

CAMP BONNEVILLE
RESTORATION ADVISORY
BOARD MEETING

Court Reporter: Jaime S. Morrocco, RPR, CM

Date: September 11, 2002

Time: 7:00

Place: Camp Bonneville

Vancouver, Washington

RIDER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

P.O. Box 245

Vancouver, WA 98666

(360)693-4111

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Let's get started. Thank you very
2 much for joining us out here at Camp Bonneville on September
3 11th. I think before we get started, I want to recognize that
4 there are actually some people that were a member of this team
5 that are still not with us as a direct consequence of
6 September 11th. Harry Craig, as some of you may recall who
7 have been with us for a while, was the EPA representative in
8 this process. He's also in the Coast Guard Naval Reserve. He
9 was called to active duty as a result of September 11th. My
10 understanding is he's still serving in that capacity. I think
11 it's important we recognize his efforts, the significance of
12 that.

13 To start the meeting, I'd like to go around the
14 table as we traditionally do. Eric Waehling, Camp Bonneville
15 BEC.

16 FRANK FUNK: Frank Funk, member.

17 VALERIE LANE: Valerie Lane, member.

18 JEROEN KOK: Jeroen Kok, Vancouver/Clark Parks and
19 Recreation Department, Clark County representative.

20 JENNIFER WALTERS: Jennifer Walters, Fort Lewis.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Christine Sutherland, RAB.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: Karen Kingston, RAB.

23 DON WASTLER: Don Wastler, I grew up here,
24 Restoration Advisory Board.

25 GREG JOHNSON: Greg Johnson, Department of Ecology.

1 ^ ED MARSH: Ed Marsh, FBI.

2 MIKE NELSON: Mike Nelson, Corps of Engineers,
3 Seattle.

4 BUD VAN CLEVE: Bud Van Cleve, Northeast Hazel Dell
5 Association and RAB.

6 IAN RAY: Ian Ray, RAB.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Inadvertently, this is my fault, I
8 see here on the agenda that the open discussion, community
9 issues should be the next item. I inadvertently put it after
10 progress update. I'd be happy to open that discussion
11 presently or we can stick to the agenda. It's up to you all.

12 JEROEN KOK: Let's do open discussion, community
13 issues.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Community issues, past issues, after
15 that I'd like to give you an update on the progress of some of
16 the things we've been up to the last few days, last few weeks.

17 KAREN KINGSTON: I have a question. When you're
18 hauling the contaminated soil, you had those trucks go out,
19 where do you haul to? Can we have information as to where?

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Absolutely.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: I know Steve is definitely up on
22 that. He's very tedious about his logs and whatnot, but I'd
23 like to know where that is going.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: Sure. If we were to remove
25 contaminated soils, as at the drum burial site?

1 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: There are very strict requirements
3 for tracking where that goes. I can't tell you off the top of
4 my head specifically where it went this time, although we can
5 certainly track it down. But if it's contaminated dirt, we
6 have to profile it, take samples of it to see if it's
7 classified as hazardous waste, or if it's non-hazardous but
8 still waste, we need to manage it in certain ways. It's then
9 disposed of accordingly.

10 I know Arlington --

11 KAREN KINGSTON: I was going to say, is it going to
12 Arlington? Are they burning it?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: I can't tell you off the top of my
14 head. I can tell you we can find out specifically because we
15 have to track it. What we do is with each load that leaves,
16 there's a shipping manifest. There's a series of signatures
17 that are required. That shipping manifest travels with the
18 material until it reaches its ultimate disposal site at what
19 we call a TSDF, treatment disposal facility -- treatment
20 storage and disposal facility. Once it has reached there, a
21 copy of that shipping document has to come back to the
22 shipper. If we don't get it back, we're required to notify
23 the Department of Ecology that we've somehow lost track of a
24 shipment of soil, in this case, or any kind of waste. There
25 are very strict controls over that.

1 I can't tell you whether the specific dirt that
2 we've hauled off of here has gone to Arlington or an
3 equivalent facility someplace else, but we can certainly find
4 that out if you want us to.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: I'd like every now and then maybe
6 for even Steve to come in. I think it's important. For
7 instance, one of the things I ran into when I was doing my
8 research on the fire department and PUD lines and whatnot was
9 the fact that the fire department, everybody had old numbers
10 for Steve and Warren. They didn't even really know exactly
11 know who Steve and Warren were.

12 Steve has an environmental specialist ranking,
13 doesn't he, from what I understand with the Army? I'd like to
14 see him come once in a while, if he wouldn't mind, if you can
15 drag him out from working on his cars. I'd like to see him
16 come once in a while because he can probably speak up and
17 say - I'm not asking where every granule went - "It went to
18 Arlington, it went to here."

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Mike, do you happen to know on these
20 contracts where most of it has gone?

21 MIKE NELSON: Like the drum burial site, for
22 example, they do profile it. As Eric said, they take
23 analytical samples of this and get a profile of what is the
24 waste, is it hazardous. In that case, it did go to Arlington.
25 If it's not hazardous, it goes down to below Portland, one of

1 the small towns. They have a certified landfill for
2 non-hazardous materials from sites like this. I don't recall
3 the name of that town, but I can find out for you.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: I'm just interested in knowing
5 where it goes, in case it comes up.

6 Another question. That is the EA. I know that you
7 had to go after additional funding, the Corps had to for the
8 private comments. We're getting towards a year.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. I do know it's under
10 contract. They're writing the responses to those comments.
11 Have you heard from Ken?

12 MIKE NELSON: They're preparing those responses now.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Do we have a date?

14 MIKE NELSON: I'll find out.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: I think it's fairly soon we should
16 be expecting drafts to those comments that I'll take a look at
17 to make sure they do reflect my position. Once we've sorted
18 out that those comments are reflective of the Army's position,
19 then they'll be released.

20 KAREN KINGSTON: Mailed out through the general mail
21 or are we receiving them here?

22 ERIC WAEHLING: We haven't talked about that,
23 whether it's mailed out through general mail.

24 MIKE NELSON: I'll find out. I'm not sure. We have
25 the funding, they are being worked. As far as the progress of

1 it, where it's going, I'll find out.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, Karen, since you brought
4 up and mentioned fire. At the last meeting, maybe it was an
5 e-mail, somebody requested points of contact for fire.
6 Jennifer worked up this beautiful contact sheet that I'd like
7 to hand out to everybody.

8 For fire issues related to structures of the
9 cantonment, the point of contact is the chief of Fort Lewis
10 fire department, his name is Scotty Freeman. For wild land
11 fires, forest fires and the like, that is our installation
12 forester at Fort Lewis. Camp Bonneville is a subinstallation
13 of Fort Lewis. His name is Gary McCauseland. His telephone
14 and e-mail are here, as well.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: What is his rank?

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Gary is a GS-12, I believe. I don't
17 know what the GS rating of the chief of the fire department
18 is. You could ask.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: Did you hand those out to the fire
20 department here locally and DNR so they're updated? Fire
21 department here locally, Fire District 5, is not updated.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know about Fire District 5.
23 I do know we work with Clark County in developing the
24 agreements between Clark County and the Army.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: Doesn't get to the fire department.

1 They have contacted Fort Lewis several times, were given your
2 name as the person that was in charge. Then I talked to you.
3 You said, no, you were not in charge. You were going to get
4 me who it is at Fort Lewis that they could contact.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

6 KAREN KINGSTON: Fire District 5 does not have a
7 current update.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: This would be the appropriate --

9 KAREN KINGSTON: Neither does PUD.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: These would be the appropriate
11 points of contact for anybody at Fort Lewis or anybody else.
12 I had a conversation with Scotty Freeman on this issue. He
13 was adamant that he is the point of contact for issues here.

14 They historically would come down and conduct fire
15 safety inspections. They have not done those for the last few
16 years. They lapsed. Scotty is a great fire chief. He left
17 Fort Lewis to go to work in Germany for a couple years. He
18 since has come back to Fort Lewis, which is good for us. He'd
19 be more than happy to talk to you. He really knows his stuff.

20 KAREN KINGSTON: He doesn't need to talk to me. I
21 congratulate you for getting this on board. I probably would
22 suggest that before it's handed over to the PUD or to the Fire
23 District 5 that you include the current phone number for Steve
24 and Warren. They don't have the correct phone number. They
25 have the one from about '94.

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: Which I think still rings. I think
3 the machine picks it up. I'd sure like to see those people.
4 I was pretty concerned when PUD became concerned about the
5 lines.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. We've been giving those
7 numbers to 911, working through the 911 office. It sounds
8 like it's not getting down to the locals.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: No. Last thing I needed to do was
10 have PUD come and get angry about how the lines were
11 maintained on the day when the FBI had something going on.
12 They were going to click it off.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: I have a new hat temporarily in that
14 I should be the contact for power line issues.

15 Along those lines, as some of you may or may not
16 know, I'm in the process -- a contractor is developing a
17 management plan for maintaining the buildings and the
18 infrastructure here at Bonneville. I need a plan so that I
19 know how much money we'll be needing in the future and also to
20 help Steve and Warren focus their efforts on where they need
21 to be doing their work to help stabilize the facility as best
22 we can.

23 Within that plan it's also going to include power
24 line maintenance, to include tree trimming, and also which
25 power line runs we can disconnect because they're no longer

1 needed, and thus reduce the burden of maintenance for those
2 lines, hence the cost.

3 While I'm talking about facility maintenance, last
4 month I had a contractor come down, and they replaced and
5 cleaned a number of roofs both here at Camp Bonneville and
6 Camp Killpack. I don't have a building -- final building
7 count. I wish Warren were here. I think it was well over 10
8 buildings we replaced the roofs, and others we just cleaned
9 and did a little patching and maintenance. Some of the roofs
10 were looking a bit old. We had a couple leaks starting in a
11 few buildings. When water starts getting into the buildings,
12 they could go downhill very quickly. I wanted to stop that.
13 We had that work done, as well.

14 Also as far as facility maintenance, Warren has been
15 diligent in working very hard to clear a path and repair and
16 inspect the fence around the central impact area. He's been
17 working there. It's actually in relatively good shape,
18 remarkably good shape considering it hasn't been maintained in
19 a few years. There are a number of breaks in a few trees
20 across it, but it's largely intact, and he's repairing those
21 breaks. That's the central impact area, not the perimeter
22 fence. We'll probably start that next.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: That's an institutional control
24 issue, right? I'm not happy with that fence at all.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Which one?

1 KAREN KINGSTON: The one around the impact area.
2 He's cleaning around it, I'm glad to hear it.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: We're maintaining what we have.
4 What happens in the long run remains to be seen.

5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Isn't that fence line not
6 even correct? Isn't that kind of what you've drawn out on a
7 map?

8 ERIC WAEHLING: The lines on the map were incorrect.
9 The squiggly blue line that you see as the perimeter, that's
10 the actual fence line.

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: That's pretty much correct?

12 ERIC WAEHLING: That is correct. I walked that
13 myself with a GPS unit. I know that's correct.

14 KAREN KINGSTON: I have a question. In light of the
15 difference in the fire protection plan for this area because
16 of the impact area and the fans and whatnot as far as when
17 they'll come in and when they won't, does that impact the FBI
18 building or your equipment as far as fire insurance goes? You
19 know, for instance, if I was in this area, and I've got my
20 fire insurance for me --

21 ED MARSH: Because we're the US Government, we are
22 all self-insured. We don't even have automobile insurance.
23 The US Government is self-insured. You don't insure anything.

24 But you're right, the fire issue has become a big
25 deal. We used to have an engine right here that was

1 maintained by Clark 5. We had all the numbers. We had the
2 regular SOP for any type of fire, range control.

3 Once range control left, yeah, it's kind -- it
4 obviously worries us. That's one of the reasons why we keep
5 the brush away from our buildings. The good news about us is
6 we have a road, 50 yards of concrete. We basically have a
7 firebreak, if you have a big fire here.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Because if there was a fire here,
9 they're not going to come in and save your building, they're
10 going to do the perimeter, from what I understand.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: That's not true.

12 ED MARSH: No. Clark County 5 should be for that
13 building because that's part of a building.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: For structure fire.

15 ED MARSH: It's a structure.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: If there was a regular fire...

17 ED MARSH: If we have a wildfire out here, obviously
18 we're going to do our best to make sure that the fire lines
19 get cut behind our range.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, I'd like to respond to
21 that.

22 If there is a wildfire, we have agreements in place
23 that the Department of Natural Resources will be the responder
24 to the fire. The plan is that they will defend the perimeter
25 of the installation to contain the fire until such time that a

1 caretaker or Army representative can meet them at the front
2 gate to escort them to the area where the fire is.

3 If the fire is in the central impact area, they will
4 not -- they will fight it from the perimeter of the central
5 impact area. If the fire is outside of the central impact
6 area, then they would attack it like they normally would any
7 other fire. Those agreements are in place from the Department
8 of Natural Resources.

9 Gary McCauseland is the chief forester. Fort Lewis
10 has its own fire program and firefighters. They work with
11 DNR. Joe Reissner (phonetic), who is the forest fire guy, he
12 confirmed these agreements with the Department of Natural
13 Resources, that they would be the responder. DNR is the
14 responder to all wild land fires within Washington State.
15 That applies to here, as well.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: Well, I was concerned more with
17 the -- go ahead.

18 IAN RAY: At previous meetings, we have heard that
19 you could have UXO anywhere on this 3800 acres. Is that
20 right?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: No, that is not right. Well, there
22 is the potential for UXO anywhere on this 3800 acres. The
23 concentrations of UXO are being defined and are in the central
24 impact area, the targets.

25 IAN RAY: You could have UXO outside of the central

1 impact area, couldn't you?

2 ERIC WAEHLING: We cannot preclude there's
3 potentially UXO outside the central impact area. That does
4 not necessarily equate that there is UXO outside of the impact
5 area. Would you agree with that, Greg?

6 GREG JOHNSON: No, I wouldn't.

7 IAN RAY: If I were a fireman, I would want to know.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Does the Army feel comfortable for
9 the fire department, or anybody else, that you're bringing
10 people in, escorted by Warren, who is a caretaker? I'm not
11 playing that down whatsoever.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: I understand.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: But he's a caretaker, he's going to
14 bring them in, expose them to that danger.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: The Department of Natural Resources
16 is aware of that. They know about the issue. They agreed
17 that this is how they would respond.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: Could we have a DNR representative
19 here to tell us that?

20 ERIC WAEHLING: I can't commit the DNR, but I'll ask
21 them.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: Don't you think?

23 VALERIE LANE: Eric, I've been dealing with the DNR.
24 They're not very intelligent. They can't even figure out
25 where the pipeline is. If you're going to get a

1 representative in here, bless your heart. That Floyd Green is
2 pretty well thin spaced out here in the Northwest. They've
3 been working on picking up that garbage I mentioned since the
4 month before May. Still up there. There's a pile of lumber,
5 they're building little fires with it. That's up on the
6 pipeline, which is south of Camp Bonneville, which is on the
7 leased land.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

9 VALERIE LANE: Hey, they don't even show an interest
10 in going up there.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know.

12 VALERIE LANE: I can't get anywhere with them.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: I just know that we do have an
14 agreement. I can't comment on DNR.

15 Frank.

16 FRANK FUNK: I would think that common sense would
17 tell you they're going to shut down a fire, contain it as
18 quick as they can, even if they have to bring helicopters in.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: There's aerial, there's other
20 methodology.

21 FRANK FUNK: If they don't, it's going to get away
22 and you'll have thousands of acres. They're going to contain
23 that some way. If they have to come in here with bulldozers
24 to do that, they'll do it.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: I disagree.

1 IAN RAY: Time for another one?

2 ERIC WAEHLING: Sure.

3 IAN RAY: The Agreed Order, the period of discussion
4 between the Army and the Washington Department of Ecology was
5 over a couple days ago, the 60-day period.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, it's ongoing. The time
7 period can be extended at Ecology's discretion. The Army can
8 request an extension or Ecology can grant it to themselves.
9 Ecology has extended the discussion period.

10 BUD VAN CLEVE: That's been done?

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. We've had a series of
12 meetings.

13 IAN RAY: Of concern is when the public comment
14 period will be.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: I can't tell you at this time
16 exactly when it will be. You do have an advance copy. You're
17 welcome to give the Army or Ecology or both your thoughts
18 about that, but there will be a formal public comment period,
19 as well. That will be advertised in the papers. Of course,
20 you will all know about it, too.

21 IAN RAY: Are you going to cover the walking the
22 creek and things like that --

23 ERIC WAEHLING: I was going to do that.

24 IAN RAY: -- in the progress update?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

1 IAN RAY: Let's see. Regarding Landfill 4
2 excavation, when you go to the DoD or wherever you go to get
3 the \$2 to \$2.5 million to excavate Landfill 4, do you have to
4 give them details like volume of earth, labor, road
5 maintenance?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Indirectly, as part of our estimate,
7 we're required to use a cost estimating model, which
8 incorporates those costs. We call it RACERS (phonetic). What
9 does the acronym stand for, Mike?

10 MIKE NELSON: I don't recall what the acronym is.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: It's a cost estimating modeling tool
12 that the Corps uses. I'm required to base my costs on that.
13 It incorporates those figures.

14 IAN RAY: Can the RAB see those figures?

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah. Do you mean the workup sheets
16 behind them or just the final sums?

17 IAN RAY: Details: how much labor, how much road
18 maintenance.

19 MIKE NELSON: Can I ask a question here? Maybe you
20 can help me to get the information you're seeking.

21 Is the concern about the \$2.5 million that it's not
22 sufficient to ultimately cover what it's going to cost to do
23 that work? What is the concern about the money developed
24 under our cost modeling?

25 IAN RAY: Where the 2.5 is being spent, the details.

1 ERIC WAEHLING: You just want to see how much will
2 be going to waste hauling, how much to build the roads and
3 stuff?

4 IAN RAY: Yeah.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: We can generate that.

6 MIKE NELSON: It's going to be in summaries. We
7 don't have the cubic yards of soil that's going to be
8 excavated based on what we know today. We have a range of
9 soils that we ultimately think will come out of that site. It
10 may be more or less.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. But we have figures that we
12 generate that we input into the model and it gave us cost
13 estimates.

14 MIKE NELSON: We've got those summaries --

15 ERIC WAEHLING: We can print those out.

16 MIKE NELSON: -- if it will help you to understand
17 what you're doing.

18 IAN RAY: When you're asking for two to two and a
19 half million, it seems like somebody is going to ask you,
20 "What are you spending it on?"

21 MIKE NELSON: We have that information.

22 IAN RAY: I'd like to see that.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Ian, the answer is yes, we're going
24 to show that to you. We'll print it out.

25 IAN RAY: Somebody else go ahead.

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, Don, Jeroen is first.

2 JEROEN KOK: Christine first.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I understand that the
4 unrestricted use, which would be outside the impact area,
5 would be commercial utility, recreational camping. I'm
6 talking about UXO.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: I understand.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: That that would have to be
9 cleared 10 feet from the surface.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: For unrestricted use, that is
11 correct.

12 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: And everything outside of the
13 impact area would be unrestricted?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: That's not correct, no. The
15 strategy is that none of this property would be for
16 unrestricted use. There would be institutional controls
17 associated with all of the property of some sort.

18 An institutional control might be something as
19 simple as if you're going to dig here, you need to take these
20 precautions. If you're going to build a building here, you
21 need to make sure you have these precautions. You're notified
22 these are issues, you may need UXO escorts, that sort of
23 thing. The property is not going to be for unrestricted use.

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: In the camping area, there
25 are going to be signs everywhere saying, "Do not dig"?

1 ERIC WAEHLING: That's not necessarily true. For
2 example, in the camping area, I'm just speaking off the top of
3 my head, these are the remedies that need to be fleshed out.
4 There's a range of options. In the camping area, it may be
5 sufficient to clear to four feet.

6 Depending on what the use is for these areas will
7 also determine what the appropriate remedial activities would
8 need to be. We flesh those out in the EE/CA/RFS document that
9 you will all be participants in where we lay out a range of
10 options. Those options will be from "do nothing" to "clear
11 everything to 10 feet." There will be options in between.

12 (Bruce Overbay joins meeting.)

13 ERIC WAEHLING: And risk reduction associated with
14 each of the activities. The determination of whether we need
15 to dig to 10 feet or four or one or nothing hasn't been made
16 yet. It won't be made until you've all had a chance to see
17 it.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: I have a question towards that. Is
19 Clark County aware that in the areas where there would be
20 camping that the UXO handbook requires 10 feet?

21 MIKE NELSON: That's not true.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: The DDSB standard for camping areas
23 is four feet, isn't it?

24 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah. The depths it gives on those
25 aren't exactly I won't say accurate.

1 ERIC WAEHLING: It's guidance.

2 GREG JOHNSON: It's guidance. If you'll read on to
3 the next page, you can design a depth matrix for certain
4 activities.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

6 GREG JOHNSON: Which is kind of what we're doing
7 with this Level 1 screening. Right now we're waiting on Clark
8 County to give us the future use before we start designing the
9 depth matrix.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Or a more accurate picture of the
11 future use.

12 GREG JOHNSON: More accurate picture. That's where
13 we're at on that. That's going to be a collaborative effort.
14 As we talked about last time, I'm going to keep you guys in
15 the loop on what we're designing.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

17 GREG JOHNSON: I will go out of my way to keep you
18 guys informed of every step of that process.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Greg didn't know this, but I was
20 hoping Greg could talk to us from his thoughts on the progress
21 update.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: Is that added to a transfer escrow?
23 Is this an afterthought after escrow?

24 GREG JOHNSON: As far as transferring it to Clark
25 County?

1 KAREN KINGSTON: (Nodding head.)

2 GREG JOHNSON: I can only speculate on that. I'd
3 say if I was Clark County, I would want that before I took the
4 property over.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: It actually doesn't necessarily have
6 to occur before or after because what's important is that
7 those decisions and those activities, remediation activities,
8 occur before the property's used.

9 Now, whether Clark County is executing the cleanup,
10 hiring the same contractors, other contractors that we might
11 use, or whether the Army's doing it or not, that's not
12 necessarily as important as the correct decisions are made,
13 that the RAB is involved in those decisions.

14 Obviously, the regulators, Ecology, have a big say
15 in what happens. Whether it's the Army that's paying for it
16 or Clark County through the escrow -- ESCA, that's a separate
17 issue.

18 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: If you don't know the depths
19 of how deep you would have to go in certain areas, how would
20 you be able to put a price to that?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: One of the ways we can put a price
22 to it, one of the things that has to happen is Clark County
23 and the Army need to come to an agreement on what is the
24 estimated cost. We can make estimates.

25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Without that

1 characterization, depths?

2 ERIC WAEHLING: For example, it's been our
3 experience to date at Camp Bonneville that the vast majority
4 of the ordnance has been within the top 18 inches of soil.
5 When you're making cost model estimates, it is reasonable to
6 assume from a cost driver point of view that your cost driver
7 is going to be in the top 18 inches, and that you're only
8 going to find very few that are deeper than that. They won't
9 necessarily throw your cost modeling off. Make sense?

10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: It does.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: That's a ways down the line.

12 MIKE NELSON: On this 10 feet, it's been kicked
13 around several times. What they're doing in this work that
14 Greg is involved in, this Level 1 screening, the present reuse
15 plan, camping, day hike area, that begins to go into the
16 Level 1 screening. They say how deep we have to clear for
17 tent camping in a specific area. That's all part of the
18 process in that Level 1 screening.

19 But the 10 feet, it is a default depth. If you plan
20 to come out here in the future and put up a building, put a
21 foundation in, the default depth is 10 feet or four feet below
22 the footing depth of that building before you can even build
23 that building.

24 Does that help on the 10-foot issue?

25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I understand the 10-foot

1 issue. I was looking at graphs in the handbook. It said
2 camping. It was specific about camping, 10 feet. If you
3 don't have a device that can go that deep, how would we expect
4 to go that deep?

5 GREG JOHNSON: It won't.

6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Camping wouldn't be a
7 possibility?

8 GREG JOHNSON: If they're going to have camping,
9 they're going to have camping. I don't think there's going to
10 be any area on Camp Bonneville that's going to be cleared to
11 10 feet.

12 MIKE NELSON: It's not required for public use.

13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I'm just stating what I read
14 in the handbook.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: I just want to add two things and
16 we'll move on.

17 First of all, Clark County is very actively involved
18 in this process, as well. It's not just Ecology and the Army.
19 Jim Mansfield with Clark County is an active participant.

20 I think the most important thing to remember is,
21 it's not whether it's required or not by regulation; it's what
22 is sufficient to make it safe. That's what we're focused on.
23 We're not focused on what default depths are in the
24 regulation; we're focused on what it is going to take to make
25 this area safe for different reuses.

1 KAREN KINGSTON: Who determines that?

2 GREG JOHNSON: The final will be Governor Locke and
3 the Chairman of the Department of Defense.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: Is he kept up to speed?

5 GREG JOHNSON: Somewhat. He's been out here one
6 time.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Locke?

8 GREG JOHNSON: No, chairman of the DDSB.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: He hasn't been out here yet. What
10 happens is we have to work out the issues amongst all of us
11 and come up with a plan. Then what happens is it is then
12 presented to these various decision makers ultimately.
13 They're briefed, brought up to speed on the decision, the
14 bases of the decisions, before they ultimately make the
15 decision. They're not brought up on a daily operations of
16 what we're up to.

17 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah.

18 FRANK FUNK: I have a question. What is it now? I
19 missed two meetings, what is the deal now, do you just jump in
20 and start talking or do you raise your hand or what? I'm just
21 curious.

22 VALERIE LANE: Both hands.

23 FRANK FUNK: They raise an important issue about the
24 UXO. UXO, before you can do anything here really, has to be
25 satisfactorily removed. The ecology is very important, but

1 UXO has to be done before anything can be done here, really
2 turned over for anything. It can be turned over. But if the
3 County takes it, before they can use it, it has to be cleaned
4 up.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Right, Ecology needs to accept.

6 FRANK FUNK: Right. When you talk about the
7 ecology, it's very important, but UXO has to be done before
8 you can do anything with this property.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: You may have misunderstood me. When
10 I say "ecology," I mean the Washington State Department of
11 Ecology, the organization Greg works for. I should be more
12 clear with that. I don't mean just the environment. It slang
13 or vernacular. When I'm referring to "ecology," I mean the
14 Department of Ecology. Sorry.

15 FRANK FUNK: Okay.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Jeroen, you've been trying to jump
17 in.

18 JEROEN KOK: That's fine.

19 I wanted to go back to something mentioned earlier.
20 The facilities maintenance plan that you're developing, can
21 you tell me when you anticipate completing that? Will the
22 County get a copy of it? Do you have a budget?

23 ERIC WAEHLING: To answer that in order: I should
24 receive a draft copy of the fence maintenance plan second week
25 in September, which is this week. I should see that by the

1 end of this week.

2 The facility maintenance plan I should probably see
3 a draft, internal Army draft copy, first or second week in
4 October. The County will receive a draft copy of that for
5 comment.

6 The intent of that document is to develop budgets.

7 JEROEN KOK: Thank you.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Do you cc that, any of those kind
9 of documentations that have to do with site facility, over to
10 the FBI? Do you have a contact for them that you
11 automatically send it to?

12 ERIC WAEHLING: No. I'm not including -- well, no.
13 I'm not including the FBI facility in our maintenance plan.
14 That's the FBI's. They own the building. They're responsible
15 for it.

16 ED MARSH: We actually maintain that.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: The FBI is a tenant of this
18 installation.

19 ED MARSH: To be perfectly honest with you, not only
20 do we maintain our own, but Warren and Steve haven't had any
21 budget. We've actually slid some materials over to help Steve
22 and Warren maintain some of this place.

23 I think it's great they're coming in. I don't have
24 to give any more roofing materials now that they're reroofing
25 it themselves.

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Don.

2 DON WASTLER: Since I have the floor now, just a
3 couple things I want to address.

4 I think Ian's request is valid. On those same
5 lines, I'd sure like to see a detailed list of expenditures
6 for Clark County altogether, on all of their work and what
7 they do on those lines.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: As related to Camp Bonneville?

9 DON WASTLER: As well as related to all of their
10 fieldwork, public works, how much they spend for labor and all
11 that. I think it's a valid request. If they're going to
12 spend that much money, we should know how it's being spent - I
13 mean, not just with this - this is something of my concern
14 with Clark County altogether.

15 One question I want to bring up tonight is how many
16 former military reservations that have had petroleum and toxic
17 waste, UXO, unexploded ordnance, has Base Realignment and
18 Closure successfully closed down and transferred?

19 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't have a number.

20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: None with Army.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: Zero. I already know that one.
22 Zero.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, I don't know that's
24 necessarily true.

25 DON WASTLER: Of all the military reservations that

1 are up to be transferred, how many has Base Realignment and
2 Closure successfully cleaned up and transferred without any
3 problems?

4 ERIC WAEHLING: It's never easy. Mike, do you have
5 a number?

6 MIKE NELSON: It's maybe deceiving, but portions of
7 bases -- portions of those bases have been transferred for
8 public or for commercial use.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Dozens actually.

10 MIKE NELSON: Not fence to fence, but portions of
11 those bases are in public hands.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Vancouver Barracks is an example.

13 IAN RAY: No UXO.

14 GREG JOHNSON: There's been a lot of BRAC transfers.

15 DON WASTLER: The reason I'm asking, for this early
16 transfer business, how much experience does Clark County have
17 with this kind of thing?

18 ERIC WAEHLING: They don't have any experience with
19 it.

20 DON WASTLER: FDR talked about changing horses in
21 the middle of the stream.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: I do know that the Navy -- there has
23 been a couple of Navy sites that have been transferred with
24 UXO under the BRAC program. I believe there's been one Army
25 installation early transfer.

1 DON WASTLER: I'm not talking about early transfer.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: Transfer, period?

3 DON WASTLER: I'm talking about a successful
4 transfer. Because it's an early transfer doesn't mean it's
5 going to be successful.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: No, I don't know how we can get
7 that.

8 GREG JOHNSON: I can add one thing to that that's
9 kind of pertinent. There's a funding matrix I have. I'd be
10 more than happy to e-mail it to anybody here. The only UXO
11 money actually right now is for BRAC. They're the only ones
12 getting any money pretty much.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: And some FUD sites.

14 DON WASTLER: I explained this to Eric. I've worked
15 on these government projects that have a deadline. When
16 people start getting in a big hurry, the quality of the
17 project falls, the safety of the people that are working on
18 the project goes down, sometimes people get hurt. I don't
19 know if it's a good idea to be rushing things.

20 GREG JOHNSON: I'll have to disagree on that one.
21 When this does happen, it's not going to affect that. We are
22 still going to hold Clark County to the same standards we
23 would hold the Army to. Ecology is the lead agency on this.
24 There won't be any shortcuts, I can guarantee you that. We
25 would not let that happen. They're going to be held to the

1 same standards. Their contractors are going -- we're going to
2 oversee the whole process, just like we would if it was Eric.
3 Whether it's Eric or whether it's Clark County, it's the same.

4 DON WASTLER: For Base Realignment and Closure, for
5 this whole process, they've offered this Restoration Advisory
6 Board, they've given us this opportunity, where in the past
7 Clark County, all they do is have some public meetings, and
8 that's the end of it. I don't think there's as close
9 communication with the community as Base Realignment and
10 Closure.

11 GREG JOHNSON: Maybe Jeroen can respond.

12 JEROEN KOK: I'll respond to a couple of Don's
13 questions and comments.

14 As far as Clark County having experience in early
15 transfer, obviously not. However, the County has contracted
16 with some consultants who do have experience, so they're being
17 advised by those consultants that do have that experience. So
18 they bought some experience.

19 If you're interested in detailed expenditures by
20 Clark County on Camp Bonneville or otherwise, specifically on
21 Camp Bonneville you can request those from the Department of
22 Public Works. I would suggest you ask directly Pete Capell,
23 if you're interested in those numbers.

24 As far as public involvement and outreach, I would
25 say that based on my experience in both Clark County and City

1 of Vancouver government, this current board of directors by
2 far exceeds any other governing body as far as making an extra
3 effort to involve the public, engage the public, ask them for
4 input on a number of different projects throughout the various
5 departments in County government.

6 DON WASTLER: Was there a board for the reuse plan,
7 a community board for the reuse plan?

8 JEROEN KOK: Yes, there was.

9 DON WASTLER: There was?

10 JEROEN KOK: I've got a copy of it. I'd be happy to
11 point to the sections.

12 DON WASTLER: I know there was a Friends of Camp
13 Bonneville. Some of these organizations have fallen through.

14 JEROEN KOK: There was a steering committee and
15 several subcommittees specific to different elements of the
16 reuse plan.

17 DON WASTLER: Thank you all very much.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: A question to what you just said.
19 When you say that Clark County hired consultants, when there
20 is no pre-existing transfers with UXO, the only thing the
21 Army's dealt with so far is near Sacramento. That is a base
22 that is in private hands, but it changed hands in the UXO area
23 in 1959 and 1964.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't agree. Mare Island in
25 California recently transferred property under the BRAC

1 program with UXO.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: What was that?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Mare Island.

4 GREG JOHNSON: M-a-r-e Island.

5 IAN RAY: M-a-r-e.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: If you know anything about
7 California, when it comes to environmental activism,
8 oversight, California is second to none.

9 JEROEN KOK: I will add that the consultant, one of
10 the consultants that the County hired, specifically worked on
11 that project.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: Worked on Mare?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Have we looked at the issue
15 of migration of ordnance like through erosion and frost
16 heaving?

17 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah, that's going to definitely be a
18 consideration, the frost line. It's going to be a big
19 consideration when we're designing the depth matrix.

20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Would that be erosion on the
21 slopes that aren't going to be checked thoroughly?

22 GREG JOHNSON: Well --

23 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: When I think of the issue, it
24 makes me think of a long-term issue. Why I'm concerned about
25 early transfer is that the Army, you know, severs all its ties

1 with the base. If we have migration underground, we have
2 migration from erosion, in 10 years it won't be addressed.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, I don't agree with that.
4 You're absolutely correct it is a long-term management issue.
5 As part of that long-term management, once everything is said
6 and done, you then set up something we call five-year review
7 periods. You actually start off with two years, go to three,
8 working your way to five years.

9 What the five-year review period is, it's a back
10 check. It's an opportunity for the regulators and Clark
11 County and the other folks to back check. They double-check
12 to make sure that your management strategies are properly
13 functioning.

14 So one of the things that will most likely be part
15 of that, they'll come out and do site inspections. They'll go
16 to areas of high erosion. They'll talk to the site managers
17 and will start identifying: Have there been responses to UXO
18 that has eroded out of a hillside or something that may have
19 shown up in a creek because it has eroded or washed into the
20 creek? If that starts to occur, that means your management
21 strategy isn't working, you need to modify it to be able to
22 accommodate that.

23 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: That is Army funded, those
24 two-, three-, five-year?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah. It's actually very standard.

1 Whether it's Army funded or whether it's funded as part of the
2 funds for operating the park, I can't tell you right now.

3 I do know that those five-year reviews are standard
4 procedure whether it's a landfill, whether it's Camp
5 Bonneville with our issues here, or whether it's a groundwater
6 plume. It's a standard thing that's described in MOTCA.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: If it's a park, besides the
8 impact area, just signs, I'm not talking about fences, those
9 items would probably -- they probably wouldn't have surfaced
10 to management, I would assume. If something was found in the
11 creek, do you think someone is going to bring it to management
12 unless it was a caretaker or something? I don't see that.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm not sure I understand.

14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Let me see how to put it.
15 I'm concerned about the long-term. I'm concerned -- I don't
16 know how to describe it.

17 JEROEN KOK: Are you saying if somebody runs across
18 something, that they would pocket it rather than report it to
19 the proper authorities?

20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I don't think anybody would
21 report that, honestly. Actually, for sure, because of how
22 valuable that piece would be amongst the people that grew up
23 here.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: You're concerned about souvenir
25 hunters?

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Yes. Then say something does
2 happen, someone gets hurt from one, the Army's not going to be
3 able to pay to go look at that slope all over again. That
4 would be the County, which would be out of money. You know
5 what I mean?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: That's not true. The Army
7 ultimately is always responsible for anything that we leave
8 behind, always. Under an early transfer scenario, under a
9 normal transfer scenario, the Army is ultimately responsible
10 for anything we leave behind.

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: It's different from what you
12 said last meeting.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: I've had a clarification on that
14 issue from talking to our attorneys, okay? Yes, under an
15 early transfer scenario, you'll hear people talk about
16 liability insurance, cost overrun insurance. Once everything
17 is said and done, even after all that is expended, my
18 understanding, what our attorneys tell us, is that still
19 ultimately the Army would be responsible, the Government would
20 be responsible.

21 Say the unimaginable happens, we find a nuclear
22 waste dump out there. Sounds preposterous.

23 JEROEN KOK: How about a different example?

24 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm choosing an illogically extreme
25 example, but it's still a valid point. If that were to

1 happen, all the monies that were part of the ESCA were
2 expended, and we bankrupted Lloyds of London, the Federal
3 Government is still responsible for coming back and taking
4 care of what's left. If Hanford II is identified here, the
5 government is still ultimately on the hook.

6 Actually, Frank is next.

7 FRANK FUNK: The horse people have ridden here for
8 many years. They told them, "If you're riding out here, run
9 across something, report it." They've done that. I know one
10 lady in particular found some practice shells, blue ones, off
11 to the side of the trail. She come back and told them. They
12 cleaned it up.

13 That's an education program that you put into
14 your -- that you build into your system, that if you're out
15 here, you run across something, if you find something, you
16 report it, they'll clean it up. It's an education.

17 IAN RAY: You're first.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: That's well-noted.

19 I think what I want to be clear on, though, since
20 you have talked with the attorneys, I'm assuming that what
21 you're referring to is new-found items, pretending in this
22 scenario of finding some nuclear waste or something, that
23 would be a new-found item. But in the case of frost heaving,
24 some of these other issues that are supposed to be developed
25 into the management plan.

1 I don't like this early transfer thing. I'd like to
2 go with what the RABs across the nation are calling it, and
3 that's "dirty transfer." In the idea of a dirty transfer,
4 Clark County has it. They've already been funded for this
5 five-year maintenance program. So five years out you have
6 frost heaving, and I don't know too much about that, about
7 what it will do, but that does become an issue.

8 My understanding is, because it's already been
9 discussed and premanaged, that will be Clark County and my
10 pocketbook, is that correct, not the Army?

11 ERIC WAEHLING: I can't comment on that. The
12 agreements have not been struck. The discussions haven't even
13 started yet. Ultimately what the business agreement between
14 the Army and Clark County is, if it were to happen, who would
15 end up paying for it, I can't comment.

16 I can comment that the problem would be addressed.
17 Ecology will make sure. That's why they're here. Ecology is
18 there to make sure that the plans are in place and that the
19 funding -- that Clark County is financially viable to be able
20 to support those plans to be able to address those.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I just want to have on the
22 record, I would ask Clark County not to take that risk, if you
23 can write something into your documents. I think our property
24 taxes are high enough, and I don't want to have some major
25 frost heaving problem or something like that happen, and I

1 don't want to pay for it, because we didn't do it. It's the
2 Army. They're trying to take action for that.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Greg.

4 GREG JOHNSON: The Army forever, for the remainder
5 of the time we're here on this planet, in this country, is
6 going to be responsible for taking care of the ordnance that's
7 found here. I mean, that's just the way it's going to be.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: The ultimate responsibility.

9 GREG JOHNSON: The ultimate responsibility. If
10 ordnance is found, they are going to have to come and take
11 care of it, or a contractor, hire a contractor to take care of
12 it. They're the responsible party that put it here, and
13 they're going to be the ones who are going to have to take
14 care of it.

15 Frost heaving and erosion are definitely a problem.
16 We would be crazy, any of us here, to think that things aren't
17 going to get found.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: No matter what we do.

19 GREG JOHNSON: No matter what we do, we're going to
20 find things. I just walked the creek the last two days. I
21 found stuff. There's stuff here. The erosion is going to
22 happen, frost heave is going to happen, and stuff is going to
23 come up. But we are going to hold the Army liable to take
24 care of the problem.

25 As Frank was saying, the institutional controls,

1 there's probably going to be some type of signs telling people
2 what to do if they do find stuff. When they do find it,
3 hopefully they're going to tell the right person.

4 But, you know, if you look at the big picture, this
5 whole thing, we're taking a military training area where they
6 used live ordnance designed to kill people and we're putting a
7 camp on top of it. There are going to be issues. We're just
8 going to have to do the best job we can with what we have to
9 address them.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: The signs and all that, that's only
11 one small component of an overall management plan. We're
12 still going to go into areas and remove them. We're going to
13 use areas where we're going to have fences, physical barriers.
14 The signage is only going to be in the areas where we have the
15 very lowest probability that there's going to be anything
16 there. That's not our first line of defense; that's our
17 backup to the backup plan.

18 So don't think that the Army is going to try to
19 skate out of here, put up a bunch of signs, saying it's good
20 to go. That's not at all what's going to happen here.
21 There's going to be a significant effort put towards removal,
22 then there will be fences, and then for those areas, like here
23 inside the cantonment area, there will be fences here, signs
24 here, saying, "If you find something that looks odd," or,
25 "Don't dig here. If you need to dig a hole, this is how you

1 need to go about doing it." Don't think that the signs are
2 the only thing that is going to happen.

3 Bruce.

4 BRUCE OVERBAY: In response to Christine's concern
5 on frost heave. Frost heave occurs basically in four to six
6 inches of the topsoil, not any deeper than that. You have
7 subfreezing temperatures, it warms up suddenly, freezes again
8 at night, then you will get that. Around here, we haven't had
9 that in 25 years.

10 As far as the ground cover is concerned, our ground
11 cover is going to eliminate a lot, except for what Greg is
12 talking about, the erosion. If we have a heavy rain, comes
13 through a small draw or valley, particularly our roads out
14 here, that's going to create more erosion than anything else
15 because that's where your major runoff is going to hit. Water
16 is going to the little gullies on the side.

17 As far as moving of any ordnances with frost heave,
18 that's going to be minimal, except for maybe by the creek
19 where you have open areas, and they will heave up, then fall
20 off of the bank, maybe expose. A concern, yes. As far as
21 movement, I don't think you're going to get very much at all.

22 I've lived in this area all my life. I've worked in
23 construction, in the dirt, 46 out of 54 of my years. I've
24 seen everything around here you can imagine. As far as our
25 frost heave is concerned, we don't get that much.

1 FRANK FUNK: You're right.

2 DON WASTLER: In regards to what he was saying about
3 walking the creek, every year when the water's low like this,
4 I walk our creek, and I make sure I pick up all the trash out
5 of there. Every year I find something else that wasn't there,
6 bottles that washed up, that take corks. Probably been in
7 there since the 1920s. I was sure I had it all cleaned up
8 before. This stuff just comes up from who knows where. I
9 think what he has a good point on, erosion and stuff will be
10 bringing stuff up for years to come.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

12 DON WASTLER: With what Christine was saying about
13 the property taxes, that's one thing that I'm concerned about
14 with this early transfer and one of the reasons why I'm here.

15 I watched my parents struggle trying to pay their
16 property taxes for over 40 years and battling with all the
17 little games that Clark County has thrown at them. To be
18 honest with you, I don't want Clark County anywhere near this
19 place. Seems like they're always coming up with some kind of
20 trick for something.

21 I was thinking about that today. I actually watched
22 my mother go into tears over property taxes in 1996, thinking
23 about some of the problems, things they've had to go through
24 just to keep themselves at a reasonable tax status over the
25 years. And after I've gone down and actually looked at the

1 laws, the whole battle, I don't have much faith in Clark
2 County really, to be honest with you.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to just say one more thing
4 about the erosional issue or any of the other issues. I think
5 this is why it's going to be important when you see a draft of
6 the RIFS document, which is equivalent to an EE/CA document
7 that you've heard us talk about, where there's a range of
8 options laid out, that you look out for these issues that
9 you're concerned about because that is going to be the
10 document where we spell out how we're going to manage things
11 that will include the review process.

12 It's important that those should be included in that
13 document. If there's other things you think of or are aware
14 of as you're reading it, we need to know about that. It will
15 also be available to the public for a formal public comment
16 process, as well as to the RAB.

17 FRANK FUNK: Progress updates?

18 ERIC WAEHLING: It is 8:00. It's been one hour.
19 Ian?

20 IAN RAY: Quickly, without discussion.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay.

22 IAN RAY: Yeses, nos.

23 Is there a hard copy of the August 2002 BCT meeting
24 available?

25 MIKE NELSON: We didn't have one.

1 ERIC WAEHLING: No meeting.

2 IAN RAY: Could Greg Johnson, on his new reports
3 that we're getting, tell us who the technical team members are
4 on your next report?

5 GREG JOHNSON: Sure.

6 IAN RAY: Also, this paragraph here where it says
7 the reason the first one-third is 50 meters, the area of
8 concern varies with the mortar range, that kind of thing, it's
9 very difficult to understand. I don't understand it. I
10 wonder if you could draw a picture for us next time.

11 GREG JOHNSON: Sure. I could do it real quick.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Maybe he can do it as part of the
13 progress update.

14 IAN RAY: That's it.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: We're one hour into this. This was
16 actually a great discussion. Do we want to take -- I'd like
17 to take a quick five-minute break.

18 FRANK FUNK: I want to get out of here. I'm not
19 going to stay for the open house planning because you don't
20 have anything to show anybody.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay.

22 FRANK FUNK: I'd like to go on with the progress
23 update.

24 GREG JOHNSON: Shall I explain that real quick?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

1 GREG JOHNSON: Just picture kind of the impact area
2 right here (indicating). Say it's this square right here,
3 these are the firing positions (indicating). The range of the
4 60-millimeter mortar is approximately 2,000 yards maximum
5 range. 2,000 yards comes to about right here (indicating),
6 that's from the firing points. We're assuming that the
7 60-millimeter mortars would be from here to here (indicating).
8 Now, the 81s have a range of roughly 3200 yards. That would
9 put them all the way over to the end and past. 105s, 155s,
10 way past that.

11 The transect spacing that the EPA wants to use in
12 their proposal is 50 meters based on 60-millimeter mortars.
13 Because they're smaller, they have a smaller signature for the
14 magnetometer. In the 50-meter spacing, they'd be a lot easier
15 to pick up than the 81s, which you could spread your spacing
16 out to a hundred acres.

17 But none of these are perfect options because the
18 other thing you've got to take into consideration is 25
19 degrees. Approximately I'd say a third or maybe a little bit
20 less of this impact area is going to be over 25 degrees.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Slope.

22 GREG JOHNSON: Right, slope.

23 Is it the best option? It's one of the options.
24 It's one of the options. It's a lot of money to spend for
25 what we're going to get out of it. A lot of this is going to

1 depend on the fence issue. Ecology wants the fence, wants a
2 bigger fence, and that's what we want.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Army wants a fence.

4 GREG JOHNSON: Army wants a fence.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: What that fence needs to look like
6 in the future remains to be seen. Clark County we understand
7 wants a fence. The issue isn't whether there's going to be a
8 fence. No matter what we do in that area, there's going to be
9 a fence of some sort.

10 GREG JOHNSON: It's probably going to be a new
11 fence.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Most likely. I mean, I don't know,
13 I can't tell you what it's going to look like now. Our
14 technology is not to the point that no matter what we do in
15 that central impact area, it's going to require a fence.

16 GREG JOHNSON: Short of complete remediation.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Even then.

18 GREG JOHNSON: Even if we did complete remediation
19 on this impact area, I would still -- would not tell anybody
20 in this room that there's not going to be UXO found out there.

21 JEROEN KOK: Can you define "complete remediation"?

22 GREG JOHNSON: That would be every square inch down
23 to 10 feet, including trees.

24 JEROEN KOK: Moonscape.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Gravel pit.

1 IAN RAY: Is harvesting timber going to be possible
2 if you don't do complete remediation?

3 GREG JOHNSON: I wouldn't harvest any of the timber
4 out of the impact area. Actually, I wouldn't harvest any of
5 the timber out of any of the demo areas either.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: The Army's position is that we don't
7 think harvesting timber is a viable source of revenue.

8 GREG JOHNSON: I've detected fragments.

9 IAN RAY: The reason I ask, the reuse plan depends
10 upon harvesting timber.

11 GREG JOHNSON: I think that's going to have to be
12 changed. I think there's maybe some timber here that can be
13 harvested. I would definitely say not here, and I would say
14 definitely, definitely not around any of the demo sites,
15 especially with what I've found in the last couple days.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Can I get a good description
17 of what might happen within 50 meters? You're going to look
18 in one area every 50 meters? Can you describe how that would
19 take place?

20 GREG JOHNSON: I don't draw very good.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: This is just one EPA proposal. It's
22 not necessarily the one.

23 GREG JOHNSON: This isn't necessarily what everybody
24 is going to agree on. EPA's consultants came up with this
25 idea. It's got holes in it that we've already noted. We're

1 just going to have to go back and forth until we decide what
2 we're going to do.

3 Say 50 meters here, like that (indicating). Say we
4 get past the range in the 60s, then we go to the hundred-meter
5 spacing. What's going to happen is a hydro-axe is going to
6 come in and they're going to cut a swath all the way through.
7 It's going to be nine foot wide. They're going to go another
8 50 meters, cut another swath (indicating). The entire area,
9 except for the 25 degrees, is going to have these swaths cut
10 in. They'll be 50 meters apart.

11 The geophysics are coming in with an EM-61, they're
12 going to carry that with a magnetometer through here
13 (indicating). Seeing how it is nine foot wide, in order to
14 optimize the data, they're going to go up and then back, then
15 back up so they can do three passes through there
16 (indicating). The 61 gets about three feet.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. That does nothing more than
18 give you an approximation of area. There's other ways that we
19 could go about that. You could save the money and default to
20 600 feet around each of the targets where you can calculate
21 statistically where 99% of the rounds should fall. That's
22 another option.

23 There's various approaches. This is just one of
24 them. Honestly, at this time I don't even know if it's one of
25 the higher candidates for characterization, considering the

1 future use of that portion of the property. That's not
2 clearance, that's just characterization.

3 Frank.

4 FRANK FUNK: How wide is 50 meters? You talked
5 about nine feet. How wide is 50 meters in feet?

6 GREG JOHNSON: It's 50 yards basically, 150 feet.
7 Basically what that would do here is you're going to have UXO
8 scattered here (indicating). You may find a couple things
9 here. What that is going to tell you is you need to come in
10 and do some more investigation. On the other hand, you may
11 miss the entire thing (indicating). Especially when you get
12 up into here, you may miss it. You may catch a corner of it.
13 If you do, then the idea is to try and chase it, do
14 remediation.

15 This is one proposal.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: When you're doing this work,
17 you're going to expand the search as needed, correct? If you
18 go -- if you're detecting ordnance outside of the fence line,
19 you're going to continue to search there?

20 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Now, you stated in the 37
22 millimeter, there's no way to really look for that, correct?

23 GREG JOHNSON: No, there is. The 37 millimeter,
24 you're talking -- this is one of the problems that I kind of
25 have with this. The 37 millimeter, you're going to need those

1 transects down to maybe 5, 10 meters. Then you're looking at
2 (indicating).

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: That's not feasible for this
4 project?

5 GREG JOHNSON: If you're going to do that, my
6 opinion would be just to clear-cut the entire area.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: If you don't even have a line
8 exactly on where the 37 millimeter are, a major portion of the
9 37 millimeter could be outside of the fence line because you
10 would expand the search as needed as you found the 37
11 millimeter, correct?

12 ERIC WAEHLING: But they're going to shoot at a
13 target.

14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: You don't know the target,
15 though.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: We do. We went out and looked for
17 them and we found targets out there.

18 GREG JOHNSON: We have defined targets areas.
19 There's one here, one here, one here (indicating). When you
20 say that, with the 37, you'd have to say it with everything.
21 It would have been the 105s. The 37 millimeter will go
22 approximately 5,000 yards. The 37 millimeter, it would be the
23 same as the 105s and 155s. The 37 millimeter would cover this
24 entire area. Then again, we have 75s, 76s.

25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Aren't those really big?

1 GREG JOHNSON: 76s aren't that big. They're exactly
2 three inches, three inch round. 76 are basically the same
3 thing. A 37, you have different versions. You have an
4 anti-aircraft version, then you have the anti-tank version.
5 They aren't interchangeable. The anti-aircraft one will go
6 15,000.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: It's a high velocity because it's
8 designed to get altitude.

9 GREG JOHNSON: The 37 millimeter standard anti-tank
10 round will go 5,000 yards, about three miles.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: They're not going to remediate 37
12 mm's?

13 GREG JOHNSON: I'm not saying that. All I'm saying
14 is for this proposal, if we went to look for 37 millimeters,
15 we would be -- I mean, five yards is about that much
16 (indicating).

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Again, this isn't remediation. This
18 is just characterization. This is the step before
19 remediation. It's: Are you better off saving your money and
20 actually applying it to remediation rather than using it?
21 It's nothing more than another study.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: I see what you're saying.

23 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Okay.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: The Army, we want to spend our money
25 and effort on actually cleaning something up instead of

1 continuing to study.

2 GREG JOHNSON: The other think was the Army's
3 proposed 600-foot grids and geophysics also.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

5 GREG JOHNSON: The other plan was to do nothing, put
6 up the fence, wait for technology to catch up.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: I have to say, this is really --
8 we're getting way ahead of ourselves in part of these
9 discussions in that these are the discussions that are fleshed
10 out in the RFS document. What's happening is we're getting
11 confused. When we're talking about transects for
12 characterization, it's just a study, it's another study. When
13 we're talking about some of these other proposals, such as the
14 boxes, we're actually talking about remediation, going in
15 there with the intent to remove it.

16 GREG JOHNSON: We reached an impasse. You know, the
17 Level 1 screening, we put all that time and effort into it.
18 When we finally got to the very end of it, it was determined
19 by some of the people on the technical team that the impact
20 area, the way the Army had characterized the target areas,
21 wasn't good enough. So now we're at an area -- at an impasse.

22 What the impasse consists of is the Army wanted to
23 call these target areas (indicating), okay? Others wanted to
24 call this whole thing a target area (indicating). The Army's
25 proposal, everything other than these target areas, would be

1 range safety fans, which would go straight to a feasibility
2 study.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Meaning we would evaluate our
4 options that are available to us.

5 GREG JOHNSON: Basically what it would come down to
6 would be a fence, in my outlook.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. But within that document for
8 that area, we would evaluate everything from the 10-foot
9 removal to do nothing and options in between. That's what you
10 would see in the document, are different versions of what Greg
11 is talking about here.

12 GREG JOHNSON: This goes the other way. What would
13 happen is the geophysics would be there, and this would be a
14 target area (indicating). Target areas go to site
15 characterization, so site characterizations in Camp
16 Bonneville, like I've said before, usually means or will mean
17 a hundred percent geophysics.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: Which is functionally the same thing
19 as a clearance. I'm a little passionate, I apologize. That's
20 because I'm enthusiastic about this stuff.

21 GREG JOHNSON: He has a version, we have a version,
22 EPA has a version, and probably Clark County, when they hire
23 their consultant, is going to have a version. That is what I
24 would like to do, is kind of wait for Clark County to get
25 their consultant on board and then we'll put these all in a

1 folder. When the decision gets made, I can assure you I'm not
2 going to be in the room. It's probably going to be like
3 Governor Locke.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: Greg, no, that's not true. You will
5 be in the room. You are one of the instrumental people from
6 the Department of Ecology for the recommendation we'll send
7 forward.

8 GREG JOHNSON: Before the Governor decides, he turns
9 it over to Clark County. They decide if they're going to take
10 it. It will come down to, "What are we going to do?"

11 ERIC WAEHLING: I think it's important that
12 everybody understands that the recommendations that will go
13 forward to the ultimate decision makers are from people in
14 this room: Greg and myself, and you all. That's why we're
15 here talking to you.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: Can I just stress to you fellows,
17 you need to understand that there is this group, and there is
18 even a larger group of residents out here, that are extremely
19 nervous about the idea of a dirty transfer to Clark County
20 with UXO. I mean, we are like a cat on a hot tin roof with
21 the idea of transferring this place dirty with UXO.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: Not characterized well enough maybe
24 outside the fenced area up there. People are nervous about
25 that.

1 I did not realize that there is a difference between
2 characterization and remediation. I thought one led to the
3 other, same basket. So if you can kind of clarify, we're just
4 talking about characterization, we're trying to keep our --
5 spend less on that because we want to have more for
6 remediation, let us know when you're making those changes
7 because I'm not following.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: It's hard sometimes. I understand.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: I'm assuming it's all part of the
10 remediation issue, as well.

11 GREG JOHNSON: Site characterization, in essence,
12 it's a study.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: It's a study.

14 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah, it's a study.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: It does lead to remediation. It's a
16 step along the way.

17 GREG JOHNSON: Say we were to use the geophysics, we
18 did find something here, we did further investigation, found
19 more, then that area would be remediated. I have a hard time
20 understanding this stuff, I really do. There's so many
21 different terms for it.

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Considering the history of
23 Camp Bonneville, I'm surprised that we would just pick a few
24 targets. I know that --

25 ERIC WAEHLING: We're not just picking a few

1 targets. We went out and looked. Greg actually has gone out
2 and double-checked where we looked.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The history of the site,
4 clearly with the neighbors, it's shown there's been --

5 ERIC WAEHLING: -- change over time?

6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Yes. With foreign
7 militaries, how could we be sure on picking some of the visual
8 targets in 2002?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: You know, we can't.

10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How is that still on the
11 board?

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Again, think of this as an onion.
13 It's multi-layers of management that need to occur. You're
14 right, there's been change over history. This place has been
15 used since 1911.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I understand.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: We're going to do the best we can
18 with what we know today, and that's how we make the decision.
19 As another layer of safety, that's why you have these
20 management institutional controls to provide another layer of
21 safety. That's why you clear areas where you're going to have
22 a lot of people. Another layer of safety. That's why you
23 have these five-year interim reviews so if you start running
24 into things we didn't know about, we have a mechanism to
25 address that so we come back and address it, make sure people

1 are safe and continue to be safe.

2 I don't want to cut this discussion short because
3 this is really good. It's 8:20. There's been some efforts
4 ongoing. We walked Lacamas Creek today, as a matter of fact.
5 I know Greg has some photographs he might want to share maybe
6 afterwards for people who are interested.

7 GREG JOHNSON: I haven't developed them yet.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: I meant what you have in your hand.

9 GREG JOHNSON: I was going to point out to
10 Christine, you're correct, a lot of things have changed.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Maybe you can show them the study.

12 GREG JOHNSON: This is basically how they determine
13 target areas. They go through these old photographs. These
14 are 1974, we have some '63s, on and on and on, talking to
15 people. What they come up with is basically what they have.
16 That's how they determine it.

17 You know, yes, they could miss target areas. That
18 could happen.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: As Ecology, are you comfortable
20 that the Army or the Corps and nobody has contacted the
21 foreign militaries that have been historically here? Are you
22 guys comfortable with the fact that nobody's contacted them?

23 GREG JOHNSON: I don't know what we'd get from that.

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Are there clear guidelines of
25 the impact area that have followed the site? I've read the

1 Archive Search Report, and I don't see any clear guidelines of
2 where the impact area would be. If you found something in the
3 creek, you would consider the creek --

4 ERIC WAEHLING: The creek is over by the demolition
5 site.

6 GREG JOHNSON: Actually, I have something here.

7 FRANK FUNK: I spent 21 months, 10 days in the
8 military, artillery. The military never did put us in an
9 unsafe position in an area like that, except in combat area.
10 In combat area, there's mine fields and stuff. In practice
11 areas like here, they don't leave live mines. They may
12 practice with some dummies with a cap in them, but they do not
13 put live mines out there, leave them out there for somebody to
14 step on and blow themselves up. This is a base where they
15 trained people; it's not a base where they blow people up.

16 As far as the impact area is concerned, yes, they
17 did shoot live shells out there. 105 outfit, shoot seven
18 miles, clear across this place twice. But they cut charges
19 and can shoot in a short distance. They shoot high angle like
20 a mortar. They were hitting that target area, that main
21 impact area.

22 You can have some shells there, true, but they do
23 not -- the military walks all over this place. Today they
24 would take military people and send them all over this place.
25 They never have, to my knowledge, as we've been through this,

1 had a GI blown up or hurt due to a shell out here.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: No.

3 FRANK FUNK: UXO, yes, we're concerned. Yes, we
4 should be concerned. But when we get into this thing, it
5 should be cleaned up as it should be - satisfactorily, yes.
6 We worry a lot about some things, and we should worry, but we
7 don't have to overkill the worry.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: We're talking about trained
9 personnel and people that have been through boot camp. I'm
10 talking about my soon-to-be teenage kids that might be
11 renegades running through this place.

12 FRANK FUNK: Did you ever see a soldier go out here,
13 they run through this stuff, do everything, with the pup
14 tents, they go with their knife, cut the other guy's tent, run
15 off into the brush. They do that screwy stuff, too, you know.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to say this site has an
17 80-year history of the public accessing it, Girl Scout camps,
18 Boy Scout camps, school groups, people hiking out here.

19 VALERIE LANE: Poachers.

20 FRANK FUNK: Horsers.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: There's a long history of public
22 access.

23 VALERIE LANE: They ran cattle over here after World
24 War II.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: There's a long history, and there's

1 never been an incident of anybody being hurt. Now, we can't
2 rely on that. Anything we do is going to make it better.

3 IAN RAY: Right.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: That's why we need to do these
5 management structures.

6 Thank you, Frank. I just have a quick question for
7 somebody who shot artillery. Did they ever have you shoot
8 willy-nilly or was there always something to shoot at?

9 FRANK FUNK: We had an elevation and deflection
10 every time.

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Did you have a target every
12 time?

13 FRANK FUNK: Yes. You didn't shoot at random, set
14 it up, pull the lanyard, go off into the blue sky somewhere.
15 You were instructed from fire direction what your coordinates
16 were, your deflection and elevation. You set it on that.
17 When you first were learning, they had people checking you.
18 But when you were in Korea, they didn't have a supervisor
19 there, an instructor watching you.

20 I was a sergeant first. I had one of those Howitzer
21 units. They give us a deflection of 2800. We set the
22 deflection, that's moving the tube this way, the elevation is
23 this way (indicating). If they gave you 850, you elevated.
24 They said elevation, deflection.

25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: During your training?

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Highly controlled.

2 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Highly controlled. But was
3 it a certain area you shot at every time, a pinpointed area
4 that you shot at every time, during your exercises?

5 FRANK FUNK: When you came into a position, I don't
6 remember what they called them, the stakes, and they also had
7 a flashlight on them for night use, a little light that would
8 come on. You sited your Howitzer in on those stakes. Your
9 deflection was in between those. You had 2800 degrees
10 deflection. If they said 1500 left, you went 1500 left.

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Every day was your - I don't
12 know the words.

13 FRANK FUNK: You may not change your position for a
14 week. You might have the same area, fan, that you're shooting
15 from for a week.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: But it wouldn't be for the
17 entire training session?

18 FRANK FUNK: Or you might move three times a day.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: You go to various firing points
20 which we identified. They have those surveyed and marked so
21 they can calculate the coordinates.

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Same target?

23 FRANK FUNK: No. You have many targets in this fan.

24 MIKE NELSON: In the impact area.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Within the impact area.

1 FRANK FUNK: To give you an illustration, in
2 Korea --

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: He just talked about a couple
4 targets.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: That was just illustrative. We know
6 of seven target areas.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: He said he could change three
8 times in one day.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Different targets.

10 FRANK FUNK: We would go to a different location,
11 set up, but the fan changes.

12 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Then your fan changes?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: They shoot at the same area. They
14 might shoot from over here to the central impact area.

15 FRANK FUNK: Frontline might change.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: That's combat. Different than what
17 would have occurred here.

18 FRANK FUNK: Yeah.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: They might be in that firing point,
20 shoot in the central impact area, then move over here and
21 shoot into the central impact area.

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Correct me if I'm wrong, but
23 they wouldn't -- for 80 years they've been here, they wouldn't
24 have seven targets that they've been shooting at?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: No. But within that central area.

1 GREG JOHNSON: Within the impact area, the targets
2 could have changed a lot of times.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: And did.

4 GREG JOHNSON: There could be ones they haven't
5 found yet, I would say. That's my opinion. There could be
6 ones that there were there, bulldozed over. That's why it's
7 important, I believe, that the impact area be denied access to
8 the public.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. That's why there needs to be
10 a fence, because it did change over time.

11 This is good discussion, but we also need to bring
12 you up to speed on some of the other things we've been doing.
13 Greg mentioned, perhaps Mike and Greg jointly can discuss it
14 because I wasn't part of it, today they walked Lacamas Creek,
15 low water. They were looking for the emergence of bedrock,
16 but at the same time Greg found some other stuff that's worth
17 talking about.

18 MIKE NELSON: Do you want to do that now or take a
19 break?

20 We do have the contractor back on-site that's been
21 doing the well work, the groundwater investigation,
22 Landfill 4. He came on Monday, and he put a new well in down
23 near the creek, the lower part, at the landfill. Also we have
24 an area that we plan to put two additional wells in, which are
25 south/southwest of the landfill, obtain some samples from

1 them.

2 As the contractor does his work, he's escorted into
3 these sites because there's a situation where we know there
4 may be scrap ordnance, kinds of ordnance. The contractors
5 escorted into that site found the intended position for that
6 well did have what we call anomalies as he walked himself in
7 there. What we did, "Contractor, back away from that well
8 until we have a chance to clear a corridor into that site
9 prior to you coming in with your equipment and putting those
10 wells in." That's where we are with those two wells.

11 Also the other task we have is to walk Lacamas Creek
12 from the bridge you saw down here all the way up to the
13 landfill area. It's about a half a mile walking that creek.
14 We did that this morning and this afternoon.

15 As we walked that creek we would begin to see the
16 bedrock emerging either in the floor of the creek or on the
17 side of that creek. We can use that as a point where we may
18 be able to sample the seeps coming out of that, seeing if that
19 contamination is flowing on top of that bedrock and exiting
20 that weathered zone along the creek.

21 We did find some bedrock areas. Those have been
22 mapped. We'll go back and see if there's areas we can go back
23 into and do some sampling of those seeps when the water flows
24 again.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: It was too dry for any of those

1 seeps?

2 MIKE NELSON: We found the bedrock, but it may be in
3 a location that we can go back in and sample those seeps. The
4 concern is, the seeps will flow when the water is high in the
5 creek, how are you going to get a sampler in there to sample
6 those seeps? That's an issue we have to work out. That was
7 done today. We found the areas that we believe are potential
8 seep sites. Greg skirted up and down that creek bed today.
9 Bless his heart, he had a bunch of tag-alongs that struggled,
10 stepped in holes and got our boots full of water, fell over in
11 the creek. But we made it half a mile up and back.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: Have you considered then sampling
13 where you think the seep is and then the water levels,
14 sampling the soil right at that point?

15 MIKE NELSON: That's a possibility to sample that
16 soil. What we're finding is where that seep is occurring,
17 it's down near the creek bed itself. So if you did have soil
18 coming from the seep, becoming contaminated, when the water is
19 high, that would be flushed.

20 There's a possibility -- we need to find out during
21 high water where is the seep actually flowing, then we can go
22 back in there when the water is low again and possibly sample
23 that soil.

24 IAN RAY: There's your famous cross-section.

25 MIKE NELSON: Yes.

1 IAN RAY: Landfill 4. The bedrock is down here
2 (indicating).

3 MIKE NELSON: Yes, sir.

4 IAN RAY: You say you found the places where this
5 bedrock exits at the creek?

6 MIKE NELSON: We found where the floor of the creek
7 does have bedrock existing on it. It appeared to be quite a
8 ways downstream from the landfill. We took measurements as we
9 walked our way back down the creek to determine where are
10 those. We have to go back and do some mapping to see, are
11 those bedrock floors in that creek consistent with where we
12 expect to see this bedrock daylighting, coming out of the
13 landfill. It may be the same location.

14 IAN RAY: Even without seeps oozing out the creek
15 banks, if you see bedrock, couldn't you check the soil on top
16 of the bedrock to see if this stuff here from Landfill 4 is
17 traveling along the top of the bedrock?

18 MIKE NELSON: Eventually we can.

19 IAN RAY: When would you do that?

20 MIKE NELSON: When the water becomes high again.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Ian is asking to test the soil, not
22 the water.

23 IAN RAY: Before you get water out there because
24 there has been water seeping out already. If it has this gunk
25 in it, it will have left the residue in the soil. Can you

1 test the soil now? Does it make any sense?

2 ERIC WAEHLING: The question, Ian, we need to ask a
3 chemist, it's an excellent question: Would any material that
4 is dissolved into the groundwater leave residue behind on the
5 soil? I can't answer that question. We should certainly ask
6 that of a chemist to see if it's worthwhile.

7 MIKE NELSON: It also depends how far downstream
8 from the landfill did we find that bedrock. Is it so far
9 downstream that it wouldn't have a connection between the
10 landfill and the bedrock that we found in that creek bed
11 downstream?

12 We're still mapping it out to see where it is in
13 relation to the landfill. I think if it's in an area that's
14 close to the landfill, it would be a good candidate for going
15 in there and doing some soil sampling now. We could find out
16 from the chemist if it's a possibility.

17 KAREN KINGSTON: Especially for ammonium
18 perchlorate, it sinks. The speeds they're noting it at other
19 bases is horrendous. Once it gets down there, it's moving
20 several feet a month.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: It moves at the same rate, a rate
22 proportionate to the groundwater. If they happen to be in an
23 area where the groundwater moves quickly, it would also move
24 quickly.

25 We have an area where it's moving at 10 feet per

1 year, 10 to 60 feet per year is our estimate.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: Where these seeps are?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: The soil types at Landfill 4, in the
4 weathered bedrock.

5 MIKE NELSON: It's a very slow movement of that
6 area.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: That's in our favor then.

8 MIKE NELSON: It is.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Oh, yeah.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Have you seen any of the maps down
11 at Public Works, the old map, not Mundorf, the fellow that
12 used to come out here and map the Troutdale aquifer on his
13 vacations, he came out here and did it? Mundorf didn't like
14 it because he was doing it on his vacations.

15 MIKE NELSON: Is this the USGS folks?

16 KAREN KINGSTON: Dan Snyder is USGS, excuse me.

17 MIKE NELSON: We talked to Rod and Dan.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: Have you seen Rod's maps, that old
19 1954 map?

20 MIKE NELSON: I'll look and see. We have a bunch of
21 their maps. I'll see if we have the '54 map.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: I don't know that he copied it.
23 It's that old map that he has.

24 MIKE NELSON: That is Rod?

25 KAREN KINGSTON: Rod Swanson. Remind him, he gave

1 me a piece of it. He'll remember. I have a piece of it.

2 IAN RAY: Talking about the flow of groundwater,
3 there were some slug tests that were going to be run many,
4 many meetings ago. We never heard anything about slug tests.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: That's how we were able to calculate
6 the flow rates through the soil.

7 IAN RAY: Has that been done?

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

9 IAN RAY: What's the rate of flow?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: They calculated the estimated rate
11 of flow between 10 and --

12 MIKE NELSON: Let me get the exact figures for you.
13 It is a very slow flow rate. Let me get that information.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: I believe it's between 10 and 70
15 feet per year.

16 MIKE NELSON: We have the exact figures.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: What is the estimated
18 application of the perchlorates and RDX?

19 ERIC WAEHLING: What do you mean, what potential
20 loading might be?

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Yes.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: We don't know. How much might be
23 there?

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: No. What year is the
25 possible earliest date?

1 ERIC WAEHLING: We don't know. We don't know that
2 answer.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Before the '50s?

4 ERIC WAEHLING: Probably not before the '50s because
5 ammonium perchlorate wasn't used then.

6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I didn't know what the
7 history was on that.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: We don't know specifically when it
9 was left there. Probably over time as they've used that as a
10 demo site.

11 Any other questions about Lacamas Creek and the walk
12 up Lacamas? Greg, do you have anything you want to share with
13 folks about the Lacamas Creek effort?

14 GREG JOHNSON: The things I was passing around,
15 that's some of the OE scrap that was out there. BDU-33,
16 RDX-76, an air drop bomb. It's a simulator. They use it to
17 simulate what a MK80 series bomb will do. It's about that
18 long (indicating). It has a CXU spotting charge in it. But
19 it wasn't dropped. I want to stress that. It wasn't air
20 dropped. They were brought over to Demo 4 and disposed of.
21 These were all kick-outs from Demo 4.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: They weren't actually in the creek,
23 were they?

24 GREG JOHNSON: No, I didn't find these in the creek.
25 But if you were to draw a circle, they would cover the creek.

1 Actually, I did find some stuff in the creek on the way back.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: Did you?

3 GREG JOHNSON: Yes. I found a spring, which wasn't
4 UXO, but what it was was something somebody put on a shot, got
5 ejected.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Thrown.

7 GREG JOHNSON: I found a red smoke grenade on the
8 creek bank. I wasn't looking.

9 Anyway, I think this has ended up -- we have -- I
10 think it's a little bit further than what we originally
11 anticipated, I would have to say. The UXB grids they did, how
12 many were there, Mike? They did a surface clearance. Let me
13 draw you a quick picture of that, too.

14 MIKE NELSON: This was done in preparation for soil
15 sampling.

16 GREG JOHNSON: This is the demo area. It's about
17 like this where the UXB had done surface clearance grids
18 several years ago (indicating). These are hundred-foot grids.
19 Where I found this stuff was 150 feet past here (indicating).

20 Here is the main road. We were trying to go in
21 where the well is. The creek goes right through (indicating).
22 If you look at this as a radius from the center point, it's
23 definitely going to cover that. That's where I was going with
24 the timber, too.

25 This timber all through here, I wouldn't touch it

1 (indicating).

2 ERIC WAEHLING: The thinking is currently that the
3 UXO scrap you're seeing was ejected as part of operations?

4 GREG JOHNSON: Yes. None of the stuff I found was
5 fired. It was stuff that was put on disposal shots, wherever
6 they were through here, and subsequently when the explosion
7 happened they were thrown. I believe you probably have
8 several hundred more feet here before we stop seeing it
9 (indicating).

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Stuff goes a long way.

11 GREG JOHNSON: When they start doing this removal
12 action here, the Army has said they're going to chase it.
13 They're probably going to have to chase it, chase it, chase it
14 (indicating).

15 The Corps is trying to get a contractor to come in,
16 build a road, UXO cleared first, then build a road so they can
17 go in and put the well in.

18 MIKE NELSON: Not UXO, but scrap material.

19 GREG JOHNSON: Okay.

20 MIKE NELSON: You have to be careful. We haven't
21 found any UXO in there. It's scrap.

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: But the potential is there?

23 GREG JOHNSON: OE scrap.

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The potential is there for
25 only scrap?

1 ERIC WAEHLING: When you start finding scrap, you
2 always have the concern there might be UXO. That's why you
3 need to do the clearance.

4 GREG JOHNSON: This is a 37 millimeter (indicating).
5 This is how they come together. Usually they come apart in
6 three distinct pieces. That's what they're kind of designed
7 to do.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: What age is that about?

9 GREG JOHNSON: I couldn't say. I don't have a
10 guess.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Do they still use them?

12 GREG JOHNSON: I believe they do.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: That's the size shell that killed
14 those boys?

15 GREG JOHNSON: Yes. I believe the one on east
16 coast was MMR. I think it's in New Jersey is where it
17 happened. This shell has probably killed more people UXO-wise
18 than any other ones I know about.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: They found it in a tree and used a
20 wedge.

21 GREG JOHNSON: This is a frag that looks like it's
22 from a mortar thinner case. I can't be positive on that.
23 This is a grenade spoon. We also found a conical nose plug
24 for a MK80 series bomb out there.

25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: All that information, is that

1 in line with what you have as being taken to that landfill?

2 GREG JOHNSON: It follows -- all the ordnance in
3 Appendix H for the Camp Bonneville work files, it follows
4 that, with the exception of the MK80 series nose plug. The
5 MK80 series bombs came out in the '60s. They're a low drag.
6 Same ones they use today. Usually, the conical nose plug goes
7 in the front for a wind deflection because there's a fuse
8 well, then they use a base detonating fuse in those.

9 It probably means they brought MK80 series bombs up
10 there and detonated them.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: The Air Force.

12 GREG JOHNSON: Or the Navy. They brought the stuff
13 down here and blew it up. I wasn't expecting to find those.
14 There will be more stuff we aren't expecting here.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: There was not a BCT meeting in
16 August. There is actually not one scheduled for September
17 either, although we are always in contact with one another.
18 There's not a formal meeting.

19 As I mentioned earlier, discussions between Ecology
20 and the Army relative to the Agreed Order are ongoing. We've
21 had two so far. A third one is scheduled for later on in the
22 month.

23 From my perspective, this is unfair because Greg
24 hasn't been part of those meetings, but I think those
25 discussions are going well. We're largely in agreement with

1 what needs to happen on the ground, physically what needs to
2 happen. There are some disagreements as far as
3 jurisdictional, legal-eagle disagreements that attorneys are
4 squabbling over. I'm frankly not part of that.

5 I would say, as far as the team goes, Barry and Greg
6 and myself, Ben Forson, we're all along the same lines of
7 thinking about what needs to happen on the ground. Each one
8 of us has our own version of it, but we're generally going in
9 the same direction. That's where we are with that.

10 Please, I encourage you to query Ecology for their
11 version. I'm hesitant to say anything since they're not here,
12 Barry is not here.

13 I'm really energized and scrambling to try to get
14 things moving at this site. I really, really want to get the
15 perimeter wells in the ground this year. I want to get the
16 groundwater wells around the two demo sites in the ground this
17 year. My window is closing, but my highly motivated team is
18 scrambling to do this because that's an important issue, as
19 well as the soil sampling for the ranges needs to happen as
20 well.

21 The window of opportunity for getting wells in the
22 ground is quickly closing. When the ground becomes saturated,
23 we can't bring our heavy equipment in. We're scrambling.

24 Ecology is bending over backwards to support us in
25 that effort. Ecology is doing very quick turnarounds on

1 review of documents, helping us. For example, I asked Ecology
2 to help us locate and define -- come to agreement on the
3 discussion of the location and the construction of the wells
4 ahead of time so that if we have issues of chemistry, how the
5 labs are going to do their work, we can resolve that
6 independent from where we're going to put these wells. So
7 Ecology is really helping us out.

8 I want to formally in front of everybody thank
9 Ecology for their assistance in helping the Army get work
10 done. Ecology is very motivated to see things done, as is the
11 Army.

12 IAN RAY: If you get the equipment in there in the
13 dry season, can you leave it there when it's raining?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Probably not because we need to get
15 it out.

16 IAN RAY: It starts raining in about another two or
17 three weeks.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: That's why we're scrambling to do it
19 before it starts raining.

20 DON WASTLER: I've seen equipment sink to the axles
21 just from the weight.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: I understand that. We're trying to
23 locate them on existing roads.

24 DON WASTLER: Right from the weight of the vehicle.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: I understand. It would require

1 construction of roads, things like that. I can't guarantee
2 that we're going to beat the weather, but we're racing to try
3 to do just that. Maybe we'll be lucky and the rains will come
4 a little late. We are on borrowed time.

5 From a progress point of view, that's it in a
6 nutshell. A lot of people have been working really hard.

7 GREG JOHNSON: You might want to tell them briefly
8 about the reconnaissance work.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: That's upcoming?

10 GREG JOHNSON: That's upcoming. That's probably
11 going to happen before the next time we meet.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Let's hope so.

13 GREG JOHNSON: You can tell everybody why they're
14 doing it.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: As part of the ongoing discussions
16 we've had in the past with folks, you're familiar with the
17 reconnaissance effort we did last year, where we had the folks
18 come out and they walked transects?

19 GREG JOHNSON: That's where we found the AOPCs,
20 firing points, that's where they determined all that stuff for
21 the Level 1.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: The BCT asked of the Army, I agree,
23 I think it's prudent, for the areas where we anticipate the
24 most number of people going to be there, basically west of
25 this Lacamas Creek area here, we wanted to make doubly sure we

1 didn't miss anything. They asked us to come back and do
2 additional reconnaissance through that whole area. It's going
3 to be about 800 to 1,000 acres additional.

4 We don't necessarily have any reason to suspect
5 there's areas we missed, but we want to make doubly sure
6 because these are going to be the areas where we expect to
7 have a lot of people. That's the tent areas, the educational
8 areas around the buildings. We're going to come back and do
9 additional reconnaissance.

10 What we're doing is we're modifying the work plan we
11 had worked up for the previous effort to encompass those areas
12 and also there's a few lessons learned after having done it
13 the first time that we're going to incorporate, as well.

14 We expect to have those to the Department of
15 Ecology, submitted to them, the work plans to do that work, by
16 September 18th, 19th, which is the week after next.

17 BRUCE OVERBAY: Next week.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: Next week. As soon as we can get
19 approval from Ecology to do that work, we're going to be out
20 in the field starting that work, doing the reconnaissance work
21 through that.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: The reconnaissance is for
23 characterization?

24 ERIC WAEHLING: It's for characterization.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: Thank you.

1 ERIC WAEHLING: It's a study.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: All right.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: It's not a clearance. Again, that's
4 another example, Ecology has committed to helping us turn that
5 around. Legally Ecology is entitled to at least 30 days to
6 review a document and provide response back to the Army.
7 Ecology has committed -- Ecology wants to see this move
8 forward. They're trying to be much quicker than that in
9 getting that review and comments back to us. That helps us
10 get people in the field, try and keep things moving. A lot of
11 people on the whole team are working hard to see this happen.

12 GREG JOHNSON: We're going to start a new strategy
13 at Ecology as far as the Bonneville thing goes. We're going
14 to be a little more aggressive on it. We want to see this get
15 done. We're getting a little tired of the lags that are
16 starting to follow. We've got I believe five people now on
17 the team.

18 I don't want anybody to be under the impression
19 we're rushing anything. We have the resources to do this.
20 We're getting tired of the seven weeks of nothing happening,
21 stuff like that. We want to start getting in there, getting
22 it cleaned up as best we can.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: As is the Army.

24 GREG JOHNSON: As is the Army.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: I think that's it in a nutshell. By

1 my watch it's six minutes to nine.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: I have one issue. The ITRC, the
3 very last UXO training course that they're giving is December
4 10th and 11th. I think we've talked about it. Norvell talked
5 about it and whatnot.

6 I would like to attend. I don't know who all I need
7 to get --

8 ERIC WAEHLING: The question is you want to attend
9 as a representative of this RAB rather than representing
10 yourself?

11 KAREN KINGSTON: I'm representing myself, but I'm
12 going, then coming back and give the community RAB members a
13 briefing of everything, of what I learned there, or come back
14 with handouts, share it with you. There's more next year.
15 There's one in Orlando.

16 BUD VAN CLEVE: Where is it?

17 KAREN KINGSTON: Monterey.

18 BUD VAN CLEVE: Not a bad spot to go. Beats
19 Seattle.

20 KAREN KINGSTON: Do I need an approval? I want to
21 make sure I don't have anybody kicking along the way.

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I'm interested in going. I
23 don't know how many representatives you can send.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: Two or three.

25 GREG JOHNSON: How many did they say last time?

1 KAREN KINGSTON: Last time they said four.

2 JEROEN KOK: But that was to Seattle.

3 IAN RAY: Is that an ITRC thing?

4 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.

5 IAN RAY: Same as before.

6 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.

7 BUD VAN CLEVE: We can send four people?

8 KAREN KINGSTON: I don't know.

9 GREG JOHNSON: Request five or six.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: I contacted the ITRC to see if

11 there was a scholarship available and whatnot. They said yes.

12 I said, "Okay, put my name on it until further notice."

13 BUD VAN CLEVE: Find out how many people they will

14 pay for.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: Go on the web site, go on the ITRC.

16 Just click on ITRC. It will take you right to their website.

17 Stacy Kingsberry is the contact. Her number is listed on

18 there as a contact. If you want to make arrangements, then

19 jump on.

20 Do we need --

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How many spots did you

22 reserve?

23 KAREN KINGSTON: I didn't reserve any.

24 GREG JOHNSON: Actually they have an application on

25 there. If you fill out the application, they'll e-mail it

1 back and let you know whether you've been accepted.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes, exactly, because you want to
3 be able to go on a Department of Defense or the Western States
4 Governors Association, you want somebody to give you a
5 scholarship, so you have to apply. I applied. I can take my
6 name off, but I'd like to go.

7 GREG JOHNSON: Can't you go as RAB members?

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Yeah, yeah. What do I do, Ian?

9 IAN RAY: There are only two RAB members who don't
10 know this, and that's Frank Funk and Robert Frohs. All we
11 have to do is give them the opportunity and everybody sign up.

12 JEROEN KOK: Who pays for the RAB members to go to
13 that training?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: That would have to be the ITRC.

15 JEROEN KOK: It doesn't come out of the Army?

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Not directly.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I'm interested in going. The
18 only way I can go, I have two young children, I need to get a
19 lot organized for a two-day conference. Is there a way I can
20 get an acknowledgment to go? What kind of process would I
21 need?

22 IAN RAY: As far as I'm concerned, you can go.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: If I was missing and Bud was going
24 to go in April or something like that, I would expect you guys
25 would all vote whether I was here or not.

1 BUD VAN CLEVE: I think personally you two should
2 go.

3 IAN RAY: I do, too.

4 BUD VAN CLEVE: If you can. If you can't, or if we
5 can send more, I'd consider it myself.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Anybody can apply to go. There's no
7 limitations. Every one of you can go. You may not be able to
8 all get scholarships.

9 GREG JOHNSON: The last one we went to, you went on
10 line, if you were a state regulator, RAB member, federal
11 regulator, or tribal, you went on, filled out this form, and
12 they confirmed it, sent it back to you.

13 We went and sat through this two-day class. At the
14 very end of it, what they do is they have a form, and they
15 send you a check for everything you spent. All they ask was
16 that you buy your plane tickets more than two weeks in advance
17 so it would save them.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: They use Army per diem.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: It's government.

20 GREG JOHNSON: 55 bucks a day here.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: Then sponsoring my thing.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know where they get the
23 money, if they have the resources to do it.

24 GREG JOHNSON: It's joint from Army, Navy, Air
25 Force, EPA, everybody chips into it.

1 KAREN KINGSTON: Can I keep making arrangements? Is
2 everybody fine?

3 JEROEN KOK: Do we need to vote on it?

4 VALERIE LANE: I don't think so.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: As long as I come back and bring
6 you all gifts?

7 BUD VAN CLEVE: I think the two of you should go.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: It's available to everybody.

9 IAN RAY: First come, first serve. Do it.

10 JEROEN KOK: So moved.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: So moved.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: Thank you.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Don.

14 DON WASTLER: I'm finding out that the minutes to
15 these meetings are sent to Atlanta, Georgia.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: What?

17 DON WASTLER: I was told that the minutes to these
18 meetings -- where do they go? Who reviews the minutes to
19 these meetings? What's so funny?

20 BUD VAN CLEVE: Who cares.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: They go to Fort Lewis, then to you.
22 They don't go to Atlanta.

23 DON WASTLER: Do they review them in DC?

24 ERIC WAEHLING: No.

25 DON WASTLER: They don't?

1 ERIC WAEHLING: No.

2 DON WASTLER: Another thing I wanted to bring up is,
3 there's a lot of people who don't have computers. A lot of
4 these people don't read the paper, but they still own
5 property, they live here, have a right to know what's going
6 on.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: They do.

8 VALERIE LANE: I guess they better get a computer or
9 read the paper.

10 DON WASTLER: I'm surprised people don't read the
11 paper.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: We'll continue to make all
13 reasonable efforts to reach out to people. I don't think it's
14 reasonable to necessarily go door-to-door and sit down with
15 individuals each time.

16 DON WASTLER: I asked the County Commissioners if
17 they contact these people by mail. They made some remark
18 about it's so much junk mail. Junk mail is in the eye of the
19 beholder. That's one way of contacting these people and at
20 least they'll know for sure what's going on.

21 Ever since this whole thing has been in the process,
22 I think there's a lot of people still in the dark. Probably
23 two years from Ian's neighborhood association meeting in 2000,
24 I think there's probably a lot of people that attended that
25 meeting that still are probably in the dark about what's going

1 on.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: That's why it's important that
3 everybody talks to their neighbors. Word-of-mouth is
4 tremendously powerful.

5 DON WASTLER: I only have so much communication with
6 them. I don't have a computer. I don't think you should have
7 to have a computer. A lot of these people, they work all day
8 long. A lot of people work shifts, they have responsibility
9 to pay their taxes. They may not have the time to keep up
10 with these things. I think they still have a right to be
11 informed.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: We'll try to continue with the
13 multi-pronged approach. We use the media outlets that are
14 available to us. Word-of-mouth is tremendously powerful. If
15 there are formal organizations like neighborhood committees
16 available, those would be used. I think it's really all that
17 we can do. I really do, Don. I don't know what else can be
18 done.

19 DON WASTLER: I just feel bad that this process has
20 gone for so far. This whole thing started in, what, 1995.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

22 DON WASTLER: Something like that. A lot of the
23 neighbors, the only people who are really informed are the
24 people who are interested to come and that have the time to
25 come. Actually, a lot of people like Bob Frohs, they have

1 businesses and responsibilities. Some people work shifts.
2 Some people have responsibilities. It's difficult for them to
3 keep up with what's going on, yet they still own property, pay
4 their taxes, live here. They have a right to know if there's
5 going to be any significant impact.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. We'll do what we can, Don,
7 continue to do what we can. That's all I can say really. I
8 appreciate and concur with your concern, that people need to
9 know what's going on.

10 DON WASTLER: I bring this up, because people I rode
11 the school bus with 40 years ago, they've been here for
12 generations paying property taxes. Some of the businesses
13 have been taken over from their grandparents.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: But you're telling them?

15 DON WASTLER: I'm trying to keep these people
16 informed. I can only do so much.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: They'll tell their neighbors and
18 word-of-mouth will hopefully --

19 DON WASTLER: When the notices came out in The
20 Columbian, The Columbian said, "This is what's there." They
21 didn't give any listings of what the contents were. They
22 said, "It's okay, the impact study said everything's okay."
23 They didn't say what was in that impact study or what was
24 proposed.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. But they did say the impact

1 study is available, correct?

2 DON WASTLER: They said it was available.

3 BRUCE OVERBAY: Yes, they did.

4 DON WASTLER: Like I said, these people are busy.

5 If they even go to Vancouver Mall, they don't know where the
6 library is.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: Don't you think he deserves credit
8 for his outreach?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Absolutely.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Maybe we can all try harder.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: You do deserve credit. What you're
12 doing is valiant, very much appreciated as far as your
13 community outreach, talking to your neighbors. We all need to
14 follow that example.

15 DON WASTLER: When I talk to my neighbors and ask
16 them what's with the Camp Bonneville issue, what's going on,
17 they say they saw something in the paper. They're not
18 informed really.

19 IAN RAY: Can you invite them to the meeting?

20 DON WASTLER: I mentioned we post that in the
21 newspaper, the neighborhood section.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: And we did.

23 DON WASTLER: I'm curious to know why something like
24 that wasn't done years ago.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: We didn't think of it. We're going

1 to continue to do it now.

2 DON WASTLER: It's almost like I feel now with this
3 early transfer in the works, it's too late. Unfortunately,
4 we're --

5 ERIC WAEHLING: No, it's not too late. Thank you,
6 Don.

7 DON WASTLER: Thank you for hearing me.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, it's 9:00, past 9:00, we
9 didn't talk about our open house. I know people are anxious
10 to get home, it's getting late. How do we want to proceed
11 from here? We've kicked around the idea of an open house. Do
12 people want to see that happen? Maybe it's too early to do
13 that, as Frank made his sentiment known.

14 KAREN KINGSTON: I second it.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: How does the group feel?

16 IAN RAY: What was the motion?

17 ERIC WAEHLING: There wasn't a motion. How do
18 people feel about this? Is the timing just not right to do it
19 yet? I'm getting a sense that there's not a whole lot of
20 enthusiasm.

21 MIKE NELSON: We heard last time from Jeroen that
22 the County is considering this, but they're putting it out
23 till the October/November time frame.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: The County is not ready yet either.

25 BRUCE OVERBAY: Last meeting we talked about

1 November, December.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm just touching base.

3 BRUCE OVERBAY: Let's touch base next month and see
4 what happens. I think we'll be better off with November.
5 Jeroen will know more.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Let's schedule our next meeting.
7 Traditionally the next meeting would be second Wednesday of
8 October. Unfortunately, I have a conflict. I will be in
9 Atlanta on Wednesday, the 9th, which is the second Wednesday.

10 JEROEN KOK: We can go with you.

11 BRUCE OVERBAY: Furnish tickets for us?

12 JEROEN KOK: Military transport.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Probably run a whole lot smoother
14 without me. I could try to find an alternate. If you want to
15 meet without me, you can certainly do that.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: We want to go on the military
17 transport.

18 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Go with you.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: No. It's commercial transport in
20 the cattle class.

21 GREG JOHNSON: Do we need to meet?

22 BRUCE OVERBAY: No.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Do we need to meet? If you want to
24 meet, I can try to see if we have somebody to represent the
25 Army in the process. We could meet in November. I won't be

1 able to be there on the 9th.

2 BRUCE OVERBAY: I say we go to November. We've
3 skipped October before the last couple years. Give Jeroen a
4 chance to get more information from the County.

5 GREG JOHNSON: The Agreed Order, probably won't be
6 anything on that anyway.

7 VALERIE LANE: It should be raining by then and
8 we'll know whether you got the wells in or not. By November,
9 it's flooding at my place.

10 GREG JOHNSON: If anything comes through on the
11 reconnaissance, I'll e-mail it to everybody if I have anything
12 on that.

13 JEROEN KOK: Is there any point in us doing RAB
14 housekeeping meeting, strategizing, discussions?

15 IAN RAY: That's a good point. Don brought up the
16 lack of communication with the neighborhood, with the County.
17 That's something that could take up an hour or two.

18 JEROEN KOK: Maybe we could go ahead and meet.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: We can have the fire house
20 available. We'll send out an agenda if you want us to.

21 ED MARSH: If you want to meet here, I can make sure
22 this place is open.

23 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Can we meet at Camp
24 Bonneville?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Here instead?

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: At Camp Bonneville.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: None of the buildings are open.

3 JEROEN KOK: Fire house is good.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to have it at the fire
5 house, if I'm not going to be here.

6 BUD VAN CLEVE: It's easier to get to.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Let's stay with the fire house. Do
8 you want to meet on the 9th of October?

9 JEROEN KOK: 7:00.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Ian, if you would work with Jennifer
11 to handle the agendas, confirm the meeting space.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: The County consultant?

13 JEROEN KOK: I don't know about the County
14 consultant.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: The mayor.

16 JEROEN KOK: But Brian Vincent, who is in Public
17 Works, who Pete Capell assigned to help coordinate the
18 County's feasibility study for early transfer was supposed to
19 be here tonight. He called me this morning, had a family
20 matter come up, couldn't make it. He does intend to come to
21 the next RAB meeting. I'll inform him when the next RAB
22 meeting is and invite him.

23 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Can he brief us on any
24 updates or anything on early transfer?

25 JEROEN KOK: I'll ask him to do that.

1 GREG JOHNSON: Do you want an Ecology presence in
2 that meeting? It's up to you. We'll be more than happy to
3 you.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: Are you sick of us?

5 GREG JOHNSON: No, I like all of you.

6 IAN RAY: Where do you live?

7 GREG JOHNSON: I live in Shelton, but it doesn't
8 matter. I can come down.

9 IAN RAY: I'd say you're welcome.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: We'll probably come up with
11 something. When is the meeting?

12 ERIC WAEHLING: October 9th.

13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Fire station.

14 JEROEN KOK: Fire station.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: And the open house? No?

16 ERIC WAEHLING: To be determined.

17 BUD VAN CLEVE: To be determined.

18 JEROEN KOK: We can talk about that next time.

19 (Meeting adjourned.)

20

21

22

23

24

25