UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN

PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING

Wednesday, March 13, 1991
City Park Recreation Center
10455 Sheridan Boulevard
Westminster, Colorado 80030

ADMIN RECORD
A-SW-000098

I N D E X

Speakers:	Page
1. Barb Moore	14
2. Paula Elofson-Gardine	17
3. Joe Temple	21

Exhibits:	Page
1 - Public Notice	4
2 - Community Relations Plan	4

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. WENDY GREEN: I'd like to go ahead and get started, if people could go ahead and sit down. Okay. I will now formally commence this public meeting to receive comments on the U. S. Department of Energy's proposed final Rocky Flats Plant Community Relations Plan for the Environmental Restoration program. Tonight's public meeting is officially designated as the Westminster, Colorado, public comment meeting, on the proposed final Community Relations Plan, held on the 13th day of March, 1991, at the Westminster City Park Recreation Center, 10455 Sheridan Boulevard, Westminster, Colorado, commencing at 7:40 p.m.

My name is Wendy Green, and I'm the Meeting Officer for tonight's public comment meeting. I'm a technical facilitator from the University of Colorado at Denver's Center for Public/Private Section Cooperation. In addition to technical facilitation like I'm doing this evening, my work with the Center includes training of public sector managers and public policy research.

I have been retained this evening by the U. S. Department of Energy to conduct this public comment meeting as an independent, unbiased party, to insure that all interested organizations and individuals have the opportunity to comment on the proposed final plan. What that means is that I am not an advocate for or against any party, nor am I

for or against any position taken by any party. Rather, I'm a neutral party in this process, and my job is to supervise the conduct of the meeting.

The proposed final Community Relations Plan was prepared by the U. S. Department of Energy and it's operating contractor, EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc. The document was written in order to meet the community relations requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Colorado Hazardous Waste Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and the Interagency Agreement.

The proposed final Community Relations Plan was released for public review on January 30, 1991. A public notice announcing the availability of the document, the sixty day public comment period, the February 21, 1991 public information meeting, and tonight's public comment meeting, was published in three major daily newspapers in the Denver area. I have marked the text and the publication date of the newspaper notice as Exhibit 1 for the proceeding and will now introduce it for the public record. In addition, I have marked the proposed final Community Relations Plan, dated January 30, 1991, as Exhibit 2 and I introduce it into the record of this proceeding as well.

(Whereupon, Exhibits 1 and 2 were received in the record.)

You as members of the public, have two different options for making comments on the proposed final Community Relations Plan. You can make oral comments this evening, or you can submit written comments to the U. S. Department of Energy by March 31st. Both written and oral comments will receive equal consideration. If you would like to submit something in writing, you can either do so by submitting it this evening, or by mailing it to Beth Brainard, Public Affairs Officer, at the U. S. Department of Energy's Rocky Flats Plant Office. Her address is available at the registration table if you would like to do that.

All participants in the comment meeting will be listed in the meeting record. Sitting to my left is Sherry Thorsen, who is the Court Reporter for this meeting. Her job is to transcribe verbatim the proceedings of this meeting tonight. If you have prepared written comments that you would like to submit to supplement your oral testimony, or if you have a transcript of your oral testimony, please bring it forward when I call on you to make your comments. I will then give it to the Court Reporter and she will mark it as an exhibit of the proceedings. It will then be entered into the record, in addition to the transcript of your oral comments.

A responsiveness summary, which is a written summary of all of the responses to oral and written comments, will be prepared by the U. S. Department of Energy and will

be made part of the administrative record. After reviewing the record from these proceedings, along with the written comments that have been received, the U. S. Department of Energy, with the concurrence and approval of the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the Colorado Department of Health, may modify or supplement the proposed final Community Relations Plan.

After I conclude my remarks, you will have an opportunity to ask questions about the procedures that we will be using this evening. Then, Beth Brainard, who is the Public Information Officer for the Department of Energy's Rocky Flats Plant, will give a short presentation on the proposed final Community Relations Plan for any of you who missed the information meeting that was held last month. We will follow that with a brief question and answer period that is designed to help clarify issues related to the Community Relations Plan in order to help you prepare your comments.

Questions will be answered by the panel, who is to my right and I'll introduce them in a moment. Following the question and answer portion of the meeting, we will begin accepting the oral comments. If you plan to make any comments, I need you to register with Tracy Williams at the registration table in the back. Commentors are going to be called on in the order in which they are registered, and they are asked to deliver their comments from the table with the

microphone at the front of the room.

Does anyone have any questions about the process we're going to be using this evening? Okay. Then, Beth Brainard will make her brief presentation on the proposed final Community Relations Plan.

MS. BETH BRAINARD: I'm going to try and keep this brief. I recognize most of the faces and I think that most of you were here for the information meeting, and so we will try and there's a handout in the back that will guide you through the presentation. Basically, the Community Relations Plan was developed to provide us with a groundwork for community involvement in the environmental restoration projects out at Rocky Flats. It certainly is not an all-inclusive document, it certainly does not represent all of the public affairs and community activities that are going to be commenced for that site. But, it is what we believe to be a very good foundation for a solid community relations plan and a community involvement program.

The plan was designed to meet regulatory requirements and also community interests. We do have to comply with CERCLA. We have to comply with the Colorado Hazardous Waste Act. We also have the IAG, which was signed in the last couple of months. But, it also incorporates ideas that were brought to us by the public. It is not completely controlled by regulatory documents and we hope

that it reflects some of the wants and desires of the community, and that's certainly what we're here to find out tonight and find out where we've missed and where we need to improve.

This public created this document. We went out and did 67 community interviews. We talked to folks. And, if you look at the handouts, you can see basically who we talked to and what the demographics were. Our hope was to go into the homes, go into the offices, we spent, you know, two and three hours with folks, trying to get what their interests were, what their concerns were, how they could be better reached by not only us, but by EPA's information, by CDH's information, and the types of information that they needed from us, and we think that probably more than anything, that was probably one of the most effective and most educational processes that we've engaged in in a long time. I think that Jill, who is the coordinator for the Community Relations Plan, learned a lot and I think we all gained a lot of knowledge as to what people need and what they want.

As you can see by the list, we did talk to political figures, we talked to elected officials, we went and talked to the Mayors. We tried to speak to local businesses, we tried to speak to as many of the activists and organizations as possible. And, certainly tried to talk to some of the news media that represent or follow the story

very closely and have a lot of knowledge. And, like I said, we got a lot of good information. I think a lot of what we learned was incorporated into the plan.

The folks that we interviewed expressed basically five areas that they had concerns, that they wanted to see addressed in the information that came out about the plan and the types of meetings that we held. One, they had concerns about health affects. They wanted to know what was going on in that regard, both to the community and to the worker. They were concerned about environmental issues. They wanted to know about the restoration projects, how they were going to be commenced, what was going to happen. They wanted to know schedules. They also wanted to know about economic issues, in terms of both the plant's operation and the plant's inoperation.

They felt it was important that they have involvement in the planning processes. And, finally, they wanted to talk and they wanted to know a little bit more about defense policy and how that is actually implemented and who the caretakers are of those programs. They gave us--in the interview we found basically five areas that they seemed to think were good for getting information out. As you can see by the list, the newsletter, fact sheets, public meetings, computer bulletin board and briefings, and as I said in the information meeting, about the only one that we

are not going to be able to meet immediately, but we certainly are still very interested is the computer bulletin board.

We also asked them how they wanted to participate in the cleanup activities, what ways did they feel they could have the best involvement, and once again, you can look at your handout, they thought that a community work group or a technical review group would be very helpful in the preliminary stages of the draft of the document. They also wanted document review. They needed--they believe they needed more time to look at documents, they needed time to digest the material, they wanted public comment on those documents, they wanted workshops where we brought technical people in, as well as CDH and EPA to talk about the programs, to talk about the plans, and they wanted up front planning.

The--as I said, this was developed with a lot of regulatory requirements but also a lot of information that we gained from the interviews and have gleaned from the public meetings. Certainly, we are required to have information repositories. We are required to have an administrative record, and I understand that's fairly close to being complete. We do keep a mailing list. We disseminate news releases, public meetings and responsiveness summaries, much like the one that you'll get for this comment period.

Basically, what we did in this plan is we outlined

1 additional, not only what we had to do to remain in
2 compliance with the agreements, but also additional public
3 relations efforts that are either currently in progress or
4 would like to implement and certainly some of them are
5 already going. Our plan has been going on for a long time
6 and will be enhanced. Others will be added. We do provide
7 public tours. We do have a speaker's bureau, employee
8 communications is another channel of communication where we
9 get to our employees as much information about the plant.
10 They certainly are another public.
11 Briefings and presentations, they want fact sheets
12 and citizen guides. Environmental restoration updates.
13 Those are bi-monthly reports that talk about the restoration
14 projects and the status and the monitoring figures that we're
15 getting and just--it's a variety of information about the
16 environmental restoration activities and what we're trying to
17 do out on the site. Technical review group. Between the
18 time that the IAG was actually signed and last summer, it was
19 raised that there needed to be some sort of an interim
20 community relations plan before--that was created and
21 approved and used prior to obviously this CPR.
22 We're only in the public comment period right now,
23 it's not in it's final stages yet, the public brought to our
24 attention that we needed to have a plan in place, and
25 certainly we implemented an interim community relation plan

1 that went into effect in February of this year. It does
2 reflect a lot of the objectives in the final plans, but it's
3 a much more condensed version and that's available in the
4 reading room now.
5 The schedule for the development of this plan, as
6 you can see, we are now in the public comment stage, and I
7 think that the most important date that you need to note
8 right now is that--is the close of the public comment and
9 like I say, the--like has been said, the written comments as
10 well as the oral comments are equally weighted. We certainly
11 hope that if you come up with something more tonight after
12 you've given us comments to hear from you again. There's no
13 limit to how much you can submit and we'll take what you have
14 and welcome your ideas. And, what's the deadline on the
15 public--
16 MS. GREEN: March 30th.
17 MS. BRAINARD: March 30th. Anyhow, March 30th is
18 the deadline and as I say, submit them to us and we welcome
19 your ideas and suggestions.
20 MS. GREEN: Okay. As I noted earlier, we had a
21 meeting on--they had a meeting on February 21st and the
22 purpose of that meeting was both to describe the plan and to
23 deal with questions if anybody had any questions about the
24 plan. And, I'd like to offer your that opportunity again.
25 If you have any questions that you'd like to ask the panel

about the plan that has been developed before we start the formal comment period? Okay.

I'll go ahead and introduce the panel. They are also here to ask questions of the commentors in case that they have any questions to clarify the comments. Obviously Beth Brainard is the first person. Then Terry Smith, who's manager of Community Relations EG&G Rocky Flats. Then Sonya Pennock, who is the Community Relations Coordinator for the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, and then last is Ann Lockhart, Public Affairs Manager for the Rocky Flats Program Unit of the Colorado Department of Health.

We will now start the formal comment portion of tonight's meeting. Let's see. Comments on any issues related to the proposed Community Relations Plan are appropriate. Also, panel members may ask clarifying questions during your comments, if they find that they need to ask those questions to understand what you're saying. I want to stress that this is a formal meeting, and a recorded proceeding. In other words, everything that is said at this meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be prepared.

It is imperative that we develop a complete record of your comments, so when you speak, we need you to come forward to the microphone and speak audibly one at a time into the microphone. Please begin your comments by stating

your name and your mailing address. One final comment. There will be a transcript of the meeting and it will be available for public review at the information repositories. Those repositories are listed in the public notice for tonight's meetings and details about them are also available at the registration table.

Okay. Barb Moore? I've been told that this is a directional microphone and you need to get as close as possible to it. Okay.

MS. BARB MOORE: My name is Barb Moore. [redacted] 1 [redacted]. My comments this evening, we've been told by the Department of Energy and EG&G and others, that this Community Relations Plan is one of the best Community Relations Plan in the nation. It really is a sad commentary to the importance of a Community Relations Plan to say this. After many interviews EG&G and DOE have conducted, and a tremendous amount of compiling of information, DOE has come up with a whopping 33 pages of document and this 33 pages of documents fails miserably to meet the needs of the surrounding communities of the Rocky Flats plant.

If this is the best CRP that DOE has, I sure would hate to see the worst that they have. The site description in the CRP is ungrievous error, and I will be submitting a proposed replacement for several of those paragraphs. One

1 error in it's description, and one that has been repeatedly
2 discussed at these different hearings, is the fact that the
3 nearest community is one mile from the plant, not six miles.
4 If the DOE would look outside their boundaries, they would
5 find this out. There are houses, farms, schools and
6 businesses all within a two mile radius of this plant.
7 The plant history is seriously flawed in this CRP
8 and in no way represents a truthful and accurate historical
9 record of the Rocky Flats plant. The citizens of this
10 community are well informed as to what the actual history of
11 this plant is, and the description in the CRP is an insult to
12 our intelligence and our knowledge. More importantly, it
13 downplays the seriousness of the accidents, spills, burials,
14 dumpings, of tons and tons of radioactive hazardous waste
15 over the past 39 years.
16 The administrative in--the CRP talks about the
17 administrative record, and this record is still not intact in
18 a library. It is a requirement of the IAG that this record
19 be maintained and kept intact and is one of the few resources
20 the community has of researching and finding out how the
21 activities and cleanout activities are progressing at the
22 plant. Without this record being kept intact at all times,
23 it is a great handicap to the communities and the researchers
24 that are looking into these issues.
25 The--I have real problem with the Community

1 Relations Plan and the IAG in the fact that it provides no
2 medium or mechanism for enforcement of the regulations for
3 the public. The EPA and the CDH have a dispute resolution,
4 the public and the communities are just out on a ledge. If
5 we do not like what is going on out there, and we see a
6 serious fault in it, our only recourse is a civil lawsuit.
7 The IAG was developed to keep DOE out of court. We
8 also need a mechanism to keep the communities from suing DOE
9 and have a dispute resolution so we can sit down and discuss
10 these differences together instead of going to the Courts. I
11 think that would be a waste of our time and DOE's time and a
12 waste of our resources. The true point of the IAG is to keep
13 DOE out of courts and on to cleanup. We also need that for
14 the citizens.
15 I strongly suggest and urge that the Department of
16 Energy, EG&G, CDH and EPA establish a citizen dispute
17 resolution committee that has the same power and the same
18 dispute resolutions as the EPA and CDH already have. In
19 regard to the responsiveness summaries, the responsiveness
20 summaries must be made available on a more timely basis.
21 These summaries also must include in one document all written
22 and oral testimony. At this time the written and the oral
23 testimonies are kept in separate documents.
24 I find the segregation of the two testimonies to be
25 a hardship for us and for the communities need to know what

all the comments are. So, I would strongly urge that all comments, written and oral, be included in the responsiveness summaries, and that these responsiveness summaries be produced on a more timely basis. I thank you for your time this evening. I will be submitting a more complete plan in the future.

MS. GREEN: Did you have any questions of Barb?

MS. BRAINARD: I would hope she would submit some specific suggestions.

MS. GREEN: Okay.

MS. BRAINARD: On these, okay? Good.

MS. GREEN: Okay. Paula Elofson-Gardine?

MS. PAULA ELOFSON-GARDINE: Hi. My name is Paula Elofson-Gardine. E-L-O-F-S-O-N hyphen G-A-R-D-I-N-E. [redacted]. I am the director and spokesperson for Concerned Health Technicians for a Cleaner Colorado. I also am an officer on the board of directors for the Rocky Flats Cleanup Commission. Joe Temple, however, is the spokesperson for that group.

I have a number of concerns that I would like to bring to your attention that are serious flaws in this report. I will be submitting written comments since they are too numerous to enumerate tonight. I think the most alarming concern about this report is the mischaracterization of the history of the plant. As Barb said, I would support her in

her assessment that it's a travesty and an insult to those people that are informed citizens that are well aware of the history of this plant. Specifically, on pages nine and page seven, I would cite that your significant event descriptions of 1957 and 969 are so seriously flawed, I would urge you to go back to your history books and internal memos.

I would cite the criticality safety assessment internal memos and the appendices of that report, the 1980 EIS, the Health and Safety Lab DOE Krey and Hardy Report, the NCAR report and Martell Report of Plutonium 239 and Americium 241 contamination of the Denver area, and comments on the 1957 fire by Dr. Carl Johnson, which extrapolates that the release and dust loading of destroyed banks of HEPA filters alone from the 1957 fire is equal to approximately 15,337 curies of plutonium released to the public. And, since the current off the monitors or had no monitoring capability for over a week, eight days after the fire, they still had a 13,000 microcurie release, which exceeded 16,000 times the daily release permissible. I'd say that says enough in itself, wouldn't you?

And, the releases that they cite in this report, for the CRP is 26,000 microcuries. I'd say there's a little bit of a discrepancy when the transuranium elements in the environment report by the DOE itself in 1977 listed fourteen curies off site--or excuse me, 10 on-site, four off-site,

which amounts to 22.8 million lethal doses or 22--excuse me, 228 grams of plutonium. I'd say that's enough to concern any close in resident, wouldn't you?

On to other areas of this report, on page 9, you list that plutonium particles can barely penetrate the skin surface and can be completely stopped by a sheet of paper. One of our affiliates with the Cleanup Commission apparently questioned your author of this report, who stated that yes, that's correct, we only deal with alpha radiation out at the plant, and I'd say that is an outright fallacy. If this person is that sadly misinformed, I hope you'll put this person through retraining.

Since your own quarterly report, I will cite this health physics report, radioactive materials associated with Rocky Flats Plant monthly information exchange meeting, if they look at their own data, it shows you have alpha and beta and gamma emitters. I would specifically refer you again back to the criticality safety assessment report of 1989, I believe, in which they found one of your ducts had such serious Americium contamination that they were wrapping it in lead shielding in an attempt to ameliorate the gamma radiation that was being exuded by that.

Also, the EPA has a report that they put out in 1977, transuranium elements in the general environment proposed guidance for dose limits for people exposed. From

1978 and EPA's estimate was 11 curies of plutonium and one curie of Americium released with concentrations off site. So, I would urge you to do some correction and back stepping on these reports so that you don't continue to A) insult the public; and B) take us for a bunch of imbeciles.

Past reports did not include newsletter information for organizations to be involved with. I would say that as members of the Rocky Flats Cleanup Commission who are specifically focused on cleanup of the facility, I think it's unfortunate that the technical assistance grant group was not allowed to be intimately involved in the cleanup newsletter process with regular columns, etc., for an independent input to the process.

I have some other comments here. I think that there is some concern that there has been a failure on the plant's part to address the residues and the drums. I realize that's not completely in the CRP, however, in the characterization of how much you have to deal with here, there is some real concern, again, with dispute resolution. As Barb brought up, that we do have an opportunity for some relief beyond going to the courts.

Since these relative amounts of radionuclides are such that if you have barrels that have thousand gram limits, and your sodium iodide detection in the criticality safety assessment, appendices D, show that you had a fluctuation of

plus or minus 3,000 grams of plutonium per barrel, if you have 61 curies per barrel, if it's only got 1,000 grams of plutonium in it, I think that this is a significant concern in terms of waste and waste storage and waste treatment issues, that still have yet to be addressed.

So, I feel that the total picture here is still being obscured by I would call the coaptation plan of the public. Thank you.

MS. GREEN: Thank you. Okay. Joe Temple.

MR. JOE TEMPLE: I'm Joe Temple with the Rocky Flats Cleanup Commission, [redacted]. I just have a few comments tonight. The main one I'd like to ask is that the Rocky Flats Cleanup Commission be placed on the technical review committee that is identified in the Community Relations Plan. We feel like we have a lot to offer from a technical standpoint and we'd like to participate on a regular basis.

I would also like to emphasize that we would hope that the update that DOE puts out on a regular basis is more of a open forum for the public to comment, not just the Cleanup Commission, but anyone would have an opportunity to submit their--an editorial to that paper so that it can get wide distribution for public dialogue to continue. I'd like to recommend that there is some kind of a dispute resolution process for citizens, if they do disagree with certain

1 decisions made at the plant.

2 One in particular that the Cleanup Commission still
3 is not comfortable with is the lack of enclosures placed
4 around excavation activities at the plant. These enclosures
5 are not only to protect the workers who should be in at least
6 Level D protection, but also the surrounding community. With
7 the winds the way they blow out at the plant, and the lack of
8 total knowledge of what would be encountered during these
9 excavations, I think it behooves the plant and the public to
10 require that these enclosures be in place while excavation
11 occurs at the plant. But this is just one of the items where
12 we feel an adequate dispute resolution process is required to
13 get a full airing of the issues.

14 I would like to thank Beth for putting together
15 this document dated February 28th, which documents our
16 consensus that we reached at a meeting on how to conduct
17 informational meetings. I think it is a good start that
18 should be applied to any meetings that are conducted, not
19 only by DOE or EG&G, but whether it's a Ahearne or Conway and
20 I know you've sent it on to those organizations, and I thank
21 you for putting that together. Hopefully, it will streamline
22 and make less awkward some of the experiences we've had in
23 the past.

24 And, finally, we'll be submitting some corrections
25 or additions to some of the statements made in the community

relations plan with regard to the level of contamination at the plant that has been previously alluded to this evening. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Joe, can I ask you a question? I know there's several members of the Cleanup Commission giving testimony and just so we understand, is yours the official Cleanup Commission position or will there be an official Cleanup Commission Position, or should we just take everyone's comments and consider that cumulative?

MR. TEMPLE: No, I am the official spokesman for the Cleanup Commission, but we will be submitting a set of written comments that will be in addition to my statements this evening.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MS. BRAINARD: Joe? I'd like to--you and Barb and Paula have all mentioned the--a place to go for resolution and I'd certainly like to ask that you be a little more specific on that, exactly what you're looking for. I think as we talked about in the information meeting, I'd sure like to hear more about it, what you'd like to have.

MR. TEMPLE: It would probably parallel the dispute resolution process that you currently have in place for the agencies. In other words, it would escalate the issue to a higher--

MS. BRAINARD: Okay. I guess I'm asking in terms

also of participants, who you think would need to be involved in that.

MR. TEMPLE: Okay. Fine.

MS. BRAINARD: Thanks.

MS. GREEN: Tracy, have you had any more people sign up? Does anybody who has already made comments have anything additional they'd like to say? Okay. We'll go ahead and adjourn early this evening. Thank you very much for coming.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 7:45 p.m.)

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the:

4 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

5 IN THE MATTER OF: Community Relations Plan

6 Public Comment Meeting

7 LOCATION: City Park Recreation Center, 10455 Sheridan

8 Boulevard, Westminster, Colorado;

9 DATE: March 13, 1991

10 were held as herein recorded and that this is the original

11 transcript for the files.

12

13 Sherry Becker-Thorsen
Reporter

14

15 Federal Reporting Service
17454 East Asbury Place
Aurora, Colorado 80013
(303) 751-2777

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25