contact handled and non-contact handled waste.** Non-contact handled waste is waste in which the contact reading is great than 200 millirem/hour. The site does not have nor will it generate any of this type of waste. The bulk of the site's TRU waste is between undetectable (0) and 10 millirem/hour.
- **What criteria were using in determine which residues can be sent to Savannah River? What are other options for the residues than those being pursued?** In the Residues EIS, it was concluded to be reasonable for all residues, except scrub alloy, to be repackaged as waste. The EIS also concluded it reasonable for salt, ash, sand, slag and crucible, fluoride, and scrub alloy residues to be shipped to SRS for treatment.
- **Scrub alloy** — Preferred for SRS because this is how the material was historically treated and was the most cost-effective and efficient to implement. There are no backup options.
- **Salts and ash** — Repackaging for disposal at WIPP was the easiest to implement and most cost-effective. Shipping to SRS would have required the site pre-process the material to transport and process there.
- **Sand, slag and crucible** — There was not a clear cost benefit either way. Shipment to SRS was chosen because it allowed the site to remove the material more quickly.

Shipment to WIPP is a backup option.

- **Fluoride residues** — Shipment to SRS offered the most cost-effective method. Repackaging for disposal at WIPP would require diluting the residues and increased the risk of worker exposure. Other options: treat and ship to WIPP, or recover plutonium via acid dissolution at the site.
- **Why were wind and aircraft accidents not analyzed for the tents?** High wind (not involving projectiles) was analyzed and a risk category of BEU (Beyond Extremely Unlikely) was assigned. High wind with projectiles, or an aircraft crash were not analyzed because there is little difference in protection between a tent and a Butler-type building in the event of a crash.
- **How was Building 991 upgraded to enable TRU waste storage?** TRU waste is only stored in designated areas of the building because no modifications were required to meet the criteria to store TRU waste.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF CAB SLIDE SHOW PRESENTATION SCRIPT:

Erin Rogers had previously reviewed with the Board a script for the Speaker's Bureau slideshow. Based on comments received from Board members, she revised the script, submitted it to the Executive Committee for review, and now presented it to the Board for approval. However, at this meeting a quorum was not present, so the Board could not approve the revised script. CAB members present discussed the revised script, especially a new optional section added which discussed risk issues. Board members did not feel this was a useful section to have as part of the presentation, but that it may be worthwhile to keep as backup material for the presenters. Erin will do a presentation of the entire slideshow at a future Board meeting, at which time she will ask for the Board's approval to proceed.

LOW LEVEL WASTE SEMINAR RECOMMENDATION TOPICS: Again, since no quorum was present at this meeting, the Board could not finalize or agree to any sections of the suggestions from the August low level waste seminar held in Nevada. It was hoped that members of SSABs throughout the weapons complex could agree by consensus on certain suggestions, and then a recommendation would be sent to DOE from all the site boards transmitting their comments. However, not all CAB members had filled out the worksheets expressing their comments on the suggestions. Staff will send out a reminder notice to those who have not completed their worksheets, with the hope that some agreement could be reached on portions of the seminar's drafted suggestions to DOE. This will be discussed again the January 7 Board meeting.

WIPP DISCUSSION FOLLOW-UP AND IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE

MEETING DISCUSSION TOPICS: Erin Rogers went over the notes from CAB's discussion earlier this month on issues related to WIPP, and had drafted some possible areas of commonality between Board members. There appeared to be two areas on which the Board could agree:

- Research should continue into technologies that would make radioactive wastes not dangerous in the future; and
- Waste should be stored or disposed in a manner that poses the least risk to humans and the environment.

However, because there was no quorum present, Board members could not take any action. Board members did feel that they would like to move on to focus their discussions more on DOE's interim storage plans for TRU waste, and to examine more closely all storage plans

and options. Mariane Anderson (DOE) will take CAB's comments and include in a summary of community member comments on the site's TRU waste contingency options. CAB will develop a list of its comments and suggestions on this issue at the January 7 Board meeting. It was recommended that the Board tour the WIPP site — seven members expressed an interest in such a tour; Erin will check into logistics and get back to the Board with options.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: January 7, 1999, 6 - 9:30 p.m. (work session)

Location: College Hill Library, Front Range Community College, 3705 West 112th Avenue, Westminster

Agenda: Low level waste seminar follow-up discussion; leave of absence policy; presentation on the NEPA process; TRU waste contingency storage EA scoping discussion

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:

1. Make revisions to slide show script; present to Board at future meeting - Erin Rogers
2. Send reminder notice to CAB members to fill out low level waste seminar questionnaire - Ken Korkia
3. Check into possible tour of WIPP site for Board members - Erin Rogers

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:25 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](#)