

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
September 27, 2000
Meeting Minutes**

Introduction and Administrative

Reed Hodgkin began the meeting explaining that the meeting room would be again be arranged as an open square table to foster better communication among the participants. Those who wished to join the conversation were asked to sit around the table; those who attended the meeting to answer technical questions or to observe were seated behind and around the square.

A participants list for the September 27, 2000 RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group meeting is attached (Appendix A).

Reed reviewed the Focus Group purpose.

Reed reviewed the agenda for this meeting.

The September 13, 2000 RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group meeting minutes were reviewed and approved with the following modification: Leroy More requested at the meeting that a peer review process be established for the Rocky Flats Radioactive Soil Action Level (RSAL) Review.

Leroy submitted to the Focus Group a paper describing the peer review process as recommended (Appendix B).

Reed reminded the Focus Group and the RFCA Agencies that two actions from the Agencies would be due at the next Focus Group meeting:

- The Path Forward for the Focus Group - Key Policy Questions to Be Addressed and the Time Frame for Discussion, and
- Report-back to the Focus Group on How Its Input is Influencing Decision-Making by the Agencies.

DOE, CDPHE, and EPA agreed to make these reports at the October 11, 2000 Focus Group meeting.

1/12

Clean up Alternatives Exercise

Reed Hodgkin began the discussion by reviewing the Focus Group process for an initial evaluation of alternatives for the 903 Pad clean up. DOE presented a qualitative evaluation of four bounding alternatives for clean up of the 903 Pad at the last meeting. The members of the Focus Group left the meeting with a homework assignment to individually conduct their own qualitative evaluations of these and other alternatives. The group was to compare and discuss their results at the current meeting.

Reed had placed enlarged versions of the evaluation matrix on the walls around the room. One chart was provided for each of the original four bounding scenarios identified by DOE. He asked the members of the Focus Group to identify additional clean up alternatives and evaluation criteria and write them on blank charts.

Kathy Schnoor had identified two additional scenarios at the September 27, 2000 meeting:

- Soil excavation and removal to RSAL (Tier 1) plus engineered barriers except new pond at Indiana Ave.
- Soil excavation and removal to 10 pCi/g plus engineered barriers except new pond at Indiana Ave.

Leroy More identified two additional scenarios:

- Soil excavation and removal to 10 pCi/g plus engineered barriers plus Nearby or On-site Retrievable Monitored Storage (NORMS),
- Ultimate goal of long-term stewardship - technological development for cleanup to average background level.

Leroy provided a written description of the NORMS concept to the group (Appendix C).

CDPHE identified an additional evaluation criterion for the exercise:

- Secondary benefits.

This criterion was intended to capture spin-off benefits of an alternative, such as creation of wildlife habitats or recreational opportunities.

Leroy More also identified an additional evaluation criterion:

- Technology development.

This criterion was intended to evaluate the potential that an alternative would promote development of new technology for future "final" cleanup of the site.

After this activity was completed, the list of eight alternatives considered in the exercise was:

- Soil excavation and removal to RSALS (Tier 1) only,
- Soil excavation and removal to RSALS (Tier 1) plus engineered barriers,
- Soil excavation and removal to 10 pCi/g only,
- Soil excavation and removal to 10 pCi/g plus engineered barriers,
- Soil excavation and removal to 10 pCi/g plus engineered barriers plus Nearby or On-site Retrievable Monitored Storage (NORMS),
- Ultimate goal of long-term stewardship - technological development for cleanup to average background level,
- Soil excavation and removal to RSAL (Tier 1) plus engineered barriers except new pond at Indiana Ave.,
- Soil excavation and removal to 10 pCi/g plus engineered barriers except new pond at Indiana Ave.

The revised list of evaluation criteria included:

- Threshold Criteria
 - Protect human health and environment
 - Protect local off-site residents
 - Protect future on-site land user
 - Protect site workers
 - Protect transportation worker and public
 - Protect disposal site worker

- Meet surface water quality standard - onsite
- Meet surface water quality standard - offsite
- Protect environment
- Comply with ARARs (including Endangered Species Act)

- Balancing Criteria
 - Long-term effectiveness
 - Reduction of toxicity, volume, mobility
 - Short-term effectiveness
 - Implementability
 - Capital Cost (Remediation)

- Modifying Criteria
 - State acceptance
 - Community acceptance
 - Stewardship
 - Secondary benefits
 - Technology Development

Reed invited the members of the Focus Group to fill in the blanks in the wall charts, using the results of their individual evaluations. He defined four symbols to be used in the plotting exercise:

- Up arrow represents probable success in meeting the criterion,
- Down arrow represents probable failure in meeting the criterion,
- Horizontal arrow indicates that there is insufficient information to predict success at this point, and
- Question mark indicates a need for significant new information in order to have the discussion.

Before conducting the exercise, the group held a short discussion.

Mary Harlow indicated that there was as yet insufficient information about the alternatives for her to participate in the exercise - her arrows would all be "down" as a result.

Hank Stoval suggested that many criteria should be considered from both a short term and long term perspective. The process was changed to include two arrows in each box of the matrix - one for short term success in meeting the criterion and one for long term success in meeting the criterion.

It was emphasized that engineered barriers will eventually fail.

Leroy More was asked if the NORMS alternative would include storage of just waste generated as a result of remediation or other waste as well. Leroy responded that the alternative would include just remediation waste.

Hank Stoval indicated that he considered Monitored Retrievable Storage to be disposal and that the City of Broomfield would not support this option. Leroy responded that Monitored Retrievable Storage was intended as a temporary remedy only - until permanent action such as treatment could be taken.

Victor Holm indicated that modification of the water standard should be considered by the group. Hank Stoval responded that the City of Broomfield would not support changing the water standard and that the Water Quality Control Commission was the venue in which it should be considered.

Members of the Focus Group expressed concern that their answers would represent commitments and that the answers would be used out of context at later times. The representatives of the RFCA agencies emphasized that the inputs to this exercise would be considered "preliminary for discussion only" and would not be used out of context or construed as commitments from the members. They further stated that the agencies' evaluations were also "preliminary for discussion only" and did not represent commitments.

Members of the Focus Group asked Reed to review the purpose of the exercise. Reed responded that the exercise would help to prioritize the issues for discussion by the group and would identify areas needing more information to allow the discussion.

CDPHE indicated that explanatory comments were available for the agency's matrix evaluation. Those comments are included in Appendix D.

5

The members of the Focus Group then assembled around the wall charts and began filling in the matrices with their evaluations.

Discussion of Exercise and Path Forward

Following the exercise the group discussed how to proceed. Members of the group asked that the matrices be documented and analyzed. Reed Hodgkin accepted the action to transcribe the results of the group evaluation and take a first shot at analyzing the results. He committed to try to have the matrices out via email by the end of the week.

Mary Harlow asked why ground water protection was not included in the evaluation criteria. John Rampe of DOE responded that the discussion to date had focused on plutonium migration and ground water in the vicinity of the 903 Pad was not a contributor. Ground water will be a significant player when volatile organic compound contamination is discussed.

Victor Holm suggested that a method should be created to determine the level of confidence that a selected alternative will really work as designed.

It was suggested that more information is needed to evaluate worker risk and transportation risk.

Some members of the group indicated that the evaluation criteria did not have enough specificity to allow a good evaluation and asked that the criteria be better defined.

It was suggested that the group begin looking at the most conservative alternative and work from there.

A member of the group suggested that a round-robin discussion be held on each issue as defined by the individual boxes on the matrix.

It was suggested that the group examine the question: will increased excavation produce increased risks to workers?

It was suggested that the group examine the question: What will the status of public health protection be at closure under different alternatives?

6

Some members of the group stated that a better understanding of the candidate engineered controls is needed in order to continue the discussion.

Reed agreed to propose an agenda for the next Focus Group Meeting based on the Focus Group's comments and his analysis of the matrix results.

Radioactive Soil Action Level Update

Jeremy Karpatkin of DOE announced a RSAL conference call for Wednesday, October 4, 2000 at 3:00 p.m. MDT. He stated that there was not yet a call-in number, but that one would be announced before the call.

Jeremy briefed the group on the current activity to map out the public involvement process for the RSAL review. He stated that a plan and schedule would be available in the next few days.

Actions

The following actions were identified by the Focus Group:

- Definition of "Waters of the State" (Rich Horstmann, CDPHE)
- Briefing on Recovery and Revegetation after the Hanford Fire (Mary Harlow - City of Westminster)
- Briefing on Path Forward for the RFCA Focus Group (RFCA Agencies)
- Briefing on Influence of the RFCA Focus Group on Decision-Making (RFCA Agencies)
- Transcription of Matrix Exercise (Reed Hodgin)
- Analysis of Matrix Exercise (Reed Hodgin)

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

7

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
September 27, 2000
Meeting Minutes**

**Appendix A
Participants List**

8

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
September 27, 2000
Meeting Minutes**

**Appendix B
Leroy More Memo: "Peer Review for the Rocky Flats RSALs"**

9

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
September 27, 2000
Meeting Minutes**

Appendix C

**Leroy More Paper: "Nearby or On-site Retrievable Monitored
Storage (NORMS) for Contaminated Soil Excavated at Rocky
Flats"**

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
September 27, 2000
Meeting Minutes**

**Appendix D
CDPHE
Explanatory Comments on CDPHE Evaluation Matrix**

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
Attachment B**

Title: August 30, 2000 Meeting Minutes

Date Presented: N/A

Author: Christine Bennett
AlphaTRAC, Inc.

Phone Number: (303) 428-5670

Email Address: cbennett@alphatrac.com

12/12