

Rocky Flats 2025 Annual Report Virtual Public Meeting

Colleen Maleski: Hello, and welcome to the Rocky Flats Annual Report public meeting. We'll get started in just a moment, as we allow attendees to join from the waiting room.

Okay, let's get started.

So, good evening and welcome to the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Legacy Management's Rocky Flats 2025 Annual Report meeting. We're so grateful that each of you have taken the time out of your evening to join us. My name is Colleen Maleski, and I'll be your host and facilitator this evening. Please note, this meeting is being recorded and the link to this recording will be publicly available on the DOE website after the meeting. If at any time you need technical assistance during the meeting, you can use the chat function to communicate to our tech support.

So let's get started. Our goal this evening is to share key highlights from the Rocky Flats Site calendar year 2025 Annual Report. The full report is available on the Rocky Flats website, which you can find a link to in the chat. It is a lengthy document, so know that if you are trying to download it, it may take a few minutes, even if you have very fast internet speed. So our goal tonight is to really provide you with the key insights from that report. I'm joined tonight by many subject matter experts who are going to share a brief history of the Rocky Flats Site, as well as an overview of the 2025 surface water monitoring, groundwater monitoring, site operations, and ecological monitoring. And after the presentation, we'll have time for Q&A and a public comment period.

So, before we dive in, let's actually get grounded in how we're going to operate today. So to ensure that you and your fellow community members have a positive public meeting experience, we're going to invite you to embrace some of our public engagement norms. So you can probably already tell participant microphones and cameras will be muted throughout to ensure that we have a distraction-free meeting. And we're going to ask and invite you to listen, to understand, and thoughtfully consider the information shared, be respectful of one another and the staff, and really try to focus on the annual report. That's going to be our main topic tonight, and so we'll share contact information for any additional questions or comments that you might have that are about other topics. We do encourage you to ask questions throughout, so you'll be able to submit them. We will answer those questions at the end of the presentation, but feel free to



submit them throughout the presentation. Know that we may combine similar questions and that we're going to prioritize questions that are most relevant to the content shared from the annual report. Following the Q&A, we will have time. We'll open the floor for public comment, and at that time, we'll invite you to raise your hand, and you'll be invited to come off mute at that time when it is your turn.

I'm going to make a few notes about Q&A functionality, just so if you are trying to submit them throughout the presentation, if you are on a Zoom app on your phone or computer, you should see a Q&A feature button in Zoom to be able to submit questions to at any time. And you'll just type it in the chat box, and ultimately submit and click send. If you are on a Zoom browser, so that could be on your phone or on your computer as well, you will not probably see the Q&A feature, and so we do invite you to use the chat. So, if you can take a moment to see if you have the Q&A button or just the chat box, we'll be pulling questions from both of those in order to ask our great subject matter experts the questions that you have about the report.

So, with that, I think all of the logistics are taken care of, so let's get started. I'll invite Michelle Franke to provide an overview of the Rocky Flats Site.

Michelle Franke: Thank you, Colleen. I'm Michelle Franke. I'm the site manager of the Rocky Flats Site, and I work for Department of Energy Office of Legacy Management. So, before we dive into the details on this year's annual report, I wanted to give a quick overview of the Office of Legacy Management — who we are and what we do and a brief site history of the Rocky Flats Site, in case you're tuning in for the first time or want to learn a little bit more about the history of the site. So, I'll start by my overview of the Office of Legacy Management.

The Department of Energy created the Office of Legacy Management in 2003 to safeguard human health, environments, and public properties bound to the nation's postclosure responsibilities at former atomic defense sites. And what that really means is that Legacy Management has been tasked with caring for and completing the long-term requirements at sites that may have had activities during the Manhattan Project, the Cold War, or maybe some nuclear research and development during that time period that were contaminated by that activity, and then were cleaned up and closed by other entities and transferred to Legacy Management. So, Legacy Management does not do the cleanup and closure, but we do take care of the long-term requirements, and that may look like groundwater monitoring that may include groundwater treatment system, monitoring and maintenance and operation, also things like records, maintaining records at these sites, engaging the public at these sites, and so those



are some of the things that we do. As you can see on the map on this slide, we have 103 sites from Alaska to Puerto Rico, from California to New York and beyond. So we have quite a diverse portfolio of sites and a diverse different regulatory regimes, of which Rocky Flats is just one. Next slide, please.

So a bit of Rocky Flats background. In 1951, the Atomic Energy Commission was looking for a place to build a plutonium trigger plant. Triggers are also known as pits, so you may hear me use that term as well. But they wanted to build a facility that could produce more plutonium triggers for nuclear weapons. They looked at a few different areas and ultimately settled on Rocky Flats for that plant, and so construction of the plant began in the early 1950s, and from the early 1950s through the 1980s this plant produced plutonium triggers mainly. In fact, almost every nuclear weapon in the U.S. arsenal has a trigger from the Rocky Flats Site. So this site was definitely a key component of the U.S. nuclear weapon production regime in the U.S. at the time.

During the production era from the 1950s to the 1980s, the site grew to be essentially a small city of about 800 buildings in about a 380-acre area, and those buildings included, of course, plutonium trigger production facilities, but also uranium facilities, things like banks, cafeterias. They had their own fire department, their own police force, and things like that. So it really was a small city. I think it's been described once as having everything everyone needed except a place to sleep at night, because no one stayed overnight there. And then that production area, again, about 380 acres, was surrounded by what was called a security buffer zone, which as the name might suggest, was really a buffer from the secretive plant and the public. And so this was largely undeveloped land that surrounded this plant.

In the early 1990s, the U.S. decided that it no longer needed this facility. And so at that point, the plant — the site went through one of two major transitions. This was a transition from operation and production to cleanup and closure, and so that project began in 1995, and it was a huge undertaking. It included taking down all 800 buildings except for two sheds that were constructed after 9/11 at the entrances to the site, the east entrance and the west entrance, to inspect vehicles coming and going from the site. Those two remained, but all the other buildings were taken down. Additionally, the soils on-site were evaluated for contamination, and areas where the contamination was higher than the cleanup standard were excavated, and so all that soil was also shipped off-site and clean fill was brought in to fill in these areas. The groundwater was characterized, the surface water was characterized, the air was characterized. So there was a lot of environmental sampling and characterization done during this period.



That cleanup and closure project ended in 2005. One of the very unique things about Rocky Flats is that all that waste associated with taking down the city and cleaning up the soils and things like that was taken off-site. So Rocky Flats does not have what we would call disposal cell on our site that encapsulates waste from the city. It was all shipped off. And then at cleanup and closure, the site was divided into two areas. So if you go to the next slide, you'll see a map that I think better depicts what those two areas are.

So when this plant was operational, the total size was about 6,500 acres, and again, within that, sort of in the center, was about a 380-acre city where all the work occurred. So at closure, the site was divided into two areas that you can see there. So first, we'll talk about the yellow area in the center. That is the Central Operable Unit, and that is what the Office of Legacy Management still maintains and monitors in perpetuity because there is some residual contamination there that does require some institutional controls, also known as use restrictions, and continued groundwater treatment. And then surrounding that, you see the green area that at the time of closure was called the Peripheral Operable Unit, but really that consisted of, again, that largely undeveloped security buffer zone. So that area was extensively characterized and sampled, and based on the sampling results, our two regulators at the site, the first being U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the second being the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, determined based on all the data collected and the risk assessments done, that that land was suitable for what is called unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, essentially any use. And so again, that land could be used for anything, but ultimately it was already earmarked to become a wildlife refuge. And so that land was transferred to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and is now part of the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge. If you go to the next slide —

So our activities on-site today are governed by the Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement, and you'll hear us talk about that a lot as we go through the presentation. We also refer to it as the RFLMA, so you may hear that as well. And that's a document that is publicly available that spells out all the requirements that we have to meet, including the water standards that we have to meet in our groundwater wells and in our surface water sampling locations, the monitoring frequency, the reporting frequency, things like when we need to meet with the regulators. It does include a consultative process. So as issues arise, we would meet with again Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, who are the other parties to this agreement with us. And we perform a variety of activities under that RFLMA or Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement today. Things like groundwater and surface water monitoring, treatment system operation — and you'll hear about these things



today — inspecting the site, of course, erosion control, the consultations I mentioned and the reporting, but we also perform a lot of other activities that aren't necessarily spelled out by the RFLMA, so things like maintaining the site records and making those publicly available on the website. And then sometimes we do some non-RFLMA water monitoring, or things that aren't necessarily spelled out in our agreement. Of course, PFAS is an emerging contaminant, and so that would be an example of that kind of monitoring that we do. Bottom line here, we have people on-site almost every day, we're doing a lot of activities on-site, and we are definitely keeping a close eye on the site. Next slide, please.

So this is a new infographic we developed to summarize our very lengthy annual reports, and really highlight the key points. I'll let the subject matter experts talk to the key points for each of their sections, but the one thing I'll point out here is on the bottom right, it says there were zero reportable conditions at our Points of Compliance. And Caleb will talk a little bit more about this when he talks about surface water, but that's really important to us because the Points of Compliance are the locations where the surface water ultimately leaves our site and goes on to the refuge and then beyond, and so we are continuously monitoring the water that leaves that location and make sure that it meets our requirements. So with that, turn it back to Colleen.

Maleski: Thank you, Michelle. Now I'd like to welcome Caleb Artz to present on surface water monitoring.

Caleb Artz: Good evening, everyone. My name is Caleb Artz and I am the surface water lead for the Rocky Flats Site and I'm a contractor working for RSI. Today, I'm going to discuss surface water monitoring and water quality evaluation at the Rocky Flats Site for calendar year 2025.

This slide here shows the two major drainages for the Rocky Flats Site, which include Walnut Creek and Woman Creek. To the north is Walnut Creek, which is comprised of No-Name Gulch, North Walnut Creek, and South Walnut Creek where they converge to form Walnut Creek. To the south is the Woman Creek drainage, which is comprised of both the South Interceptor Ditch and Woman Creek. Pictured on the right are the two Points of Compliance, Walnut Creek Point of Compliance and the Woman Creek Point of Compliance.

I want to give some context about the amount of flow that is leaving the site and going on to the wildlife refuge. It's relatively low when you compare it to other streams and rivers that you may see in town, like Westminster or Broomfield. For example, the average daily mean flow rate for WALPOC, so the Walnut Creek Point of Compliance, during calendar year 2025 was 0.023 cubic feet per second, with a maximum daily average of 1.6 cubic feet per second. Woman Creek



flows a bit more continuously than Walnut Creek and has an average daily flow rate during 2025 of 0.16 cubic feet per second, with a maximum flow rate of 6.17 cubic feet per second. For additional context, I mentioned that these flow rates are relatively low compared to something you may see walking around town. For example, a few miles to the east, the USGS monitoring station called Big Dry Creek at Westminster, during 2025, their average flow rate was 10.45 cubic feet per second with a maximum flow rate of 154 cubic feet per second. So you can see that relative to other creeks and streams you may see, we have a relatively low flow going off the site and onto the wildlife refuge. Next slide, please.

So this slide serves to show the layered approach in which surface water is monitored across the Rocky Flats Site. And what I mean by layered is essentially that surface water is monitored more than once as it flows downstream towards our Points of Compliance that Michelle mentioned earlier. While this graphic doesn't necessarily show all of the surface water monitoring locations, it does show the ones that are most important for determining remedy performance across the Rocky Flats Site. Starting furthest downstream are the two Points of Compliance, or POCs, WALPOC and WOMPOC, which stand for Walnut Creek Point of Compliance and Woman Creek Point of Compliance, respectively. At the Points of Compliance, this is where all surface water exits the site before flowing onto the wildlife refuge, and compliance is assessed through 12-month and 30-day rolling averages for plutonium, americium, uranium, as well as nitrate that is grab sampled at WALPOC for nitrate assessment. These water quality samples are also collected through continuous flow paced composite sampling. Moving further upstream, our next layer of monitoring are the Points of Evaluation, indicated in green, or the POEs. These also are assessed through 12-month and 30-day rolling averages, and water-quality samples are collected via flow-paced composite sampling that monitors for plutonium, americium, uranium, and other select metals. These locations are located closer to the former industrial area, and they help to indicate water-quality parameters as water flows downstream towards our Points of Compliance.

I want to take a second to point out GS10, which is located in the center of this graphic. As mentioned in the infographic, we had one reportable condition, and that was at one of our POEs, or Points of Evaluation, and that was at the monitoring location GS10, which I'll talk about in a few more slides from now. But I want to just give everyone some spatial context of where this particular monitoring location sits relative to the Rocky Flats Site as a whole.



Next, moving further upstream, our performance monitoring locations, and this is our final layer of monitoring that occurs at the Rocky Flats Site. These performance monitoring locations are positioned to observe surface water impacts from the former landfills on-site. Next slide.

As I just mentioned, the performance monitoring locations are used to monitor surface water impacts to water-quality standards, or water-quality parameters, on the Rocky Flats Site. Starting with monitoring location GS59 — this location is used to monitor impacts from the Original Landfill. This is done through continuous flow paced composite sampling that analyzes for select metals as well as quarterly grab sampling that analyzes for mercury and volatile organic compounds, or VOCs.

Moving on to the Present Landfill, or the PLF, which is not indicative of its name, it is not a current landfill; it's not active. Monitoring location PLF System Effluent, or PLFSYSEFF, is used to monitor impacts from this former landfill, and this is done through quarterly grab sampling that analyzes for semi-volatile organic compounds, volatile organic compounds, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, as well as metals. Next slide, please.

As I mentioned earlier, the Points of Evaluation are positioned closer to the former industrial area. These locations help indicate water quality parameters as water flows downstream towards our Points of Compliance. Water-quality samples, again, are collected through continuous flow-paced composite sampling that analyzes for plutonium, americium, uranium, and other select metals. During 2025, there was one reportable condition, and this was for the 12-month rolling average for uranium concentrations at Location GS10 that I mentioned earlier in that infograph— or that graphic that showed the surface water monitoring locations across the site. This reportable condition was triggered on April 30th of 2025, when the 12-month rolling average uranium concentration went above the 16.8 microgram per liter standard. As of May 31st, 2025, the 12-month rolling average uranium concentration came below that 16.8 standard and was calculated to be 16.4 micrograms per liter. While this was a reportable condition, this was— data and concentrations that we saw at GS10 were not outside the realm of what we've seen over the last 20 years since site closure. This location in particular has a lot of data that we can compare to to observe trends over long periods of time. No other RFLMA POE analyte concentrations were reportable during calendar year 2025. And I've talked a bit about reportable conditions, and essentially what this means is when either the 12-month rolling average or the 30-day rolling average goes above the applicable water-quality standards that are found in Table 1 of Attachment 2 to the RFLMA, a reportable condition is triggered. Figure 6 of that same Attachment 2 is a flowchart that outlines the steps that we then take to address this reportable



condition. After data is validated, the Department of Energy has 15 days to notify agencies and the public. Additionally, after data is validated, a 30-day window is given to submit a plan and schedule with regulators for an evaluation of a path forward. Next slide, please.

As Michelle mentioned, last year, in calendar year 2025, we had no reportable conditions for our Point of Compliance monitoring, which is ultimately where all of the surface water exits the site. Compliance is assessed, again, through 12-month and 30-day rolling averages. These water-quality samples are collected, again, through flow-paced composite sampling. This composite sampling is obtained from automatic samplers, in particular ISCO autosamplers, at the Points of Compliance. There are actually two of them, the first of which — the first of which is, basically, functions during normal flow conditions, the second of which would trigger during high runoff events or flood events. The second one is used essentially when we have a large runoff event. That first sampler would start to fill up, and then the second one triggers at a higher pace, which then collects more continuous grab sampling throughout that entire period, so that we can monitor continuously and sample continuously through these large rain events. Next slide, please. And with that, I think that's all I have.

Maleski: Yes, thank you, Caleb. So we'll transition from surface water to groundwater. So over to you, John Boylan.

John Boylan: Thank you. My name is John Boylan, I'm the groundwater lead for Rocky Flats. I also work for RSI, the contractor to Department of Energy Legacy Management. And I'll talk to you about groundwater monitoring and operations during calendar year 2025. Next slide.

So, the monitoring network, as an overview, was established over many, many years of pre-closure sampling. Prior to closure, we had up to 1,500 monitoring wells, and the samples that were collected from those wells over the years define the areas of groundwater that had been impacted by historic operations of the Rocky Flats Plant. Those areas are now within what is now the Central Operable Unit, the COU, the Rocky Flats Site, and what Michelle talked to you about. An important factor in the entire hydrologic system at Rocky Flats is that impacted groundwater discharges to surface water before that surface water exits the Central Operable Unit. And Caleb mentioned the layers, the multilayered surface water monitoring, where the water that leaves the site has been monitored upstream, so it leaves the site at the POC, it's been monitored upstream at the POE, but in fact, it's also been monitored at the monitoring wells that are upgradient of those streams. So this groundwater is monitored currently using 88 RFLMA or Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement monitoring wells, and those are divided into four

well classifications that I'll go into in a minute. Each of those classifications is assigned a monitoring frequency, and each well can have several monitoring objectives. Those objectives, as well as the frequency of sampling, the decision rules for that well — in other words, what to do with the data — the contaminants, the analytical suites, and so forth, those were all defined in the early 2000s over a lengthy process that involved EPA, CDPHE, Department of Energy, as well as representatives from the cities in the area that were most interested in Rocky Flats cleanup and closure. Next slide.

During 2025, the monitoring network did not receive any changes. We still have the 10, what we call RCRA wells, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. These wells are monitored most frequently of all our wells, and they serve to assess whether the closed landfills on-site are impacting the groundwater. And again, those landfills are the Original Landfill and the Present Landfill, which, as Caleb mentioned, is not presently active. It's just called the Present Landfill. And then the most important class of wells is the nine Area of Concern wells, or AOC wells, and the Surface Water Support Location. They're most important because they're where impacted groundwater could discharge to surface water and impact the surface water quality. And because of their importance, they are also defined in the RFLMA, the Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement, with reportable conditions. That's the only class of wells that has reportable conditions defined, and unlike surface water with a 12-month rolling average and the 30-day average, in terms of reportable conditions for the AOC wells and the Surface Water Support Location, what defines a reportable condition is two consecutive results from the routinely collected samples exceeding the RFLMA standard for a specific contaminant. So if we have two concentrations above a standard in two consecutive samples, that well is now reportable, and per the flowchart, the decision rules in the RFLMA, we meet, well, we being DOE meets with CDPHE and EPA to establish and determine the — the path forward. Then there are 27 Sentinel wells that are monitored semiannually. They're located downgradient of plumes in the treatment systems. They look for evidence of the plume migration, and 42 evaluation wells that are sampled every other year. They were not sampled in 2025. They're located within plumes near source areas and the interior of the Central Operable Unit. They evaluate whether monitoring of a specific contamination area can cease. And then there are the treatment system locations. Next slide.

This map shows the arrangement and distribution of monitoring wells. The most highly visible are those pinkish ones. Those are the evaluation wells that, again, are located in kind of the center of the Central Operable Unit, as well as source areas and where the plumes are at the highest concentrations. And then in and near the drainages, you can see some blue diamonds.



Those are the Sentinel wells. And on the areas upgradient to and downgradient to the closed landfills, you can see yellow dots that are the RCRA wells, and then if you look carefully, there are orange plus symbols down the — in the drainage bottoms that — those are the AOC wells. Next slide.

So in 2025, on our schedule was to monitor the 46 wells, that is all the wells except for those evaluation wells, plus the Surface Water Support Location and the treatment system locations. And what did the data say? It was basically consistent with what we've seen in previous years. And in fact, the statistical results from the RCRA wells were almost identical to what we've gotten in previous years, and the AOC wells downstream of those contaminant plumes did not exceed the applicable RFLMA standards. We had no reportable conditions. If you want to look at any of the details on those, the annual report shows — has a lot of information and details on that. Next slide.

This map shows where the treatment systems are, and Caleb has already talked a bit about the PLFTS, or Present Landfill Treatment System up on the north. I'll talk about the Solar Ponds Plume Treatment System in green, top center. The East Trenches Plume Treatment System also in green toward the right, and the Mound Site Plume Collection System, which is kind of in the center, but it is in brown. The Mound Site Plume Collection System, or MSPCS, used to be a treatment system, but we no longer treat water there. Instead, we transfer the collected groundwater over to the East Trenches Plume Treatment System for treatment. Next slide.

Before I get into the chart, the treatment systems continue to collect and treat contaminated groundwater. What was discharged had lower concentrations than what came in. The effluent from the East Trenches Plume Treatment System met all the applicable RFLMA standards. And that particular system, the ETPTS, treats groundwater from several different source areas, including the East Trenches plume and the Mound Site plume. The contaminants are chlorinated solvents, which are a component in volatile organic compounds that Caleb mentioned, the VOCs, and the main one is trichloroethene, or TCE. And so, if you look at the chart, what we have is a — it's a time series plot where the concentration is on the vertical axis, and I'll point out that each level is 10 times higher concentration. It's a logarithmic scale than the one below. And then across the bottom is time, going from January 1st of the year 2000 through the end, December 31st of 2025. And then in the chart, you can see a dashed pink line, that's the TCE standard, again, because TCE is the contaminant that is at highest concentration in the water. And the red — the sharp red triangles that are connected by lines. What that is, is for each sample that is analyzed for VOCs, the detected compounds, the concentrations of each of those detected



compounds, they're all added together, and you get a number, and that is the — that number is posted on the chart, and that's what you're looking at. Essentially, the total VOCs detected in that particular sample. And so, the ones in red are the raw untreated water that's coming into the treatment system, and the ones in green are the same as the total detected VOCs in that sample in the water, leaving the treatment system after it has been treated. And you can see that the concentrations in the treated water were much higher before, i.e. to the left of that vertical dashed green line, and that vertical dashed green line represents when we changed over to treating water with an air stripper instead of passive flow-through treatment media, and that was a much more effective, as you can see, much more effective treatment method. And we are also at that point, transferring the Mound Site Plume Collection System water over to the East Trenches Plume Treatment System for treatment. And then to the right of that green line, the vertical dashed line, you can see the concentrations in the effluent are much, much lower, and they're below the TCE standard, and in fact, there's a gap in the line there for 2024, because we didn't detect any VOCs in the samples of effluent collected in 2024. Next slide.

At the Solar Ponds Plume Treatment System, this is a significantly different treatment system, not just because it treats uranium and nitrate instead of VOCs, but also because it has received much more attention postclosure. The effluent from the SPPTS met the RFLMA nitrate standard, and that's despite the fact that we have expanded the groundwater collection infrastructure over the years, including in 2024, and it now collects groundwater and treats groundwater with much higher concentrations of nitrate and uranium than what was in the untreated water prior to closure. However, the uranium treatment is not as effective as — well, it wasn't as effective as it needed to be. And so in 2025, in the summer, we installed a new uranium treatment component, or UTC, that summer and went through two months of performance testing. And adjustments and optimization have continued into 2026. It's designed to remove uranium so that the solar ponds will meet the site-specific standard of 16.8 parts per billion. And I should point out that the influent to that treatment system includes both Rocky Flats contamination, as well as natural uranium, and that's a — that can be an important distinction because the most productive vein-based uranium mine on — in the United States is 5 miles from the Central Operable Unit. So there's a lot of natural uranium present. Rocky Flats Plant, however, did not work with natural uranium. It worked with chemically modified uranium that's called enriched uranium or depleted uranium. And so with some specialty analytical techniques, the difference between that so-called anthropogenic or modified uranium and natural uranium can be teased out, and that way we can tell whether what we're seeing in a uranium sample is due to Rocky Flats contamination, or what was there naturally. And we still, when it comes to surface water



standards, we still — it's 16.8 parts per billion, it doesn't care what flavor of uranium it is. We still have to meet that standard. But in fact, downstream at the Point of Compliance, WALPOC, that continued to meet the RFLMA standard when it was flowing. Next slide.

The pictures on the left focus in on that UTC. The top left shows what looks like two rectangular buildings. Those are actually conexes or cargo containers. And the one on the left is the — is the new uranium treatment component that was designed and manufactured off-site, and then, after we had installed the utilities and the plumbing and electrical, we brought that in, set it down in the proper location and hooked it up, added your — some solar panels to the roof so that it would have adequate power. The conex on the right is our power facility. It houses lithium ion phosphate batteries, and also has more solar panels. So, the electrical power that we need to treat this water, both for uranium in the UTC, that conex on the left, and then the nitrate treatment component, which you can't really tell. It's in the foreground by those two conexes. The electrical power comes from the batteries and the solar panels recharge the batteries so that it's a continuous cycle. And then in the lower photograph is — shows the inside of the UTC, and in the foreground, you can see where — I'll talk a little bit about the treatment mechanism, the process, and that's mixing equipment in the foreground, and then in the far distance is a big white tank. That's where the waste is contained.

So the chosen approach to treatment is called coprecipitation, where we add alum, which is a chemical that's used widely in water treatment. It's also used in agriculture and food preparation and skin care, swimming pools, and a number of different applications. It's thoroughly mixed in the water, then tiny little particles form, and those particles grab the uranium, the particles settle out and are also filtered out, and the resulting solids, those little tiny particles, are routed to that big tank in the far distance in that UTC conex picture, and then that tank, the solids in the tank, are dewatered, the water is routed, the treated water and the water from that tank are routed for nitrate treatment. Meanwhile, the solids, when it builds up enough, those are put in a separate small roll-off, essentially kind of like a dumpster. Those are further dewatered, and then sampled to assess what's in the solids, the waste, and then depending on what's in the waste, we determine how to disposition, how to dispose of, and where to dispose of that waste, and then it's hauled off and disposed. That hasn't happened yet. We expect that the waste disposition will be required once to twice a year. It hasn't yet been a full year, and we haven't needed to dispose of this waste yet. Next slide.

So back to groundwater monitoring. We do continue to monitor five Sentinel wells for plutonium and americium. Again, these Sentinel wells are used to evaluate whether contaminants are



moving and, in the case of the plutonium and americium wells, they are situated downgradient of the buildings that were most highly focused on plutonium and americium, and that includes Building 771 complex and the Building 371 complex, and as — as in previous years, every result was marked as a nondetect for those two constituents. And plutonium and americium were also below the standards at the downstream POC. Next slide.

Caleb mentioned, or he had on his slide about GS10, the reportable condition, that we had analyzed — we had one sample analyzed by Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and we also analyzed several groundwater samples, had them analyzed by Lawrence Berkeley also, and this was to distinguish between natural versus anthropogenic or man-affected, man-impacted uranium, to look and see if the uranium is present due to Rocky Flats Plant contamination or is natural. And one of the drivers for collecting those samples, in addition to GS10, was the downgradient PLF Monitoring Well 73205. And that's because it has elevated uranium, relatively speaking, as well as an increasing, statistically increasing trend in uranium. And so we wanted to know if that's contamination coming out of the landfill, or if it's natural, and it was determined to be 100% natural uranium, not contamination from historic activities. We also analyzed samples from two downgradient monitoring wells in the Solar Pond Plume Treatment System area and the surface water performance location GS13, also downgradient of that system, and the results were consistent with what we've seen in that area before. Roughly three-quarters to almost 100% natural uranium. And then the last of those samples was collected from a location at the upstream end of the groundwater collection component that I mentioned that was installed in 2024. And as that is much closer to the source area, we expected we'd have higher concentrations of anthropogenic uranium, and indeed we did. It was 93% anthropogenic. So that was reaffirmed our expectation. Next slide. Thank you.

Maleski: Thank you, John, for the updates on groundwater. So as a reminder, if you have any questions on the content as it's being presented, feel free to submit that to the Q&A or to the chat. And next, I'd like to welcome Robyn Collard on site operations.

Robin Collard: Hello, I'm Robyn Collard, and I'll be covering site operations. I'm the RSI technical manager, and next slide.

All field activities were conducted safely and successfully. The annual inspection was conducted of March of 2025. We had no violations of physical or institutional controls. There were no significant subsidences or erosion. Our roads are evaluated year-round. In June of 2025,



the roads were regraded. Road base was added, and rock crossings were refurbished, and then a dust suppressant was applied. Next slide, please.

The signs and the fences are inspected quarterly. We have about 250 signs that are attached either to the gates and/or to the fencing around the Central Operating Unit. We have a lot of elk, so wildlife and wind are our most common causes of damage. The signs and fences are repaired and/or replaced as required. Next slide, please.

The Present Landfill, in name only, we have quarterly and weather-related inspections that were performed on the PLF, and they are performing as designed. What would cause or invoke a weather-related inspection would be if we were to get 1 inch of rain or water or more, or 10 inches of snow or more within a 24-hour period, and that is an institutional control per RFLMA. Next slide, please.

The OLF was inspected as required in October of 2025. The RFLMA parties agreed to modify the inspection frequency from monthly to quarterly. We have eight landfill settlement monuments that are surveyed quarterly, and the conditions are within the design criteria. There was no slumping observed at the OLF hillside during calendar year 2025. Next slide, please.

The North Walnut Creek slump, the nearby infrastructure remains operational. The swell and the rock crossings that were installed in 2019 to direct the surface water runoff away from the North Walnut Creek slump continue to function as designed, as do the inclinometers and the piezometers that were installed in 2020. And in the 2025 survey data, it showed less movement than in prior years, with movement of approximately 0.2 inches per month, or for an average of 2.4 inches for the calendar year of 2025. Thank you. Next slide.

Maleski: Thank you, Robyn.

Collard: You're welcome.

Maleski: So now I'd like to invite our final presenter, Karin McShea, to talk about ecological monitoring.

Karin McShea: Hi, my name is Karin McShea, as Colleen said, and I also work for RSI, the subcontractor to LM, and I'm going to talk about ecology and summarize some of our activities that occurred in 2025. So starting with vegetation management, so we do have an integrated pest management program where we use a variety of tools to manage our noxious weeds, and herbicide use is one of them, one of those tools. And in 2025, we sprayed 136 acres with

herbicides, but the majority of that was spot-treated, so 135 acres were spot-treated, so spot treatment is a very precise method that targets noxious weeds, and it has very little effect on some of our natives that we have out at the site. We interseeded approximately 3.4 acres throughout the site, and the purpose of that was to increase vegetation diversity and cover throughout the site. And last year we mainly used rabbit brush, which is a native shrub in Colorado, and we wanted to increase the shrub component in some of our areas. So we also mowed and trimmed vegetation on about 14 acres and along 16 miles, linear miles on the site. And this was done along roads and next to our equipment and also on the terminal dams, those three remaining dams on-site. And the purpose of this vegetation management was to reduce the potential for wildfires to increase our safety, so the personnel that have to go around the equipment and maintain the equipment, to make sure that they're safe out there, and also to allow more — an easier inspection of those terminal dams. So, for vegetation monitoring, we conducted vegetation monitoring for a variety of reasons that's listed on the slide here, and, including Preble's mouse, habitat mitigation, and also for erosion control or soil stabilization. And many of these areas that we monitored were disturbed from projects that occurred approximately five or so years ago, as an example, the Original Landfill Hillside Stabilization Project that was completed in 2020. So since the completion of that project, we have been monitoring the area and making — to make sure that the revegetation has been trending towards success, and the data does show that revegetation in these areas is doing well, and has met our stabilization success criteria. So what that means is we would, for the Original Landfill Project, for example, we would monitor that vegetation on an annual basis until it met success criteria, and now that it has, we're going to monitor it less frequently as part of our normal — our general revegetation monitoring program. And as part of that program, we monitor all the revegetated areas approximately every three to four years to make sure that vegetation is doing well and that we don't see any issues that we need to address.

So before we move on to the next slide, I want to talk about this picture that was taken in June of 2025, and in the previous year, in 2024, we treated several areas with indaziflam, which is trade name at Rejuvra, and it's a new — a fairly new herbicide that has been shown to have very great success on annual grasses like cheatgrass. And we have seen a great decrease in cheatgrass in some of those areas that we sprayed. So in this photo, this photo was taken along the boundary of a sprayed area, which is on the left, and an unsprayed area, which is on the right side of that yellow line. And in this picture, the purplish plant that's very dominant on the right side and the unsprayed area is cheatgrass. So you can see visually that there is quite a difference and a reduction in cheatgrass in those sprayed areas. So we're going to assess these areas. We're



going to continue to assess these areas and use this herbicide potentially in the future. On the slide. Sorry, in the future on the site. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So now shifting to wildlife, we conducted quarterly prairie dog surveys, and we look for prairie dogs and burrows while conducting those quarterly surveys, but also while we're on-site. As we mentioned, we're on-site, one of us is on-site most every day of the week, and so we do look for incidental or fortuitous observations of prairie dogs. And in calendar year 2025, there were no active prairie dog towns on the COU, on the Central Operable Unit. For bird monitoring, we conducted several pre-project, or pre-construction, bird nest surveys to make sure that those project activities do not negatively impact birds, which are — most of them are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. And as John talked about the UTC project, the uranium treatment component project, we did conduct a pre-construction survey for that project, and we found a Say's phoebe nest, but it was in an area where the project activities wouldn't have disturbed it, so we actually left it in place, and Say's phoebes are very habituated to human presence, so we kind of just monitored that nest throughout the season, and we successfully produced three young fledglings in 2025. So we're very proud parents of those three fledglings. So several years ago, we installed nest boxes to increase habitat for cavity nesting birds on-site, and in 2025, nine of those 25 bird boxes were used by mostly wrens and tree swallows, which are native species in Colorado. And we also take note of incidental observations of birds and nests. Like I said, almost every time we're out on the site, we're looking out for birds and nests and especially for raptor nests — they're pretty sensitive to human disturbance. And we have seen active raptor nests on-site in the past, but not in 2025. The closest nest that was observed in 2025 was about a quarter mile east of the COU boundary or the site boundary. So since closure, Michelle was showing us pictures of that small city, described that small city, since closure that has been replaced with a grassland, and as you would expect, our wildlife population has changed over that time, since that time, and, including our elk population. So during closure and during operations, we used to have about 20 elk that came down from the mountains during the calving season, but since the cities came down, and they mainly used the buffer zone — that buffer zone — that security buffer zone for calving. But since that time, since we have increased their habitat, we now have a resident elk herd and the population has been increasing over the years. And they're very large animals, and they're very curious, and they do damage our equipment, some of our equipment on-site. So we have been testing and installing various elk deterrents on-site to protect our equipment, and we've used our game cameras to capture their behavior, and the picture that you see here on the right, on the top, shows a small fenced area, or an exclosure, where we're trying to exclude elk from an area, and we installed



that enclosure last year to protect our surface water telemetry equipment that you can see kind of in the middle. And you can see the tripod in the middle has guy wires that come out to stabilize the tripod, and the elk used to just trip over those guy wires, and we would have to, you know, make repairs pretty frequently, but since we've installed these — these enclosures, we've been — we haven't seen any issues. The elk just move around that fenced area. So it's been very successful. So, to wrap up the eco— ecology section, I wanted to talk about adverse biological conditions. So, it's a very specific — it has a very specific meaning. The definition is unexpected mortality or morbidity of vegetation or wildlife, and we did not observe any adverse biological conditions in 2025. And again, every time we're out on-site, we're looking for some of these issues, whether it's incidental or as part of a survey. So now, thank you for your attention. Next slide, please. And if you have — and I'll actually bring it back to Michelle.

Franke: Sure. Happy to bring it all together. So as Colleen mentioned, feel free to drop some questions in the Q&A function. Our report is posted on our website. Unfortunately, I believe our website has been experiencing some issues, and that's not just unique to Rocky Flats. I think the LM websites as a whole have had some issues with some reports not being able to be viewed right now, and so we are working on that, but it is posted, and we hope to have that back up soon. These slides also will be posted and available once we get the website back up and running. If you do have any additional questions — and Colleen will talk about this again — that come up after the meeting, you can certainly email us at our RF info email address, and that'll come up on the screen in a future slide.

Maleski: Well, thank you, Michelle, Caleb, John, Robyn, and Karin for all of the insights. So, we're moving into the Q&A period of the meeting, and we'll have approximately 15 minutes for questions before we will transition into public comment. So, if you can go to the next slide, we have a few reminders just on how Q&A will work. So, of course we will prioritize questions related to the topics that we covered today here for the 2025 Annual Report, and I may be combining — if there are multiple questions that come in on similar topics, we may combine those just to ensure that we can cover more topics over the course of the Q&A period. And if you do not get your question answered live tonight, we welcome you to email rfinfo@lm.doe.gov, and we'll make sure that you do get a response. So, thank you. I've seen several questions coming in through both the Q&A and the chat. If we can go to the next slide, I will show you, though, if you haven't found those features, so if you are on a mobile phone, this is what it will look like ultimately. The first part shows if you are on a mobile Zoom app, you will actually see the Q&A feature. If you are on a mobile Zoom browser, you will need to submit it in the chat because you won't have access to the Q&A, and if you go to the next slide, this is what that



feature will look like if you are on your computer. So, thank you so much to everyone who's already submitted questions. I think we have some ready to — ready to roll. So, first and foremost, I think this question is probably for you, Michelle. What changes to the Rocky Flats Site groundwater and surface water do you anticipate with climate change or more drought conditions?

Franke: Yeah, that is a great question. Thank you. You know, overall, I think as is consistent with many sites across the West, I think we expect to get a little drier here at our site over time with climate change potentially, but I also want to kick that over to maybe John Boylan, who might be able to weigh in on groundwater, and Caleb, who might have some thoughts on how that might affect our surface water monitoring.

Boylan: Okay, thanks, Michelle, and thanks for the question. So, yes, we have seen more dry wells as a result of the lack of precipitation and, sneak preview here, it's — there's even more this year, given our dry winter and dry spring. The dry wells are more higher in number this year than last year, which where last year was dry also. So, you know, since we're monitoring for impacts to the groundwater from the Rocky Flats Plant, if there's no groundwater, by default, there's no impact to that groundwater, because there is no groundwater. We will continue to monitor until — unless and until the decisions and the path forward is changed through consultation between DOE and the regulators. So we'll continue to go out and follow our schedule. We'll have our same routine quarterly and semiannual and biennial sampling that's defined in the RFLMA. And, you know, if a well's dry, then we move on. If it's not dry, we collect samples.

Artz: From a surface water aspect, I think a lot of what John said applies as well. As you all know, it was a very dry 2025 and has continued to be dry into 2026 and, sneak preview, like John had mentioned, we have not collected a lot of surface water samples this year. Particularly at WALPOC, we have had no — or Walnut Creek Point of Compliance, we've had no meaningful flow this year. I think we did have a little bit yesterday with that rain that came through, but as the climate changes potentially and dryer conditions persist, we will have to assess maybe changing our pacing rates for some of our samplers to collect more samples more frequently, but in general, if there's no water to collect, we're not really collecting samples.

Maleski: Thank you, Caleb. Thank you, John. While we're on the topic of water, so I know, Caleb, you had talked about the — you know, Points of Compliance where surface water leaves the site, so this is a question for you, John, I think, of how does groundwater leave the site?

Boylan: That's a great question. I'll try not to get too deeply into the details, but basically the groundwater's flowing through, a call it 2- to 3-dozen-feet-thick layer of permeable soil that's sitting on top of dense clay. That clay is resistive to flow, and so what happens is the groundwater flows laterally through that call it soil, and then it goes down — it — it's flowing generally from west to east, and it — as it comes across a drainage, like Woman Creek, Walnut Creek, it will discharge into the surface water, or instead of discharging, it will be sucked up by the plants. And the estimates and modeling has shown that of the precipitation that falls on Rocky Flats, approximately 90% of that gets sucked up by the plants or gets evaporated. It's through evapotranspiration, it's called, and so that leaves only 10% to recharge the groundwater. So that kind of adds to our lack of groundwater to begin with. But that's the hydrologic cycle. It discharges to the surface water before that surface water flows off-site.

Maleski: Thanks, John.

Boylan: Sure.

Maleski: So if we can go back to the infographic — there's a question on the infographic, so if we can go back, I think it's Slide 10, the question is, so I think there was a question about the potential discrepancy of zero reportable conditions versus obviously the POE GS10 reportable condition. So Michelle, I don't know if you want to start kind of explaining the entire kind of bottom section there of the reportable conditions, and Caleb, you might want to weigh in too.

Franke: Yeah, I'll definitely be happy — so, under reportable conditions, you'll see three different categories there. The top one being Area of Concern wells, and John talked about that, and what would lead to a reportable condition at that — at those specific wells. We did not see any reportable conditions there in 2025. And then underneath that is the surface water Point of Evaluation sampling category. And so Caleb talked about on that map, those are those green locations that are upstream of our Points of Compliance. And so that is where we did have one reportable condition at our location called GS10 for uranium. And Caleb, to talk about that, and Caleb, I'll let you weigh in a little, again, like, another high-level summary of what that was in a second, and then underneath that, you'll see, again, in big letters, because the Points of Compliance there are where the water ultimately leaves our site for good, and so there were no reportable conditions there. So while we did have one above at the Point of Evaluation, we did not see that translate to a reportable condition at our Point of Compliance. So Caleb, if you want to weigh in a little?



Artz: Michelle summarized that really well just from a high level, the one reportable condition, again, was for just one analyte at that GS10 location, and that was for the 12-month rolling average for uranium concentrations. And that was really the only reportable condition we saw across the site in general and for the Points of Evaluation. And like Michelle mentioned, ultimately, we are most concerned about reportable conditions at our Points of Compliance, where all of our surface water, and kind of how John had mentioned, groundwater ultimately leaves the site and flows on to the wildlife refuge.

Franke: I'd also like to real quick say this is our first rolling out of this infographic, and so if you do have feedback, we do welcome that at our email. You can email us after this. We'd love any candid feedback about how this is laid out.

Maleski: Thank you both. Okay, I think, Michelle, this might be for you as well. So everyone's referenced kind of the dry weather. And so of course that brings up community concerns as it relates to wildfires. And so what is being done at the site to respond to and or prevent fires in the area?

Franke: Yeah, that's definitely on our minds. So I'll hit on two things, kind of two different aspects. One is that we do take great care when we do our work on-site to try to prevent sparking a wildfire by any means necessary, right? So Karin mentioned we mow our roads, or near our two tracks where we're going to be driving, so we try to reduce the risk that we'd spark a wildfire from a hot vehicle. If we're going to conduct any work that has any risk at all of maybe producing a spark or things like that, that work is heavily reviewed by our site staff, health and safety staff, and other subject matter experts to see, first of all, do we have to do this work? Can we do it another way, right, that we don't even have to risk, or to put a lot of safeguards in place to ensure that, you know, we have people standing by with fire extinguishers and things like that when we're conducting this work. Or maybe we don't conduct the work on-site, we can conduct it somewhere else. So we do have those kinds of things in place to prevent a wildfire. We have been meeting as well with local government, fire departments in the area, so we had the first meeting with them on May 12th of this year to talk about the site and what a response at the site might look like. And then we have a follow-up meeting with them actually next week on July 1st, again, to talk about response to a potential wildfire at the site.

Maleski: Thank you. So I'm not seeing any additional questions coming in through either the chat or the Q&A. I'll give it about 15 more seconds to see if there's any kind of final burning questions. And then also a reminder again, if you dig into the thousand page report, if something



comes up after you log off tonight, you think of another question, you are absolutely welcome to email rinfo@lm.doe.gov. And then that way you would be able to get a response. I do see another one that just came up. So, there's curiosity of when the PFAS monitoring report would come out.

Franke: Yeah, that is a great question. So we do collect quarterly PFAS samples. So that report — those results are actually reported quarterly, and so there are already numerous reports on our public webpage, and we're actually about to post another one for first quarter of this year. So stay tuned.

Maleski: Okay. Well, I will move us then. Thank you for all of the great questions from our audience. Thank you for the great insights from our presenters. So I'm going to transition us then into public comment. So, we'll also have about 15 minutes, for us to be able to hear from all of you. So public comment really provides an opportunity for community members to voice their thoughts and opinions on relevant topics. And the way that that will work today, so we are going to hear comments on a first-come, first-served basis until the public comment period is over. So, similar to the Q&A, if you are not able to share your comment live tonight, we do invite you to email us. It's that same email address. And so you'll be able to share those comments, share additional questions, and you won't be able to share visuals tonight if you do participate in the public comment, so if you have any visuals that would go along with your comment, you could also email the — the RF info box, and that is where we will be able to receive those.

So, in a moment, we will ultimately open public comment, and at that time, I'll ask that you raise your Zoom hand if you want to find — take a moment to find that functionality on your screen. You are also welcome to practice that, so we will lower all the hands before we officially open the comments, so if you want to try that out, you're welcome to do that right now. And so, once I open public comment, you will raise your hand, wait to be called upon, and be able to have your — your two minutes to share your — share your ideas. When it's your turn to provide comment, we'll ask that you state your name, your place of residence, and if you have any applicable organizational affiliations. You will have the opportunity to speak once, and you'll have up to two minutes to speak. You will not be able to transfer your time to any additional participants. So, we ask to keep your comment related to the topic of tonight's meeting. That is the 2025 Rocky Flats Site Annual Report, and I'm going to remind you, our engagement norms that we shared at the beginning of the meeting still apply, so I'll ask that you be civil and be constructive. And I will note, we won't tolerate any abusive or inappropriate behavior, and so if you violate our guidelines, I may ask you to redirect, I may shorten your comment time, or have to mute you



from the meeting. So, I'll announce the speakers as it is your turn, and when you hear your name, you'll see a notification come up on your screen to invite you to unmute your microphone. So you unmute yourself, and be able to share your public comments.

So I will open up the public comment period now, and welcome anyone who has thoughts to share. I will note that our presenters will be listening, but this is — this is really a time for us to hear from you, so we won't be engaging in discussion — we won't be, kind of having that conversation or dialogue back and forth. We'll be listening to what you have to say tonight.

My mom was a public school teacher, so I do have a very good wait time. Next year, we'll have music to kind of support this — this period of time.

I am not seeing any hands being raised, so, I will again remind you, if there are any comments, if there are — oh, I've got a taker. Chris, would love to welcome you to share your — your comment.

Chris Allred: Good evening. Hi, my name is Chris Allred. Hear me okay?

Maleski: We can, thank you.

Allred: Hi. Yes, my name is Chris Allred. I work with Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center. I've been studying Rocky Flats for about 11 years, and many of my colleagues have studied Rocky Flats for 40 or more years, going back to 1979 and a couple of scientists who even did sampling for the atomic energy agency back before that. So I appreciate the presentations tonight. Thank you for your time and for the opportunity to comment. I would like to say that I did find the introduction to the presentation tonight to be very misleading. I think that the Department of Energy has had a tendency towards trying to rewrite history, and I find it troubling to see that pattern continue. For example, the timeline attempted to portray the decision to close Rocky Flats as, oh, it was decided Rocky Flats wasn't needed anymore. And it was failed to be mentioned that it was closed from an FBI raid in 1989, and the contractor, Rockwell, later pled guilty to environmental crimes. Also, it's not true that all of the weapons-grade plutonium was removed in 2003. There is still plutonium buried in infinity rooms at Rocky Flats and it spread throughout the surface soil in — in the downwind communities and the wildlife refuge. So also, I do have concerns about the Department of Energy trying to silo conversations and not allowing other panelists to see questions, and I think that this meeting should be more widely distributed to local governments and have it be a more accessible forum in public. Thank you.



Maleski: Thank you, Chris, for your comment. Thank you. Are there any additional participants who'd like to share public comment tonight? Okay, so seeing none, as a reminder, please do email the RF info inbox if you have questions or comments that come up after you sign off tonight. And I think I'll turn it over to Michelle for a few closing words.

Franke: Yeah, I appreciate you all coming. I appreciate the participation. Thanks, Chris, for making a public comment as well. Again, you can reach us anytime at that email inbox and look forward to hearing from you soon. Thank you.

Maleski: Thank you and have a great evening.

