

**ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD****MINUTES OF WORK SESSION****February 6, 1997**

---

**FACILITATOR:** Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Linda Murakami called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

**BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:** Alan Aluisi, Tom Clark, Tom Gallegos, Mary Harlow, Victor Holm, Jim Kinsinger, Beverly Lyne, Tom Marshall, Linda Murakami, Gary Thompson / Jeremy Karpatkin, Frazer Lockhart, Tim Rehder, Steve Tarlton**BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jan Burda, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Paul Grogger, Susan Johnson, Sasa Jovic, David Navarro, Todd Saliman**PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT:** Joe Rippetoe (citizen); Bob Kanick (citizen); Kate Simpson (Parsons Brinckerhoff); Rick Reynolds (citizen); Molly Mayo (CCEM); Larry Helmerick (DOE); Kenneth Werth (citizen); Melody C. Bell (DOE/RFFO); Mark Hickman (citizen); Mariane Anderson (DOE); Jim Stone (RFCC); Susan Flack (ChemRisk); John Corsi (Kaiser-Hill); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff)**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:** No comments were received.**BRIEFING ON THE EFFORT TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER GROUP FOR DOE'S MIXED WASTE FOCUS AREA** (Molly Mayo, CCEM): Molly gave a quick update on the work to date in this area. DOE's Office of Science and Technology is convening a group of individuals whose work will be to focus on the development of technologies for treatment of mixed waste. The purpose of the group will be to ensure a wide range of viewpoints are brought to the program's technical requirements for technologies developed to treat mixed waste; to integrate tribal and public issues, needs and concerns; to provide peer review; and advise the program on how best to accommodate site-specific issues. CAB member Susan Johnson will be a member of this group.**PRESENTATIONS ON THE D&D PROGRAM AT ROCKY FLATS** (Melody Bell, DOE; Dennis Floyd, Dennis Wise and Michael Simmons, Manufacturing Sciences Corporation): The Board heard from DOE and MSC regarding activities and plans for D&D projects at the site. DOE is managing deactivation and decommissioning as integrated project closures, which enables early planning and budgeting to close facilities. The Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement (RFCA) establishes the regulatory framework for facility closures. Under RFCA, regulatory approval is required for decommissioning decisions documents, and Decommissioning Operations Plans for buildings with significant contamination or hazards. RFCA defines deactivation as placing a building in a safe and stable condition to minimize long-term cost of surveillance and maintenance. Decommissioning is considered all activities which follow deactivation, and retiring the building from service. Decontamination is the removal or reduction of radioactive or

hazardous contamination from facilities, equipment or soils, and dismantlement involves the actual demolition and removal of any building or part of a building during decommissioning. During the disposition of facilities, a characterization is done to identify the type of contamination and any safety hazards, the hazards are reduced by removal of SNM solids, liquids, residues, chemicals, or idle equipment. All equipment is then dismantled, and the building is decontaminated. What follows then is the shutdown of all system utilities, such as removal of fire systems, ventilation, electrical plant, and then the building is demolished. Any site remediation would follow this disposition process, within RFCA guidelines. A Facilities Disposition Working Group has been established to ensure a systematic approach to decommissioning. Members include DOE-RFFO, DOE-HQ, Kaiser-Hill, CDPHE, EPA, and the DNFSB. The working group ensures that RFCA requirements for decommissioning are met. Decommissioning activities scheduled for FY97 include completion of Building 779 deactivation and Work Area 1 process equipment removal; demolition and removal of 2% of site facilities; beginning Building 779 decommissioning; beginning Building 886 deactivation; and disposal and removal of excess chemicals from major plutonium facilities.

The National Conversion Pilot Project (NCPP) began in April of 1994. Stage I of the project was planning, which was completed in October 1994. Stage II began the actual cleanup phase. The cleanup of the first two buildings (883 and 865) is complete with reuse activities slated to begin by June of this year. Approximately \$8 million was required to prepare for cleanup, and another \$13 million involved to date in the actual cleanup of these buildings. Stage III of the project will involve reuse. The Rocky Flats Local Impacts Initiative (RFLII) is the Community Reuse Organization overseeing the reuse of the buildings. MSC has submitted a proposal to RFLII to become the Stage III contractor. MSC developed an application process to hire many ex-Rocky Flats workers to become team members on NCPP's cleanup and reuse activities. MSC first evaluated the education and experience of those workers, and began training them in new duties. Training for those workers will be ongoing. NCPP's Waste Management program cited many successes, including a solid record of environmental compliance, practicing safe and aggressive pollution prevention and waste minimization techniques. MSC notes that this is because of maintaining a well trained and competent workforce, as well as accurate and thorough characterization of waste. MSC developed the use of CO2 blasting for decontamination and refurbishing, and also uses biodegradable detergents and non-hazardous cleaners to help reduce the volume of waste and disposal costs. They recycle and reuse every possible waste stream, with the result of a 96% reduction from their original projections in the generation of mixed wastes. Within the next few weeks, MSC estimates that 4,000 cubic feet of waste will be removed from Rocky Flats. Also, MSC has received no findings or violations during numerous CDPHE and Nevada Test Site (where the waste will be shipped) inspections of NCPP activities. MSC is proposing for the future two property disposition centers in Buildings 444 and 447 to process contaminated materials following with cleaning, refurbishing, surveying and eventual release.

#### ***Q&A Session:***

***Question:*** Joe Rippetoe: Has there been a flow chart put together on the targeting and prioritizing of facilities?

***Answer:*** Melody Bell: The only facility in the disposition process is Building 779. Deactivation does not fall under RFCA, and Building 886 has started the deactivation process. There is a flow chart in the Draft Decommissioning Program Plan that identifies

how every facility will go through this process. Until the Program Plan is approved, there will not be any more decommissioning projects.

**Question:** Kenneth Werth: When you privatize these projects, the companies will have to lay out a plan of how to dispose of the material. Disposal is not an option at Rocky Flats.

**Answer:** Melody Bell: The same requirements as for any work at the facilities will have to be met by any company doing decommissioning work at the site.

**Question:** Tom Marshall: Have the levels for decontamination been set?

**Answer:** Melody Bell: No, not yet. There is a subgroup working now on establishing rad disposition standards. A document on those standards should be ready for public comment around July.

**Question:** Tom Marshall: On the privatization, will union employees be used to do the deactivation work? Will they also be doing the decontamination, or just the facility stabilization?

**Answer:** Nancy Tuor: We have a project labor agreement at the site that divides the work between the steelworkers and the building trades. Primarily, the steelworkers do the work that's radioactive, then at a certain lower level of trace amounts, the building trades take over the work. But it's facility dependent.

**Comment:** Mary Harlow: I just finished reading the HEU vulnerability report, and MSC is mentioned in there and cited for the fact that people were working, the facility was clean, and they were impressed with the methods being used for D&D. It's commendable to be recognized in such an otherwise derogatory document.

**Question:** Kenneth Werth: You put this material into containers and ship it to the Nevada Test Site. Does NTS have a process that we don't know of to handle this material?

**Answer:** Michael Simmons: The material going to NTS is designed and designated for burial. The containers are considered long-term burial storage containers, they have structural integrity. Right now we are doing what we feel is best to segregate material for waste, recycling, and to minimize the amount of material going to NTS.

**Question:** Joe Rippetoe: When a piece of equipment is cleaned and ready for release, does it go into the RFLII bid process to be disposed of?

**Answer:** Dennis Floyd: Not in the concept we're proposing. We propose to take title to the equipment and then sell it in the commercial market, and share the benefit with DOE.

**Question:** Joe Rippetoe: You indicated that 88% of your workers are recycled site workers. What percent are British?

**Answer:** Dennis Floyd: We have four British workers out of 70, about 6%.

**Question:** Tom Marshall: You're dealing primarily with uranium - what levels are you decontaminating the structures to, and when you're releasing materials, what levels are

those decontaminated to, and are there standards that you have to meet?

**Answer:** Dennis Floyd: The IM/IRA defines the standards that we have to meet in the equipment as well as the facilities. Generally it is the same guidance as NRC standards.

**Question:** Gary Thompson: When you move to working on plutonium facilities, are there standards set up for internal contamination, especially since there are many pieces that would be difficult to survey?

**Answer:** Michael Simmons: There are a couple of techniques. Pieces that would be impossible to survey would be scrapped out in the most efficient way possible.

**Question:** Joe Rippetoe: It has been almost three years operation at Rocky Flats. Concerning the funding, is the split of expenses between MSC and DOE roughly 60/40, or what?

**Answer:** Dennis Floyd: It's predominantly DOE. Of the \$21 million, about 98% is DOE. If we were to do this work under fee, there would be an additional \$2 million that MSC would contribute.

**Question:** Tom Marshall: Regarding NEPA, there's supposed to be an environmental assessment on Phase III before it proceeds. Where does that stand?

**Answer:** Steve Tarlton: I got a draft copy in the mail today, so apparently it was finished this week.

**Question:** Tom Marshall: My assumption is that the effect of D&D activities and future use activities will be thoroughly examined in the Site Wide EIS. Is that correct?

**Answer:** Frazer Lockhart: I don't believe that will happen in the Site Wide EIS. The architecture that was described that will go through those issues is under the RFCA process, operational and program plans. Steve Tarlton: It's my understanding that the Site Wide EIS will be completed as a baseline impact assessment, and will show a current status of the site which is upgrading the environmental baseline from the last time a Site Wide EIS was done in 1988. The baseline will be what subsequent environmental assessments will evaluate changes against.

**Question:** Tom Marshall: The baseline you will examine in the Site Wide EIS is the most recent iteration of the Ten Year Plan, which includes D&D activities and reuse. The schedule for the release of the Site Wide EIS is important.

**Answer:** Steve Tarlton: My understanding is it's not a baseline EIS, it's a baseline of the environmental conditions at the site as they exist now. Frazer Lockhart: The site has committed to provide for NEPA analysis as required for projects. The Ten Year Plan is still evolving. We're not going to hold up everything until all the plans are final, or we will never get anything done.

**Question:** Tom Marshall: Are you going to finish the Site Wide EIS?

**Answer:** Frazer Lockhart: I'm not in a position to answer that. Jeremy Karpatkin: The site is

on the verge of making public to the community what our path forward on NEPA will be, and that will address the question of disposition of the Site Wide EIS. But the policy has not been completely approved yet. We're talking days or weeks before that's made available to the public.

**Question:** Ken Korkia: Did you encounter some things you didn't plan on, and how did you handle that?

**Answer:** Dennis Floyd: We had a recipe in our IM/IRA as to how to deal with unexpected occurrences. We didn't have many, but a few. We dealt with those by the fault-tree approach defined in the IM/IRA. We have good documentation of each work package for the equipment we've cleaned up. We have a good data base. Michael Simmons: When we did our characterizations, we were extremely thorough. We didn't work on equipment until we were confident that we knew what we were getting into.

**Question:** Kenneth Werth: Are you saving any of the high precision machinery to make that canister for storage?

**Answer:** Michael Simmons: That's one product we envision making. We're wanted to make sure we salvaged as much of that precision equipment that we could. Some of it was not salvageable. We have been able to refurbish everything we thought was critical to make the engineered waste containers.

**UPDATE ON RECENT ACTIVATIONS OF THE EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER AT ROCKY FLATS** (Jeremy Karpatkin, DOE): Jeremy provided in the Board packet quite a bit of information for CAB members to review about recent activations of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC). Jeremy provided at this meeting a report-back to CAB and the public on recent events. In the future, DOE will make more of an effort to clarify any new information and changes to information previously provided to the public in its press releases. In addition, daily summaries will be made available to the public at each of the reading rooms, and report-backs to the public will be routinely scheduled after each activation. There have been three activations of the EOC recently; however, none were beyond the 'alert' level. On November 21, a false alarm was triggered on a criticality panel; there was in fact no criticality, but the alarm was investigated and cleared. On December 19 there occurred a rupture of pipes due to freezing weather; there was some water damage but no danger of release. A similar event with frozen pipes occurred on January 14.

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

**Comment:** Kenneth Werth: I received the January 1997 issue from DOE on Non-Proliferation and Arms Control Assessment of Weapons-Usable Fissile Material Storage and Excess Plutonium Disposition. I wish to quote from the book: "The can in canister approach does not meet the spent fuel standards. The cans could be retrieved and transferred back into weapons-grade plutonium using contemporary technology." It also states: "An assessment is overly optimistic that additional development work on the can in canister option will allow immobilized plutonium to meet the spent fuel standard. Research and development options are not adequately addressed. The report does not properly reflect the problems with research, development and design, which would have to be dealt with to meet the spent fuel standard. Vitrification and immobilization requires sufficient technology development and testing." The statements and notices that were distributed in this book,

over 8,000 comments, nine out of 10 stated that the public is not in favor of the two disposition options that they are looking at, especially the burning of plutonium and uranium in reactors. DOE should not be able to override public opinion.

**Response:** Frazer Lockhart: We're not in any position to respond to comments on a DOE-HQ document looking at many alternatives. That was an EIS document done at a national level, and it received and accepted comments from around the country. I don't have enough personal knowledge to respond to that specifically. Tom Marshall: DOE has decided to follow a dual-track approach and explore both the burning of plutonium as a mixed oxide fuel mixed with uranium in reactors, and immobilizing it either in glass or ceramics. One of the immobilization technologies is called can in canister. Gary Thompson: The spent fuel standard means fuel that has come out of a reactor and is therefore very hot because of fission products, and therefore it's difficult for people to process. One of the things that has been proposed is to take plutonium, put it in glass, in pods, 20 pods to a glass bottle, and then fill that glass bottle with glass containing high-level waste, in other words fission products. That approximates your spent fuel standard. The other way to get the spent fuel standard is by taking this material, plutonium and uranium, and making mixed oxide fuel and burning it in a reactor. We really can't do precisely what everyone wants. We've looked at three options. One was a borehole, and they decided not to do that. We already have two facilities dug in the ground at great expense, and it's not likely we'll use either one of them. So the mixed oxide fuel is one approach, and the vitrification is another.

**HEALTH COMMITTEE PRESENTATION: CDC GRANT PROPOSAL** (Beverly Lyne): Following CAB's tentative approval at its January Board meeting, the Health Committee developed and submitted a grant proposal to the Centers for Disease Control for a grant to prepare a guide to conducting community needs assessments at DOE nuclear weapons facilities, and to implement an educational pilot program based on recommendations in the Rocky Flats Community Needs Assessment.

*Decision: Approve and support the grant to the Centers for Disease Control as prepared and submitted by CAB's Health Committee. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.*

**HEALTH COMMITTEE PRESENTATION: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT** (Beverly Lyne): The Health Committee brought to CAB a recommendation to be forwarded to DOE-HQ and DOE-RFFO, which recommends that DOE-HQ and DOE-RFFO enter into a partnership with Rocky Flats stakeholders about how best to address the findings of the Rocky Flats Community Needs Assessment. CAB will convene and oversee this process. Also, the recommendation asks DOE-HQ to work with CAB's Health Committee to develop a methodological handbook for community needs assessment that could be used at other sites.

*Decision: Approve the recommendations prepared by the Health Committee regarding the Rocky Flats Community Needs Assessment. A few minor changes to the text were suggested. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.*

**PLUTONIUM AND SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS COMMITTEE PRESENTATION: LETTER TO DOE EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER SAFETY OF OPERATIONS AT ROCKY FLATS** (Mary Harlow): The Plutonium and Special Nuclear Materials Committee drafted a letter for CAB's review and approval, which states that CAB is concerned with the safety of operations at Rocky Flats following fines and violations of the Price-Anderson Act due to radiation protection system inadequacies. Also,

CAB has recently begun receiving copies of the Shift Superintendent's Daily Summary, which CAB believes shows a number of problems attributable to inattention to sound nuclear safety practices. The letter notes that CAB is concerned these problems may lead to an accident involving a release at the site. In the letter the Board asks DOE to provide the following information: Kaiser-Hill's self-assessment and corrective actions following the March 1996 stand-down; the "Lessons Learned" document following the T3/T4 trench remediation and drum crushing incident; and Kaiser-Hill's response to their "Notification of Contract Deficiencies."

*Decision: Approve the letter to Jessie Roberson, with changes to the text as discussed.*  
**APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.**

**ENVIRONMENTAL/WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON WATER QUALITY ISSUES WORK PLAN ACTIVITY** (Tom Gallegos): Tom gave an update on FY97 remediation projects. RMRS provided a schedule of activities for the current fiscal year. A Corrective Action Management Unit (CAMU) is planned for this year due to pending changes in state regulations for storage of remediation wastes; the permit will serve as a contingency. Also, the site plans source removal at the Mound site, where there is significant groundwater and soil contamination. This will involve excavation and treatment of contaminated soil, which will be treated by thermal desorption and returned to the excavation area after treatment. The site this year will develop a remediation strategy for the 903 Pad and Trench T-1; characterization of the Pu&D yard formerly used for unused equipment; and investigating the possible development of an in-situ treatment program for contaminated groundwater at the Mound plume.

**UPDATE ON NATIONAL DIALOGUE** (Tom Marshall): Tom Marshall has participated as part of a working group helping to plan a national dialogue on all aspects of radioactive waste and special nuclear materials management. He most recently attended a planning meeting for the national dialogue on January 22. CAB in several recommendations has endorsed a national dialogue. A planning committee was developed in August 1996. The idea is to review materials in a comprehensive and coordinated fashion. There have been three meetings of the planning committee and several conference calls. Broad principles have been developed for the dialogue; however, many details remain to be worked out. The pilot meetings/field workshops are planned for July of this year. CAB may wish to consider sponsoring a regional workshop in our area.

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

- Approval of New Board Members. Based on a recommendation forwarded by the Membership Committee, CAB approved two new Board members: Susan Barron, temporary administrator of the Rocky Flats Reading Room at Front Range Community College; and Bob Kanick, a nuclear engineer and resident of Boulder. Susan will be a community representative and Bob will be a technical representative.

#### **NEXT MEETING:**

Date: March 6, 1997, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

Location: Westminster City Hall, lower-level Multi-Purpose Room, 4800 West 92nd

Avenue, Westminster

Agenda: \* Discussion with Dr. Alice Stewart; presentation by Don Hancock on community concerns related to WIPP; recommendation regarding assessment of integrating management contract at Rocky Flats

**ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:**

1. Revise and send recommendation on findings of Community Needs Assessment - Staff
2. Revised and send letter to Jessie Roberson regarding safety of operations at Rocky Flats - Staff

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:05 P.M. \***

(\* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.)

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:**

---

David Navarro, 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](#)