

00001

1

2

3

CAMP BONNEVILLE

4

RESTORATION ADVISORY

5

BOARD MEETING

6

7

8

9

10 Court Reporter: Jaime S. Morrocco, RPR, CM

11

12 Date: May 14, 2003

13 Time: 7:00 p.m.

14 Place: 6701 N.E. 147th Avenue

15 Vancouver, Washington

16

17

18 RIDER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

19 P.O. Box 245

20 Vancouver, WA 98666

21 (360) 693-4111

22

23

24

25

00002

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Hello, everybody. Good evening.
2 Most of you know this already, but I see a couple new faces.
3 My name is Eric Waehling. I work for the Army and I'm the
4 project manager for Camp Bonneville. Welcome to our May 14th
5 Restoration Advisory Board meeting.
6 For those folks that are new, please come sit up at
7 the table if you want. The more the merrier. We try not to
8 bite each other.
9 I'd like to start the meeting as we usually do, by
10 going around the table and giving an opportunity for people
11 to identify themselves. You're not obliged to, but if you
12 care to, this is an opportunity to identify your presence for
13 the meeting and have it recorded in the minutes.
14 I'll start. Eric Waehling, Camp Bonneville BEC, US
15 Army.
16 BUD VAN CLEVE: Bud Van Cleve, Northeast Hazel Dell
17 Neighborhood Association, and RAB.
18 KAREN KINGSTON: Karen Kingston, Camp Bonneville
19 neighbor and RAB co-chair.
20 JEROEN KOK: Jeroen Kok, Vancouver/Clark Parks and
21 Recreation Department, Clark County representative.
22 IAN RAY: Ian Ray, RAB.
23 ED MARSHMAN: Ed Marshman, FBI.
24 DENNIS McGUIRE: Dennis McGuire, resident of Summer
25 Hills right next to Camp Bonneville.

00003

1 KYLE McGUIRE: Kyle McGuire. I'm here for a scout
2 merit badge.

3 CHUCK MASON: Chuck Mason, Veterans of Foreign Wars
4 and neighbor.

5 DON WASTLER: Don Wastler, Restoration Advisory
6 Board, neighbor of Camp Bonneville.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Christine Sutherland, RAB.

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Barry Rogowski, Department of
9 Ecology.

10 VALERIE LANE: Valerie Lane, RAB.

11 JENNIFER WALTERS: Jennifer Walters, Camp Bonneville
12 administrative coordinator.

13 FRANK FUNK: Frank Funk, RAB member.

14 ERIN MIDDLEWOOD: Erin Middlewood, The Columbian.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you very much.

16 Before we get started, Karen, do you have anything
17 you want to bring up or talk about?

18 KAREN KINGSTON: No. I'll wait till the updates.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Frank?

20 FRANK FUNK: I wasn't at the last RAB meeting for a
21 reason, and I read the minutes, especially about the meeting
22 of the membership committee. And I would like to address this
23 to the installation co-chair, which is Eric. If you take
24 exception to what I say, I respectfully ask that you wait till
25 I finish and then take exception.

00004

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, with all respect, Frank, I
2 was hoping that we -- could we do that in the open discussion?

3 FRANK FUNK: It's important that this is before the
4 committee. You might want to throw me out.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't want to throw you out, not
6 at all.

7 FRANK FUNK: It's important that this be before this
8 committee as we go.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: During the open discussion, Frank.

10 FRANK FUNK: It isn't open for discussion, period.
11 It's a statement I'm going to make. This committee is out of
12 order. This whole committee is out of order.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: In the open discussion you may
14 bring it up.

15 FRANK FUNK: You say I can bring it up?

16 KAREN KINGSTON: Is that right, Eric? Can we agree
17 on that?

18 ERIC WAEHLING: Frank, one of the things that has
19 been brought to my attention by others in the RAB body is that
20 they've asked that we try to adhere more closely to the agenda
21 and the agenda topics.

22 FRANK FUNK: That's fine.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: And that we try to hear these sorts
24 of things as part of the open discussion.

25 FRANK FUNK: Let me ask you a question. You got a

00005

1 7:45 thing, says old business, RAB members. Can I put it
2 there?

3 DON WASTLER: Frank Funk, I specifically asked to
4 have that spot.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: We need to move on.

6 DON WASTLER: I agree. We need to move on.

7 FRANK FUNK: I'm specifically asking to address the
8 committee, to the installation co-chair, period, with you guys
9 listening. Now, you've asked for something. I think I should
10 be able to get something also.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: That's fine. He asked ahead of
12 time, Frank. We're moving on, we're going to adhere to this.

13 FRANK FUNK: You're railroading the committee,
14 that's what you're doing, and that's wrong.

15 DON WASTLER: She's following the agenda, Frank.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: I am following the agenda. You can
17 wait till the break and then you can bring this up. You can
18 take some of my time in the community updates, after the
19 break.

20 So right now we have some business to take care of,
21 and we will --

22 FRANK FUNK: This is very much RAB business, very
23 much RAB business.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: This whole meeting is RAB business.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: One avenue might be if you'd like to

00006

1 make a motion to modify the agenda and let the RAB body
2 decide, would that be appropriate?

3 FRANK FUNK: They're not going to do that because
4 you have the neighborhood associations sitting here. They're
5 going to oppose you because your RAB committee is made up of a
6 majority of neighborhoods, and they're going to oppose that.

7 VALERIE LANE: I won't, because I heard a couple
8 remarks that I don't approve of.

9 FRANK FUNK: How about you making a motion then?

10 VALERIE LANE: I'd like the discussion to go on, but
11 put it wherever you want, but I want it done tonight before we
12 go home.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: Absolutely.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Valerie, would you like to make a
15 motion?

16 VALERIE LANE: I'd like to make a motion that I hear
17 this discussion of Frank Funk bringing up about the committee
18 for recruiting new people on this RAB, some of the comments
19 that have been made, and I want it discussed tonight before we
20 all go home, before 9:00. I want it put there. I don't want
21 to be here till 10, 11 o'clock.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: Before adjournment.

23 VALERIE LANE: Before 9:00 at night I want it
24 discussed.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to address the motion and

00007

1 then bring a second issue, a question of when we'd like to
2 adjourn. Valerie, we have a motion.

3 FRANK FUNK: Asking for a second?

4 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm asking for the second.

5 JEROEN KOK: Second the motion.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: All in favor? Nays? We'll make
7 sure that we hear you tonight and work our way through that.

8 FRANK FUNK: Okay.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Valerie brought up another issue
10 that I'd like to ask the RAB members to decide before we go on
11 any further. When would people like to adjourn the meeting
12 tonight? That way we can make sure we know when we're going
13 to have our meeting ending tonight, there's no question. The
14 RAB as a body can decide.

15 BUD VAN CLEVE: I would say when the majority feels
16 like our business is over.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, there were some differing
18 opinions about when the business is over and when the meeting
19 should have adjourned last time. I'm hoping that we can
20 identify a no later than adjournment time now as a body so
21 folks can feel they've had some control over that, aren't
22 railroaded.

23 BUD VAN CLEVE: I don't care when it is. Let's just
24 move on. We're not doing anything. Wasted time.

25 IAN RAY: Speaking for myself, I seldom get the

00008

1 business done that I want to get done, and I don't care how
2 long the meeting lasts, I want my business to get done.
3 That's my point of view.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: We can either go on like we have or
5 does anybody want to identify a no later than time to adjourn
6 by?

7 VALERIE LANE: Excuse me. I'd like to identify the
8 fact that I've been coming to these meetings since about 1995,
9 been on the RAB since it started. Most of these meetings have
10 ended right around 9:00. There are a few discussions that
11 take you to 9:15, 9:20, 9:30. I believe when 9:30 in the
12 evening comes along, this is a volunteer position, I don't
13 know about you guys, but I do work. I have my own business.
14 I have to accommodate customers who work themselves. That
15 means early in the morning, late in the evening. I try to
16 ride a few horses in between.

17 I can't be here till 10, 11:00 at night. I'd like
18 to see it end somewhere around 9:00. If we're on a hot
19 subject, let's go on to 9:15, 9:20, wrap it up, go home.

20 FRANK FUNK: I agree with Valerie. Once in a while
21 we get into something. I've been called on it one time. We
22 get talking about something that's not germane to the
23 business. I think you can politely say to the person, as they
24 did me, it wasn't very polite, but he called me on it, and he
25 was right. I was doing something not germane to the committee

00009

1 and they stopped the debate and went on. I think if somebody
2 gets off into left field somewhere, you can bring them down,
3 ask them to get back on the committee.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: So our objective is to end around
5 9:00?

6 FRANK FUNK: I agree with that. I second Valerie's
7 motion.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: All in favor?

9 DON WASTLER: We've lost 10 minutes off our agenda
10 already.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: I really didn't think it would take
12 us this long to decide what time to adjourn the meeting.

13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I ask we stick to the agenda.
14 We have that timed. It says between 9 and 10. Let's stick to
15 the agenda.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: I second it.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: All in favor of adjourning, shooting
18 for 9:00, say aye? It wasn't unanimous. We'll adhere to the
19 agenda.

20 Army updates, field data from the wells. You all
21 recall Gaynor Dawson was with us last time. He was talking
22 about the numerous wells and some of the thinking that went
23 into installing those wells and why we chose to locate them
24 where we did. I have brought to you a copy of some of the
25 data that I submitted to the Department of Ecology, which is

00010

1 showing the results from those wells that we've submitted to
2 Ecology, so they're considered draft until Ecology has had an
3 opportunity to review and comment and conduct their quality
4 control, quality assurance.

5 There is another map. We have a map here that shows
6 the location. I apologize for the small print. It's showing
7 the location of all the wells that are on Bonneville as well
8 as the locations of the wells that we've sampled off of
9 Bonneville. It correlates. The numbering for those wells --
10 the naming of those wells correlates to this field report so
11 you can see, correlate the results to well locations.

12 Also we had a request at the last meeting that the
13 comments on the expanded site investigation, the report that I
14 gave you all for Landfill 4, that we provide comments that
15 Ecology and EPA provided on those documents. I brought those.
16 Those are up here, as well.

17 Let's see. As far as field activities go, we
18 haven't -- we've wrapped up the soils sampling for the small
19 arms ranges. Aside from that, there hasn't been a whole lot
20 of field activity going on since we last met.

21 Also, this is indirectly related to cleanup, there
22 was some -- as you all know, I have some assistance in the
23 management of the facility of Camp Bonneville. A gentleman
24 named Tom Kersio (phonetic), who works for Fort Lewis, is
25 helping me manage Bonneville. Specifically he's helping

00011

1 Fort Lewis manage the real property and the buildings and the
2 roads and fences, keeping things working, working with Warren
3 and Steve to keep Bonneville standing, lights on. You may be
4 hearing his name or even hearing from him if you contact the
5 camp.

6 As far as Army updates related to fieldwork, that's
7 all that I have. Anybody have any questions?

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: On the back page of the
9 submission that you provided, on perchlorate, it says they are
10 not considered valid. Is there going to be a retest?

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Not considered valid?

12 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The back page, it's the
13 graph. If you read perchlorate, there's an asterisk. I just
14 wanted to know if there was any more information you had
15 regarding the testing?

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah. Well, I can tell you about
17 that. When we did the first sampling, we had some issues with
18 that where we got a reading that we weren't -- didn't have a
19 whole lot of confidence in. So what we did do is we went out
20 and took some confirmational sampling where we took what we
21 call a split or duplicate. We took a sample and sent it off
22 to two separate labs. Those came back as non-detects.
23 What we're trying to do is we're trying to figure
24 out why one lab had a detection and two other labs didn't have
25 a detection. The reason that's flagged as questionable is

00012

1 because it's inconsistent and we're trying to figure out
2 what's really going on there: Is it there or is it not?

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Were all three tests Army
4 funded?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah, we paid for all of them.
6 We're, with Ecology, going to be trying to figure out why we
7 have one hit and two others say no. When we sample it again,
8 see what we get.

9 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Do you have a date that
10 you're expecting?

11 ERIC WAEHLING: To get the next round of samples?

12 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Yes.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: We're trying to get the quarterly
14 monitoring program in place. But fairly soon. Of all the
15 wells that cause us concern, obviously that is one. But I
16 wanted to get it in front of everybody that potentially
17 there's something there. It's inconclusive. Two labs say no,
18 one lab says yes. We have to stay tuned and keep looking at
19 it.

20 KAREN KINGSTON: I have a question. Barry, do you
21 see that kind of thing happen very often?

22 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Well, in this particular case, I'm
23 a little bit -- I'm interested in why there's some other
24 parameters here that seem like they're kind of out of whack,
25 too.

00013

1 If you look at dissolved oxygen percent saturation,
2 it seems really high to me. A lot of times if you get some
3 very regular or familiar parameters along with your other
4 chemical analysis, like dissolved oxygen, pH, that doesn't
5 look too bad, temperature, but the DO looks really, really --
6 38%, that's very, very high. That looks like something went
7 wrong with the sample and the analysis, quality assurance, to
8 me. I'm not sure of that.

9 You're asking me a two-minute glance at the data.

10 There's a lot of numbers, a lot of stuff that goes into it.

11 Something looks askew with this information to me. I would be
12 uncomfortable with accepting this as good data.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: And the Army doesn't have a whole
14 lot of confidence either, as we've identified there being
15 issues with it.

16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yeah. I would want to see some
17 split samples or duplicate samples, more QA done on more
18 samples from these wells, and actually quarterly monitoring,
19 like every quarter or six months, with some splits and
20 duplicates to see if we can get some consistency. Sometimes
21 it's very difficult to tell with one sample from one lab. If
22 it doesn't look right, you want to go back and check.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: The one sample from the one lab, is
24 that the lab that was reporting perchlorate? That's the one
25 you're concerned with more than the other two?

00014

1 BARRY ROGOWSKI: This is one sample right here from
2 numerous wells, five, six and eight, five deep and shallow,
3 six, seven, eight shallow.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: So, anyways, there's definitely some
5 issues, some questions that we have about the data because, as
6 Barry pointed out, it just doesn't make a whole lot of sense.
7 Confirmational sampling.

8 IAN RAY: What percent saturation would you expect
9 with dissolved oxygen?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Normal is closer to nine.

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Depending on temperature. I think
12 it's between six and nine percent.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

14 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Colder water has more dissolved
15 oxygen; warmer water has less.

16 IAN RAY: These show three to four times what you'd
17 expect?

18 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Right. Something is off here, I
19 think.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Those are from Demo 3, which
22 is near the border?

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Those particular ones, yes, which is
24 additionally why we have some concerns. Fortunately, the
25 wells that are located along the fence line didn't show

00015

1 anything. But the analysis was run by the same lab, which is
2 why we need to continue to, first of all, find out what's
3 going on here, why are we getting some things that don't make
4 a lot of sense. Then, secondly, continue our monitoring so
5 that we get some trends and can develop some confidence one
6 way or the other.

7 It may well be there or may not be there. We need
8 to know one way or the other and start getting data that makes
9 sense and that we can have some confidence in.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Also, Barry, are you aware of any
11 other contaminants that could be present that we're not
12 testing for that would skew the dissolved oxygen? Do you know
13 how sometimes when there is something else present you're not
14 testing for, there's an indicator?

15 BARRY ROGOWSKI: The things that affect dissolved
16 oxygen are organics and temperature primarily. If there's a
17 high organic content, the organic matter eats up the oxygen
18 because it's a natural-occurring biological system.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. But other things that can
20 skew it, one possibility we're asking the lab to look into,
21 you have preservatives that they use, various acids to
22 preserve the samples. Sometimes they can be contaminated.
23 Their containers can be contaminated. The machine could be
24 out of calibration. All these sorts of things can possibly
25 throw it.

00016

1 That's why we need to go back, find out what went
2 wrong, but also to continue sampling, do some splits, send it
3 to different labs. That's why we went out and took
4 duplicates, went to two separate labs, things like that.

5 IAN RAY: Do we know, in a few sentences, the method
6 for determining percent saturation dissolved oxygen?

7 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I don't know what the lab used.
8 I'm sorry.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Maybe something to recognize.
11 On the west side of Lacamas Creek, if you look at this map
12 (indicating), the west side of Lacamas Creek, along that
13 creek, there was that old landfill that was supposedly
14 remedied in the '50s, according to '50s standards. Do you
15 remember that? In the ASR, there was a whole stream - not
16 "stream" meaning water - but a whole area that was a landfill
17 is what I think it was titled, and then it was supposedly they
18 called it "cleaned up" in I think '57. That's directly
19 upstream from the samples. I just thought I'd mention that.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Interesting.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: In '57, I wonder what cleanup
22 standards were.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Certainly they were different than
24 what they are today.

25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I'd expect.

00017

1 ERIC WAEHLING: That possibility didn't even occur
2 to me, to be honest.

3 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think we just have bad lab
4 results personally. I want to see more lab results and some
5 more quality assurance of the lab results.

6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Good. I think we should.

7 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's what I think.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Ian?

9 IAN RAY: Another thing possibly related, at the
10 presentation at the waterworks where the DOE did the
11 Enforcement Order, there was a DOE person there who told me
12 that he had been looking at hundreds of well logs from around
13 the fence of Camp Bonneville. What was he doing with those
14 well logs?

15 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Well, do you want me to talk about
16 that, the handout, the wells and stuff?

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Sure, yeah.

18 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Good question, Ian.

19 This handout that I have here, if you look at this
20 one, several-page handout, this is Landfill 4, Demo Area 1.
21 I'm sorry I don't have overheads. Nnamdi Madakor, whose name
22 is on this, professional licensed hydrogeologist, state of
23 Washington, we're taking all of the wells throughout Camp
24 Bonneville and all the well data that we can get surrounding
25 Camp Bonneville from residential domestic wells, we're

00018

1 plotting it on a regional --

2 VALERIE LANE: You can't go back very far, though.

3 They didn't do anything before the '70s.

4 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's right. You only use what
5 you got.

6 VALERIE LANE: You're only going back to the early
7 '70s?

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: As much as we can get. We can only
9 take the data we have to work with. We're going from there
10 forward.

11 VALERIE LANE: Okay.

12 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You're right.

13 So we're taking all the wells that we can get.

14 Instead of just trying to do little fragments of stuff, we're
15 trying to plot them all together on a regional map so we get
16 an understanding of not only localized groundwater flow, but
17 also regional groundwater flow and potential contamination.

18 We're getting more data together on these wells.

19 Here on the west and also on the south, the south

20 well, the County is providing some information as far as their
21 shallow wells and their water quality people we've asked to
22 provide some data for us on the wells.

23 The things we're doing, type of things we're doing

24 with this, if you look at this map, starting with the first

25 map, what Nnamdi has done is plotted the concentration of

00019

1 perchlorate in the shallow aquifer around Demo Area 1, and the
2 red is the highest concentration going out. It starts at 120
3 parts per billion, 110, 100, 90, and goes out until we don't
4 have any more data in the shallow aquifer, using the
5 monitoring well system we have.

6 Nnamdi has also taken the groundwater elevations in
7 the wells, which starts at 500 feet, 505 feet above mean sea
8 level, and goes down to 490, and plotted the flow direction of
9 the groundwater in the shallow aquifer depicted by the arrows.
10 So you can see that shallow groundwater flow primarily goes
11 towards Lacamas Creek, but also tends to follow topography in
12 kind of a spiraling southerly direction. Generally follows
13 topography in the shallow groundwater.

14 There is high concentration of perchlorate of 138
15 parts per billion at monitoring well two, which seems to
16 generally disperse radially from that area following
17 topography. The reason why it's cut off is the model, the
18 computer model that we're using, when it doesn't have data, it
19 just cuts off. We don't have data, so we don't know past that
20 point. We have no way to extrapolate other than a guess.
21 We're not guessing; we're using the data that we have.

22 The second figure just shows the groundwater flow
23 direction a little bit more clearly without the perchlorate.
24 The third map, I want to make a point to notice
25 where north is. On these, north is this way on the first two,

00020

1 then north switches (indicating). It's important to get the
2 orientation correct.

3 This is the deep aquifer. This is the perchlorate
4 concentrations in the deep aquifer. You want to hold it
5 upright. You can see that actually monitoring well 2B is
6 still the highest concentration of perchlorate. It's
7 actually -- the deep well is actually a higher concentration
8 than the shallow well at 241 parts per billion.

9 You can see that based on the data that we have,
10 with a limited number of wells, groundwater flowing parallel
11 to Lacamas Creek, actually in a southerly direction in the
12 deep aquifer is what we're modeling here, concentrations are
13 also decreasing in a southerly direction.

14 The new well that we put in, which is pretty
15 important, about 300 feet south of the landfill, still is
16 detecting perchlorate, at lower concentrations, but it's still
17 there. That's important to note that actually perchlorate is
18 going off of -- beyond the point where we have any
19 information.

20 What we are in effect doing here is we're tracking
21 this plume from the landfill in a southerly direction to try
22 and get a better idea of where the plume is going, what the
23 flow velocities are and what the concentrations are.

24 Based on this map and the amount of data we have,
25 the limited amount of information that it's mapping, I would

00021

1 say we probably need to place some more wells in a southerly
2 direction, maybe even on both sides of Lacamas Creek and maybe
3 even farther south to try to get more data down here in the
4 direction that the perchlorate is going away from the
5 landfill.

6 What we're seeing here is that Nnamdi has calculated
7 the flow velocities in the deep aquifers at 33 feet per year.
8 It's not very fast in moving, but it has moved about 300 feet.
9 So maybe in 10 years it's gone 300 feet. If you could know
10 how long perchlorate has been there, you could probably figure
11 out how far it would have gone over 10, 20 years. Maybe 600
12 feet, rough. These calculations are all here if you want to
13 double-check them. I don't understand them, but they're all
14 here.

15 What it does start to give us is a beginning of an
16 understanding I think of what's going on with Landfill 4, Demo
17 Area 1, the groundwater and perchlorate. It is traveling in a
18 generally southerly direction at not a very fast rate. But we
19 have definitely confirmed that it's 300, 350 feet away from
20 the landfill, and probably farther, and we need to get more
21 information to determine what's going on there.

22 DON WASTLER: Is that forest right there?

23 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yeah, that's forest.

24 DON WASTLER: If they start doing any timber
25 harvesting there, like at that one meeting I mentioned to the

00022

1 gentleman, if they start doing some timber harvesting, it's
2 going to increase the velocity of that, won't it?

3 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It could, yeah, depending on what
4 the infiltration rate is of the groundwater. Depends whether
5 the water is overland flow and goes right into the creek, goes
6 out the creek, or whether it actually goes into the
7 groundwater into the water table. Probably a little bit of
8 both.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: As we've talked about before, the
10 current plan that we're still pursuing is we're hoping to be
11 able to do source control, meaning if we have something that's
12 in the landfill that's adding the stuff to the groundwater, we
13 want to control that. Best way to do it, or one way to do it,
14 is to dig it up all the way.
15 We're in the process of soliciting contractor bids,
16 proposals to do just that. That way you can be assured that
17 things won't get any worse, and hopefully start working to
18 make things better. In addition to that, as Barry mentioned,
19 we continue to do some work to bound the problem so we have a
20 surety that it's not getting away from us.

21 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Let me just point something out
22 here. This is very preliminary, I would say draft. If you
23 look at the regional map, based on where Landfill 4 is up
24 here, the information that the Department of Ecology is coming
25 up with is slightly different than the information the Army's

00023

1 consultant came up with. The Army's consultant thought
2 primarily groundwater was going towards the creek. Our
3 modeling is just modeling, don't take it for gospel.
4 We think groundwater might be going a little bit
5 more southerly, parallel to the creek. That would say it's
6 following topography down the creek system in a southerly
7 direction, maybe this way, south/southwest (indicating), down
8 here. We're actually interested a little bit more in some of
9 the wells down here (indicating). The wells we put in as our
10 sentry wells, maybe some wells to the south of the base also,
11 just as a precautionary thing. Given the distance and the
12 distance that we have contamination here, we only have
13 contamination, remember, 300 feet. 300 feet is a little bit.
14 ERIC WAEHLING: A dot covers 300 feet.
15 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yeah. You know, it's a little tiny
16 distance that we have known contamination. We're talking
17 thousands of feet to the nearest domestic well, so we know now
18 with the information we have, we have a pretty good buffer in
19 here. Of course, we haven't had any contamination detected
20 other than right up by the landfill. That's just what we know
21 right now.
22 KAREN KINGSTON: I definitely want to compliment
23 your team for putting all this together. This is so easy to
24 read. If anybody has further questions, it's easy to kind of
25 check yourself to see if we're all on the same page when we're

00024

1 looking at which way it looks like the groundwater's flowing.

2 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We would like to work towards

3 having a really big map like this with all the information

4 like this on a map like this (indicating). It's going to take

5 just a little more time, but maybe by the next meeting we'll

6 have something that will have more regionalized groundwater

7 flows and contamination.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Overview that way (indicating).

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yes.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: This is super, though.

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: If we can add in a few more wells,

12 if Eric would be generous --

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Just have to figure out where to put

14 them.

15 BARRY ROGOWSKI: -- we could have a much better

16 picture of what's going on.

17 KAREN KINGSTON: Great.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: Ian.

19 IAN RAY: At the last meeting, we were expecting

20 that we might at this meeting hear about the scope of work and

21 the bids for digging out Landfill 4. Is that going to be done

22 tonight?

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, I can tell you where we are in

24 the process. I was in Atlanta last week reviewing the

25 proposals that we received from the contractors. I can't tell

00025

1 you the details as far as dollars because we're still in
2 negotiation, but I can tell you we received two bids.
3 Unfortunately, neither one was satisfactory.
4 When we solicit a contract, we have a requirement to
5 come up with an internal government cost estimate. We use
6 that as the benchmark to determine whether a contractor's
7 proposal is at reasonable cost. We also review the proposal
8 for technical sufficiency to make sure the government's going
9 to get what we're paying for and that it's going to satisfy
10 our needs, why we're doing this.
11 I can tell you that one proposal was pretty close to
12 our internal government cost estimate, but it wasn't
13 technically what we were really looking for. Another proposal
14 we got was technically excellent, but it was significantly
15 higher than our internal government cost estimate.
16 So then the next step in the process is that we
17 provide critiques, if you will, we make comments on the
18 proposals and we provide that back to the contractors. They
19 have an opportunity to adjust their proposals. They're
20 working on that now. Hopefully we'll get back something
21 that's a little bit closer to what we need to be able to
22 satisfy this.

23 IAN RAY: One of the functions of this board,
24 according to the public participation guide, is to consider
25 the sequencing of response actions. I can't help but wonder

00026

1 if we would just dig out Landfill 4 and get rid of the source
2 of all the contamination, then the four years of the extended
3 site investigation would have been unnecessary, and maybe this
4 work would be unnecessary if you just took the stuff out of
5 the ground and got rid of it.

6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's an excellent idea.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: That's exactly what we're proposing.

8 We agree.

9 IAN RAY: We're four years behind and we've done all
10 this work that cost \$2, \$3 million to get to this point.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

12 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think one of the best things we
13 can do is probably dig out the source of the contamination,
14 the landfill, keep the monitoring well system in place and
15 look at the groundwater concentrations of contaminants to see
16 if there's a net effect, if there's a change. Hopefully they
17 would start going down, the concentrations would start going
18 down. Good comment, Ian.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: You don't have any disagreement from
20 either of us.

21 IAN RAY: What about the future for such things as
22 considering that the RAB will have some input in sequencing of
23 response actions? Is that going to happen?

24 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, you're actually touching on a
25 broader question as far as what is the future of the RAB.

00027

1 IAN RAY: Perhaps it should be done at another time.

2 I think you will notice that the public participation guide
3 that governs what we do here requires that the RAB participate
4 in proposals and sequencing of response actions.

5 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Ian, let me respond to that. I'll
6 go ahead and take a shot at it.

7 If you notice in our Enforcement Order that the
8 Department of Ecology issued to the Army, we had two actions
9 that we thought needed to be taken almost immediately. One
10 was digging out Landfill 4, which seemed to us to be almost an
11 obvious thing that needed to be done, like right now. Why
12 wait? Contamination is only spreading. Let's take care of it
13 and stop spread of the contamination now.

14 The other one was we have lead concentrations in
15 berms in the small arms ranges where you can go out and pick
16 up handfuls of lead. There's clearly a lot of lead out there.
17 Go out, remove those berms. Not only is there lead, but
18 there's live rounds sitting there. I've seen several of them.
19 What's a kid going to do? He finds a live round, if
20 I was a kid, I'd pick it up, put it on a rock, boom. I have a
21 hole in my leg from one of those, too. My brother did it. I
22 mean, that's what boys and girls do, kids, whatever. Get that
23 stuff out of there.

24 We said within six months of this order, let's get
25 rid of it. We put that right in our order. Army has agreed

00028

1 to try to accomplish those things. You have public comment on
2 the order. You like the sequence of those events, say,
3 "Yahoo, go guys, get it done." If you don't like it, say, "I
4 think that's a dumb idea." Let us know.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, this may seem trivial to
6 you all. It was the Army that proposed both of those actions.
7 We brought it to the table.

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Nevertheless, it needs to be done,
9 whoever brought it to the table.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

11 IAN RAY: It's a mystery to me. If these proposals
12 were made and we went ahead four years ago... Making this
13 extended site investigation, spending millions of dollars,
14 only now we are talking about, "We're going to dig out this
15 contaminant." This is all very mysterious to me.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: To tell the truth, Ian, not
17 everybody agreed with that proposal.

18 BUD VAN CLEVE: Was there an alternative?

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Not at the time. There was one
20 school of thought that wanted to continue to study and study
21 and study. There's another school of thought that said, "We
22 got to go do something. It's an interim action, not the last
23 thing we're going to do."

24 BUD VAN CLEVE: Broad difference between study and
25 doing.

00029

1 ERIC WAEHLING: The Army is the first to agree with
2 that. I mean, it's appropriate to do both, but they have to
3 be in appropriate proportions.

4 BUD VAN CLEVE: Within reason.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I concur. As Barry just said, this
6 makes a lot of sense. It's intuitively obvious what needs to
7 happen on these things as an interim action, not the last
8 thing that's going to happen. We still have some stuff in the
9 groundwater. We still need to get our arms around it, but
10 it's time to start doing stuff, time -- we got to get the
11 yellow equipment out there and start moving dirt.
12 That's all I have. We're right on schedule.

13 BUD VAN CLEVE: Something's wrong.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Don has requested that we make a
15 little time available on the agenda. We are happy to do that.
16 There's been some stuff that Don has been working on for a
17 while and wants to talk about.

18 Just as we made the time available for Don, I would
19 say that we would make it available to others if they feel
20 they want to have a few minutes in front of the RAB and have
21 space on the agenda. We'd be more than happy to accommodate
22 everybody. Don just happens to be the first one to ask for
23 it.

24 DON WASTLER: Actually, I didn't think I needed to
25 ask. It's all stuff that should have been taken care of with

00030

1 open discussion before, but we never got that far. It's
2 gotten to be old business now.
3 Back when we gave Clark County the questions in
4 February and they came with their answers in writing at the
5 March meeting, some of the members weren't very happy with the
6 answers that we got. There was a couple of questions on here
7 that I actually asked, and I wasn't very happy with the
8 answers. It left me to wonder. I question the credibility
9 and the judgment of the people that are running this whole
10 outfit here.
11 One of the questions on there was, "Will you test
12 the wildlife for contamination levels in their blood?"
13 Actually, I asked the question at the November meeting. I
14 asked if they were going to test the aquatic life in Lacamas
15 Creek. You said, "Well, it was going to be too expensive." I
16 had a specific reason for that. Before we got any more
17 information out of it, the subject got changed, we never got
18 any farther.
19 Clark County's answer was, "The County has no plan
20 to test wildlife. Our understanding is that the animal would
21 need to be destroyed."
22 Well, they take blood tests on animals in the wild
23 all the time without destroying them. My question was about
24 the aquatic life in Lacamas Creek. Catch a fish. It actually
25 says that in the notes. It's in the November notes when I

00031

1 asked the question. The creek's full of snails, there's all
2 kinds of life in there.

3 The reason I asked the question is the incident that
4 happened where I live on Shanghai Creek. The water tested
5 clean, but something came through there and killed 90% of the
6 aquatic life, and it has yet to recover.

7 I don't know if you're testing this water when we're
8 having heavy rains or not. That's another reason why I'm
9 concerned about the timber harvest. When we have heavy rains,
10 something washed through that creek and did some serious
11 damage that hasn't recovered yet. There may be something
12 there that's washing in that we don't know about, and the
13 aquatic life in the stream is the first link in the chain.
14 The wildlife is drinking the water out of the stream, the
15 plants are absorbing the water out of the stream. I mean, the
16 plants aren't going to absorb that much in what short of time
17 a heavy rain is going to wash --

18 ERIC WAEHLING: You're talking about
19 bioaccumulation?

20 DON WASTLER: Right. That was my question.
21 Clark County came back with their answer about
22 they're going to have to destroy wildlife. Actually what I
23 wanted to say was I wanted to ask Jeroen, because actually
24 I've been coming to these meetings since November 2000, Jeroen
25 has been at every single one of them, he's probably been at

00032

1 all of them before, and I think Clark County is actually
2 getting their money's worth with his employ. I think if
3 anybody is representing Clark County, he would be
4 knowledgeable about what's going on, and so questions to him
5 would be: Did Commissioner Stanton and Pete Capell, Bronson
6 Potter and Brian Vincent, did they consult with Jeroen before
7 they answered any of these questions? He could have probably
8 straightened a lot of that out.

9 JEROEN KOK: I did have an opportunity to comment.

10 Not all of my comments were incorporated in the published
11 responses that you saw. I don't recall specifically if I
12 commented on this particular one. I did note, as you did,
13 Don, fish and wildlife can be tested for certain things
14 without having to terminate them. I agree with your
15 observation on that comment.

16 DON WASTLER: Plus they said destroy animals. When
17 they start dropping trees in there, thousands of animals are
18 going to die. It's more than just squirrels. There's habitat
19 there for animals that can't have human interaction.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Don, I can't speak for the County on
21 this. Barry can chime in. There is a time and place where
22 it's appropriate to test the receptors, in this case wildlife
23 or aquatic species such as fish, to see if there is a
24 bioaccumulation of a pollutant. Not all pollutants
25 bioaccumulate.

00033

1 It's not something that you do immediately. It's
2 not the first step. There are times when it's appropriate.
3 I'm sure, as Ecology continues in its oversight role, whether
4 it be the Army or the County or whomever, if their experts
5 feel it's an appropriate step to take, then it would happen.

6 DON WASTLER: The question was one issue. I
7 remember at the November meeting, Jeroen and I were looking
8 right at each other when I asked the question. When I saw
9 their answer, you know, right away I'm thinking, these are the
10 people that are making the decisions on this.

11 Besides the question that was asked, I'm thinking
12 about their judgment, their character. Here is the person
13 that's here representing Clark County, and he would have the
14 answers about what's going on here, and I don't think they
15 consulted with him as well as they should have before they
16 answered all these questions. I know some of the other
17 members of the board aren't happy with the answers that they
18 got.

19 While I still have some time here, I'm going to go
20 on to this other question I actually asked. It was actually
21 between myself and another member that's pending. "Would you
22 consider a veterans war memorial or cemetery in the reuse?"
23 I read Commissioner Stanton's answer to that, and I
24 need to correct that statement. It's not just a veterans
25 regional cemetery. Actually Commissioner Stanton left out the

00034

1 veterans and said regional cemetery in one part. It would
2 have been or it would be, probably would have been, a national
3 cemetery, the same as Arlington.

4 Frank, this is my time. You can challenge me on
5 this later.

6 FRANK FUNK: I just want to ask a question.

7 DON WASTLER: Right now I have something to say and
8 I'm going to finish saying it.

9 FRANK FUNK: Go ahead.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Stop it.

11 FRANK FUNK: I didn't hear you.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: I said stop it.

13 FRANK FUNK: Knock it off yourself. I have a right
14 to ask a question. That's not germane. The cemetery is not
15 germane to the cleanup.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: Let's maintain a level here.

17 DON WASTLER: It does, Frank. It does. It has to
18 do with the character and judgment of the people who are
19 making these decisions.

20 FRANK FUNK: It's not germane to the cleanup of Camp
21 Bonneville.

22 DON WASTLER: It has to do with the character and
23 judgment of the people that are making the decisions on this.
24 As I was saying, it would have been a national
25 cemetery, and they would not even consider it. I have a

00035

1 document here that I'm going to read. It has to do with all
2 of us. It has to do with the cemetery.
3 This is a citation of honor that was issued to a
4 family of a man that was missing in action. It says, "He
5 lived to bear his country's arms; he died to save its honor.
6 He was a soldier; he knew a soldier's duty. His sacrifice
7 will help to keep aglow the flaming torch that lights our
8 lives, that millions yet unborn may know the priceless joy of
9 liberty. And we who pay him homage and revere his memory
10 rededicate ourselves to a complete fulfillment of the task for
11 which he so gallantly has placed his life upon the altar of
12 man's freedom." I'm going to repeat that one part: "millions
13 yet unborn."
14 This was issued March 17th, 1946. That's all of us
15 and your families and everyone. This could be issued to your
16 grandson. That national cemetery, you can't buy a spot in a
17 national cemetery. You have to earn it. There's been people
18 exhumed from Arlington because they weren't supposed to be
19 there. The price is not easy.
20 The cemetery itself is not the issue. The simple
21 fact that the people here that are making these decisions
22 would not even consider it is an insult and actually a
23 disgrace. They could have at least considered it and said,
24 "Sure, but here are the obstacles. We'll see what we can do."
25 Instead, they didn't even consider it.

00036

1 Thanks, that's all I had to say. Some of the other
2 things I had to say, we managed to get them straightened out
3 ahead of time.

4 JEROEN KOK: I wasn't around when the Reuse Plan
5 was -- actually went through the public process. It was my
6 understanding that a military cemetery was considered in the
7 process of determining the mix of reuses that Camp Bonneville
8 would become when the County took ownership. I guess I would
9 defer to some of the diehard RAB members for their
10 recollection on that.

11 DON WASTLER: The only thing I know is Chuck Mason
12 here is a good friend of my father's. Actually, I didn't see
13 much of him until my father's funeral at Willamette. Just by
14 coincidence he mentioned that they were trying to get 300
15 acres at Camp Bonneville for a national cemetery. That's less
16 than 10% of the property. That's less than 10% of the
17 property.

18 I gave him Colonel Baker's address at the Pentagon,
19 and he wrote Colonel Baker. Colonel Baker referred it to
20 Robert Daskey (phonetic), who referred it to Commissioner
21 Stanton. I have her letter here. She has a list of reasons
22 why.

23 Still, so what about the obstacles? I live by
24 there. I'm a neighbor. I'm not happy about the traffic.
25 That's a sacrifice I'd be honored to make. Less than 300

00037

1 acres for the people that gave us the freedom to even have a
2 park.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Don, I'm by no stretch an expert on
4 these things, particularly when it comes to locating
5 cemeteries. I do know that we haven't been approached by any
6 of the Federal agencies that locate these national cemeteries.
7 I know there's been a number of new ones constructed in the
8 area. The one that comes to mind is up in the Kent, Enumclaw
9 area. We've not been approached by anybody to locate. I'm
10 saying I haven't been approached.

11 DON WASTLER: It was sent to Colonel Baker. That's
12 as high as you go for BRAC.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: For BRAC. But a cemetery isn't
14 something that BRAC does. We're in the business of closing
15 and cleaning up and transferring the installation. I'm just
16 saying within the government, I've not been approached by
17 anybody.

18 DON WASTLER: I'm saying, why didn't Colonel Baker
19 refer it up to somebody else?

20 ERIC WAEHLING: What I want to say is I very much
21 hear the sentiment and applaud and agree with the debt to the
22 honor of these people, to the fallen soldiers that you're
23 talking about. We need to make sure we continue to honor
24 them. I'm not sure if this is the most efficient venue to
25 make sure that that continues and that we do a better job of

00038

1 that.

2 DON WASTLER: I was just disappointed. You know,
3 these are the people that are making the decisions. These are
4 the people that we're going to be counting on to hold -- like
5 I said, these are the people, after the property's been
6 transferred, that we're supposed to trust. They're going to
7 be making the decisions. I think they could have done a
8 better job with consulting with Jeroen on these answers.
9 That's one thing. Then this here, it leaves me in question as
10 to the credibility and the judgment of the people who are in
11 charge of this whole thing.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Ian.

13 IAN RAY: You might have to lobby the County
14 Commissioners or the LRA, perhaps the Veterans of Foreign Wars
15 or the American Legion would be interested in joining your
16 lobby.

17 DON WASTLER: He's sitting right here.

18 IAN RAY: Another thing in that regard. At the
19 Department of Ecology presentation at the waterworks, I think
20 it was on April 29, another picture of the Reuse Plan
21 appeared. There's an interesting dotted line that shows where
22 the regional park is and where the regional park is not. I
23 had not seen that before. I think Jeroen is probably going to
24 show you this later.
25 But the regional park is essentially in the

00039

1 floodplain of Lacamas Creek, all the flat places. The rest of
2 it is not in the regional park. That's going to take some
3 explanation. I'm sure it will be satisfactory. But there's a
4 lot of land that's not going to be regional park apparently.

5 DON WASTLER: Thank you, Ian. That's all I have to
6 say.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you, Don. We're still on
8 schedule.

9 BUD VAN CLEVE: Scary.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: We have a 10-minute break on the
11 agenda, after which we have community updates. Frank, I'd
12 appreciate it if you -- if we could talk about what you had to
13 say.

14 FRANK FUNK: Be glad to.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Let's take a 10-minute break.

16 (Pause in proceedings.)

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Let's try to maintain the positive
18 trend and stay on schedule.

19 I know this isn't a necessary thing, but one of the
20 things I think we all need to keep in mind, appreciate amongst
21 ourselves, is to treat each other with civility and respect as
22 we go through this process. There will be differing points of
23 views, no doubt. We all need to continue or we need to make
24 sure we keep in mind that we treat each other with respect and
25 hear each other's opinions, hear them with respect, even

00040

1 though we don't agree with them. I'd like to remind the RAB
2 to try to keep that in mind as we treat one another in this
3 process.

4 Frank, thank you for being patient.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: First we have to clear the updates,
6 then I'm happy -- I don't have too much to say in there, then
7 I'm happy to give him the rest of the time.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: First of all, Coleen Broad is the
10 chairperson of the membership committee. She's not here. I
11 don't know, anybody else that's on that, do you have anything
12 that you want to say? Okay.

13 Then the other is the BCT. Ian, did you want to
14 talk a little bit, bring us up to speed?

15 IAN RAY: I don't have much to say.
16 We've done our work, submitted our questions and
17 suggestions, comments to the Army. We've asked the Army to
18 comment on what we say. We're waiting for a response from the
19 Army.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Did you send me a letter?

21 IAN RAY: I have it with me. Would you like to see
22 it?

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Is it a letter or e-mail?

24 IAN RAY: E-mails.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm afraid I don't have an answer

00041

1 for you just yet. I haven't gotten to them, Ian. I
2 apologize. I didn't realize I had them.

3 IAN RAY: What's Jennifer's role in this? Jennifer
4 gets copies?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

6 IAN RAY: Does she give them to you?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah, she helps track them and bring
8 things to my attention.

9 JENNIFER WALTERS: Eric was out of the office most
10 all of last week, too, in Atlanta.

11 IAN RAY: The questions go back to February. We're
12 going on four months now. Maybe we could have some attention
13 to the questions.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: These are questions you've sent me
15 this month that were from February?

16 IAN RAY: If you just want to deal with questions in
17 April.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: I apologize, Ian, I'm caught
19 flat-footed.

20 IAN RAY: We do have an obligation. The BCT
21 committee wants to -- the ball is in your court.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you. Noted.

23 IAN RAY: Could we have a commitment as to when
24 you'll come around with the answers?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Is there a chance I could answer

00042

1 them now?

2 IAN RAY: No. I think by the next meeting, though,
3 we should be able to get this thing rolling.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay. That's my commitment.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: You'll be in touch by e-mail?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. I can only extend my apologies
7 for not catching it sooner.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Anything else, Ian?

9 IAN RAY: That's it.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Frank, do you want to go ahead and
11 give your presentation.

12 FRANK FUNK: My comments are basically directed to
13 Eric, the installation co-chair. The membership committee met
14 in March, and it reported in April, the minutes of the
15 meeting. At this meeting, a serious concern arose.
16 Sue Swenson had made an application for membership
17 on the RAB. It became -- Christine objected to her because
18 she was a horse person. Out of the six RAB people sitting
19 there, five of them were neighbors. I was the only one that
20 was not a neighbor. The RAB tonight, people sitting here, out
21 of the seven members, five of them are neighbors.
22 Also developed at this meeting, when we came in, we
23 didn't come together, Sue arrived, I told her to sit at the
24 table. She sat down and Karen told her to leave the table,
25 sit out in the audience. That's what she done. Because we

00043

1 don't have seat assignments here, we set wherever we want. We
2 have never had a seat assignment.

3 I urge the installation co-chair, under the laws, to
4 adjourn this RAB because it's out of balance, overloaded with
5 neighbors, does not conform with the Bylaw D of the original
6 bylaws, or the 1998 guidance.

7 It says it's to be a diverse committee, and it's not
8 a diverse committee. It's out of balance. It's supposed to
9 reflect a wide variety of concerns and interests in the
10 community. If I was a neighbor, I'd be interested in being on
11 this committee, too. I can understand that. But by the same
12 token, the committee's out of balance, just totally out of
13 balance.

14 From all the indications, the property will be
15 transferred to Clark County in the fall anyway. Maybe it's a
16 moot question. But the committee needs to be properly diverse
17 and balanced or eliminated.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: Don, then I'd like to address
19 Frank's question.

20 DON WASTLER: Actually, Frank, when I first started
21 attending these meetings, I wasn't even aware that you or
22 Valerie were members of the Clark County Saddle Club.

23 VALERIE LANE: There's more than two horse people
24 here.

25 DON WASTLER: I kind of grew up with horses. My dad

00044

1 sold them all when I was 12, but he was a member of the Clark
2 County Saddle Club. I remember specifically in this room, I
3 believe it was last year, might have been 2001, I'll find the
4 minutes, in fact, I have a note of it, where it was suggested
5 against the County having an open park, open to the public,
6 but I suggested having it open to non-profit organizations,
7 youth organizations. I specifically used the Clark County
8 Saddle Club as an example to get it for the weekends or
9 something like that. I remember everybody laughed at me.

10 FRANK FUNK: I didn't.

11 DON WASTLER: I didn't even know there were horse
12 people on here. My parents were members when I was a kid.
13 I'm still thinking about that, and I know it would be a great
14 place to go trail riding. I didn't know there was any horse
15 people here.

16 I remember I did say that, I'm sure it's in the
17 minutes someplace, where I suggested non-profit organizations,
18 Boy Scouts, Clark County Saddle Club, reserve it for weekends
19 under supervision. I remember everybody laughed at me. It
20 was like you wanted to open the doors to the public and let
21 everybody go in and trample the place.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: I think, Don, equestrian is one of
23 the reuses that has been considered. I think it still may be
24 accommodated in some of the areas of the park.

25 FRANK FUNK: So far it's still there.

00045

1 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to talk to Frank's point
2 that he brought up directly.

3 No, I will not recommend the adjournment of this
4 RAB.

5 FRANK FUNK: I didn't expect you to.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't have the authority to do so,
7 nor would I if I did.

8 But you bring up an excellent point: What is the
9 future of this body? What is the intent of the body, within
10 the context of trying to transfer the property to Clark County
11 in an early transfer scenario? I've had some questions about
12 whether the RAB would continue or not.

13 I can't answer directly. I don't know the answer to
14 that, whether the Army would be required to continue with the
15 RAB. But I do know Clark County has committed, Judie Stanton
16 has committed with continuing with a public process. Whether
17 it's this form or not remains to be seen.

18 Many of you have been part of this process for a
19 long time. We could probably all go on for a long time of
20 where the process falls short, possible ways things could be
21 done better. Perhaps it would be useful for all of us over
22 the next few months to consider better ways to do this, and to
23 make recommendations as a body to Clark County as to ways they
24 might do a better job at conducting the public process
25 associated with this, to do a better job at representing the

00046

1 County as a whole, the community as a whole.

2 FRANK FUNK: Sue Swenson isn't here tonight. She
3 has been successfully run off is about what it amounts to.
4 She said she don't want to be a part of this. The way she was
5 treated, she don't want to be a part of it.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm sorry to hear that.

7 DON WASTLER: So am I.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Even more reason why I think it
9 would be beneficial for the community as a whole, for the
10 County, if we all were to give thought to what works and what
11 hasn't worked very well with this group, so that as the public
12 process is developed and established with the County, they can
13 do a better job.

14 What do you think, Jeroen?

15 JEROEN KOK: I agree totally, Eric. I appreciate
16 the fact that you've suggested that. I would urge the RAB
17 members and any of the general public here to think about
18 that, put your thoughts in writing. I'd be happy to receive
19 them and convey those on to the County, or feel free to convey
20 them directly to the County as well, Commissioner Stanton or
21 Public Works director Pete Capell.

22 But, yes, I think as you think about how the County
23 could better involve the citizens of Clark County, it's
24 something that we need to do, as well, so as the early
25 transfer hopefully happens, we are then prepared to do a

00047

1 better job of involving the public during the remainder of the
2 cleanup process and following on with implementation of the
3 Reuse Plan.

4 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I'd like to second that. From our
5 public meeting, we sent out 1400 personal mailers to people
6 and put advertisements in several of the local newspapers.
7 Many of you were at our public meeting, saw the turnout that
8 we had. You're aware of the amount of public involvement that
9 was in that effort.

10 DON WASTLER: The one thing I have to compliment you
11 for, I was speaking to Eric about this before the meeting, was
12 you did send the fliers out and you did have a public meeting.
13 It was available. That's more than I can say for what the
14 Army did with the Environmental Assessment. Even though the
15 people didn't turn out, they still had the opportunity and the
16 meeting was there.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I don't know what was
18 conveyed, and I don't want to debate with you, but I was at
19 that meeting, I was standing right there.

20 FRANK FUNK: I can't hear you.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I was at the meeting, at the
22 PUD, I was standing right at the area that - what was her name
23 again, Carol?

24 FRANK FUNK: You mean Sue Swenson?

25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: It didn't happen the way you

00048

1 just conveyed it. I just want to put that on the record, that

2 I was standing there.

3 FRANK FUNK: Didn't happen at the meeting?

4 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: It didn't happen the way you

5 described it.

6 FRANK FUNK: From the table?

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Yes.

8 DON WASTLER: She seemed nice. I was kind of

9 wondering where she's been.

10 FRANK FUNK: She is involved with youth, happens to

11 be 4-H youth, that's her interest. She does other work.

12 DON WASTLER: That's the only meeting she attended.

13 I'm sorry, I spoke out of turn.

14 FRANK FUNK: I don't have a problem with that

15 because you're a fellow that is ignored sometimes in these

16 meetings. When you got your hand up, they won't call on you.

17 I object to that, too. I don't always agree with you, which

18 you know.

19 DON WASTLER: She seemed nice. When these people

20 come, I look to see if they come back. When I don't see them

21 come back, I'm wondering why.

22 FRANK FUNK: That's the reason.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: No, it was not the reason at the

24 table.

25 BUD VAN CLEVE: Frank, I have made announcements at

00049

1 our NAC meeting, which is the Neighborhood Association Council
2 for Clark County, representing all 35 unincorporated areas,
3 for anybody interested in getting active or involved in the
4 board out here. I've not gotten any response at all. I made
5 this announcement on three or four occasions.

6 Getting people to come out to a meeting in Clark
7 County is one of the toughest things you can do. First thing
8 they say when you say Bonneville, they think it's up the river
9 or you got a Pontiac. There's not a whole lot of knowledge of
10 just what Camp Bonneville is. I don't know what percentage of
11 our population right now in Clark County is less than 10-year
12 residents, but I would say well over half.

13 I don't know what the answers are. We need a public
14 education arm to reach the people. I would love to see a
15 varied group here with representation from all parts of the
16 County. That's the very reason I'm here. I live on 68th
17 Street, and so does Ian. He lives outside the gate, and I
18 live over by Highway 99.

19 I started coming to the meetings because Ian asked
20 me to, to come out. I'm interested in what happens with that
21 property on behalf of Clark County and the citizens.

22 FRANK FUNK: While I do represent the horse people,
23 I represent -- I've talked as you have talked at the meetings,
24 horse council, the saddle club. I convinced the people at the
25 horse council, Sue was one of them, "Maybe I can be of help

00050

1 there." They're interested. My interest is not just with
2 horses. My interest is for the whole park. I'm interesting
3 in riding trails, sure, but I'm interested in the development
4 of this park for Clark County.

5 You're right, it's hard to get people. You get
6 somebody, she feels she was run off.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Do you also think that maybe
8 when she came, she got documents about this thick to look
9 through, do you think that potentially did it?

10 FRANK FUNK: That didn't bother her.

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How many people have come to
12 a meeting, get documents, I have seen Ian's files and my own
13 files, and that's pretty darn intimidating.

14 FRANK FUNK: Like this (indicating).

15 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I just want to make that
16 point, the BRAC process is pretty big and in-depth.

17 DON WASTLER: One thing I know I think I've
18 mentioned before, for me, Don Wastler, I probably wouldn't
19 even be here, but like I say, the animals living up there
20 can't come to these meetings and say, "Please don't destroy
21 our home." That's probably the main thing that keeps
22 motivating me to come here, because I'm already seeing what's
23 happened. I want to just try and prevent it from happening in
24 the future. I saw what happened to the watershed where I
25 live. I just see a rerun coming from Camp Bonneville. That's

00051

1 why I'm here. I know a lot of people probably don't have that
2 much interest.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm hearing some excellent thoughts
4 and ideas. I think it would be very useful for Clark County
5 to continue thinking along these lines and gel some of these
6 ideas, jot them down for the benefit of Clark County.
7 Actually, I should say for the benefit of you all, the rest of
8 the citizens, recommendations as to how to better involve the
9 public in this process for the very reasons you've all brought
10 up.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: I think it's important also to say
12 that public involvement, you don't have to have a sticker that
13 says you're a member of the RAB. You can still come and be
14 involved and receive information, I don't know, maybe even
15 work on a committee of some sort. I encourage everybody. I
16 sometimes get 30 calls a month. I was amazed that not more
17 people came to the Ecology meeting, in fact, when I walked in,
18 with all the phone calls I get, the neighbors that drove up my
19 driveway to tell me, boy, they're coming, got these questions.
20 When I walked in, I didn't see one of their faces.
21 I think you and I both encourage everybody to come
22 and be a part of it. They don't have to.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: They're open meetings.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: They don't have to sign up.

25 IAN RAY: What part of the meeting -- where are we

00052

1 on the agenda?

2 KAREN KINGSTON: Now questions and answers, I think.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Wrapping up community updates.

4 IAN RAY: Could I ask one question in community
5 updates?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Sure.

7 IAN RAY: There's been some buzzing around the RAB
8 and the community this month about the difference between time
9 critical removal actions and remedial investigation and
10 feasibility study actions. I'm wondering, is the Landfill 4
11 extended site investigation considered a time critical removal
12 action or is it considered a remedial investigation and
13 feasibility study action?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: It is neither. It's an
15 investigation. The contract that we're pursuing to remove the
16 source control, the removal, that will be conducted as an
17 interim removal action under MOTCA. There will be a public
18 comment component associated with the work plan as required by
19 MOTCA, 30-day public comment.

20 IAN RAY: Let's see if I have that right. Digging
21 out the Landfill 4 is going to be an interim?

22 ERIC WAEHLING: The time critical removal versus
23 remedial investigation and feasibility study action, Barry
24 help me out here, but they are terms used within the Federal
25 process of cleaning up a site. Washington State has their own

00053

1 process - very, very similar but different words - that is
2 identified in their MOTCA, the Model Toxic Control Act, the
3 order that gives Ecology the authority. Within MOTCA this is
4 conducted as an interim removal action.

5 The bottom line, though, what's really important,
6 it's not what you call it, the bottom line is that we're going
7 to control the source, we're going to be working to clean up
8 the environment and making things safer. Whether it's time
9 critical or remedial investigation and feasibility study
10 action, interim action, the bottom line is we're going to be
11 doing it.

12 IAN RAY: Part of the buzz in the last month
13 regarding those two response actions was whether the community
14 has a role, a participating role, in the decision-making
15 process as to what is done. The definitions of those two
16 response actions has something to do with whether or not the
17 RAB is going to be involved in the decision.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, the community as a whole will
19 be involved in the public comment opportunity that's required
20 under MOTCA. The work plan is developed, we'll talk about the
21 work plan and everything like we have. The community as a
22 whole will have an opportunity to review and comment on that
23 work plan for 30 days when it's ready.

24 IAN RAY: Does this board get to look at this work
25 plan?

00054

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Both as RAB members and public.

2 IAN RAY: We have never seen a work plan. This will
3 be our first.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, no, it's not. You've seen
5 many work plans.

6 IAN RAY: Name one.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: The expanded site investigation work
8 plan. Every investigation we've done has a work plan
9 associated with it.

10 IAN RAY: Are you saying you've actually brought
11 down a document for us to look at called a work plan?

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah. And the discs that we've
13 provided, digital copies of various documents, there's work
14 plans associated with those.

15 IAN RAY: I can't speak for discs.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

17 IAN RAY: Okay. That's good.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: And there will be a work plan for
19 the interim removal action. It will go out to the public.

20 Are we required to have a public meeting for that
21 response?

22 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Only if 10 or more people request
23 it.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: We'll certainly talk about it here.

25 BARRY ROGOWSKI: The important difference is time

00055

1 critical removal actions, emergency removal actions, don't
2 require public comment period because they're supposed to be
3 time critical or they need to happen right now, whereas
4 non-time critical or interim actions aren't quite as hastily
5 done so there's no planning that goes into it and there's a
6 public participation and comment period, which is what the
7 landfill removal will have, along with lead removal.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Why is Washington State not
9 requiring the Army to perform under CERCLA and they're
10 allowing MOTCA?

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Because I'm not the Federal
12 Government. I can't enforce Federal law. I'm Washington
13 State, state government, I can enforce only state law.
14 But having said that, the Army is required under
15 Federal law to abide by CERCLA, so actually the Army has to
16 not only abide by State law, which I can enforce, State of
17 Washington Department of Ecology can enforce, but they also
18 have to abide by CERCLA under their own executive mandate.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. But Washington State's
20 program is EPA, what's the term?

21 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It's not Federally delegated. It's
22 not a Federally delegated program. It's an independent
23 program. It's a state law passed by citizen initiative. It's
24 not delegated, although it's very similar to cleanup process
25 in most other states and very similar to the Federal cleanup

00056

1 process.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: Some people think it satisfies both,
3 that MOTCA will satisfy CERCLA, as well.

4 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It's pretty darn close.

5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: What is EPA and CERCLA? Do
6 they have anything in common? Does EPA enforce the CERCLA on
7 the Army, on you?

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Who wants to answer that? I'll
9 answer it, I'll give it a shot.

10 Yeah, EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency,
11 enforces CERCLA. They are an enforcing arm of Comprehensive
12 Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act,
13 CERCLA. Under CERCLA, EPA can write enforcement or consent
14 decrees, administrative orders that enforce CERCLA at specific
15 sites.

16 So, yes, EPA enforces CERCLA and makes sure the
17 CERCLA process is followed. However, all Federal agencies are
18 required to abide by CERCLA through executive mandate,
19 presidential mandate.

20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Since the State is defined as
21 the lead agency, the EPA doesn't have jurisdiction that much
22 because they're following you? I don't understand the
23 relation, why EPA doesn't have --

24 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You've heard of Superfund? You've
25 heard of National Priorities List maybe under Superfund? EPA

00057

1 sets priorities. The way EPA sets priorities is through the
2 National Priority List or NPL, i.e., Superfund sites. EPA
3 works on sites when they're listed on the NPL. EPA has clear
4 jurisdiction. If a site is not being worked on by EPA, it is
5 the -- the jurisdiction turns over to the State. There are
6 State sites.

7 Out of the 10,000 sites that are contaminated in
8 Washington State, 500 of them might be National Priority List
9 sites where EPA is involved. The other 9,500 are not a
10 priority for EPA, so therefore the State takes over
11 jurisdiction or maybe even the State hands it off to the local
12 County jurisdictions, fire departments, in the case of leaking
13 underground storage tank sites, that type of situation.
14 There's kind of a pecking order I guess is the best way to
15 summarize it.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Thank you.

17 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Since Camp Bonneville is not on the
18 NPL, the State is exercising its State authority.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: Ready to move on to the question
20 and answer period. A quick question about the water testing.
21 Lacamas Creek was only tested past the input of the -- where
22 Matney Creek intersects.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Which time?

24 KAREN KINGSTON: Where is the picture that describes
25 Lacamas Creek, the tests?

00058

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Isn't that it to your right?

2 The blue dots, is that what you're talking about?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Are you talking about the two

4 off-post stream sample locations?

5 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes. Was Lacamas also tested on

6 base as well?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: That was my question.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: It was tested immediately adjacent

10 to Landfill 4. It's been tested where the creek flows onto

11 the installation. It's also been tested at the installation

12 boundary where it flows off in the past. Those two, when we

13 were conducting the community sampling, somebody asked that we

14 take a sample of Lacamas Creek, and we obliged by doing so.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: I was just checking to make sure we

16 did it on base than just after where Matney joins.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Nice segway to the first question.

18 One of the questions was, refreshing everybody's

19 memory, the hydrogeologists and various people walked up

20 Lacamas Creek because we were trying to learn more about the

21 geology in the area, looking to see if bedrock emerged in the

22 bottom of Lacamas. One of the things we talked about trying

23 to do was to see if there was a way we could try to figure out

24 how to sample the seeps. One question that we had received

25 was: Was that ever done? The answer is: No, not yet. We're

00059

1 still trying to figure out how to do it.

2 They went out to try to do it one time. What became

3 difficult about it was the seeps flow when it rains. When

4 it's raining, you're also getting a lot of surface runoff as

5 well as water coming from the seeps. It was impossible to

6 tell what was seep water and what is water running off the

7 surface of the land as it drains into Lacamas. The sampling

8 crews at the time weren't prepared to install any sort of a

9 well or anything like that. So it's still a possibility.

10 It's probably likely we'll do so. We're still

11 trying to figure out how we're going to actually sample the

12 seep. That's where that stands right now.

13 Ian.

14 IAN RAY: Somehow I don't see that that's a very

15 difficult thing to do. You take a sponge or a piece of paper

16 towel and sop up some of the water seeping out of the creek

17 bank.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: How do you know that that's not

19 water that's running over the surface?

20 IAN RAY: You can see it.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: You really can't. That's what we

22 thought. When the crews went out to try to do it, they

23 realized you really can't. What good is a sample if you can't

24 say it's seep or surface water runoff?

25 Surface runoff would most likely be great news for

00060

1 me because it would be non-detects, but I can't say for
2 assurity that it's actually a seep that's reflective of
3 groundwater or surface water flow.
4 We're still working on it. We're still trying to
5 figure out how we can do it. The answer is we haven't done it
6 yet, but we're still working it.

7 IAN RAY: I'm from Missouri. I'll have to be shown.
8 I'd like to go out with a crew and see if we can't get some
9 seeps. I live right across the street from Lacamas Creek.
10 There's lots of times when it's running low, nothing running
11 over the surface, you can see that the creek banks are sopping
12 wet. Doesn't seem to be such a big problem.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Ian, I can only tell you what I've
14 been told by the field crews.

15 IAN RAY: Maybe they need some help.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Perhaps. I'm not saying we're not
17 going to do it. We're still trying to figure out the best way
18 to do it.

19 IAN RAY: I just told you.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: I'll certainly make that
21 recommendation.

22 IAN RAY: That's one of the functions of this board,
23 to make recommendations like that, isn't it?

24 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes, absolutely.

25 A request we had is a comment from EPA, DoD about

00061

1 draft final, Landfill 4, expanded site investigation. As I
2 mentioned earlier, those are available at the table. I should
3 say that -- even those these comments say draft from the EPA,
4 we actually have received final copies in the mail. These
5 were a digital print of the comments that Ecology sent to me.
6 They are finalized. I ran off the electronic copy because it
7 was handy.

8 BUD VAN CLEVE: This is not a draft then?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Right, no. These are comments.
10 They've been received. The maps that Barry provided, you'll
11 notice in the Ecology comments, one of the things that -- it
12 makes more sense if you have the maps. That's part of the
13 reason why Barry brought these maps.

14 At the last meeting Gaynor -- what did you all think
15 of Gaynor? Was he useful?

16 BUD VAN CLEVE: Yes.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: I thought he did a great job. If
18 people would like, and at the appropriate time, I'd be happy
19 to ask him to come back. The outside-in approach, I wish we
20 didn't use that term from the beginning because really what
21 we're talking about is the wells on the installation boundary
22 are sentry wells.

23 The thinking was that we wanted to make sure we
24 didn't have anything leaving -- we wanted to locate those
25 wells in the most probable location so we can see if there's

00062

1 anything leaving the installation, and at the same time
2 conduct groundwater investigation around potential sources.
3 The concept was originally thought up by the Army
4 with Gaynor helping us, brainstorming developing a strategy
5 about a year ago. At various points the concept and the work
6 plans were developed over time. There wasn't a specific
7 moment in time that the decision was made. It evolved over a
8 period of time. Gaynor explained the logic about how we --
9 about why we did that.

10 I don't know if that answers the question. The
11 person that asked the question, are they here or not? That
12 was the thinking in the timing of that.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: You're looking -- did he answer
14 that to where you feel satisfied?

15 IAN RAY: Yes. In fact, I think the following four
16 questions were mine. They are directed at trying to figure
17 out why we're concentrating so much on way downstream where we
18 have the source of contamination in Landfill 4. We covered
19 this earlier in this meeting, that we've spent millions of
20 dollars on this project and we still have the source of
21 contaminants sitting in the ground.

22 I'm just interested to know: How does this process
23 work? How do we get ourselves into this kind of a pickle?
24 That's the way it looks to me.

25 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Ian, I think I addressed part of

00063

1 that earlier in the meeting when I talked about these maps and
2 the fact that I actually wish whoever brought up this thing
3 about outside-in approach had never mentioned it that way
4 because that's not at all what was done, as a matter of fact.

5 The landfill and the monitoring well network around
6 the landfill was installed at the source area and is working
7 from the source area down-gradient to determine the extent of
8 the plume. The extent of contamination is shown with the deep
9 aquifer map here.

10 The traditional approach is always to start at the
11 source of contamination, find the highest concentrations of
12 contamination, map out the plume. That's what's being done in
13 this case.

14 These regional wells that were installed were put in
15 for an entirely different reason. These are sentry wells.
16 They're regional wells that were installed. In part, I was
17 behind that because we never had at Camp Bonneville anything
18 but a very localized distribution of wells at localized source
19 areas. Because of that, we could never get a comprehensive
20 understanding of regional groundwater flow velocities,
21 regional contaminant characteristics, if there were any, and
22 any off-base transportation of contaminants to domestic
23 drinking water wells.

24 These wells installed along the boundaries were set
25 up to coincide with the wells inside the base and the other

00064

1 wells that were being installed. We installed 15 or 16 or 17
2 of them at the same time so that we could get some
3 triangulation and have both shallow and deep wells installed
4 in various locations. We could sample those wells all at the
5 same time so we could start to build a comprehensive picture
6 of what's going on, not just at Landfill 4, a little 300-foot
7 area, but on a much wider scale.

8 What are these sources up here doing compared to
9 what's going on way down here (indicating)? Can we start to
10 put this all together in a bigger picture and get a better
11 understanding of it so that we're just not, you know, taking
12 snapshots, but now we've got a panoramic view of what's
13 happening?

14 BUD VAN CLEVE: Define "sentry" as you're using it.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Like a guard.

16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's kind of a general term. But
17 contamination is coming from here and going towards this
18 drinking water well over here (indicating). We put one in
19 between so that you get it here before someone's drinking it
20 (indicating). You know a year in advance, you get
21 contamination here, you say, "You know, something is coming
22 near your well. We need to get you on City water or bottled
23 water in your house and keep sampling your well so if it comes
24 up contaminated, we have an early warning system, sentry
25 well." It's an early warning system. It's just the smart

00065

1 thing to do in this case. That's why the wells were tried to
2 be placed around the base like that.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: Before Clark County takes this, is
4 there going to be any study done of whether or not the impact
5 area has contamination coming out of it?

6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think there needs to be a study
7 done of whether the impact area has contamination coming out
8 of it. I don't know if it's going to happen before or after
9 Clark County takes it.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Ecology, you'd be pressing that
11 issue, wouldn't you?

12 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think the way it would need to be
13 approached logically is that you have a target area, a place
14 where there may be more munitions exploded or shot at. You
15 would first look for those target areas. You'd first sample
16 soil to see if soil is contaminated. Soil has to get
17 contaminated before the soil can transport them to the
18 groundwater. If you find high concentrations in the soil,
19 then you would move towards groundwater probably. I would
20 proceed in that fashion.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Has any soil sample been
22 taken in or around the impact area?

23 BARRY ROGOWSKI: No, no, not yet.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: Pregnant pause. Hasn't been yet.

25 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We have taken soil samples at the

00066

1 demo areas and groundwater samples at the demo areas.

2 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Did you read in the

3 minutes --

4 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I don't read minutes.

5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: -- the situation that Sean,

6 EPA Sean, had with the placement of Demo 2 wells?

7 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yeah, I'm fully aware of Sean's

8 issues with the wells being too far away, in his mind, from

9 Demo Area 2.

10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Obviously -- not obviously.

11 Do you disagree with his approach?

12 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Let me just say, I don't disagree

13 with the fact that they're farther away than I'd like them to

14 be. Given the opportunities we had, where there were

15 opportunities to put wells and where we could place them,

16 those were the best places I think we could put them without

17 putting in new roads and mowing down a bunch of trees, doing

18 that type of thing.

19 We did not install one well that we wanted to

20 install up-gradient of Demo 2. I would still like to see that

21 well go in. I would like to see some more extensive soil

22 samples graded over demo area two, look at that.

23 The wells weren't optimal, granted. We don't live

24 in a perfect world. They're down-gradient, a little bit

25 farther than I'd like to see them. But that's the way it is

00067

1 right now.

2 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: When it comes to more
3 investigation about Landfill 4, the inability to put more
4 wells on the other side of the creek and near the creek,
5 because of non-contamination, is Ecology going to take a
6 standpoint, "Find a way to put roads in there"?

7 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think you bring up a good point.

8 In an area where you know you have contamination, where you
9 were actually able to document a fairly significant landfill
10 with contaminants in it, is a lot different than Demo Area 2.
11 We could never even find that landfill, never found the demo
12 area. We think we've found it on photographs. We haven't
13 found contamination. We don't really know what's out there.
14 Demo Area 2 is still very sketchy in my mind,
15 whereas Landfill 4 is a certainty. We have a landfill, we
16 have contamination, we have shallow and deep contamination.
17 We already have wells in there that are placed pretty well
18 coming up with hits. I think we should continue to search
19 that.

20 So, yeah, I think it's a big factor, Landfill 4.

21 We're going to make a lot bigger effort to get wells in. If
22 we have to put roads in to get wells in, I think we should
23 look at that more seriously.

24 Demo Area 2, I mean, you know, if we keep looking,

25 we don't find anything, we're chasing ghosts. I don't know

00068

1 what we're going to find there. I mean, we can keep looking.
2 It's one of those things. We've looked. We've done archive
3 reports, aerial photos, soil sampling, put in wells. At what
4 point do you say, "We've looked and we've looked and we've
5 looked, and we are just not finding anything there"? I don't
6 know when you're comfortable stopping, you know, but it's just
7 a question back at you.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Thank you.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Have we addressed or partly
10 addressed the outside-in questions? There were a number of
11 them. We kind of circuitously talked about them.
12 Again, the question: Can simple guiding procedures
13 be provided for submitting a RAB advisory? I'm not entirely
14 sure what "RAB advisory" means, but I think what is meant by
15 that is if the RAB wants to advise, how should that be done?
16 I think the appropriate format, a couple avenues.
17 Verbally at these RAB meetings, that's really a lot of reason
18 why we have these. We have Ecology here, the Army is here,
19 various folks.
20 If somebody wants to write down their advisory, an
21 easy way to get that into the record would be to submit it
22 here at the meeting and we'll get it transposed into the
23 minutes. That's another way of making sure. Those minutes
24 become part of the administrative record. They're also posted
25 in the public repositories.

00069

1 Another way to do it would be to submit a formal
2 letter. That's also an option for submitting an advisory,
3 making sure it's established on record.

4 IAN RAY: For things that come up at the RAB
5 meeting, how would you determine that they are advisory? A
6 lot of things have been said here tonight that are of an
7 advisory nature, but they haven't been specifically said as,
8 "This is an advisory." How do they get defined? How are they
9 defined? It has to be mentioned, "This is an advisory"?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: No. I consider all of our
11 discussions as advisory.

12 IAN RAY: That means you just put the minutes in the
13 administrative record?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: All the minutes are in the
15 administrative record, in the public repositories. They're
16 obviously in all of our minds as well as being on paper.
17 Perhaps I'm missing the definition of "advisory" or what
18 you're conceptualizing.

19 IAN RAY: I don't know what it is. I'm trying to
20 find out what is an advisory, what qualifies as an advisory
21 from this board to the Army, what kind of things qualify?

22 ERIC WAEHLING: Again, all discussions are advisory
23 in my mind. They're all part of the process, feedback, talk
24 and exchange of ideas, talking back and forth. If somebody
25 wants to submit a formal advisory, that's the way I

00070

1 interpreted this question, that there was a formal advisory
2 that the board or an individual wanted to make, what is the
3 way to make sure that's documented? I think those three
4 methods I outlined would probably be the best.

5 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think, just for the heck of it, I
6 think if you want something formal, you ought to send it
7 through the co-chair or through you as a technical
8 representative ought to put it down and sign it RAB, put it on
9 the record.

10 I think it's nice that we're taking notes and that
11 Eric is listening, all that's great, but if you really want
12 something in the record, put it in the record and sign it from
13 the RAB co-chair, run it through your co-chair, run it through
14 Ian as your technical representative.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: I was just going to voice the same
16 thing and say that maybe if Ian has something he feels is more
17 than a comment, lends further towards advisory, maybe we'll
18 speak up and say it more often.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Certainly submitting it as a letter
20 is the very best as far as formally establishing that.

21 FRANK FUNK: To clarify that, are you talking about
22 what is conducted in the meeting, then you submit the letter?
23 The reason I raise that question is, we've had a standing
24 policy to an extent that somebody doesn't speak for the RAB
25 unless it's been approved by the RAB. That's the reason I

00071

1 raise the question.

2 IAN RAY: I don't believe that an advisory would be
3 any more than an individual's advice.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: Exactly.

5 IAN RAY: If I offer an advisory, I'm not speaking
6 for the RAB, I'm speaking for myself.

7 FRANK FUNK: I just ask that it be qualified, that's
8 all.

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Sorry. I'm using more of your
10 time. I think it's an important point.
11 One of the things, we've got several different
12 venues for submitting comments or questions to government
13 agencies, whether it's Department of Ecology - I'll take
14 Department of Ecology for example. We have somebody that's in
15 executive correspondence. If you send something to our
16 managers, i.e., Tom Fitzsimmons, somebody else, that goes
17 through our executive correspondence system. It comes in,
18 goes in the database, came in May 5th, must be responded to
19 within two weeks. It's tracked from the time it comes to our
20 agency, there's a formal written response sent to you as a
21 citizen, and it's made sure that it comes straight back to
22 you. Even as a private citizen, one person, you have a formal
23 letter, you want to send it to our director, we're going to
24 respond to that one way or the other.
25 I think we have public comment periods, when they're

00072

1 open and closed, that's a formal comment period. We have to
2 provide some response, technical or legal answer to those
3 comments when they come in.

4 Also as a RAB, I think the RAB and the Army has a
5 responsibility. If you submit things through the RAB to the
6 Army, the Army is obligated to respond to those things.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It's a little bit different than
9 just having a discussion here. We can sit and have a
10 discussion, it's filtering and sorting of all this
11 information, but every now and then something rises to the top
12 out of an hour discussion. That one thing is important all of
13 a sudden. We decide that one thing, we might want to write it
14 down, put it on a piece of paper and sign it from our
15 co-chair, from somebody, send that for formal comment,
16 response.

17 I see this here is a big filtering kind of thing,
18 learning, discussing, going back and forth. Out of that comes
19 to those things that rise to the top.

20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I think your steps are
21 helpful. It's nice to see that spelled out. But I get the
22 feeling from Ian when it comes to the Army, maybe the garbage
23 is full because it doesn't feel like you have those steps
24 lined out. Some of it doesn't get answered, quite frankly.
25 He's got this database. He has checks and balances on that.

00073

1 It doesn't feel like you have any or you're just not spelling
2 them out.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: We actually have a similar process.

4 When a manager, in this case we have different terms, but when
5 it comes in as a letter, it's tracked.

6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How about as an e-mail?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: I just want to say if I get a
8 letter, I have to respond to it, as well. E-mails, I try to
9 respond to. To be honest, it's not a formal process.

10 BARRY ROGOWSKI: E-mails aren't tracked.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: They aren't tracked. We all do the
12 best we can to filter through and respond as best we can.

13 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It's not the same.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: It's not the same as a letter.

15 Barry is absolutely right.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I think that's very helpful.
17 E-mails I know have come in. They die pretty quick. I think
18 it's helpful to hear that.

19 IAN RAY: From this day forward, I'm going to send
20 you my comments and questions by US mail. Will that bring an
21 answer?

22 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah, I'm obligated to do that.

23 That's a formal submission.

24 IAN RAY: What I'm hearing now is the e-mails I've
25 sent you, they're not being answered because you don't have a

00074

1 process and you're not obligated to answer? When I talk to
2 you and I raise a question, I want an answer.

3 BARRY ROGOWSKI: There is not an organizational
4 obligation, other than my personal obligation to you as an
5 individual. You send me something in the e-mail, not the same
6 level of obligation I would have if you sent correspondence to
7 my boss.

8 BUD VAN CLEVE: What if he printed it out in a hard
9 copy and mailed it to you also?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Then it's submitted as a letter.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: What about electronic in letter
12 format?

13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Fax?

14 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Now we're getting --

15 ERIC WAEHLING: It's splitting hairs.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: I'm trying to look for fax or
17 something else.

18 DON WASTLER: What they're trying to establish is a
19 signature, you sign your name. If you send a form, you can
20 have all the copies with your signature, but your signature
21 there, the ink right there, your handwriting is what is the
22 bottom line. Isn't that what you're trying to establish?

23 JEROEN KOK: I think electronic signatures are now
24 an acceptable thing. I think the point is still that US mail
25 will get you into a more official response process than e-mail

00075

1 will.

2 DON WASTLER: I was rude intercepting that. I think
3 that's what they were trying to get.

4 IAN RAY: I don't know where we are, but this is
5 very troubling. We are supposed to communicate among
6 ourselves, isn't that right? For me, I've been assigned a
7 task, to establish some working relationship with the BCT.
8 I've given you all questions, I've given you comments, polled
9 the group and so forth, and we're not getting any answers. I
10 want to know, how am I going to get some answers?

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I'm not quite sure that's the case.
12 You've asked a lot of questions here today. I brought some
13 answers here. You have all of our comments here. The things
14 that you've asked for, you're getting. You may not be getting
15 the sense that it's complete or it's exactly what you're
16 looking for or there's a disconnect somewhere. There's a lot
17 of stuff coming.

18 IAN RAY: I guess I have to make the distinction
19 that the DOE is pretty good about conversation, just solving
20 problems person-to-person, it's very good. But I'm sorry that
21 the Army is not.

22 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Well, thank you. Sorry, Eric.
23 What is going on anyway?

24 IAN RAY: There's a great difference. I'm getting
25 to the point where I don't want to write anymore if I'm not

00076

1 getting answers. I'm just trying to do my job and I'm asking
2 you to help.

3 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I'm not defending the Army any more
4 now. You're on your own, Eric, on this one.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm doing my best. Again, the most
6 assured process, if you want a formal response, e-mail is not
7 the same. I do my best to try to get back to everybody, but a
8 letter has to be responded to. I'm going to try to redouble
9 my efforts.

10 JENNIFER WALTERS: If it makes you feel any better,
11 he doesn't always reply to me.

12 VALERIE LANE: Do you send him a letter?

13 KAREN KINGSTON: You can't win here now, Eric.
14 Let's get his mother on the phone.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm not making excuses.

16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Did you remember Mother's Day?

17 ERIC WAEHLING: I sent an e-mail.

18 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It's 9:15, we beat that one to
19 death.

20 FRANK FUNK: Open discussion?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: We have three others. Do we want to
22 continue going down the list real quick?

23 KAREN KINGSTON: I think so.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: RAB and community comments, DOE
25 Enforcement Order presented April 29, become part of the

00077

1 permanent record.

2 I think Barry addressed that the public comments
3 are -- they become part of the public record.

4 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It closes tomorrow, and after that
5 we'll compile everything and put together our list of
6 questions and responses.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: No. 10, as far as old business,
8 okay. We had some discussion about how to answer this as far
9 as the road map. As part of the Enforcement Order, and I know
10 Jennifer responded to the e-mail, Ian, regarding what the
11 schedule is. The Enforcement Order has a schedule associated
12 with it. You responded that wasn't what you were looking for,
13 which is why I brought this timeline, which is anticipated, it
14 not written in stone, but it's anticipated, the order of
15 things, approximately when.

16 The red ones indicate where there's a public comment
17 component associated with it. But things are going to move
18 around as we go down this path.

19 IAN RAY: There was one more element to the question
20 at the February RAB, of which this is almost all of the
21 answer. The other element was, are there any hang-ups or
22 disagreements about the authority or the technical methods?
23 Do we have any hang-ups right now? For example, has the Army
24 accepted the Enforcement Order, or are you in a hang-up
25 condition?

00078

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Define "hang-up"? I'll be very
2 honest with you. The Army has a problem -- some people in the
3 Army have some disagreements over the Enforcement Order and
4 authorities associated with it.

5 IAN RAY: I would call that a hang-up.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, I don't. The reason I don't
7 identify it as a hang-up is because we are continuing the
8 cleanup. We are continuing with the work. I am adhering to
9 the order because I have not been told not to. There are some
10 lawyerly issues, but as far as continuing to do work on the
11 ground, no, we don't have a hang-up. How is that for an
12 answer?

13 FRANK FUNK: Good. Next one.

14 BUD VAN CLEVE: That's one opinion.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: That's his viewpoint.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: No. 11. Yes, we talked about that
17 earlier. Everyone is welcome to come to these meeting.
18 11.2, these are public meetings. Anyone can come
19 and talk. I think that was addressed earlier, as well. Do
20 people agree?

21 FRANK FUNK: Yes.

22 DON WASTLER: Actually, it's in the congressional.
23 These meetings are open to the public and can come to talk,
24 Title V.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Open discussion.

00079

1 BUD VAN CLEVE: I'd like to ask a question. I had
2 suggested that we arrange for a public forum, open forum.
3 Judie said, Why don't we all sponsor, cosponsor, meaning Army,
4 Ecology, Clark County, and organize an open forum discussion
5 with a panel to answer public questions?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: That's the first I've heard of it.

7 BUD VAN CLEVE: I brought it up before, but I guess
8 nobody heard it.

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I remember.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: I heard it.

11 BUD VAN CLEVE: For instance, we had an issue with
12 the hospitals here. Hasn't been a new hospital built in the
13 State of Washington (sic) for 20 years. Legacy is going to
14 build one out in Salmon Creek. We organized a public forum,
15 had it out at Chinook Middle School. We ended up with over a
16 hundred people from all over the County coming to question the
17 people on the panel.

18 We've had various open forums on various political
19 issues, various community issues that have been well-attended.
20 We have facilities at Clark County, we have facilities at
21 Washington State University, we have facilities at several of
22 the high schools that can accommodate this sort of thing.

23 I guess I'm looking for other ways to get more
24 public input and more public involvement.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: I think it's a great idea, if you

00080

1 want to spearhead that and work with the County. I think
2 it -- to encourage public involvement, I think local
3 government is probably the most appropriate.

4 BUD VAN CLEVE: I know I can get the neighborhood
5 associations in the County to help sponsor it. But we need
6 also the involvement, authorization from the County. I think
7 the County would be in favor of it. What do you think,
8 Jeroen?

9 JEROEN KOK: I agree. In fact, Don Strick, who I
10 think some of you may have seen at the last couple meetings,
11 he couldn't be here tonight, is developing a public
12 involvement process at the County level, which contemplates
13 the exact kind of thing you're suggesting.

14 I will get ahold of Don tomorrow, see where he is in
15 developing that. If there's any draft guidelines or draft
16 plan that he has developed, I'll be happy to pass that along.

17 BUD VAN CLEVE: I know Judie agreed with it. I
18 think we can go even further in contacting Baird's office.
19 That's not a problem.

20 JEROEN KOK: No.

21 BUD VAN CLEVE: Teresa Wheel is working for Baird.
22 She's a dynamite lady.

23 DON WASTLER: I think it was 1996 or 1995 when this
24 whole thing first came up, there was one at the grade school
25 on Fourth Plain, just on the other side of 162nd.

00081

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Frontier.

2 DON WASTLER: Sheriff Lucas was there. I think that
3 was the first they had. It was in the paper. I'm surprised
4 we still don't have that many people interested.

5 BUD VAN CLEVE: I know I can get the sheriff's
6 department involved.

7 DON WASTLER: Sheriff Lucas was there. Ed Marshman
8 might have been there. I think that was the first one.

9 BUD VAN CLEVE: Something on that scale is the only
10 way we're going to get public involvement and get this
11 information out to the public.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: Bud has e-mail and whatnot. Can we
13 make a formal situation where you are the contact with the
14 County?

15 BUD VAN CLEVE: Sure.

16 JEROEN KOK: I do officially respond to e-mails.
17 You don't have to put it in writing.

18 FRANK FUNK: Is that discussion over? I have two
19 points I'd like to ask.

20 Where you had the bylaws committee, where there's a
21 possibility, a good possibility, of a transfer, I would
22 suggest that you table the updating the bylaws because by the
23 time you get it done, you'll be into the transfer and it will
24 be committee work that's kind of wasted in a way if you update
25 your bylaws. My suggestion.

00082

1 My other question is, when the transfer occurs, and
2 I think it's going to, will the RAB be officially adjourned by
3 the Army?

4 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know what the official
5 process is or how that works. I don't have the answer to
6 that. I don't know how it's been done in other sites.

7 FRANK FUNK: It talks about it.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: There is an official adjournment
9 process. I think there's a secretariat level involvement.
10 How that works with an early transfer, I don't know.

11 FRANK FUNK: We would be terminated, I think,
12 because we won't -- we were set up by the Army, not the
13 County.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. I don't know that process.

15 BUD VAN CLEVE: I think we need to ask Judie that,
16 what plans are, how community involvement will be handled.

17 JEROEN KOK: I think there are two questions there.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: There are.

19 JEROEN KOK: One is, where does the Army sponsorship
20 of the RAB end and how does it end? The follow-on question
21 is, what process does the County then pick up to involve the
22 public?

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: I think you're right, we have some
25 varying opinions that we're getting from high up as far as

00083

1 what we do with the RAB. The County's advisory committee will
2 not be a RAB. I think the initial things I got from the
3 Pentagon was that as long as you're around, a RAB has to be
4 around, unless the people adjourn it.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I think it's been site by site. I
6 think different things have been done at different locations.
7 Maybe that's why we're getting conflicting stories.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Maybe it's military, branch related
9 as well.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: I would hate for this to end.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: And I hate to see you lie, Eric.
12 I'm teasing you. Anyway, we won't know until we get some
13 official word on what happens to the RAB. In fact, I don't
14 think it completely adjourns, it just --

15 ERIC WAEHLING: I really don't know. That's a good
16 question.

17 FRANK FUNK: Would I be out of order, I'd like to
18 get out of here. You guys can talk all night if you want, but
19 could you give us a meeting date?

20 DON WASTLER: I have a couple questions still for
21 open discussion. I think they're important ones.

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Let's get the meeting date
23 first.

24 JEROEN KOK: How about June 11th?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: June or July?

00084

1 KAREN KINGSTON: What's the date you have here?

2 JENNIFER WALTERS: Second Wednesday.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: We're already set here for the
4 second Wednesday.

5 JEROEN KOK: June 11th.

6 ED MARSH: Is it June 11th at this station?

7 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.

8 JENNIFER WALTERS: I think this is the one you
9 booked. I called, and you had it.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Both you and I were running around
11 trying to make this happen. Then we can decide for the July
12 and August because the PUD is cooler than here, but everybody
13 can decide for July and August.
14 Don, you said you wanted a chance to say a couple
15 things.

16 DON WASTLER: The flyer that the Department of
17 Ecology sent out for that class, it said that HDX and RDX was
18 found in the groundwater. It said that in the flyer. It was
19 a chemical compound in this propellant which is basically a
20 fancy word for gunpowder. All of the test results that come
21 back say non-detected.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: It was detected in Landfill 4.

23 DON WASTLER: It was in Landfill 4?

24 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah, RDX. That was my question.

25 The flyer said it's been found. Remember, at the class I

00085

1 showed Ben Forson the copy of the one that Eric passed out at
2 the March meeting. So far everything I see says non-detected.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Its been detected.

4 DON WASTLER: When you were saying if a person's
5 well water is contaminated, they have to put them on City
6 water, City water is away from that area.

7 VALERIE LANE: He said bottled water, too.

8 DON WASTLER: Who is going to pay for that?

9 VALERIE LANE: You.

10 DON WASTLER: If our water is contaminated with
11 something that came out of Camp Bonneville, we can't drink the
12 water out of our well...

13 ERIC WAEHLING: The Army would pay.

14 DON WASTLER: We're 300 feet from the road. If we
15 have to put in City water, who is going to pay for all that?

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Or bottled water.

17 BUD VAN CLEVE: You buy the hose, they'll bring the
18 water.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: If the Army's responsible for
20 contamination off the installation, let's say in the unlikely
21 event that the drinking water well was contaminated, whether
22 it's public or private entity, they're the ones responsible.
23 It would be the Army.

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Even if it transfers?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Even with the transfer, the Army is

00086

1 still ultimately on the hook.

2 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Is it cost overrun or the
3 Army? I think there's a big difference in a cost overrun.

4 JEROEN KOK: Seems to me that would be an off-site
5 issue, which is not part of the cleanup for the site itself.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: The bottom line is, still the Army
7 is there. The County is acting as the Army's agent. The
8 bottom line is the Army is still owner.

9 DON WASTLER: The question is answered. If
10 someone's well is contaminated with something that came from
11 Camp Bonneville, the Army is going to foot the bill for
12 whatever their water needs are?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. One way or the other, the Army
14 will foot the bill.

15 Anybody have any ideas what they want to talk about
16 in June?

17 KAREN KINGSTON: Colonel Green.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: I can extend an invitation.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: Do you want to call him? I've been
20 sending e-mails. Should I call him? Do you call him?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: I've actually talked to him about
22 it.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: What did he say?

24 ERIC WAEHLING: Colonel Green, the garrison
25 commander of Fort Lewis.

00087

1 JEROEN KOK: What is he going to talk about?

2 ERIC WAEHLING: Participate in the meeting. He
3 hasn't been available to date. If you want to try asking.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: What did he say?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I talked to his secretary. He's out
6 of town.

7 JEROEN KOK: Make sure you send a letter.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Make sure I send a letter.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Colonel Baker is going to give you
10 more answers. Colonel Green hasn't really been involved.
11 Colonel Baker is the man.

12 ED MARSH: Does he have any authority?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: He's the unfortunate soul that owns
14 the property from a real estate point of view. Every other
15 decision, the funding, the operation, all that is Colonel
16 Baker. Colonel Green has very little --

17 KAREN KINGSTON: Do you have a preference, Baker or
18 Green?

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Baker is the decision maker, not
20 Colonel Green.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: I think it would be good even at
22 this late date to say he's been here.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Colonel Green?

24 KAREN KINGSTON: Baker.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah. Certainly that would be more

00088

1 appropriate than Colonel Green, probably far more
2 satisfactory. You'll get more information out of Colonel
3 Baker than you would out of Colonel Green because he hasn't
4 really been involved.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: Can you let us know if he's able to
6 come because then I'll put the word out and people can maybe
7 have questions ahead of time so he knows what he's walking
8 into?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: We can extend the invitation. I
10 can't commit him.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: Does anybody have anything else
12 they would like to get?

13 IAN RAY: Small detail that went by a while ago. I
14 was referred to as the technical representative. I ain't no
15 such thing.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: I consider you that.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: All right. Shall we adjourn?

18 BUD VAN CLEVE: Yes.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you very much, everybody.

20 (Meeting adjourned.)

21

22

23

24

25

1

CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF WASHINGTON)

) ss.

4 County of Clark)

5

6 I, Jaime S. Morrocco, a Notary Public for
 Washington, certify that the Camp Bonneville Restoration
 7 Advisory Board Meeting here occurred at the time and place set
 forth in the caption hereof; that at said time and place I
 8 reported in Stenotype all proceedings had in the foregoing
 matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting
 9 under my direction; and the foregoing transcript, pages 2 to
 88 both inclusive, contains a full, true and correct record of
 10 all such testimony adduced and oral proceedings had and of the
 whole thereof.

11 I further advise you that as a matter of firm
 policy, the Stenographic notes of this transcript will be
 12 destroyed
 two years from the date appearing on this Certificate unless
 13 notice is received otherwise from any party or counsel hereto
 on or before said date;

14 Witness my hand and notarial seal at Vancouver,
 Washington, this 19th day of May 2003.

15

16

17

Jaime S. Morrocco, RPR, CM

18

Notary Public for Washington

19

20

Location: **Fire Station 88** *see below for directions*
6701 NE 147TH Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98682

7:00 PM	Open Meeting	Base Environmental Coordinator
7:10 PM	Army Updates - field data from all wells - recent camp cleanup activities	Base Environmental Coordinator
7:45 PM	Old business - RAB member	Don Wastler
8:00 PM	Break	Everyone
8:10 PM	Community Updates	Community Co-Chair
8:20 PM	Question and Answer Period Base Project Performance - Predetermined, copy attached	Environmental Coordinator
8:40 PM	Open Discussion	Everyone
8:55 PM	June Meeting Itinerary	Everyone
*9-10:00 PM	Continue Open Discussion and <i>Adjournment</i>	<i>Everyone</i>

* *adjournment anytime between*

NOTES:

- Question and Answer Period at 8:20 PM will follow the attachment. If you have a new question it should be addressed during Open Discussion at 8:40 PM or be put on the Predetermined Questions for the next meeting.
- **Directions from I-5:**
 1. Take Highway I-205 East.
 2. Take Orchards / SR 500 Exit
 3. Turn East on NE Fourth Plain Road
 4. Turn Right at NE 147th Avenue
 5. The fire station is clearly visible from NE Fourth Plain Road. If you reach the Safeway you have gone to far.
- If you have any questions or need further help with directions, please give Jennifer Walters a call at 253-966-1771 or email at waltersj@lewis.army.mil

Question and Answer Period

1) Were checks of Lacamas creek bank seeps ever done? If so, where are the results published?

No, but still working.

2) Can comments from both the EPA and DOE about the Draft Final Landfill 4 ESI be made available to the entire RAB?

Yes, will distribute at meeting.

3) Will comments from the community and the RAB about the Draft Final Landfill 4 ESI become part of the permanent record within the ESI Document, or the Administrative Record, or both, or other place(s)?

They are submitted into the Administrative Record. All comments should be formally mailed via the US mail system.

4) Where in the process of finding the plume from Landfill 4 was the decision made to use the "outside-in" method? (The outside-in method begins the search at the greatest distance from the source.)

Will explain at meeting.

5) What was the approximate date of the "outside-in" decision (not the date of the contract)?

Will provide at meeting.

6) Who was the authority making the decision for "outside-in" - the contractor, the army, regulators, or others?

Collaboration between the US Army and regulators.

8) Can simple guiding procedures be provided for submitting a RAB Advisory?

All advisories are and should be submitting at the RAB meetings, either verbally or in writing. All advisories are than recorded in the minutes and submitted into the Administrative Record.

9) Will comments from the RAB and community about the DOE Enforcement Order presentation on April 29, 2003 become part of the permanent record?

Yes, Ecology will be submitting them into the permanent record.

10) Can the uncompleted old business from the Feb 2003 RAB be addressed as was indicated it would be - that is, the request for a "road map" of coming events, responsibilities, public comment periods, etc?

The "road map" or schedule is part of the Enforcement Order. Which was distributed at the February RAB meeting by Ecology. More copies will be provided. Explanations and review of this schedule will be given.

11.1) Can nonmembers function the same as RAB members with all of the rights and privileges of members - except voting?

Yes

11.2) An official ruling on this issue of nonmember participation is desirable so RAB members can speak with credibility to members of the community. They don't want to say, "C'mon down and chime in" and have a person denied.

Know one will be denied from speaking and/or commenting about Camp Bonneville environmental cleanup issues at RAB meetings or otherwise.