

Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments

Boulder County City and County of Broomfield Jefferson County
 City of Arvada City of Boulder City of Westminster Town of Superior

Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments Board Meeting Minutes Monday, December 5, 2005 8:30 a.m. – 11:00 p.m. Jefferson County Airport, Broomfield

Board members in attendance: Mike Bartleson (Alternate, Broomfield), Jo Ann Price (Alternate, Westminster), Ron Hellbusch (Alternate, Westminster), Clark Johnson (Alternate, Arvada), Jim Congrove (Director, Jefferson County), Karen Imbierowicz (Director, Superior), Jane Uitti (Alternate, Boulder County), Shaun McGrath (Director, City of Boulder), Jennifer Bray (Alternate, City of Boulder).

Coalition staff members and consultants in attendance: David Abelson (Executive Director), Rik Getty (Technical Program Manager), Barb Vander Wall (Seter & Vander Wall, P.C.), Erin Rogers (consultant).

Members of the Public: Kate Newman (Jefferson County), John Rampe (DOE), Shirley Garcia (Broomfield), Bob Darr (DOE), Marion Galant (CDPHE), Carl Spreng (CDPHE), Bob Nelson (City of Golden), Marjory Beal (League of Women Voters-Jefferson County), Susan Vaughan (League of Women Voters - Jefferson County), Amy Thornburg (USFWS), Mark Aguilar (EPA), Rob Henneke (EPA), Scott Surovchak (DOE-LM), Ron DiGiorgio (retired RFETS Steelworker), Patricia Rice (RFCAB), David Krucek (CDPHE), Dave Shelton, (Kaiser-Hill), Shelley Stanley (City of Northglenn), Kim Cadena (Rep. Beauprez), Sam Dixon (citizen) .

Convene/Agenda Review

Chairman Shaun McGrath convened the meeting at 8:40 a.m.

Business Items

1) Consent Agenda – Mike Bartleson moved to approve the consent agenda. Clark Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0. (Jefferson County was not present)

2) Executive Director's Report - David Abelson reported on the following items.

- David first updated the Board on the status of mineral rights acquisition legislation for Rocky Flats. The Allard-Salazar amendment was attached to the Senate Defense Authorization bill. The bill now goes to conference committee and David expects the provision to survive.
- DOE's Inspector General has issued a report which concludes the DOE has not begun a Natural Resource Damage Assessment for Rocky Flats. The report argues that as long as DOE still has personnel working on Rocky Flats issues, it makes sense to integrate the ongoing Remedial Investigation/Feasibility study (RI/FS) and the Natural Resource Damage

ADMIN RECORD

Assessment. DOE agrees with this conclusion and will start conducting the assessment as part of the RI/FS regulatory process.

- As expected, the Rocky Flats worker compensation amendment discussed at last month's meeting was rejected by the Senate. David also updated the Board on the status of a request by retiree Jerry San Pietro for the Coalition's assistance in obtaining answers to several cleanup questions. DOE has provided responses to both the Coalition and Mr. San Pietro. In its response, DOE provided some information and noted that if Mr. San Pietro needs further data, he will need to file a Freedom of Information Act request. David understands at least some of the information Mr. San Pietro is seeking is available in the Rocky Flats reading room.
- David reported that he has not yet heard back from DOE-LM regarding the Coalition's LSO letter. The Coalition is in a bit of a time crunch to get the new Stewardship Council up and running by February. David will press back on DOE to provide a response, particularly with regard to the process for soliciting applications.

JoAnn Price referred to the monthly list of checks and asked about the reason for a check written to Kimberly Lohr, a former Coalition staff member, last month. David responded that he needed some help with integrating and organizing computer data and Kimberly was available. She has also been helping David and Erin Rogers look at the website to make sure the information organized so that it can be transitioned into a new LSO website. JoAnn asked if the LSO website will be ready when the new group starts. David said the staff is working to organize the existing RFCLOG website, and is also soliciting proposals for a new website for the LSO. He is planning to integrate the information from both the Coalition and RFCAB websites into the new LSO website.

JoAnn asked why the Woman Creek Reservoir Authority (WCRA) was not mentioned in the Coalition November 16, 2005 letter to Legacy Management on the Local stakeholder Organization (LSO) that was included as part of the consent agenda. David said it was because WCRA did not participate in the planning meetings mentioned in the letter. JoAnn asked if they were invited to participate in these meetings and David confirmed they were.

Shaun McGrath noted that in the November minutes, there were two issues on which David thought DOE might have some disagreement with the Coalition's LSO letter. The first issue was the quarterly data exchange meetings. The second issue had to do with moving a task from section 2 to section 4, which included 'other issues as jointly agreed to by the LSO and the Secretary of Energy'. David said that the issue in question was 'evaluating technical issues related to long term stewardship'. Shaun said he just wanted to flag this latter issue because he thinks the Stewardship Council needs to maintain its independence. If DOE does not agree with the Coalition's letter, particularly the part about evaluating the technical issues associated with long-term stewardship, Shaun believes the Board should make this an issue.

Public Comment

Ron DiGiorgio thanked David for his recognition of the new workers organization, Steelworkers Organized for Active Retirement (SOAR). SOAR has not been interested politically up to this point, but they have discussed this issue recently, and he would be interested in representing SOAR on the Stewardship Council.

Bob Darr (DOE) stated that Clay Sell, DOE's Deputy Secretary, will be announcing DOE's

acceptance of Kaiser-Hill's completion of the Rocky Flats cleanup on Thursday at 1:30 p.m. at NREL. This will be a media event and all are welcome to attend. The Board will be receiving an email with the details of this event.

John Rampe (DOE) updated the Board on a presentation he gave last week to RFCAB regarding the results of a risk analysis for the 903 lip area. He handed out copies of his presentation. The purpose of this risk assessment was to determine if the elevated levels of plutonium found in this area posed additional significant risks to the future Wildlife Refuge Worker. The risk analysis methodology generally followed the approved Comprehensive Risk Assessment methodology. For this evaluation, the risk assessors used all the available data, including both alpha and gamma spectroscopy. They aggregated the data over two exposure units: 1) the Wind Blown Area Exposure Unit (715 acres), and 2) the 903 Lip Area Exposure Unit (33 acres). DOE will be releasing a white paper this week discussing this analysis and the results. They used three different scenarios to evaluate the risk, and the results can be found in the handout. The statisticians did a 'rareness evaluation', which is an estimate of the number of sample results that are likely to have plutonium greater than 50 picocuries per gram. The results were 1.58% of the samples for the 903 lip area and 2.66% for the ORISE survey units.

Karen Imbierowicz asked how much higher than the standard of 50 pCi/g the experts would expect based on these results. John answered that the models do not predict how much over 50 pCi/g they would see, but the highest concentration found in the samples was about 440 pCi/g.

Shaun McGrath suggested that this new data be included in Rik's work on residual contamination.

FY06 RFCLOG Budget Hearing

The Board is required to hold a public hearing before approving an annual budget. A draft FY06 budget was discussed at the November Board meeting. No changes were suggested, so the budget up for approval is the same one reviewed at that meeting.

Karen Imbierowicz referred to page 1 of the budget which lists an Executive Director salary for three months. Since David has said his last day will be around January 15, she wanted to know why this is budgeted for three months. David responded that because there are so many uncertainties as the Coalition progresses toward closing down, most items are probably overestimated. This budget includes all staff for three months and infrastructure for 2 months, with the intention of providing the Board some flexibility. David does not think that three months is realistic, but it is there just in case.

Clark Johnson asked if it is safe to assume that anything left over will be transferred to the Stewardship Council. David said that this is indeed the case.

Shaun McGrath noted that the Coalition's expenditures for FY05 were \$277,000, and asked why the budget for 2-3 months of FY06 is proportionally so much higher, at \$127,000. David noted that there are two areas that account for this difference, personnel and contractual. There is \$25,000 in this budget for personal time pay for the Executive Director and a \$25,000 contingency fund, as well as some padding in other areas. The personal time pay is a contractual obligation. Shaun asked about how much the Coalition will have to transfer to the Stewardship Council. David noted that DOE still has the \$400,000 earmarked for the LSO, and he estimates that the Coalition will also be transferring about \$100,000 to them, although it is hard to say exactly how much. Shaun asked if the \$400,000 from DOE been authorized and appropriated. David said that

it has been.

JoAnn said she thought the LSO was going to be given \$500,000 from DOE, but now it is \$400,000 and she is wondering what happened. David explained that the director of DOE-LM decided to give \$100,000 of this funding to the Coalition to keep it afloat through this year, as the Coalition has been working extensively on stewardship issues. That \$100,000 was spent during FY05, and the Coalition is currently using a reserve to fund its operations.

Barb Vander Wall clarified that the Board needs to understand this vote constitutes both the approval of the budget and authorization of the funds. She also noted that she needs to revise the budget wording regarding the Chair as an elected position, as the Coalition did not vote to elect the current chair.

JoAnn Price moved to adopt the FY06 budget and appropriate the funds. Karen Imbierowicz seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

LSO Discussion

Staff updated the Board on plans for the development of the Local Stakeholder Organization, which will be called the Rocky Flats Stewardship Council. David handed out a draft timeline of the main scope of work for the LSO covering the period from January through July 2006. This is intended to help provide an understanding of what the Stewardship Council can expect to focus on during its first few months.

- 1/06-7/06 Interim surveillance and maintenance plan
- 1/06 Close RFCLOG, finalize Stewardship Council IGA, interview Stewardship Council members
- 1/06-7/06 Primary scope of Stewardship Council
- 2/06-7/06 Stewardship Council meetings / Board development
- 2/06-7/06 Periodic Congress and DOE update newsletter (staff suggestion)
- 2/06-7/06 Continue to work with DOE/regulators/Congress/press
- 2/06 Review final RI/FS report
- 3/06-4/06 Proposed Plan 60-day public comment period
- 3/06 Washington, D.C. trip
- 6/06-7/06 Review/comment on Proposed Plan responsiveness summary

In terms of steps to close the Coalition and establish the Stewardship Council, three action items need to be discussed today: 1) Stewardship Council IGA, 2) Stewardship Council staffing needs, and 3) Soliciting applicants to serve on Stewardship Council. At this point, the Board invited representatives from Northglenn and Golden to join them at the table for this discussion.

The Board first discussed the proposed IGA for the Stewardship Council. JoAnn Price directed the Board to page 3. She would like to include language covering 'elected official or staff/consultant' for alternate directors. Barb Vander Wall suggested the Board use the phrase 'or employed by'. JoAnn agreed to this change. Shelley Stanley from Northglenn said she was not sure about the intent of using the words 'employed by'. Shaun McGrath offered that the intent would be for this language to cover the appointment of consultants as alternate directors. Barb clarified that this would mean anyone that is paid by the entity. The Board was in agreement with this language.

Jennifer Bray noted that their City Attorney had two comments on the draft IGA. First, there is a typo on page 2, on the fifth 'whereas', 'desires' should be 'desire'. Also on page 7 in the second paragraph, the City Attorney would like to add that any funding requests will be subject to the member governments' approval. Barb responded that the current IGA works that way as a matter of law. Shaun asked if it would suffice if the IGA simply referred to the law in question. Jennifer responded that they would still prefer if this could be called out in some way. Barb will develop language to address this concern.

Bob Nelson from Golden asked how the funding for the rotating government seat will be determined. Shaun suggested that only the member during the rotation would contribute. The Board members also agreed that they would not expect non-governmental members to contribute to the Stewardship Council budget and discussed having this detailed in the IGA. David noted that he would strongly recommend that only governments contribute to the Stewardship Council. He also pointed out that this is more of a policy issue, not necessarily an IGA question. Bob Nelson referred to page 1 of the IGA and noted that Golden's City Attorney would like to strike the words 'political subdivision'. Barb will follow up on this question.

Mike Bartleson said that Broomfield's City Attorney had a question about the need for the indemnification clause on page 9, noting that by law this is set anyway. Barb responded that this is good point, and that laws do exist, but are limited in their scope. She went on to say that her office has always taken the position that it is good to firm up the argument that this is a political subdivision. This classification covers such issues as indemnification, open records, and oaths, all of which are also procedures spelled out elsewhere. She believes the current language helps firm up this organization's standing as a political subdivision. The Stewardship Council is doing something somewhat unique by adding non-public entities as members. She would counsel that the parties continue to operate according to these guidelines, and not mix private interests and public interests.

Ron Hellbusch directed the Board to pages 5-6 and the language related to incurring debt. He stated his understanding that this clause does not obligate individual governments to take on debt related to this new organization. Barb responded that, while it is not expected to ever happen, the organization would have the authority to incur debt, unless the bylaws otherwise limit this power. Ron added that Westminster would like to have this spelled out in the IGA. Barb responded that the bylaws are a better instrument for addressing this issue.

Clark Johnson brought up the issue of the quinquennial review on page 8. He suggested that this be shortened to a triennial review, and that the Board also institute a triennial review of the bylaws. The Board approved this change by acclamation.

Shaun McGrath questioned the definition of the four non-governmental members on page 7. He pointed out that the language seems to imply that members are chosen for a group they represent,

rather than as an individual. He suggested that the Board consider rewriting this section. Barb added that the current language was intended to accommodate this intent, but that this was a difficult section to draft. She said this flexibility was provided in the definitions section for 'alternate directors'. Shaun suggested that this be changed. On page 3, the definition of alternate director appears to allow these members to choose their own replacement if they decide to no longer serve on the Stewardship Council. Shaun suggested that the language be more specific that the members are appointed as individuals, and also make it clear the alternate would only serve in the 'absence' of director, not as a replacement if that director leaves the Council.

Shaun then raised the question of whether the four non-elected members should be allowed to have alternates. JoAnn suggested that any alternates should be listed in the application for membership. Clark asked if Shaun was suggesting that groups, such as SOAR, would not be eligible for a seat on the Stewardship Council. Shaun noted that the Board could appoint individuals in this circumstance, but have the seat connected to the group. David asked if the Board intended that individuals tied to a group be able to name an alternate, and those not affiliated with a group would not have an alternate. He said this is how the draft application is written. Clark then posed the question of whether the seat would belong to the individual or the organization and, therefore, who would be able to choose a replacement. Shaun noted that the Secretary of Energy would be appointing an individual, and not an organization. Therefore, the organization would not be able to appoint a replacement. Clark asked whether the group would lose their seat if the individual representing them resigns. Shaun suggested that the Stewardship Council would be able to fill the open seat as it sees fit. JoAnn noted that if the Board approves the application of a director which includes a designated alternate, they would have already approved the alternate to take over for the director. Barb suggested that the Stewardship Council's bylaws should have a removal provision, which is typically triggered by a certain number of absences from meetings. JoAnn added that if a non-elected director decided to leave, the Board should be free to replace this seat with different group if it so desired. Barb will add language to clarify that only those members representing groups will be allowed to designate alternates. In the end the Board agreed that groups would be appointed but the application process would clarify who would serve as the Director and the Alternate Director(s).

Regarding ex-officio members, Shaun noted that the language defining 'ex-officio' members is very broad, and asked if the Board would like to limit this definition. He also asked if the Board would like to have a Northglenn or Golden representative serve as an ex-officio member when it is not their turn to serve as a full member. David noted that the current language allows this flexibility without the need to go back to councils for approval. The Board decided to leave the current broad language. Shaun next addressed the process for selection of the chairperson. He noted that with so many members, a rotation system may be undesirable. He suggested an election system to determine the chair position. JoAnn added that the Board could limit the chair position to the elected members, and then rotate among the nine governments. It was noted that DRCOG elects its chairperson. Jim Congrove suggested that the Board vote on this. Shaun moved that the IGA be modified to reflect that the Chair of the Stewardship Council be a local government representative and that the Chair be elected by the Board and not appointed. 2nd Mike Bartleson seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Jane Uitti suggested that on page 8, section H, the last sentence should be changed to make the reference to 'bylaws' a separate section. Barb agreed this was a good clarification.

Karen Imbierowicz wanted to make sure everything discussed today regarding potential bylaws changes are recorded and kept for future consideration. David said he will get this language out to

the Board as soon as possible and the group can work through issues by email. He wants to make sure any potential roadblocks are identified and addressed earlier rather than later. Barb noted that once the local governments review the IGA, there will likely be an additional document that will involve termination of the Coalition IGA.

The Board moved on to a discussion of staffing needs for the Stewardship Council. Karen Imbierowicz, JoAnn Price and Lorraine Anderson have been working on developing a plan for staffing. Karen noted that they have identified five positions that are going to need to be filled for the Stewardship Council to be functional. They have recommendations for the first four positions. They would like to see Rik continue as the Technical Advisor, Barb Vander Wall as attorney, Jennifer Bohn as accountant, and David is in the process of soliciting bids for web designer. The committee feels it is important to keep David on as Executive Director at least through the first three months of the transition period. JoAnn suggested that since these positions are already in the Coalition's FY06 budget for three months, perhaps the Board can establish these temporary positions now. Shaun suggested that the Board approve these five positions, all on three-month contract with an option for renewing upon re-evaluation at the end of the three months. Clark said he thinks the Board should fill these positions for six months, with a 3-month review. Karen noted there was no real consensus within the committee regarding whether it should be three or six months and that they may need full Board discussion on this topic, perhaps at an Executive Session at the January meeting. Two of the members on the committee thought they should set up staff for six months, and one thought three months. JoAnn noted she was not against six months, but wants to be able to re-evaluate their needs after three months. Shaun offered that the staffing suggestions make sense, and the Board will have to discuss the length of the positions at a later date.

The next topic for discussion was the process for soliciting applicants for the four non-elected seats on the Stewardship Council. Shaun opened the topic for discussion by asking the Board how it would like to set up this process, and whether interviews should be at a Board meeting or an Executive Session, and in which setting should the Board discuss its recommendations.

JoAnn Price said she thought this was going to be left to Stewardship Council. Shaun responded that the initial recommendations would come from the Coalition until the Stewardship Council is up and running, simply because of logistical sequencing issues. JoAnn asked if the selection of Board members would come from the Stewardship Council. David said they would like to have all members selected and ready for the first Stewardship Council meeting. Karen Imbierowicz asked if there was really enough time to get DOE approval of application process and agree on Board member recommendations by January. David responded that the Coalition can easily solicit applications quickly. He would like to send out a letter this week and spread the word as widely as possible. He suggested they include a disclaimer in the letter addressing the fact that DOE has not yet offered its formal approval of the LSO Plan the Coalition submitted to DOE.

The application form is pretty simple. JoAnn asked if the Coalition can start interviewing at the January 9, 2006, meeting, either immediately before or following the meeting. Shaun responded that this is possible. Jane asked David to send the application form to the local governments so they can post it on their websites. David will do this, and also suggested sending it to stakeholder organizations, the Coalition's fax list, and perhaps running an ad in the newspaper. He said he is open to other suggestions as well.

Shaun asked if the Board would like to hold public interviews during the Coalition meeting. JoAnn said she thinks they should do them after the meeting. Barb clarified that the interviews

cannot be in an Executive Session. Shaun offered that they could vote on the new members by email. Barb said this had to be an open, public process, but they could use a committee for this task. It was noted that the first Stewardship Council meeting is planned for February, so interviews and selection should take place before this date. Shaun suggested sending a letter announcing the application process as soon as possible, with a due date during the third week of December. Interviews can take place in January, and the Board will vote at the February meeting. Shaun moved that the Board approve this process. The motion was seconded by Karen Imbierowicz.

Clark Johnson noted that he is concerned about this really tight timeframe and how this might be a problem for nonprofits and other groups. He is concerned that some might argue that this is not very inclusive process. Shaun suggested that they could instead plan to conduct the interviews at the February meeting. Clark agreed that this was a more realistic plan. JoAnn said she was also concerned about the unrealistic schedule, and that perhaps the Board could schedule a special meeting. Karen Imbierowicz also expressed her concern that the original schedule was too tight and that she did not see any reason the Coalition could not make the application deadline mid-January, schedule interviews for February, and make appointments the same day. She thinks having a set of standard questions would help with the interview process. Shaun noted that he would like to have some time to talk with colleagues about the applicants.

David made a suggestion that applications should be submitted well in advance of the February meeting so that the Board can conduct interviews at the February meeting. He also suggested that the Board schedule an Executive Session at the January meeting to discuss FY06 staffing needs for the Coalition and the Stewardship Council. The Board will need representatives from each government at the next meeting to address these issues. Shaun proposed scheduling the interviews for the February 6, 2006, meeting, and having the Board spend some time discussing nominees in a January Executive Session without taking action. The Board could then reconvene after the Executive Session to select nominees. Barb added that the Board must to go into Executive Session for valid reason, and the nominees can only be discussed as they relate to this discussion. Jim Congrove suggested that each applicant be asked same questions, which would allow them to be asked in writing and be reviewed in advance by a committee. David remarked that he would then need feedback on the draft application form to make sure questions are appropriately addressed. In the draft, he took a pretty general approach to the questions. Jane Uitti pointed out that if there are only 7-8 applications, it would be feasible to conduct all the interviews at a Board meeting. However, if there are many more, she wonders if the Board would want to institute some sort of a pre-screening process. Shaun said the Executive Committee could make that decision once the applications are received. Shaun restated his motion to direct David to send out a solicitation letter right way with an application deadline of mid-January, conduct interviews at the February 6, 2006, meeting, and vote in February. The motion passed 7-0.

Rocky Flats Interim Surveillance and Maintenance Plan

Scott Surovchak from DOE-LM gave a presentation to the Board on DOE's plans for interim surveillance and monitoring. He noted that he worked for DOE-EM from 1991 until 2 years ago. He was then made the site's transition coordinator, and after the transfer of responsibilities to LM, he was named the DOE-LM manager for Rocky Flats. In this position, he is responsible for 6,200 acres at the site. He showed a photo of the site from a month and a half ago to illustrate the great changes that have taken place at Rocky Flats recently.

He first reviewed the schedule for transitioning responsibilities from EM to LM. Two of these transitions have already been completed. Upon declaration of cleanup, LM took over site access, air monitoring, ecological monitoring, present and original landfill inspections, and groundwater treatment operations. On November 1, LM took over records management, which is a very large portion of the site's responsibilities. DOE will issue a decision on its acceptance of the physical completion of cleanup by December 7, 2005, at which time LM will assume the responsibilities for groundwater and surface water monitoring and pond operations.

The Integrated Monitoring Plan (IMP) did not specifically address maintenance concerns, as these were addressed in other procedures, such as maintenance of groundwater treatment systems. This is an interim process until the Record of Decision (ROD) is issued. The interim plan covers public involvement, records management, environmental monitoring (ground water, surface water, air, and ecology), operations and maintenance (groundwater treatment systems, pond operations, landfills and erosion), access control monitoring, data management, regulatory compliance, inspections, and reporting. DOE-LM is trying to avoid making any pre-decisional assumptions. Scott mentioned that, although they could probably guess as to what the ROD will require, legally they cannot make any assumptions now. They know the big issues will be monitoring, maintenance, compliance, and reporting. DOE is planning to hold quarterly meetings for at least the next two years to discuss these topics.

Scott noted that it will be important for the Stewardship Council to help with public involvement. The Post-closure Community Involvement Plan identifies DOE's expectations for ongoing public participation of Rocky Flats. DOE will maintain the public reading room through at least December, 2006. Nearly all of the Administrative Record is already posted online, and it has been improved it recently. Rik noted that while there are still some bugs, it is much better than it was previously.

Records management is huge segment of the work for which LM will be responsible. Source One staff is being retained to work on this task.

Environmental monitoring will be performed to ensure conditions remain protective to human health and the environment. Surface water, groundwater, air and ecological monitoring will continue as described in the final 2005 IMP until DOE acceptance of Kaiser-Hill's Declaration of Physical Completion. There are currently approximately 120 monitoring wells, which is 30-40 more than originally anticipated.

Operations and maintenance plans are in place for the three groundwater treatment systems, as well as pond and surface water operations, the two landfill covers and associated systems.

DOE will also be conducting ecological monitoring for threatened and endangered species, vegetation, noxious weeds, and wetlands.

Site Inspections/Meetings/Reporting will include:

- Onsite personnel will monitor condition of site to verify remedy performance
- Annual site inspections – notifications sent to regulatory agencies and the Stewardship Council 30 days prior. The inspection checklist will be followed, and follow-on inspections will be performed as necessary. A report will be released next week on this topic.

- Quarterly meetings to present data and activities, data packages will be provided
- Annual meeting upon completion of annual report, will include data tables, data evaluations/recommendations

To summarize, Scott stated that environmental monitoring will continue until levels in surface and groundwater are below standards. Any discontinuation of monitoring will be done following approved decision flowcharts. All analytical data will be stored in one database with web access. Erosion control is the site's greatest near-term challenge.

Karen Imbierowicz asked what period of time constitutes 'interim'. Scott answered that the interim period is until the final ROD is issued. The ROD will include a final Long Term Surveillance and Maintenance Plan. Karen then asked what happens when monitoring levels are below the standards. Scott answered that the process is fairly standard. She asked if DOE's goal is to stop monitoring at some point. Scott responded that this would be a high-level goal, but he does not know if it is attainable. The IMP process to initiate the cessation of monitoring is fairly rigorous. Karen said she would like to see how this process would work, and what the standards are for stopping monitoring. Rik mentioned that he, Shirley Garcia and Al Nelson had participated in the development this process and can provide her with the information she requested. Karen asked for him to summarize the process. Rik said that the process is dependent on trend data, and needs regulatory approval. Scott added that the time period to develop trend data may well be several years, due to an inability to gather data because of low water flows.

Shaun McGrath asked what would govern contingency planning or remediation if an exceedance is discovered. Scott said this process is laid out in the IMP, and includes evaluation, notification, and re-sampling. Shaun asked if the processes Scott mentioned covered the National Wildlife Refuge lands. Scott clarified that these processes will only apply to DOE-retained lands. Shaun asked who is going to be doing monitoring in Wildlife Refuge. Scott answered that anything on DOE-retained lands will be subject to CERCLA, and the Wildlife Refuge will not be subject to CERCLA.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Big Picture

David reviewed the schedule for the remaining Coalition meetings, and noted that the schedule has changed based on today's discussions. He will need to review the new tasks and come up with plans for the future meetings.

The January 9, 2006, meeting will include more transition discussions, as well as an Executive Session to sort out staffing decisions.

February 6, 2006, topics may include Stewardship Council interviews, signage (may be moved to the January meeting), briefing packet for the spring D.C. trip

David asked if the Board would like him to begin planning for a spring D.C. visit. He will need to figure out the best dates, and will send an email to Board members for feedback. He said in the past the Coalition has worked around dates of meetings of the National League of Cities and NACO. He will try to find out who is interested in attending.

Shaun McGrath asked if the Board would like to commission a study to capture the history of RFCLOG. He brought up this idea at a previous meeting and thought he had heard a positive response. Shaun suggested that the Board ask David put together report in the range of perhaps 30-50 pages, and do it in a way that highlights the Rocky Flats model of a local government role in federal cleanup projects. Karen suggested that David develop a proposal for the project. Shaun noted that the FY06 Coalition budget includes a contingency fund of \$25,000 that could be used for this kind of project. The Board agreed and David will draft a proposal.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.

[Back to Meeting Minutes Index](#)

[Home](#) | [About RFCLOG](#) | [Board Policies](#) | [Future Use](#) | [Long-Term Stewardship](#) |
[Board Meeting Info](#) | [Links](#) | [Contact Us](#)