

**From:** [David Wood](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Discussion about Rocky Mountain Greenway Trail at Rocky Flats  
**Date:** Monday, March 11, 2024 11:57:35 AM

---

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Westminster City Council,

I am a retired physics professor (Colorado School of Mines) living in Candelas and I am responsible for [https://urldefense.com/v3/https://rockyflatsneighbors.org/\\_!!E0sFAW4Yvqtm762YPg!xPuLAYSSTZ0XH\\_f4FeczRkwIJQPJDKA0m4nAunujiusp48z39couHYhhA4\\_kF21o-79aV6Ao-Bf81W-IDP2vZBOdbvUCuS](https://urldefense.com/v3/https://rockyflatsneighbors.org/_!!E0sFAW4Yvqtm762YPg!xPuLAYSSTZ0XH_f4FeczRkwIJQPJDKA0m4nAunujiusp48z39couHYhhA4_kF21o-79aV6Ao-Bf81W-IDP2vZBOdbvUCuS), a non-profit, pro-science website which has examined all aspects of Rocky Flats safety since about 2018. A recent update contains many resources for public officials.

Should the Council so decide, I would be happy to provide unbiased information (at whatever level the Council wishes) about what has been measured for both the Refuge and the regions around the Refuge.

As you know from the embarrassing situation Broomfield placed itself in, public testimony about Rocky Flats issues is contentious and can sway municipalities unprepared for the tactics of anti-nuclear activists. The issues are not in fact complicated. The Broomfield City Council in 2018 chose to ignore testimony from its own official physician, and of Dr. Jennifer Opila of the CDPHE, before voting to withdraw from funding the Jefferson Parkway. I urge you to take steps to avoid a similar debacle when public statements occur this evening. It is possible that an absence of due diligence by the Council may lead to legal ramifications later.

What does due diligence on the part of the City Council look like?

- Acquaint yourselves with the actual facts about the east side of the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge
- Assess the credentials of those speaking for or against the issue. Some suggested questions occur below.
- Determine whether speakers represent your actual political constituents

Groups including the Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center, the Colorado chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility and individuals including Chris Allred, Jon Lipsky, Randy Stafford, and a few others are likely to appear. I am delighted to learn that Chris Allred has already corresponded with the Council.

- The groups above are not pro-public health; they are anti-nuclear (including nuclear power).
- Not one group or individual has a background in the physical sciences or epidemiology. They never ever discuss radiation DOSE, which is the only indicator of hazard.
- These groups and individuals have left a paper trail of fearmongering and misinformation, in some cases for as long as 40 years (Peace&Justice).
- The groups frequently claim to represent concerned citizens but do not.

Awareness of facts will insulate the City Council from recriminations and possible liabilities later. Some FACTS which bear on what you will hear tonight:

1. Plutonium is a trace contaminant in Rocky Flats soil; it accounts (according to NIST) for less than 1% of total soil radioactivity.
2. As you know, the negotiated clean-up standard for the Superfund-remediated parts of the Rocky Flats area was 50 pCi/g (radioactivity per unit weight of soil). 80% of 522 samples from the Jefferson Parkway campaign had levels below 0.8 pCi/g, more than 60 times smaller than the standard.
3. The radioisotopes which are dangerous via inhalation or swallowing emit very ionizing "alpha particles". 99.4% of measured alpha emitters are natural.
4. At the east gate of the Refuge (very near the overpass) annual doses (using the highest measured plutonium concentration and including the careful characterization of 'hot particles' by Dr. Michael Ketterer) are about 4.4 microSv. Rather than explain what this is, it's better to note
5. At present, plutonium contributes 335 times less (inhalation) and 216 times less (swallowing) than natural radioisotopes.
6. Recent epidemiology has concluded that there is no evidence of increased cancer rates from any plutonium sources. (There is a small increased rate for nuclear plant workers.)

====Suggested questions for spokesmen of anti-nuclear groups====

1. Can you compare the annual dose from inhaling plutonium-contaminated dust or ingesting soil from the east side of the Refuge with local background radiation values?
2. What does the peer-reviewed scientific literature say about such doses, or about plutonium in particular?
3. Could you please send us published references on these issues?

Sincerely yours,  
DMW

dmwood@mines.edu  
Emeritus Assoc Prof  
Department of Physics  
Colorado School of Mines