

**ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**  
**MINUTES OF WORK SESSION**  
**July 7, 1994**

**FACILITATOR:** Reed Hodgins

- Meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m.
- Linda Murakami introduced the new staff members: Lisa Hanson, project administrator; Ken Korkia, program coordinator; Erin Rogers, outreach coordinator; and Deb Thompson, executive secretary
- Beverly Lyne distributed copies of the 1995 draft budget for the RFCAB; deadline for comments on the budget is Wednesday, July 20 (make comments to the RFCAB office)

**PLUTONIUM STORAGE/SAFETY - VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT BRIEFING:**

- Presented by Jeff Kerridge, DOE - Rocky Flats Field Office

**QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD TO PLUTONIUM STORAGE/SAFETY - VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT BRIEFING:**

**Question:** What is considered long-term vs. interim storage?

**Answer:** Interim is approximately 10-20 years, long-term 20-50 years.

**Question:** Is there still a problem with water leaking in some of the vaults?

**Answer:** There is no plutonium in the tunnels, but some exists in the vaults adjacent to the tunnels; however, the vaults are almost empty - should be completely empty by August.

**Question:** What criteria will be used to determine vulnerability?

**Answer:** Anything that has the potential to cause worker exposure, or cause a release to the environment or public.

**Question:** Could there be unidentified vulnerabilities?

**Answer:** Only if there has been an error in the assessment.

**Question:** What was the storage situation prior to five years ago?

**Answer:** The product and waste were being transported offsite.

**Question:** Why is decane inert?

1/7

**Answer:** Over a period of time, alpha chemistry can produce hydrogen, but 239 plutonium is low reactivity.

**Question:** What makes the containers start leaking?  
**Answer:** It was caused by a chemical reaction with the fluoride, and the fluoride created a hydrofluoric acid that degraded the material and the seal.

**Question:** Were quantities of material in categories reported?  
**Answer:** Yes, the total number of packages sitewide and number of packages in each category.

**Question:** What is the size of the containers shown in the pictures?  
**Answer:** One or two liter.

**Comment:** The amount of material is important in considering the storage problem.

**Question:** What magnitude of a problem is this, and what is the schedule for dealing with it?  
**Answer:** It involves metal material that could potentially oxidize, and has not been brushed and stabilized. A schedule has not been set; the draft stated that the plutonium would be in a safe configuration by the turn of the century.

**Question:** Are there containers that would be satisfactory for long-term storage?  
**Answer:** Yes, there are containers scheduled to be developed within two years.

**Comment:** DOE feels that it is dealing with the highest priority vulnerabilities first. The bottom line findings:

- the priorities are right
- no surprises

**Question:** How do you test the filters?  
**Answer:** Test flow - through known particles in a controlled environment. The filters are tested independently before they are installed.

**Question:** How much of the Rocky Flats budget is being spent on correcting vulnerability issues?  
**Answer:** It would only be a guess - but the funding is being spent on prioritized issues - approximately \$25-\$30 million per year.

**Comment:** This has been a valuable presentation - but we need to get a better sense of the magnitude of the problem than was presented in this report.

**MOTION:** The CAB moved to refer this issue to the Site Wide Issues Committee and request a report back from them at the next meeting. The issue will be on the next agenda on Monday, July 11 at 7 p.m. at the CAB offices, and visitors are welcome.

**MOTION APPROVED**

**Comment:** Recommendation from stakeholders group: have the Site Wide Issues Committee form a dedicated oversight group.

**NATIONAL CONVERSION PILOT PROJECT:**

- Board needs to decide appropriate level of involvement. Eugene DeMayo has proposed recommendation to DOE:
  - cleanup buildings
  - conduct Stage I decision-making
  - involve CAB in Stage II decision-making with more than 30 days

**Discussion:**

**Q:** If you aren't going to do Stage III, would you do Stage II?

**A:** There is specific funding available for this project only - external to Rocky Flats.

- Trade-off: may involve importation of plutonium later (Stage III).
- Alternative Use Committee - request for more CAB member involvement and in-depth study.
- Discussion: will decision to proceed with Stage II de facto approve Stage III?
- Valid concerns on proposal.
- Need to decide re: going from Stage I to Stage II.
- Need to focus on immediate issues.
- Need an SME to address depleted uranium risk.
- Deadline for comments: 7/15/94.

**Q:** Can we do Stage II and not do Stage III?

**A:** Yes. Stage III is a separate decision.

- CDH and Governor's Office feel that Stage III decision will be objective.

**Q:** What will happen to buildings if Stage II goes and Stage III doesn't?

**A:** DOE is making plans for use - DOE might do this.

**Q:** Can process (decision-making) work?

**A:** System has adequate safeguards to prevent "steamroller."

- Proposal should tell DOE what we want from them.

**Additional discussion needed?**

- More information on specific issues:
  - amounts and level of risk
  - what does public really think?

- proposal should be modified
- Q:** Amounts of material and level of risk?
- A:** Important, and that should be addressed in EIS.
- Q:** What does public think?
- A:**
  - Public either hasn't heard about it, or doesn't care
  - Public trusts process
  - Ask city council members in area affected, and see if they can stir up public interest on this project
  - There has been public involvement process
  - There are multiple publics
  - Discussed at eight public meetings
  - "Bulk" of responders agree or accept Stage II
  - Public forums were not adequate to inform/involve public
  - Arvada sees CAB, RFLII as process for public comment
  - Much of public is uninformed of issue
- Q:** Are there other alternatives for future site use?
- A:** NEPA process will answer.
- Q:** Will CAB have representative on Steering Committee?
- A:** Option available - CAB should review.

**Discussion of specific proposal wording:**

- Clarify first paragraph: delete everything following the wording "(NCPP) Stage II" - and add statement "scope of work to include the cleanup of buildings, declassification, NEPA process, process verification, operational repairs, market analysis, and continued public outreach, if this is a priority for DOE and if using the funding available for Stage II will not decrease funding available for other projects."
- Retain second paragraph as is.
- Retain second-to-last paragraph as is.
- Revise last paragraph by removing last sentence.
- Omit all other paragraphs.

***Consensus reached on the following statement:***

**Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board  
Recommendation to the United States Department of Energy Regarding a  
Decision to Proceed to Stage II of the National Conversion Pilot Project**

The Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board (RFCAB) advises the Department of Energy that the RFCAB has no objection to the proposed National Conversion Pilot Project (NCPP) Stage II scope of work to include the cleanup of buildings, declassification, NEPA process, process verification, operational repairs, market analysis, and continued public outreach, if this is a priority for

DOE and if using the funding available for Stage II will not decrease funding available for other projects.

Although not directly an issue during Stage I decision making, many of the stakeholder members of the RFCAB are concerned with many aspects of the proposed NCPP Stage III.

Other RFCAB members have expressed enthusiasm and endorsement of the entire project.

The RFCAB expects to be provided adequate opportunity to advise DOE on Stage II decisions.

**MOTION:** Joe Tempel moved to refer to the Site Wide Issues Committee for discussion those issues raised on which conclusion was not reached, including public involvement.

**MOTION APPROVED**

- Steve Tarlton: The process of reaching consensus highlights the difficulty of approaching an issue cold - he hopes the Board will use its staff to assist in preparing these issues for Board discussion, and make sure information is received well ahead of meeting date.
- George Martelon: Mark Van Der Puy asked him to comment to the group that he sincerely appreciated the thoughtfulness and the way you went about this process, will communicate the Board's concerns throughout the process, and congratulates you.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:**

- Kenneth Werth:
  - Q:** Have any of the CAB members been informed about what DOE wishes to do after EG&G's contract runs out? Implications of dealing with a new operator? What if new operator doesn't want to listen to public?
  - A:** EG&G may be replaced or may stay.
  - Q:** Will CAB or its committees voice concern to the new operator?
  - A:** Yes.
  - A:** DOE will have same or more input as in past.
  - Q:** Is this group familiar with Waste Policy Act of 1982?
  - A:** That law applies to high level waste, which is not located at Rocky Flats. Other laws apply to Rocky Flats (transuranic waste).

- Sam Cole: NCPP discussion is good, and appreciated. An EIS should be prepared. CAB should look at expected end result.

**PUBLIC PORTION OF MEETING ADJOURNED.**

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

**ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**  
**MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE SESSION**  
**July 7, 1994**

- Vendors Conference is Monday - CAB has information booth.
- Board Retreat - July 17, 1994 - Oxford Hotel, Denver
- Address two issues:
  - conflict of interest
  - representational issues
- **PROPOSAL:** Make up salary difference for Ginger Swartz.  
**APPROVED.**
- Note: Bylaws are vague regarding quorum.
- Conflict of interest for Jim Burch
  - support for review of risk assessment
- Community Outreach Committee would like approval to finalize CAB's list of Community Values, and to work jointly with the Public Participation Focus Group on public involvement efforts.
  - Suggest Board have opportunity to review and evaluate, have committee make proposal for decision at next Board meeting. Call in comments to CAB staff prior to next meeting.
- Next meeting agenda:
  - defer to staff and Executive Committee to prepare

**MEETING ADJOURNED 10:14 p.m.**

7/7